

PERA Committee  
Meeting Minutes  
Monday, October 20, 2014  
3:30pm-4:30pm

Present: Andrew Nelson, Teri Schuster, Adam Larsen, Jim Spratt, Jennifer Youngren (observer), Pam Steele (Observer), Kim Radostits (observer). Ann Tilton (by phone).

BEGIN: 3:35 p.m.

1. Review of minutes from 10/6 meeting, no corrections.
2. Update on Anne Weerda from Kids at the Core
  - a. Mr. Mahoney is open to having Ann come back.
  - b. Consider half-day meeting
  - c. Ann is on maternity leave. We are waiting to hear back from her. Adam will share the results of their conversation when he hears back.
3. Strategic sharing out at faculty meetings – Please update us on how this is going
  - a. No sharing has happened yet. Will do at next faculty meetings and report back
  - b. Share exam types (I, II, III) and proposed weightings—greater for classes that are a teacher’s emphasis
  - c. Share considered cut scores for the ratings
  - d. Remind teachers to be collecting data throughout the year. Adam can help with formatting a system to collect and interpret their data.
  - e. State continues to work on its system and we will look at it when it becomes available
  - f. Advise staff to read the PERA minutes on the website. Kim shared that the minutes are overwhelming and people may need time and group discussion to understand
  - g. PERA committee is unclear about the process and doesn’t know how to explain it to staff. Adam suggests telling people the details will be determined by each staff member and their administrator as details are not yet available.
  - h. Jenifer and Pam shared that for those who just started on the RCD process this summer, 3 units are not an achievable goal. Teachers want to do the work correctly and need more time to make this work. K-6 teachers feel overwhelmed by the volume of work and speed of implementation.
  - i. HS teachers feel they are able to achieve rudimentary RCD units with the understanding the units will need revision. They have developed a structure with the first unit and can transfer much information to units 2 and 3. However, they will not be finished products.
4. Follow-up from Andrew’s idea on normative approaches to setting growth targets and ratings categories
  - a. If 50% of students can be predicted to achieve their SLOs, what % of students achieving their SLOs becomes “distinguished” in evaluating teachers?
  - b. Adam showed data from 2<sup>nd</sup>-6<sup>th</sup> grade MAP scores broken out by teachers, % of students who met their goals. Perhaps 37%-63% would be the average range for “proficient” evaluation of students achieving their SLOs.
  - c. MAP scores are heavily influenced by factors not controlled by teachers (mood, stress, ADHD, distractions, test fatigue, etc.). Non-equivalent groups of students could also be problematic in determining fair evaluations. Adam thinks this can be controlled for in the process.

- d. Expected growth targets need to be made very clear to each staff member from the beginning of the evaluation process.
  - e. Type III tests will be harder to arrive at growth targets
5. Adjourn 4:30. Next meeting November 10, 3:30