

IPAT Minutes

February 25, 2016

Those present were Pat Barber, Carol Bell, Kara Carney, Willie Clark, Mirjam Darley, Paul Hockenbury, Caroline Hoffner, Randy Petrilla, Cynthia Saunders, Ryan Saxe and Dawn Walker. Also present was Beth Goins, Sandy Riley-Hawkins and Evan McCarthy.

The meeting was called to order at 9:08 a.m.

I. Welcome, introductions and review of minutes –The minutes of November 4, 2015 were moved for approval by Paul, second by Randy. The minutes were approved without objection.

II. MCTES 2015-2016

A. Student Growth Measure Video – Evan prepared a video regarding student growth measures. This is only for teachers teaching FSA. Changes requested:

- Preface video by saying this is for '15-'16.
- include the composition of IPAT “administrators” and “representatives appointed by the MEA.”
- Make language consistent (effect and impact).
- VAM rating and VAM value.
- Add “for the last three years” to ‘More than 10 students for the last three years.’

Another video is being built for those whose score is derived from student learning growth scores. After edits are made it will go back out to IPAT and then will be distributed through the normal communication channels. Then, it will be posted on TNL and MEA will post on MEA website.

B. Student Growth Measures '15-'16 –

State setting cut scores for FSA-VAM. IPAT made recommendations for '15-'16 in November 2015 but due to changes in State Board rule and experience from '14-'15 Evan is proposing some changes.

Proposals for IPAT committee:

All

1. Only include teachers with 10 or more students in calculations of thresholds. The evaluation manual currently says we will use all district teachers to calculate the standard deviation used to set thresholds. However, the teachers with less than 10 students won't receive a score from that test and their results tend to spread out the thresholds, making it more difficult for regular teachers to receive highly effective ratings. This especially caused problems in K-2 grades where ESE teachers often have a few kids in each grade.

Motion by Randy, second by Dawn to accept. Motion carried.

2. Lower the threshold for Highly Effective Teachers from the District Average +half a standard deviation to the district average. This would make it a little easier for teachers to get a Highly Effective rating if they are one of our better teachers. This would also better align our way of assigning Highly Effective ratings with the state's approach.

Motion by Paul, second by Carol to accept. Motion carried.

3. Place teachers crossing 3 or more classifications in the middle when crossing 3 and the upper middle when crossing 4.

Recommendation not adopted. Currently our plan states that if a teacher's confidence band crosses three thresholds the score does not count. It needs to be verified that this is in our plan.

4. Standardize all student growth and performance measurements using z-scores (like the state does) before calculating teacher ratings. Student scores would be standardized within each test population before being aggregated by teacher.
 - a. This would allow K-2 to be combined for ratings, covering more ESE teachers as well as K-2 special areas teachers.
 - b. This will also produce values more comparable to the state's VAM scores.
 - c. Would be able to pull standardize scores in clusters such as ESE, ELL, and gifted to help control for some of the difference between students.
 - d. Creates the opportunity to more easily compare Teacher aggregated values across different state and local exams (including local EOCs).

Motion by Dawn, second by Mirjam. Motion carried.

3-10 non-FSA assessed teachers

5. Instead of ELA scores use the difference between State VAM predicted student scores and actual student scores for both Math and ELA. This would help teachers in historically lower performing schools.

Recommendation not adopted. Further research is requested on how it will help teachers in Title I schools. Drill down by grade level.

6. Set a rule for the % of students in a school that need to be taught by a teacher for the teacher to receive a school VAM rating. My suggestion is 80% of the tested students in the school.

We are only talking about K-5 special area teachers on this recommendation. Assessment data if only K-2 or only 3-5. All MS are FSA. Recommendation not adopted.

K-2nd

7. Use iReady Math scores in addition to iReady reading scores. Can calculate ratings for both separately and use a weighted average to combine the ratings (similar to state). This would better reflect the effort teachers put into math instruction as well as reading.

Recommendation not adopted. Research to be done.

10-12th grade Teachers without EOCs

8. Use average student difference between current and previous year Reading Developmental Scale scores to assess Intensive Reading and Intensive Language Arts teachers. There are at least 1600 students and 28 Intensive Reading teachers in grades 10-12 and 800 students and 13 Intensive Language Arts teachers.

Referred to subcommittee.

9. Use student pass rates for Algebra 1 retakes or PERT to assess Math for College Readiness teachers. There are roughly 1200 students and 21 teachers for Math for College readiness.

Referred to subcommittee.

10. Use ACT & SAT Reading/Writing scores to assess English 3 teachers. This would only use ACT & SAT results from tests taken during or immediately following the time students were enrolled in this course. There are roughly 1700 students and 23 teachers for English 3.

Referred to subcommittee.

11. Use ACT Science scores to assess Chemistry, Marine Science, Research 1, Anatomy & Physiology, and Earth/Space Science teachers. ACT Science focuses on general scientific process comprehension and results interpretation.

Referred to subcommittee.

Algebra 1

12. The state gives us a VAM file for Algebra 1 teachers we should consider using. The VAM values for Algebra 1 teachers would be a growth measurement rather than a performance measurement of students. That would help the Algebra 1 teachers in historically lower performing schools.

Required by law. No action needed.

13. There is also a distinct possibility the state is creating VAM values for Geometry and Algebra 2 this year as well. These would also help teachers in lower performing schools and we should consider using them if they exist.

Required by law. No action needed.

Other EOCs

14. Do we want to control for ESE, ELL, etc. in student scores?

Same as #4. Agreed.

2016-2017

15. Begin developing local EOCs for subject areas currently uncovered by standardized assessments or without a state assessment in the same grade level. Can be implemented for 2016-2017.

Recommendation not adopted.

C. Student Growth Ratings from 2014-2015 – Evan presented a powerpoint for 2014-2015. 80% effective overall for FSA and non-FSA. 22% get rating from state VAM. At all levels and in title I and non-title I schools, student growth rating was higher with the MOU than without the MOU.

III. Other Business –

It was communicated to administrators that their VAM is attached to the school they are moved *to*. That is not the case. It is the case that if an administrator is moved to a new school the VAM attached to them is the school they came *from*.

An analysis of iReady to FSA is needed. For 3rd grade not administering AP3 for iReady.

A subcommittee to study iReady is needed. Non-Title I and Title I. Sandy to pick administrators and to include elementary executive directors; Pat to appoint teachers.

Plan language was distributed. Please review and send suggestions for changes to Pat via email.

Date for administration to complete final evaluations for '15-'16. The date in the contract is May 15th. Proposal to move the date to Friday, May 27, 2016. Consensus was to move the date. Paul will communicate with administrators, and MEA will communicate with teachers.

Roster verification – in elementary some teachers are not teaching all students for all subjects. Grade levels are done by subject specialization. In some schools we have 'platooning' – 2 teachers take on 2 classes (one teacher takes reading and math, one teacher takes science and social studies) Teachers are verifying rosters that are not reflective of this departmentalization/platooning. This is an issue for inclusion ESE students as well. It was determined that FOCUS can be set up to reflect departmentalization, so it may be a training issue.

IV. Future Agenda Items – Result of research from measurement dept.

V. Future Meeting Dates – Monday, March 14, 2016, 8:30 – 12:30; Wednesday, April 6, 2016 – 12:00 – 3:30 p.m.; Friday, May 20, 2016, 9 a.m. – 12 p.m.

Adjournment: 12:32 p.m.