**Meeting**: Educator Working Group Meeting #4

**Date**: February 16, 2016 from 5:00PM-7:00PM

**Location**: Townsend Building, Dover, DE

**Participants**: Educators from around the state forming the Educator Working Group, Representatives from the Delaware DOE, consultants from TNTP

**Agenda, Updates and Meeting Objectives**

* An update was provided from the CAECC meeting.
* The budget priorities were described and the idea of the teacher leader pilot was introduced.
* Members of the group requested a copy of the EWG presentation given to the CAECC.

**Minutes Approval**

* The minutes from Educator Work Group Meeting #3 were approved.

**Feedback on Pilot Design Principles**

* The EWG was presented with draft design principles for the pilot, including:
  + The pilot needs to simulate the experience for teachers and schools.
  + Teacher leader roles need to be piloted at all types of schools.
  + A goal is for schools, districts and the state to learn what it will take to implement successful teacher leader roles in all Delaware schools.
* Members of the group offered the following feedback on the design principles:
  + Suggested adding a design principle that participating schools and districts needed to have genuine interest in participating.
  + Indicated that the learning goals for the state would differ from those of districts and schools.
  + Three counties should be represented in the pilot.
  + This should not just be for classroom teachers.
  + Charter schools should be represented.
  + Only pilot the model teacher leader roles. All roles should be piloted statewide, though a particular district shouldn’t have to have all five.
  + There needs to be a fair process for selecting teacher leaders.
* Members suggested that additional work should be done to communicate that the pilot is happening and to generate interest. Presenting information to school principals and DSEA’s district presidents was suggested.

**Teacher leader Responsibilities and Outcomes**

* Overall feedback:
  + Be more specific with verbs describing responsibilities and outcomes. For example, “help” could be “facilitate” or something else.
  + “Participating teachers” implies teachers chose to be supported. Change to “supported teachers.”
  + The distinction between the “Community Partnerships Lead” and the “Instructional Culture Lead” is clear in the role description but lost in the actual responsibilities and outcomes.
  + For outcomes such as, “Increase teacher ratings on related measures of teacher effectiveness,” call out the actual components of DPAS expected to increase.
  + The group asked for more information about how other states evaluate outcomes. Some members also asked whether there were alternatives to the evaluation rubric. It was noted that evaluation of teacher leader roles would be a focus in a future EWG meeting.
  + For roll-out, it needs to be clear that outcomes are not necessarily evaluative. There are many outcomes with shared responsibility. It will also need to be defined how outcomes data are collected. There were different perspectives on the use of surveys.
  + Consider credentialing teacher leaders as evaluators. Several members reminded the group that many EWG members did not feel that teacher leaders should be evaluators.
  + A non-punitive approach to mediation is needed. Consider adding something about mediating teacher-teacher relationships as a responsibility to all roles.
  + Leads should be established as peer-to-peer dynamic and a safe space to improve instructional practice.
* Instructional Practice Lead
  + Make sure there is a clear difference between this role and mentor teachers. One idea is that the Instructional Practice Lead provides more general, comprehensive support to more than just new teachers. The mentor may focus just on specific elements of instruction. There were differing opinions about whether mentor teachers should be allowed to be teacher leaders concurrently.
  + Make it clear that the Lead supports teaching methods and is not necessarily content-specific.
* Digital Content Lead
  + A key difference between these roles and people who may be doing similar work is the Leads having a “foot in the classroom.”
* Instructional Strategy Lead
  + Members asked whether participating in national conference should be a responsibility. It was noted that this could be part of “conducting ongoing research.”
* Community Partnerships Lead
  + This role should focus on mental health and physical well-being and not just be about Response to Intervention.
  + Add outcome about addressing hunger and other physical needs.
  + Add’ “community partners” when talking about resources.
  + Add nutrition, counseling and wrap-around services to responsibilities.
  + Make the role more about non-academics.
* Instructional Culture Lead
  + Be more specific about this role supporting component 2.
  + The role of arts teachers was discussed, and it was noted that an arts teacher could fill any of the teacher leader roles.

**Teacher Leader Release Time Recommendations**

* This agenda item was not discussed at this meeting.

**Our Colleague Feedback Question**

* This agenda item was not discussed. More information would be sent via email.

**Scheduling Future Meetings**

* In addition to the scheduled meeting on March 9, the group agreed to meet the evening of March 22.
* The group asked whether we could have a full-day meeting in April to cover the remaining topics.

Approved 03.09.16