

Members Present “X”:

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

<p>Purpose of Educator Effectiveness Work Group: The ESSA workgroups help inform development of Oregon’s ESSA state plan and implementation by exploring aspects of the law and paying particular attention to areas of flexibility in order to create a plan that best represents Oregon’ values and priorities. The workgroup provides guidance to the ODE ESSA Leadership Group. Each workgroup is made up of an internal ODE cross-office team and external stakeholders.</p> <p>Each workgroup has a responsibility to adhere to State and Federal Statutes. Group leadership will provide guidance and references to both.</p> <p>Outcomes: 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:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • 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. 	<p>Purpose & Outcomes of Today’s Meeting:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Consider questions and responses from cross workgroup session. • Unpack Senate Bill 290 and related OAR to better understand the current landscape of teacher evaluation and identify potential recommendations. • Cultivate a deeper understanding of the Oregon Matrix. • Explore key areas of intersection between the Oregon’s Equitable Access to Excellent Educator Plan and ESSA.
--	--

Meeting Notes:

Agenda Item / Topic	Discussion Summary (Discussion, Questions, Answers & Agreements)	Follow up & Action Items Staff & Timeline
Cross Work Group Discussion	<p>Victor Cato, ODE, asked group to divide into an equal amount of teachers and administrators per table for the work that will be completed today.</p> <p>He outlined the agenda, goals for the day, and reminded the group of the group norms that were formed during the first meeting held in April. No additional norms were added.</p>	

Agenda Item / Topic	Discussion Summary (Discussion, Questions, Answers & Agreements)	Follow up & Action Items Staff & Timeline
<p>Unpacking Senate Bill (SB) 290 and Oregon Administrative Rule (OAR) 581-022-1723</p>	<p>Each table was asked to talk about the cross-work discussion about how educator effectiveness affects the standards and assessment, accountability, and district and school improvement work.</p> <p>The groups each provided a share out in the form of Venn Diagrams which is depicted in another document and will be included when these minutes are distributed.</p> <p>The group was allotted an ample amount of time to read the Senate Bill 290 and Oregon Administrative Rule (OAR) 581-022-1723 in order to have an in-depth group discussion.</p> <p>The purpose of educator effectiveness system was discussed and the group provided the following proposed purpose:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Culturally responsive and sustaining system of support and evaluation that facilitates continuous growth of all teachers and administrators to meet the needs of all students • Goal setting that improves students and educators through data informed decision making and differentiation • Defines levels of effective educator • Student input • Align or link to a professional development system that speaks to different elements of an effective educator • Statewide guidance and accountability <p>The group unanimously agreed no recommended changes are needed to the Oregon Revised Statute (SB 290).</p> <p>Suggested changes to OAR 581-022-1723:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Framework elements need to be revised (scoring of the goals). 4b) use of Oregon Matrix should be optional. 4c) language should be <i>may</i> instead of <i>must</i>." A.) Omit everything after "performance". If it's all "may" you don't have to do student learning. B.) Added "interim". Framework to include one student learning goal and one PD goal. • 1.) "Customized" improve implementation gap of the system if limit customization and implement a statewide rubric. 2a.) If the word "may" is used; some teachers wouldn't need to be evaluated. Added 2E.) student surveys. 3.) Added a 3.F - self-sustaining practices 3G - all out culturally sustaining practices in a globally diverse society 	

Agenda Item / Topic	Discussion Summary (Discussion, Questions, Answers & Agreements)	Follow up & Action Items Staff & Timeline
	<p>(accommodate rural). 4b) Matrix -what information is wanted and why decision points for using it.</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • 4b.) Matrix be replaced with another tool. There needs to be training and consistency and understanding by teachers. 4c) Should “significantly” be quantified. • 4c) if change “must” with “may” it affects academic performance (4A). <p>Everyone provided their group’s recommended written changes to OAR 581-022-1723 to ODE staff for reference.</p>	
Digging into the Matrix	<p>Sarah Martin, ODE, spoke about the three summative evaluations based on multiple measures required in the Oregon Administrative Rules (OAR): Professional Practice (PP), Student Learning and Growth (SLG), and Professional Responsibilities (PR).</p> <p>Sarah spoke about what is currently required (outlined in the PowerPoint presentation) and what can be customized.</p> <p>Question: What should Oregon’s summative evaluation method for combining multiple measures of professional practice, professional responsibility and student learning and growth be?</p> <p>Recap from April Table Talk benefits of the matrix:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Allows for consistency in providing ratings • Helps with directing professional growth • Professional practice axis is a good place for conversations <p>Drawbacks of the matrix:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Not well understood by all • Lack of trust • Lack/Inconsistency of training • Every district uses a different rubric <p>Possible Solutions: Should we have the same rubric? Should we move Oregon’s model to the same rubric for consistency? The group provided the following:</p> <p>Pros</p>	

Agenda Item / Topic	Discussion Summary (Discussion, Questions, Answers & Agreements)	Follow up & Action Items Staff & Timeline
	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Consistency in language • Providing professional development • New teacher induction would be smoother • State could support keeping districts up to date because you could evolve as the practice evolves • Provides a vision for what effective teaching looks like that was shared • Could be used in teacher and leader development in higher Ed--shared language • Shared resources between small districts with their larger hubs/ESDs • Venn Diagram - EE current sits out side, if you had a common language and understanding of proficiency could it inform the rest of the system that is being designed through ESSA in a more streamlined way. • Would be easier to monitor the health of your system • Can be used to “nudge” the system/practice <p>Cons</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Common rubric does not guarantee consistency of implementation • Current system has not resulted in any dramatic change in the numbers assigned to teachers--have rubrics made a difference? Having the same rubric would not necessarily improve this • When a district develops their own rubric teachers know that their peers were included in the process--buy-in by staff • Can paint a one size fits all of teachers? <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • (We use one rubric for students how is this different using one rubric for teachers?) • What about specialists? One rubric would mean that the language would not reflect the work of all staff <p>What should Oregon’s model look like for summative evaluation?</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Does the state need a summative score? Equitable distribution of excellent educators--the use of a score could be useful for this purpose • Incentives - class size smaller • Driving professional development based on what the evaluation/scores tell you • Purpose of summative evaluation-value of not averaging or taking things down to one number. Looking more description (as domains do) 	

Agenda Item / Topic	Discussion Summary <i>(Discussion, Questions, Answers & Agreements)</i>	Follow up & Action Items <i>Staff & Timeline</i>
	<p>Would use summative to:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Guide PL provided by state (and also at district/state) and resources and be able to have a more focused conversation-can suss out what needs to be focused on • Make decisions on whether there was access to effective educators. Rather than basing it on one number you would base it on domains • Better data on where incoming teachers are struggling or shining - could inform college prep system • Law tells us what the model looks like, Matrix gets in the way. Modify Framework language so that districts can develop a system that is more useful to their educators. Matrix has undermined the ability to make it meaningful, nimble and formative • If we need a number, having the Matrix optional will mean that every district will have a different formula for combining the multiple measures 	

Meeting Adjourned

Next Meeting: June 28, 2016; Portland Airport Sheraton Hotel

Attachment: *Recommendations from the Assessment Workgroup for Educator Effectiveness*

Recommendations from the Assessment Workgroup for Educator Effectiveness

May 18, 2016, Red Lion Hotel, Salem

- Go beyond Highly Qualified Teachers (HQT)
- Senate Bill 290 – St. Large & Growth Goals
 - Implemented inconsistently.
 - Role of student growth & reliability across states
- Mentor new teachers
- View of support versus punishment – coaching – smart goals
- Not enough time in districts & schools to analyze educator effectiveness data

Assessment Literacy

- More support needed for both admin and teachers
- Need more focus on leader evaluations