**Meeting**: Educator Working Group

**Date**: March 22, 2016 from 5:00PM-7:00PM

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

**Participants**: Members of the Educator Work Group; representatives from DOE; consultants from TNTP

**Agenda, Updates and Meeting Objectives**

* A representative from DOE presented a revised timeline for launching the teacher leader pilot.
* Group members requested that the pilot is referred to by a consistent name, and “the teacher leader pilot” was decided upon.
* The group agreed that they had been given the information they had requested to date, including the EWG’s first report to the CAECC and key messages to help members answer questions about the teacher leader pilot.

**Minutes Approval**

* The group did not vote on minutes from the February 16 and March 9 meetings.
* Before April 15, members that have not attended any meetings or have attended only one meeting will be removed from the list.
* Minutes from Educator Work Group meetings from February 16, March 9 and March 22 will be voted on April 15.

**Release Time Requirements**

* The group suggested that teacher leaders would need between 25% and 50% time for their roles and that at least 50% time would need to remain in the classroom for the teacher leader to be considered to have a “foot in the classroom.”
* The group also agreed that different schools could find ways of providing this time while still helping the teacher leader keep a foot in the classroom (e.g. TAM teacher model in preK)
* Some members believed that the Instructional Practice Coach would need more release time during school than other roles, given the explicit responsibilities to coach others, observe classrooms and model instruction.
* The group agreed to review draft language that would balance the following feedback:
	+ The way to measure release time would vary based on elementary (e.g. percent time), middle school (e.g. class periods) and high school (e.g. class periods) and whether a school had block scheduling.
	+ To maintain credibility of the roles and ensure other educators believe the teacher leaders are earning the extra compensation, there should be an expectation that work would take place after school hours. A phrase like, “roles require after school time” was suggested.

**Teacher Leader Selection and Time in Role**

* The group agreed to use the model selection process and requested that the process consistently use the word “educator” instead of “teacher” when describing the selection committee.
* A representative from DOE presented a timeline for what teacher leader selection would look like for the pilot year.
* The group agreed to discuss time in role as part of a larger conversation of teacher leader evaluation in the next Educator Work Group meeting. The group will also be revisiting the idea of a reapplication process.
* The group highlighted some language changes to the minimum requirements:
	+ Consistently use “LEA” instead of “district.” (applies to selection process as well)
	+ Ensure language clearly says that each role would have a few additional selection criteria and **not** imply applicants need to meet criteria for all roles.
	+ Use an endorsement from fellow educator, not a nomination.
* For role-specific criteria, the group requested that the selection criteria were more reflective of someone going into the role rather than someone with several years of experience in the role. For example:
	+ “Effective coaching techniques” becomes “Knowledge of effective coaching techniques”
	+ “Experience starting and leading projects” becomes “Record of partnering with families and teams.”
* DPAS II criterion 1d could be included for Instructional Culture Lead.
* The group provided feedback about the additional criteria all teacher leaders should exemplify. They suggested the following:
	+ The traits shown in example district D from EWG #5 meeting materials.
	+ Interpersonal skills
	+ Organizational skills
	+ Communication skills
	+ Working with teams
	+ Lead, inspire, is respected (paraphrased)
	+ Consensus builder and can broker compromise
	+ High professional standards and willingness to go above and beyond
* The group wanted to revisit the question of whether “highly effective” should be required as minimum requirements and wants to review this question while reviewing the exact language from the DPAS II rubric.

**Initial Discussion of Teacher Leader Evaluation**

* A member of the EWG distributed an example of how teacher leaders are evaluated. This example will be explored further at the next EWG meeting.

**Conclusion and Feedback Questions**

* The group agreed that the next meeting should focus more on teacher leader evaluation and time in the role. There may also be additional discussion of aspects of the teacher leader selection process such as whether and how “highly effective” ratings on DPAS II are used for minimum requirements.