**Meeting**: Educator Working Group

**Date**: March 9, 2016 from 5:00PM-7:00PM

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

**Participants**: Four members of the educator work group; representatives from the Delaware DOE; consultants from TNTP

**Agenda, Updates and Meeting Objectives**

* Since quorum was not present, it was stated that the group would discuss ideas related to agenda topics but would not make any final recommendations.
* The group reviewed the objectives for the upcoming meetings and agreed that the following topics were priorities:
	+ Teacher leader selection
	+ Teacher leader evaluation
	+ Relationship of the new roles to existing teacher leadership opportunities (e.g. EPER roles)
* A member of the group requested that more specific information about substitute coverage be provided for the all-day EWG session.

**Minutes Approval**

* The minutes were not voted on since quorum was not present.

**Teacher Leader Pilot Timeline**

* DDOE’s draft plan for launching the teacher leader pilot was presented, including:
	+ Having schools submit applications with district and staff support
	+ Ensuring that schools demonstrate interest and ideas for teacher leadership in their schools
	+ Releasing application guidelines on April 1
	+ Set deadline for submitting application on April 22
	+ Select schools by May 3
* The group was interested in hearing more about the criteria for selecting schools.
* The group agreed that the process provided opportunity of educators throughout Delaware to engage in the process.
* A member of the group requested that EWG receive a sample communication they could share with their colleagues.

**Release Time Requirements**

* Topic was not discussed.

**Teacher Leader Selection**

* The group reviewed notes from previous conversations with educators and identified the following key ideas:
	+ Teacher leader selection process needs to be transparent and fair.
	+ There need to be a basic set of skills and responsibilities defined.
	+ Selection process should be consistent and defined by state.
	+ The group did not want term limits for the roles. They did, however, want to explore creating a reapplication process for teacher leaders.
	+ The group wanted to explore having a nomination process to ensure meaningful educator input in selection.
* The group suggested the following modifications to the sample process presented:
	+ The final decision should be made of a committee composed of a school administrator, educators selected by school administration, educators selected by the union, and a district-level expert. A union observer could also be present to observe process. (Revision to steps 8 and 9 of the sample process presented)
	+ The committee would also be involved in reviewing applications from teacher leader candidates (sample process step 5).
	+ The way committees are currently used to select school staff could be used to inform the model selection process for teacher leaders.
	+ A rubric should be created to assess readiness, and it should be used by whoever is assessing applications and other selection activities.
	+ Step 6 of the sample process—“additional steps”—should involve activities related to the specific teacher leader role. For example:
		- Instructional practice: model or videotaped lessons
		- Instructional strategy: lesson plans/unit plans they created or coached someone else to create.
		- Community partnerships: demonstrate the way they’ve involved community in solving real school challenge before.
		- Digital content: show use of digital content in own classroom
		- Instructional culture: communicate needs they’ve observed in students and what they’ve done about it
		- All roles could talk about what they have/are currently doing as well as their vision for what they will do in the role.
		- All roles could participate in a coaching role play.
* Minimum requirements were defined as the minimum criteria anyone being considered for teacher leader roles need to fulfill. These are different from additional criteria which assess higher order skills and readiness to fulfill the specific responsibilities of each teacher leader role.
* The group suggested the following minimum requirements for teacher leadership:
	+ Minimum of 5 years of teaching experience
	+ Minimum of 2 years teaching experience in the district hiring for the role
	+ Two years of effective ratings in components I, II, III and IV of DPAS II.
	+ Depending on the role, “highly effective” could be required for certain components.
	+ Component V would be assessed as part of later steps in selection. Impact of student growth would need to be demonstrated, but educators would have multiple options for demonstrating it.
* One participant asked whether these criteria would be rigorous enough, given how many educators are given “effective” ratings. This led to the suggestion that effectiveness in all four components over two years be required, though the concern was still acknowledged by the group.

**Conclusion and Feedback Question**

* It was stated that educator work group members not present would be resent materials from tonight’s meeting.
* Two members of the public suggested that the timeline for selecting pilot schools would make it difficult to involve a committee in teacher leader selection before the end of the school year.