

Performance Evaluation Advisory Council March 3, 2011 Minutes

Attending: Marion Martinez, Chair, Nancy Pugliese, Mike Buckley, Susan Kennedy, Diane Ullman, Karissa Niehoff, Sharon Palmer, Carole Clifford, Robert Rader, Patrice McCarthy, Rock Girard, Mary Loftus Levine, Phil Apruzzese, George Michna., Dennis Carrithers

Minutes—Minutes of February 14 approved

Future Meeting Dates

March 24, April 13 and 25(?), May 5 full day, June 2

Use of CAS website recommended for posting minutes and materials

Draft Principles

Discussion of *Principles for Educator Evaluation Systems*. Suggestion was made to solicit additional input from members. PEAC members will send suggestions to Marion and Dennis by March 16th.

Reporting expectations and charge of PEAC

Requirements of state statute and federal requirements from State Fiscal Stabilization Fund (SFSF) were discussed and the weighting of what must be reported. Request for copies of federal SFSF requirements and PA 10-111 will be made available to PEAC members.

Role of PEAC discussed in terms of the guidelines being voluntary or mandatory, formation of best practices, and going beyond what the laws require; issues will be clarified at the next meeting.

Relationship of the advisory nature of PEAC, the SDE, and the State Board of Education was explored. The advisory role of PEAC discussed and the process of identifying dissenting opinions.

Action Plan

The revised action plan is color coded. Red areas are PA10-111 requirements and blue areas are SFSF requirements.

Further discussion of how to aggregate the reporting of teacher categories and what is required.

Barbara Beaudin summarized the four areas of focus: Improve state assessments; Improve data system; Improve least performing schools; Improve evaluation of teachers and principals. A data system is in place to connect teachers, courses and students.

Report on Vertical Scale Scores and Student Growth Model

Barbara Beaudin reviewed the development of the student growth model and provided a written report and a color-coded chart. The yellow section is what is required for CMT, CAPT, Modified Assessment System (MAS,) National Occupational Career Technical

Institute (NOCTI) and other assessments for priority districts and English language learners; the green section is voluntary with the state system of formative testing (CBAS) and the blue section planned for the future relative to PA10-111, Smarter Balance National Consortium (SBAC) and the Partnership for Assessing Readiness for College and Career (PARCC).

Vertical Scale Score growth was not designed for teacher evaluation. However, the data can be useful when examining whole school growth.

George Michna reported on the survey by the Council of Chief State School Officers (CCSSO) to determine what other states are doing to measure educator effectiveness. The issues of data and validity for accountability and assessment have arisen. In 2005, the United States began a student growth model project as a result of the requirements of NCLB for any eventual achievement of 100% proficiency by 2014. The value added model raises significant issues. States are trying to be more collaborative in examining the value added model while including other factors. The experience of the RTTT states indicate they are engaged in varying discussions of how to measure student growth and teacher effectiveness, including the weighting student achievement in teacher evaluation. One methodological challenge is how to consider content areas that are not state-tested. Equity is lacking. State testing is generally not designed to test growth. (Most states do not have a collaborative group like PEAC.)

Gil Andrade reported on the benchmark assessment system (CBAS). It began as a formative assessment project six years ago. Now it is an interim benchmark system that is not based on a mastery testing system. The benchmarks are grade leveled and based on the state curriculum framework. Math is grades 3-8, with algebra in process. Also being developed is an automated essay benchmark. All are free to districts. Currently, about eighty districts are using the assessments. There is flexibility of timing so tests can be given earlier or later than when the curriculum suggests. The state will transition from the Connecticut curriculum standards to the Common Core State Standards with the goal of “2015 tests on desks.”

Marion discussed the roll-out and implementation of the Common Core State Standards; Larry Ainsworth, Leading and Learning Center, is working with SDE and district curriculum experts to power the standards, create pacing guides and grade level alignment.

The next meeting is March 24th. An invitation will be extended to Dr. Morgaen Donaldson of the University of Connecticut.

Respectfully submitted,
CAS