

ESSA Teacher/Leader Effectiveness Subcommittee Minutes

Thursday, September 8, 2016 | 9:00 AM – 12:00 PM | State Capitol – Peace Garden Room

Facilitator/Team Lead	Note Taker	
Stefanie Two Crow Gail Schauer	Karla Mittleider	
Meeting Convened	Meeting Adjourned	Breakout Room
9:05 am	12:20 pm	Peace Garden Room

Attendance

Planning Committee Members

<input type="checkbox"/>	Nick Archuleta	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	Larry Nybladh	<input type="checkbox"/>	Jeffrey Brandt
<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	Rebecca Pitkin	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	Rod Jonas	<input type="checkbox"/>	David Richter
<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	Amiee Copas	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	David Steckler	<input type="checkbox"/>	Richard Rothaus
<input type="checkbox"/>	Teresa Delorme	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	Jim Stenehjem	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	Mary Eldredge-Sandbo
<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	L Anita Thomas	<input type="checkbox"/>	Robert Lech	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	Russ Ziegler

Others Attending

<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	Laurie Stenehjem	<input type="checkbox"/>		<input type="checkbox"/>	
-------------------------------------	------------------	--------------------------	--	--------------------------	--

NDDPI Ex Officio Members

<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	Robert Marthaller	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	Laurie Matzke	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	Peg Wagner
<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	Gwyn Marback	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	Mary McCarvel-O'Connor	<input type="checkbox"/>	

Agenda Items

Welcome	Presenter: Gail Schauer
The meeting objectives were reviewed, everyone present was welcomed and introduced.	

Overview of Agenda	Presenter: Gail Schauer
The agenda was reviewed. Ms. Schauer stated that due to other meetings, the agenda would be shuffled around.	

Sub-Committee Roles, Responsibilities, and Expectations	Presenter: Stefanie Two Crow
<p>The handout entitled "Roles & Responsibilities for ESSA Subcommittee" was reviewed. Discussion was held regarding the role of <i>Presenting Back to Large ESSA Group</i>. A volunteer is needed to report the information from this subcommittee to the large ESSA group on September 30th.</p>	

Overview – Section 5: Supporting Excellent Educators	Presenter: Gail Schauer
<p>The handout entitled "Section 5: SUPPORTING EXCELLENT EDUCATORS" was reviewed as this is the template assigned to this subcommittee for review and to provide recommendations to the ESSA Planning Committee. A brief overview of all key elements of the ESSA State Plan Template was discussed for each section below:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> 5.1 Systems of Educator Development, Retention, and Advancement 5.2 Support for Educators 5.3 Educator Equity 5.4 Performance Management and Technical Assistance for Supporting Excellent Educators <p>Homework. Subcommittee members are to review the Equity Plan which can be found at https://www.nd.gov/dpi/Community/NDStateEquityPlan/.</p>	

Discussion on Workgroup Timelines	Presenter: Stefanie Two Crow
<p>The handout entitled "ESSA Teacher/Leader Effectiveness Subcommittee Timeline" was reviewed. The timeline provides each subcommittee meeting date, topics for discussion, key questions to consider, and scope of work for supporting educator excellence. The final Rules and Regulations should be received in December 2016. Discussion was held regarding the next meeting dates. The subcommittee meeting should be held the day after the large ESSA group meets to reduce travel for the subcommittee members. The large ESSA group's next meeting will include reports from the subcommittees, discussion and voting. Length of subcommittee meetings was also discussed.</p> <p>The mission for NDDPI was reviewed. Discussion was held regarding the definition of "educator". It needs to be specific on who is included (teachers/administrators). The State Equity Plan identified educators to include teachers, principals, and other school-based instructional staff.</p>	

Summary of Key Elements of 5.1: Systems of Educator Development, Retention, and Advancement	Presenters: Jim Stenehjem and Laurie Stenehjem
<p>Mentoring Programs – Jim Stenehjem (administrators) & Laurie Stenehjem (teachers). Laurie Stenehjem presented two handouts: "North Dakota Mentoring Program" and "North Dakota Teacher Support System Mentoring Program by the Numbers". Details of the program were reviewed as well as data/statistics. Special education teachers have special education mentors. Approximately 60%-70% of first year teachers are in the program but the percentage was hard to determine because the teachers were identified incorrectly on the MIS03. Ms. Stenehjem indicated that most large districts participate in the program and many are finding it helpful to have one person help enroll the first year teachers. Some smaller districts did not participate because they felt they could provide their own mentoring. Ms. Stenehjem called this "mentoring light". Discussion was held on what other states do. Mr. Steckler stated this was an intense program. Larry Nybladh suggested that if the teachers go through the mentoring program, there should be an endorsement added to their teaching license. Discussion was held regarding the funding of the program.</p>	

Summary of Key Elements of 5.1: Systems of Educator Development, Retention, and Advancement	Presenters: Jim Stenehjem and Laurie Stenehjem
<p>Jim Stenehjem presented three handouts entitled: “North Dakota Teacher Evaluation System”, “Performance Determination Rubrics: Standard 7 – Student Achievement Growth Indicators”, and “Missouri Leadership Development System – Business Model”. Mr. Stenehjem reviewed the First Year Principal Mentoring Program. School districts are paying for this program. The program was initiated last December with six first year principals piloting the program and this year there are 17. The first year the mentors were retired administrators but this year there also are practicing principals. According to Mr. Stenehjem’s estimate, there were 27 new principals in the state and he wondered if those not enrolled were from small districts and the cost of the program was the barrier. This program went beyond the formal academic training in that it was on-the-job training and the application of skills. The next step would be to add additional training for both the mentors and new principals by adding more critical skills modules. Discussion was held on student teaching and the resident teacher program.</p> <p>The “Missouri Leadership Development System – Business Model” was reviewed. If the mentoring programs were important, we needed to figure out how to get funding and it should cover small schools as well as large districts. North Dakota allows principals to not have a masters degree completed initially, and in schools of 100 or fewer, no masters degree is required. Discussion was held on requiring mentoring for new principals, but not providing state funding for it and the challenge of unfunded or underfunded mandates. Discussion was held regarding funding sources (federal and state) to support the principal mentoring program. Comments were made that if required, schools should be allowed to choose at the local level. The subcommittee’s job was to figure out what was needed and it would be the NDDPI’s job to get the resources. The subcommittee needed to decide where North Dakota was going, what North Dakota needed to do to achieve the objections and to define the end goal.</p> <p>Discussion was held regarding what to report to the large committee. Mentoring first year teachers and principals should be reported. Discussing was held regarding going two years and the different levels of licensing. Mr. Stenehjem volunteered to report to the large committee.</p> <p>Overview of Current PTESS System – Jim Stenehjem. Mr. Stenehjem reviewed the “North Dakota Teacher Evaluation System” handout. Every school in North Dakota indicated that they have an evaluation model for their teachers. Discussion was held on the ranking system in the evaluation models. Teachers are given a lot more expectations. Training could be enhanced and it should not be driven from the top. A good system was in place for the evaluation of teachers and the biggest gap was including a student growth component. Discussion was held regarding how to track student growth. Student data on growth could be used but student test scores needed to be tied in. Discussion was held on “highly effective”. ESPB would define “highly effective” and NDDPI would give guidance to schools on how to report it to parents. Discussion was held regarding aligning student data to the teachers. Student data would be used in evaluation but not on the dashboard. The Report Card would indicate where the highly efficient teachers are.</p> <p>ESPB Update on Effective Teacher Definition – Dr. Rebecca Pitkin. Tabled.</p> <p>Leadership Academies – Jim Stenehjem. Tabled.</p> <p>Recruitment and Retention Task Force Update – Gail Schauer. Tabled.</p> <p>Discussion Questions. Provided in Key Questions section of Tentative Timeline handout.</p> <p>Call for Recommendations. The subcommittee members unanimously recommend for teacher and principal mentoring to continue. Levels of licensing was also discussed. PTESS should continue with enhancements for continuous improvement.</p>	

Summary of Key Elements of 5.2: Support for Educators	Presenter: Stefanie Two Crow
<p>Overview of Support for Educators – Stefanie Two Crow. Stefanie Two Crow reviewed the allowable uses for Title II from the handout entitled “Title II – Preparing, Training, and Recruiting High-Quality Teachers, Principals, or Other School Leaders”.</p> <p>Resources – Title II Part A 3% Set-Aside. Under ESSA there is a 5% statewide set-aside (1% or approximately \$100,000 for administration by NDDPI and 4% or approximately \$400,000 for statewide initiatives in mentoring, leadership academy, etc.) and an optional 3% set-aside may also be considered for statewide initiatives (approximately \$300,000). The Title II state discretionary funds will go away in the new law. Discussion was held regarding how to use these funds. It was decided that further information on how this would affect the local level was needed before a final recommendation could be made. The REAs would lose funding. The rationale should be to have a plan focused on what is best for kids and then to solicit funds for it. Information was needed on how the current funds were being spent and what would happen after the new bill is in effect.</p> <p>Discussion Questions. Provided in Key Questions section of Tentative Timeline handout.</p> <p>Call for Recommendations. Mr. Stenehjem will report at the large committee meeting that the set-aside was discussed and Larry Nybladh and David Steckler would speak, as administrators, about needing further data to see if it would work. It was requested that NDDPI provide a chart of estimated Title II district allocations for 2017-18SY with set-asides decreased in increments to show each district allocation amount.</p>	

Q&A and Next Steps	Presenters: Stefanie Two Crow and Gail Schauer
<p>Highlight 5.3 Educator Equity and ND Equity Plan Homework. The subcommittee members are to review the Equity Plan.</p> <p>Follow-up Email to Disseminate Timeline. An email will be sent to disseminate the meeting minutes.</p> <p>Doodle for October/November Meeting. A doodle will be sent out to determine the next meeting.</p>	

Next Meeting. The next ESSA Teacher/Leader Effectiveness Subcommittee meeting has not yet been scheduled. However, the next full group ESSA meeting is scheduled for:					
Date:	September 30, 2016	Location:	Baymont Inn & Suites in Mandan, ND	Time:	10:00 a.m. – 3:30 p.m.