

**The State of Florida**

**Moderator: Julie Orange**  
**February 6, 2012**  
**8:30 a.m. ET**

Operator: Good morning, my name is (Jennifer) and I will be your conference operator today. At this time I would like to welcome everyone to the Teacher and Leader Preparation Implementation conference call. All lines have been placed on mute to prevent any background noise, after the speakers' remarks there will be a question-and-answer session. If you would like to ask a question during this time, simply press star and the number one on your telephone keypad. If you would like to withdraw your question press the pound key. Thank you, I will now turn the conference over to Julie Orange with (inaudible).

Julie Orange: I think we're getting quite a feedback on our end – anybody – if someone that's on a cell phone could you maybe mute it? That seems better.

OK, this is Julie, we're going to go ahead and get started with our continuation of our meeting from February 1st. Thanks to everyone for fitting this in your schedule and I know several of you have emailed me indicating that you're not going to be able to stay on for the entire call this morning, so we will do our best to expedite the process. But remember to make sure that you ask questions as they come up, so that everybody's clear on the information that's presented before decisions are made.

And I do have a list of folks that I knew were on the call, so I'm going to read those off, and if I did not call your name I'd like you to speak up when I'm finished.

I have (Vivian), (Anna), (Mark), (Adriana), (Debbie), (Meagan), (Gloria), (Lance) and (Jasmine). Any others on the line?

Female: Hi Julie (inaudible).

Julie Orange: Try that again, I'm sorry.

(Susan McKachen): (Susan McKachen).

Julie Orange: OK great, (Susan) thank you.

Valerie Storey: This is Valerie Storey.

Julie Orange: OK great, thank you, Valerie.

Kathy James: Kathy James is also here.

Julie Orange: OK great, anyone else?

OK, here in the room, we have pretty much the same group that was gathered last time, we have Rebecca Harris, Eileen McDaniel, Juan Copa, myself and also (Kimberly Pippen) and I'm going to turn it back over to Juan we're going to pickup, we were on slide 11 from our PowerPoint on the sample size, so Juan is going to pickup with the conversation where we left off.

Juan Copa: Good morning. We're on page three of the table handout which is also embedded in the PowerPoint, where we left off last week was on the sample size and the recollection was to stick with the 10 sample size and to waive on making any determinations about any minimum threshold for percentage.

AIR had noted – A-I-R had noted a – that it may be reasonable also to consider a percentage to determine the representative nature of the data in making a decision on whether to use the data or not. And the committee itself at this time to leave that open but revisit it once we look at some simulations.

OK, next point is the completer cohorts to include and this is similar to discussions you had in the data points for – that Rebecca went over. But just to recap where the committee had landed in January, the desire of the committee was to include data for completers that were employed either the first year following completion or the second year following. And AIR has

provided a recommendation on that which can be found on page five of the table.

Last group of recommendation says that AIR recommends that only completers one year out should be included in the approval and accountability system to prevent the introduction of experience and other time related variables. So AIR is recommending that we limit it to just one year out, but the committee had in January reached a consensus on one year or either immediate employment after completion or the second year after completion.

So with that I'd like to turn it over to discussion of the committee whether you would like to reconsider your recommendation in light of the AIR recommendation or would like to stick with the original recommendation?

(Anna): Juan, this is (Anna). Just for clarification, are we saying the first year, immediately after completion? I understand that but the second year, are we saying the second year of that same completer or somebody who gets hired after one year of being out?

Juan Copa: My recollection from the committee discussion was it was the latter basically the person who may complete in 09-10 for example does not show up in 10-11 but then gets employed in 11-12.

(Anna): OK, thanks.

(Gloria): Juan, this is (Gloria). I think after reading the AIR's recommendation, it would make the data set cleaner if we stay with one year.

Juan Copa: OK, any further committee discussion, I don't know –.

(Gloria): Is (Lance) on the line?

Julie Orange: (Lance) is on the line, (Lance) are you there?

(Lance): Yes, I'm here.

(Gloria): This (Lance)?

(Lance): Yes I'm actually fine with just the first year, I think the second year is going to create some complications, for those who were employed both years and I thought we had talked about both honestly, people that show up for the first time in year two, people that are there for both years, but I thought we had gone the other way that we said if there – they have to have been there for two consecutive years for us to use year two.

(Gloria): Yes, I thought too.

Female: Yes, that's correct, that's what I recollect.

(Lance): And because –

Female: Yes, this is (inaudible) I know that's what we've said because we have talked about the fact that you know teachers really don't feel like they're working off experience until at least year three, so that's why we were going to consider years one and two.

(Gloria): Right, so can I make a motion that we consider one year only?

Julie Orange: Is there a second?

(Lance): I'll second that, this is (Lance).

Julie Orange: OK, is there any discussion?

(Megan): This is (Megan), I still think year two data would be valuable but I mean if there's – if I'm the only one who thinks that then I'm fine with year one but I do think that year two even though you might be operating off of a little bit of experience, you're still relying mostly on your training.

(Kathy): This is (Kathy). I'm just concerned that when we start looking at the teachers' induction presence in the counties that we're going to have (inaudible) throw in a lot of concerning factors and so if we go two years out it's going to get the data a little bit more messy and less stable for us to be able to use it.

(Gloria): I agree.

(Debbie): This is (Debbie). What I'm wondering is, I agree with that part but what I'm wondering is and I don't know what the percentage of people who graduate from a program and then don't get a job until the second year following program completion. I'm wondering if we'll miss a group of people that we could potentially get data from if we only look at anybody who gets the job that first year out, that's my wondering.

(Lance): Yes, this is (Lance) again. There will be probably a small portion of folks who would first show up in year two for whom we would not get data if we use only year one but my concern is that you know we've got to think about the confidence interval that is going to be established and I'm a little concerned about how using mixed data sets, you know year one for some people in year one –

(Debbie): Yes, yes.

(Lance): The first year for some people in year two and even possibly as we originally thinking about two years worth of data. I'm not even sure how that all would factor into – how we could determine an appropriate confidence interval, how would that affect the statistical analysis of the data. I think there's some real complications there that may be far most costly than the value added of –

(Debbie): Yes, and that I mean like I said that this isn't something I feel strongly about one way or the other it was just a wondering when we were having the conversation, so I'm good with a year.

Julie Orange: All right, if there's no further discussion let's move to a vote then, are there any nays?

I'm hearing none, the motion passes.

Juan Copa: OK now we'll move on to – or we're back on page three under the metric options. The data is basically would be the average value added scores of completers from a particular institution district.

The question then become do we just – and this was also a tend to – or similar to the discussion you had with Rebecca on February 1st, but it's a question of

do we want to rely on just one year data, do we want to rely on the series of years of data?

And AIR of course has a recommendation to – which can be found on page five to combine data across years of (pause) because of course when you combine data over a three-year period at least, you improve the precision of the data, the information and you know we have more much more stable measures if we look at data overtime. So just to have on the record, the question is do we want to rely on one year snapshots or do we want to aggregate across years?

(Debbie): This is (Debbie), and my feeling about it is if we've already set a standard or a precedent by a decision that we've made earlier, to the degree that it would make sense to align that – those decisions throughout the presses that would make sense.

(Anna): I agree with (Debbie).

(Gloria): I agree with (Debbie) as well, this is (Gloria).

Juan Copa: In the interest of expediting the call is if – do we want to make a formal motion to just maintain the consistency, three years of data?

(Debbie): I say move, this is (Debbie).

(Anna): I second, (Anna).

Julie Orange: Any discussions? Hearing none, are there any nays? Hearing none, motion passes.

Juan Copa: So the next point is a more technical concern, it has to do with the use of standard errors and confidence levels in the use of the VAM data as you recall back to our favorite slide the caterpillar chart, those vertical lines which represented each institution or district, they represented the confidence interval of – that you have with the data.

So for example you know back to our patented example of a presidential popularity poll, a poll is taken, and it's typically a plus or minus margin of

error, so for example if the popularity is 45 percent plus or minus 5 percent, what that's saying is if you sample the different group of people, you would likely get a results within 40 percent and 50 percent, so it's that range of confidence, the range of scores that you would expect given a different sample.

So AIR does recommend using standard errors or taking standard errors into account when making determinations about program approval or accountability in using VAM data. So the first question on the table I guess is, do we want to move forward with using standard errors whenever we use the value added data?

I would note if you recall back to the presentation from (George Knoll) from Louisiana, they actually did not use standard errors, but typical practice with the use of this data again to rely on improving the precision of the data, typically the technical folks would recommend the use of standard errors at least in part when using this data. So I guess the first question is do we want to use standard errors or not and using VAM data?

(Valerie): This is (Valerie) I didn't see the (Knoll)'s presentation but what rationale did he gave for not using standard error?

Juan Copa: I think – again the challenge with using standard error and again we're going very – following very closely – very highly on the precision argument is that you could end up to a point where you have data that's very indistinguishable when looking at institutions and that ends up – in a sense becomes – is not actionable.

So there is that trade off, do you want to have data at least give you some information in consort with other factors. So remember this is not the sole determinant that would lead towards program improvement, identifying potential areas that you could focus on. Do you want to err on that side or do you want to be as precise as possible knowing that if you take precision to an extreme, you may end up with data that becomes very indistinguishable as of no use or is not actionable at all.

So it's that trade off, they we're finding that the data gave them some indication of changes that needed to be made in institutions and then they did see some positive experiences when those changes were addressed.

(Lance): And this is (Lance). Given the nature of the data that we're working with and the kind of decisions we're talking about I think we need to take a very conservative approach here which for me suggest that we do use standard error and a fairly strong level of confidence so I'm going to make a move that we do include standard error.

(Gloria): I second it, this is (Gloria).

Julie Orange: Is there any discussion? Hearing none, are there any nays?

Motion passes.

(Gloria): I'd like to make a comment when we talk about the actual review process, I think we need to have language explaining the importance of all our fragility when it comes to the standard error and confidence level so that we don't, oh my God – penalize institutions based on that VAM score.

Julie Orange: OK, we noted that, thank you.

(Gloria): Thank you.

Juan Copa: Now on this – moving on the second column of page four and I'm not sure we need the committee to reach a final recommendation of this at this point and I think (Lance) did allude to this in his motion about being conservative in terms of the high level of confidence.

But AIR does have a recommendation on what level of confidence to use in establishing the confidence interval using the standard error and AIR does recommend the Florida use at least the 68 percent confidence level which is one standard error.

And preferably a 90 percent confidence level which is about one-and-a-half standard errors in comparing districts. Again I'm not sure the committed needs to reach a decision at this point on such a technical recommendation but



I would note that in your thinking as we go through in future meetings any data runs, just to note that AIR again does recommend a standard error be used and does recommend that at least a 68 percent confidence interval is used.

So, now with that we can move on to the bottom of page four again column – I say column one it’s the only column with words in it, even though it’s really column two. But column one which talks about one committee – one decision the committee made back in January in terms of what standard to use to evaluate programs when comparing programs or institutions/districts.

Remember from that caterpillar slide again it’s that horizontal line, the standard by which you would judge the programs against. And we have presented a lot of data at the meeting about whether it was just at performance of average teachers, the average performance of completers and then we had different looks in terms of experienced teachers, the teachers with advance degrees.

And where the committee had landed was to use a standard of effective teachers, effective being – that goal being that we would expect our programs to produce teachers that are effective out of the gate.

So the challenge though in doing any sort of simulation at this point is that the state has not defined what effective means at this point for use of – in teacher evaluations. The plan is to make that determination, to have a policy decision placed before the state board of education by this summer for use next school year in effective – so in defining effective.

So the question then becomes prior to the establishment of the state wide definition for effective, does the committee want to consider alternatives to explore until such standard is set.

(Debbie): This is (Debbie), Juan. One of the things that I may be incorrect about, I don’t know but I’ve been doing a lot of work with the teacher evaluation group and I know that districts have to determine what effective is in term of how they’re doing evaluation of their teachers.

And the state has to approve those and I know that they're – we're influx and we're doing some things that perhaps where the pilot purpose – because those all get state approved and even though they may vary from district to district, the district still sets its effective standard and if that's the place these people are going to be employed then effective is going – and the districts are going to have to be in line with what the state does.

It would seem that perhaps for pilot purposes we could just accept an effective assessment based on what the district has determined recognizing that the district effectiveness scale has to be district – state approved. Does that make sense?

Juan Copa: (Inaudible).

(Gloria): Makes sense but I do have a question. How align are the district effective data?

(Debbie): We're going to have to be very align because the state has to approve the models and I mean until such time as the state sets a standard, what they're using right now is what the districts are submitting. So if we want our pilot to replicate what's real for our teachers that's being determined at a district level right now anyway.

(Gloria): I understand. However based on past history what the state has allowed districts to do has an immense amount of variants, so –

(Debbie): Well it sounds to me like that's not going to be the case begin August of 2012.

(Gloria): Right.

Juan Copa: (Debbie) you're correct, in terms of – we would expect more standardization, beginning with the next school year, the 12-13 school year.

(Debbie): Right.

Juan Copa: The first year we will have variation across the 67 districts and also keep in mind that that variation, even when a state wide standard is set there will still be inherent variability from district to district because there are other

measures of performance that may be included plus the overall evaluation which includes the instructional practice which the state will not have – doesn't have the authority to set a standard for.

(Debbie): Right and that –

Juan Copa: So there will be variation even after 12-13.

(Debbie): Right and I mean that replicates life and I'm sure that happens in colleges and universities as well, even you know faculty members. The faculty members just like schools to schools so I don't know we'll ever get to a point where in the work that we do we can really standardize standardization, I don't know, but it would seem to me that if we have these teachers working in districts that coming from different schools that we would just let effective be as defined by the district until such time as we have something more standard, of course that's just a thought.

(Gloria): Let me ask you this, are there core variables or values other than the VAM that all districts must use?

(Debbie): Whatever they're divined – yes what they're using for teacher evaluation right now is to dependent on what their instructional framework is and the target setter set by the district in order for teachers to be identified as needing improvement and satisfactory effective or highly effective and so the districts are setting those things right now and the state is reviewing their recommendations and approving them.

(Gloria): Now that's why I understood but I thought there were certain characteristics or values that were required of each district.

(Debbie): Depending on their instructional framework and the FEAPS, the FEAPS.

Juan Copa: And the frameworks must be aligned to the FEAPS forward to get accomplish practice.

(Debbie): Right.

- (Gloria): How is the common core going to play, what kind of role is common core going to play on this?
- Juan Copa: In terms of the assessment use?
- (Gloria): Yes in terms of the curricular framework.
- Juan Copa: I don't know if I could speak to that yet, the common core of course will be – those assessments should be in place I believe by the 14-15 school year which if all goes according to plan that would replace the statewide assessment programs –
- (Gloria): Correct.
- Juan Copa: Be it replaced by the park assessment, [coming for] assessment, so at that time I think is the same logic would hold in that performance, the valuation to take 50 percent upon student performance and 50 percent based on instructional practice and it's just a question of the assessments being replaced by different (inaudible) assessments.
- (Gloria): Yes, but –
- (Debbie): Yes (Gloria) this is (Debbie) and this is how I think that that gets answered. Part of the evaluation process for teachers requires that they're aligning their curriculum with standards base – that they're using standard based instruction as a part of their curriculum, so that's going to get captured in the evaluation on the indicators that are put in place as a result of the instructional framework.
- So the common core are the standards around which the teachers are designing their instruction and so that's how it's going to get played in there, it's going to be one of the indicators on this evaluation which roll up into an overall rating of effective – highly effective needs improvement or unsatisfactory.
- (Gloria): Thank you that made sense.
- (Debbie): OK.

(Kathy James): This (Kathy) I'm so confused because I'm hearing a lot of conversation about the part of the observations that is – or the observations as opposed to, to-do test scores and I thought that the VAM preferences were to student test scores which means we've – in this county we've only got F-CAT so we could get similar assessment.

(Lance): Yes, this is (Lance), I think what we're trying to determine here is whether we want to use – as a benchmark whether we want to us just average VAM score for all teachers or the average VAM score for those teachers that have been evaluated as effective.

And a conversation we had earlier about his was really it doesn't really make a significant difference at this point which benchmark we use because everybody will be evaluated against the same benchmark it was what political statement do we want to make about expectations in the preparation of new teacher, do we want to set the bar high, set expectations high with what we initially have thought we wanted to do.

But it – since it's going to be problematic for a while to identify or potentially problematic to identify though an average VAM score for all of those effective teachers then maybe in the interim we could just use average VAM score with the hope that we can transition in to using that higher benchmark when the teacher valuation data are stable enough that we can easily compile that higher benchmark.

Juan Copa: (Lance), you did a great job articulating the point.

(Mark House): This is (Mark), can you all hear me?

Julie Orange: Yes.

Female: Yes.

(Mark House): OK yes I've been muted for a while by the operator but this is my question, this is kind of an operations question. If we were to go with this, you know this as (Lance) would just recommended in the interim, what is the process,

business process that would ensure that we would switch this metric once those data are available?

Juan Copa: This is Juan I think a formal recommendation of the committee would be that as strong a statement is possible again, the point we're trying to get across here I guess is that we recognize the desired decision the committee is to move to this effective benchmark yet the challenges we don't have that data in place right now to run any simulated data on which to further inform decisions.

So it's a question of whether we have some interim during the pilot phase knowing that we've the desire to transition to something else when this is operational.

(Mark House): Good, thanks.

(Gloria): Could we turn that to into a motion, exactly as you said it?

(Kathy James): This is (Kathy), let me ask you to think about something else too. When we start looking VAM scores for what we classify as effective teachers, I'm thinking we probably ought to confine it only to the ones that are teaching FCAT subjects because every teacher will have advance score but every advance score is not necessarily reflection of what they teach.

And so if we're going to evaluate our new teachers we need to be comparing the apples to the apples and so you know the 4th grade teachers need to be – we need to be looking at 4th grade teacher. Reading scores not the media special (inaudible).

(Gloria): But wait a minute are we also using (kind) of 4th assessment?

Juan Copa: (Gloria) yes when those become – when those come on line but again based on the current state of –

(Gloria): For like (date) – if using those –

Juan Copa: I think the reality as we have – we are limited to the FCAT VAM data and (Kathy) that's an excellent point, I think earlier recommendations that you

reach last week would help address that and focusing only on in field, in program teachers.

(Kathy James): Exactly.

Juan Copa: So that they are teaching the Math, Reading subjects and were trained in those areas.

(Gloria): OK time out, those in higher ED were being held accountable for program feedback for improvement, not only to FCAT, we're being held accountable for end of course assessment.

(Kathy James): This is (Kathy) we don't have end of course assessment in most counties for most subjects yet, we're still in development –

(Gloria): We do have them in Miami-Dade County and I know that one of the – those in the room that has EPI's, I mean can you speak to that?

Female: No we don't have them across the board in Miami-Dade County.

Juan Copa: Correct, yes actually Miami-Dade County's evaluation system this first year, the one that they submitted to the state they're relying upon FCAT.

Female: And FCAT alone.

Juan Copa: Correct.

Female: (Anna)?

Juan Copa: And again the important point to make here is that this entire system again based on what race the top and the bill that passed last session, 736. Envision having assessments in place to cover all – variety of teachers by the 2014-15 school year, so again FCAT is a limitation right now and that's why we're limited to that data, was pretty much the discussion early on about being cautious with this data because it is based on such a small sample of teachers.

(Gloria): Correct.

Juan Copa: And, but recognizing the fact that as this build out we will have measures in place for the other assessments, starting with the end of course in Algebra and then moving forward to the other state what end of course and also other standardized test that are used throughout this state plus the areas covered – that are not covered by statewide assessment.

All that is an evolving process but right now, to given this current state of affairs, the limitation that we have right now during this pilot phase is to look at the days that we have currently which is the FCAT day.

(Gloria): I think that we should use average VAM scores and at the time because I don't think we could do anything else.

(Adriana): This is (Adriana). Do we have to make a decision about this right now? Is it possible to table this until you know the districts complete more end of course assessments and we have more information, or do we have to move on this today?

Juan Copa: Well, I guess it's two part question, in terms of making a decision on a threshold that may not necessarily happen – need to happen today, however we cannot wait until 2014-15 for example when all the tests should be in place to move forward, we have to move forward starting with what we have and then build out from there.

(Adriana): OK.

Female: So given –

(Adriana): Juan.

Female: Go Ahead.

Female: Can we write this in such a way that as we develop more VAM scores from more of the end of course exams we can just add them to our list?

Juan Copa: No absolutely and that's an expectation.

Julia Orange: So given that would anybody like to go for a motion?



- (Lance): Yes this is (Lance), I'll make a motion. Keeping in mind that we've already said that we're only going to use data for in-program, in-field and that population will grow as new test become available so it's kind a self polices, so I'm going to make a motion that we use average VAM scores an interim benchmark until such time as we have reliable data for effective – VAM scores for effective teachers at which time we will change the benchmark to affect the benchmark for effective teachers.
- (Mark House): I would second that motion.
- Julia Orange: Any discussion?
- (Gloria): Wonderful.
- Female: I'd like to clarify, we're going to compare our novice teachers to experience teachers who are also in field, is that correct?
- (Lance): When we get to that point that would be our goal. And again remember this is just to set a high expectation for teacher preparation. It doesn't really hurt anybody here, it's just for – again, we're just setting a benchmark against which we're going to look at how programs are performing.
- This is not going to be looked at for individual teachers, this is a program evaluation standard that we are talking about here, so it's just a question of setting the expectations high, so the variance is going to be same – essentially the same, the impact on all programs should be the same, no matter what benchmark were used.
- (Gloria): Correct.
- Julie Orange: Any other discussion?
- (Debbie): No this is (Debbie) I just want to apologize for taking this on the teacher evaluation broad walk. I think it must be the fever going to my head but I realize now we're talking about scores, I'm so sorry.
- Julie Orange: That's OK.

Female: (Inaudible).

Julie Orange: Right, any nays? I'm hearing none, motion passes.

Juan Copa: Great, now we're moving on to the next main block which has to do with the student performance by subgroups. The committee did indicate a desire to include student performance by subgroup as an enhancement to the accountability system.

AIR does note certain areas for considerations, they are noted in the second column. Questions about for example which subgroups do be used, which we did discuss back in January to include all but AIR does restate a question about the determination of which subgroups to use.

They do cite different procedures, the need to be considered for cases where institutions or districts may not have – may have completers who did not serve particular subgroups or small numbers of particular subgroups and a question about on what basis would recognition be awarded to programs or institutions through the use of subgroup data.

So I guess the question on the table here is a reiterate – just to confirm the desire of the committee to include subgroup performance in the evaluation program as an enhancement again that can be considered as “a bonus type system.”

So it's a question of whether we want to reconfirm that decision and then if so, leave it to discussion if you want to address these specific concerns about what to do with situations where you have small numbers or if you have programs that don't produce – that produce completers that don't serve.

These population really questions kind of the business rule type questions on how you would take all that subgroup data and then make determinations across programs in a fair and equitable manner knowing that the variation among the populations that completers may serve.

So I guess the first question is easy, do we want to reconfirm the desire to include subgroup performances enhancement?

(Mark House): Juan this is (Mark House) again and I have a question, reflecting back on the conversation and my memory could be hazy, but I thought we talked about – I know I mentioned not only using the subgroup data as an enhancement and again this may be something that we discussed later in terms of how to do this, but I think it's important that all programs demonstrate that they are looking at these data as subgroup performance and using those to inform their programs.

And then we talked about that's just at the acceptable level that your using – that you are actually monitoring such data and using those to improve your programs and then the high performing level was being showing positive results in improving the performance of these subgroups. Now maybe I'm characterizing that incorrectly but I thought that's what we discussed?

Juan Copa: Let me take a shot at –

(Gloria): But could only be for bonus, correct?

Juan Copa: (Mark) let me take a shot at what I thought I heard you say. In terms of, it was really – maybe we were thinking of this incorrectly, it's more of a statement of having this data available to districts so the districts (inaudible) – sorry not district, districts, institutions have this data on hand to look at this data, see if they need to address certain areas. But whether or not it's part of an accountability system that's a separate question.

So it's really just a desire on – to make this data readily available to the districts institutions look at this data but whether or not it's part of the accountability system is a different issue, is that that?

(Mark House): Not – that's not quite what I'm trying to say. And you take for example right now, let's talk about current state of affairs, we have re-hire (bill) to data, employee (bill) to data or employment satisfaction data.

We're not judged on whether not we have improvement in employer satisfaction year-over-year, we just have to demonstrate that we are using

those data to inform our program and so as a demonstration of actually acknowledging those data and using them to make our programs better as appropriate to whatever information the data provides for us.

And so I'm translating that to the same thing that we're taking subgroup performance data and we're using that to inform our programs, modify instructions, programs and services et cetera. That's at the acceptable level. What I'm getting at here is I think that when we look at the diversity in our state and when we look at the primary focus, a race to the top, and your legislation for closing the achievement gap that we should expect, all teacher preparation programs to look at these data and then use those data to inform their program.

And then if we want to give bonus on top of that for actually showing some positive movement year after year on that that would make sense to me.

(Lance): This is (Lance), I've got to weigh in with (Mark) on this. I think the nature of our conversation was that these could be very valuable data for programs to use to help inform decisions about initiatives that would assist them in preparing teachers able to help close the achievement gap in the state.

We did talk about the potential for – if the data is particularly positive for institution that that may be an indicator that might get that particular institution to that 4th level, that new level that we're going to create, whatever we're going to call that, program of distinction is one term that's been used.

This might be one indicator, we did also talk about that this would necessarily be something that would penalize anybody but the fundamental use I think is going be internal to the programs for continuous quality improvements. So I think this is a metric that we really want to have and I think we've got time to determine how the metric will be appropriately applied within the standards but we really need the data I believe.

Julie Orange: Would anyone care to make a motion?

(Adriana): I'd like – this (Adriana), I'd like to make a motion that institutions be provided with student performance data by subgroups and that a consideration be made as that data being potential for recognition or bonus of institutions.

(Anna): And not be used to penalize?

(Adriana): I'm sorry, not be used to penalize, no.

Julie Orange: Is there a second?

Female: I'll second (Anna).

Julie Orange: Any discussions?

(Lance): Well the only question I have, I agree absolutely with the philosophy but I'm wondering if we need the second piece as part of the motion here or we just making a determination whether or not we're going to use these metric and then in some future time, we'll determine appropriate uses for the metrics, so.

(Mark House): Right, (Lance) and I'm with (Lance) because the way the motion was stated it limits – I think it kinds limits the use of – it limits the ability to hold programs accountable for at least using those data in some way.

(Adriana): OK then I'll re-track the second part of that motion and just state the motion as that institutions be provided with student performance data by subgroups.

Rebecca Harris: And this is Rebecca. (Mark), right now the data elements we're considering are for the accountability system and it sounds like you're talking about process.

(Anna): Right.

Rebecca Harris: Be part of the standards discussion that we'll get to once we have the accountability system set.

Julie Orange: So there's an amended motion on the floor, is there a second?

(Lance): Is the amended motion just to include this metric in the (system)?

Rebecca Harris: Yes.

Julie Orange: Yes.

(Lance): OK I'll second, this is (Lance).

Julie Orange: Any discussion? Hearing none, are there any nays?

Female: Nay.

Julie Orange: OK hearing, I think one, the motion passes.

Juan Copa: And just so we're clear here as well, I think the desire is to again include this information but the how, how to include it is a future discussion, then accurate?

Rebecca Harris: Yes.

Julie Orange: Yes.

Juan Copa: OK, all right moving on to the last piece and this one should be fairly quick because it's really also just a confirmation on our part to make sure that we have captured what the committee desires, recognizing that it's probably more characterizes the future measure given the current state of our data because we do not have this data available as of yet.

Is the committee did express a desire to include the new teacher evaluation results for all completers, the evaluation program effectiveness, so again all teachers will be evaluated this teachers and also non instructional class from personnel too on the evaluation system as laid out (Senatal) 736, where each teacher will receive a overall rating of highly effective, effective, needs improvement/developing or unsatisfactory.

So there was a desire from the committee to use this data as part of the evaluation, the accountability system and also with important caveats in mind namely that the performance would be measured in the context of the districts that the completers are teaching in, recognizing the variation from district to district.

And it was also a desire to focus on specific elements of the evaluation system, not simply the student performance piece but pieces of the instructional practice or observation piece as well.

So again our complication here is that we will not have data on the new rating system until the fall of 2012, districts are first required to report this to the state, beginning in the late summer of 2012 reflective of the 11-12 school year.

And we also know we have limitations for – in terms of the deep dives that the committee showed the desire for especially on instructional practice piece pulling out specific elements so would not have that date in placed as of yet.

So I think what we're looking for here is just a confirmation from the committee to state this as a preference to include this data when available and then to really just further note that when this data become available questions will be reached on how it is used in consort with the VAM data or in lieu of the VA data of other areas that we'll made to table.

So I guess I've talked a lot here for a whole bunch of nothing but we want just a confirmation for the committee that the desire is still is there to incorporate this data once it is available.

(Debbie): Juan this is (Debbie) that's what I did earlier but you all can just cut what I said earlier and paste it in here, this is really where it belongs, so I would concur that, I think it's important that we include this information.

(Gloria): Agree with (Debbie), this is (Gloria).

Julie Orange: Is there a motion on the floor to clarify?

(Debbie): Yes I would make a motion, this is (Debbie) that we include the teacher evaluation system information as we specified in the conversation or I mean do you want me to like to say some?

Julie Orange: Yes, would you spell it out for me?

(Debbie): OK, will somebody more coherent than I am then probably wants to make a motion and I'll just second it, how's that sound?

Julie Orange: That sounds good, is there any takers.

(Gloria): Yes, that we – the motion would be that we will include the new teacher evaluation results for all completers in the evaluation of program effectiveness.

Julie Orange: OK, is there a second.

(Debbie): Yes, this is (Debbie).

Julie Orange: OK, any discussion? We're hearing none. Are there any nays? We're hearing none, the motion passes.

Juan Copa: Why thank you, that concludes our section. I just like to thank the committee for help working through this over not just the last couple of phone calls but the last couple of meetings as well, it's not the easiest topic to discuss but we – I think we've come a long way since November, thank you.

Female: Thank you Juan.

Julie Orange: Thank you.

Female: (Julie)?

Juan Copa: And just want – I know I just signed off, just want one more plug. And (Lance) is aware of this because he serves on that committee as well, we will be having the next meeting of our student growth implementation committee tomorrow and Wednesday at UCS, thanks to (Lance) for hosting us.

And we will be discussing the development of additional models pass the FCAT model namely with the Algebra one end of course and also begin the discussion of identifying other assessments to explore plus the alternate assessment for our students with disability.



So we have two days of the discussions plan there with our technical partners AIR and that – those committee meetings are also available via the web in our – so anyone interested I advise you to take a look, thanks.

Female: Thank you Juan.

Julie Orange: OK moving on just quickly, I know many of you need to go, just wanted to make sure that we're clear on what our next steps are. The PowerPoint that you have from earlier in the week, you'll notice obviously the homework in here, we had a due date of today.

Let me explain what that homework is so everyone's clear, we're going to email you a link to a survey, it's very quick, it should only take you a couple of minutes to do, it's going to have each one of these data elements that you've agreed to include, the placement rate retention, employer satisfaction, value added model and teacher evaluation system data.

It will not include the areas that you opted to include for the bonus, what you're going to do is you're going to take the one – the primary elements that you want to include and you're going assign a weight to each of those, adding up to 100.

We're going to have you do those individually and then we're going to compile those result and that's going to be used in preparation for our March 8 webinar and we'll be able to come back to you with some data and some weighting options for you to consider some various weighting options so that you can help make some decisions moving forward.

Now since it is a very brief survey, we would ask that you would do that within the next two days and have that finalized by Wednesday so that we can move forward with our planning internally and again it's going to be a quick easy survey where you just assign a percentage to each one of those. Does anybody have any questions about that process?

So we can also add a comment field, if you have any specific comments that you want to make on any of those so that you can – we can capture that information.

Juan Copa: And this is Juan I just want to note one thing about – that the comment field may come in handy because as Julie noted the survey will have the areas that we've identified including the last one that we talked about which is data that we do not currently have available.

So in coming up with the options for weighting, you might want to take that into consideration for example you may set a certain weight for just the value added data right now and then maybe perhaps in your comment field identify that once we have evaluation data we would think that – then become this percentage and the value added data should be reduced to this or something.

Because again you won't be – we won't be able to model any data on the evaluation results right now so the waiting of that particular element maybe a future determination that probably will be better served in the comment field.

Julie Orange: OK, any questions on that process?

Female: Nope.

Julie Orange: You'll notice on our last slide it just captures what our intent is for the March 8 and again that will be presented back to you and then we will begin discussions on the cut point, the different performance categories and then the specifics on what to do with those areas for enhancement or bonus point.

And currently that is our last webinar that's scheduled prior to our May meeting, we'll need to address whether or not we need to add any in April once we get through the March 8 and find out where we are. But we do have a location confirmed for our May 9th and 10th at the University of Miami, so thank you (Gloria) for confirming that. Did you want to speak to that location a bit?

(Gloria): Well we have reserved a room at the university (common) and there will be parking available and I'm communicating with Julie to make some recommendations for hotels and hopefully maybe one night we can all go for some Cuban food.

(Debbie): What a good over (sight) (Gloria).

(Gloria): I was planning on taking everybody.

(Debbie): Good, Julie I have a question about the link, this is (Debbie) I've just cut and pasted into my browser and I'm getting an error message, are you sure that the  
—

Julie Orange: Put in an email with the actual survey ID —

(Debbie): OK.

Julie Orange: Let's you in to the exact survey.

(Debbie): OK because I just tried to do it and I couldn't get in there.

Julie Orange: We'll send you that later today.

(Debbie): OK, thank you.

(Jasmine): And this is (Jasmine) before we sign off I would just encourage everyone to keep using and even utilize more of the hope street site, I think it could be a valuable forum to continue discussions in between meetings.

Julie Orange: Absolutely, thank you. We appreciate everybody's time and if nobody else has any further discussions we'll go ahead and adjourn, thank you.

(Jasmine): Thank you Julie.

(Lance): Bye everyone.

Female: Bye-bye everybody.

(Debbie): Bye.

(Lance): Bye.

(Gloria): Bye-bye.

END