

Task Force for Improving Education
Effective Teachers and Leaders
June 21, 2013

Committee members present: Janie Ward-Engelking, Phyllis Nichols, Katie Pemberton, John Goedde, Paula Conley, Mary Huff, Brian Smith, and Penni Cyr.

Others present: Marilyn Whitney, Office of the State Board of Education (OSBE), Allison McClintick, OSBE, Christina Linder, State Department of Education, Paul Headlee, Legislative Services Office (LSO), Eric Milstead, LSO.

The group discussed getting to more focus and specifics on the recommendations. The three areas identified for refinement are:

1. Mentoring and Induction for new Teachers and Leaders
2. Ongoing, job-embedded Professional Development
3. Recruiting and Retaining high quality teachers

Sen. Goedde reported that one of the areas the Legislative Interim Committee on education might pursue is a regional approach to leveraging professional development expertise. There are educators in the regions who could be made available through stipends to those districts that don't have certain types of expertise.

Rep. Ward-Engelking noted that struggling districts are aware they need help and it would be helpful for them to have regional resources that they may already have a relationship with.

Sen. Goedde provided copies of the National Conference of State Legislatures "Getting to Excellence: A Legislator's Guide to Educator Effectiveness Policy."

The group was joined via phone by Cathy Pine, Director of Professional, New Jersey Department of Education who talked with the group about that state's mentoring and professional development, which is based on the work done by the New Teacher Center.

New Jersey passed legislation in 2003 to require mentoring for novice teachers. The state does provide a mentoring handbook and guidance to the districts for the requirement. In August 2012, the legislature passed a new tenure bill Teach NJ, which contains statutory language on mentoring support for new teachers and broadened the requirement to cover experienced teachers moving to new districts. They will be moving forward next month to revise some of the program to incorporate the new requirements.

New Jersey has a provisional teacher program. When individuals graduate from a teacher preparation program they get a certificate of eligibility and when they are hired receive a provisional license. They receive a standard license once they meet certain requirements, which include mentoring. Alternate route teachers coming through have an additional requirement for the number of hours of training particularly around pedagogy.

Each district has to have a mentoring plan, but the state provides guidance and resources. There are requirements for who can serve as a mentor and mentors have to be trained.

All new teachers are required to receive a comprehensive orientation to the district particularly around the state's new evaluation system. Individual Professional Development plans are also developed between teacher and supervisor. This is where intervention for struggling teachers would occur.

Currently, their mentoring requirement is 30 weeks for new teacher and 34 weeks for alternate route teachers. They are moving to a full year of mentoring and requiring a minimum of 1 meeting/week for the first 8 weeks for alternate route teachers and 1 meeting/week for the first 4 weeks for those individuals who have done clinicals.

They are discussing a requirement for a mentoring log so that time will be logged and districts can assess the program and collect some data at the state level. Log detail is up to district and there are confidentiality issues, so the logs are confidential. The focus is on the time for the professional growth. The logs go to the district office. The purpose is to document the contacts because mentors are paid.

Mentors are paid \$550 for traditional route novices and mentors for alternate route novices is an additional \$450. The licensing office determines the cost as part of cost of licensure. Some districts pay for the mentoring, but most teachers have to pay that cost themselves. The state paid for it until 2007, but it is now either up to districts or individual teachers.

Mentors are selected according to certain criteria:

- Recognized as being successful in their content area.
- Rated effective or highly effective.
- Have taught for at least 3 years
- Certified
- Agree to attend training arranged by district

It is up to superintendents or professional development committees to select the mentors. There is great flexibility for districts. Observations in the classroom aren't required but the guidelines allow opportunities for teachers to observe other teachers and be observed.

Districts have to evaluate their programs and share with the state department. The state is considering how to build more capacity for data collecting and monitoring. As they build out their data system, they want to find ways to collect more of the data. To date, they haven't had a systematic plan to look at impact.

The state advocates for collaboration time, but it has not been put in regulation. They are thinking about how that would look in regulation and whether it is hours/week

The state has a process of reviewing district performance every 3 years. There are certain domains including human resources and operations. The mentoring program and how it is documented is part of the district rating.

Professional Development was also addressed by the new regulations passed by the New Jersey legislature this year. One of the things specified is that when a district makes a professional development plan, they have to include leaders. This recognized the critical nature of the principal and instructional leaders. New Jersey requires individual growth plans for teacher and supervisors including principals and superintendents. Schools must have plans and goal setting. Those plans get reported at district level. The districts have to determine how they resource it. New regulations

have provided a definition of professional development built on the definition of Learning Forward. Learning Forward looks at professional development as having multiple facets and emphasizes the responsibility for teachers and leaders to work together for student learning. High quality professional development should include working in teams to analyze data.

Administrators are also mentored. Principals have a 2-year mentoring requirement to be eligible for a permanent certificate. Superintendents are also mentored through their professional organizations. The principal program is much more prescribed and the mentee pays the cost.

Paul Headlee provided background on Idaho state funding for mentoring.

1997	\$370,000 new teacher support
2000	\$2 million new teacher support
2003	\$2 million new teacher support

The statute that existed required the local board of trustees to provide a mentoring program. But that statute was changed to eliminate that requirement.

Paula Conley shared information about the Coeur d'Alene District's mentoring program. It is a 3-year program paid for by the district. There are 4 quarterly required meetings for mentor and mentee and numerous offerings on best practices. Mentors do observations and mentees go to observe, sometimes with their mentor so there is dialog afterward. There are stringent requirements to be a mentor including an application process. The CDA has a mentor coordinator.

Penni Cyr shared that the Moscow District also has a mentor program, but there is no release time.

Ms. Conley shared information about the CDA District's professional development model. They have late start on Monday at 10:00 a.m. The teachers meet from 7:00 – 10:00 and it is up to the school what they do with the time.

Brian Smith noted that some districts are so pressed on their contact time that they would have difficulty making this work. There would be a need to provide funding to make more time available.

Paul Headlee reported on the legislative appropriations for teacher professional development. There was \$3.75 million appropriated specifically for professional development in FY 2013 and going forward probably \$12.5 million geared toward professional development for implementation of Idaho Core.

The group discussed the importance of having dedicated professional development time ongoing.

Some districts that have gone to a 4-day week have been able to build in professional development without having to add more days.

The group was joined by Anne Stafford, a teacher at Borah High School who has been involved in the Boise District's mentor program for many years. Anne shared her perspectives and information about how that program is structured.

Allison McClintick (SBOE) handed out a brochure put together collaboratively by Idaho's teacher preparation programs. It highlights each program's entrance requirements, graduation requirements and other program details so that they can be compared. Christina Linder(SDE) then shared with the committee the new, state-specific program approval review process for Idaho

teacher preparation programs that will be conducted every 3-4 years (instead of the current 7 year cycle) and will focus on implementation of the Idaho Core, use of data and instructional technology, and effective clinical practice. Finally, Ms. Linder shared the proposal for the CCSSO grant which is built upon this new university approval process. The goal of the state, which would be greatly facilitated should Idaho win the grant, is to significantly increase accountability for teacher preparation programs and licensure candidates. The overview is included with the June 21st meeting materials at http://www.boardofed.idaho.gov/board_initiatives/Education_Improvement_Taskforce/06-21-13/index.asp.

Josh Barnett and Gary Ritter from the University of Arkansas joined the group to share their findings from research on differentiated pay systems. The powerpoint is available at http://www.boardofed.idaho.gov/board_initiatives/Education_Improvement_Taskforce/06-21-13/index.asp

Discussion and questions included:

Some districts run the bonuses through Foundations

How do you budget for open-ended plan where everyone has an opportunity? In year 1 you have to budget as if everyone gets 100% and then continue to build a surplus based on the amount not allocated.

Would every teacher be paid same except for the bonus? Districts would still likely want to keep steps and perhaps use half of funds for steps to fund the bonus plan. Some districts are setting different increments and providing allocations for people moving up in 3-5 years. This allows districts to provide support and cost of living raises as well as bonuses.

Ritter and Barnett suggested that if a state were looking at a statewide plan it might work to create a statewide pool of money and set guidelines for what individual plans can look like but let districts use that money in their own way. There would need to be some non-negotiables, such as bonuses based on student growth not end points.

Adam Barnett, Compensation Analytics Manager with Denver Public Schools joined the group to discuss that district's ProComp system which has been in place since 2004. He noted that they have had some successes and some struggles. An overview of ProComp is available on http://www.boardofed.idaho.gov/board_initiatives/Education_Improvement_Taskforce/06-21-13/index.asp.

The program was funded at \$25 million/year through a voter approved levy. The model forecasted 20 years out and based award amounts on trying to stay w/in the budget of the old steps schedule.

The General Fund pays for salaries, and the district make the assumption that employees come in on the traditional step schedule. Some teachers are not in ProComp. They are those who decided not to opt in. All teachers are eligible. COLAs are determined by the central office, usually baseline COLA across all bargaining units.

With ProComp, mentoring and collaboration are rewarded in “Top Performing and High Growth Schools.” They reward mentors and peer observers separately paid through stipends on top of base salary.

Douglas County in Colorado recently proposed merit pay. Their voters denied the program. They spent a lot of time, but it was not approved. Adam noted that there must be a lot of collaboration between the teachers’ union and the district.

One of the challenges is to make sure the data is good, which requires systems with capability.

The group will meet jointly with the Fiscal Stability group on July 12th. They will also meet again on July 29th.