OREGON DEPARTMENT OF EDUCATION

Salam Noor, Deputy Superintendent of Public Instruction

ESSA Educator Effectiveness Work Group Meeting
June 28, 8:30 am – 3:30 pm
Portland Sheraton Airport Hotel

Members Present "X":

X	Team Lead: Sarah Drinkwater, Office of Student Services	X	Colin Cameron, Confederation of Oregon School Administrators	X	Brian McCasline, South Lane School District
X	Team Support: Theresa Richards	X	Erica Cooper, Lebanon Community Schools	X	Michael McDonald, Bend-LaPine Schools
	Team Support: April Campbell, Equity Unit		Esperanza De La Vega, Portland State University		Tricia Mooney, Pendleton School District
X	Team Support: Victor Cato, Office of Dept. Supt	X	Becky DeSalvo, Ashland High School		Marsha Moyer, Independent Contractor
X	Team Support: Mindy Cordsen, Office of Student Services	X	Don Dorman, Linn Benton Lincoln ESD	X	John Ogden, Oregon City School District
	Team Support: Sarah Martin	X	Michael Fisher, Springfield Public Schools	X	Maureen Ray, N Clack SD/ Alder Creek MS
X	Team Support: Roni Pham, Early Learning Division		Sarah Flores, Portland Public Schools		Brooke Rich, High Desert ESD
X	Team Support: Lisa Plumb, Office Teaching & Learning		Melissa Glover, Salem-Keizer School District		Ken Richardson, David Douglas School District
X	Team Support: Brian Putnam, Office Teaching & Learning		Mayra Gomez, Centennial School District	X	Armando Ruiz, Coquille School District
	Team Support: Rae Ann Ray, Office of Student Services		Lloyd Hartley, Clatskanie School District	X	Julie Smith, Chalkboard Project
	Team Support: Hilda Rosselli, Early Learning Division	X	Bobbie Jager, BEST~ Building Excellent Schools Together	X	Terrel Smith, Sherwood High School
X	Team Support: Jamie Rumage, Office Teaching & Learning	X	Nori Juba, Chalkboard Project, AVID, Bend La Pine Schools, OSBA		Tim Sweeney, Coquille School District
X	Team Support: Markisha Smith, Office Teaching & Learning		Chris Kuka, TSPC Commissioner/Bend La Pine Public Schools	X	Erin Whitlock, Oregon Education Association
X	Inge Aldersebaes, OEA Choice Trust		Victoria Lazareva, Umatilla School District		Charlene Williams, Portland Public Schools
X	Kasi Allen, Lewis & Clark College		Kona Lew-Williams, Hillsboro School District	X	Alicia Wishart, Douglas ESD
X	Chris Brantley, Salem-Keizer SD/TSPC/OSBA	X	David Marshall, Milton-Freewater Unified School District		

Purpose and Outcomes of this Work Group:	**Outcomes of Today's Meeting:**
The workgroup will shape recommendations and guidance toward Oregon's plan for the implementation of the ESSA. The work completed by this workgroup will include: • Review and potential revision of the Oregon Framework for Teacher and Administrator Evaluation and Support Systems including the related Oregon Revised Statutes and Oregon Administrative Rules. • Proposal and guidance to the field for a state and local system that meets the requirements for ESSA through state licensure and certification. • Proposal of a system that ensures low income and minority students are not served at disproportionate.	Goal 1: Summarize current leanings of workgroup to inform ODE leadership regarding potential revisions to the requirements for Oregon's evaluation system. Goal 2: Explore key areas of intersection between the Oregon's Equitable Access to Excellent Educator Plan and Workgroup Recommendations.

Agenda Item / Topic	Discussion Summary *(Discussion, Questions, Answers & Agreements)*	Follow up & Action Items *Staff & Timeline*
Welcome and Introduction	Brian Putnam and Markisha Smith, Oregon Department of Education (ODE), welcomed the Educator Effectiveness Work Group members. Markisha outlined the agenda for the day. During the morning session, the group would discuss the purpose statement of Oregon's Evaluation and Support System, talk about the Key Strategies of the Educator Equity Plan, work on recommendations for discussion around revising the Oregon Administrative Rule (OAR): Student Input and Culturally Responsive and Global Diversity and discuss the Oregon Matrix: Student Performance and State Assessments. He briefly reminded the work group of who the ODE sponsor, leads, co-leads and internal staff were by introducing them. He also reminded the workgroup about the meeting norms and work group assumptions around equity being front and center for the work they are doing. The two goals for the day's work were also outlined	
Purpose statement of Oregon's Evaluation and Support System	Brian Putnam provided a review of the purpose and goals of the Educator Effectiveness Workgroup created during the last meeting held May 18, 2016 in Salem. The purpose was: "*Culturally responsive and sustaining system of support and evaluation that facilitates continuous professional growth of all teachers and administrators to meet the needs of all students.*" Victor Cato, ODE, spoke about the formation of the ESSA Advisory Committee that convened June 9, 2016. He provided a handout that gave an overview summary of the ESSA Advisory Committee, their charge, and the work they will be doing in regards to ESSA. All recommendations created during the Educator Effectiveness Work Group meetings will be given to the ESSA Advisory Committee. The Advisory Committee represents a second layer of stakeholder engagement by providing feedback directly to the Deputy Superintendent around possible policy implications and implementation considerations. This input is reported back to the workgroups and is used to strengthen and refine their recommendations that will ultimately guide the development of the State Plan. This Advisory Committee consists of education stakeholders throughout the state of Oregon.	Include Oregon Education Association (OEA) under the representation list in the ESSA Advisory Committee overview handout Victor had provided.

Agenda Item / Topic	Discussion Summary *(Discussion, Questions, Answers & Agreements)*	Follow up & Action Items *Staff & Timeline*
	A question was asked regarding the purpose statement on why they chose "meet the needs" versus "ensuring the success". The group talked about how the needs of one group are different than others. A recommendation was suggested to include "and ensure the success" after "meet the needs". Some of the members felt the purpose statement didn't need to be wordsmithed. It was recommended to return back to this after the group has a conversation about the OARs. It was felt the language should align and be consistent with the OARs. A suggestion was made to include "teachers and administrators to assure college and/or career readiness" in the purpose statement to align with the language/initiatives already familiar to Oregon educators.	
Key Strategies: Educator Equity Plan	Markisha spoke about the three key strategies that were pulled directly from the Education Equity Plan. The group focused on three major strategies when thinking about closing the gap in regards to educators and their distribution in schools with high populations of students of color and students of poverty. She outlined the key strategies and sub strategies: Human Capital Management • Recruitment and hiring practices – having schools and districts employee educators (principals and teachers) that reflect the student population they are serving. • Recruitment incentives – what keeps educators in the schools • Retention - how to retain educators Ongoing Professional Learning • Review and alignment of funding streams – opening financial means to have high quality teachers • Improve and expand induction and mentoring programs • Improve quality and delivery of culturally responsive professional development across the state • Require districts to submit Equity Action Plans – there are a lot of districts doing some work in this area. This is one piece of a bigger puzzle on how changing practices to focus on this.	

Agenda Item / Topic	Discussion Summary *(Discussion, Questions, Answers & Agreements)*	Follow up & Action Items *Staff & Timeline*
	Monitor Teacher and Principal Preparation • Utilize the Oregon Educator Equity Advisory Group • Critically examine licensure requirements that might result in barriers during the pre-service phase. Markisha provided a handout for groups to consider ways in which the Key Strategies of the Equitable Access Plan align with the Standards of Professional Practice and the Educator Effectiveness Work Group Recommendations. Discussions ensued regarding these strategies. It was mentioned that strategies for differentiated staff development is needed. It was also mentioned one district was looking at how they can use internal district professional development requirements to push into Teacher Standards and Practices Commission (TSPC) licensure to go into equity teaching. This will help with licensure renewals.	
Standards of Professional Practice	Markisha spoke about the crosswalk and ways in which the Key Strategies of the Equitable Access plan align with the Standards of Professional Practice and our Workgroup Recommendations. Markisha gave an example: Sub-strategy 2 – on-going professional development to align with sub-strategy 3 that aligns with online professional learning and instructional practices. They are asking the group to discuss what intersects. It was asked what strategies can be used for differentiated staff development and what the state is doing. There has been some work amongst districts looking at Senate Bill 290 and to use internal district professional development requirements and how to push that through the TSPC licensing renewals. The field would like to have direction from ODE on how to support professional development and support administrators to become more confident and production to have collaborative conversations for best practice. The group wants more flexibility however have some parameters. The group engaged in a rich conversation around professional development and the differences amongst the schools within the state. The group was given a crosswalk handout to provide feedback to ODE. Everyone was asked to fill it out and return it to Victor Cato.	

Agenda Item / Topic	Discussion Summary *(Discussion, Questions, Answers & Agreements)*	Follow up & Action Items *Staff & Timeline*
Presentation of a Potential Revised OAR	Brian Putnam reviewed potential changes recommended by the Educator Effectiveness Work Group from the previous meeting and gave the group an opportunity to make changes to the OARs. The group was provided with a copy of changes that they recommended during the last meeting in May and asked to discuss at their tables if they mean that student input (i.e., surveys) would ultimately be factored into an educator evaluation. **<u>PowerPoint Notes on Student Input:</u>** • Student inputs rather than survey • Adding it to the short list could create confusion • Researched based student input measures – agreed upon and research informed • Both student input and parent input • Resources for teachers to find research informed+ **Vote:** include student input – 6 downs; 7 ups; 4 sideways (can live with it). Student voice has an important role in evaluation; however, the group could not agree on what that looks like.	
Culturally Responsive and Global Diversity Language	Should these statements be included? What are the potential impacts on district systems? **<u>PowerPoint Notes on Culture and Diversity:</u>** • Should be located under another place within the OAR – under 3 or 4 or 3a. • Not sure that G belongs – how is it measurable – combine G and F to be "embed culturally responsive/sustaining practices for students to be successful in a global/diverse society" **Vote**: to include F (G is assumed under F) somewhere under section 3: 17 thumbs up; 0 thumbs down	
Oregon Matrix: Student Performance and State Assessments	**Student Performance** Should student academic performance be a required component of the summative evaluation? ▪ SB 290 says "must take into consideration multiple measures of student, school and district performance data which MUST include student academic growth data that is both formative and summative"…	

Agenda Item / Topic	Discussion Summary *(Discussion, Questions, Answers & Agreements)*	Follow up & Action Items *Staff & Timeline*

	PowerPoint Notes on Student Performance:
	• If you use "must", then it must align to the key responsibilities of the educator - academic performance aligned to academic growth
	• C – Must tie to responsibility of the teacher and the "may" should be in B.
	• Including language that gets measures to be aligned to responsibilities as agreed to by the evaluator/teacher
	• Vote: 15 ups, 1 sideways, 1 down
	• If we have the language aligned around the role, specify set goals that include student learning and growth (admin & teachers)
	• Vote: 7 ups; 9 sideways, 2 down
	• Based on consideration of student learning and growth that may align to district standards of performance for professional practice
	• Types of assessment that should be included
	Vote: 2 sideways, 7 down, 1 up
	
	Oregon Matrix
	Should the summative evaluation be represented by a single score?
	• If so, should the method of determining a summative evaluation score be uniform statewide? No
	   • If yes, should the Matrix be the method?
	   • If no, then why
	      • Rationale for no uniform method
	      • Should there be any required components/parameters to determining summative evaluation? Should this be consistent statewide?
	
	PowerPoint Notes on Oregon Matrix:
	• If evaluation should no longer have a number – there was not true comparability with the matrix so the weighting was already distorted. The comparability is about quality as a lens of comparability. Comparability definition of how to define that. It's about comparability of quality versus comparability of quantity.
	      • The system doesn't tell a real truth and the standards are not measured district to district (apples to apples). Is the system going to be individualized no matter what standards they do? There is a system that doesn't tell the tremendous truth anyways.
	• Provide individual districts flexibility because there is no reliability	

Agenda Item / Topic	Discussion Summary *(Discussion, Questions, Answers & Agreements)*	Follow up & Action Items *Staff & Timeline*

	district to district. The matrix is not reliable.
	• Doesn't understand why we are talking about the matrix at all because it's not comparable or reliable and creates low morale.
	• Reasons to remove the matrix from the OAR:
	  ▪ Don't want a single score
	  ▪ Keep the matrix
	• Remove Oregon matrix in 4b in OAR and make it optional
	Vote: 16 down, 1 sideways – means remove the Oregon Matrix words
	
	• Method of reporting – parameters around statewide and how summative data is reported. Possibility would be reporting on information about teachers. Do we want a consistent uniform method at the school level about reporting summative evaluations?
	Vote: 9 ups; 5 sideways, 3 down	

Oregon Framework:	Brian Putnam handed out copies of the Oregon Framework for the group to review.
	• SB 290—Section 2
	  • Oregon Framework addresses this by putting three categories aligned to the adopted standards:
	    ▪ Professional Practice
	    ▪ Professional Responsibilities
	    ▪ Student Learning and Growth
	• SB 290 requires:
	  • standards of performance
	  • multiple measures
	  • consideration of "…evidence of student growth and learning…"
	
	The workgroup was asked to read the Oregon Framework and to discuss amongst their individual groups of the Five required components, is there any area you would recommend be targeted for revisions?
	
	They were asked to jot down their thoughts and to hand in their notes to anyone on the ODE team.	

Meeting Adjourned / *No future meetings scheduled.*