

**Effective Teachers & Leaders / Fiscal Stability
Career Ladder Work Group**

**Meeting Notes
August 12, 2013**

Members Present: Linda Clark, Wayne Freedman, Bert Marley (proxy for Penni Cyr), Brian Smith.

Joining by phone: Mary Ann Ranells

Others present: Jason Hancock, Christina Linder, Allison McClintick, Marilyn Whitney, Amy Nelms.

The group discussed the revised model for the career ladder

They determined that getting to one schedule sooner would be best.

Novice licensure must be in place when the career ladder is implemented.

The group discussed the concern about whether the legislature feels they get enough accountability for putting \$200 million into teacher compensation. When the continuing contract was in play there was an incentive for the legislature to look positively at the career ladder.

Mary Ann Ranells commented that the labels used for the ladder will be more important than the money. She cautioned the group to be careful what the levels are called. Teachers will want to know "is it better than what I currently have" and will want a clear process on how they advance from one tier to the next. Principal leadership will make or break the whole thing. She commented that she firmly believe this is a great idea.

Accountability goes back to the evaluation model and how it is designed so that teachers are held more accountable. It should be fair and equitable, careful about labels, with a clear process for transitioning. There must be continued training of principals with emphasis on inter-rater reliability. Increases in student achievement occur when teachers are collaborating and have identified specific in-house goals. The 33% of the evaluation can become a very compelling piece. Inter rater reliability and a checklist of teaching criteria doesn't increase student achievement.

Christina Linder noted that the MET study and other research show that having performance standards in and of themselves doesn't increase student performance. Collaboration is key.

Christina asked if there is disagreement that once a teacher reaches a professional level they cannot go back to basic level.

Dr. Clark commented that she has no interest in keeping a teacher who would have to drop back to the basic level. The novice piece is very specific to beginning teachers. If they have experience and an improvement plan and a probation plan and can't get to that level, they should be let go.

Christina clarified that a teacher would be out if they can't meet the requirements for professional licensure.

The group did previously talk about a master level teacher moving back down a level if their performance didn't meet the requirements.

The likely timeframe for implementation of tiered licensure is 2 years and then it would be part of the certification cycle.

Marilyn Whitney passed out the draft recommendations from the Structural Change focus group. There is overlap on the Professional Development discussion and recommendation.

Brian Smith asked if it would be possible to add job embedded collaboration time into statute to allow flexibility like the Coeur d'Alene model.

The group discussed the need to weigh this against how much instructional time is needed. The instructional minutes have to be modified. There is already some time for snow days, etc. but net effect is that you reduce the instructional time. It would be up to districts. You can allow districts to do that. Now there are barriers. There should be more local flexibility.

Phyllis Nichols and Alex Labeau joined the meeting.

Dr. Clark walked the group through the draft recommendations.
(see document)

Recommendation 1: Restoration of operational funding to 2008-2009 level.

If you were to take a 5 year approach to building back. It would be \$16.5 million per year to get back to 2008-2009

This is the #1 priority for school superintendents and it will likely be a top priority for the ISBA.

Wayne Freedman asked if the group was asking for both this as well as the career ladder. Is asking for both unreasonable?

The group discussed that the legislature will have to prioritize the funding requests.

Dr. Clark pointed out that average per pupil expenditures in the US is \$10K per student. May need to have a conversation about where districts should be compared to the average. To be funded currently at 40% of the national average and be talking about building a world class education system, is incongruous.

Restoration is just getting back to where we were. It's not growing government.

Jason Hancock commented that Idaho will never spend at the national average. The state has a high birth rate (well above the replacement rate), low per capita income.

Phyllis Nichols commented that students have changed over the years. Schools are dealing with tough students.

Recommendation 2: Implementation of a Career Ladder.

Dr. Clark pointed out that this is also not completely new money.

Recommendation 3: System of Funding Schools.

ADA averages 94.75% of enrollment. Any district that runs a rate higher than that would lose with an enrollment model when you adjust the divisors. Boise District, for example, is 94.8% and Meridian is at 96.5%, Council is at 99.5%, New Plymouth 94.9%. This is an impediment to mastery learning and all the requirements of ISEE. To go to 100% would be \$55 million. That's not realistic. It's worth making the shift even if you take a hit initially.

Dr. Clark noted that everyone below the state average is a smaller district. Districts that lose would save in other places. Can't get to personalized learning when it's about who's in a seat.

There is awareness in the legislature of the cuts that have been made. The disconnect is that there were a number of districts that took the approach of using fund balances and one-time money to stave off the cuts as long as they could. Districts were able to delay the cuts, but districts are still having to cut now because of those delays. Districts are still in process of truing up ongoing expenditures with ongoing revenues. The legislature looks at it as the past.

Recommendation 4: Recruiting and Retaining excellent teachers.

Mentoring: Use the existing state framework based on recommendations of New Teacher Center. Best practices would support a full-release mentor model. The move to tiered licensure, requires a mentor program.

Funding the payment to mentor teachers could be part of career ladder. There are other costs as well.

Recommendation 5: Professional Development

Support job-embedded professional development and develop a state framework.

Continue \$10 million annually to support Idaho Core/SBAC training.

The group discussed PLCs and Learning Forward and their standards for professional development

Last year put into board rule was a definition of professional development.

Include funding with guidance so that districts have flexibility to implement a program for new and existing teachers.

What would the cost be for the release time? There are 680 FTE new teachers, so use 700 for estimates. Then do a per body per cost of substitutes

The group discussed adding Guiding Principles to put the specific recommendations under:

1. High performance requires Fiscal Stability
2. High performing schools require effective teachers and leaders