

**THE STATE OF FLORIDA**

**Moderator: Julie Orange  
December 5, 2011  
4:00 p.m. ET**

Operator: Good afternoon. My name is (Hope) and I'll be your conference operator today. At this time, I would like to welcome everyone to the Teacher and Leader Preparation Implementation Committee Meeting.

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 then the number 1 on your telephone keypad. If you would like to withdraw your question, press the pound key. Thank you.

Ms. Julie Orange, you may begin your conference.

Julie Orange: Hi. Thank you, everyone. This is the Teacher and Leader Preparation Implementation Committee. I apologize we're starting late. We're having a little bit of technical difficulty this afternoon. Thank you for bearing with us.

We're going to go ahead and look at our agenda and with our introductions with the committee members, again, this is a call we have others that are joining us that wanted to hear and – they cannot participate in the call but they're welcome to (inaudible).

The committee as to their data request list, and that is our managing item here is to go through the list that you developed at our face-to-face meeting in November so that we can make sure that we understand what your request was and we can hopefully answer your question as to whether or not we can

have that data available for the January 11th and 12th face-to-face meeting in Orlando.

That's the purpose of this call. Everyone should have a copy of the data request list. And we're going to go through those. They are numbered because we wouldn't necessarily go through them in order and that's basically because we want to make sure that we're focusing on some – here at the beginning that we can get through fairly quickly, and then we'll come back to some that may take a little bit longer where we may need some clarification from you so just interrupt me if you're not sure where we are and we'll make sure that everybody is on the same page.

We're going to start with the (Sect) number 2. And in this particular data request, you indicated that you're asking for how many completers are placed in FCAT-assessed teaching assignment in the first year following the present completion.

And in this case, AIR did address this and Christy – Christy or (Dan), did you want to mention anything regarding where this information was addressed?

Christy Hovanetz: Well, Julie, can I first as an organizing principles walking through this?

In addition to talking about the feasibility of the request, can we also ask for clarification on the purpose of the request for the intent of what types of decisions are going to be made with this data so that way we have a better context of, is this the right question to be asking or not?

So we can do a whole bunch of different types of data analysis and looking at it from multiple ways. But I think what our underlying questions are, is what is this information – what is this information going to inform, and when we have that information, I think we'll be able to better address whether or not this is the best analysis to do it or if there's another data analysis that we should be looking at. So in addition to just looking down numbers 1 through to however many we have here, to put it in that context as well.

And so we did provide this information when we talk about the number of completers being placed in FCAT testing grades as we saw in one of the

slides. I don't have the exact numbers in front of me but we saw that there were 30,000 completers and approximately 6,000 of those were in FCAT-tested subject and grades.

And so we did provide that information on two of the PowerPoint slides in the initial presentation. If there's something beyond just pure information that you're looking for, if, you know, wanting to know how many are assigned in those FCAT grades and subjects, so – but that information is something that was provided up to 9th and 10th meeting.

Julie Orange: OK, great. Thank you.

Were there – from the committee members, were there – does anyone want to comment on anything else regarding this request as far as your purpose for wanting this information?

OK. Let's look at the third one. This is – again, we've asked AIR to run this analysis on how many completers are placed in (state-assessed) teaching assignments the first year following program completion.

So this is the – we interpret this as being the same request as number 2 except for looking at Algebra 1.

Female: And Biology.

Kathy Hebda: Right. This is Kathy. I just – I think our interpretation of this is the same thing as question 2, only looking at everything that includes the statewide (EOC) end of course exam. Juan, did you want to add something to that?

Juan Copa: And this is Juan.

Just to reiterate to the analysis that was presented in November, it relies upon the value-added growth models that have been produced for FCAT Reading, FCAT Math. We will be producing value-added results for the end of course assessments as they move online with Algebra 1 coming shortly and Biology and Geometry to follow. So once that data is available, we would, of course, incorporate that into the analysis of the Teacher and Leader Prep Program.

Julie Orange: Hey, anyone have anything to add?

OK. Looking at – we’re going to skip to number 5 – and this is asking, how are completers who do not – in the teaching profession until several years after present completion performing and specifically are they included here?

(Rebecca): This is (Rebecca).

The data that was presented at the November meeting is just for individuals who become employed in an FCAT-assessed area, the school year following their year of completion of the program. So no, they have not been included in the analysis that you have seen so far.

Their inclusion moving forward is definitely something that can be discussed but there are kind of policy implications of how far out is an institution responsible for their completer. So if someone becomes employed two or three or four or five years after program completion, (inaudible) that institution responsible for their performance during their first year of teaching.

Female: And another consideration too is it might not be their first year of teaching. They could have gone and taught in another state for a number of years and so then you have the experience variable to contend with that. We don’t have a good track or measure on.

Female: Right, whereas the (inaudible) taught in a private school and then moved to – which we don’t have access to their information on and then moved to a public school. So right now, we’re speaking with the one year out after program completion.

Julie Orange: Hey, any discussion there?

Beverly Slough: Yes, this is Bev.

I wonder – in the job market that we have now, and sometime individuals have a difficulty in acquiring employment their first year out, but didn’t they come after a couple of years and get a job and then therefore they are first year teachers, are we dismissing that data by choosing to go in this direction?

Julie Orange: There is no way for us to tell if that person really is a first year teacher or not. So at this point, the decision has been made that because we can't tell who really is that first year teacher two or three years after program completion or who taught out a state and moved back in or who taught in a private school and now is teaching in a public school. The decision has been made not to include them.

Beverly Slough: And speaking directly to your concern too is there's no way for us to know if they chose not to apply for a job or if they just could not get a job or like the cited examples here if they were teaching else, where that we didn't have the data. So there are multiple things that we're not able to know in order to determine if they could or should be included in the analysis. It raises a whole lot of other questions as well.

Julie Orange: Thank you.

Any other comment?

OK. We're going to skip over to number 8. And this is looking at completers employed the first year following program completion with the teacher-evaluation system rating.

Kathy Hebda: This is Kathy.

Since we don't actually have that data at the moment because districts are implementing those new evaluation systems for the first time this year then it's not something that we can use for the committee's consideration at this time.

It maybe something certainly that we would want other committee or others that want to consider for the future. But as of the timeline for working through this school year, we wouldn't have that data to provide to the committee today.

Male: Could I ask a question about that one?

Kathy Hebda: Sure.

Male: Do we have the data in terms of the completers that are employed the first year following program completion period meaning that – because I was noticing something and I think it was Louisiana or Tennessee, I can't remember which, where they looked at the number of graduates from Teacher Preparation Programs and the numbers – that percentage of those graduates that were actually placed and employed the following year in teaching positions?

Kathy Hebda: We do have those data and then we also mentioned, I think, earlier in number 2 and 3 where those data were FCAT subjects for at least that were provided in the presentation and the presentation was about those growth model result.

Male: Yes.

Kathy Hebda: But we do have those numbers for everybody who regardless of subjects complete the program and then was employed the next year.

Male: OK, all right. Thanks.

Kathy Hebda: Sure.

Julie Orange: Any other discussion there?

OK. We're going to look at number 9. This is – there is the question on how many programs are five-year programs. And if we can determine the impact of five-year programs compared to those who are completing a four-year bachelor's program.

(Rebecca): This is (Rebecca) again.

As far as we are aware, there really are only four pure five-year programs at University of Florida and Jacksonville University. It's difficult for us or really, we cannot compare the impact of five-year programs to those completing in traditional four-year bachelor's program because of how we collect data. It's difficult to separate out the bachelor's level completer versus the master's level completers for a particular program area.

Julie Orange: Anyone have any questions about that one?

Vivian Posey: I have a question. This is Vivian Posey.

I think this was my question originally so let me see if I can just summarize what I think I heard you say...

(Rebecca): OK.

Vivian Posey: ... that if students come out of one of these five-year programs, they will be – their evaluations will be lumped with those who are coming up a four-year traditional program. Is that right? So we're going to count them. We're just not separate them out. Is that what I heard you say?

(Rebecca): Yes. They are included in the analysis of the data.

Vivian Posey: OK, OK, thank you.

Julie Orange: OK. Any other comments there?

OK. We're going to skip over to number 11. And here, the question was – can we look at the number of non-renewals of contracts for ITPs, DACPs and EPI programs. And also the reasons for non-renewals contracts for those individuals – from those particular programs.

And in this case, we could tell you the number of programs but we don't have the information as far as the reason for non-renewal. So we're not sure exactly what the information of the numbers – what the purpose, I guess, of the question was that we could get to more information as to what you need that information for so we can better understand what you're trying to answer.

Gloria Pelaez: Hi. This is Gloria Pelaez from the University of Miami.

I think if I remember correctly, when we're trying to determine the people that are not renewed due to budget cuts or commitments to other's appointment through an effective teaching or knowing (inaudible) student learning, et cetera.

Kathy Hebda: OK. This is Kathy.

If I understand, I think the purpose was then to see if we get a reason for non-renewal related to performance rather than some other reasons.

Gloria Pelaez: Correct.

Kathy Hebda: Only if that's the way it's reported. And in many times for annual contract teachers, when the information is reported, the reason is not given in that way. So I think this is an area again where I think we could show people the exit interview data for all teachers we could certainly match program completers to the exit interview data but it's not clear that this is really going to be a reliable source of performance or non-performance information.

Gloria Pelaez: Perfect. As long as it's not non-performance like you just said, I think we're going to be OK. I just would hate anybody to use that to say that they were not performing what in case we don't know the real reasons.

Kathy Hebda: Right.

Gloria Pelaez: Thanks, Kathy.

Kathy Hebda: Sure.

Julie Orange: Any other discretion there for number 11?

OK. Number 12, use of (fair) data was brought up.

Kathy Hebda: This is Kathy.

We don't have a growth model for (fair) as of yet. So at this point, the – we're not able to provide information based on (fair) results, but it's something the department is considering, Juan, that you want to talk about. (Inaudible)?

Juan Copa: But this is just similar to question number 3 looking at other state-wide assessments. As we move forward on the implementation of Race to the Top and the requirements of the legislation on teacher-evaluation.



We'll be building models for different types of assessments, so it's a question that this is something we can look at down the road but we're just not there yet.

Kathy Hebda: Any questions about that one? No?

Julie Orange: OK. We're going to go to number 15. And this was looking at the result of the annual completer and employer satisfaction survey.

This particular request, we will be able to provide the means for the – for questions that are related to how completers or first year following program completion for public schools out there.

They rate themselves on their performance related to the Florida's Educator Accomplished Practices and how their employers say they are prepared related to Florida's Educator Accomplished Practices.

Does anyone have any other questions about completer and employer satisfaction data?

OK. We're going to look at number 16. And the request here was change the data collection for DACP and EPI program completers to capture their in-field subject area to be able to determine who is teaching in the field of the preparation that they received.

Eileen McDaniel: And that's something we can certainly look at down the road and that maybe something even this committee discusses when you get to recommendation's phase, but at this point in time, it's not possible for us to change that process either through legislation or rule or anything else to get your data fast enough to do that.

Julie Orange: Any comments there?

Female: Julie, can I go back to number 15? I just thought of one other thing...

Julie Orange: Sure.

Female: ... with that. Annual completer and employer satisfaction survey, it's been quite some time since I have seen that survey. Is it possible to bring a copy of send a copy to us of that for the January meeting so we know what that is entailing at this time and whether has it been updated in terms of what we're not asking the kinds of questions we're asking and then employer satisfaction survey, is it relevant to what's the new information is and what we're looking for?

Eileen McDaniel: This is Eileen.

The survey is being given to all three types of program since 2007 and so we have data on our Web site. We can also send you – send that report to you electronically so you can take a look at and see what the questions are.

And we are actually in the process right now of redoing the survey for the spring 2012 submission for those completers from 2010 and 2011 that will reflect the new seats.

Female: Oh, wonderful. Thank you very much. We appreciate that.

Female: That'd be great.

Female: Thank you.

Julie Orange: OK. We're going to go back to the beginning now with number 1. And your – the first one on the list was the question of could you see the institutions and district advanced course around other state averages

And we have a question here to try to understand what things that you want to evaluate schools against, if we're wanting to compare them to veteran teachers, first year teachers, teachers with three-plus years experience?

Juan Copa: And this is Juan again. Just to back up to refresh everyone's memory.

If you recall from the AIR presentation, they have presented those slides with the Caterpillar charts, the series of lines, vertical lines up and down that represented the institutions. But there was a horizontal line that was also there as well which really represented the standard by which those programs are

being evaluated against. And the standard that was using the initial analysis was the average performance of the first year completers that were in this analysis.

But as you also may recall from (inaudible) presentation, there are different ways in looking at this different standards that can be used to evaluate programs. And this isn't have to be one standard. That's another important thing to keep in mind.

But Louisiana looked at evaluating the program of completers based on how these (inaudible) and experienced teachers. So that's – basically what this question is trying to get at, we think is trying to look at so we would do – does the committee want to propose different standards to take a look at as opposed to just that one standard that would be the first standard that was used in the analysis which was the average of program completers, and if the committee is prepared to discuss maybe other potential standards to look at.

Female: And we can track those decisions this evening and maybe prepared for January.

Julie Orange: Any comments here?

OK. We're going to move to number 4.

Kathy Hebda: But before we do that, Julie, let me just make sure the committee understands what we're asking.

You've seen an analysis now so far where the standards that folks were – could be evaluated against would be a relationship of one program completers against how all program completers did by subject.

Louisiana looks at a couple of different things. They look at how do they do with the first year teachers and how the completers do against veteran teachers or experienced teachers.

Between now and January, there is another bar such as experienced teachers or another one that the committee would like to see to review in January for consideration of the possible standards going forward.

Adriana Garcia McEachern: Kathy, this is Adriana.

Is that data available? Are we able to compare VAMs to experienced teachers, compare the program completers to say a teacher has been teaching five years?

Male: Yes, we can, because we have – for the purposes of the changing teacher-evaluation systems, we have through – with AIR (inaudible) course have calculated VAM scores for a number – for all of our teachers teaching these course subjects – Reading, Language, Arts and Math.

So we would have – what you have in the analysis were those that were linked back to the programs.

Adriana Garcia McEachern: Right.

Male: But in the reference category, we could do a number of things based on statewide data.

Female: And I think that might be helpful to see that comparison between...

Female: I agree.

Female: Yes, OK.

Female: Can someone clarify which comparison that you'd like to see?

Female: Comparison to our program completers to experienced teachers. Now, I don't know how we're going to define experienced teachers, how many years down the road that they've been teaching.

Female: Well, I think that is going to be a challenge so – because we don't have reliable years of experience data. We can compare to statewide averages.

Male: Right.

Female: But I don't know if we're going to be able to – even if we did determine what experience was, be able to get a good read on that.

Male: Right. And what we did observe when we looked at the data is, you know, teachers one year out are different from two years out are different from three years out, but three years out, those teachers are getting close to the state average.

Female: And we know three years out because we have three years worth of data.

Male: Right.

Male: But just – again, just to clarify, this is not completers out of a program. It's just in a general sense looking at all of the statewide VAM data what's the average performance of teachers that have five years more of experience, 10 years more of experience.

We do recognize that the teacher experience variable or a factor that's collected by the state does have some issues but it is – it's what we'll have at the moment. It's the best indicator we have right now of the standardized statewide indicator of teacher years of experience. It's a perfect no but it does provide us with some information worth at least investigating.

Female: And we could investigate that to see if there is – what kind of difference there is if it's significant or not.

Vivian Posey: Julie?

Julie Orange: Yes.

Female: This is Vivian Posey.

I would like to suggest for the committees – the committee's consideration that we make a comparison with first year completers with those teachers who have advanced degrees while we assume that the teachers with advanced

degrees are going to have higher VAM scores. It may do a lot to validate the importance of that in terms of recognizing teacher value.

Julie Orange: OK. Great, thank you.

Mark Howse: Hello. This is Mark Howse. Sorry for getting on the call late, but I wanted to ask a question.

Is it possible to look value added score? I think I came in on the tail end of this to the actual evaluation rating and they did get an average score (inaudible) teachers who are rated effective.

OK.

Female: We have a system (inaudible) and the people are expressing their predictions of their evaluation system.

Mark Howse: Yes, thank you.

Julie Orange: Any other comments here?

Kathy Hebda: This is Kathy.

And I just (inaudible) a request (inaudible).

First off is to make sure that folks understand that some program completers will have advanced degree when they complete their programs because that's the nature of the program they entered into. Others will not but the comparison is in the committee's purposes is all programs completers regardless of their degree level compared to teachers with advanced degrees. Is that an accurate representation?

Female: Kathy, I don't know whether you're directing that specifically to me or to everyone.

Female: ... completers and we said earlier in that question about the five-year programs that we were going to lump everyone together regardless of whether they have master's degree or a bachelor's degree.

And so we've got that group already and I think what I'd like to see from this is comparing that group with teachers who have been teaching a number of years and have advanced degrees.

Kathy Hebda: The two parts of the request are experienced teachers and experienced teachers with advanced degrees. Is that accurate?

Female: Yes, yes, and thank you for clarifying that.

Kathy Hebda: OK. So it sounds like to me that we have a request – we have a request to consider those (inaudible).

Julie Orange: If we look at number 4, in this case, the request was how (inaudible) and EPI candidates who are already teachers of record performing prior to or during the program compared to how they perform after the program completion. And we've asked AIR to run this analysis. Christy, did you want to speak to this?

Male: (Inaudible) the question here.

Julie Orange: So the – one of the analyses that we did was looking at the three different completers and how they were performing before they enter the program compared to how they are performing after they've completed the program. So it's kind of a longitudinal and pre and post analysis as well. So we're comparing cohorts in the three different programs as well as pre and post.

And we haven't looked at the pre and post yet. That was a suggestion that had come up at the committee that we are able to do that.

Male: Right. Potentially, you would need several years of data to do that so you need – before they went into the program after they came out of the program. So the question we would have is how feasible is it and I'm not sure we have the – have enough data to do this.

Female: We do not have enough current data to do this.

Male: Right. That's a longer term.

Female: We would have to get more years of data from the department.

Male: (Inaudible) it is several years of data that, you know, they're teaching, they get out of the program and then you have to do the follow-up.

Kathy Hebda: Actually, this is Kathy. We would be happy to continue the discussion with the – with AIR staff about the additional data that might be needed. And what we can bring back to the committee would be for the January meeting.

When we summarize all of the data requests after tonight then we'll have details about what we can and can't do with number 4 for the committee to review.

Female: Thanks, Kathy.

Julie Orange: OK. We're going to look at number 6. And this request was VAM data at the content program level looking specifically at how programs are performing. And again, that's AIR to run this analysis.

Christy or (Dan), did you want to speak to this?

Christy Hovanetz: I'm sorry, Julie. I'm taking notes on the last one on the data that we need to think so I'm sorry, I watching up on the...

Kathy Hebda: That's OK, Christy. This is Kathy. I was going to just let the committee realize too that number 6 and number 7 are really a very tough request – one is just all program completers and seven breaks it down into those that are actually teaching in the program that they were...

(Dan): Right.

Kathy Hebda: And then also way, way at the end, number 23 is a related question about once we – once you actually focus on just those that are completing in the program area or teaching in the program area that were trained in what happens to the end. So 6, 7 and 24 are those that are...



Christy Hovanetz: They do get really small so the number 6 of VAM data within the content program level, we do essentially have that saying, “OK, here are all the teachers that were – went through the program, here are their Reading and Math scores.”

And then all the teachers that went through our Reading program here and their Reading scores, all the teachers that went through a Math program would do their Math scores. I think Lance had us go down one step further that said, “Are they teaching in the subject area or content area that they were actually trained in – so linking up what was the program completed and what is the current teaching assignment to be sure that they’re actually teaching in the field not just the broader general feel. So we can absolutely do that.

The ends are going to get ridiculously (inaudible) and (Dan) and I were also conversing...

(Dan): Right.

Christy Hovanetz: ... on the pre and post looking at the end sizes for that and that I think that was the discussion that we are having before we flip over so I think all of these are related that the number of teachers that you’re going to find within the same program completing the same – with the same – that are similar teacher assignments that they also were trained in and have data for is – I mean we saw the attrition from 30,000 completers down to 6,000 in tested grades and subjects that’s going to go even...

(Dan): Almost 90 percent.

Christy Hovanetz: Yes, even far, far, far smaller once we get in the content areas and then once you try and break down those content areas looking at individual institutions or programs not even from a statewide perspective. It’s just going to get really, really, really small.

And then with some of the noise we’re seeing around the data, I’m not sure how many decisions you’ll be able to make based on that analysis. So I guess the – (Dan)?

(Dan): So (inaudible) playing off, I understand Lance made the point that he want to do this sort of pairing down for validity but as Christy had said, when you get the sample sizes thinking of how valid is it to say maybe you'll have five to 10 people per institution, we can make this linkage. So it maybe – you know, it makes conceptually makes sense but empirically we may not be able to implement it just given the reality of how the programs round and what we have in the data.

Female: Kathy, thanks for all of that because we do all have the data there and you've been working so closely with it. Unless the committee members have an objection then I think that's something we would want the committee members are able to see and determine as to how – let them see how small the ends are, when are the ends really small, what circumstances might be surrounding using data that somebody who's teaching out of their program really what is a good definition of out of the program to see how we can – and we can work with AIR between now and January to make sure we've got a really solid definitions to provide to the committee about what is in or out of program area.

Female: So you're saying, Kathy, this is something we could revisit?

Kathy Hebda: Yes. We can still provide the information to you. Since you've requested it (inaudible) that is the program area for which you're trained has clearly been expressed as (Dan) said, by Lance and other committee members that seemed very supportive.

Female: Yes, it is.

Kathy Hebda: Then it would certainly be worth the committee actually seeing the resulting data, seeing how small the ends are, having a good definition of what's in or out of program area (inaudible) talk about perhaps recommendations (inaudible).

Gloria Pelaez: Hello.

Female: Hello.

Kathy Hebda: This is Kathy. Did you hear what I said, Gloria, or was there too much background noise?

Gloria Pelaez: There was too much background noise, sorry.

Kathy Hebda: OK. That's all right. It may help for folks to put their phone on mute if they're not speaking.

What I was just saying is that the cautions about the low ends are really important so that the committee isn't expecting the same kinds of numbers that you saw when everybody is included.

Gloria Pelaez: OK.

Kathy Hebda: But since the – since teaching in the area of the program that you're trained is very important as (Dan) brought up their committee members mentioned, Lance and others in particular, that it's still would be worth if we think that the committee to see the resulting data, be able to talk about what the definition is of being in the program or out of program because how you set that definition is also going to determine how big your ends are so that you would at least get to see that information and what implications there might be for including everybody in our out of program.

Gloria Pelaez: OK. That would be great.

Kathy Hebda: OK. Juan, do you have something else you wanted to add? No, OK.

Julie Orange: Any other comments on 6, 7 or 23? Those are the ones that were similar.

OK. We're going to go to number 10. This is VAM data by student subgroup was the request. And I believe we have a question here as far as whether or not you're suggesting VAM results by school type but we're not sure exactly what the request was regarding student subgroup.

Male: Yes. We're looking at characteristics of the school in terms of percent minority, percent of free/reduced lunch, the schools that the teachers end up teaching in.

Male: I think I contributed to this question and I was actually talking about the subgroup – the subgroups along the lines of AYP subgroups (inaudible) characteristic subgroup.

Male: Understood but I guess we're trying – where we're a little unclear is are we looking at completers – the performance and completers at the different types of schools that they end up teaching at in terms of the characteristics of those schools along those AYP-type subgroups.

Male: What I have in mind is zooming down to how will a (FAMU) a new completer does with ELL students versus African-American students versus Hispanic students in terms of growth within those student subgroups.

Male: OK. That clears it up.

That should be a feasible request.

Adriana Garcia McEachern: This is Adriana.

What subgroups specifically would we be able to get the data for?

Juan Copa: Well, the AYP subgroups are the major race – the race categories so...

Adriana Garcia McEachern: OK.

Juan Copa: ... African-American, Hispanic, et cetera.

Adriana Garcia McEachern: Right. So, OK.

Juan Copa: Free/reduced lunch.

Adriana Garcia McEachern: OK.

Juan Copa: ELL.

Adriana Garcia McEachern: Right.

Juan Copa: Students with disabilities.

Adriana Garcia McEachern: OK. Thank you.

Christy Hovanetz: Juan, this is Christy.

Can you clarify just a little bit when we say how does a (FAMU) completer do with ELLs or SWDs? Are we literally trying to look then at what the student expectation is for each individual student and then determining whether or not the teacher was successful in meeting that student or that completer was successful in meeting that student's expectations? It sounds like we're developing a subgroup exclusive VAM model.

Juan Copa: Right.

Male: It's not, I guess asking things very clearly but it's not really doing anything different with the model. This is just the grouping of the students and calculating aggregates by those subgroups. It's all about filtering of data.

Male: When you say the students, aggregating by students, it's – you're talking about the elementary and secondary students?

Female: Yes. So we would have to go down to the student level and aggregate the students that were taught by teachers that completed the program at (FAMU) and essentially creates the expectation around the student...

Male: (Inaudible) students.

Female: ... rather than around a teacher that has a group of students. So we're creating a different – we're creating a different unit of analysis. The unit of our analysis then is a subgroup rather than a teacher.

Gloria Pelaez: Well, how do we think this through then? This is Gloria Pelaez from U.M. If I have a completer from U.M. and she's teaching second grade, if we have data from the ELLs and (ESC) students, for example, and she's doing much better with ELL than with (ESC) that would give me information for improvement of my program towards the (ESC).

Christy Hovanetz: And I understand what you're saying. So just in the hypothetical example, we're giving teachers or we're providing a calculation that has a teacher's VAM score.

Male: Across all students.

Christy Hovanetz: Across all students that that teacher comes in contact with. So now what it sounds like is being asked is for each teacher, we provide an individual VAM score for ELLs, SWDs and all the other AYP subgroups.

Male: No, I don't – Christy, I don't – no, I don't think we're going that way. It's more in the lines of your first thought looking at, for example, just aggregating the students within our class and looking at that in terms of percent of the students that met their expectations to the VAM. I mean it's similar to the type of reporting we're looking at...

Male: That's correct.

Male: ... type of reporting that we're looking at so the teachers can see, for example, their students what their expected score was and whether or not they met that expected score. This would be basically taking that type of data, looking at aggregating it by the different subgroup characteristics to produce, you know, the – of her students that – of the teacher's students that were ELL, 80 percent of them met expectations for, example, things like that.

Female: OK.

Male: And new VAM score – there's supposed to be one VAM score just looking at the pieces of the data, a different metric from the VAM (inaudible).

Female: So let me propose though, if a teacher has 15 students, are we saying that we're sub-grouping this out and then providing a percent that have met those expectations because now, we're getting into student level data that's identifiable and might only be one or two students that have disabilities, one or two students that are ELL, you know, small group that, you know, (FRL)

Female: But remember, that would vary greatly by district.

- Female: But I guess that I'm unclear of what our unit of analysis is. Is our unit of analysis the teacher?
- Male: It is the teacher.
- Female: And if so then the teacher if we're reporting X percent of this teacher's students, ELL students met expectations, that might be two ELL students or X percent of the teachers has to be these students met expectations, that just might be one student.
- Female: That's correct but wouldn't we – couldn't we get the number of students – say the number of students in that classroom that were ELLs or free/reduced lunch?
- Female: Correct.
- Female: Yes.
- Female: To that end, we wouldn't – we need the end and then we could see, you know, if the target was met by the students or not within that subgroup.
- Male: Let me offer this. Let's table the discussion. The folks of the department will have further discussion. There are – I think there are ways of addressing the end comes that we're talking about here in terms of, you know, perhaps not looking at this at the individual teacher level but of all completers from a particular program pulling all the students (inaudible). So I think there are ways of addressing this but in the interest of time, let's leave it at – we are – we are moving forward as if it is feasible and we will work out the details of the AIR.
- Female: Thank you.
- Male: That was good.
- Male: Pull out that discussion, Juan.
- Juan Copa: Yes.

Julie Orange: OK. We're going to move on to number 13. This is looking at how many who enrolled in a program actually complete the program. And (Rebecca) is going to tell us about this data.

(Rebecca): For this particular question, we can definitely provide completer numbers by institution, by program and so forth.

The – we've only been collecting admit information and candidate information for two years so that's really not enough time to allow progress (inaudible) programs. And so for two years, we can provide the numbers of people admitted and the number of candidates enrolled in the program but just keeping in mind that there is still time for them to complete their program.

Julie Orange: Anyone have any questions about this and...

Female: Well then we wouldn't really be able to get data for this to address this, right? I mean if we only have two years worth of admissions data, we don't know whether those students that were admitted actually complete it, right?

Female: That's right. We would not know that at the state level.

Female: So – yes, so I don't know how useful that data might be then.

Female: Right.

Female: So you don't want to see any completer numbers or admission numbers.

Female: Well...

Vivian Posey: This is Vivian Posey again.

I agree. I'm not sure that that is all that important to the work that we're doing which is focusing on VAM scores and student achievement and if – to me, it sounded this and maybe I'm not understanding this question completely but if they haven't completed the program, are they teaching, they're not teaching at all so they really aren't even in the set that we're – that we are looking at.



- Female: Whether they completed the program or not, so this (inaudible) they're teaching or not depending on the program that they are in.
- Female: But if they haven't completed the program, would they be teaching in the classroom?
- Female: Yes.
- Female: They could be without the four-year certificate.
- Female: Right. There are – and obviously, the people that are in a four-year bachelor's degree program. That would not be true but there are lots of other programs out there where someone could be not completing the program and they are teaching in the classroom.
- Female: But how can institutions then – oh, I see, so they're still enrolled in the institution. They're still going back for course work to finish up perhaps but maybe not.
- Female: (Inaudible) not.
- Female: I'm not sure of the linkage with the universities then.
- Female: Well, unless the university has that student enrolled and enrolled means different things at different institutions.
- Female: Correct.
- Female: Is this a large number or is this again one of those very, very small groups that maybe they're teaching in a field where there aren't a great deal of candidates to select from? Is that how we think that they are in a classroom teaching without finishing their program?
- Kathy Hebda: We know there are a large number of teachers who each year teaching on a temporary certificate and those folks eventually go on to complete teacher training on a professional certificate and they aren't – they complete that teacher training in a number of ways through one of the three types of approved programs or the course by course (inaudible).

Male: (Inaudible).

Kathy Hebda: So they're not as big as they used to be. We – that's another – there are a couple of other issues on here where you're requesting data about those folks.

Female: Right.

Kathy Hebda: But yes, they definitely exist.

Female: OK. And it's a significant number, Kathy, that we should be including.

Kathy Hebda: I would say it's significant, yes.

Female: OK.

Kathy Hebda: So back to this request, so this particular item, I think, was – the original question was how many folks who are admitted to the program eventually complete the program, and that's the data we don't have enough ears on yet at the state level to be able to track those individuals who were admitted just two years ago to really have a good handle on whether or not they should have completed by now or still might be enrolled or any of those things.

Female: OK. Thank you.

Kathy Hebda: Sure.

Julie Orange: OK. Looking at number 14, this was request looking for more information about the FTCE competency level data and (skill course). And AIR, did you want to address that you've looked at this and the findings or no findings that you've had?

Christy Hovanetz: On the certification exam, one might be best to talk from the (inaudible) policy perspective. We did quite a bit of analysis on looking at the relationship between scores and teacher value-added scores and there really were not strong relationships in that arena.

- Kathy Hebda: Right. So there is – AIR didn't do an initial run and at this point, there is nothing really to report but we have that baseline information so if things develop in the future, we have that data to go back to.
- Male: I'm sorry, Kathy, I am distracted here on the side. But it sound like I heard her say that there were no string correlation and then you say there is nothing to report and those – and this is how – I think those are two separate things if you're saying that there is just low statistical – low relationship or correlation between the two. And now I'm trying to – I'm trying to (inaudible) that with you saying that there is nothing to report.
- Kathy Hebda: Let me explain that then. Christy is right that they run – but they only run certain exams so it doesn't mean that there couldn't be other ways to run the data or look at or we couldn't possibly find some other relationship in the future but the way they run the data this time, we've got the results that Christy mentioned.
- Male: OK, that there was no significant relationship or correlation between evaluation ratings and value-added?
- Kathy Hebda: I mean it's not evaluation rating. Teacher certification is...
- Male: OK, OK, so I get it, OK.
- Kathy Hebda: Teacher certification examination.
- Male: Yes, I'm sorry, I'm sorry. Thank you. Thank you for clarifying that.
- Kathy Hebda: (Inaudible).
- Female: And looking at the certification exam, were those conducted on a rate or specifics or it's analyzed on each exam?
- Female: It was looked at in both ways. It was looked at the specifically the scale score but also a passing, not passing.
- Male: Right.

Female: And we didn't say anything about significance. We just said that there was a low correlation.

Female: OK.

Male: Right.

Julie Orange: OK. Moving on to number 17, this was information about the variety setting, intensity and duration of field experiences, what metrics are being used to determine if the candidate has had a successful field experience and what qualifications of individuals could supervise, what are the qualifications of individuals who supervise the field experiences.

(Rebecca) is going to address that.

(Rebecca): This is an area where I don't think we can get all of the questions that you have but we do have a little bit of information that the committee might be interested in specifically the number of field hours that someone complete before their final student teaching or culminating field experience and the number of hours of their actual culminating field experience./

So that's some information that we will be able to share. The question about the metrics that are used to determine if the candidate has been successful and so forth, those vary by program and by institution so we don't really have data that we can share related to that. So some of this, we can get at that you could possibly use and some we cannot.

Julie Orange: Does anyone have any questions about the field experience data?

OK. We'll move on to number 18. This is how many first year teachers come from out of state or a pathway to certification that is not state-approved program and where do those first year teachers end up, what positions are they filling.

Kathy Hebda: And this is Kathy.

Number 18 is kind of related to number 21. In both instances, we do have data that show how many folks start out with a temporary certificate, and we

do have some data that shows once they earned a professional certificate which route they completed and we can provide that to you – one of my – one of our questions about this is similar to what Christy was saying at the beginning.

If there is something specific you're looking for in this data that you think is helpful to your decision making process, we have it but we just want to make sure we're providing what it is you're really looking for.

(Anna Bryan): Kathy, this is (Anna Bryan).

Unless we're trying to compare these, you know, "(memorandum)" first year teachers to program (inaudible).

Kathy Hebda: I'm sorry, the last thing you said was a little muffled. Can you say the last part again?

(Anna Bryan): All right. Unless we're trying to compare these non-program completers to program completers, I don't see a reason for this data. I'm having a hard time understanding why we want this information.

Kathy Hebda: You do have another item on here earlier on that we talked about the different types of program completers prior to completing the program that (Dan) and Christy were discussing. So perhaps that's where the question really is captured rather than in 18 and 21, are there other committee members that want to discuss this.

(Kathy Dane): Kathy, this is (Kathy Dane).

Kathy Hebda: Hi.

(Kathy Dane): I think part of our concern was that if we're looking at whether we approve programs or not that we really do need to know whether they're part of Florida's programs of whatever kinds we have or someone else's and if there is a significant difference.

Kathy Hebda: (Kathy), did you mean the state-approved programs other than Florida program? Is that what I understood you say?

(Kathy Dane): Well, either out of that or out of state, you know, you can pick up the courses here and there. You know, there's a lot – there's too many different ways you can get certified in Florida.

Kathy Hebda: But you're still talking about the committee's role is really focused on Florida's approved programs?

(Kathy Dane): Right, but if we don't know where the first year teachers come from then it's really hard to tie it back. I don't know how many people we have that are in – that are teaching in Florida that haven't gone through any Florida programs at all. And so when we start comparing and averaging everybody together then we kind of muddy the water a little bit.

Kathy Hebda: And so it's – I'm guessing – what I think I'm hearing is that it might be helpful to know this information for context purposes and how many folks you're actually influencing when you talk about changing requirements for approved program completers.

(Kathy Dane): Yes, that's exactly it.

Kathy Hebda: OK.

(CROSSTALK)

Kathy Hebda: I'm sorry, what was the next comment? Somebody spoke after (Kathy).

Gloria Pelaez: Yes, it's Gloria. I said that's it. I think you captured I think for at least what I was thinking about.

Kathy Hebda: OK. Well, we can provide the information. I mean we have it, that we'll provide it to you in January. There wouldn't be any performance result associated with it. We can provide that information for context unless someone is to do that.

Gloria Pelaez: Thank you.

Julie Orange: OK. Then we'll move forward and go ahead and provide that.

We're moving on to number 19. And this – there were several completers looking at admission requirements, trying to find out who is entering the programs and trying to find out are the institution selecting the best candidates and are they trying to get the best people into the program. And (Rebecca) is going to share with us what we have on this.

(Rebecca): We can share what the statutory requirements are and we can also share what institutions say they review as part of admission to a program. But the actual data along with those requirements we do not have but you can see what institutions are reporting that they look at related to candidates before they are admitted to their program.

Kathy Hebda: Does the committee want that data, that information?

Adriana Garcia McEachern: Well, this is Adriana McEachern from FIU. Are there any – some really significant differences in admissions requirements besides what is in statute that institutions are requiring for students, you know, besides a GPA and passing the (GK) and so on?

Female: The information...

Female: Go ahead.

Female: The information we have is along the lines of it's the institution required in an interview, if they require this edition of some kind prior to the program. And as you point out, there really isn't a large variety in what is required prior to program admission.

Greg Adkins: This is Greg Adkins. I was one that was interested in that type of information. You know, I guess looking at what we do have would be of interest, I just have seen where other Teacher Preparation Programs that have been rated as highly successful in other states have had stricter admission requirements for the most part, not in all cases but for the most part in other programs and just for comparison purposes only.

Female: Yes.

Female: Well, I mean – I think that’s an important issue and I know that many of us have been talking about them in terms of raising the admission requirements, raising GPA and so forth. I’m not sure how many of us have actually done that in institutions of higher ed yet and they’re still keeping with the statutory requirements but it might be interesting to take a look at that.

Female: We’ll definitely provide the information we have.

Female: OK. Thank you.

(Rebecca): OK. We’ll move on to number 20. This is looking at the outcomes as they complete the program and how the people perform in the program.

I guess I would really need some clarification from the committee. I don’t think we can provide this information in any meaningful way unless you all give me some clarification of what it is that you’re looking for. The thoughts that came to my mind were the completers grades and GPA with the program which we do not have and collect at this point in time, but I don’t know if you all have another idea of what their outcomes might be that we can look at.

Female: Frankly, (Rebecca), I don’t see why this would be important because I think you would – it would be a monumental task in terms of outcomes if they complete the program. I just don’t understand why we would need this data for what our tasks are.

(Rebecca): I mean the outcome is they must achieve the Florida’s Educator Accomplished Practices and the other standards and so forth and tasks, the teacher certification exams and then have the requisite GPA for graduation. Basically, the outcomes, but we don’t typically report that anywhere that I am aware of.

Female: (Inaudible).

(Rebecca): Yes.

Male: And I agree with both Adriana and Gloria. I think that started to get down into the ground plotter and distract from really what we were trying to



accomplish in terms of recommending an overall, you know, guidelines for evaluations at the program level.

Female: So may suggest that we delete 20?

Female: Certainly. I'd be more than able and happy to delete 20.

Female: OK.

Female: Is there any – are there any – those that are opposed to deleting number 20?

Female: No, sounds good.

Julie Orange: OK. Let's move on to number 22. This is – there was – this was one of the last ones that was discussed and there was the request for out of field waivers asking who has them and what programs are they from. And we're not sure exactly what was meant by the out of field waivers. Does anybody want to elaborate on that part?

Female: These are – we're referring here to, teachers who are teaching out of fields. Is that what this is trying to get at and what programs they're from?

Female: And I think – don't we address that earlier in one of these data sets?

Kathy Hebda: This is Kathy.

We do address the in-program and out of program area. So if a person completed a program in elementary K-6 and they're teaching fifth grade, they would both be in-program and in-field. So if this wasn't out of field question then it seems that maybe we have addressed it already but the in-program – our of program issue...

Female: Right, right.

Female: Right.

Female: I also think this has to do with a conversation we had whereby an institution did not like – where we get our report. There was one of our completers

wasn't doing as well as we had expected but when we look, she graduated elementary and was teaching middle school Math. We didn't prepare her for that. That's clearly stated on the report so I don't think we need to add a data field for that.

Eileen McDaniel: This is Eileen.

I believe the waiver came from the fact that once the teacher is teaching on the field in a school district, they have to go before the school board and be approved and then parents are notified and so forth. But that is still going back to the same question, is the teacher in field or out of field for the program that he completed.

Female: And we already have that covered.

Eileen McDaniel: And we already have that covered.

Female: Right.

Female: Yes, we do and so may I suggest we delete 22 please?

Female: You may.

(CROSSTALK)

Female: OK. Are there other – I know I've gotten a couple of e-mails wanting to know whether or not this is the final day of request list and I wanted to make sure that it's clear, if there's other information that you would like to see, definitely if you have that now and you want to bring that up or if you want to send an e-mail and we can look into that, but remember, we're trying to make sure that we have this information for you for the January 11 and 12 meeting in Orlando. Does anyone have anything that they'd like to bring to this committee as a whole right now, additional day of request?

Female: Someone had a question about placement rates, and that's not really addressed in the data request that we just went through but I want to have an appointment.

- Female: Is it possible to get that information?
- Female: Somebody repeat the question, I couldn't hear it.
- Female: There was a question early on in the conversation about just the over-all number of completers who were employed and that...
- Female: OK, thank you.
- Female: That may get it the placement rate question that (Rebecca) just said that she had heard. That's different and, of course, the ones that we looked at the analysis because the analysis looks like the Reading, Language or the Mathematic courses for purposes of VAM results.
- Female: Right.
- Female: But they want to see the number and percent of all completers who were employed, we can provide that.
- Female: Right. But it's only employed in the public schools and charter schools, right?
- Female: That is correct, that is correct.
- Female: OK.
- Female: In Florida.
- Female: In Florida.
- Female: Right.
- Female: So I don't know why we're not collecting it in Virginia, so OK, OK.
- Female: (Inaudible).
- Female: (Inaudible).
- Female: OK.

- Female: Yes.
- Female: Most of our kids go to New Jersey so if you could start collecting that for us, we'd be quite grateful now.
- Female: Getting on the phone with the governor right away.
- Julie Orange: Anyone else have anything that you'd like to share with the committee as a whole?
- Female: Julie, do you have a deadline for – if we do have any other requests, do you want it by a certain date?
- Julie Orange: You know, one second, we're going to discuss that internally.
- Female: OK.
- Julie Orange: OK, one week from today, so I believe that would be the 12th, Monday? And you can just e-mail that directly to me and I'll make sure that it's routed to the correct location.
- Female: Thanks, Julie.
- Julie Orange: OK. If no one has anything else, we'll definitely be in touch through the Hope Street tight and again, mark your calendars for the January 11th and 12th meeting in Orlando. We're going to be on the same place.
- Lance has been gracious enough to make sure that he provide us same location and we will make sure that we get you some follow-up notes from today's meeting back out to you.
- Male: Julie, I just want to thank you and the (BOE)s and everybody for your guidance and leadership in this effort. It's very well organized plans and it's well executed.
- Female: Bravo.
- Female: Thank you. Have a great evening.

Female: Thank you to everyone.

Female: Thank you.

Female: Bye-bye.

Female: Bye.

Male: Bye.

Operator: This concludes today's conference call. You may now disconnect.

**END**