

## 4/27/15 Core Committee Notes

### Review Annual Report

#### *Traci's Summary of surveys*

##### Positives

- Mapping
  - Good. Needed bigger blocks of time, but good
- Tech late starts
  - More teacher driven, good
  - Choices, good
- Peer observations are best part
- PLC Leaders do a good job

##### Improvements

- More focus
- Paperwork/documentation is a frustration
- Time for follow-up training
- Took time to review the document
- Next year's goals could be harder → good preliminary results with testing
- Data tracking for what students should be expected for students at each level
- Late starts did have some people like it, some did not

### 2015-2016 PLC Work Process Overview & Discussion (Traci's plan)

- DuFours model
- Reviewed the framework/4 questions
  - 4 questions generated 3 action streams (curriculum/instruction, assessment, intervention/acceleration)
  - Groups must work in all 3 streams during the year
  - Streams align with Q-Comp requirements
  - Observation and reflection are outside of the pathway piece
- Reviewed DuFour's PLC process
- Late starts
  - Cannot be top-down
- As PLC's work and realize they need something, they'll channel their needs to staff development and inform Late Starts
  - Every group from the bottom-up will plan what they are doing.
  - PLCs could team up—vertical alignment
- iTeam
  - strengths/weaknesses of various group configurations (grade level vs. subject)
  - Blocks of writing time and passing that info along (REAMS)
- There's a list of tasks groups can choose from within each stream (though the list is not exhaustive)
- Support will be available no matter which action stream task groups choose (place on web site or connect specifically with Traci or Peter)
- Documentation is already solidified for showing people have done the required pieces → line up between the existing paperwork and the new model?
  - Will that require plan change? Yes.
  - Plan change already happening for change to observation rubric
- Leaders will get all pieces for working through this process in a binder at the start of the year

- Then, there will be no monthly “do this, this date” thing any more
- At leader meetings, people will connect with other leaders to determine weekly agendas
- Sometimes the leaders will meet just with building level leaders instead of district-level
- ❑ Checklist was helpful as far as keeping everyone on track
- ❑ Student engagement is MDE focus/teacher evaluation statute
  - Those instructional strategies will be determined by group. Those are wide open. They’re not a “pick from this list.”
  - Strategies can be outside of reading
  - Best practice plan vs. statute plan
  - Look for continuous improvement
- ❑ Strategies discussion
  - Instead of calling it instructional strategies as far as Q-Comp requirement, call it something different so it’s broader?
  - Incorporate curriculum/instruction bullet 6: Incorporate best practice instructional strategies

### **Review Plan 2015-2016 Changes**

- ❑ Continuing from PLC Work process discussion
- ❑ Look at requirements document (page 4-6)

#### **122A.60 Subd. 1a Staff development activities must:**

- (1) focus on the school classroom and research-based strategies that improve student learning;
- (2) provide opportunities for teachers to practice and improve their instructional skills over time;
- (3) provide opportunities for teachers to use student data as part of their daily work to increase student achievement;
- (4) enhance teacher content knowledge and instructional skills, including to accommodate the delivery of digital and blended learning and curriculum and engage students with technology;
- (5) align with state and local academic standards;
- (6) provide opportunities to build professional relationships, foster collaboration among principals and staff who provide instruction, and provide opportunities for teacher-to-teacher mentoring...

#### ***Practices Required by Statute***

Licensed staff members receive ongoing, site-based professional development facilitated by trained teacher leaders.

Professional development is designed to improve content knowledge and the instructional skills of licensed staff members to increase student achievement through the examination of data and professional learning.

Professional development occurs regularly during the school day through individual, team and schoolwide learning activities and allows licensed staff members to improve instructional skills to meet identified student needs.

Professional development is collaborative in nature and builds professional relationships among staff members and with administrators.

Professional development is aligned with district and site staff development plans and state and local academic standards.

A teacher induction and mentoring program is in place to provide continuous learning and sustained support to probationary teachers.

- ❑ Any plan change has to explain how the change meets state statute
- ❑ How to change the strategies language (page 22)
- ❑ If a book is needed, let Peter know
- ❑ The process for strategies—keep as part of pathway or break out?
- ❑ Some districts: Design some change in instruction and then try it and then come back and PLC team looks at it. AIW-type process.

- Anecdotal side can work well with a process like this
- ❑ See New Goals Approval Process → see point below
- ❑ Have Traci do observations?
  - Opt out is a possibility for groups
  - Betsy was thinking have Traci be the second observer for Leaders to make it easier (people taking preps to watch others)
  - Wouldn't need as many subs
  - Could build some inter-rater reliability to have someone observing across the district
  - Do some co-observation and remind people that Traci is available if needed to help with observations of Leaders/coaches
  - Leave it as is

### **New Goals Approval Process**

- ❑ Each PLC has a google doc home. All meeting minutes are there. Traci has access.
- ❑ Form for each person's goal.
- ❑ For principal approval, Traci will pull from that document and generate a building-level document with everyone's goal on it. No paper trail/back and forth.
- ❑ Goals and quarters at RMS-CES.
  - Difficulty of turning it around 4 times
  - Could it be parallel with observation dates?
  - Some elementary teachers are done in the fall.
  - Challenge if people are feeling like they're done after a % of the year
  - Minimum of two reporting times
    - From plan: "The goal has a minimum of two reporting periods during the year based on the building schedule. The mid-year progress report(s) allows the teacher to discuss classroom student achievement progress with the PLC Leader and PLC peers. Teachers will then determine a plan that will address next steps and what, if any, additional assistance is needed in order to meet the goal. In May, the teacher will submit student growth data that shows whether the goal was met."
    - This does mean a shift if people can be done tracking after they've met two times.
- ❑ Process should not change practice, can be a frustration when it does
- ❑ Every goal has to be based on Q-Comp district building goal → does the wording below indicate that, for example, each individual's goal does not have to be related to the district goal. Individuals could set a math goal, correct? Goal has to be aligned to standards and student achievement.

#### ***Practices Required by Statute (page 11 Q-Comp requirement document)***

Teacher compensation is reformed to address all of the following:

- The steps and lanes salary schedule, or the base salary improvement system, is revised to link performance to increased compensation.
- No teacher's compensation is reduced.
- At least 60 percent of a teacher's increase in compensation must be based on the performance gains in three areas: (1) schoolwide student achievement on a standardized assessment, (2) measures of student achievement and (3) teacher evaluation.

The schoolwide student achievement goal on a standardized assessment is measurable, and it can be clearly determined if the goal has been met and compensation is earned.

The measure of student achievement is measurable, and it can be clearly determined if the standard of student performance has been met and compensation is earned.

The standard for teacher performance is clearly defined and can be measured through the evaluation program. There is a process in place to determine if a teacher has met the standard and earned compensation.

**Recommended Best Practices (page 12)**

The salary schedule reform links movement in one direction (step movement) to performance gains in three areas: (1) schoolwide student achievement on a standardized assessment, (2) measures of student achievement and (3) teacher evaluation.

Schoolwide goals assess rigorous annual gains and are written in specific/strategic, measurable, attainable, results-based and time-bound (SMART) format.

Schoolwide student achievement goals are consistent with goals set in the district strategic plan and other state or federal programs.

Schoolwide goals are written to compare year-to-year achievement of all students tested and include additional measures (e.g., closing achievement gaps, increasing performance levels for all students).

The measure of student achievement is a goal at the grade, team or classroom level measured through a locally determined assessment and is written in SMART format and aligned with the schoolwide goal.

A review and reporting process is used to ensure equity and rigor among all staff members and to determine if compensation has been earned for the measure of student achievement goal or goals.

The standard of teacher performance is rigorous and demonstrates effective teaching.

- Individuals write a goal that aligns to \_\_\_\_\_ where applicable with the exception of \_\_\_\_\_.
- Math has done vocab or problem-solving type goals (“real-world”)
- Academic vocabulary goal. Who would still struggle with that sort of structure for goals?
- Keep the structure the same.
  
- It’s ok to let people be “done” goal-wise once they’ve met their goal even if it’s not the spring, not the end of the year
  - Articulate this shift clearly so people don’t see this as a relaxing of expectations?
  - Have a reflection piece—though I was done at an earlier part in the year, reflect on whether or not you continued to use the stuff that you tracked
- Individual student achievement goal. Yes, language still good.
  
- Intervention and Acceleration Action Stream
  - Looked at language
  - Need acceleration language option
- REAMS
  - Don’t make it redundant—check that they’ve done the intervention work—even if it’s through other meetings
  - Talk more about students in grade level meetings than PLCs
- RMS-CES
  - Driven by need.
  - Do it to meet the plan, but sometimes it’s not the need
  - Already doing this in the grade level
  - There is accountability with minutes submitted for grade level meetings
  - Follow-up in PLC: any follow up on those students brought up in that meeting?
  - Count grade level meeting time as PLC time
  - Attended grade-level meetings can be the engagement piece of PLC engagement
- RHS
  - Don’t have grade level meetings

- Do share what happened in past year
- ❑ There are times we don't count (observation meetings pre/post)
- ❑ We just need evidence to support that individuals have done what's needed to earn the \$ in this category
- ❑ Concern about specialist sometimes not having the accommodation information they need
- ❑ What impact has this intervention process had on student achievement?
- ❑ Keep language the same, keep paperwork available, but no need to require it for individuals unless they want to use it because they've found it helpful for tracking what they do
- ❑ Minutes reflect the discussion

**Review 2015-2016 Calendar**

- ❑ 3 months where we have 120 minutes in a month, but otherwise we have more than is required each month
- ❑ Not all staff development time is PLC time. Need to be mindful of that.
- ❑ Last year 2, 200 on calendar. Requirement is 2, 020. 180 extra
- ❑ For next year, 140 extra instead of 180. Extra=above the minimum required by our plan.
- ❑ The state's best practice, we are not emerging.
- ❑ How do we get extra minutes?
- ❑ Teachers are used to PLC time = Q-Comp time is the way people think at this point
- ❑ Late start activities will look broader
- ❑ Professional development days and how that time is used
- ❑ Most effective instructional leadership comes from principals
  - Encourage communication amongst all these different groups/interests
  - 420 of plan minutes are those SD days. Need SD/Q-Comp to overlap or we have to revise the Q-Comp calendar
  - Anything we do would impact student achievement, right? Yes. MDE police are not coming even if the thing we do on SD days/SD time is not Q-Comp driven, but principal or district driven
- ❑ Peter can work with board—"not too worried about that" as far as the minutes
- ❑ Autism population and EL population
- ❑ Orange squares on calendar are extra middle school meetings since their meetings are 30 minutes
- ❑ Which day during workshop week will the 180 be?
  - Peter will bring that up at upcoming meeting
- ❑ Core Committee meeting dates 2015-2016
  - September 21, ½ day pm
  - December 7, ½ day pm
  - February 16, ½ day pm
  - April 26, full day

**Review 2015-2016 Groups**

- ❑ Looked at groups. Made revisions as needed.

**Postings and Career Ladder Turnover**

- ❑ Observation groups. Replacements have already been found
- ❑ Core Committee—Chart of Wonder as to terms and re-hiring follows

Cycle	School Year	On committee	Up for re-hire
Year 1	2011-2012	Jean, Betsy, Brandy, Becky, Jan	
Year 2	2012-2013	Jean, Betsy, Brandy, Becky, Jan, Kathy*	

Year 3	2013-2014	Jean, Betsy, Brandy, Becky, Jan, Kathy	Jean, Betsy and Brandy
Year 4	2014-2015	Jean*, Betsy*, Brandy*, Becky, Jan, Kathy	Kathy, Jan
Year 4	2015-2016		Becky, Brandy
Year 5	2016-2017		Jean, Betsy
Year 6	2017-2018		
			*=-Year 1 of cycle

Cycle	School Year	On committee	Up for re-hire
-2		ES A, ES B, MS A, MS B, HS A, HS B	ES A, HS A
-1		ES A, ES B, MS A, MS B, HS A, HS B	ES B, MS A
Year 1	2011-2012	ES A, ES B, MS A, MS B, HS A, HS B	MS B, HS B
Year 2	2012-2013	ES A, ES B, MS A, MS B, HS A, HS B	ES A, HS A
Year 3	2013-2014	ES A, ES B, MS A, MS B, HS A, HS B	ES B, MS A
Year 4	2014-2015	ES A, ES B, MS A, MS B, HS A, HS B	MS B, HS B
Year 4	2015-2016	ES A, ES B, MS A, MS B, HS A, HS B	ES A, HS A
Year 5	2016-2017	ES A, ES B, MS A, MS B, HS A, HS B	ES B, MS A
Year 6	2017-2018	ES A, ES B, MS A, MS B, HS A, HS B	MS B, HS B

Committee Designation	Committee Member
ES A	Becky
ES B	Jean
MS A	Betsy
MS B	Jan
HS A	Brandy
HS B	Kathy