

TPEP Steering Committee (MASTER)
January 24, 2012

QUESTION	ESD 101	105	112	113	114	121	123	171	189
Where are you in the process?	Selecting instructional framework(s); I believe it is the will of this group to operate as a consortium for both short term and long term benefit.	In-depth study of instructional frameworks; intro to principal eval; ongoing development of communication plans/action planning.	One third of the districts involved have made their decision regarding instructional framework; others will by end of next week.	Decision-making around instructional framework(s); meeting had to be cancelled due to weather.	Have met 4 times; actively engaged in research around 3 frameworks.	Decisions have been reached by most districts; will be moving on to exploring measures and evidence and summative scoring next.	Preliminary choices on framework(s).	Final processes of framework exploration and decision-making.	Phase 1–research and learning is completed.
What decisions, if any, have you reached? What are they?	At least 4 of 8 districts are leaning/choosing Danielson’s FFT. Will know for sure prior to mid- February.	Three out of 5 districts have chosen Danielson’s FFT to serve as basis for teacher eval system; others have not yet made decision.	Two districts have chosen CEL; 1 has chosen Danielson’s FFT; others have not yet made decision; other decisions have included district communication plans; decision-making models; creating in-district committees.	Probably a split between each of the 3 frameworks ; will be developing shared PD plans.	Decisions made by the end of this month	Four out of 7 districts have chosen Danielson’s FFT; one 5Ds+; one Marzano and one is undecided.	No final decisions reached yet; preliminary: 2 out of 5 will select Danielson’s FFT; two will select 5Ds+; other will choose one of those.	Eight of the 9 districts have narrowed their choices to one of 2 frameworks – Marzano and 5Ds+. Decision will be made by end of February.	Two frameworks have been chosen to focus on—3 districts selected Marzano and 2 selected Danielson.
How many people regularly attend your meetings?	Forty representing 8 districts; also 2 UniServ reps regularly attend.	Forty-five representing 5 district teams and several from non-RIG who are observing the process.	Approx. 90-100	Approx. 150	Approx. 30 representing 4 districts; teams include a district administrated, principal; WEA president and several other teachers and administrators.	Approx. 60	35-40	60+	Between 45 and 60. Some non-RIG who are observing the process sometimes attend.

QUESTION	ESD 101	105	112	113	114	121	123	171	189
Lessons learned thus far	Strong need for clarity around emerging issues; strong need for ongoing PD and worries about sustaining that level of support; strong need for PD to be for all levels of the system – teachers, principals and central office; concerns about resources needed to support and sustain.		Clarity needed regarding how the criteria and framework are used during observations, evidence collection and for the summative evaluation. Timely and accurate communication within the districts as well as within the RIG; strong need to be able to differentiate between larger and smaller districts; RIG districts want to “see” the end product; it is difficult since the summative scoring decision has not been made.	Align the support model along the lines of WSLA – would be beneficial to assign a staff member to each team. While each ESD staff member is assigned to a group, it’s not the same; differentiated support is critical; local leadership makes a difference – especially distributed leadership is moving the work forward; communication (web pages, email distribution lists, multiple communication forums, etc.) to keep everyone informed of the work.	Having the right people at the table; active involvement of WEA will help later with the MOU and other contract issues; importance of accurate and timely information; regular ESD meetings and other forms of communication from ESD lead and OSPI; providing enough background information, structure and time during the regional meetings to allow the district to be productive; modeling and debriefing the protocols used so they can be used back in district – very positive feedback on that.	Communication is key within the district and across stakeholder groups; sharing of resources and processes appreciated across the districts. Learning from the pilots has been invaluable – hard to imagine doing this work without their lead.	Districts are definitely at different stages; some districts had done some work last year and are a bit frustrated going over information. A communication / action plan within district is vitally important.	People are feeling anxious; at different places in terms of background knowledge and readiness to engage in the work. Combination of stakeholder groups on team has been essential and beneficial. Support from ESD lead and OSPI has been appreciated as has learning from pilots. A common roadmap and more ongoing clarity about what are steering committee decisions and what are local district decisions would be helpful. PD needs and how to best support RIG and non-RIG districts.	Bringing a group of districts together to work within and between districts very useful. Providing opportunities for equal stakeholder voice. Practitioners sharing work, successes and learnings. ESD lead to answer questions priceless. Need for clarity of what and why as districts grapple with decisions which may impact how they do business and what political capital they’ll have to use now and in the future. Shifting information frustrating.

QUESTION	ESD 101	105	112	113	114	121	123	171	189
Other useful information?	Level of interest growing among non-pilot and RIG districts. Great interest in whether all frameworks will be acceptable.		The work of the pilots and the collaboration within the ESDs and OSPI has been extremely helpful. PD for teachers AND administrator is vitally important to ensure successful implementation. Resistance by districts (mainly smaller ones) that this will go away. Involvement of board members has been positive.	A general road map of the work is important for districts to follow; timely support and communication with OSPI and ESDs; it would be helpful to have a clear sense of what is “loose” and what is “tight”; districts wish to have control over decisions but need guidance on best practice; supportive PD aligned to frameworks, habits of mind regarding evidence gathering and sifting, and protocols for formative feedback will be essential.	It is not always possible to recreate the sessions as planned by ESD lead – instead it had worked to take the expected outcomes and tailor activities to best meet the needs of the districts; 114 is including other districts in information sessions through the Regional Curriculum Leadership Consortium; districts have received detailed training, electronic links and support materials on the 3 frameworks.	Interest and anxiety is beginning to rise in non-RIG districts.	Some concerns about whether PD support will be adequate; especially if there are limited district resources available – this could negatively impact implementation.		Suggest that TPEP Steering Committee or directors field questions on weekly basis in a public fashion so we can all learn from each other. Now that the FW and scales have been selected, the work of closely examining the scales will begin with an eye toward selection of the 20% and PD to prepare them and their peers. Districts will become increasingly anxious about what resources they’ll have to use. Have not begun to work on the principal evaluation part of the work yet and principals are concerned about learning more about that while learning to calibrate their use of the teacher evaluation.