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**Meeting Report**

This document focuses on work the Commission members addressed at their first meeting, September 14, 2012. The Commission members worked in small groups to address three questions. The responses to those questions are reported here. The responses were analyzed and organized in order of the frequency an idea was addressed. This means that the topic that received the most comments is listed first (asterisks indicate the number of times the idea was mentioned). The Commission’s group norms are listed at the beginning of the report.
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**Group Norms**

Effective work groups use group agreements to guide how the members work together. The following are suggestions for agreements that can support our work:

**Communication:**   
We agree to communicate with one another by listening carefully, speaking thoughtfully, and responding respectfully.

**Confidentiality:**We agree to keep confident the commission member’ discussions, while sharing information that we agree to disseminate.

**Participation:**We agree to participate fully and to contribute to the outcomes/products that result from our work.

**Problem/Conflict Management:**   
We agree to use conflict resolution steps when serious differences emerge.

Added at the September meeting:

**Decision-Making:** We agree to start with consensus, and will move to majority rule if consensus can’t be reached.

**Planning for the Work**

**Question 1  
What knowledge, resources, materials, documents do we have that provide a foundation for our work? What do we know now?**

Current assessment (e.g., multiple options, evaluation, already in use, state supported) \*\*\*\*\*\*\*\*\*\*\*\*\*\*\*

KSDE (including flexibility, communications, focus on students, resource support, accountability standards, improvement models, local-level models, etc) \*\*\*\*\*\*\*\*\*\*\*\*\*\*\*

Educator experience, attitudes, work ethic, confidence, creativity\*\*\*\*\*\*\*\*\*\*\*\*

KEEP (including pilot data, handbook, and experience) \*\*\*\*\*\*\*\*\*

Data (student, survey, competencies, population, societal, curriculum, and instruction) \*\*\*\*\*\*\*\*\*

Other states and organizations’ examples (including waivers, models, etc) \*\*\*\*\*\*

History and Experience (e.g., instructional evaluation, reform, school improvement, standards, AYP) \*\*\*\*\*

Collaboration (with educators, experts, etc) \*\*\*

Population and achievement with differences (SES, psychological, physical, societal) \*\*\*

Committee makeup (e.g., diversity, experience) \*\*

Timeline\*

Begin with the end in mind, current evolution\*

Higher education, better preparation

Staff stress

**Question 2  
What additional information, resources, and documents do we need in order to meet the requirements of the “waiver”? What do we need to know?**

**Questions and comments about assessment:**

-What are we already doing with the data we collect? (Assessment audit)\*\*

-What are “multiple measures” and examples are there?\*

-What common assessments are currently being given, such as DIBELS, SRI, ACT, and KCA?

-Can the new CTE be used?

-Are standards-based assessments available nationally?

-Is there national research on what makes a measure reliable and valid?

-Can there be some common assessments/measures by course? By subject area? By specialty e.g., library/media, counselor, art, P.E.? Differences between elementary and secondary?

-What are “multiple measures” and examples are there?\*

-We need locally developed assessments.

-We need accountability/standards for non-core teachers.

**Questions and comments about contractual agreements:**

-How will these process effect current written negotiations? Agreements? State statute?\*

-How will we navigate the local negotiation issues?

**Questions and comments about other states and resources:**

-What are other states doing?

-Can we have more examples from other states?

-What has gotten other states into trouble?

-Is there national research on tying multiple measures of student learning to personnel evaluations?

**General questions and comments:**

-Professional development will be essential (for staff to develop measures, for evaluators, for in-house support) \*\*\*\*\*\*

-We need time.

-What does growth look like?

-Are we creating an index/number/rating process?

**Question 3  
What milestones should we reach by December 2012? March 2013? May 2013? Add needs and concerns.**

**December 2012:**

**We will have:**

-Greater knowledge and understanding of the evaluation process/KEEP\*\*\*\*

-Draft proposal and recommendations to the state

-A sense of the possibility of this task

-Confidence in the process

-A recommendation for a student’s growth evaluation system to KSDE

-Understanding of the status of our work

- A plan to disseminate information to gather feedback

**March 2013**

**We will have:**

-Preliminary wide dissemination of the work, with feedback from field so that we can provide changes to KS legislation that may impact our work\*

-Identification of multiple measures

**May 2013**

**We will have:**

-The final report with recommendations and plans for ’13-’14 pilot to present to the State Board\*\*

-The final product & PARTY

**Commission needs:**

**-**First, we need to know more about this topic based on research and other states’ experiences, including materials to read\*

-A list steps that we should take first

-We need to create Google Doc for continuation of conversation and professional development (by October 1)

-We need to look at the current appraisal system and how it compares with KEEP

**Commission member concerns**

**-**Time before Oct meeting to review research – on website?

-Are we coming up with a number?