

**TPEP Advisory Committee – Meeting # 3**  
**Meeting Minutes**  
**Dec. 5, 2012**

**4:00-4:05 Welcome and Norms:** ELL Program Administrator Amy Carder welcomed the committee and shared the agenda for the meeting. She asked members to talk to the person next to them about the group norm they will focus on for the meeting.

**4:05-4:25 Updates:**

- *Instructional Framework:* Amy Carder said the committee is 99 percent certain that UW-CEL 5D+ instructional framework will be adopted by Bellingham Public Schools. A memo will go to the superintendent tomorrow from the TPEP Work Group recommending the adoption of the UW CEL 5+ framework. She said after the last meeting, feedback was gathered from district staff through an on-line survey, and that there was a lot of positive feedback for UW-CEL 5D+. She said the majority of questions and concerns expressed were about the new evaluation process rather than the instructional framework. The most common questions were about professional development, time, workload, test scores, student growth and what that would look like with the new system. There were two information meetings for TPEP the last week of November.
- *Leadership Framework:* has not yet been decided on. The Work Group is looking at AWSP Leadership Framework and attended an informational session on Principal Evaluation sponsored by WWU on Dec. 3.
- *Communications Plan:* main themes that teachers are asking about are below. These will be included in the TPEP Q & A district wide communication coming out in January:
  - Professional Development
  - Time/Workload
  - Test Score/Students Growth
  - Evaluation of Specialists
  - Some additional question were added by the group:
    - Who/when (timeline)
    - Comprehensive/focused
    - How will evidence to support goal be collected?
    - View as Powerful Teaching and Learning vs. Evaluation
    - What software is being considered for the collection of evidence?
    - Student Mobility—factors outside of teachers’ control
    - IEPs, Lifeskills, BRIDGES
    - Shared students
    - How does this tie in to reporting student progress?

- How public would these evaluations be?

**4:25–4:45: Exploring Common Themes:** Some common themes between the teacher and principal evaluation criteria are culture, data, content, instruction and community. Amy Carder asked the committee to split into small groups to look at common themes. She asked the groups to discuss similarities and differences between teacher and principal evaluation criteria within their specific themes.

**Culture:** A real focus on collaboration and learning.

**Content:** Overall administration support to promote consistency.

**Instruction:** Principals are left out of instruction mostly, more focused on teachers. Creating culture and closing the gap are similar. Principals have aligning curriculum, not on the teacher side though. Managing resources and closing the gap is more focused for principals.

**Data:** Teachers are constantly using assessment. Principals are helping by being instructional leaders. Centered in the classroom but also a large picture.

**Community:** A similarity is the communication piece for both groups. Community is different for both groups. Principals foster community within the school and outside of it.

**4:45-4:55 Exploring the UW-CEL 5D+ Framework and Rubric Overview:** The instructional framework had its own organization before Washington State created the 8 criteria.

Trina Hall, Title I Program Administrator, spoke about UW-CEL 5 Dimensions of Teaching and Learning. She said the original frameworks had 5 Dimensions but the new framework has additional components.

- Purpose
- Student Engagement
- Curriculum and Pedagogy
- Assessment for Student Learning
- Classroom Environment and Culture

**4:55-5:30 Student Growth for Teachers and Principals:** Amy Carder asked the committee to discuss in small groups the language for teacher evaluation criteria 3, 6 and 8. These were the three criteria that include student growth components. She asked committee members to look particularly at the language in each of the four rating levels.

- What would teachers be doing to be “proficient” under each element? What would make teachers “distinguished?”

Some feedback from the committee included:

- Teacher could be proficient and doing well but in order to become distinguished they need to take on leadership roles. Some members think it will be difficult for principals to establish teachers as distinguished.
- Communicating goals with students and parents, being informative.
- Surprised that proficient did not include collaboration with students.

AWSP Leadership Framework Student Growth Criteria: There are three criteria for principals that include student growth. Acknowledgement that teachers are doing this and that administrators need to support them. Student Growth is a component for both teachers and principals.

**Next Meeting:** Wednesday, January 23 at 4 p.m., District Office Board Room