

# **Committee to Advance Educator Compensation & Careers**

## **Meeting Minutes**

Meeting #12: December 11, 2014

3:00pm – 6:00pm

Sussex Tech Library  
17137 County Seat Highway  
Georgetown, Delaware

### **Attendance:**

Committee members present:

- Teri Quinn Gray (CAECC Chair) – President, State Board of Education
- Lindsay O’Mara – Education Policy Advisor to Governor Markell, Governor’s Office
- Mark Murphy – Secretary of Education, Delaware Department of Education (DDOE)
- Frederika Jenner – President, Delaware State Education Association (DSEA)
- Jeff Taschner – Executive Director, Delaware State Education Association (DSEA)
- Darryl Scott – Chair, House Education Committee and Representative, District 31
- David Sokola – Chair, Senate Education Committee and Senator, District 8
- Harvey Kenton – Representative, District 36

Committee staff present:

- Ryan Fennerty (CAECC Director) – Special Advisor, Governor’s Office
- Donna Johnson (CAECC Stakeholder Engagement Lead) – Executive Director, State Board of Education
- Emily Silberstein – Partner, TNTP
- Stephanie Corona – Project Manager, TNTP

Others present:

- Elizabeth Lewis (Office of Management & Budget)

## **Welcome & Overview of the Agenda**

Committee Chair Teri Quinn Gray welcomed Committee members as she called the meeting to order at 3:15pm. She reviewed the goals of the meeting and provided an overview of the agenda. Teri then turned the floor over to Emily Silberstein, Partner at TNTP, to facilitate the conversation.

Emily Silberstein (TNTP) opened the discussion with a review of the focus of the meeting:

- Do a deep dive into a selection of career pathway examples from other districts and states to better understand the distinction between Teacher Leader & Senior Teacher Leader roles and the processes by which those districts developed these roles with educators
- Present a proposal to clarify the composition, charge, and scope of work for the Educator Work Group that will be a part of the extended design process.

## **Part I: Deep dive into career pathway models**

Emily Silberstein (TNTP) provided an overview of a three models of career pathways from a selection of districts across the nation who had undergone more recent efforts to introduce teacher leader career pathway models in their schools. The Committee discussed examples from Baltimore Public City Schools, Houston Independent School District, and Lawrence Public Schools (Massachusetts).

Emily provided an overview of how each system had structured its career pathway, the nature of the roles and responsibilities developed for Teacher Leader and Senior Teacher Leaders (or the approximate equivalent), including an overview of the eligibility criteria, selection processes, and performance evaluation processes that each district had put in place to support the implementation of the career pathway.

The Committee discussed how each system had tackled important design questions, including what might constitute “model” teacher leader roles whose core responsibilities seemed to meet common themes and needs in every school system. Moreover, the Committee reviewed how various districts had structured these roles in multiple school contexts (Elementary vs High Schools) to not only meet specific school needs and goals, but also so that they are relevant and accessible to specialists and other non-traditional classroom educators. The Committee also focused on reviewing selection processes in detail, to understand the level of decision-making that district central offices, principals, and building level teachers had in selecting future cohorts of teacher leaders in each school system.

The Committee also discussed the implementation challenges that each system had faced in implementing their teacher leader career pathways, from financial sustainability considerations, to how to ensure the roles developed are valuable and meet school needs while also accessible to a broad range of educators, and how to structure credible and transparent selection process. The Committee devoted considerable attention to lessons learned from Baltimore City Public Schools given their proximity to Delaware and the fact that TNTP had worked with BCPS in supporting their pathway design and implementation process.

## **Part 2: Review design processes from other systems**

The Committee reviewed the process by which Baltimore Public City Schools, Houston Independent School District, and Lawrence Public Schools went about designing their alternative career pathways and teacher leadership roles.

The Committee discussed the Baltimore experience in detail, noting that the district had developed a Joint Oversight Committee (JOC) and a Joint Governing Panel (JGP) in partnership with its Education Association to develop the details of the career pathway framework. The Joint Oversight Committee (JOC) – comprised primarily of district and union leadership - was charged with making policy decisions whereas the Joint Governing Panel (JGP) – comprised primarily of educators - was to provide a school-level perspective and feedback on school context. Emily noted that the structure allowed the district to develop a career pathway model in partnership with union leadership while also incorporating feedback from a consistent group of educators of a prolonged period to ensure the pathways and leadership roles developed would provide schools with the necessary supports for their students and teachers. Emily noted Delaware might adopt a similar model for the next phase of the design work – e.g. with the CAECC continuing to convene periodically as the state-level committee charged with recommending policies, but with an Educator Work Group comprised of school-level practitioners to inform the next layer of detail in developing specific roles and responsibilities and selection processes for Teacher Leadership roles.

The Committee also reviewed the processes employed in Houston and Lawrence Public Schools, noting that in all cases, advisory bodies and working groups were created after an initial design phase to ensure the voices of principals, teachers, and specialists featured prominently in the design of multiple teacher leadership roles targeted to address common critical school-based needs while also retaining flexibility to adapt them for multiple school contexts.

## **Part 3: Discuss the Educator Work Group structure & charge**

The Committee turned to a draft proposal which articulated a potential timeline, composition, and scope of work for a second phase of the CAECC process where educator-led work groups would help resolve outstanding questions pertinent to the design process and to broaden and formalize educator involvement in the development of teacher leadership roles.

The Committee discussed a proposal for an “Educator Work Group”, comprised primarily of school-level administrators, teachers, and specialists, to focus on clarifying the details of Teacher Leadership and Senior Teacher Leadership roles, as well as a “Technical Advisory Group”, comprised primarily of state and district personnel, to focus on clarifying the technical details associated with implementing the alternative state scale.

The Committee acknowledged that the Educator Work Group should include representatives from across the state, including educators from a variety of grade-levels and subject areas, both classroom educators and specialists in addition to school leaders. Some Committee members that district personnel – such as an HR manager – should be represented on the Educator Work Group for additional perspective.

The CAECC discussed a proposal that it continue to meet periodically through at least July 30, 2015 to resolve outstanding questions pertinent to the design process and to broaden and formalize educator involvement in the development of teacher leadership roles. A number of Committee members voiced their support for the a proposal that the CAECC remain the ultimate decision-making body on all policy questions, but that it carefully consider the recommendations issued by supporting educator work groups led by practitioners at the school and district level in the next phase of the design work. It was noted that these work groups would require and facilitation, and it was agreed that the staff team designated to support the CAECC should work with the appropriate agencies to clarify how to provide those resources. Other Committee members suggested that DSEA representation be included in the Technical Advisory Group in particular, to ensure that technical issues relating to release time, critical definitions impacting current definitions of the “work day” and allocation of roles benefit from their involvement so that recommendations have their input prior to being issued to the CAECC.

The Committee agreed to continue to refine and clarify the scope of work for the Educator Work Groups in the next few discussions and clarify those details in its report.

### **Public Comment Period**

No public comment.

### **Next Steps and Closing**

Teri Quin Gray closed the discussion and announced the next meeting date for December 18 from 5:00pm – 8:00pm in the Governor’s Conference Room in the Tatnall Building, Dover.