

From: Ginger Difalco
Sent time: Thursday, May 26, 2011 5:30:09 PM
To: Janet Barresi
Subject: Fwd: agenda and materials for tomorrow's Chiefs call
5-27-11 C4C Call Agenda.doc 05.26.11 Chiefs Revised NCTQ Support Statement.docx 05.26.11 Chiefs for Change
Attachments: Statement on AASA and NSBA.docx NCTQ College of Ed project.docx C4C PARCC Elements.doc Specifications for Leadership Proposal Sample--20110502.pdf PISA For Schools 20110502.pdf

Dr. Barresi: I am forwarding you this information related to your Chiefs Conference call that will take place at 10 a.m. in the morning (Friday, May 27). Ginger

----- Forwarded message -----

From: **Patricia Levesque** (patricia@excelined.org) <patricia@excelined.org>

Date: Thu, May 26, 2011 at 3:44 PM

Subject: agenda and materials for tomorrow's Chiefs call

To: "Barresi, Janet" <janetbarresi@mac.com>, "Bennett, Tony" <drtonybennett@gmail.com>, "Bowen, Stephen" <stephenbowen@myfairpoint.net>, "Cerf, Chris" <cdcerf@gmail.com>, "Gist, Deborah" <Deborah.Gist@ride.ri.gov>, "Huffman, Kevin" <huffman.kevin@gmail.com>, "Kevin Huffman" (kevin.s.huffman@tn.gov)" <kevin.s.huffman@tn.gov>, "Pastorek, Paul" <pastorekpg@gmail.com>, "Robinson, Gerard" <gtr924@aol.com>, "Skandera, Hanna" <hannaskandera@yahoo.com>, "Smith, Eric" <drericjsmith@gmail.com>

Cc: John Bailey <John.Bailey@dutkoworldwide.com>, "Deirdre Finn" (dfinn@excelined.org)" <dfinn@excelined.org>, "Fonda Anderson" (fonda@excelined.org)" <fonda@excelined.org>, "Christy Hovanetz" (christyh@excelined.org)" <chovanetz2@meridianstrategiesllc.com>, "Jaryn Emhof" (jaryn@excelined.org)" <jaryn@excelined.org>, "Mandy Clark" (mandy@excelined.org)" <mandy@excelined.org>, Matthew Ladner <ladner55@gmail.com>, Barresi asst Ginger Difalco <ginger.difalco@sde.ok.gov>, Bennett asst Debbie Downing <d Downing@doe.in.gov>, Bennett Scheduler Amy Miller <amiller@doe.in.gov>, Bowen asst Georgette Valliere <georgette.valliere@maine.gov>, Bowen Scheduler Sandra Moreau <sandra.moreau@maine.gov>, Cerf asst Helene Leona <Helene.leona@doe.state.nj.us>, Gist asst Angela Teixeira <angela.teixeira@ride.ri.gov>, Huffman asst Janice Mann <janice.mann@tn.gov>, Pastorek asst Christine Rose <christina.rose@eads-na.com>, Robinson asst Emily Webb <emily.webb@governor.virginia.gov>, Robinson Scheduler Lucille Lindamood <lucille.lindamood@governor.virginia.gov>, Skandera Scheduler Cathie Carothers <cathie.carothers@state.nm.us>, Smith asst Nyla Benjamin <nyla.benjamin@fldoe.org>, Smith Scheduler Joseph Morgan <joseph.morgan@fldoe.org>

Chiefs,

Attached is the agenda and materials for tomorrow's Chiefs for Change call.

The call is scheduled for tomorrow, Friday, May 27, 2011, 11:00am-12:00pm EST.

Call-In Info: Number: [850-391-0329](tel:850-391-0329)/Passcode: 84940

There are two draft statements for approval tomorrow.

All chiefs, except **Barresi, Bowen, Huffman and Robinson** have approved the draft statement in support of the NCTQ college of education research project. After the call tomorrow, we will release the statement to Kate Walsh so if you would like to sign on, please let us know by tomorrow.

The second statement is a draft response from the Chiefs to the national school boards and school administrators association recently released resolution to have blanket regulatory relief from ESEA. This will be discussed on tomorrow's call.

Also, attached are materials from Kate Walsh on the NCTQ research and from the Kern Family Foundation on the proposed funding projects with Chiefs on PISA pilot testing and leadership professional development.

Finally, there is a summary of the 10 criteria critical for successful PARCC implementation based upon discussion in DC.

Let us know if you need anything else for tomorrow.

Patricia

--

Ginger DiFalco, Executive Assistant
Office of the State Superintendent
[\(405\) 521-4885](tel:4055214885)



Foundation for
Excellence
in Education

**Chiefs for Change Conference Call
Friday, May 27, 2011
11:00am-12:00pm EST
Agenda**

Call-In Info: Number: 850-391-0329/Passcode: 84940

- I. National Council on Teacher Quality – Kate Walsh to answer questions on the College of Ed project and ask for statement of support**
- II. Kern Foundation – Ryan Olson to present two projects to Chiefs**
 - a. PISA pilot testing – 100 schools**
 - b. Leadership professional development**
- III. 10 Core Elements for PARCC**
- IV. Statement on American Association of School Administrators and National School Board Association resolution for blanket regulatory relief from ESEA**

www.ExcelinEd.org

P.O. Box 10691 • Tallahassee, FL 32302 • (850) 391-4090 • (786) 664-1794 fax

The Foundation for Excellence in Education (FEE) is a 501(c)3 organization. A copy of the official registration and financial information for FEE may be obtained from the Division of Consumer Services by calling toll free 800-435-7352 within the state of Florida. FEE may use a percentage of your contribution to support required administrative costs, direct costs, and/or activities in support of education. Registration does not imply endorsement, approval, or recommendation by the state. Registration number is CH23393.

Chiefs' Statement to support National Council for Teacher Quality:

"Great teachers make great students. Preparing teachers with the knowledge and skills to be effective educators is paramount to improving student achievement.

Ultimately, Colleges of Education should be reviewed the same way we propose evaluating teachers – based upon students learning.

Until that data becomes available in every state, Chiefs for Change supports the efforts of the National Council on Teacher Quality to gather research-based data and information about the nation's colleges of education. This research can provide a valuable tool for improving the quality of education for educators.

Schools of education must equip teachers with the ability to effectively prepare students for an increasingly competitive global economy because the true success of these programs is measured by K-12 student achievement – whether students taught by graduates are being equipped for success in college and their careers."

DRAFT

Formatted: Width: 10", Height: 14"

Chiefs for Change Statement on AASA/NSBA Call for Blanket Waivers

As an organization dedicated to putting children first through visionary education reform, Chiefs for Change opposes the recent petition by the American Association of School Administrators and the National School Board Association to suspend the accountability provisions of the Elementary and Secondary Education Act (ESEA) and the interventions provided to students.

We support the swift reauthorization of ESEA. Chiefs for Change has outlined principles to guide Congress as it works to improve federal policy. Providing a blanket waiver to all states will bring negotiations on reauthorization to a standstill, creating uncertainty for states and potentially threatening the progress that has been made by many states to improve the quality of education for students across America.

We support more federal flexibility, including the use of **targeted** waivers, but only when such flexibility supports education reform and when it is earned based upon state actions that have produced greater student achievement. . Blanket regulatory relief would weaken accountability and more importantly, deny students critical educational services and options.

In these difficult economic and fiscal times, we understand the challenges caused by declining revenue. However, education leaders must view these circumstances as an opportunity to advance real reform instead of returning to business as usual.

DRAFT

U.S. News and World Report
National Council on Teacher Quality
National Review of Teacher Prep

What we are looking for to rate program quality

Institutions need 5 essential components to build great teachers. These 5 components frame NCTQ's standards.

1. RECRUIT TALENT

2. PROVIDE STRONG CONTENT PREPARATION

3. DEVELOP PROFESSIONAL KNOWLEDGE and SKILLS

4. PRACTICE, PRACTICE, PRACTICE

5. TRACK OUTCOMES

NCTQ's standards cover the breadth of what new teachers should know and focusing on what is most relevant and can be measured by available evidence.	
1. RECRUIT TALENT	
WHAT WE ASK ABOUT EACH PROGRAM	EVIDENCE WE SEEK
What are the academic criteria that you use to admit students into the teacher preparation program? Were candidates required to have themselves been good students? By what measure? Can the institution compare the academic skills of teachers against other college students?	Admissions standards, usually spelled out in program catalogue
What evidence can you provide of successful strategies to recruit talented minorities into the profession?	Data on percentage minorities enrolled versus comparable campuses
2. PROVIDE STRONG CONTENT PREPARATION	
How are you preparing teacher candidates to teach to the Common Core standards?	Course requirements
How are you preparing elementary teachers to teach the full elementary curriculum?	Course requirements
What is the mathematics preparation of elementary/special education teachers? What topics do they study? How many courses do they take?	Course requirements, syllabi, math textbooks
How do you prepare middle school teachers, and in particular, how do you prepare them to teach more than one subject area?	Course requirements
How do you prepare high school teachers to teach multi-field subjects, particularly social studies and science?	Course requirements
What kind of content preparation do you require elementary special education teachers to have and is it distinguishable from the content preparation you require of secondary special education?	Course requirements
3. DEVELOP PROFESSIONAL KNOWLEDGE and SKILLS	
Do both elementary and special education teacher candidates learn the scientifically based theories of reading instruction? Is this knowledge supplemented by requiring candidates to learn sound strategies for teaching English language learners and struggling readers?	Course requirements, syllabi, required textbooks
Do teacher candidates learn about how to design instruction for students with special needs? students for whom English is a second language? gifted students?	Indicators on evaluations of classroom planning projects, portfolios, or other exit requirements
What do your teacher candidates learn about assessment including standardized tests, formative and summative assessments?	Course requirements and syllabi
Do your methods courses teach candidates about how to better teach the specific subject areas that they will be teaching?	Syllabi from methods courses identified by institution
Do you evaluate candidates on their knowledge and application of classroom management techniques necessary for dealing with the full range of behavior problems?	Indicators on evaluations of student teacher practice
Do you evaluate candidates on their ability to identify and apply technology that will boost learning?	Indicators on evaluations of classroom planning projects, portfolios, or other exit requirements
How do you ensure that candidates will have knowledge of the state's K-12 learning standards?	Indicators on evaluations of classroom planning projects, portfolios, or other exit requirements
Are special education teachers taught how to modify/customize instruction to the needs of their students?	Course requirements and syllabi
Do both elementary and special education teacher candidates learn the scientifically based theories of reading instruction? Is this knowledge supplemented by requiring candidates to learn sound strategies for teaching English language learners?	Course requirements, syllabi, required textbooks
4. PRACTICE, PRACTICE, PRACTICE	
What is the length of the student teaching experience? Are student teachers allowed to take coursework concurrent with student teaching? What is the nature of that coursework? How long is a student teacher at any one site?	Student teaching handbooks or other written policies
What are the criteria for selection of placement schools? Do you require	Handbook or other written

teacher candidates to have some sort of experience in a high performing high needs schools? How do you define high performing?	policy
When do student teachers start who fulfill student teaching in the fall --at the start date of the university/ college or at the start date of the placement school? What about students in the spring semester?	Handbook or other written policy
What are the criteria you have established for a classroom teacher to mentor one of your student teachers? How do you communicate these criteria principals and school districts? Do you have a role in the selection of cooperating teachers?	Communications with principals/districts; evaluation forms;
How is the student teacher evaluated? How often? Do you give the cooperating teacher a role?	Formative/Summative evaluations
Is there a system set up that makes it practical to fail a student teacher and still allow him/her to graduate in a timely fashion?	Explicit written policy
Do you permit student teachers to complete their experience out of state, without any supervision by an employee or contractor of your institution?	Explicit written policy
What is the length of the student teaching experience? Are student teachers allowed to take coursework concurrent with student teaching? What is the nature of that coursework? How long is a student teacher at any one site?	Student teaching handbooks or other written policies
What are the criteria for selection of placement schools? Do you require teacher candidates to have some sort of experience in a high performing high needs schools? How do you define high performing?	Handbook or other written policy
5. TRACK OUTCOMES	
Do you survey your graduates? Do you collect data on alumni performance? Do you collect data on retention of graduates? How long do you track your graduates?	Surveys
Does the program secure data from a teacher performance assessment?	Data report from the performance assessment
Do you survey schools that hire your teachers? On what measures?	School survey
If your state has value-added data linking back to institutions, what is your standing?	Data provided by State
What is unique, innovative or revolutionary about the program?	Institutional choice

Chiefs^{FOR} CHANGE

Formatted: Width: 10", Height: 14"

Principles for Common Assessments:

1. Must be a fair, appropriate measure of student growth toward college readiness.
2. Must measure teacher contribution to that growth.
3. Needs to be seen as face valid and increase their value with teachers.

Key Themes:

- Making assessment better, faster, more comparable (to states and the world).

Ten Criteria:

1. Time:

- The biggest issue is the time in which results are returned. Tests should be delivered as late as possible with results returned as soon as possible. This is not about moving tests up earlier in the year; it is about delivering results faster.
- Common Assessment should have a strong end of year (EOY) summative assessment that is machine scoreable so results can be turned around in a week. The EOY summative assessment should not contain open ended items on the test that will delay delivering the results.
- Open ended writing or math items should be administered separately from the EOY summative assessment and should be administered earlier in the year (through course 3).
- Common assessments should provide "rough comparability" meaning that cross state comparisons can be made, but do not need to be a 1:1 match (e.g. states can administer exams on different days with different items).

2. Cost:

- Administrative costs need to be driven down to allow tests to be extended to science and social studies.
- Administrative costs need to be driven down to ensure states maintain annual testing in grades 3 through 10. If costs are not held down, tests may be cut back to grades 4, 8, 12, reducing the ability to measure growth and teacher contributions to learning
- Lowering Costs requires:
 - i. All items to be machine scoreable. This includes multiple choice, gridded response and short essays. Short answers are not ready for machine readable formats yet. Automated scoring can't read students showing work in math.
 - ii. Tests should be administered online not offline. However, the tests have to be able to be delivered by paper as a backup.
 - iii. Need to expand the number of providers to drive down price. Procurement needs to cultivate multiple providers for online summative administrative platforms that are computer platform independent (not just PCs, but OS X, tablets, etc).

3. Reliability of Scoring

- Tests need to install as many separately identifiable, reliable and verifiable measures. For example: a subportion of the test items should be from TIMMS or PISA. This provides face validity and international comparability. Additionally NAEP cut scores should be used.

4. Grade Spans in High School:

- Common assessments need to provide/require 9th grade assessment. Critical year to gauge college readiness, student growth and teacher contributions from grade 8 to 9 and grade 9 to 10.
- PARCC has grade 3-11 literacy assessments.

5. Expand assessment: K-2 and Science and History in 6-8:

- Chiefs should drive the development of “lightweight” K-2 assessments. “Lightweight” assessments should be low-stakes, no consequence and more diagnostic in relation to students, but a solid, valuable measure of the teacher contribution. .
- Chiefs should work on assessments for 6-8 that touch on Science and History. Literacy standards for science and history and math standards including elements of literacy and math. Reading passages in science reinforces literacy while teaching science.

6. Execution:

- Biggest threat of all isn't design, but execution.
- Chiefs should ensure solid execution by directly participation vs. deferral to assessment directors.
- Chiefs should ensure Achieve works with solid project manager to ensure effective execution.

7. Making Literacy Assessment More Face Valid/Accepted by Teachers, Parents and the Public:

- Common assessments should be literacy tests, not English/Language Arts tests. They need to examine reading across subjects, not just literature (e.g. science, history, etc.).
- Writing passages should be to sources not decontextualizing prompts.
- Quality of the passages must be beautiful. Passages should be worth reading. This requires planning to obtain permissions in time and obtaining enough permissions to help scale the assessment.

8. Making Mathematics Assessment More Face Valid/Accepted by Teachers, Parents and the Public:

- Common assessments in math should have “focus.” Current instruction and assessments are a mile wide, inch deep. Standards are very focused but the same focus is needed in the assessments. As a test blueprint issue should ensure that students who cannot pass core pieces of fundamental math standards should not pass the math test
- Fluency matters. Students must be able to do certain math computations with speed and accuracy. There should be key fluency measures / timed items each year. (e.g. can you do these 10 problems in a min)?
- There's a temptation to make math problems overly complex. Common assessments need to balance straight forward questions with more complex questions.

9. Innovation Within Parameters:

- There will be many ideas on types of test items and types of innovations in assessment. However, to ensure high stakes accountability can occur in a timely fashion with low administrative costs, certain parameters should be set.
- All test items/assessment requirements should meet standards of security, reliability, and validity.
- All innovations are acceptable as long as they meet these requirements.

10. Make High School More Modular and Less Seat Time Based:

- In order to make high schools more modular, the assessments need to be flexible enough to accommodate. The issue will be how to make assessments flexible while maintaining ability to measure teacher contribution