

**THE STATE OF FLORIDA**

**Moderator: Julie Orange**  
**February 1, 2012**  
**4:00 p.m. ET**

(Rebecca): So does anyone have any questions about the placement rate data and the metric options or decisions that you need to make before I let (inaudible) (Jasmin) kind of walk you through the decision process?

Vivian Posey: (Rebecca), this is Vivian Posey.

(Rebecca): Yes, ma'am.

Vivian Posey: I have a quick question. Are we talking about Initial Teacher Preparation programs only or is – are the completers going to be from EPI programs also?

(Rebecca): Right now, we're talking about all three programs types. And, of course, further down the road, when you see the data as based on the metric that you use specifically and how you decide to kind of create that metric.

If the data shows that maybe different performance levels need to be set for a different program types, that would be acceptable. So if you're making a decision about whether this should be included, you're not making a final decision that's saying you're including it for all programs exactly the same. Does that answer your question?

Vivian Posey: Yes, thank you.

(Rebecca): You're welcome.

(Adriana): Julie, this is (Adriana). I have a question about the cohort group. Can you tell me more about that? Are we talking about cohorts of various programs or a cohort of completers from any program at the institution?

Julie Orange: Well, when we talk about cohorts of completers, it's everyone who completes a program in a particular academic year.

As to whether it's – whether it's the cohort of completers we're looking at – we're attributing to the institution as a whole or to a specific program is one of the decisions that second question on – in the decision point question column that you – the committee needs to decide upon.

(Adriana): OK. OK, thank you.

(Rebecca): You're welcome.

(Megan): This is (Megan). I had a question about metric option number 2, that if we follow those completers who are not employed until their second year out of the program, would that in any way affect our ability to do what we're talking about with using their advance course for their first and second year out of the program, how would those two things compare?

(Rebecca): The decision that you make for this metric point does not need to affect or doesn't affect you in any box for decisions that you'll make about the use of (VAM) data.

(Megan): OK, thank you.

(Rebecca): You're welcome.

Julie Orange: Any other questions? If not, I'll let...

(Megan): OK, I had one more, sorry, this is (Megan), OK.

When you say how many cohorts of completers should be included, is there a statistical – a major statistical improvement of accuracy between following like three years worth of cohort or five years?

(Rebecca): I don't have the answer to that question.

(Megan): OK.

(Rebecca): I mean it really would likely vary by the programs based on the number – actual number of completers, how much that additional year increases then at the end.

(Megan): OK, thank you.

(Rebecca): Does (Juan) want to add something to that.

(Juan): Was that (Megan)?

(Megan): Yes, it was.

(Juan): This is (Juan).

I think a lot of – at least with the student performance side of data, there's been a lot of work looking at just one year snapshots versus aggregating across two years or three years and three years seems to be the point that you get the maximum benefit in terms of it also being actionable data to get back to (Rebecca's) point about sure more data in a general sense is good, better – more data is better than less data. But if you get too far out, if you do over five-year period, over...

(Megan): Right.

(Juan): ... you get to a point where really you're looking at performances that may have changed along the way that...

(Megan): Right.

(Juan): ... your ability to have actionable decisions.

(Megan): Yes, OK, that's – and that's why I was curious as to whether there – would that create of a difference in the worth of the data from three years to five years.

(Lance): This is (Lance). I've got a couple of questions.

Julie Orange: OK.

(Lance): The first question is will the data for this metric all be state-provided data?

Julie Orange: Yes.

(Lance): OK. And then I don't know if this is a question or I guess it's more of a statement but I think we need to think about this.

One of the concerns I have is that we tend to think about this at a state level when in reality employment opportunities tend to be not the same statewide. So I'm a little concerned about how we're going to use a metric like this and how are we going to compare institutions or programs in an area where there's decline in population and the demand for teachers is not the same as it is in growth areas.

You know, not all candidates are highly mobile coming out of school so there's – there tends to be a direct impact there on how many wind up taking the job that first year if they're not mobile and they're in a declining population region. So I'm a little concerned about the metric itself in terms of how fair this maybe from institution to institution. So anybody have any thoughts on that?

(Erin): (Lance), this is (Erin).

I did that (have some thought too). Are we looking at though the placement rate itself being the metric or the evaluation within that first year being the metric?

Julie Orange: This particular data element is just the placement rate. The evaluation system is one of the later ones that we will be discussing.

(Erin): And there's probably some concern especially in some of the more rural areas where you're, you know, preparing teachers that wouldn't be placed or coming out of those (sites) how we address that but I think it's a valid concern.

(Lance): Well, and we've talked about the geography of, you know, those programs that are closer to state borders in the Northern tier where there's probably an increased likelihood that they might cross state lines and go out of state.

And I know part of the argument here is that we're state-approved programs and we're supposed to be preparing teachers to work, you know, first and foremost in public schools, in the public school system in Florida and I understand that.

But there are realities too that not everybody takes a job in a public school and the playing field is not level on this issue for all institutions and all programs. It's not even level among programs. If you're a critical program area, you're probably going to have a higher percentage of placements at least that you would anticipate that would be easier to have a higher percentage of placements than in some other areas that are not critically short in the state.

So I just have some broad concerns about having a placement rate metric at all because I think there are so many other factors that come into play here that it's – that it may not be a very reliable indicator of program quality at all.

(Debbie Cook): (Lance), this is...

Julie Orange: (Lance)...

(Debbie Cook): I'm sorry.

Julie Orange: Go ahead.

(Debbie Cook): And this is (Debbie). I just have a question because I don't play in the institute of higher ed as often as others do and so certainly those of you who are in colleges and universities would know better.

If we look at trends and patterns over time and look at how schools are doing against themselves and we don't think of the rating as something that you compare against others but you compare it against yourself, could it be an indicator of anything relative to the program?

I don't know the answer to that but I understand your concern because there are a lot of mitigating circumstances, but if institutions are using their own information to look at what's happening within the institution over time, would that or would that not give you useful information?

(Lance): Well, it could be a valid data point for internal use in the program but that's not what we're talking about here. We're talking about establishing program approval standards and clearly, that needs to be a standard that's going to be looked and the benchmark is going to be some type of state benchmark if it's going to be used for program approval decisions.

(Debbie Cook): Well, could the – if we were going to use it as an element for program approval, could we consider it as – for continued approval that needs to be an upward slope not a downward slope instead of it needs to this cut-off point where it needs to be that cut-off point or – I mean I don't know. It's just a question.

(Lance): And if you say it's an upward slope and then you have a demographic shift that's outside the control of the unit which we've seen happened in the regions of the state then that's not within the unit's control.

(Debbie Cook): Right.

(Lance): So this is my concern about that. To me, retention data, the next metric we're going to talk about, you probably make a more compelling argument that a well-prepared teacher is more likely to stay in a profession and be retained longer, despite all those other variables about higher rates that may change from year-to-year and those types of things, so personally, I like the retention data as a better metric of program quality than initial placement data for a lot of reasons but just my thoughts on it.

(Adriana): Yes, I just want to piggyback on some of that. This is (Adriana). In terms of when the evaluators will come to the college to look at our programs for our program approval, what are they going to use in terms of if we keep that data element, how will that be evaluated? I mean if you place a – FIU places 51 percent of their program completers, you know, and FIU places only 35 percent, I mean what does that actually mean?

You know, I'm not sure again and I think I have to agree with (Lance), and I'm not sure that this kind of data is really that – I mean it's important I guess to know how many of our candidates are getting jobs but in terms of the program approval process and the evaluation of the program, you know, how critical and important is this data element to the evaluation of the quality of the program?

(Jasmin): Hi, everybody. This is (Jasmin). And I heard some concerns on the line about placement rate data and so I think there's maybe an opportunity to go ahead and if there is a motion on the floor to vote whether or not we think this should be included before we move on to perhaps decision points that may or may not be relevant depending on whether or not this is something we want to keep as a committee.

(Rebecca): And this is (Rebecca) again. One thing I wanted to point out was these are – as I stated earlier, these are two metric points. They aren't the only metrics. If you think that there might be some value to the inclusion or placement data but you feel there needs to be some geographic or district contexts included within the metric option, you could amend a metric option to include that if you feel there is value to including this in the accountability system.

(Erin): This is (Erin). Can we – would it be possible to include the metric before we put the motion on the floor, (Jasmin)?

(Jasmin): Yes.

(Erin): Maybe there's a benchmark and one maybe you could help us establish what the state norm is and then to sub-state norm to say that we're meeting the state norm or exceeding rather than using an arbitrary number to say like – for example, an (MK), you have to have 80 percent of your students passing state-level exams.

So if (Juan) could establish the number, if 60 percent is the average of state placement and you have to exceed, maybe there are some value in saying that you're preparing teachers that are getting placed, but to have a fluctuating number and to have a committee make a decision or use that as a metric is a

little bit finite but you may not – it may not be a good indication of how the program (is doing).

Female: (Erin), right now, it's just whether this is something to be included kind of at the higher level not the actual how – like number that someone needs to meet. The March webinar...

(Erin): OK.

Female: ... kind of present the data based on this metric for you all to see to kind of start thinking about that. If this is an important element to be included, is it just yours to say average and your – you know, a certain amount or below a certain amount or something that's coming later.

(Erin): OK.

(Megan): This is (Megan). I agree with (Erin) and I understand what (Lance) is saying but I do – I think it's valuable – I think that it should be part of an evaluation as to whether a program is graduating or completing people who end up getting jobs, I think that's important to include.

Now, I also think that we – if there's a way to possibly capture those people who take out of state job opportunities because if we're talking about programs employing people then it really should be – it shouldn't matter where people get a job but I do think it's important to know, ye, this program is graduating people who get jobs.

Female: OK.

Female: But employment – but employment is driven by the economy so, you know, Broward, as far as I know, they haven't been hiring a whole lot of teachers and neither has Dade and that's driven by the economy.

So our institutions are going to be held accountable for the placement of their students in jobs when perhaps the economy is not allowing for a whole lot of jobs out there that are being created for teachers.



(Debbie Cook): But do the – here's a question because again, I don't work in higher ed but does the economy affect the entering number of completers? In other words, if people know that there are not as many teaching jobs, I would think it would stand the reason that they themselves would choose not to enter a teaching preparation program.

Female: Yes, but that's not really what we want. I mean we want to prepare teachers.

(Debbie Cook): No, I understand. No, I mean I know what you're saying but I think wouldn't it stand the reason that you wouldn't have a program that is (flush) with people who can't find jobs or at least don't those numbers, you know...

Female: I think...

(Debbie Cook): ... adjust themselves based on the job economy?

Male: Well, it's not that dynamic of process. You've got to remember how long these people are in programs, the people that don't get hired – that didn't get hired this fall enter the program they're in in the case of Initial Teacher Prep programs anywhere from two, three, four, five years ago.

So they may not have known, "Gee, there's not going to be opportunities in this particular certification area that I'm going to pursue in teaching two, three, four, five years from now when I complete this program."

So I'm not sure that it's – that that reaction is the same at the frontend as the impact is at the tail-end of the programs particular for the ITPs that are longer duration.

(Debbie Cook): (Inaudible) out, are we saying there's a large percentage of people of completers who don't – really don't get a job the first year but is there a large number of people who don't get a job two years out of a program?

Female: Yes.

Female: Yes. There's been – I mean many of our graduates, you know, in the past two, three years have just not been getting jobs. You know, it's taking longer for them to get employed. It's just not there. The jobs aren't there right now.

- Female: I think there is some stat – maybe (Juan) or (Rebecca) knows this – there's some stat on how many actually complete a teacher prep program and never ever enter into the teaching profession. I think there – you know, I think there is some data out there.
- (Cathy): Female: In our last meeting – this is (Cathy). But in our last meeting, didn't we see the numbers that said there were graduating fewer than we need in Florida than we're hiring?
- Female: We're...
- Female: Hiring from out...
- Female: ... hiring people from outside of the state from alternative routes because we aren't preparing enough people through traditional – or even our rates are state-approved elsewhere in the certification route.
- Female: Well, in better economic times, those that had completed the teacher prep program had other options as well.
- (Mark): This is (Mark). And I was just thinking about this. We're trying to capture the importance of this metric. And I don't know but is it possible for us to look at this in terms of not the benchmark itself but the fact that the program's actually using these data whatever the results are in a way that is constructive to the program and look at it from that stance and take it – take the focus off of a particular performance or benchmark level and just look at the fact that whatever it is that the program is using it effectively to improve the programs.
- Female: So I think there is compelling evidence on both sides but I think we're starting to get bogged down in this issue. Well, it may just be helpful to take a quick yes or no, no if there is a similar – if someone is willing to make a motion on the floor to that extent.
- Male: And I don't want to prolong the debate but if – let me jump in for one more comment if I can, please.

I'd be a lot less concerned about this metric if I thought that as we get farther along in our work that we wouldn't be – we wouldn't make a decision to use this metric in isolation as a way of measuring because I think what we're talking about here is tied to the mandate that state-approved programs should be responsive to the needs of the state and the districts they serve.

So if that's what we're after here then this – we may be able to keep this metric. All I'm concerned is that it shouldn't be ever used in isolation. The retention data is another way of looking at that, employer survey is another way of looking at whether or not we're meeting the needs.

So I'd be OK with keeping the metric in place but I'm very nervous if we ever decide that this is going to be a stand-alone metric for some – for some standard that's going to be tied directly to program approval because I think it's very risky.

Female: I think we maybe a little bit ahead of ourselves and at this point, we're just looking at, is this something that we're still interested...

Female: OK.

Female: ... in looking at and continuing to pursue, not necessarily making a final decision or deciding how something will be used.

(Debbie Cook): Right. And this is...

Female: Once I see the data, I mean you can – once the data is actually presented based on the metric you decide upon, if for some reason you feel it's at that point not appropriate to continue to include in this system that's being developed, you can definitely elect to remove it from your list of recommendations.

(Debbie Cook): Right. And this is (Debbie). And it sounds like I know that in some of the other processes. If there's an opportunity to decide weighting in value and worth of particular elements, and I would agree with (Lance).

In fact, (Lance), my hope would be that we don't have any element that's a single stand-alone element that we look at it in light of the context around

which that element is developed. So I would say that's probably a good idea and we can talk about weighting in that kind of stuff perhaps after we know what all the elements are going to be or what we're considering.

Female: OK.

(Mark): That being said, I would like to make a motion that we retain placement rate data as an element for conferring program approval and evaluation.

Female: Is that...

(Debbie Cook): And this is (Debbie Cook). I second that motion.

Female: Thank you. We're going to do a roll call vote. Is anyone opposed? First of all, sorry, take back the roll call though.

Are there any nays? OK, hearing none, approved. And we'll move on to— wait, before we move further on, we need to know – now that you've decided to include it, are you including it just for people who get employed their very first year following program completion or people who get employed their first or second year following program completion or some other...

Female: Could I suggest we use both years since we have completers that are finishing midyear – mid school year?

Female: Right.

Female: That it's probably not fair to just use the first year if you're a December graduate.

Female: If you're a December graduate, you would then have a year and a half to be placed and still be considered in your first year following program completion based on the way they just take it.

Male: OK?

Female: Anyone disagree?

- Female: Anyone wants to make a motion about a metric to be...
- Female: Yes.
- Female: Yes.
- (Debbie Cook): (Rebecca), let me ask another question before we do. This is (Debbie) again. You were talking earlier and you were talking about the effect of using the first and/or the second year. Can you remind me of what you said?
- (Rebecca): For the first year, just – it rewards programs that quickly place completers in instructional provisions as well as the public schools so if you elect to use first or second year, it allows individual completers additional time to find employment and still have their preparation program, receive credit for their placement as an instructor in an instructional position in a Florida public school.
- (Debbie Cook): Thank you.
- Valerie Storey: This is Valerie.
- Female: Yes.
- Valerie Storey: If we're looking at two years out for a completer, is a graduate from the teacher prep program completes the masters program in one year which is possible now because more of the graduates are going onto the masters program. Are they completers from both programs and not two years?
- Female: If they complete two state-approved programs, yes, it would be within the data for their bachelors level program and if they also complete a masters state-approved program whenever they complete that degree, they'd also be included in the data for their masters program
- Valerie Storey: All right. Thank you.
- Female: Is there a motion on the floor? Do we have other questions about this one?

(Mark): I will make a motion that we consider option two under this metric for placement rate data.

(Megan): I'd second that motion.

Female: So with that, (Erin), did you second? (Megan), did you second?

(Megan): Yes, I did.

Female: OK, thank you.

Any nays? OK.

So is there – sorry, is there any discussion? No, OK.

Any nays? No, OK. Hearing none. We'll use option two.

Going to the next column then, the next position point is the number of cohorts of completers that should be included ranging from one to five. Are there any thoughts from that?

(Megan): This is (Megan). I would say I've been using three cohorts.

Female: Any motion? Is that a motion, (Megan), or...

(Megan): I can make it a motion. I move that we use three cohorts.

(Adriana): I second that. It's (Adriana).

Female: Is there any discussion?

Are there any nays? Hearing none. It's approved and that brings us to the next position point which is institution district level or program level. Are there any thoughts on that?

(Rebecca): This is (Rebecca). Again, based on the fact that you've selected multiple years and multiple cohorts, there should be sufficient data for this one to be acceptable to be used at a program.

- Female: I make a motion to (Megan) that we use the program level.
- Female: Is there a second?
- (Cathy): I second. (Cathy).
- Female: (Cathy).
- Female: OK. Is there any discussion?
- (Erin): This is (Erin). I just have a quick question. When we were doing cohorts and year by program, I just want to bring up the concern again and maybe this is (inaudible) but when you have a small in (inaudible) Science program as your Math, your critical shortage area is where your programs are very small, are you going to you able to get valid data or this is not the time to tell you that?
- Female: There are some very small institutions with very small programs where there still maybe issues of reaching an (NF10) threshold but where the vast majority of programs using the three years of cohorts and the two years for people to be able to become employed therefore there should be sufficient data to be used at the program level.
- Female: Would you use accumulative then of the three years or we should not need to worry about that at this point?
- Female: We're using accumulative of the three years of cohorts.
- Female: OK, thank you.
- Female: Yes.
- (Lance): Now, this is (Lance). I'm wondering why this has to be and/or conversation. I'd like to see us use of that both program and unit level.
- Female: But would that occur?
- Female: Institution.
- Female: Yes.

Female: We could do both and look at it and see if everyone still thinks it's something that could be done, that both where the date shows that it should be done exclusively one or the other.

Female: No, I think it would be important for the institutions to also know the retention as a whole by institution as well as an aggregate that are separated by program.

Male: I agree.

Female: I'm (inaudible).

(Cathy): And I'm (Cathy). I'm also concerned about the district programs because there's so few in the district (ACP) that you're going to have to maybe look at it at a district level because there wouldn't be enough people.

Male: Right.

(Cathy): And there's probably just a lot at this point.

Female: Right. The district is one program that we're looking at it at the district level. The program level really only affects Initial Teacher Preparation programs.

Female: So there's...

(Cathy): OK, thank you.

Female: I guess there's a motion on the floor right now to look at the data from a program level and there are different viewpoints emerging but before we address those, what we would need to do first...

Female: Let me just withdraw my motion, (Jasmin).

Female: OK, and we amend the motion.

Female: I amend the motion to consider the element of the institution and program level.



Female: Yes.

(Lance): This is (Lance). I'll second that amended motion.

Female: OK, is there any discussion on the amended motion?

Female: Could you clarify, I'm sorry?

Female: Yes, the amended motion is to look at data on both the program level and the institution and district level.

Female: OK. I missed the word both I think.

Female: And any other discussion?

Are there any nays? OK, hearing none, I just want to make sure I capture this. I've got the approval for placement rate date and...

Female: Metric option two.

Female: ... metric option two, three year – three cohorts and institution and program levels.

Female: Right.

Female: OK. We're going to move on to retention data.

Female: OK. Moving on to retention data, the district committee recommends to include this data element in the accountability system. Two ways it could be measured are the average length of stay the program completers in an instructional position for a public school district across five years of employment or the percentage of completers continuously employed in the instructional position in the Florida public school district at the third year mark and at the fifth year mark.

The average length of stay metric is not your retention data because it allows programs to receive credit if someone becomes employed at least for a year or two and return to an instructional position.

The committee may decide that program should receive credit for completers who are employed in multiple years even if the employment is not continuous or if you all feel that continuous employment is important then you may recommend to include the second option which is the percentage of completers continuously employed.

If the second option is selected based on your placement rate data decision, the continuous employment percentage could be included for completers to become employed their first or second year following program completion and the five year marks included in both options are based on current research in the field that tends to examine retention of teachers after five-year mark.

The additional questions are basically the same as we went through for the placement rate data. The – again, the same issues, smaller programs need multiple cohort years to reach the (NF10) threshold. And if you elect multiple cohorts then there should be – to use multiple cohorts and there should be sufficient data to allow this metric to be used at the program level.

Anyone have any questions about retention data? OK. Did everyone understand the difference between average length of stay and percent of completers employed? OK.

Female: I think – first of all, it might be worth confirming that we still want to use retention data just as we did and the (row) above. And is there any discussion on the yes/no of using retention data or motions to that effect?

(Mark): I'd like to make a motion that we retain retention data as the metrics for the teaching evaluation systems (I'm sorry) teacher preparation program evaluation system.

(Debbie Cook): I would second. This is (Debbie). I would second that motion.

Female: Is there any discussion?

Are there any nays? OK, fantastic.

Are we ready to address cohorts or institution district and program level again?

Female: And we have to do metric option two.

Female: ... to the metric option.

Female: OK, are there any thoughts or motions with regard to metric options?

(Lance): This is (Lance). I've got a question about the possibility of a third possible metric and that, it would be simply the percentage – the total percentage of the original cohort that is employed at the – whatever years we decide to pick, year three, year five.

And the reason I'm saying that is because you can have people moving in and out that neither of the other metrics would necessarily capture accurately but if you're just looking more globally at how many – out of a cohort of X number of students have graduated from a program and institution in a given year, three years later, how many of them are working in a school district.

And it wouldn't matter if it's the same three that was there year one or a different three. It's how much service is that – has that institute provided in terms of placements over time to that particular school district or to all school districts in Florida where we have the employment data. So there's – it just seems to me there's another metric that we might want to consider here. We actually look at that here at UCF because to us, it's a more meaningful statistic.

(Megan): (Lance), this is (Megan). I have a question, because I like that idea. If we're looking at the percent of the original cohort employed, are we looking at the percentage based on how many actually found a job the first or second year out and then keep that job because otherwise, then aren't we almost talking about placements?

(Lance): Well, there's a degree of that but what we've seen when we looked at the data, to get to either of the two metrics you're talking about, you have to track every single individual from year-to-year and then compile all those data.

What I'm talking about, you can simply count the number of employees from each cohort in a given year. It's a very easy metric to develop and yes, there's mobility within the number so some of it's retention and some of it's placement but there are so many – again, so many factors have come into play in determination of how you're going to calculate that.

If a teacher goes out, if we look at metric – the continuous placement metric, if a teacher goes out and – or a candidate graduates goes out, teaches for two years and then takes a year off for maternity leave and comes back, suddenly that person, it would not be in a continuous employment mode but is that something that should reflect negatively on the institution? So – but if that person is back teaching again in year five, you're going to get captured again in that more global metric that I've described.

So it's just the – it's just the third possible metric that I think we could consider using here. I'm not suggesting we don't, that the other two don't have value, but I think that there's a third metric that might also have some value to us and it's a very easy one to compute.

Female: You'd like to make a motion, (Lance)?

(Lance): Yes, I'd like to make a motion that we add a third metric that would simply be the percent – the total percentage of the – of a cohort employed in the Florida public school during year three and year five after the cohort's graduation.

(Debbie Cook): (Lance), this is (Debbie). So would we look at all three of these things as a metric or since we now have three, are we going to have to pick one of those out?

(Lance): Well, I guess we're probably going to have to pick one although I don't know that we're limited to using a single metric for one data element but...

(Debbie Cook): I mean because I'm wondering if there could be value in looking at all three of those things.

(Lance): Yes, I think each of them will tell you something different quite honestly at all.

(Debbie Cook): Will they all be informative?

(Lance): They may well be and that's why I'm not sure we need to say we're going to pick – or use only one of these metrics so I think that the two that are there now independently have some value and I think if we add a third one, that would have an additional potential value.

(Debbie Cook): And then you've got three different lenses that you're looking at retention data through and that's not necessarily a bad thing.

(Lance): Correct.

Male: I would agree with you, (Lance). I do know for what – kind of where we are focused if I am you. The continuous employment is going to be meaningful to us as well. So I think having those three lenses would be important and I'm ready to make a motion if – but I want to leave a window for additional discussion if there is before I do so.

Vivian Posey: Julie, this is Vivian. I just have a quick question about the terminology for continuously – continuous employment. Is it – do we have a significant number of completers that might be placed in the district the first year then decide if they're going to move to another district the second year and then another district the third year? Are we going to count continuously or is it (inaudible).

Female: No.

Female: No. Our purpose is – continuous employment is anyone employed in a Florida public school district and in an instructional position year-to-year even if they happened to move schools or move districts. They would (inaudible).

Female: My – I have a comment.

Female: OK.

Female: I'm wondering and just thinking of the economy as some mentioned for the first one, the placement rate data. There are many that become employed for years one and two based on seniority purposes. If there are budget cuts then they are no longer employed. And that is no reflection on the quality of the program although it is helpful information to somehow capture why that individual left.

Female: So there is actually a motion on the floor right...

Female: (Inaudible).

Female: Yes, it hasn't been second. So is there a second for the motion that we look at only the total percentage of the original cohort employed in the Florida public school year three, year five?

(Lance): No, that wasn't my motion. I didn't say only.

Male: Yes, that wasn't the motion.

Female: (Inaudible).

Female: (Inaudible).

Female: (Inaudible).

Female: OK, what?

Female: So then what is – is your motion all three, is your motion the one, (Lance)?

(Lance): Right now, I just motion – made a motion to add a third metric to our list of options that we're going to consider here.

Female: Got it, thank you. I missed that amendment so I wanted to make sure I'm capturing that. Thank you.

Is there a second to that motion?

(Megan): I second that motion. This is (Megan).

Female: Is there any discussion?

Are there any nays? All right. I think that brings us then to...

Female: (Inaudible).

Female: (Inaudible).

Female: (Inaudible).

Female: Cohort.

Female: No, they're going to use that one.

Female: How many are we going to use?

Female: Two or three?

(Mark): I would like to make a motion, and this is (Mark), that we look at all three motions which would include the two – as they are represented in the document and the additional motion that we've just approved as the metric options for the retention data element.

(Debbie Cook): (Rebecca), this is (Debbie). I have a question. Can we – I mean can we ask a question before we accept it and do that?

(Rebecca): Yes.

(Debbie Cook): OK, good. Is it possible to look at all three?

(Rebecca): It's possible. It's a lot of work to look at all three.

Female: (Inaudible).

Female: (Inaudible).

Female: (Inaudible).

- Female: ... that (Lance) said, yes. For the reasons (Lance) said and (Lance's) number three might – you know, not having run the data, I can't say how – but it seems like it would be a close approximation of number one possibly but it still is slightly different.
- (Cathy): I have a question. This is (Cathy). It's about one – the way it reads, it says the average lengths of stay in instructional position, is that likely number two, is it in any slide or is that the one job that you're in?
- Female: And in an instructional position in a Florida public school district. So again, for our purposes, you could have moved from a district from, you know, Broward County to Dade County but if you are reported in an instructional position in each year, you're counted.
- (Cathy): Well, there are instructional positions that aren't necessarily teachers as well.
- Female: Right.
- Female: Right.
- (Cathy): So if you were...
- Female: (Inaudible).
- Female: (Inaudible).
- Female: (Inaudible).
- Female: ... different business rules about that. At the moment, it just says instructional position. You may decide down the road that you want to narrow that or broaden that.
- (Cathy): It looks like the way the metric was written, it was that you're hiring a teacher and that they stay in the job in that school and that's the way I was thinking about that one. And if that's the case, I'm not sure that it's very valuable when we have the other two.



- Female: Right. It's not that they stay in the exact same position at the exact same school.
- (Cathy): I think maybe – I think the language says, "In a Florida district school," so it maybe if it just said in any Florida district school would clarify the situation.
- Female: OK, yes. It would be in any Florida public school district.
- (Mark): I would like to retract my motion. And, you know, I mean I would like to ask a question.
- Female: OK.
- Female: OK.
- (Mark): And this to (Rebecca) in terms of the difficulty in calculating some of these. Number two, which do you see is the most difficult? Which would you think – who would be the most difficult one?
- Female: One is the most difficult. Two – two and what (Lance) added or what you all added at (Lance's) – after (Lance's) motion are easier to compile than number one.
- (Lance): Yes, I agree to you that that's probably true. And based on (Mark's) comments about the importance of number two and (Rebecca's) comments that three is a good surrogate for one and certainly far easier to compile those data, since (Mark) has retracted his motion, I'm going to make a motion that we use metrics two and three for this data element.
- Male: I second that motion.
- Female: I second that motion.
- Female: Is there any discussion?
- (Greg Adkins): Yes, this is (Greg). Could you restate the third one again, please, the third option?

(Lance): The third one would just be a global look at the percentage of a particular cohort that are employed in public school – Florida public schools in year three and year five after graduation. So if you have 100 graduates and you've got 50 employed in year three then you've got a 50 percent metric there. And if you've got 48 percent in year five, that's your metric there.

And it doesn't matter if it's the same 50 percent that were there in year one or year two or whatever. So you don't have to – you don't have to track individual teachers from year-to-year and then aggregate those detailed data. You just – you know you have 100 graduates, you know you've got 50 employed in year three. There is your statistics for year three. So it's a much more global picture but it gives you probably a reasonable approximation for number one at a much cheaper data cost.

(Greg Adkins): OK, thank you. I mean just my take on it is obviously I think I would prefer to have number one but if it's something that is just extremely difficult and extremely expensive, I could (inaudible) two and three.

(Debbie Cook): And it sounded like – (Greg), this is (Debbie). It sounded like what they were saying earlier is that three might be a reasonable approximation of one kind (inaudible) so we may get some of that information captured in that other data element.

(Greg Adkins): Right, I heard that. Thank you.

Female: And if they're not continuously employed as it's mentioned in metric option number two, what – how does that inform the accountability of the teacher prep program?

Female: That's why the metrics that (Lance) provided is also good to examine because that allows those who are not continuously employed that are still employed at the third or fifth year mark. This still allows credit for their preparation program.

Female: And I just have a question. So those that perhaps were employed in years one and two no longer employed in year three but someone else, their first year of

employment could be year three. That would be included in metric option number three.

Female: Correct.

Female: OK. All right.

Female: There's a motion on the floor that has been (inaudible) to include two and three. Is there any further discussion?

Female: I'm just wondering for those who were not continuously employed, piggybacking on what (Alicia's) earlier, would it be possible to get the reasons why they're not employed? Would that be too difficult to get that information? You know, in other words, were they laid off, did they leave Florida, did they not perform well?

(Greg Adkins): This is (Greg Adkins). I can try to take a stab at answering your question. I mean this state does, you know, collect some exit survey data but it wouldn't quite get to all of those reasons.

A lot of the reasons are actually fairly general. I think if we were to try to get to, you know, what you're looking for, it would take – you know, we'd have to actually look at really doing something a little bit more detailed in terms of exit survey data. I mean right now, we've got it all over the place.

Female: Right.

(Greg Adkins): So we're trying to do our own because the general stuff that we actually do provide the state – this probably doesn't give you the detail that you would like to get to really make a determination why the person is leaving like it maybe just general that the contract was allowed to expire.

And the contract's allow to expire for a number of reasons. Sometimes it's because of performance, sometimes it's because, you know, they took another position and they didn't code it that way when they enter the data into the system. So yes, it would be good information for us to know but right now, it would be very difficult for the system in place to allow us to get to that.

Female: Thank you.

(Mark): This is (Mark). And this is really a question again for (Rebecca), because when I'm looking at this and maybe it's because I've been in meetings all day and – but because there is a continuous element in number two for three and five, what – how do we get around tracking each candidate, I mean each graduate year after year? How do we get around that?

(Rebecca): The education data warehouse has the ability to take the completer cohort and match it against the employment data first year out and then take those who are employed the first year out and match it against the employment data from the second year to see if – how many people are still there, third year, fourth year, fifth year.

(Mark): OK.

Female: Is there any other discussion? Hearing none.

Are there any nays? Oops, cohorts. That brings us back to the questions of how many cohorts of completer should be included as our potential position point, again, anywhere from one to five is possible as well as looking at the institution district level and the program level. So a couple of things to think about. Are there any thoughts or motions in that direction?

Male: Well, in the interest of trying to expedite things, I'll make a motion that we use a minimum of three cohorts and that we look at the data for both program and district level.

Female: I second that.

Female: Is there a second?

Is there any discussion?

Are there any nays? Approved.

OK. I believe I captured that. We've voted to retain – keep retention data. We're going to use options two and three and look at a minimum of three cohorts as opposed to institution and program levels.

All right. Moving on, we're going to look at critical teacher shortage area data.

Female: OK. Critical teacher shortage area data, this is very similar to placement rate data so hopefully some of the previous decisions that were made can help us move through this one quickly.

Basically, it's the same as placement rate except for the fact that it's the percentage of individuals who are placed in a critical teacher shortage area position instead of just any instructional position.

So the same benefit apply to – if you just use it the first year following program completion or the first and – or second year following program completion. And the same issues – benefits and issues exist for including multiple cohorts and examining the data at the institution level or the program level. Anyone have any questions about critical teacher shortage area data?

And the other thing I should point out before questions or discussions, this – on the table, this one stated that's just to remind us that this is an area that you will all thought would be appropriate for kind of as a bonus within that accountability system. So that's why it's stated.

(Debbie Cook): Right, because this is when we had watched the – this is (Debbie) – we had watched the information that – from the chancellor and one of the things that was like how it's contributing to Florida in general and not when we thought if we were helping to deal with critical teacher shortage. That could be something that would be a bonus for folks, right?

Female: Thanks. At the institution level or program level, I know you all had some discussion about that at the January meeting. And I think that it was left to be considered as a bonus at the institution level. And even with the inclusion of multiple cohorts, it's likely that quite a number of programs would not reach

the (NF10) threshold for this data element if it were included at the program level so the institutions, I mean we can look at those if you all feel that way, but there may be some (NF10) issues.

Male: I would like to make a motion that we include critical teacher shortage area as data element for teacher preparation program evaluation.

(Debbie Cook): This is (Debbie). I second it.

Female: Is there a second?

(Debbie Cook): Again, sorry, this is (Debbie). I second it.

Female: Thank you.

Is there any discussion?

Female: I'm sorry. Am I still on mute?

Female: No.

Female: No.

Female: OK.

Female: Hearing no discussions. Are there any nays? OK, approved. We'll look at critical teacher shortage area data.

(Inaudible) where we go from there, potentially looking at first year following program completion or a first or a second year following program completion.

Female: First or second.

(Lance): Yes, this is (Lance). I've got another thought on this one and I'm not sure that in a critical teacher shortage area that the percentage of completers is going to be the most important metric for us because these completers of these programs tend to get hired if they want a job.

To me, it's more of a production issue and what I'm concerned is we don't have a metric there. I think one of the things we got to be looking at at the institution level for those that have programs that meet these needs is the total number of candidates graduating.

Male: So, (Lance), and I agree with you. I was thinking about that. Are you suggesting that we use an (and) instead of percentage or add (and) and it also include percentage?

(Lance): Well, the percentage of completers who – I mean it's a critical teacher shortage area. So we could be producing less and less teachers in these critical areas which means the percentage that get higher is going to go up. It's going to look like a good metric and we're definitely not meeting the needs of the states.

To me, this is a production issue in the critical teacher shortage area, not so much an employment issue. The employments pretty much are given. If they want a job in a public school in Florida in a critical teacher shortage area and they're qualified, they're going to find a job.

So – and what we had talked about is having a system in place to try to recruit more people into these critical teacher shortage areas and then that exemplary or top level, level four indicator would be actually showing an increase in production. We were talked about production here and not employment when we had this conversation in our face-to-face meeting.

Female: I agree with (Lance).

Female: At the face-to-face meeting, we provided production information for initial teacher preparation program but we provided employment data for all programs (inaudible) measure production at this point for Initial Teacher Preparation program.

(Inaudible) to be a bonus area to be available for all programs like the employment percentage would need to be included but that doesn't mean that you can't add a metric based on production for consideration for Initial Teacher Preparation program.

Male: Yes, then I'm going to make a motion that we add a metric for production because I think certainly for ITPs and perhaps the downstream for EPIs as well, that's going to be a more important metric for us.

Female: Right.

Female: (Lance)....

(Gloria): I'm sorry, guys, this is (Gloria). I was having technological issues. Where are we – are we still with the shortage – critical shortage area?

Female: We are. (Lance) just made a motion to add a metric for production.

(Gloria): Are we going to use this data element as an approval element?

Female: Yes.

Female: Yes.

(Gloria): I'm sorry. That would be horrible for the privates.

Female: Why?

(Gloria): First of all, even right now, most of the private institutions, even if – are we doing this at the institution or at the program level?

Female: That part would come later depending on whether or not we approve a metric for production and right now, there is emotion on the floor but it hasn't been (inaudible) yet.

Female: OK, this is the thing, most of us in the (inaudible) part of this host team even when we do this at the institutional level, our N does not reach ten in most programs, let alone a critical teacher shortage area. And I understand when we heard the chancellor preparing teachers for Florida, you have to understand that the majority of our students in teacher preparation lead the stage and a mission of a private institution is not just for the state where we're at.

We are not publicly funded.



So for us, this would be a de facto not met, and I don't think we should have a data element that a whole group of the players cannot meet. Just to give you some stats, 92 percent of our students leave the state upon graduation.

Female: I think one of the things that the committee has discussed is the possibility of using this information as a bonus and not necessarily as a core element of the program.

Female: Well, if it is a bonus, I have no problem, but if it's an element for approval, I will have a terrible problem.

Female: OK, well, we haven't sorted everything out yet in terms of – which it would definitely be, although it sounds like committee discussions have definitely been leaning towards using this as a bonus.

And that said, there is a motion on the floor to add a metric for production, is there a second?

(Cathy): I will second it for the point of discussion. This is (Cathy).

Female: OK, is there a discussion?

Female: I'm against it, so.

Female: My question would be if we do it as a production then I think we need to talk about percentages or proportions of critical shortage compared to the others because we don't want to be penalizing the smaller institutions and if you know we have to compete against the UCS from the University of West Florida, it's probably not fair to say the number – the raw number is.

Female: That is correct.

(Lance): This is (Lance), let me – I guess I need to be a little more specific. I'm not talking about doing comparative absolute number comparatives from institution to institution, what I'm saying is that if an institution offers stem programs, then they should be working to increase enrollment in those

programs to help meet the needs of the state in these critical areas and that is what we want to try and look at.

(Gloria): Perhaps that should be a function of the state institutions and not the private institutions, both are state colleges and (SUS).

Male: Except that is a responsibility of all state approved programs to help meet the needs of the state and I think that is – I mean I understand, (Gloria)....

(Gloria): OK, I'm sorry, but I think that would be something that could be brought up in a legal issue because it seems very unfair to the (ICOF).

(Debbie): (Gloria), this is (Debbie), and one of the things that we have talked earlier that in some cases, if there was not an – and at least ten, then it wouldn't be an element that we would consider for that particular institution, one of the things that you said earlier is you would have trouble meeting and as Ken in that case, perhaps then it wouldn't be an issue at all that would even need to be considered because you wouldn't meet the cutoff criteria for consideration.

(Gloria): So the institution then, (Debbie), wouldn't be penalized?

(Debbie): I don't think so, now if particularly if what we are looking at as an added element and not something that would be – your program would be approved or not approved if you weren't able to do it.

I mean the way that we talked about looking at it would be that you know how when we get down to actual ratings or whatever, there is going to be like approval and then there may be like this would be something that would be considered something that would be commendable about the program I think, to put it in layman's terms.

(Gloria): Well, I appreciate the conversation. My concern is this. As long as that not reaching that end or not meeting that criteria does not go to the aggregate score of needs improvement to affect the final decision of a program being denied, I have no problem with it.

The second is I don't really believe that it's fair to put a whole cohort of institutions like (ICOF) institutions for a bonus point that most of us could not reach. That is my whole concern. Just so you know, in most of our cases, admission numbers are if you will, covered or very well established by the university admissions department.

We are not allowed to admit more than 25 teachers a year into our program and so last semester, I graduated seven so even my complete number of graduates and completers does not reach the ten threshold. Do you see where I'm coming from?

(Lance): Yes, (Gloria), this is (Lance).

I certainly understand your concerns and why you would have those. I'm also convinced though that if we do put a production metric in here that we can implement that metric in terms of how we ultimately write the accountability standard in a way that would be absolutely fair to the (ICOF). I really believe we can accomplish that.

(Gloria): Right. If we can do that and we can all keep that in mind, I have no problem.

Female: OK.

Female: Is there any further discussion?

Female: Well, I'm – you know, again, would this then not preclude then the – say the (ICOF) institutions and possibly other institutions who may not have all the programs in the critical shorted area from getting that bonus or being distinguished.

Female: Well, I don't think it's necessarily going to be the only indicator that a university may have that, would cause it to be an institute of distinction.

Female: OK, but it would be one indicator that could possibly affect that distinction rating however that unfolds.

(Gloria): And remember, if we are going to have distinction at the state level, that could possibly be used for marketing purposes and a U.S. (inaudible) will report –

internal reporting to the U.S. news and world report, that could affect the institutional ranking.

So we really need to tread carefully about some of these elements.

(Mark): This is (Mark) and (Gloria), you know, I definitely understanding a very sensitive (inaudible) and I know that it's going to be a touchy area but I can't risk knowing that we wouldn't have some measure of the looking at – meeting the needs of critical shortage areas in the state because of that reason and I'm not saying this is not important, this is very important but I think we have to be creative, find some way to work around and we have to look at this.

(Gloria): I agree with you, (Mark), and I was confident, I'm confident in land and especially the people in higher eds who know how programs are approved from our end. And as long as this doesn't come back to bite us, I don't have a problem.

You know what I mean?

(Mark): Yes, I understand.

(Gloria): Thank you.

Female: Are there any nays?

(Gloria): One.

Female: Nay.

(Gloria): (Gloria).

Female: OK, thank you, the motion passes and what we have talked about now is adding the metrics for production and a couple of other options included percentages of completers. Is anybody interested in making a motion in that direct or in discussing that direction or similar directions?

Female: Or if you are going to include the production and the percentage or ...

- Female: Can you tell me what this percentage would be percentage of what? All the programs (inaudible) if the institution...
- Female: (Inaudible) completer, the percentages that were – that were presented to you all at the January face to face for the percentage of completers who become employed...
- Female: OK, that go into ...
- Female: (Inaudible)...
- Female: The areas or (inaudible) shortage...
- Female: Right, how many of them are in critical shortage areas.
- (Gloria): And (Rebecca)?
- (Rebecca): Yes?
- (Gloria): Does that include completers who are hired by the district out of field?
- (Rebecca): Yes, anyone...
- (Gloria): So if I produce a math teacher who is hired as a reading coach, I can count it if I ever reach end of 10?
- (Rebecca): Critical storage areas.
- (Gloria): OK.
- (Rebecca): Any motion on which metric you include?
- (Cathy): This is (Cathy), I would like to suggest or move that we use number two as – and (specified) as we did with the very first placement.
- Female: Is there a second?
- Female: And is there a third metric out there now with what (Lance) recommended or how did that go?

Female: Yes.

So there are three options out there, option one is when first year, option two is first or second year and option three is the one about the production.

Female: Yes.

Female: And so then – so we would probably then go with number two and number three.

Female: We have already approved number – no?

Female: We approved the addition of number three as a consideration, right?

Female: Yes.

Female: Yes.

Female: OK.

Female: OK.

Female: So I would like to amend that to accept (Lance's) and number two that is on our paper.

Male: I would second that motion.

Female: Is there any discussion?

Are there any nays?

(Gloria): Nay.

Female: Is that (Gloria)?

(Gloria): Yes, I'm sorry.

Female: That's OK, I just want to make sure I capture it.

Thank you, the motion passes. We are going to move now to cohort and again, institution district and (inaudible) there are things we can consider at this point.

(Cathy): This is (Cathy), I would like to suggest we use the same that we did for the first one so three cohorts and at both levels.

Female: Is there a second?

Male: I would second that motion.

Female: Is there any discussions?

Are there any nays? Hearing none, that passes and we will move forward to employer satisfaction data and employer satisfaction data. Based on my understanding from the cover stations at the January meeting, you were pretty certain that a satisfaction data is to be included, the metric you were interested in was not – it is their preparation was in regards to the Florida Educator (published) practices but whether principles indicate completers meet criteria to be rehired,

So I haven't included any metric option because the decision was specific enough and somewhat limited by our current satisfaction data collection processes.

So that is why there aren't really metric options for you, however, someone who is more brilliant than I and has other metric adoption, please feel free to suggest it.

So this question is again to be considered in addition are the number of cohorts that should be included and whether the element should be considered at the institution district level or the program level and the thing to be aware of here is due to low survey response rates, we will run into NF10 threshold issues and to use low cohort numbers and we look at it at the program level.

(Gloria): I move that we look – this is (Gloria), I move that we look at this at the institution level – district, not program.

Female: I think that...

Male: I will second that motion.

Female: Any discussion?

Any (inaudible)?

Male: Does this mean they were automatically approving the metric as a part of this?  
Because (inaudible) know that we have done that yet.

Male: Yes, I was about to make that motion as well.

Female: So if someone likes to make a motion about whether we (inaudible)...

(Gloria): Isn't the metric the percentage of completers?

Male: No, the metric here is the satisfaction.

Female: Right.

Female: Satisfaction.

Male: And I would like...

Male: It's a data element, we have to prove the use of a data element...

Female: Yes.

Male: I would like to make a motion that we include employer satisfaction as a data element.

Female: Second.

Female: Let us back up and let us see that first and then get to looking at the institution and program level after that, depending on how this pans out. So with regards to employer satisfaction data, (Mark), you just made a motion that we...



(Mark): Yes, I did.

Female: OK, is there a second?

(Gloria): Second, (Gloria).

Female: OK, any discussions?

Male: I just like to amend that motion of (inaudible) (Mark) to include the current metric just so we make it official that we did approve the metric since I know there is only one there but....

Female: Yes, OK.

Male: Yes, I would like to amend the motion to include the current metric.

Female: Second.

Female: Discussion?

Nay?

OK, so we are going in include employer satisfaction data and look at it at the (inaudible) OK look at it at the...

Female: OK.

(Lance): This is (Lance), I'm going to make a motion that – and for this one, we limit it to three cohorts and that we look at the institution level just because of the low response rates. The reason I say three is because...

Female: I second.

(Lance): Just to – by way of explanation, the reason I say three is because I don't know many programs out there that look the same four or five years ago as what they look like now. So I'm not sure that employer feedback that far back is relevant to current programs and ought to be part of accountability.

Female: Is there any more discussion? Any names?

Hearing none, that passes. So we have made it through why data elements and now, we are on (salon)...

Male: Thank you.

Male: And we have 20 minutes left, right?

Male: And I will navigate us on these final 20 minutes through some of the complex elements we have been (inaudible) with over the last few minutes. My role here is to go over the final three blocks on your table, the value added model data block, which is the most complex, I will divide into pieces to facilitate the discussion, the student subgroups, soon performance by subgroup blocks and the teacher evaluation system results block.

And I would like to proceed through the value added model data in this format and a number of decisions were reached or at least, indicated at our last meeting in January and since that time, we have received a list of recommendations from the American Institute for Research, AIR, and a more technical partner, and that standalone document has been posted to the Hopestreet site.

Female: That is right. Thank you.

Male: (Inaudible) that.

Female: Yes, thank you.

Male: And – but the table here in front of you that will guide the discussion has incorporated those recommendations and so I would like to go in pieces first just starting with the global point.

(Debbie Cook): You said it has HAS, right? (Inaudible), this is (Debbie), you have – it has incorporated those changes?

Male: Yes.

(Debbie Cook): That is OK, thank you.

Male: Yes, the table has incorporated the AIR recommendations.

(Debbie Cook): OK, thank you.

Male: The first point that we just want to receive confirmation on is that the committee at the January meeting decided to use the (inaudible) data as part of the accountability system and AIR does speak to that point in their recommendations, they also recommend that yes, value added model data should be included and with the number of considerations and we will talk about those considerations and they also state that that strong consideration should be given to the weighting of this information due to the limited number of completers with the VAM scores.

Again, program approval should not be based solely on the VAM scores of completers, that is the AIR recommendation and that aligns very nicely with the discussion we had very early on today about not treating these measures as standalone measures, it's part of a multi-metric piece.

So I don't know, since this is a fairly complex block, I don't know if you wanted to open the floor now to a motion just on that point of reaffirming the committee decision to include VAM, I will turn it over to (Jasmin).

(Jasmin): Is there motion to include value added model data and are in our process?

Male: Yes, I move that we include the value added model data in the (inaudible) valuation program evaluation process.

Female: And I second that motion.

(Jasmin): Is there a discussion?

Are there nays?

OK (inaudible).

Male: OK.

Now, the first consideration, after the January meeting of the committee, there was a decision or definitely an indication made to only focus – only include VAM data for completers who were trained in program and teaching in the field but there are enough – AIR does not have a recommendation on that point but there are a number of considerations that you can find in the first column on page four to note and of course, we had a lengthy discussion in January about the challenges with this data in term of the limited number of completers and when that data is further filtered down to only in program, in field completers that of course, further limits the number of completers on which the base information (inaudible) so we want to take this opportunity just to reopen this decision point to the committee to reaffirm again this decision point to the committee to reaffirm again just noting certain elements, do we want to on the face of it, simply limit to only in program, in field, for all indicators of institutional level performance or do we want to limit any program levels decisions.

We have been focusing here exclusively on institution and or district level data because of the limitations with N sides, but if we want to put a premium on in field, in program, do we want to limit that only to any program level decisions and then yet another challenge to consider in this overall discussion is the framework under which we currently operate now where EPI and DACP completers, by virtue of those programs, it's not possible at this time to determine whether or not those students or those completers are in field because the program is not content specific.

And with that, I will turn it over to (Jasmin) whether we want to reopen the discussion about infield and program limitation.

(Jasmin): OK, are there any thoughts or motions in that regard?

(Cathy): This is (Cathy). I feel very, very strongly that we need to be measuring what the programs are doing and so the VAM data, I believe, needs to be in program and in field.

Female: And I agree with (Debbie) 100 percent.

- Female: Yes, this is (inaudible) and I agree with that also. I think it would be useful for us to know the VAMs at the program level also as well as I think at the institutional level.
- (Jasmin): Is there a motion?
- Female: Want me to make a motion?
- (Jasmin): Yes, please.
- Female: OK, I make a motion that we include the VAM data at the institutional and the program level – the institutional (inaudible) district program level.
- Female: Or in programming field, (Debbie)?
- (Debbie): Right, in field and program...
- Female: And in field, yes. Infield VAM at the institutional district and program level.
- (Gloria): I second the motion, this is (Gloria).
- Male: I want to make sure – did I hear you say in program and infield or just the infield?
- Female: Infield – both, both.
- (Gloria): No...
- Female: I think...
- (Gloria): At the institutional level, in program infield.
- Female: Right.
- Female: They should be aligned with the area of certification infield and the data should be provided at the institutional as well as the program level.
- (Gloria): Oh, at the program level?

- Female: Yes. I think it will be important – I would want to see those VAM – that VAM data at the program level...
- Female: Sure.
- Female: Program approval...
- Male: ... verification, again with the challenges, with drilling this down further at the program level, (inaudible) to clarify, in terms of the accountability system, do we want to limit this information to the institutional level and if possible, provide program level information, VAM information but the accountability system would be driven off of the aggregate institution level information.
- Or do we want to drive accountability decisions also at the program level.
- Female: I think it should be at the institutional level because of the issues with the data and the size...
- Female: Well...
- Male: As a point of process, I think we have had the motion that it was seconded and so we need to finish that out if we want to go back and revisit that.
- Female: So what you are saying, it would be more difficult to get the data at the program level?
- Female: So then...
- Female: You can – there is program data level data available to (inaudible) that could be provided to institutions.
- The question though so – there is a myriad of things we could provide institutions for their own use and (inaudible) but the question at hand based on the issues that one was talking about with the number of Ns was whether in the accountability systems, would you limit it to institution level or would you also try to include program levels?
- Female: I mean, I would like to see it at both.

Female: The motion right now and for both, so that...

Female: This is...

Female: ... seconded, thank you.

Is there any further discussion?

Are there any nay?

(Megan): This is (Megan), I have a question, if we are using it for both, and then would that potentially mean that if an institution only had one particular program for which there was VAM data, would all of it competed – would it basically be judged or evaluated just on that one particular book of data?

(Debbie Cook): Well, if you look at (inaudible) well, it's going to depend if you – look, this is (Debbie) honey, if you look at where it says sample size underneath it...

Female: Right.

(Debbie Cook): Then if we go to a sample size that it's got to be a finite number or more in order for us to consider it, that would mean the answer to that would probably be no.

(Megan): OK. OK.

(Debbie Cook): Because the sample size thing is underneath it.

(Megan): Yes OK.

Male: If I can, let me clarify, that – (Megan's) point, that does speak to the limitations of the data. We know we have limited VAM data at this point because again, it's only reading and math features in certain grade levels...

Female: Right.

Male: For institutions and district produce a myriad of teachers across different subjects and grade levels and so it will always be – not always, but at this

point, based on the data we have – the VAM data we have now, it will be a – just a portion, potentially of an entire institution or districts completers unless of course it's a very focused program that only produces reading and math ...

So what I think this does speak to and it's not a decision point for this particular meeting, is this could help inform your decision processes about weighting, how much to weight this information given those limitations.

Female: OK, all right.

OK, OK.

(Jasmin): Is there any further discussion?

Male: I just want to again, this is just a matter of process, if we – you know, it sounds like I'm hearing that we want to go a different direction than the motion that is on the floor and had been seconded that you know, that we would need to vote that down and revisit this as a different motion.

(Debbie Cook): OK, remind me of what the motion is on the floor, right now, honey,

(Jasmin): Well, I can retract the motion and then just include this at the institutional level.

Female: OK.

(Jasmin): So the motion would be – let's say – teaching infield and in areas of certification, VAM scores at the institutional level. Right?

Female: That I what I understood...

(Jasmin): Right, is there a second?

(Gloria): Is it at the institutional level?

Female: Yes.

Female: Yes.



(Gloria): I second it.

(Jasmin): Any discussions?

Any nay?

OK, approved.

(Juan): All right, moving on to the next consideration, sample size, we have talked a lot about that with the other elements as well and the committee did reach a decision on the minimum sample size of at least ten completers with VAM data, AIR – A-I-R on page four does note that recommendation and they also provide an additional consideration that you may want to consider to not only look at that minimum number but to see that that proportion is considered representative of the institution or the district as a whole.

So for example, if a – an institution produces 1,000 completers, and they – only have ten with VAM data, that is what – one percent of the overall completed picture and so (inaudible) they are cautioning that you may also want to consider not just the minimum number but also how much that number represents the entire universe of completers at a school in a given year.

Female: Which speaks to my point, right, (inaudible)?

Female: Yes.

(Juan): Yes.

So I will turn it over to (Jasmin) if you want to consider an additional caveat to your minimum cell size.

Female: Do they have a recommendation, I mean is there – and if it is less than X percentage, it shouldn't be what makes sense – all right...

Female: Yes, I think that is the idea, that would be something that we would consider as a committee.

Male: Correct.

(Juan): They are silent on what that X percent would be and I'm not – in terms of reaching a finite number at this point, I'm not sure that is critical but whether or not you would want to continue that consideration may be a point of the decision here.

Female: (Juan)?

(Juan): Yes.

Female: If I remember right, we were looking at having VAM scores for – that are in program, in field for roughly 20 percent?

Female: Twenty percent?

Female: I'm asking, that is a question.

(Juan): I don't have that data in front of me but I believe it was somewhere in the teens...

Male: Yes, UCF, our experience has been consistently at the 12.5 percent point for the three year for which we have received data to date.

Female: Yes.

Female: Actually, state wide, it's just over 22 percent.

Male: But that doesn't factor out that a lot of teacher are double counted when we look at the data.

Female: Right.

(Lance): So that is not the percentage of completers, that is the number of data points you have against completers but there are a lot of people that are counted in there twice, that is the issue that we had.

We started out, remember, with 250 something at UCF which would have been 25 percent unchanged then when we eliminated the duplicate copies and the out of field and out of program, we were down to 12 and a half percent.

So I believe that a better size or a better proportion to thank you know, that we are going to have data for what percentage of total completers, that is probably a more accurate figure.

(Gloria): So that, (Lance), are you saying like ten percent?

(Lance): Our experience have been 12 and a half here.

Female: Twelve and a half.

Female: Right.

(Lance): Now, that will improve as more tests are run over time, but based on historical data and the limitations of what we have now for (FCAT), that is what we had here and it's been very consistent at that number for three years worth of data.

(Jasmin): Anyone have a recommendation they would like to put forward?

(Cathy): This is (Cathy), I would like to hold off until we actually see that data to make a percent recommendation.

(Gloria): That is a good point.

Female: Yes, I think so too. I don't know if we can decide this.

(Jasmin): OK.

Female: Am I right? I mean...

Female: Yes.

Female: OK, we can table that and then that would bring us, yes OK.

(Lance): Well, can I just chime in again here for a second? One of the complications here, this is not an easy thing to put a percentage on because there are some

complications in the math here and if we are looking at what percentage – if we are going to do this at the institutional level, and look at what percent of the institutional completers hidden in that is what percentage of institutional completers came out of programs for which you might logically anticipate FCAT data.

And so if only 20 percent of our total completers came out of programs that teach in those grades and math and reading, and we got 12.5 percent data then we really had data for 60 something percent of the people for whom we could have had data.

So at the program level, it may be more than adequate but what I'm saying here is that – it depends on what portion of total completers are in programs for which we would have potentially –or potentially have VAM data now, and that may not be a constant from institution to institution depending on what programs they have programs they have and which programs are more heavily enrolled than others and so just coming up with a single percentage to apply to this metric against the total completers at the institution doesn't make sense to me either.

(Jasmin): I think actually, this may be a good stopping point for today keeping an eye on the clock and Julie, I'm going to let you discuss potential next steps.

Julie Orange: Sure. What we will need to do, hopefully, one day this week, Thursday or Friday, we can come up with the time where we can round out these discussions that we can move forward, I think (Rebecca) alluded to the fact that once decisions are made this week, there is going to be a lot of work behind the scenes as far as getting this data ready for our next webinar, March 8, and so those of you that are still on the call, if we want to – what I can do is look at some time internally that were available and post those options on Hopstreet and hopefully, we can come up with a time, Thursday or Friday that we can get the majority of you back on the call.

We don't have a whole lot to go but we need to finish decisions on the value added model that is due to subgroups and also the teacher evaluation system,

so are there any folks that want to chime in and say for sure that you know that you know that one of those days, it's completely out and...

(Megan): This is (Megan) and I'm actually going out of town Thursday and Friday but you know, I will try my best to whatever time we pick but it may be difficult for me either way.

Female: So you are talking about tom or the next day?

Julie Orange: I believe in previous conversations, I think (Cathy), you have mentioned that your only options are from four to six, correct? Because of teaching to get out of the classroom?

(Cathy): If it's tomorrow, which is – I mean it depends but yes, generally, but even Thursday afternoon, I'm not available anyway because that is the standard board meeting.

Julie Orange: OK.

(Adriana): If you – and this is (Adriana), if you are talking tomorrow, the second and the – or Friday, the third, yes? There is no way I'm booked with meetings the whole afternoon. I mean I could do Thursday morning but (inaudible) I got meetings, meetings and more meetings.

(Mark): Sorry, it's going to be my wife's birthday tomorrow and she is not going to let me near a phone, we are going out of town for the next couple of days..

Julie Orange: How about Friday in the morning?

Female: Friday in the morning would work for me...

(Mark): It's still a no go for me, (Mark).

Female: Well...

Female: I could do mornings like 9.30-ish and afternoon 1.30-ish, those are (inaudible) you know...

Julie Orange: OK, how about this because it's about to end the call right now, I will get some options that I know will work for one schedule definitely with presenting the rest of this, and also, from what I have heard right now, I'm going to put several options out for you to choose from and what we will have to do is of course, go with the majority so that we can move forward and make these decisions and we may end up having a look at possibly Monday if we need to because there are only a few days left here.

But I think the discussion is very productive and encourage you to continue this discussion on Hopestreet and I want to truly thank those of you that made the effort to go and posted your comments and I think the dialog is good and we may be able to get some of these discussions going on Hopestreet so that when we get back on the call, we don't have to start from scratch with some of it so just encourage you to do that and now you have all the information in front of you so you can digest it a little bit more and we can move forward but I will be in touch through the Hopestreet.

And is there anyone else that is having trouble with receiving e-mail through Hopestreet? Alerting you that something has been posted?

(Gloria): I'm not getting the alerts. This is (Gloria).

Female: And have you gone (inaudible) Hopestreet for the alert?

Female: I'm not getting the alert either (inaudible)...

Female: I'm not getting them either.

Julie Orange: OK. There is on the far right column when you log in, there is an option to all you have to do is click it and it says "send me the e-mails"

Female: Yes.

Julie Orange: If you can double-check that feature and make sure that it's activated but what I will do is I talk to the Hopestreet contact to make sure that there is not a glitch in the system or something but double-check that feature for me and

verify that, but if not, check Hopestreet tomorrow for some date that would be posted.

(Debbie Cook): Julie, this is (Debbie).

And I don't know if I will have access tomorrow or not but I do know that Monday, if we have any options at all that include Monday, Monday would be much better for me but I will do my best if we have to go with Thursday or Friday.

Female: OK, and on Monday would be perfect for me as well.

Female: Yes, Monday is good.

Female: OK.

(Lance): Same here, this is (Lance).

Female: All right.

Female: Monday would be good.

Female: And maybe even (Mark) could join us because it's his wife's birthday, we can be over by then.

(Mark): Yes, I will be – I mean, I will still be feeling the effects but Monday would be good.

Female: That is good. My mother's birthday is on Friday so there you go.

Julie Orange: All right. Bye, guys. Thanks.

Female: OK, thank you.

Female: Thank you.

Male: Bye, all.

Female:           Bye everybody.

Female:           Thank you, (Jasmin).

Female:           Bye, everybody. Thank you. Bye-bye.

Female:           Bye-bye.

Female:           Thank you.

Male:             Bye.

END