

**Minutes of the Meeting of the**  
**TEACHER AND LEADER EFFECTIVENESS COMMISSION**  
**OLIVER HODGE EDUCATION BUILDING**  
**2500 NORTH LINCOLN BOULEVARD, ROOM 1-20**  
**OKLAHOMA CITY, OKLAHOMA**

**September 19, 2012**

The Teacher and Leader Effectiveness Commission met in regular session at 1:35 p.m. on Wednesday, September 19, 2012, in the Board Room of the Oliver Hodge Education Building at 2500 North Lincoln Boulevard, Oklahoma City, Oklahoma. The final agenda was posted at 1:00 p.m. on Tuesday, September 14, 2012.

The following were present:

Ms. Alicia Currin-Moore, Executive Director, Teacher and Leader Effectiveness,  
Oklahoma State Department of Education  
Ms. Connie Holland, Chief Executive Secretary, State Board of Education

Members of the Teacher and Leader Effectiveness Commission present:

Dr. Janet Barresi, State Superintendent of Public Instruction, Chair  
Mr. Ed Allen, American Federation of Teachers  
Representative Ed Cannaday, House of Representatives  
Senator John Ford, State Senate  
Ms. Susan Harris, Tulsa Chamber of Commerce  
Ms. Anna King (arrived at 3:00 p.m.)  
Ms. Renee Launey-Rodolf, Oklahoma Commission for Teacher Preparation  
Ms. Alicia Priest, Oklahoma Education Association  
Mr. Ben Robinson  
Mr. Robert Ross, President/CEO, INASMUCH Foundation (arrived 2:00 p.m.)  
Ms. Ginger Tinney, Professional Oklahoma Educators

Members of the Teacher and Leader Effectiveness Commission absent:

Dr. Keith Ballard, Superintendent, Tulsa Public Schools  
Dr. Phil Berkenbile, State Director, Department of Career and Technology Education  
Dr. Don Betz, President, University of Central Oklahoma  
Ms. Phyllis Hudecki, Secretary of Education  
Senator Richard Lerblance, State Senate  
Dr. Jeff Mills, Executive Director, Oklahoma State School Boards Association  
Representative Earl Sears, House of Representatives

Others in attendance are shown as an attachment.

**CALL TO ORDER  
AND  
ROLL CALL**

Superintendent Barresi called the Teacher and Leader Effectiveness Commission meeting to order at 1:35 p.m. and welcomed everyone to the meeting. Ms. Holland called the roll and ascertained there was not a quorum.

**OPENING COMMENTS**

Superintendent Barresi welcomed Ms. Renee Launey-Rodolf, Oklahoma Commission for Teacher Preparation, as a member of the TLE Commission.

Ms. Alicia Currin-Moore, Executive Director, Teacher and Leader Effectiveness, said that because there was not a quorum, the Commission had two options. One option would be to have a meeting before the October 17, 2012, regularly scheduled TLE Commission meeting or discuss and vote on several items at the October 17, 2012 meeting. She said she would email Commission members regarding that issue.

Representative Cannaday asked a question about the operational definition of other academic performance measures.

Ms. Currin-Moore said she had researched other states using this type of evaluation piece and there is not a clear-cut definition. If the Commission feels it is necessary to define other academic measures as opposed to providing a list that is another option. There is not a statutory reference to the definition of other academic measures.

Superintendent Barresi said information regarding that issue would be sent to Commission members for review and possible action at the next meeting.

At 2:00 p.m., Mr. Robert Ross arrived and a quorum was established.

**TLE IMPLEMENTATION UPDATE**

Ms. Currin-Moore said there have been approximately 19 teacher evaluation trainings, nine leader evaluation trainings, and additional trainings for teachers to help them understand how their framework pertains to their classroom development.

The TLE assessment was a two-part assessment and notifications were sent to each administrator regarding their passage of the written portion of the assessment. The inter-rater reliability assessments will continue through late September. The SDE will receive data on each administrator that successfully completes both the written assessment and the inter-rater reliability. Both tests must be passed in order to be a certified evaluator.

Representative Cannaday asked if there were any situations where a principal failed to become certified and yet was the only one qualified to evaluate.

Ms. Currin-Moore said no. The SDE receives information about individuals who have passed certification. Approximately 2,100 administrators have been trained. Teacher training is on a voluntary basis.

## OTHER ACADEMIC MEASURES

Ms. Currin-Moore said she has researched teacher portfolios and the difference between community service projects and service learning.

There will be options available for other academic measures. The A-F Report Card is one option. At what level the decision will be made will be important. For example, the decision to use the A-F Report Card could be made at the district level. If the decision is made at the site level, the principal may decide to use the A-F Report Card because the school received an A.

Superintendent Barresi said the Commission needs to decide how many options from the menu will need to be chosen by the district to use or the Commission could determine what options the district would use. There was concern regarding a site decision to use A-F. If a teacher is at a D or F school, because of the value added component, the teacher could have a much higher value added score and recover from a poor A-F grade.

Ms. Harris said the other academic measures are 15 percent. That is one of the problems. The schools needing the best teachers most often have trouble getting enough of the best teachers to make a difference.

Superintendent Barresi said that could be a basic question for the Commission to answer: Would the Commission like to develop an approved list that each district would select a set number of items?

Ms. Harris said regarding the list, some are appropriate for high school students but not for elementary students. The list would almost need to be grade specific.

Ms. Currin-Moore said if the decision is at the district level, the district will need to make sure that within the measures selected there are appropriate measures for high school and elementary teachers.

Superintendent Barresi asked if it was possible for the Commission to determine districts would select five for the high school grade ban, five for the Grade 6 through 8 grade ban, and five for the pre-kindergarten through five grade ban.

Ms. Currin-Moore said yes that would be possible. Some measures would be tied more directly to teachers.

Surveys and portfolios could be at mid-range. The Gallup Student Survey is Grades 5 through 12, which would be an issue. Having a definition of Other Academic Measures would help incorporate student surveys or eliminate them.

Superintendent Barresi said feedback from teachers indicated they did not want the 15 percent to be strictly academic because they wanted to show the art of teaching.

Representative Cannaday that should be under qualitative, not quantitative and is a discussion the Commission needs to have. The legislation specified an academic measure.

Minutes of the Meeting of the  
Teacher and Leader Effectiveness Commission  
September 19, 2012

Ms. Currin-Moore said under other academic measures, other states that have used that same terminology do have surveys as an option.

Ms. Priest said North Carolina and Illinois are using the Tripod Survey.

Ms. Launey-Rodolf asked if the purpose of the 15 percent was to bring in more of the professional teaching skills rather than the content.

Mr. Robert Ross arrived at 2:00 p.m., making a quorum.

Ms. Currin-Moore said service learning and portfolios would be long-term options.

Ms. Harris said on the qualitative piece if the evaluator gave a teacher a 2 or 3 and the teacher believed they should have received a 4 or 5, then the teacher would want to make sure their portfolio points to that element of teaching. Is that correct?

Ms. Currin-Moore said yes.

Superintendent Barresi said the Commission would decide on a definition.

Ms. Currin-Moore reviewed the different types of portfolios and information that should be included in the portfolios. The hybrid approach would have a portfolio having evidence of student growth for the purpose of evaluation, which would probably be the best approach to have. Student growth can be better addressed in a portfolio than on an assessment.

Superintendent Barresi said a teacher would have an opportunity in a non-tested grade and subject to include in their portfolio the goals set for their students at the beginning of the year, which would be a demonstration of growth in that particular area which will provide greater substance, and more support regarding how to attach them to the value added. It would be a supporting document.

Ms. Currin-Moore said that is correct. She reviewed the different approaches of evidence that could be included in a portfolio. To help in the scoring of the portfolios there would need to be uniformity in the entries. If the district or site is more singular in their approach, it will be easier to score. There would need to be an additional capacity to rate the portfolios. There would also need to be a variety of options regarding the portfolio audits.

Superintendent Barresi said if the Commission decided to use portfolios, another meeting would be necessary to decide the entire framework around the portfolio.

Ms. Currin-Moore said the portfolio audit would be a way to have checks and balances to ensure validity to the tests.

Commission Members discussed the possibility of two principals reviewing portfolios, local employment and local control issues, providing guidance regarding the size of portfolios, confidentiality of children, evaluator's time, and having a rubric in order to move toward a true academic measure.

Ms. Currin-Moore reviewed the difference between community service projects and service learning. A service-learning project is very in depth involving several steps.

Representative Cannaday asked would a team approach using and incorporating all curriculum at the site be required.

Ms. Currin-Moore said that is the basis of a service-learning project. The Commission reviewed all possible options that could be included on the other academic measures menu that would be presented to the State Board.

Ms. Priest said the Commission needed to define what are other academic measures and make sure it falls under the correct auspicious of the law before deciding what other academic measures should be placed on the list.

Representative Cannaday said that if the Commission is taking a hardcore definition of academic measures he would have to vote no on many of the choices.

Superintendent Barresi said the first question is are other academic measures supplemental measures that would provide additional support to findings of the qualitative and quantitative measures. Would they be additional measures outside of the other two evaluations that lend additional value to the overall evaluation?

Ms. Harris said they should be additional.

Superintendent Barresi suggested the term both academic and performance measures.

Commission Members discussed and reviewed possible options for the definition of other academic measures.

Ms. Currin-Moore said the administrator verifying the data is accurate could be part of the Other Academic Measure rubric.

Ms. Harris asked that the language of the law be reviewed before taking a vote on the definition.

Mr. Allen made a motion to approve the definition of other academic measures for both teachers and leaders. Ms. Harris seconded the motion. The motion carried with the following votes: Ed Allen, yes; Superintendent Barresi, yes; Representative Cannaday, yes; Senator Ford, yes; Susan Harris, yes; Renee Launey-Rodolf, yes; Alicia Priest, yes; Ben Robinson, yes; Robert Ross, yes; and Ginger Tinney, yes.

Superintendent Barresi read the proposed definitions:

Other Academic Measures are additional alternative instruments ensuring a robust teacher evaluation, capturing unique facets of effective teaching, and reflecting student academic performance impacted by the teacher.

Other Academic Measures are additional alternative instruments ensuring a robust leader evaluation, capturing unique facets of effective leadership, and reflecting student academic performance impacted by the leader.

Commission Members discussed the list for other academic measures and whether it will be a district, site or teacher level decision.

Minutes of the Meeting of the  
Teacher and Leader Effectiveness Commission  
September 19, 2012

Ms. Harris said she wanted to make sure the Commission would not be creating a disincentive for good teachers to go into low performing schools or vice versa. She requested some numbers/information with A-F on the list of criteria.

Senator Ford said the process is to decide on an evaluation for each teacher and each leader. What if each teacher or leader could choose from a list that would drive the 15 percentage points.

Ms. Currin-Moore said a decision is needed on how the 15 percent will be divided. Will it be one selection for 15 percent or three selections at five percent each?

Ms. Priest said if the teacher is the one being affected and the teacher is the number one indicator in student performance, the teacher should be able with their professional background choose what their option is giving them some control over their own destiny.

Ms. Priest made a motion that each teacher make an annual selection of the other academic measures. Ed Allen seconded the motion.

Representative Cannaday said as a former principal if the teachers had the option to make the choice, he would have had the responsibility of confirming and auditing each to make sure what they did reflected the score they received.

Superintendent Barresi said that is a good point, but it would then be the responsibility of the SDE to create definitions and procedures as streamlined as possible so the principal would be able to quickly figure the percentage.

Senator Ford said if it is a teacher option then the number of options needs to be significantly limited.

Ms. Tinney said the other issue would be if each teacher in the building picks a different option, schools could use their TLE to determine reduction in force.

Ms. Harris said looking at the list and determining what could be used at the elementary level versus the secondary level, the list is much smaller in either case.

Senator Ford said if the motion passes, it has no validity.

Ms. Tinney said it has validity because the person who makes the selection will be the teacher.

Senator Ford said the Commission has not defined what they could select from or if they just pick whatever they want.

Superintendent Barresi asked if Ms. Priest would accept an amendment to the motion that states from a list approved by the State Board of Education.

Ms. Priest said yes.

The motion carried with the following votes: Ed Allen, yes; Superintendent Barresi, yes; Representative Cannaday, yes; Senator Ford, yes; Susan Harris, yes; Anna King, yes; Renee Launey-Rodolf, yes; Alicia Priest, yes; Ben Robinson, yes; and Ginger Tinney, yes.

**ADJOURNMENT**

There being no further business the meeting adjourned at 3:30 p.m. Ed Allen made a motion to adjourn.

The next regular meeting of the Teacher and Leader Effectiveness Commission will be held on Wednesday, October 17, 2012, at 1:00 p.m. The meeting will convene at the State Department of Education, 2500 North Lincoln Blvd., Oklahoma City, Oklahoma.

  
\_\_\_\_\_  
Janet Barresi, Chairperson of the Board