

COMMONWEALTH OF PENNSYLVANIA
HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

EDUCATION COMMITTEE

PUBLIC HEARING ON HOUSE BILL 1980
TEACHER EVALUATIONS

STATE CAPITOL
ROOM 140, MAIN CAPITOL
HARRISBURG PA

THURSDAY, NOVEMBER 3, 2011
11:00 A.M.

BEFORE:

HONORABLE PAUL CLYMER, MAJORITY CHAIRMAN
HONORABLE JAMES ROEBUCK, MINORITY CHAIRMAN
HONORABLE JOE EMRICK
HONORABLE MIKE FLECK
HONORABLE DUANE MILNE
HONORABLE KATHY RAPP
HONORABLE BRAD ROAE
HONORABLE WILL TALLMAN
HONORABLE DAN TRUITT
HONORABLE MIKE CARROLL
HONORABLE MIKE O'BRIEN
HONORABLE JAKE WHEATLEY
HONORABLE RYAN AUMET

ALSO PRESENTS:

DUSTIN GINGRICH
JUDY SMITH
KEVIN ROBERTS
JONATHAN BERGER
MARLENA MILLER
CHRIS WAKELEY

INDEX OF TESTIFIERS

WITNESSES

PAGE

RON TOMALIS

PA SECRETARY OF EDUCATION

CAROLYN DUMARESQ, D.ED.

PA DEPUTY SECRETARY OF EDUCATION

LINDA COOK

PA STATE EDUCATION ASSOCIATION (PSEA)

TEACHER, PENN DELCO SCHOOL DISTRICT

VALERIE BRAMAN

STAFF REP. AMERICAN FEDERATION OF TEACHERS-PA (AFT-PA)

KATHY SWOPE

SCHOOL DIRECTOR, LEWISBURG AREA SCHOOL DISTRICT

PA SCHOOL BOARDS ASSOCIATION (PSBA)

JOAN BENSO, PRESIDENT AND CEO

PA PARTNERSHIPS FOR CHILDREN

RICHARD FRY, SUPERINTENDENT

BIG SPRINGS SCHOOL DISTRICT

PA ASSOCIATION OF SCHOOL ADMINISTRATORS

DR. BARRY PUVIS, PRINCIPAL

CHAMBERSBURG AREA SCHOOL DISTRICT

AND PRESIDENT OF PA ASSOCIATION OF ELEMENTARY & SECONDARY

SCHOOL PRINCIPALS (PAESSP)

CERTIFICATION

35

WRITTEN TESTIMONY SUBMITTED:

RON TOMALIS AND DR. CAROLYN DUMARESQ
PA DEPARTMENT OF EDUCATION

LINDA COOK
PA STATE EDUCATION ASSOCIATION (PSEA)
TEACHER, PENN DELCO SCHOOL DISTRICT

VALERIE BRAMAN
STAFF REP. AMERICAN FEDERATION OF TEACHERS-PA (AFT-PA)

JOAN BENSO, PRESIDENT AND CEO
PA PARTNERSHIPS FOR CHILDREN

RICHARD FRY, SUPERINTENDENT
BIG SPRINGS SCHOOL DISTRICT
PA ASSOCIATION OF SCHOOL ADMINISTRATORS

DR. BARRY PUVIS, PRINCIPAL
CHAMBERSBURG AREA SCHOOL DISTRICT
AND PRESIDENT OF PA ASSOCIATION OF ELEMENTARY & SECONDARY
SCHOOL PRINCIPALS

STUDENTS FIRST

PA CHAMBER OF BUSINESS & INDUSTRY

CHAIRMAN CLYMER: Well good morning everybody and welcome to our public hearing today on this Thursday, November 3rd. Glad to see such a fine turnout of testifiers and people who are just interested in the issue of education. Today our public hearing centers on House Bill 1980; Teacher Evaluations; a system to encourage and assist those teachers who have the academic knowledge however are not as successful as some of their fellow instructors at conveying that subject to their students. On Tuesday evening November 1st, the Capitol Area Intermediate Unit #13 had a virtual town hall meeting to discuss teacher effectiveness. All of the State's intermediate units were tuned in and they were joined by over 1400 professional educators. For two hours questions were raised and answers provided regarding the effectiveness of teacher evaluations. Today over 100 pilot projects are taking place on teacher evaluations; teacher effectiveness. From those attending Tuesday night's meeting, I can tell you that this was a most encouraging workshop. It was upbeat. It was positive. It was about teachers and about students. And we learned that teachers wanted to participate in these pilot projects. They wanted to be evaluated to see indeed, how effective they were and how they could become more effective in the class room. The program had nothing to do with teacher dismissals; make that very clear. So at this time I turn to my colleague, Chairman Roebuck for comments.

CHAIRMAN ROEBUCK: Thank you, Mr. Chairman; I certainly look forward to the discussion this morning; this afternoon on this legislation and as in part, Chairman Clymer has said, the effort should focus upon helping teachers to improve their ability to teach. It should focus on the measures we have of student success but it should also have a strong element of openness and fairness that allows you to in fact evaluate in a way that is in fact, allows for differences and allows for assessment of individual teachers according to the circumstance they are in and allows the ability to improve. So with those broad perimeters, certainly I look forward

to the discussion and to the beginning step in implementing this legislation. Thank you, Mr. Chairman.

CHAIRMAN CLYMER: Then to begin today's hearing; we're very honored to have with us the Secretary of Education, Ron Tomalis, certainly not a strange figure anymore to those of us here in the Capitol. We welcome his attendance and for his remarks. Secretary Tomalis, welcome.

SECRETARY TOMALIS: Thank you, Mr. Chairman, Chairman Roebuck, Members of the Committee. It is a great pleasure for me to be with you here again today, on this morning, to discuss this topic as you have a copy of my written testimony. For the interest of time and understanding that you have a full agenda today, I want to divert just a bit from the written testimony and speak for just a few minutes on an overview of what's in the written testimony then turn it over to my colleague, who's here at the table with me, Deputy Secretary, Carolyn Dumaresq, who has been leading up the effort on instituting the reform package. It's a very; it's very appropriate that we look at this issue of teacher effectiveness. Unlike transportation or medicine, unlike agriculture or other issues, in education we are personnel driven enterprise. Overwhelmingly the bulk of the expense of our 26 billion dollar investment that taxpayers make is tied up in personnel costs, but most important, most important the success; the mission of our public education system in insuring that all children reach academic achievement is dependent upon the quality of the teacher. The initiative that we're discussing today is directly, is directed specifically at that; making sure that children are in schools, in our schools have the highest quality teacher possible. To identify the strengths of our teachers, their weaknesses and to make sure that our teachers are prepared as possible to be the most effective teacher in the classroom. Our current system under the law isn't up to the challenge. With a minor technical change in

1996, it is my understanding that this portion of the law has not been changed in over 40 years, yet our teaching profession certainly has. Our current system; we have two categories of teachers and teacher ratings; you're either satisfactory or unsatisfactory and as you heard before, currently we have 99.4% of teachers last year that were rated satisfactory in the Commonwealth. We know but most important many of our great teachers in our public schools know that is not the case. Also our current law doesn't allow to factor student achievement into the evaluation system. The main mission of our system, the highest priority of all, students achieving academically is not allowed to be part of our evaluation system. Our current system treats teachers, unfortunately, in the rating system like widgets, interchangeable, all treated alike. Yet we know that like the rest of us here in this room, teachers bring to the classroom many different strengths, many different talents, and yes, some weaknesses. This evaluation system that we're going to be discussing focuses on identifying the strengths and weaknesses of individual teachers. It helps us drive the half billion dollars that we spend on professional development every year to make those teachers better instructional leaders in the classroom. I'll turn it over to Carolyn in a second but we started this pilot program based upon an initiative that was funded last year to incorporate two important categories. One is not just simple thumbs-up or thumbs-down on the ratings of a teacher but four different categories and too we want to build in measures of student success in how we evaluate teachers. As the Chairman noticed we took part in a webinar earlier this week on Tuesday at the Capitol Area Intermediate Unit. Over 1400 participants, school board members, teachers, administrators; all across the Commonwealth participated and what I have been told, nothing like that has happened anywhere in Pennsylvania in education history. And I want to thank the Pennsylvania Partnership for Children and the Capitol and the intermediate units for partnering with the department to put that on. In addition, in the past nine months, I've had the opportunity

to meet with last count, was about 150/160 superintendents in traveling across the Commonwealth; this one issue, more than anything else is being discussed in Pennsylvania and more than anything else, it's looked at the potential to drive academic achievement. I'd like to turn it over not to Carol and she can talk a little bit more about what's happening in the pilot program and get into a little specifics and then we'll open up for questions, Sir, if that's okay?

DR. CAROLYN DUMARESQ: Thank you Secretary Tomalis. I'm pleased to be here with you today to talk about something that very near and dear to my heart, which is effective teaching. As a 42 year veteran of public education, serving in many different capacities, from teacher to principal, to superintendent, to the executive director of the State Teachers' Union (PSEA), I am very proud of the work that I've done over the 42 years and bring to this effort a real belief in effective teaching and in the value of teachers. The system that we're talking about certainly talks about teacher evaluation, my vision is much larger; it's building a teacher effectiveness system that begins with work with higher education in helping to focus teacher preparation programs to prepare teachers to meet the real challenges and rigors of the classroom today. It moves into a system of in-service and professional development once they enter the profession that is supportive of a common language of effective teaching and in a support with of professional development that the department can help with. To that end, we began two and a half years ago with a project with Gates, where we engaged a researcher named Suzanne Lane, from the University of Pittsburgh, who conducted for our stakeholder group a research, national research of teaching effectiveness systems that were out there. There are many. Our stakeholders group, which included representatives from; there were superintendents, were IU directors, principals, business leaders, higher ed educators, PSEA both active teachers, officers, and leaders, and staff, and PFT; looked at that research and came to the conclusion that for

Pennsylvania, the language of professional teaching should be the Danielson Language. That's based on research that Charlotte Danielson has been conducting for many many many years and looking at the research on what makes an effective teacher. What are those behaviors that describe effective teaching? So our stakeholder group focused us on the language of Danielson as Pennsylvania's language for effective teaching. We then worked with a very modest pilot for entities three school districts; Allentown, Mohawk and Cornell and an intermediate unit, to pilot the rubrics that we developed using the Danielson Models to see how they worked, whether they were clear, what training we needed and we also used the results from that pilot to work with the second researcher Mathematica that is again using the results of the pilot looking at the teacher ratings on the different components and matching that to growth models. Again, not just part of the evaluation system but as a research and information for us to say, what are those components, what are those teacher effectiveness components that most closely align with increases in student achievement as measured by growth? We got the results back; Suzanne Lane went back out to interview the four pilots that we had; talked to teachers, talked to the principals, talked to the superintendents to say, what worked? What didn't work? One of the messages that we got back was the training for the supervisors and the training for the teachers was not nearly enough. This year instead of the half-day training that we conducted; we've just finished training with the help of the intermediate units, a two and a half day training, taking people through information on the first day of what the rubric says and then two days of looking at implementing the system of, how do you determine with the partnership of the professional where needs are, where the strengths are, and those 80 trainers will now, between now and January go back out to train a much larger and robust pilot which has over a 100 LEAs including charter schools, including traditional brick and mortar schools, including vocational schools, our CTCs and also

intermediate units. Again to look at this rubric which deals with classroom teachers; the rubric that we are using in this pilot is classroom teachers, those folks who deliver their service within the classroom, to say, lets again get knowledgeable and learn about this and if there's any tweaks we need to make to the language on that, or clarifying the training, especially, we can do that. So that is where we are and about to begin our pilot two in January. That's the first half; we also know that this rubric is not for specialists, not for teachers or professionals who deliver their service outside the classroom. So over the course of this year we'll be working again with the Danielson Group and with the professionals out in the field to bring them in for our nurses, our school psychologists, our guidance counselors, who deliver their service, their professional service outside of the classroom; to design rubrics specifically for their practice. We also will be going back to look at our principal model and working again with the principals in the field and the superintendants to say; the system that we had, the feed-back that we got was too complex, was too detailed and did not reflect, again, the language that incorporated our pillars, our inspired leadership components, but also effective principal behaviors as related on our rubric and we'll be doing that this year also. So we have, we'll be working with specialists, we'll be working principals to develop the, those rubrics that are designed for people outside of the classroom. There's the second piece that we've been working on in our teacher evaluation system and the teacher effectiveness system which talks about measuring student multiple measures of student achievement as it relates to teacher effectiveness. One of the components that we have been working on over the year and we've been doing focus groups, is to look at what could be included in the building measure; what would be an accurate and reliable building measure and I want to be very clear when we talk about multiple measures of students achievement. Well we are not talking about is multiple uses of the same test; that is not multiple measurers. And so

we've been very purposeful in looking at that building measurement to include things that you would traditionally think about in multiple measures which is the indicators of achievement, what I call static measures, which are percent proficient in advance over our math, our reading, our science and our writing tests and PSSA. We're looking at NOFTY; we're looking at PSSAM and the PASA, which is for our 1% students. We look at also at SAT performance and what in fact SAT has told us makes a college ready student. We've looked at our as I said NOFTY for our CTE Programs and we've looked at other indicators of academic growth, which is measured by our PVAAS system so we looked at the scale scored because we know that many teachers, many professionals touch the life of the student so we want to be fair and balanced and measure our teachers performance as the child comes into their classroom and what, in fact, value added they have at the end of that year of academic instruction. So, it's a nice blend of between academic achievement over multiple measures and growth over the PSSA. We also have other academic indicators because we also believe in, now we're talking about the building measure for all the students in that building; things like graduation rate for high schools, promotion rate for elementary and high schools, advanced placement courses that children have an opportunity to look at; SAT participation, PSAT participation. It's a very good blend of multiple measures as we look at building achievement and building growth. And again, we've been talking with folks; we have heard from superintendents and teachers as they've looked at this; that especially those who are from very high performing districts what that may have very high percent of proficient and advanced students, that it's very difficult to make more than the year of growth so we've added to the formula an extra credit factor, if you will, so that it balances out the fact that you can't make more than a year of growth if your children are already at the highest performing levels, that you get some extra credit for the percent proficient advance. It does not harm other

districts that have, in fact, more difficult, more challenging students to teach. But it's an, I think, a very nice balance and we'll be continuing to do that work at our December institute to ask for feed-back on that formula and then have that available as an academic measure of multiple measures of student achievement for the buildings. Currently, we're looking at that as a 15% of the 50% to include with a teacher, principal, and anyone who's in that building because, philosophically, we believe, that everyone in that building is responsible for the healthy environment of those children, whether you're in the special needs classroom, whether you're in a regular classroom, whether you're the guidance counselor, whether the nurse; you are responsible for the educational environment and so everyone should participate in that grade, if you will. What we also have is a thought of individual teacher, as it again, would be reflected on a very rich formula, not just multiple measure and multiple use of the same measure. But again, what that would look like, I know we have some special challenges for some special needs students because of their not always measured on tests that we believe are appropriate because of federal mandates. So we've looked to their IEPs for those growth measures. We have to look at, again, when we are ready for that piece which is taking it down to the teacher level, what are reliable valid and appropriate measures for that individual teacher? At the moment, we do not have the infrastructure to take those tests or those measurements down to the teacher level and we would need, in fact, additional revenue sources to take it down to the teacher level so that we could look at that. So currently that's under investigation, that is under development and when we find a reliable source and a reliable way to take that down to the teacher level and look at growth over three years because we know teachers have very different cohorts of students that they are, in fact, educating. We want to balance out some of the noise in the system. We'd be looking at that over a three year measure as opposed to a building, which is an individual

measure because you deal with all children. The most exciting part for me as a professional educator and as a teacher is looking at the last part, which is the elective. Because I think this brings the profession into the teacher effectiveness of model in a very distinct way. And the elective is where professionals and districts can look at what are the things that measure student achievement based on the professionals opinion. We could look at district design tests; we could look at national tests; we could look at the diagnostic tests that we have; we could look at teachers' surveys for students, which have from the next study, a very, I think, good link and a good assessment of teacher effectiveness. We could look at teacher action research, but those things we would building out and providing as the legislation provides. We could provide that each year so you don't have to recreate the wheel every year and we think that really brings us into a professional dialog with our teachers and with our specialists and with our principals as we build at that elective piece of 35% for teachers without a test or 20% for teachers with the test. But we are growing that; we will be ready again with the individual building piece. So we have a ways to go, we're training, we're launching pilot two, with a much a larger pilot we suspect we'll bring Suzanne Lane back to do the evaluation at the end of this year. She will be on site; she will not only ask people how the training was, how we can adapt that training, but also how we can adjust the rubrics and to look at that. So come September we again, will benefit from the input of a much larger pilot and over 6500 teachers, the both tested and the non-tested subject areas. So, we're very excited about where we are. Another thing that we'll be working on this year, again because we believe that this is just not about evaluation, this is really about teacher growth; this is about professional growth. One of the things on our SAS system, which I know you all know our Standards Alliance System, we have a professional development center and what we are doing now is building out twenty components that are tied to Danielson for teachers professional

development that will be free resources to the field that deals and speaks the language of Danielson, so we're about to launch those efforts also. I'm excited about the project; I am excited as a professional educator and a public educator advocate. And I'll stop there to answer any questions.

SECRETARY TOMALIS: And in closing, Representatives; Mr. Chairman; the legislation helps us to move forward on this path that we've started with this pilot program. Representative Aument's sponsorship and leadership is appreciated. We need to be able to move this project forward so that we can deploy and give indication to all of our school districts of the important endeavor that we're engaged in. Thank you.

CHAIRMAN CLYMER: Thank you. I have a just a question or two. With the improvement that would take place and we're looking at, the improvements will help all of the teachers, but even if it will help 5 or 6%, of the 120,000 professional instructors, what would that mean academically? Can you just; I mean is it any way to quantify is just, even a small segment of increase?

SECRETARY TOMALIS: Representative, there's been research that's been done that shows that if you address the lowest 5 to 10% performing teachers in a building unit that you can move the academic achievement up to a grade and a half more than what you would do if those teachers weren't in the classroom. So or you create a more effective environment. It is a multiplier effect on student achievement. Conversely is equally true, that if those teachers do not get the added professional development or the ability to raise their instructional practice that they do, they're drag a bit upon academic achievement. I look at this more along the lines of teachers who are in a grade level along the continuum of students going through an elementary school, for example, third grade, fourth grade, fifth graders, sixth grade; if there's one teacher in there that

doesn't have the skill set necessary to keep pushing those children up for academic achievement. It doesn't allow the subsequent teachers to be as effective as they can be. So focusing in primarily on the lower performing teachers, identifying the skills that they have and their weaknesses, directing professional development resources to address some of those weaknesses will lift the academic achievement of the entire building.

CHAIRMAN CLYMER: My last question before I turn it over to Chairman Roebuck is, I attended the virtual program that was held Tuesday; can you just again, state for the record, that the cooperation among the teachers themselves, among the personnel in the IU units, the principals, the superintendents; this was a joint venture in which there was wonderful cooperation and feed-back; just so the Members would know that this is not putting one group against another and we need to have that on the record.

SECRETARY TOMALIS: No Sir, it is not at all. What I was very heartened to see in participating and hosting, in part, that event on Tuesday night and taking part in a panel discussion, for those of you who weren't able to join us; The Pennsylvania Partnership for Children and the Pennsylvania Intermediate Unit hosted at each of their locations across the Commonwealth the ability for the leaders and local school districts to come to the IU sites and participate in a virtual town hall with, as Chairman said, over 1400 participants and many of you; some of you were there. One of the things that was very encouraging to me was when you heard both the union leadership at the local level, the superintends at the local level, individual teachers, say that this is a way of collaborating together to increase the quality of instruction in the classroom across the board and it helped drive a process that in too many times has not been as cooperative as it could have been. This is when we heard about it and we heard it discussed very much of a pro public education, a pro teacher initiative because they all saw the benefit of

increasing the skill set of teachers in the classroom and the ripple effect that that has throughout the entire building out, the entire district. So I was very heartened to hear the stories of the cooperation that was taking place at the local level between the labor representatives and the management in moving this initiative forward.

CHAIRMAN CLYMER: Thank you. The Chair does recognize Chairman Roebuck.

CHAIRMAN ROEBUCK: Thank you, Mr. Chairman; thank you Mr. Secretary; thank you, Dr. Dumaresq. Listening to the testimony it seems that this begins not in the classroom; it begins in the process of teacher preparation and I wanted to get a clearer sense of the roll that you anticipate that institutions of higher education will play in, I hate to use the term better preparing teachers, but at least, in laying the proper foundation so that those who are graduating are ready to enter classrooms with the necessary ability to teach.

SECRETARY TOMALIS: Chairman Roebuck, this morning I just had the opportunity to speak to the council of exceptional children and it was a good event of 150 or so participants and there were many student teachers who were in the class along with many professors, who were there, who were are in the schools of education and they were talking about the need to address teacher effectiveness issues to help them get a better understanding about what is needed in today's' classroom and help drive that change. There were some other issues that they discussed about this but and we talked to them about the need to work cooperatively in a collaborative environment to develop this tool. It has been, as you know, my background of working of working in Washington and having traveled around the country, it is a perennial issue about the quality of our new teachers coming into the classroom that we hear from the consumers of those of the schools of education. And I must say, I am very heartened to see that they're stepping up to the plate. As long as they understand what they need to do; what the tool allows

them to do is get a focus and what the legislation will allow them to do is get a focus of where they need to drive their instruction at the post secondary level to prepare these teachers. I'll let Carolyn speak a little bit more about this but if you step back and realize that we have a profile of teachers in Pennsylvania that will probably see a few retirements in the coming years. We have to focus on these new teachers coming in the system like never before.

DR. CAROLY DUMARESQ: Since I would be working with the Deputy Secretary, Jill Hans, from Higher Education to, in fact, engage the deans of the schools of education and the academic deans in looking at the language of Danielson, the language of effecting teaching so that we can again begin to engage them in conversations about retooling or reframing or supporting what currently exists in some of the institutions. I think it behooves all of us if you think of the Finney System. We have teachers teaching students. The more effective those teachers are and the higher performing those students are the better graduate goes into higher education and the less remedial work that needs to be done by higher education. So higher education receives a better product through our students learning and they, in turn, train the teachers to provide the better product. So it really is a system that supports itself.

CHAIRMAN ROEBUCK: It also seems to me that part of the issue is the, having teachers ready to teach wherever they are asked to teach. It's one of the problems, I think that my district has; I have an urban district, is that you get teachers who have no experience in urban environment. You know, I recognize if I were to go out and teach in rural Pennsylvania, I'd have the same problem of transition. But I'm not saying that colleges or universities focus upon giving students an awareness or experience that prepares them to teach in different environments. I also note that many states now require that teachers do a five year teacher preparation program; that they come out not only with a B.A. or a B.S.; they come out with a master level degree and that

enhances their quality; their ability to teach better. I wonder if we've looked at other states that are improving their educational quality when we are formulating this particular initiative, to see what they're doing and how they're improving the quality of their teachers.

SECRETARY TOMALIS: We have. We have looked at other states. That's why we brought in the Danielson Model as actually many of the states across the Country are adopting this model as well. There is some leadership coming out of the Federal Government on this issue. Actually it's building upon funding for initiatives that have been underway. So what we have in this endeavor; in this project is not a Pennsylvania's; it only endeavor. We are able to tap into some of the research. What some states are actually looking at is a greater emphasis on content skills as well; and content knowledge, not just on pedagogue. So I think that's something that we're gonna have to take a look at going forward. One point about you observation about the unique need of some of our school districts; I couldn't agree with you more. We, one thing that we have to make sure is that we recognize that not only do we see children, certainly not as the widgets that some people proclaim, that we treat as sometimes, but teachers are different as well. And when we look to spend some of that money that we do on professional development, over half billion dollars a year; that we can focus on some of the unique needs; that the needs of an urban environment are not the same as the needs of a rural environment. We're not gonna do this alone in Pennsylvania; the whole nation is addressing this issue. And we're gonna be able to take some of the best practices that we're learning elsewhere; incorporate them into the program as necessary.

CHAIRMAN ROEBUCK: And if I might have a third question? Dr. Dumaresq, you mentioned somewhere in your testimony about a test or using a test or success in SAT as a

measure of success and I guess, I have a problem with that but whenever you use any test as a measure of success, doesn't that drive the teaching curriculum towards teaching to the test?

DR. CAROLYN DUMARESQ: I believe that if you have good standards and those eligible content are measuring those standards as reflected in our Pennsylvania Common Court standards that we're moving toward with higher rigor; that teaching the eligible content is something that at least has, when I went through education, of making sure that the written, taught and tested, have a cohesiveness about them. I find nothing wrong with teaching, in fact, what you're going to measure. What else would you be testing for? So...

CHAIRMAN ROEBUCK: That comes relatively close to a question that I asked to Secretary Hickok, when he testified this summer. As to why, particularly Virginia, had done so well and he talked about Statewide standards as being one of the criteria that drove that success, so perhaps that's where we're headed. I'm not certain but... Thank you, Mr. Chairman.

CHAIRMAN CLYMER: Thank you for those questions and now the Chair recognizes Representative Rapp, for questioning.

REPRESENTATIVE RAPP: Thank you, Mr. Chairman and thank you Mr. Secretary and everyone who's here to testify today. I did attend the meeting the other night and it was very informative. I just have two questions. On page three of your testimony, Mr. Secretary, under the teacher practices, you know, I'm looking for measurement and assessment, the instruction component. This is language, quite frankly, I've seen for a long time so, use of research based strategies which engage students in meaningful learning and learning and utilizing assessment results to make decisions about student needs. Can you give me an example; let's take reading for example? How under this assessment you would be assessing teachers, evaluating teachers,

under the instruction practice, if a student is having difficulty in reading? What's going on in the classroom now versus what you expect to see under a classroom if this is put into place?

SECRETARY TOMALIS: Certainly we would like to see that the practices that would be used is the classroom management skills that bring in the research into the classroom on how to provide additional instruction time; what type of learning environment; how to address individual students needs in the collective of the twenty or twenty five kids. So that they meet those practices, are things that we would look at. It is an indicator, it's not one just indicator, there's the three other areas that we're talking about specifically is part of the equation that we would look at and there are rubrics. Should I let Carolyn go into, specifically speak to that?

REPRESENTATIVE RAPP: Thank you and I've heard you talk about children of special needs and certainly the intermediate unit is certainly involved in that but you know, I've been in the trenches in that area and so going from a parents' perspective; if a parent feels that a child is not succeeding in reading and they're requesting a different type of program or a research based method to teach their child to read; what I have seen out in the trenches is a lot of resistance for classrooms to go to a different type of remedial program. How would your administration address that when it would come to an issue of parents seeing that there needs to be something done differently here? My child is not gonna succeed with the same old, same old.

SECRETARY TOMALIS: That's an important part of the aspect of the development of the IEP. And when you develop the IEP you put in their specific measures and goals that the student and the progress that you want to see the student attain. Now we half to get back to the issue of development of the IEP in what goes into that because that will help drive some of that discussion of the parent engagement and to make sure there is that balance. So it's a great concern, I grant that, that how we deal with these special needs children and we talked about that

this morning, in talking with special ed teachers, the community of special ed teachers that I talked with is concerned. Getting their input is going to be part of this process in developing the criteria of how we would measure that.

REPRESENTATIVE RAPP: And, just my opinion, and it's not just children and special education; it's a lot of children who have not been identified and who are in regular education who are struggling to learn how to read.

SECRETARY TOMALIS: And the ability of a teacher to notice that, pick up that, identify that and direct resources could be part of the evaluation process.

REPRESENTATIVE RAPP: I'm hoping that this administration will help remove some barriers at the local level for those children to have an appropriate IEP so that they can learn how to read. Just my last question; I've heard a lot the other night, heard you mention the Danielson Training Models; Is there a website? So that we as legislators can actually take a look at that because I'm hearing what you're gonna do but I hear about this Danielson Training Module that I'm really not hearing a real explanation of what it is; what you're teaching. Is there something that we can look at on the website so have a better handle on what you're referring to when you say Danielson Training Model?

DR. CAROLYN DUMARASQ: Absolutely, we are in the process, in fact today, to be loading up on our standards on-line system, which folks can have access if you need how to get into that, please let me know I can send you the directions on how to log-in and there will be a specific location for the teacher evaluation. It will include the rubrics; it will include the training materials and explanations and I'd also invite you to look also in our *Professional Development Center* as we begin to load those components which support that. I want to just mention one thing on learning to read. Pennsylvania was very fortunate to just have been awarded a thirty

eight million dollar grant, second highest in the nation, called *A Striving Readers Grant*. We're calling it *Keystones to Opportunities*; that will be looking at that articulation from birth to third grade on reading programs and, in fact, if you'll, in our Building Model there is particular, although not a huge, but part of the components is *Ready by Three*, that looks at researched based reading programs as part of that support. So again...

REPRESENTATIVE RAPP: I appreciate that because I actually sat in a room with Dr. Reed Lyon and Miss Hunter and others a decade ago when we first talking about research based practices and I guess I'm a little disappointed that it hasn't made further progress then what we've seen. Thank you very much.

CHAIRMAN CLYMER: The Chair thanks you for the questions and recognizes Representative Carroll for questions.

REPRESENTATIVE CARROLL: Thank you Mr. Chairman, thank you both for your testimony. Mr. Secretary, you're aware, I certain, that among our five hundred school districts, we have school districts that experience and have experienced tremendous growth over the last number of years. I call you attention, in particular to the Monroe County school districts and Pike County and I'm wondering how we reconcile the evaluation of teachers that receive huge numbers of new students from other states. I know that the my colleagues on various panels have brought to your attention the concerns related to PSSA scores and students that are received at, for example, Pocono Mountain School District. How do we reconcile the receipt of these students from other states and then the evaluation of the teachers that have to educate those students?

SECRETARY TOMALIS: Very good question, Representative and that's the reason why a lot, there's some have presented what I would call, misperceptions out there that this is

one test and one score and that's all you're doing. Actually the component that we're gonna be focusing on quite a bit is growth. So a child comes in and you assess where the child is and you know where the child is as far as their background; their reading skills, their language arts skills, whatever the issue would be and then you determine how much growth there has been progress, there has been in that child over one year's time or two year's time, or depending on what the equation is. So it's not what's called a static measure. It's not just a snap shot of where a child is at any given point in time. It's showing the progress, the value added that happens to that teacher on that child over a given chronology. So the situation that you're talking about with your districts where you have an input of number of children; they're coming in at a certain point of time on their academic skill set. We want to move them from where they're at now to where they should be in a certain period of time and give teachers credit for that growth. It's not just a single measure; it's not just a single point.

REPRESENTATIVE CARROLL: We don't have to do it now but I guess I'd just like to have a further explanation as to how we arrived at what their current level is so that we can accurately measure. And secondly, just a question, I don't just represent growing school districts but districts that aren't necessarily growing areas in Luzerne County. I was impressed with the number of Luzerne County Schools that are included in the pilot that begins in January. And I'm wondering how we measure the results of that pilot that concludes, I assume, at the end of this school year with the implementation of a program that would start so soon after the conclusion of that pilot? How do we reconcile that?

DR. CAROLYN DUMARESQ: One of the ways we'll do that is we'll have Suzanne Lane, again going in to make sure that the training was appropriate in an accurate and also that folks are comfortable with that will do surveys from the teachers and the principals and the

superintendents in those schools to see if there's a way we need to adjust training as we go forward. And if there's a way we need to adjust the instrument itself, although folks, you're fairly comfortable that it's a good representation in the Danielson Models of those components. So we'll have feedback from those pilot sites to adjust training as we move forward.

SECRETARY TOMALIS: That's one of the reasons why we're running the pilot, is to get the feedback. So because there a lot of variables that we have to look at and some of which you've that you just brought up, this loop that we're building in and building off of the advisory group that was headed up by Dr. Dumaresq, before in the earlier pilot, gives us a good foundation. But this is constant feedback and to refining the tool so that it is really accurate to the various circumstances presented in our five hundred school districts.

REPRESENTATIVE CARROLL: Thank you very much.

SECRETARY TOMALIS: Thank you Representative.

CHAIRMAN CLYMER: Chair thanks the gentleman and recognizes Representative Tallman for questions.

REPRESENTATIVE TALLMAN: Thank you Mr. Chairman, thank you Secretary Tomalis and Secretary Dumaresq, for being here and just for the whole group and I'm not sure how many but the that program on Tuesday night, which you two participated in significantly; it was amazing and what I found to be enlightening, and you already referenced, was the buy-in by bargaining unit folks and administration into the, whatever we're working on, the Danielson thing. So I was really impressed with that part of it and so I'm going to ask one quick question that I gonna make a suggestion and you can give me the feedback. First question is, the Danielson Method, which I don't know and if you do get that link to wherever we need to go to see it, I would appreciate that also. Are we tailoring it then for Pennsylvania schools?

DR. CAROLYN DUMARESQ: Yes, in fact, if the stake holder group has made some suggestions on strengthening the stake holder group that we had for pilot one made some suggestions on strengthening some of the language and clarifying some of the language which we've incorporated in the current versions of the rubrics. And again, as the Secretary said, I don't know that we'll ever be done because I think, we will benefit as we go along as a profession from constant feedback, from our professional staff and from the supervisors to how to improve training; how to improve resources; how to improve the support and staff development; what good research; what the electives should be. I don't think we should think that we're gonna be done when the law gets passes. It will give us a good vision and a start to get everyone focused in the right direction but we should never just rest with that. We should always be trying to improve where we're going and what we're doing.

SECRETARY TOMALIS: And the Danielson framework, one of the reasons why we are moving in that direction is, one, is it's also supported by the field and what happened last year in the pilot. But it is also the most advanced research out there in driving teacher effectiveness. So it's certainly not a cookie cutter approach or just importing this and saying this is the way it is. It's being very tailored to what the needs of Pennsylvania's teachers and Pennsylvania students are.

REPRESENTATIVE TALLMAN: Thank you and this is a, kind of suggestion or asking for your feedback, but in looking at the bill and then some of the conversation that was occurred Tuesday; the grading system distinguished proficient needs improvement and failing. We know from Florida that the general public doesn't conceptualize that. Matter of fact, they don't conceptualize adequate yearly progress. What does that mean? I mean, I get those questions all the time. What does AYP mean? And so Florida has gone to grading their schools on the same

way that the teachers grade; A through F. So I would like to see the grading be done; A through F and if you guys think it's totally absurd to do it that way, that's fine. Tell me and I drop that idea but the public understands, cause they, throughout our history we've got A, B, C, D, E, F; or we didn't get E's but...

SECRETARY TOMALIS: The Governor proposed, during the campaign, and we are working at an initiative that will incorporate that group rating system for schools. The question is whether or not and we will be having discussions with you on that before; before obviously we talk about it in greater detail. But before we apply that to a teacher; to a grade; to a teacher, that will be a little more difficult, I think, because of the nuances involved. I understand what you're talking about, the need to do it because you're doing is what actually what I try and focus on. Is that your focusing on the consumer of our public education system; the parent, who has a better understanding. I think the fact that we're able to present this in a way now is probably the best way to go right now. I'm not ruling it out but we have a lot of hurdles to put this in place now.

REPRESENTATIVE TALLMAN: Okay, thank you.

CHAIRMAN CLYMER: The Chair thanks the gentleman and recognizes Representative Truitt for questioning.

REPRESENTATIVE TRUITT: Thank you, Mr. Chairman. My question involves the process side of teacher evaluation; I think it's interesting that we're talking about putting 50% of our attention on the product and fifty percent on the process and what I don't see on the process side is any kind of an objective measure of the teachers' mastery of the subject material that they're gonna teach. Is that something that's been considered? Something like having, if a teacher is gonna teach geometry, they take the geometry Keystone Exam or something like that?

SECRETARY TOMALIS: It is and it's also part of the pre-service package or pre-service efforts that underway but we also incorporate it into this tool as well.

DR. CAROLYN DUMARESQ: In the domain one of Danielson, in that component of planning and preparation, one of the components is demonstrating knowledge of contented pedagogue. I do see that I need to get you that website as fast as possible.

REPRESENTATIVE TRUITT: Thank you.

CHAIRMAN CLYMER: With that the Chair thanks our testifiers today, Secretary Tomalis and Deputy Secretary Dumaresq for participating. Thank you very much for being here and we look forward to further communications with you on this very important issue.

SECRETARY TOMALIS: Thank you, Mr. Chairman.

CHAIRMAN CLYMER: At this time, the Chair recognizes the sponsor of the legislation, Representative Ryan Aument. And we welcome him to make remarks and we appreciate you taking the time to be with us this morning. You may begin.

REPRESENTATIVE AUMENT: Thank you, Mr. Chairman; I will make my testimony available to the Members of the Committee. It is not in front of you currently; I was making some last minute revisions and held the final draft but I will that certainly available to you. Chairman Clymer; Chairman Roebuck, colleagues and Members of the House Education Committee, Proverbs, Chapter 18:2 says, *A fool finds no pleasure in understanding but delights in airing his own opinions*. I appreciate your willingness to hold this hearing on an issue of great consequence. You've sought to gain understanding prior to airing your opinion via formal Committee action. I appreciate your time and your attention. I also have attempted to live by the principals of Proverbs, Chapter 18, since coming to the General Assembly less than a year ago. I came to the conclusion that strong meaningful comprehensive teacher evaluation system was

needed after numerous conversations with constituents, families, teachers, school administrators and education policy experts. My wife, a teacher in her fifth year, has also been a strong and influential advocate. She is a strong and influential advocate on a whole host of issues, political and otherwise. This past summer I scheduled meetings with Secretary Tomalis and Deputy Secretary Dumaresq and concluded that my views in regards to the needs for such a system of teacher evaluation matched those of this administration. This led me to introduce House Bill 1980, and ultimately here to testify before you. As has already been mentioned, during the 2009/2010 academic year 99.4 % of the public school teachers in the Commonwealth were rated as satisfactory, yet results in the 2011 PSSA show 26% of students are performing at or below the basic level in reading. 23% are performing at or below the basic level in Mathematics. An evaluation system that yields such disconnected results between teacher performance and student achievement is not accurate nor in the best interest of our students or our teachers. First and foremost, our concern must always be our young people and their preparedness for the future that awaits them. I believe that we, as Members of the General Assembly, must be their champions. We know there are many factors that influence academic success. To be sure, a student's own motivation and support from family plays a crucial role, however, research is conclusive that high among those factors to success is an effective teacher in the classroom. Rigorous studies consistently show that the impact of high performing teachers is substantial. Eric Hanushek is a Senior Fellow at the Stanford University's Hoover Institution, writes compellingly of the economic impact of teachers and individual students. A good but not great teacher increases each student's lifetime earnings by 10,600 dollars. Consider a class of twenty; under such circumstances the teacher at the 60th percentile will each year raise each student's aggregate earnings by a total of 106,000 dollars. A teacher of the 84th percentile will shift earnings by

400,000 dollars. The opposite is also true; a low. A performing at the 16th percentile of effectiveness will have a negative impact of 400,000 dollars as compared to an average teacher. Our students have a civil right to a quality teacher in every classroom. We must therefore identify who those teachers are, we must retain them, we must encourage them, insure our students have access to them, and we must assist those teachers who are struggling. The students facing the greatest hurdles to their education must have access to the highest performing teachers. Today we simply do not have a meaningful method for identifying who those teachers are. Our concern must also be the success of our educators. Our educators deserve meaningful feedback for their own professional development. The current system limits meaningful and actionable feedback and perpetuates the status quo. Teachers need and deserve accurate feedback including the incorporation of student performance data to improve their practice in order to ensure our students are taught by professionals who continuously grow and improve. Therefore Pennsylvania needs a more robust system that distinguishes between educators who are excelling, those who are struggling and need support to improve. The cost to this Commonwealth and our nation by our failure to act is high in this era of intensifying international competition.

I'd like to briefly highlight House Bill 1980. This legislation does not attempt to micromanage every detail of the evaluation system nor should it. It does, however, implement a framework for the department to work with those in the field to implement a comprehensive plan. The Department of Education's ultimate system will reflect the input and desire of the over 100 local entities who are participating in the Department's pilot. This legislation seeks to replace the meaningless current rating scale of satisfactory or unsatisfactory. My bill expands the scale to four: distinguished, proficient, needs improvement and fails. Fifty percent of the evaluation is based on traditional teacher practices: planning and preparation, classroom environment,

instruction, professional responsibilities. These are based on the Danielson Rubric which has been revised specific to Pennsylvania needs and is being utilized in the pilot program. Over one hundred school districts statewide are part of this pilot program and will have the opportunity to give the Department feedback about necessary changes and implementation. Fifty percent of the evaluations shall be based on student performance. This will include but is not limited to performance on assessments, value added assessment data, growth, other measures and assessments to be determined and approved by the Department. The Department of Education is now working with teachers, administrators, school district and other education experts to develop the specific details of that student performance portion of the evaluation. Again, my legislation provides the framework for the Department to design and implement the tool. School districts are given flexibility to recommend other elective performance assessments that must be approved by the Department. The legislation purposely and appropriately does not specify how teachers, their individual subjects, including those not assessed by the PSSA or perhaps Keystone Exams, are evaluated. Those determinations on how proficiency and growth scores are specifically weighted will be determined by the Department of Education. Phase two of the statewide pilot has been specifically tasked with assisting the Department with making those decisions. The Department is forming details of the evaluation tool based on the feedback that it receives from stake holders. The legislation provides for other measures for grades and subjects not assessed and that will eventually include valid and reliable measures of student achievement. Legislation also includes non-teaching professionals and includes principals in the 2013/2014 school year. I think it's important to note in closing what other states are and have been doing to assist educators and promote student achievement. Twenty nine states have made policy changes related to teacher evaluations in the years between 2009 and 2011. Twenty three states require annual evaluations

and formed in-part by standardized tests for all teachers. More significantly perhaps, eighteen states now specify that teacher evaluations are to be “significantly inform by student achievement and growth”. Thirteen of those states require that student achievement and growth is the preponderant criteria in teacher evaluations. Perhaps most interestingly is the case, one of the nation’s most challenging school district in the District of Columbia; their impact teacher evaluations system is now entering its third year. This evaluation system, like the one that I am proposing uses multiple measures of classroom performance to gauge effectiveness and provide feedback to teachers. Many D.C. teachers report after expressing feelings of great initial skepticism, that they now have the feedback and support they need. The evidence, early evidence, is very encouraging. Nearly 60% of teachers who scored minimally effective in the first year of impact and stayed in the district improved to effective in the second year. Of that, 3% were highly effective and 55% effective. It’s encouraging to see the impact the system has had in just three short years in Washington DC and the impact it’s had on professional development of those educators. To put this in real numbers; this represents three hundred and twenty eight teachers. Think of the impact this new feedback has had on the students attending the schools in Washington D.C. Like my plan, the components of the impact rating system are ambitious; 50% of the evaluation is based on individual value added student achievement data; 5% is based on school value added achievement date; a full 55% based on achievement date. The remaining 45% is based on observed practices and demonstration of commitment to school and community. What we are attempting to do in House Bill 1980 is certainly not without precedent, in fact, we may be lagging behind when a majority of other states and the District of Columbia are already doing. It’s time for us to be as ambitious for our children and for our teachers. My many thanks for your time; I look forward to your input. Thank you, Mr. Chairman.

CHAIRMAN CLYMER: I just have one question, Representative. In that Washington D.C. study, the academic achievements of those students increased as well. I mean we're talking about the teachers improving their effectiveness but I am just making the assumption that in the classroom we saw the scores and the achievements go up as well; the attendance, graduation?

REPRESENTATIVE AUMENT: Thank you, Mr. Chairman. Yes, the data that I saw was specifically directed towards the improvement the teachers made.

CHAIRMAN CLYMER: The chair recognizes Chairman Roebuck for questions.

CHAIRMAN ROEBUCK: Thank you, Mr. Chairman. My question focus upon the areas that are chosen to be evaluated; the subject matter. Under your bill what are the proposed areas of subject matter that will be evaluated for teacher effectiveness?

REPRESENTATIVE AUMENT: Again, the legislation provides very broad framework for the Department to implement the tool. So, in terms of, you're talking about the subject matter what the teachers are teaching. Is that, I want to make sure I'm at the heart of your question? That's not specified not do I think it should be specified. The language talks about all, I'll refer to the legislation here, talks about teaching professionals, as well as non-teaching professionals and then the program will include principals in the 2013/2014 school year. So it includes all of them.

CHAIRMAN ROEBUCK: I guess I've a concern about understanding, if I'm teaching a subject that is not tested per say. I teach art; I teach music. How am I evaluated under your bill?

REPRESENTATIVE AUMENT: Again, the legislation provides the framework and allows for multiple measures of assessment. The pilot program, we're now entering phase two, will by and large, and is now currently making those detailed determinations based on the feedback that the Department is now receiving, as has been outlined prior to the earlier

testimony, the feedback that they're receiving from stake holders including educators, school administrators, and others. So again, I don't think it should be the purpose of the legislation to micromanage every detail of the plan. What we have put into legislation is to give the tool to the Department; 1: to expand the rating scale; 2: to ensure that 50% of the evaluation is based on the Danielson Rubric, as we've talked about and 50% shall be based on student performance measures that include standardize testing, the PSSA, may include the Keystone Exams, but other assessment tools. That flexibility is written into the legislation to allow for the school districts and the Department to utilize the flexibility.

CHAIRMAN ROEBUCK: Obviously I need to look at the Danielson website, wherever that's up. I think we all need to do that but...

REPRESENTATIVE AUMENT: To that, don't mean to interrupt the Chairman but I've spent quite a, Charlotte Danielson has a website herself. Now obviously Pennsylvania's assessment has been tailored specific to our needs but you can go to Charlotte Danielson.com and view.

CHAIRMAN ROEBUCK: Again, I want to go back because it seems to me that some subjects in Pennsylvania, we have a fairly structured way of evaluating them. Some we do not. It concerns me then that those that are not as well defined when you apply a system of evaluation, whether that's fair to those who are teaching those subjects. Student performance, my wife teaches music, whenever we have groups singing, she says to me, "stand in the back and mouth the words." Now I don't know whether I can be judged fairly under any system that evaluates my music skills but, be that as it may, I think there has to be a consistency, a level playing field in evaluating all teachers with some measure of sameness. Otherwise, we create a tiered system that is inherently difficult if not unfair.

REPRESENTATIVE AUMENT: Yes, I think that's an important point and that's why I think phase 2 of this pilot is so critical because those determinations are now being made and will be made by the Department as they continue to communicate with stake holders. Our legislation, the legislation that I have now before you provides them with the flexibility to implement that plan. So we can make those determinations; how do you, in fact, measure the student achievement in music, how do you measure student growth in art class? We've allowed the Department that flexibility to make those determinations.

CHAIRMAN ROEBUCK: Thank you.

CHAIRMAN CLYMER: The Chair thanks the gentlemen for those questions and during the conference that we had on Tuesday night, some of the stake holders did indicate they were involved in that pilot too, if I'm not mistaken and that is moving forward. That was not addressed as pilot 1 with those in the classroom but that is very, that's a very important part of the total evaluation and effectiveness of the teachers. We're not, that has not been excluded, it's just that that will take a little bit more time as the stake holders report back as you have said Representative, back to the, back to the professionals. So, at this time the Chair recognizes Representative Roae for questions.

REPRESENTATIVE ROAE: Thank you Mr. Chairman and thank you Representative Aument. Sometimes in Harrisburg it's easy for Legislators, especially the new Legislators just to kind of come here and kind of stay in the background or whatever but I think it's commendable that you addressed this very important issue and it controversial to some people and I just think it's great that you're willing to look at a serious issue and try to, you know, do something about it. But what my question is, has there been any consideration of letting parents be involved and part of the process? I have three kids that attend a public school and I have a unique perspective,

like a lot of people do that my kids that have gone through certain grade levels, they've had three different teachers so I have a lot of interaction with the teachers my kids have and I just wondering if there is ever any consideration of, you know, letting the parents weigh-in. I'm very happy with the quality of teachers we have at my kids' school but some of the teachers just, you know, a much higher level than the other ones. Has there been any consideration of having parents give input?

REPRESENTATIVE AUMENT: It's interesting, last evening I was meeting with my, with the superintendents from the three schools districts that I have the privilege of representing and I don't recall who, but someone in that group sort of threw out the idea allowing for student feedback, in terms of the assessment and so there have been, there's been a lot of input; there's been a lot of feedback and we continue to solicit feedback. This hearing has been important for me to hear the input that Members of this Committee have and will continue to entertain all suggestions for strengthening and improvement.

REPRESENTATIVE ROAE: Alright, thank you.

CHAIRMAN CLYMER: Chair recognizes Representative Carroll for questions.

REPRESENTATIVE CARROLL: Thank you Mr. Chairman, thank you Representative for the presentation. Just a moment ago you said that you considered phase two to be so critical and again with the impressive number of districts and IU's that are participating in phase two; would you support the delay of the implementation if all of the information from phase two isn't compiled and analyzed prior to September of next year?

REPRESENTATIVE AUMENT: I don't believe the delay is necessary. What we have done informed by phase one of the pilot, which has already been in existence for over a year, is to provide the framework for what the evaluation tool should look like. Phase two is providing

additional information to implement the details of that plan. So I do not believe that a delay is beneficial because I think the framework that we provided is completely appropriate and we've allowed flexibility for phase two of the pilot to make improvements and to provide additional detail.

REPRESENTATIVE CARROLL: It just seems to me if phase two is so critical that we should carefully analyze the results of phase two including the feedback and all that goes along this phase before we head down this path and so I guess I would just call to your attention that if phase two is; either it's critical or it's not critical. I mean if we're ready to go forward next September, regardless of phase two then I wonder why we're even doing phase two.

REPRESENTATIVE AUMENT: I appreciate the feedback very much. I believe that phase two is not critical to the framework that we put in place in this legislation. I believe it is critical to the details that will add to the framework but I do not believe that it is critical to the framework of this legislation as put in place.

REPRESENTATIVE CARROLL: That's a fine distinction. Thank you very much.

CHAIRMAN CLYMER: The Chair thanks the gentleman for joining us this morning. That concludes our questions Representative Aument. So again, thank you for your testimony and for answering questions.

REPRESENTATIVE AUMENT: Thank you.

CHAIRMAN CLYMER: Continuing on our agenda; the Chair welcomes the Pennsylvania State Education Association (PSEA), Linda Cook, teacher at the Penn Delco School District and joining Miss Cook, is the American Federation of Teachers (AFT), Valerie Braman, a staff representative. Valarie, good morning, we appreciate it. We welcome you as

well. So thank you for joining us this morning and you may begin; I think we all have your testimony and I know I do. So you may begin.

LINDA COOK: Good afternoon Chairman Clymer and Chairman Roebuck and Members of the Committee. My name is Linda Cook and up until July of this year, I was a teacher of thirty three years in the Penn Delco School District and then I retired. I am also a Member of the State Education Association know as PSEA, Board of Directors. PSEA represents 193,000 teachers, educational support personnel and other individuals charged with responsibility of educating Pennsylvania's students. On behalf of our members, thank you for inviting PSEA to speak today about House Bill 1980 and the importance of valid, fair and effective teacher evaluation. PSEA understands the importance of an evaluation system that defines high standards of professional practice, removes persistently ineffective teachers, and supports the professional growth of all teachers. As a matter of fact, we have advocated for several years for improvements to the current system. PSEA has participated in the Gates Momentum Statewide Stakeholder Committee and we continue to advise Pennsylvania's Department of Education on the new system as part of the committee of practitioners. And I am a member of both. We also encouraged our members to participate in both teacher evaluation pilots. Our members want a truly effective evaluation system. One that will help them fully demonstrates the professional practice and find ways to improve upon it. House Bill 1980 calls for a new framework for Pennsylvania's teacher and principal evaluation system and an ambitious schedule for designing and implementing a new system that fits the framework. This is problematic for several reasons. First, it risks requiring the use of evidence of teacher and principal effectiveness that is neither valid nor reliable. Second, it creates a framework that does not clearly connect an individual's performance evaluation to their own professional practice.

And three, it calls for a development of a new system before results of the pilot designed to inform that development can be considered. At its' core an effective evaluation system needs to be based on evidence that is strong, fair and leads to valid conclusions about job performance that will help individuals improve the professional practice. There are many reasons why House Bill 1980 and its' use of standardized tests to calculate at least 50% of a classroom teachers overall evaluation will not produce valid or fair conclusions about teachers job performance or help teachers improve their professional practice. In the interest of time, I will mention four of them. First, research makes clear that several factors besides the individual teacher influences student achievement and growth including past teachers, tutors, curriculums quality, class size, student attendance, out-of-school learning, including summer school, family resources, birth weight, medical care, food insecurities, student motivation, and peer influence. As a matter of fact, recent research concludes that student factors explain more variation in student achievement than teacher factors. It should come as no surprise then that teachers receive lower effectiveness scores on standardized tests when their students are disproportionately English learners, low income or special education students; even when statistical methods try to adjust for differences in teachers and students. Students are never assigned randomly across teachers and so student characteristics benefit some teachers and penalize other in a test based evaluation system. Not only do student factors reduce the validity of standardized test scores as a measure of teacher effectiveness but because standardized test scores primarily reflect variation in student factors rather than teachers, most teachers cannot use these results in any meaningful way to improve their own professional practice. Second, an individual teacher's influence on student achievement and growth may span many classrooms, schools and even districts. For example; many elementary school reading programs assign students to different reading teachers every

eight weeks. In the special education program, one elementary student may work with four or five different specialists that each help the student in varying degrees of intensity. Some teachers are assigned multiple schools within the district and in the case of educators who work in intermediate units assignments may span multiple districts. There are no models to accurately reflect the complex ways in which teachers are assigned to help different students in different schools or districts for different amounts of time because there is no way to calculate the actual dosage that one student has of one teacher. House Bill 1980 will to an incalculable extent evaluate teachers on others work. This cannot lead to valid conclusions about individual teachers' job performance and cannot give teachers the information they need to improve their own professional practice. Third, students grow every day and in many ways. They develop social skills, emotional maturity, behavioral self-control, speech and language abilities, fine and gross motor skills, and of course, cognition and knowledge across the complete curriculum. Any comprehensive system to measure teachers' impact on student growth needs to take account of each of the ways students develop. Unfortunately the bill relies on as little as one annual standardized test of specific academic content to calculate 50% or more of a teachers' overall evaluation. State assessments are designed to measure a subset of grade level content standards not to measure all the ways teachers help students grow. Teachers need real time measures of all the ways their students are growing in order to analyze their own professional practice. Finally, most standardized tests are not valid assessments of learning for students with special needs including English language learners, some students with disabilities and gifted students. The reasons for this vary but in general, one size fits all tests are not designed to measure achievement for students who are working significantly above or below grade level or students who are not able to fully understand the test in English. This reduces the validity of the

assessment and distracts teachers from the important work of improving the professional practice to meet the needs of all students. Over all, using standardized tests is 50% or more of a teacher's evaluation will not produce evidence of teacher effectiveness that is strong or fair nor will it lead to valid conclusions about a teacher's job performance or improvements in professional practice. Of equal concern to PSEA however, is a growing body of evidence demonstrating that the high stakes use of test scores in teachers' evaluations is likely to have negative consequences, not only for individual teachers but for the educational system as a whole. Donald Campbell's assertion that relying on a quantitative measure for high stakes decisions will distort the measure and corrupt the system; has become so accepted in social science that it is not simply referred to as *Campbell's Law*. Applied education, Campbell concluded, when test scores become the goal of the teaching process, they both lost their values as indicators of educational status and distort the educational process and desirable ways. Ultimately, an effective evaluation system needs to hold teachers accountable for their professional practice. Holding teachers accountable for outcomes that are out of their control is likely to exasperate bad professional practices not reduce them. According to Campbell's law we will distort the system we are trying to measure if we base half of a teacher's evaluation on standardized test results. While there are many parts of the education system that teachers do not control they do control their professional practice and a high quality teacher evaluation system should help all teachers know how to change their practice for the better. The most direct way to help an individual improve their practice is to focus on that practice in the evaluation system. This does not mean that student outcomes do not have a role to play in teacher evaluation but it means that student outcomes are only meaningful to the extent that we can relate specific observable professional practices to specific student outcomes. Standardized tests simply are not able to provide this kind of data. The good news is, is that there

are ways to measure student outcomes that can also help teachers improve professional practice. Teachers measure student growth all the time through curriculum based pre and post test, student projects and performances, specifically designed assessments relating IEP goals; inventories of behavioral, social, and other kinds of skills; formative assessments, and other measures. These kinds of measures happen at the point of instruction and are based on instruction, so a teacher can more directly see a link between his or her teaching and these kinds of student results. Even more importantly, teachers can change their practice immediately and differentiate instruction based upon the results to achieve different outcomes for students. Teachers appreciate the value of these measures and it is how they know that their students are learning.

It is, we think, possible to grow an evaluation system that relies upon these kinds of measures of student outcomes. That is one of the reasons we have participated in the Gates Momentum Study and have encouraged our members to participate in PDE's two teacher and principal evaluation pilots. But, the Gates contractors are still analyzing the data from the first pilot of only five local education agencies and the Commonwealth is just beginning to roll out the second pilot involving more than 100 LEA's. Results from it likely will not be available until after the deadline in House Bill 1980 for adopting the new system.

It is also possible to grow a system that adheres to all of the components of effective evaluation. PSEA consistently advocates for systems that reflect current research. We know what high-quality education [sic] looks like. It should: 1) be based upon a challenging definition of good practice; 2) be sufficiently flexible to allow managers to relate broad standards to local organizational goals; 3) set different expectations for professionals at different career stages; 4) provide ongoing training for evaluators and those being evaluated; 5) include an understanding of organizational supports and barriers to effective job performance; 6) maximize employee

engagement, self-appraisal, and feedback; 7) be based on strong, diverse evidence, including self-produced evidence, that leads to valid conclusions; 8) link to professional development; and 9) hold individuals responsible for their own professional practice.

No one benefits when an evaluation system does not do its job and our concern is that current proposals simply replace one ineffective system with another. But we can build a teacher evaluation system that removes persistently ineffective teachers and supports the professional growth of all teachers. To do so, we need to take advantage of decades of research about effective evaluation and the appropriate use of standardized assessments. We also need to apply research that defines elements of effective evaluation.

PSEA envisions a system that adheres to principles of effective evaluation, produces valid results, incorporates meaningful measures of student growth and uses measures of professional practice as the basis of evaluation result. In that regard, we believe that prudent policymaking requires that the legislature allow the Gates Momentum Project to continue its important work and report its findings before the Legislature acts. We stand ready to help the Commonwealth in producing a system that will apply the best research in evaluation and lessons learned from the pilot project to set and maintain high standards for all teachers.

Thank you for this opportunity and I look forward to your questions.

CHAIRMAN CLYMER: Valerie, I know you have some comments as well, so you may begin.

VALERIE BRAMAN: Thank you. Good afternoon to Chairman Clymer, Chairman Roebuck and Members of the House Education Committee. I thank you for permitting me to testify before you today about a matter that is near and dear to my heart as an educational practitioner, which is the subject of teacher evaluation. Before I begin my remarks, and I will

condense them greatly because I know you can read them, I would like to ask each of us to just take a moment to conjure up that image or that memory of your favorite teacher or that teacher who had that impact upon you, the one who stands out to you the most. And I'd like you to think about it was that made that teacher stand out and I'd like to encourage you also to think about whether that teacher stands out to you as effective, as important, as crucial to your own development because of that teacher's ability to make sure that you scored really well on the PSSA or the SAT or the CAT test or the ITBS or whatever it was we were taking at that time. I think most of us in the room agree an awful lot about the fact that really good teachers are really good for kids and that we all want to see and be able to work together to find a way to increase all of our capacity to support effective teaching, to help teachers who need that support as they struggle and to find ways to continue to increase the professional growth and development opportunities for all educators so that we can do what we came into the profession to do, which is to help our students and to insure that they'll be able to succeed.

By way of introduction and terms of my own background, I'll share with you that until last September I'd been teaching for nine years at Kensington High School, which is in the North Philadelphia section of Philadelphia. It became Kensington Creative and Performing Arts High School, so I did teach some of those subjects, like theater and journalism, in addition to English. I chose to teach at a school that was labeled, failing, because we had not reached AYP until this past academic year because I saw an opportunity to become a member of a staff who's goal was to greatly improve student achievement and our success was, indeed, brought about by the hard work professionalism, collaboration and the dedication of the entire school community. I began there as a classroom teacher, I became the English Department Leader there and then I became

what was called the school's instructional reform facilitator, which was basically the in school teaching coach and mentor to teachers.

For the past four years, I have also been a national trainer with the American Federation of Teachers' Educational Research & Dissemination Program in a program called Strategies for Student Success. It's a nationally renowned professional development program and I helped to write, facilitate, and train other facilitators in researched based professional development. And we focus on how to work with educators as adult learners to improve teaching and learning.

I'll begin with a purpose for evaluating teachers as we've all discussed and agreed today and we've decided that it should be to help improve teacher practice through fostering excellent teachers; nurturing teacher talent and we know that will ultimately improve student learning. If we agree on that and I do think that we do, I think that we can also agree on many of the components of an effective teacher evaluation and development system that we have discussed and that my colleague has discussed with you as well. We know that teacher evaluation and development programs should identify exemplary teachers also so that they can serve as models, mentors and coaches for their colleagues that will in turn improve student achievement. We agree that teacher evaluation and development programs should also identify the struggling teachers and develop a system of support for them. We've agreed that this will also improve student achievement. We know that teacher evaluation and development programs should ensure that fair and valid employment decisions can be made regarding all teachers. We've agreed today that this will improve student education achievement and we know that teacher evaluation and development programs should be based upon, as we've hear many times today, multiple measures of both student performance and teacher work. This will improve student achievement. We also have agreed that teacher evaluation and development programs should include the

training and the monitoring of those conducting the observation and the evaluations. This will also improve student achievement. Our overall theme is clear as professionals we welcome and we're eager for every opportunity to improve our teaching skill and develop our craft. Strengthening professional practice through supporting teacher collaboration, mentoring and coaching would empower us to better meet the goal of improving teaching and learning in our schools and for our students. And we also support a fair, transparent and expedient process for dealing with ineffective teachers, but in concert with an integrated approach to teacher evaluation and development. For any system of teacher evaluation to be effective it must be based upon a set of professional teaching standards. We've talked a lot about Danielson today. I have the advantage of being very familiar with the Danielson Frameworks for Teaching because we in Philadelphia adopted that as our model in the Philadelphia School District for evaluation and for professional development and coaching two years ago. So I was able to work with that as a teacher-coach in school with my colleagues and to see the ways in which we can look at both what we call the *on stage*, which is when I'm in front of the class and what you could see when you walk into my room to observe me, kinds of things would be, as well as what I'll call the *off stage* which is my preparation; my planning; my professional development activity; the phone calls I'm making home to parents; the extra support I'm giving to students; the time I spend collaborating with my colleagues, in order to be able to improve my practice and better help my students. In our research, it's clear on that point; it's definitive. Student achievement increases when teachers have not just the time to collaborate and work with each other and with other consultants in various professional development activities but when that time is quality and when it is structured. We can analyze data; we can do lesson studies together; I can visit your classroom and give you feedback about what I saw and you can do the same for me. We can

really look at student work and what it means and what it feels like and that is what we did in my school to great success. I'll also point out that as credentialed, creative professionals who've chosen to devote our lives and work to providing the best opportunities for our students, we as teachers and educators know what good teaching is about. It's about exciting children to explore their world; to learn how it operates; to learn how to express their understanding of it and have respect for others with different opinions. It's to challenge students to acquire more knowledge and use it wisely. It's to provide them with the opportunity to reach their potential intellectually, socially, and emotionally. Good teachers have high expectations for their students. We use a variety of materials and resources to plan lessons, monitor instruction, and assess student learning. Good teachers know that value of collaborating with colleagues, with parents, and with administrators to insure that students are successful. Teachers understand that teaching children is not merely pouring content into them, but rather it's motivating them to learn; giving them the support necessary to develop skills and knowledge and helping them to overcome problems and assume responsibilities for their actions and for their learning. So we can agree that teaching is complex. There is no single pedagogy that can meet the needs of every learner. So teachers are complex and we bring to the classroom varying skills and knowledge that are a reflection of our own training and experience. We understand the multifaceted nature of teaching and learning and for those reasons the evaluation process must reflect the complexity of teaching and the skills and knowledge of the teacher.

And this brings me to that beautiful idea of multiple measures. As the language of the bill suggests, we're not looking and as we've heard pointed out; multiple measures doesn't mean the same test being used over and over again but likewise, true multiple measures do not mean various standardized tests being used as those measures. Evidence of student learning includes

many of the things we just discussed; written work, performances, projects, collaborative group work, in addition to teacher and locally made tests and other assessments, work that we score using rubrics, portfolios, research projects what we'll call the senior project and then also standardized tests. Other student outcomes beyond the high stakes tests must also be taken into account and those things include attendance, engagement, commitment, mastery of those 21st century skills. Multiple standardized tests alone still representative a narrow portion of what we should be expecting our students to know and to be able to do. Better to find a way to develop a system that can truly examine these other independent indicators of student learning and growth that we've mentioned and discussed then to rely even on multiple test scores alone. So multiple measures for teachers cannot consist only of multiple student test scores and a couple of quick observations; the classroom observation can't be, what we like to call, a drive-by or just a snapshot of a portion of a class conducted by an overburdened school leader. A great misconception about the work of teaching is that it really is only that on-stage stuff and not the off-stage work that we put in to honing on and reflecting our craft. Student achievement is tied to that off-stage teacher time and a true observation and evaluation for professional growth and supportive student learning must consist of ongoing informal observations; visits with opportunities for feedback in a meaningful dialogue for the teacher and the observer, much as what we're seeing in some of the pilot programs but this must take into account all of the facets of the teacher's work to support student achievement. And just as teachers use multiple forms of data to continually analyze and improve our methods of assessing and supporting students, a system of teacher evaluation should measure and make available data that demonstrates the system is effective at accurately assessing teacher practice, improving teaching practice, and improving student learning. And conversely, the data should demonstrate if the system does not

systematically privilege or penalize any teacher group, whether it's teacher of standardized tests subjects, teachers of non tested subjects, special education teachers, or teachers of grades and subjects for which there is no other test.

We have some exemplary models of teacher evaluation and development. In Philadelphia we began the peer assistance and review program in the past year, which is called PAR. And it's a collaborative program with ongoing leadership between the union and the district that aligns teaching standards, professional development, observation and evaluation systems. We use the Danielson frameworks. We use those rubrics. But the focus of the program is to support the classroom performance and the efficacy of new teachers as they enter into the profession and also to help improve the classroom performance and increase student learning. We have consulting teachers, who are considered master teachers. They, in addition to principals and other school leaders, spend many hours in classrooms coaching, modeling, mentoring, planning and helping teachers to make the decisions that impact their lives and the lives of their students. They observe and they review the progress of their teachers and in both cases they actually make the retention and dismissal recommendations along with administrators to a par panel and they review these recommendations along with the formal observations and recommendations made by the principals.

Other examples include that of the RISE Program, which is in Pittsburgh and what's going on now in New Haven, Connecticut. All of these systems are characterized where both the teachers union and administration and school communities took instrumental roles in helping to develop these systems based upon research based upon time and in all of these cases there's a balance of shared accountability for student and teacher achievement that's supported by

appropriate resources. There all characterized by the elements of effective teacher evaluation systems that I we've been discussing consistently today.

So I'd like to thank you for your time today. I'd like to thank you for inviting me to be a part of this conversation. As you consider the proposed legislation I hope you'll take into account the many points I have raised and that our colleges have raised here today. I am very happy to take any questions; I want you to keep thinking about that special teacher.

CHAIRMAN CLYMER: The Chair thanks the ladies for your very informative testimony here this afternoon. Miss Cook, on the testimony that you provided, you had mentioned on page two at the bottom, you're talking an evaluation system based on evidence and then you say research makes clear that several factors besides the individual teacher influences student achievement such as tutors, curriculum, including past teachers, class size, student attendance, and I agree and that is part of the teacher evaluation. That are the things that we just heard about that, if you have a teacher, who was teaching effective, those problems clear up. You don't have to, in other words, the teacher can make attendance better, the scores will increase, the curriculum will not, the class size will not be all that sustaining, the curriculum that teacher is teaching, they'll be more effective as an effective teacher and teaching that curriculum to the student so we're eliminating on, those are the rubrics that we're attacking in the teacher effectiveness in the, in Senate Bill 1980. Because a lot of these things will dissipate and yet you're saying that these have to be addressed individually. Well, an effective teacher will do that. So what I see here is a kind of conflict is a, I have a difficulty understanding that, yes, these do influence the teacher training, I mean the teachers ability to be effective but we're dealing with that issue. That's my point. We are dealing with the issue in the program that we're presenting in House Bill 1980 and what we heard on Tuesday night so I welcome your comments.

LINDA COOK: Some of these, you can deal with some of these you can't. I can't change the home life a student comes from. I can certainly try to enrich it. I can't change the student who comes to school hungry, who worries about whether their parents are employed, who worries about where they're going to get their next meal, who worries about their struggling communities and what's around them. Those are factors that no teacher evaluation system can measure. There are, kids bring a lot of baggage to school with them and there are a lot of factors that affect students outside my school day that I had no effect over them. I could try the best I could to give resources but if you have parents who aren't involved, you have students who are worrying about five other things that are going on in their life, no matter what I do, sometime they take precedent over a student. Also, a class size of twenty-five versus what we have now in some school districts, class size of forty-five does make a difference to students. And unfortunately, as much as you may try to individualize and differentiate your instruction, the smaller the class size, the better it's going to be. So there are all factors that put together affect a student's performance in the class room and a good teacher tries to go around all those, make school interesting, makes school relevant, makes school important to a student. But sometimes the best that you can do is to let them know that they're at a safe place.

CHAIRMAN CLYMER: Well again, my point is that as we evaluate teachers and try to make them more effective, they can be effective in dealing with these problems and we recognize that and we're not, we understand that there are those outside influences. We try to provide school lunches, school breakfasts and other helps for the school district that is in need. Now the other issue that I have is on the last page, I guess page 5, it says, it is also possible, quote, "it is possible to grow a system that adheres to all the components of effective evaluation", and PSEA has consistently advocated for these systems and I look at them and I

thought to myself, well again some of these proposals that you have set in here, there's nine, are the things that we are attempting to do. Again in House Bill 1980, I mean we're trying to, we're not as rigid, these seem to be a lot more rigid, are not as flexible but we're trying to show flexibility. At least that's what the sponsor of the bill is trying to show flexibility in the interaction with the superintendents and the principals and the teachers that can share things and that they make things more effective. But this is, I don't know, this is, I think very set in place, where it would be difficult to do some of these things. You would spend a year just trying to put in place all your recommendations and we're just saying, let's not go down that trail, let's make it easier so that we can provide effectiveness for the teachers who are effective in the classroom and we're not saying that every teacher is not effective. We're saying there are those who have needs and therefore we can benefit those that have them that have to be further schooled, if you will, or helped in the process of becoming an effective teacher. It looks like more bureaucracy to me than it does in trying to do the right thing; so your comments.

LINDA COOK: Any professional, any system is, we are finding out from the pilot, the first stage of the pilot takes awhile to develop and if you can incorporate as much as you, as is listed here as you go along, then you will have less opportunity to have to change the pilot. One of the things these do, you are right, a good system involves collaboration and cooperation. But one of the things we need to look at that's in the law is the use of the word assessment. And I think that if you look at the law, it says on page 8, what assessments are and it only mentions PSSA, Keystones, PVAAT, and any Keystone examine option, local option. When you do that you are tying an assessment system that's rigid and doesn't allow for the things teachers need to do to be effective in the classroom. Every week, I gave my students reading assessment, every week at the end of that week I could go through it, I could rearrange my groups, I changed my

instructions; I had four to five different reading groups per week depending on what skills those students needed at the time. If I waited for the Keystone exam or the PSSA's and that's what a majority of my evaluations going to based on, I'm missing a great opportunity. A good system, an effective system tries to take in as many possibilities; those nine and as many opportunities in the classroom that will help a student grow.

CHAIRMAN CLYMER: I think that we have more common ground than differences here and I do believe that the legislation that has been articulated here this afternoon scores very heavy points in trying to make teacher evaluation and teacher effectiveness important so I guess we'll have to continue to dialogue on that and see where we go. So if every teacher was as proficient as the two before you, then I would say, you know we wouldn't have to maybe move forward. But you seem to have a good record and you seem to be able to interact well with the students and we only hope that every student and the purposes of course make certain that each student, that each Pennsylvania student has a quality education, is able to get the very best and of course teacher evaluation is so important and I'm not sure that you're, that every teacher can live up to the merits and to the standards that you have provided us here this afternoon. But we'll continue to discuss this situation. This time the chair recognizes Chairman Roebuck for comment.

CHAIRMAN ROEBUCK: Thank you, Mr. Chairman. Perhaps partially a question, partially an observation and it relates to the impact of poverty on the ability to teach and I don't know that anywhere in this particular legislation, there's reference to that but it seems to me that the core of what every teacher faces that when you have, and I think if we measure, there's been a lot of recent assessments about *failing schools*. I don't know if any of those schools are in impoverished areas. And my experience also suggests that it cuts across all kinds of education. I

remember well in my education experience as a Member of this Committee, going to a catholic grade school and the administrator sat with me and we talked and she said, “you know what the worst day for my kids is?”, I said “no.” She said, “Friday.” Friday because Friday means they’re no longer in this sheltered environment, they are no longer in the protected environment, they’re no longer getting lunch or whatever and they are going home to oft times dysfunctional families. It would seem to me that part, if I’m understanding your testimony, you’re saying that the problem is something that has to cut across a lot of different levels of that perhaps this particular measure doesn’t do. And those have to be incorporated in, not only, into teacher evaluations but ultimately into education success. Am I, in part, reading what you’re saying right?

LINDA COOK: Absolutely, if you look, it is kind, it’s implied, addressed, I guess you could say under the points where it says that there are several factors that teachers influence but there are others that we don’t influence. And that includes out of school learning, attendance, birth weight, food insecurities. I am president of the southeastern region of Pennsylvania, which includes Philadelphia, which includes Delaware County and Chester Upland School District. The poverty and I; we don’t like to call them; I’ve a friend who teaches in the City of Harrisburg. And we don’t like to, who always points out that failing schools is a misnomer. We have struggling schools from struggling communities. And until in certain ways, we address the issues of those struggling communities we’re not going to be able to make the great strides that we all want. Have we made strides? Absolutely. When you’ve a student enters a classroom three or four grade levels behind and in one year achieves a year to a year and a half, you’ve made great strides but when you give a standardized test, you don’t’ make great strides because you don’t hit that bar and if we’re only going to judge your schools and teachers on hitting that bar then we’re missing a great opportunity to help our students and to help our teachers. We are, if you look at

the budget cuts that happened this year, our most, our poorest school districts got hit the hardest. They lost millions of dollars. Those schools that need it the most lost the most money. So we took resources from them and we've taken opportunities away from them. In Chester Upland School District there is not one music teacher left in that district. There is not one art teacher. For a student to be successful in school, to want come to school, they need as many varieties of opportunities. If they know that next period they can have that art or music class to some students that's their savior. And it makes them want to do well in school so they can participate in band, so they can participate in chorus. But if you take those away, you've taken away their motivation and that is part of the problem in our struggling communities. Until we deal with those issues we're not going to reach our full potential for all students.

CHAIRMAN ROEBUCK: Thank you.

CHAIRMAN CLYMER: The Chairman recognizes Representative Roae for questions.

REPRESENTATIVE ROAE: Thank you Mr. Chairman and thank you ladies for your testimony. I just kind of curious, from the prospective of being a teacher, what percentage of the teachers that you work with or that you worked with in the past would you consider to be satisfactory? The Secretary of Education earlier said 99.4 % of teachers are rated satisfactory with the evaluations. I look at the teachers I had when I was a kid, the teachers my kids have now; it's probably not 99.4% but it's, you know, it's definitely up in the 90's someplace. What do you think the number is based on your experience?

LINDA COOK: Number, I can't tell, I couldn't be able to give you a number. There are many exemplary teachers in our schools.

REPRESENTATIVE ROAE: I agree.

LINDA COOK: There are some who are satisfactory teachers, who could use a little bit of tweaking and motivation. And I think it's; that's who we're aiming for. There are unsatisfactory teachers and it's in everybody's best interest that they don't continue in the profession and I think that's why in the PSEA and its solutions that work, the AFT, have moved a more expedient process to move those teachers out of the profession maybe into something else they're better suited for because a teacher that's weak or poor makes us all look bad, does not do anybody any good and brings the whole system down. But we want to work with all teachers, no matter their degree of satisfaction that we may have with them because everybody can improve. Nobody is an expert in all areas. I was an elementary teacher and a former special ed teacher; there were areas that I, even after thirty three years, was still learning and it's everybody has an opportunity to do better and that's what we would like to see.

REPRESENTATIVE ROAE: Yes, I think it's important for people to realize that saying the real numbers 99% of teachers are satisfactory if 1% are not satisfactory, you know, that'd be almost 2000 teachers and if there's twenty kids in the classroom, that'd be 40,000 kids that don't have a teacher that's satisfactory. So I think the goal should be, and I appreciate all the testimony everybody's given today, but the goal should be to have 100% of the teachers be satisfactory. And like I said, I think we're up in the 90's someplace now but I think it's important that we get it up to 100%.

VALERIE BRAMAN: I can speak to that as well. I wanted to thank you, Representative Clymer for the compliment. But I'll point out that I didn't get to be a great or even a good teacher without training, mentoring, coaching and without being evaluated. And I certainly didn't start in year one or year two and even at year eleven now, I am certainly not where I will be eventually. I think when we talk about satisfactory and unsatisfactory teachers; we also need

to create that common idea of what it means to be satisfactory and unsatisfactory. And we absolutely have to take context into account cause even an amazing teacher in a really poorly resourced school or in certain circumstances where they are lacking what they need, either whether what they need, be it human resources, whether I don't have enough copy paper, if I don't have text books, if as in my former classroom every time it rains, I pretend I'm teaching swimming in the corner, it affects my ability, even if I am a great teacher to provide great instruction and opportunities to my students. So before we make those determinations, I think, what we're talking about is finding a way to develop those common standards and language and being able to look at that whole complex picture of what it is to actually be a great or a good teacher.

CHAIRMAN CLYMER: Chair recognizes Representative Carroll for question.

REPRESENTATIVE CARROLL: Thank you Mr. Chairman. Thank you ladies for the testimony. It really isn't a question; more of a comment. I appreciate the fact that in the PSEA testimony delivered so eloquently that you hung a lantern on the fact that we have an ineffective system of evaluating teachers. And I think by default or indirectly, I think the testimony from PFT or AFT pretty much said the same thing. So I think that it highlights the need to head in the direction that Representative Aument is heading in so that we update and improve our current evaluation system and I simply call on the two organizations to work collaboratively with the Department, with the stakeholders here to try and come up with a system that fairly evaluates teachers because of the obvious importance that been stated over and over. It's clear that we have a system that's not right and it's important to move forward and find a system that is better and I'm hopeful that both the organizations can work with all involved to try and reach a common goal.

LINDA COOK: And I'd like to say that, we are. I am a member of the pilot, the Gates Momentum Stake holders group and the practitioners group. The AFT has been greatly involved, especially the group from Pittsburgh, sharing what they've done in their evaluation system. So I think everybody's goal to have a fair, equitable system that truly measures teachers effectiveness, is a goal that we all have.

CHAIRMAN CLYMER: Thanks and Chair thanks the gentleman and recognizes Representative Truitt for question.

REPRESENTATIVE TRUITT: Thank you Mr. Chairman. I thought about; thank you for your testimony both of you; I thought about your comment about; who's your favorite teacher and I came up with three names in my head and curiously out of those three teachers, I only liked one of them and I only liked him about half the time. But the reason why they're my favorite teachers is, I can look at where I am in life today and I realize that they're the ones that had the greatest impact on me getting where I am and knowing the things I know and being able to accomplish what I've been able to accomplish. And I was gonna ask you the question whether you thought the current system was effective and I just got your answer to that. It seems to me we do a tremendous disservice to a student when we tell them they're better than they really are and I appreciated these three teachers, in particular, I got the worst grades from these three teachers. That's why they pushed me and made me excel and it seems to me we do a huge disservice to the teachers when we tell 99.4% of them that they're satisfactory, when we know that really they're not and that there should really be some other levels in between satisfactory and unsatisfactory. So my question to you is, knowing how frankly, terrible the current system is, what harm can we possibly do by moving ahead with the simple framework to start creating a new system?

LINDA COOK: We are starting moving ahead; we went from a pilot of a hundred, approximately a hundred teachers to a thousand teachers. But it's better to get a system right then to keep tweaking it so nobody knows what's going on. We've changed some of the Danielson Framework to make it more specific for teachers so they know exactly what people are looking for; none of us think it's a bad idea to be looking for best practices of what works. One of our biggest concerns, if you look at the legislation, is the 50% tied to student achievement. There's a lot of research that says; that's not good. There's a lot of research that says, yes, you should use student achievement. But we need to look at what those assessments are. It's clearly defined in the legislation what that is. Do we think it's fair? No, that's one of the things we need to look at because the group that is trying to tie teachers performance with student achievement is having difficulty doing that with just a hundred teachers. And that was after six months of the pilot. So now we're still waiting for the first level results. So if we can't get that ready now, how are we gonna be ready in less than a year to move forward with a full system that will affect every teacher in the Commonwealth? Also, we have not begun to look at an evaluation that would evaluate non content area teachers or teachers in second grade who don't give any standardized tests like PSSA and certainly not the Keystone. We haven't even begun; we've talked about it in general terms; what are some possibilities, but to form even a framework for that or the rubric or the evaluation of how much should be tied to other teachers; that discussion has not begun yet.

REPRESENTATIVE TRUITT: I still, I mean, there's some key words that I saw in here, it says, *not limited to* or *measures of student achievement including but not limited to*. That means it's a framework, we're leaving the door open to adjust the system, not even in statute but at the Department level, which would be pretty easy to do. And I'm still not hearing from you, what the harm is gonna be. Personally, I'm to put a pretty fine point on it, I think it's immoral to

put the concerns of adults ahead of the concerns of children and if what we're worried about is hurting teachers feelings by creating a system that will unfairly label some them as unsatisfactory, I'd rather do that and advance the ball to getting a better system to protect our children or to improve the quality of education for our children then to just wait and do nothing. You know, perfect is the enemy of better of good enough or, do you understand what I'm saying? I don't see the harm to students in moving ahead with establishing the framework.

LINDA COOK: But where you're reading on page three, *not limited to*; you need to look at page eight that defines what they are. It says, on line, it starts on line eight, *the term assessment shall mean, the Pennsylvania System of School Assessment Tests, The Keystone Exam and equivalent local assessment or another test established by the State Board of Education.* This is the Keystone Local option and that's all that is mentioned there. So you have limited, even though it says *not limited to*, you have defined them on page eight.

REPRESENTATIVE TRUITT: Another test is a pretty broad term; I believe that leaves a lot of ...

LINDA COOK: But it's to take the place of Keystones, which is only given in High School. So therefore if you're an elementary teacher or middle school teacher, that doesn't help you any except for PSSA and only those who give PSSA's. We've never defined what in each district are multiple assessments. That would mean that all those reading weekly assessments I gave in math and reading, that I have varied my instruction for, would not be part of that evaluation. And which is a better deterrent? A state assessment that I gave in April or something that's ongoing that I do as part of my instructional practice even in science and social studies, we did them.

VALARIE BRAMAN: And first and foremost in our minds, as well as educators is absolutely our ability to provide the best educational opportunities to our students. We have the student' interest at heart. We think that student achievement and student success should absolutely comprise a large component of teacher evaluations; it's what we do. It's the way in which we measure that; it's what we're choosing to look at. You know, when I took students from Kensington High School to the Philadelphia Theater Company, where they were writing and performing their own monologues on stage at a professional theater company and calling the queues and turning lights on and getting applause from a community of theater professionals and their families coming to see them to do that, there's no test that can measure that. I know my students learned, my principal was there too; she knew my students learned; we knew the work that I was doing. There's no test that can measure that, I mean that's one example. I also don't want to provide a disincentive to teachers to go teach in certain areas or certain schools because evaluations could be unfairly unbalanced because of the ways in which we're measuring effectiveness. I don't want to provide a disincentive for people to go into certain fields. I don't want not have a physical education and health teacher, who's a crucial component of a school community because there's no good way to evaluate them and they don't know what's going to happen to them professionally. How they would grow and develop. I don't want to see an evaluation system get put into place before we're ready to put a really good one into place. Not a perfect one; we won't get there yet. But I don't want to go with what I am fillingly calling "a player to be name later" syndrome. I don't want to say, *well we don't have any tests or measures yet for a bunch of subjects and grades; let's just start and we'll figure it out eventually*, because in the meantime those teachers still need to teach those students. They still need to be coached

and observed. They still need to grow and develop professionally and those kids still need to learn in those forums as well. So it's not so much, don't do anything, it's let's do it right.

REPRESENTATIVE TRUITT: Thank you.

CHAIRMAN CLYMER: Chair recognizes Representative Emrick for questioning.

REPRESENTATIVE EMRICK: Thank you Mr. Chairman and thank you for coming today to testify on this issue. Some of my questions were also taken so I'll just reemphasize, I think there's consensus that the number 99.4% probably is not accurate. Would we all agree on that? Does PSEA believe that that's the case? Okay. Just out of curiosity, does PSEA track how many teachers are let go each year for poor performance?

LINDA COOK: Um, no, but I bet if you went to, not that I know, sort of --- I don't do that kind of work. As a local president, I could tell you how many in my local were. And I think if we ask, we could get that information.

REPRESENTATIVE EMRICK: Okay. Just, I would like to know, just out of curiosity.

LINDA COOK: At a local level, we all know.

REPRESENTATIVE EMRICK: Okay. Um, just so I understand, is it AFT and PSEA's position or your concern with the Aument that bill, mainly on the 50%, that's based on tests scores and evaluation. You're okay the way it sounds, with the Danielson Rubric.

LINDA COOK: Yes, they were part of the pilot, I, that was my subcommittee that helped develop that for the pilot.

REPRESENTATIVE EMRICK: Right, so it's not so much the one half, the Danielson half, it's the teacher evaluation based on student performance.

LINDA COOK: And the implementation of next school year.

REPRESENTATIVE EMRICK: Right. And you're afraid it's gonna be done too quickly.

LINDA COOK: Correct

REPRESENTATIVE EMRICK: Okay and I think most people would agree that, you know we want to do this right. We want to do it, you know, the right way the first time if we can. You know, I also think it's highly likely that with any new legislation or changes there's always gonna need to be tweaks at some point. You know as you progress and as things change and I do think, as Representative Truitt and the maker of the bill have pointed out, it just provides a framework with a lot of flexibility to the local school districts. One of my questions for you is, in your testimony, Linda, it said that, it was on page four, when you were talking about the teacher evaluations, it's the second, the last full paragraph, it says, *the good news is that there are ways to measure student outcomes that can help teachers measure student growth all the time through curriculum based pre and post tests, student projects, performance, especially designed assessments for IUP's, goals, inventories, etc.* Are you arguing or debating that that should be part of the 50 % teacher evaluation for tests performance?

LINDA COOK: Those are things that should be included as multiple measures of student achievement.

REPRESENTATIVE EMRICK: Okay. I guess the question I have with that component is, the teacher in that case is the one who is in sole control of everything. That the creator of the assessments, the implementer of the assessments, there the evaluator of the assessments. They're doing everything themselves.

LINDA COOK: Not necessarily in my reading assessments, were part of the reading program that were to be done before and after. My math assessments were district created. We

also had some computer assessment programs for math that we did four times a year that anybody could see the results and in fact I had a lot of these; I had to turn in my results.

REPRESENTATIVE EMRICK: So you're, through you're basic curriculum, you're executing the curriculum? So you're still doing all that. To me, those components, those evaluations, those practices, would be part of the 50% Danielson Rubric, not part of the 50% teacher test score evaluation. I don't say that that's not a critical part but to me based on what's happening, that's actual day to day classroom conduct. That is indicative of a really good teacher who can make those adjustments, who can change, who can do those evaluations, which are actually implementing and exercising those day to day practices through the pedagogy and everything else. So to me that all is critical but that really should fall under the 50% of Danielson's Rubric side of the evaluation process.

LINDA COOK: The fact that I use them would fall under the rubric, not the results of them.

REPRESENTATIVE EMRICK: Okay.

LINDA COOK: Yep, there's a distinction between the two.

VALERIE BRAMAN: The measure is student performance as it is in the bill. It's not test scores. That was actually something that we talked about a lot today is that we're not limiting our measures of student performance to test scores alone. So my pedagogy, the way in which I create these things, the way in which I administer them, the feedback I give to students, that's all part of my observation and what you would get of the 50% Danielson. My students results, their achievement, as measured by these things and I don't have sole control because my building leader, my instructional coaches, my principal, their monitoring, viewing my lesson plans. Their frequently seeing the materials I create. If I'm doing teacher made assessments,

they're seeing those too, so there are many sets of eyes and many levels of expertise that have a hand in creating those things to help support even newer and struggling teacher in that those assessments be really valid and related to the high standards that we have for our classroom instruction.

REPRESENTATIVE EMRICK: So you saying that department chairs and others are looking at classrooms per student assessments of the teachers. You are?

LINDA COOK: We are.

VALERIE BRAMAN: We are. It's a lot of work and really necessary.

REPRESENTATIVE EMRICK: Okay, I've never seen that myself.

LINDA COOK: That was one of my jobs as the lead teacher in my building was to look at all those math assessments in individual classrooms.

REPRESENTATIVE EVRICK: I guess my experience was a little different than.

VALERIE BRAMAN: It may have been.

REPRESENTATIVE EMRICK: And, I guess, the last question I have is, on the last page of your testimony, Linda, the first full paragraph where it talks about, it says, *PSEA consistently advocates for systems that reflect current research*. You said, "We know what high quality evaluation looks like." What systems, what legislation, and what recommendations has PSEA brought forth prior to Representative Aument drafting this legislation to actually bring sufficient, adequate change to the table? I mean I ...

LINDA COOK: We participated, we've participated since the beginning in the Gates Momentum and

REPRESENTATIVE EMRICK: Which was when?

LINDA COOK: Excuse me.

REPRESENTATIVE EMRICK: When did that start?

LINDA COOK: A year and a half ago. And we have our, I call it book, but we have our publication, *Solutions that Work*, that was put out almost two years ago that also references teacher performance and evaluation and through the years we've had great discussions about teachers evaluations outside of the organizations and shared what our researchers and our staff have learned and what teachers have learned about evaluation.

REPRESENTATIVE EMRICK: Okay. So a just over a year ago the Gates; two years ago they released the book. But PSEA has been around for a heck of a long time, haven't they?

LINDA COOK: If you've asked us to share what we thought were teacher evaluation practices, we've given it. I know that we have come out in in-service programs throughout the years that I was involved. We have a council of instruction and professional development that is an ongoing discussion all the time. They've presented workshops; they've presented to the School Boards Association, administrators groups, and have done it throughout many of the years that I've been involved.

REPRESENTATIVE EMRICK: Okay. Because if this was a pressing issue to move forward on, I would have assumed and especially that with the nine points that PSEA know evaluation systems, that we would have seen legislation moving in this area long ago, long ago, not just at this point in...

LINDA COOK: We don't write legislation. We can guide and give advice but...

REPRESENTATIVE EMRICK: I know you don't write legislation but PSEA is highly involved in many pieces of legislation.

LINDA COOK: Correct.

REPRESENTATIVE EMRICK: So it's, I just find it amazing that at this point PSEA is just coming to the forefront with the discussion of teacher evaluations to this degree.

LINDA COOK: We've always been part of a discussion on teacher evaluation.

REPRESENTATIVE EMRICK: But maybe that's, maybe the word discussion is the operative word because I would have thought based on PSEA's concern to improve teacher quality, to improve pro public education policies that an effective, an important evaluation system would have much higher on the priority table. But that's just my opinion, I mean PSEA may have different things that would like to share, different priorities they've had over the years.

LINDA COOK: And I think they've always had an ongoing discussion about teachers' evaluation.

REPRESENTATIVE EMRICK: Okay and what was the example you gave of the school district and the child who didn't have an art and a music teacher.

LINDA COOK: Chester Upland.

REPRESENTATIVE EMRICK: Okay and that was, they, what grade was that, what grade level?

LINDA COOK: It's the entire district.

REPRESENTATIVE EMRICK: The entire district has no art or music programs?

LINDA COOK: They have one art teacher, no music.

REPRESENTATIVE EMRICK: Okay. Alright, I think you've made a, I'm gonna go off topic here but I think you've made an excellent argument for the economic furlough bill that we could save those kinds of programs. But thank you very much.

CHAIRMAN CLYMER: At this point the Chair thanks our testifiers for being with us today. I want to make one comment; the State did not cut those dollars, those 800 million dollars.

They were Federal stimulus money. I want you to know that the State added 250 million dollars new money. Just so you know and everyone was treated as equal as possible. We weren't looking to, you know, fund one group higher than the other but I do appreciate your testimony. Thank you, Linda Cook. Thank you, Valarie Braman for your good testimony here this morning. Continuing on, we recognize the Pennsylvania School Boards Association, we have Kathy Swope, the School Director, Lewisburg Area School District and Kathy, I don't know if you have, and you have a, and also that's it. Do you want to introduce your.

KATHY SWOPE: I will be introducing, thank you. First before I even begin I want to thank the four of you who remain for being with us and hanging in there. It certainly shows your interest and dedication to this very important topic.

Good afternoon. I am Kathy Swope; President of the Lewisburg Area School Board and with me is Dr. Mark DiRocco, Superintendent of the Lewisburg Area School District. And again I thank you for allowing us to present testimony on behalf of the Pennsylvania School Boards Association on the impact of House Bill 1980, that revises the current system of evaluation for teachers, principals and certain other public school employees.

As a Member of the Pennsylvania Teacher and Principal Model Evaluation Project Steering Committee, created in 2010, that developed the instrument for Pilot 1, and its offspring, the more recently formed Teacher Evaluation Committee managed by the Pennsylvania Department of Education to oversee Pilot 2, PSBA is supportive of the ongoing work to develop a new evaluation system for teachers and principals that would include the use of multiple measures and would incorporate value added factors related to student achievement. The Association agrees that the current state evaluation system that categorizes employees as either

satisfactory or *unsatisfactory* clearly as we've heard everyone attest today, does not appropriately rate the effectiveness of an employee.

We believe that Pennsylvania's new system, if carefully developed and clearly implemented, will establish an updated, comprehensive and consistent evaluation that will provide better feedback to teachers and school leaders using various measures to reflect their performance. The new system can provide opportunity for teachers and principals to have constructive dialogue about areas of success as well as areas of improvement where improvement is needed to ensure that every child in the Commonwealth of Pennsylvania has an effective teacher in the classroom. And I will tell you, as a side note, one of the key feedback items that we got, we received from the pilot 1, was the fact that teachers highly valued the opportunity to sit down with their principals and superintendents and discuss their classroom performance. It was, I think that demonstrates that teachers do, indeed, want to perform as well as possible and, you know, do the best things for our children. Today our comments will focus on the specifics of the language under HB 1980.

One of the key pieces of the new system of evaluation will be the development of the student growth value added component in determining an individual teacher's impact on students each student's achievement. PSBA supports the use of student growth/value-added component provided that it is fair, valid, properly field tested and used in conjunction with multiple measures as components of the entire evaluation system. In addition, it is critical for evaluators to be fully and adequately trained and for those who are being evaluated to understand the new process. You'll notice as I go through my testimony that there are a number of recurring themes that have, you've heard throughout the testimony. So apologize for the redundancy.

It is important to note that Pennsylvania is not alone in seeking this approach. The National Council on Teacher Quality issued a report in October entitled *Trends and Early Lessons on Teacher Evaluation and Effectiveness Policies*. The report found that 23 states currently require teacher evaluations to include objective evidence of student learning in the form of student growth or value-added data and 17 states have adopted legislation or regulations that specifically require that student achievement and/or student growth be a major consideration in teacher evaluations. In addition, the report concluded that “the policy implications of an evaluation system that truly measures teacher effectiveness are profound. If well done the consequences could change much of what is now standard practice in the teaching profession by setting the foundation for better targeted policies for struggling teachers, higher standards for teacher preparation programs and fair but rigorous policies for replacing persistently ineffective teachers.” The weight of such performance as a component of the evaluation is a matter for the developers of the tool to decide. However, the use of student assessment scores in a teacher evaluation should encourage teachers and not produce the unintended consequence of acting as a disincentive for them to work with struggling learners or in underperforming schools.

While we agree that PSSA scores can be an important measure of teacher effectiveness, we also believe that they are just one snapshot of student performance. PSBA supports language in House Bill 1980 that incorporates the use of multiple measures to determine teachers’ success. Student achievement should be the primary goal of every school but excellent education includes growth in areas that may not be measured by PSSAs, Keystone Exams or other standardized tests. Academic progress can be shown through local assessments including written work by students, scientific experiments, demonstrations, performances, along with project and portfolios by students related to specific academic standards.

The evaluation tool currently being developed looks beyond test scores to consider such factors as depth and breadth of locally developed lessons, student engagement, which is incredibly important, and attention to critical thinking skills.

There are no standardized tests for an art or music teachers, a foreign language and family and consumer science teachers. And it is difficult to think of a standardized list of comparable measures of performance in certain areas of teaching and learning. Language under House Bill 1980 broadly states that PDE must publish a list of approved measures of student achievement that would include examinations that have been developed or selected by the district and approved by the department. While PSBA understands the concept, the language as written is vague and additional guidance is needed.

House Bill 1980 also requires similar rating tools to be used in the evaluations of nonteaching professional employees. Now this raises questions of what is fair and appropriate in measuring the effectiveness of an employee doing a specific job. Under the School Code this would include guidance counselors, school nurses, dental hygienists, school librarians and psychologists. The bill states that a rating tool will be developed for these employees that would include, among other components, assessment results of all students in the building. While the concept here may be for all professional employees to share some responsibility for student progress, these employees do not have a parallel level of direct impact on instruction to the students they serve. How could a school nurse be evaluated on the success of a student on his latest math exam? The Evaluation Committee's plan is to develop a separate instrument for non classroom professional personnel but the committee will need time to complete these important tasks but I will address that late in my testimony.

PSBA supports the development of the new evaluation system and believes that many school districts will want to use this structure. At the same time, PSBA acknowledges that some school districts have developed their own detailed and rigorous rating tools that meet the approval of the Department of Education. I know in our district we have done that, we're presently using a different tool than the PDE model. Therefore, PSBA supports provisions under House Bill 1980 that would allow the continuation of the use of alternative rating tools developed at the local level and would be approved by the PDE. The association agrees that schools should be able to continue to use an alternate tool that would be required to meet or exceed the measures of effectiveness established under the new system. And this doesn't mean evaluations will become subjective, unfair, or inconsistent across the state because PDE will have the authority to approve or disapprove the criteria. Use of a locally developed tool that models the framework established by PDE and that has been approved by PDE will not detract from the purpose and use of the state evaluation and like the state tool, should not be subject to issues related to a collective bargaining agreement.

PSBA supports the provision under House Bill 1980 to pass the baton to the State Board of Education in future years after the new system becomes operational. The work now being done by PDE to create this system began in 2010 and has been extensive and time consuming. House Bill 1980 appropriately recognizes that our volunteer committee and staff performing this work are not permanently established and that provisions must be made for continuing changes that will be necessary. This can efficiently be accomplished by the State Board through amendments to current regulations under Title 22, Chapter 351. The Board also may develop standards or regulations for implementation. Giving these duties to the Board will allow for more transparency and public input for the new system through the regulatory review process.

Although PSBA shares the urgency to have an effective evaluation system implement in the state, the association has concerns with the timeline under House Bill 1980 and suggests that specific dates be removed so The Department of Education can move forward as it deems appropriate. Being forced to move according to the deadlines set in legislation could inadvertently undermine the system that PDE has moved so methodically to create. In addition, it is important to remember that the department is still working to develop a growth model that reflects the correlation to the effective teaching practices in the instrument, in order to determine the impact at the classroom level, which will ultimately be an important component of the evaluation. Nor have the rating tools been created for nonteaching professional employees and the instrument for principals, as you have heard, needs additional modification and testing.

Development of an effective system that is research based, respected by educators statewide as valid and reliable, requires appropriate time for rounds of pilot testing, feedback and revisions and training for evaluators. The committee learned from Pilot 1, that the time for training, as Carolyn mentioned earlier, needed to increase from ½ day to 2 ½ days. It is essential that no matter what rating tool is used that adequate training be provided to teachers so that any potential anxieties about the new system can be addressed. Questions, comments, suggestions from the field must be considered before the system is operational statewide. And districts that want to develop an alternate form will need time to do so and submit it to PDE for approval. The system is still being developed with the second pilot scheduled to end in June of 2012. I strongly urge the House to allow PDE the time to do it right.

As written, some of the language under House Bill 1980 for implementations is unclear and creates ambiguity. For example, the bill states that following publication in the *Pennsylvania Bulletin*, the new tools shall be used in the rating of all professional employees. Will all districts

be required to use the new rating tools beginning in 2012-13 or will the use be phased in over years of existing collective bargaining agreements as they expire? If Districts are using old and new rating tools, will loop holes be created regarding issues of discipline and termination? While legislation cannot supersede provisions in a current collective bargaining contract, this legislation should not be open to interpretation. PSBA suggests that the language here be carefully reviewed and clarified regarding the implementation of the new system and the impact on local contracts. The association also offers support for the language under House Bill 1980 that state that provisions of the bill shall not be subject of collective bargaining agreements entered into after the effective date.

In closing PSBA offers its support for the development of the new rating system and general support for House Bill 1980 with suggestions for further consideration of certain specific areas of legislation. Particularly in allocating the time necessary to do it right and create a respected, valid, reliable system of evaluation that achieves the goal of ensuring an effective teacher for every child. Thank you again for considering our comments. And we've opened for questions.

CHAIRMAN CLYMER: Well thank you very much. That was a very good testimony and one of the comments that you made that I can support; I think is from page 3. And that the purpose of 1980 is not to be a disincentive for teachers. It's not to go after them and say we look how you are not performing but to encourage them. That is an important component and I said that in my opening remarks, is that what we want to do is encourage those teachers, help those who have the academic knowledge but need the skills to further convey it to their classes. So I appreciate that and when you had mentioned that there are no subsidized; standardized tests for art or music or other instructors who are in gym instructors, guidance counselors, the project

pilot 2 is, as you have heard earlier this morning, is going to develop the standards for that. So we are moving in that direction and if you have a comment on that, I appreciate it.

KATHY SWOPE: I serve on the committee as well as, that is working on Pilot 2; we have not, at this point, developed an instrument that is being tested as part of Pilot 2. So that is an ...; we haven't touched that area yet and I think that, I guess one of my key concerns is that that time line. It's almost like having, if you've ever baked bread, if you put all the preparation and you measure the ingredients carefully, you put it in the oven. If you take that bread out before it's done baking, you're not going to have good bread. So that poor analogy; it's the idea that we have something really great that's being created here, I believe as being participating on both of the committees. I think we're doing excellent work and I think that you've heard that there's a lot of common ground and I just don't want us to rush it and ruin it. And that's the bottom line of what I'm trying to encourage you and simply by taking those dates out and not having that constriction; I think you will greatly improve the outcome, which is what we want, is to have every child have that effective teacher.

CHAIRMAN CLYMER: Thank you. Chair recognizes Representative Truitt for questions.

REPRESENTATIVE TRUITT: Thank you, Mr. Chairman. I was just wondering if you could give me an example of the kind of thing that might be in the collective bargaining agreement that might conflict with this law.

KATHY SWOPE: Some of the collective and I'll let Mark address that as well but some of the collective bargaining agreements have specific language as to evaluation contained in the agreements. So in those cases you would potentially have a conflict. Mark, do you have something to add on your knowledge of that?

DR. MARK DiROCCO: Well basically, we try to keep our contract thin in that regard and not have those components worked in but you will find districts across the Commonwealth that have that spelled out in the CVA.

CHAIRMAN CLYMER: I have another question. I wanted to see if any of the other Members of the Committee; one of the other things I'm appreciating in your testimony is that, is that this is an effort that is working jointly with everyone combined. That it's a sharing process, it's not trying to say, we're one school district, we're going to do better with than you in our teacher evaluations. I mean it's a time when everyone is at the table sharing information and interacting and saying, here's what works; here's what doesn't work and that theme has to be promoted because otherwise the perception of what we're attempting to do could be that, that we're being disingenuous with them, with school districts; we're not doing what we claim to be doing and that is trying to improve the education process for all students and I think that's a concept needs to be out there and you've explained it quite well in your remarks that this is for the children of Pennsylvania and we need to do the best we can and the teacher evaluation is an important building block. Then that building block has to be in place and your comments.

KATHY SWOPE: Absolutely and I think that, you know, in participating in the two committees, I've had the opportunity, as well as the town, and I know several of you were participants in the town meeting that took place Tuesday night. Again and again you hear concerns about the, how the results will be used and we really have an important decision to make if we're going to keep the focus on the children and to have effective teaching and use the evaluation as the committee agreed was really important and this is all cross sections. We had business leaders, we had, you know, as Carolyn mentioned, representatives from all the educational entities. If we're really going to do that, we need to make sure that this tool is used

as a vehicle for teacher improvement and I know that in our committee some of the concerns that I've heard out in the communities as I've visited school districts that they have shared with me a concern about what happened in California when they published in the newspaper personal information about each individual teacher based on one year's performance. Those are the kinds of things that create a sense of fear and distrust. I mean in my, I'm being very honest with you, that's what I hear so that idea of collaboration that you're talking about and, Carolyn, I'll applaud, she has done an awesome job of bringing together this committee and having us be very honest with each other and talking about, you know, what effective education looks like. And we think we come up with something excellent but we need to have an understanding as we go forward that this needs to be a tool to raise our teachers up and not to beat them down.

CHAIRMAN CLYMER: I couldn't agree more with that then, with that concluding statement. Well, Kathy Swope, thank you very much for being with us this afternoon. Thank you for your testimony, we appreciate your involvement and we'll be interacting with you, I'm sure, throughout the remaining time prior to moving this legislation forward. Thank you.

KATHY SWOPE: Thank you for your time, Sir.

CHAIRMAN CLYMER: Now the Chair would like to recognize the Pennsylvania Partnerships for Children. And Joan Benso, President and CEO, is with us today and she was also a member or participant at the virtual program we had on Tuesday at the Capitol Area IU so...

JOAN BENSO: Thank you Representative Clymer. As you said, my name is Joan Benso, I want to thank the Members and staff and other interested individuals who are here today. Pennsylvania Partnerships for Children (PPC) is our only statewide, independent, child advocacy organization so I sit before you here today not representing teachers or board members

or schools administrators or the Department of Education or any other key stake holder -- important, important partners. I sit before you today as an organization whose sole purpose is to improve the health education and well being of the 2.8 million children who live in our state and the way we go about doing that is using data and evidence to try to improve public policy.

You know at first blush this conversation about teacher evaluation and evaluations for principals and non teaching professionals seems like game of inside baseball. An issue that would only be of concern to teachers and administrators and board members but we believe that the public policy conversations on evaluations are even more critical for parents and employers and the taxpayers of Pennsylvania. We recently launched an initiative called *Making the Grade, Effective Teaching in Every Classroom*, and the goal of that project is to create a public dialogue, an awareness about the importance of an effective teacher in every classroom and advancing the public policies, such as you see in Representative Aument's bill, require to enact to assure that every child has the benefit of learning from an effective teacher every day of their school career.

As Representative Clymer noted, we were proud to host and organize in partnership with the Pennsylvania Association of Intermediate Units and rely on their technology through PIU net to host a town hall meeting for 1400 concerned individuals at 30 sites in the state. I will tell you when we cooked up this idea a couple of months ago, our internal goal was 8 to 10 sites and 250 people. We were astounded by the response and I think the reason there is such a great response is this is the top of mind issue for people. I know people mention that town hall to you and Dr. Dumaresq and Secretary Tomalis both participated as did teachers, principals, union representatives, administrators from the four Round 1 Pilot. We'll have a link on our website very soon, in the next couple of days and we'll be sure everyone gets a message, so if you missed

it and you want to see it. But it was a fascinating dialogue. I think it's important to think about a little bit background as we consider this conversation.

As an organization that has worked on a lot of early and K-12 education issues, we've built a foundation to take this next step and better evaluate teachers, principals, and non teaching school professionals. Pennsylvania's endorsed an internationally benchmark common core academic standard. Something we believe in very strongly and so does the business community as the standards our kids need to meet to be competitive in the 21st century economy. Pennsylvania spent a number of years building PVAS, our value added assessment system that schools have for their students so they can look at the growth. You know, I would argue that we're probably the organization in this room that full time works on the issues children living in poverty and yes they bring that poverty into the classroom and yes they bring those concerns and those challenges they face. But I personally am offended when someone suggests that we can't measure that they grew at least some in a given year. And that's what value added assessment does; it says 'I was here today because I live in a crack infested house in a horrible community and go to a school that doesn't have enough money and at the end of the year I got that far. Every child should go somewhere in that year and we should be measuring that. We've also taken steps through the state to develop diagnostic tools and other assessments that help us improve student achievement before students fail. Help us stem that tide of our dropouts. We invest a lot of resources in professional development that we could better target with better evaluation tools and we have taken important steps to think about alternative methods to certifications. These are all really critical subtext components of a new system of improving effectiveness not just of evaluating teachers. The next logical step for us though is to knit them together and build a more important and critical evaluation tool. I am gonna blow through my testimony a little bit, I know

you're running behind and my staff will tell you, I'm not very good at reading what people write for me anyway. Early, if you knew me, that wouldn't surprise you. Earlier today, Secretary Tomalis spoke to you about the statewide study; I think most teachers in Pennsylvania are extraordinary. My kids are both products of public school; I'm proud of the education they got but we use a system that while we call satisfactory/unsatisfactory, it's simply really pass/fail. It doesn't tell us much about anything and therefore, it doesn't help us help teachers do a better job and that's our biggest concern about it. That's why we got into this debate. It doesn't show us how we can lift up teachers who are stellar in particular areas of their practice or instruction and better use them to lead teaching efforts and to mentor other teachers and to help others. Nor does it tell us where someone's stumbling and struggling. I know when I look at the meager professional development in my little 12 person nonprofit organization and I evaluate my staff, I want to be sure we're spending our money to improve their skills where they need improved not where everyone in the office may would sort of, kinda benefit. So we think that's an important step.

People talked a lot today about research. There is research, there's pretty intensive research and analysis happening, not only in Pennsylvania but around the country. The Pittsburgh public schools participated in national project *The Measures of Effective Teaching*. Now they had two few teachers in the sampling to be fully in this national evaluation. But they have found some early connections that can be relied upon. Teachers past success in raising student achievement on state assessments is indicated as one of the strongest predictors of their ability to do so in the future. In looking at value added data, The MET Project, this is the Measures of Effective Teaching Project; the MET project found that effective teachers are replicating those results year to year. Imagine what would happen if we could, for example, help

targeted professional development to meet the specific needs of teachers who are not yet seeking those expected gains and get them there. Teachers with the highest value added scores on state assessments also tend to help students better understand the underlying learning concepts they need to grow. This finding refutes the argument that the best teachers are simply teaching to the test. The MET Project researches have seen evidence that teachers with high value added scores on state assessments also helps students perform well on other exams, not just the state assessment. Additionally, they found that teachers, whose students reported, they spent a lot of time preparing for assessments, didn't have high value added scores. Actually there's, a little later in my testimony is noted a project from Harvard that's called the Tripod Project and Pittsburgh is now working to test, to add student evaluations to their assessment tools. Student evaluations were pretty predictive and aligned with other measures. And one of the questions asked students was, you know, did you spend a lot time preparing for assessment and interestingly students who said, yes, scored lower on value added assessments. I found that very interesting. Students know when they experience effective teaching and we should acknowledge that and think about how to add that component to this bill, as well. I asked a lot of questions when I had the opportunity to hear the researcher present on this last winter because, you know, I have teenagers; I know what they're like at 8:00 in the morning versus 2:00 in the afternoon. And they said it was remarkable, we should not really sell kids short and even the grumpiest high school sophomore will evaluate that math teacher the exact same way at 8:00 in the morning as their pairs in at 2:00 in the afternoon. So again, I think when we bring students also into this equation, we'll learn more. Feedback shouldn't be limited to test scores alone. This supports the concept of multiple measures and it shows the combining measures provides a more complete understanding of teacher practices and provides teachers of better ways and more additional

information to help them improve. Additional to the MET Project research you heard today about the work Mathematica is doing the Momentum Round 1 Pilot and while it is true that information is not yet available, my understanding, Dr. Dumaresq is the expert, is it will be available sometime around the end of the year so it will be available for the use of the work crew. That's going to help us move this process forward. Now I think my colleague at PSBA mentioned to you that this is clearly not a conversation only being discussed in Pennsylvania. Research and the realization that evaluations for teachers should help them be more effective is the means to drive further student achievement is driving reforms around the country. Thirty two states and the District of Columbia have made changes to their student, their teacher evaluation policy since 2009. Weighting performance as high as 50% of student evaluation is also in line with action taken a number of out states including some neighbors. States that use 50% include Arizona, California, Colorado, Delaware, the District of Columbia, Florida, Idaho, Louisiana, Maryland, Nevada, Ohio, Oklahoma, and Tennessee. We would not be first. In total 23 states require teacher evaluations include "Objective evidence of Student Learning in the Form of Student Growth and and/or Value Added Data", we are proposing to do both. PPC is enormously thankful to Representative Aument for his commitment and his leadership and his willingness to introduce House Bill 1980 so that Pennsylvania can take these important steps to build better evaluation tools. We hope this Committee will deal with that bill soon and that it moves quickly through the Legislature. There are several elements of the bill we strongly support and there are a couple of places we think it needs some work. Like most things in this world, in this building the introduction of a piece of legislation often, you know, it's not the beginning of the dialog, but it's not the end zone either. We very much support the notion that the bill requires the use of multiple measures of student achievement. House Bill 1980 notes the use of performance data

on assessments in PVAAS as measured by student achievement but doesn't limit it to the use of these performance measures. It allows for others in the development in the rating tool. The department has repeatedly noted that some of these measures included should be chosen by local districts for subjects and grade levels not measured by assessment and other standardized tests including nationally recognized exams such as the NOCTY which is available for our vocational technical students. I should note that I have not served on this work group but Bill Bartle, my colleague, who is our Youth Policy Director, has and we find ourselves in this situation where we read the legislation we understand so much what's been going on and the dialogue internally in the department for almost two years and in this work crew that a lot of that contextual information is missing. So I think there's a lot of missing information that worries us at times that is causing us unnecessary opposition. The other piece that we very much support is the notion of multiple observation and practice areas. The observation and practice models included in the legislation were the very ones identified by the Momentum stakeholder group as the most important areas related to achievement and ones that principals and teachers think we should be looking at. And again, Mathematicas work on our own pilot is connection of those things, so we'll have that information. We fundamentally believe a significant and meaningful component of student achievement must be in evaluation tools. We believe that 50% of which, 15% would be a building measure. *We're all part of the team* would be a very important way to go. As I mentioned earlier, setting the bar at 50% would've made us consistent with many other states but I do have to say regrettably that we're nervous about the legislation is drafted. Because as drafted it says that at least 50% could be 99.9% and it shouldn't be. That would be wrong and we would urge you to move the legislation out of this Chamber out of the Committee, validating 50 as a cap, right? We don't want you to, as opposed to a floor. And the bill also doesn't include a

building measure and we would urge you as a legislature to speak on that. We know that the intent of the Department has been to include that but we would urge you to time in on that. We have to say that equally important, the bill doesn't apply to charter schools. Charter schools are public schools and regardless of how you feel about charter schools, we feel strongly that this must also apply to charter schools. And we know that excellent charter schools are aggressive in making sure they have the best teachers in the classroom. And the same protections we need to provide for children in failing public schools, we have to provide in failing charter schools. So we would urge an amendment to include charter schools. We would also urge, as I mentioned earlier, that the legislature to speak to the notion student evaluation as being a required component and look into the work happening both in met and being piloted now in Pittsburgh. I shared a lot of information with you today and we're very happy to work with you and Representative Aument on this legislation. You know, simply the evaluation tool alone though, is not going to improve student performance instruction and the success of our public education enterprise in Pennsylvania, just like standards doesn't; just like money alone doesn't, they have to be knitted together. So we remind you that this is just one piece of your work on teacher effectiveness. We need to be sure we take steps when we have a better tool to individualize and target professional development to address individual teacher's needs. Just as differentiated instruction works for students, customized professional development works for professionals in any field. We need to expand our teacher induction and mentoring efforts; those first few years are so hard and so critical, we need to invest more time, energy. We need to give veteran teachers more time and more resources to mentor new teachers and we need to spend money on that. It's going to cost money. We need to put incentives in place to assure that the most effective teachers are assigned to the highest need kids in our schools and we need to help schools that are

struggling have the financial incentives to track teachers. We need to create better paths for professional development for teachers so they can advance and not seem necessarily unnecessarily stuck at some arbitrary level of professional growth. And we need to use the student input to help make these decisions. With those steps aside we believe there's pretty much a consensus in Pennsylvania that it's now time to move forward. As I said, we look forward to working with Representative Aument and with all of you to make this goal of a new teacher and principal and non professional evaluation tool a reality in our state. Our students don't get another chance to redo their childhood. If I'm in third grade today and things go well, I will not be there next year and I will not be there in three years or five years or eight years or ten years from now, when some will feel more ready and we have more background to move forward. We should be careful in moving forward. We should be deliberate in using the information, we shouldn't short-change and rush the time line of developing the tool appropriately and evaluate and training evaluators but we don't need to take multiple multiple years. Thank you.

CHAIRMAN CLYMER: Well thank you Ms. Benso for your very informative testimony and I share some of the concerns that you have raised that we be deliberative in the way we move forward but at the same time we want to make Pennsylvania a leader in education. And as a leader in education then we attract the very best to our state and we retain those teachers that are a high quality. And I also agree that, it's all about the student and that's our goal; it's a, we don't say that this is a silver bullet but we are saying that this will improve the quality of education for many of our students and many students are already receiving a fine education. We know that but at the same time, we have to help those who we feel need to be helped. So, are there any questions from any of the Members? Staff? No; Looks like Chris. Well we still have your testimony and thank you for your patience, indeed.

JOAN BENSO: Absolutely, thank you.

CHAIRMAN CLYMER: The Chair recognizes that we are running a little behind time but I want to tell you that we have had many people who wanted to come and testify on this issue so we know the issue is of very is a very meaningful issue to educators and to other interested groups across Pennsylvania and we try to work in as many as we possibly could. At this time the Chair will recognize Mr. Richard Fry, Superintendent of Big Springs School District with the Pennsylvania Association of School Administrators and Dr. Barry Purvis, Principal of the Chambersburg Area School District and he's with the Pennsylvania Association of Elementary & Secondary School Districts. Gentleman, thank you for coming before us today and we look forward to your testimony.

RICHARD FRY: Thank you Chairman Clymer. I'm gonna do my best to summarize my comments. You have copies of my written comments so I'll summarize the best I can but thank you for giving me the opportunity and distinguished Members of the House Education Committee to appear this afternoon regarding House Bill 1980. I'm Rich Fry; I have the honor of serving as a superintendent of the Big School District, about 35 minutes down 81 from here. I'm also Chairman of the Legislative Committee of the Pennsylvania Association of School Administrators PASA. We represent school superintendents, other chief school administrators across the state, and once again we appreciate the opportunity. It's important to note from the start of PASA has been said numerous times today, recognizes that the current system is obsolete. It's 33 years old and I don't think there's any debate that we need something new. So the question is what direction we go. School superintendents and other school leaders across the state applaud and support the efforts that of moving forward with House Bill 1980. We do have some recommendations. PASA believes that ratings should include fair and appropriate

consideration of student achievement as determined through an analysis of multiple measures of student performance. We are clearly at the point in education that student achievement must be part of the robust teacher evaluation model. It has to happen. Multiple measures should include consideration of standardized test scores, measures of student growth as determined by PVAS and locally developed performance measures that reflect the priorities and aspirations of the school community. And there were some questions earlier in regards to the transient percentage at Pocono Mountain and things like that. There is flexibility within this legislation that allows districts to set those measurements to make sure it's part of the evaluation. We applaud the effort that gives districts the flexibility to do that. They need to be able to address the challenges within their communities as part of this tool, things that could include student attendance, graduation rates, dropout rates, enrollments in secondary education and other measures. Again it's critical for that rating criteria recognize the needs and priorities of each community because they're different; very different. The Philadelphia school system's needs are different from the Big Springs School District needs but we may have similar poverty levels. How we go about that in evaluation form needs; we need to have the flexibility to do that and we believe this legislation provides some of that flexibility. We also support the use of three separate rating systems; one for classroom teachers, the core professionals and building administrators. It reflects Danielson; we've heard Danielson enough today but obviously it reflects those priorities that she has set and she's obviously leading researcher in this field. We appreciate and support provisions to the bill that allows school districts to use their own locally developed evaluation systems that have been approved by the Pennsylvania Department of Education is having met or exceeding the measures of effective established qualities in the bill is important that this legislation recognize that some school districts have already adopted their own innovative, high quality assessment tools. When

you hear that percentage of 99.4% and I know that makes the hair on your neck stand up, but there are plenty of districts out there doing it right. What's not incorporated into that 99.4% are professional individuals that were counseled out because of a great tool. They may not have got unsatisfactory on their final rating, thus their not collected as part of that data. But they're not teachers anymore in Pennsylvania based on a system that has worked to date. So we need to make sure that we give some flexibility to those systems that have already been approved. We believe those districts should be permitted to continue to use these systems and to be permitted to update and continue to use this systems that meet with the Department's approval. So while we're very supportive of House Bill 1980, we do offer several suggestions that we believe will improve the bill. One suggestion; our first suggestion is to provide PDE authority to approve innovative rating systems. It is important that the bill provide the Department of Education the authority to approve innovative alternative ratings systems that may not fully comply with the minimum standards provided in the bill. We've had our current system for 33 years, okay. We are in the middle of an information age. We're doubling every 16-17 months, depending what research you read. We need to be able to be flexible and as districts move forward with this, the Department needs to have the flexibility to approve those various systems. One item that hasn't been discussed much today, if at all, are differentiated plans and that's our point two in our suggestions. We need to permit school districts to use a differentiated plan of staff assessment so that evaluations can be targeted at those who are most in need of performance reviews; such as, and Joan talked about our new teacher, such as novice teachers and professional staff to demonstrate the need for all ongoing assessment performance. What a plan like that would do would permit administrators to target their attention to those most in need of review or improvement. Other veteran staff or master teachers may have a longer time frame before they

go through the process. It could be every other year. It's important for the fidelity of this system to get to the level that it needs to be, that administrators have time to fully implement and dig deep into the data that is going to be collected if as written, to do every teacher in this manner, is gonna provide a huge challenge for local districts that are in the midst of serious budget cuts. One of the first area districts to look at obviously is their administrative staff. They're a little further away from the classroom, classroom teachers. We have to have the capacity to be able to pull off what's being writ within the bill. Lastly, and this has been debated, but we think it's important that we provide for a phase-in of the evaluation system for classroom teachers beyond 12 -- 13 school year and for principals and non teaching professionals beyond the 13 – 14 school year. These are major changes that will require considerable time to learn. Yes, the framework is done and pilot 1 has helped define that framework but there is some important works that needs to occur within design as part of phase 2 and the pilot. To do it right we need to make sure our administrators are trained; we need to make sure our teachers understand the toll and we also need to learn from lessons that occurred around us because of race to the top states. You just need to look to the state north of here with the challenges they've had with race to the top and their evaluation system. They're struggling on how to define that system within for guidance councilors for school psychologists, for out-reach clinicians. We need to learn from those states and make sure that we take out time in that process. We can't absolutely put children at the sideline in this process. It has to happen quickly. We agree with that. But we think that a further phased in process, probably over the course of two years, would be more fitting. We also caution the committee about having student achievement count too much in the evaluation tool design for the evaluation of non teaching support personnel; again councilors, nurses, school psychologists, speech clinicians. The bill provides for up to 20% of the evaluation may be based

on student achievement. Again, states participating in the federal race to the top grants have been struggling since receiving the grant with that one issue. We need to be careful with that. In addition to these suggestions, there are also a few points that we want to caution in regards to the bill and some language. Make sure that the language in the bill that makes null and void the current form, the PDE 5501 form or any alternative rating that has been approved by PDE to date is not invalid. The language that we saw earlier this week made those evaluations invalid. And let me give you an example what can happen if this would effect for the next school year. And I would rate; my district would rate a staff member unsatisfactory at the end of the school year. That, under the current language, would be an invalid rating for next year. We would have to start from square one. That's not the intent. Make sure that the language reflects that. Insure that the new evaluation system properly balances the need for a thorough and comprehensive analysis of performance against the need to make the system user friendly and as minimally burdensome as possible. I touched on that point before. This is going to be a robust system that is good for this state. We need to make sure that we supported administrators and supported staff in moving it forward and that we've been conscious of time constraints and competing obligations that faces administrators. There's not a school reform package that comes down the road that doesn't have to be managed by a school administrator. Yes, they are instructional leaders and the most important thing they do on a daily basis is supervise staff but understand that there's a lot of competing initiatives with our administrators and we need to balance that. Lastly, the bill provides authority to state Board of Education to change the rating tools and develop standards or regulations necessary to implement the new requirements. All this is a highly technical point; the existing regulations and school code are standards of the Secretary of Education and not the State Board of Education. We suggest that the committee may want continue to provide the

authority to the Secretary rather than transfer it to the State Board of Education because 33 years is a long time and that's the one we've currently lived. In summary, past of supports efforts to modernize evaluation system, we also support the fair and appropriate use of multiple measures of student achievement as criteria in the evaluation of professional personnel. We recommend that the new system be phased in over time to insure they properly, effectively implemented and finally during these extraordinary difficult budgetary times, please be mindful of the costs and burdens such new systems will impose on already shrinking district budgets and administrative personnel. Thank you.

CHAIRMAN CLYMER: Before we entertain questions, the Chair will recognize Dr. Barry Purvis for his comments.

DR. BARRY PERVIS: Thank you, Representatives and Chairman Clymer for allowing me to speak today. Good afternoon and I know I will try to summarize my comments because my stomach is growling, probably yours is also since we've been here for awhile. I am Dr. Barry Purvis; I am the principal at Chambersburg Area School District, located in Franklin County. I am also the President of the Pennsylvania Association of Elementary and Secondary School Principals, which represents nearly 4,000 school principals working in Pennsylvania.

PAESSP supports efforts to design principal evaluations based upon multiple measures by qualified evaluators. Evaluation of principals by multiple measures should be balanced and reasonable. These measures should consider the five categories designated in the bill: planning and preparation, school environment, delivery of service, professional development and student performance.

Research has provided models and methods of assessing each of these areas. The standards provided by PDE for principals define what we should be looking for and

accomplishing in the area of school leadership. Currently, there is field testing of a new evaluation system for teachers. It is supposed to be implemented for all school districts by July of 2012, with a new evaluation system for principals the following year. We feel this is an inadequate timeline. All principals and teachers should have at least a year to become familiar with any new system. However, we would suggest that the timelines be moved back at least a year. If the true intent is to develop an evaluation system that will be meaningful and helpful to teachers and principals, then this is a reasonable request.

As you well know, the school principalship is a demanding job requiring each individual to possess a range of skills and abilities. The work expectations for me and my fellow principals have grown over the years and in some cases have become so extensive that one person could not possibly achieve all the expectations of the job description and many areas of the state now are struggling to find principals to fill positions. A principal would greatly agree that his/her primary duties is to classroom instruction and the quality of teaching but in order to do so the principal must have adequate time and resources to effectively observe, evaluate and plan with staff for improvement. Although it may be necessary and easy to say that principals would spend more time on the important task of staff evaluation, the answer we generally receive is; they must do it all. They must do cafeteria duties, hall duties, bus duties, meet with parents, attend many school activities; sometimes we're out more than 100 nights a year. It is not a lack of effort that the answer is impossible to fulfill but there only 24 hours in a day.

We believe that whatever the final evaluation tool is, consideration should be given to the time it will take to administer the evaluation program properly and which duties of the principal should have priority over others. So the first concern we have is having the adequate time, resources and training to properly administer the evaluation system. Another concern is the

imbalance reliance on student test scores in the evaluation process. The notion that 50% of the overall rating must be based upon student test achievement provides an imbalance which not only unfair but harmful to overall school improvement efforts. When we are focused upon improving student achievement research is clear; good school culture focuses upon student learning as the best situation for long term permanent improvement and student achievement. Research also tells us that it is impossible to successfully change the school culture in less than three to five years. We agree that test scores are important and significant in assessing student achievement. I feel the bill as written put too much emphasis on student test scores as a means for principal evaluation. Ineffective principals with good student bodies will remain because of the composite of the student body. Effective principals will be dismissed for the same reason. Therefore, any change in the 50% to reduce that would be helpful. There should be a defined appeals process for those evaluated in which they challenge the accuracy of the data used, expertise and qualifications of the evaluator; overall conclusion of the evaluation in which they may present their own data. Teachers are provided that own remedy through the grievance arbitration process; we ask for similar consideration. There should be a sufficient amount of time between terminal evaluations to enable the evaluated principal to shape the culture for productivity. This should be at least two years.

This does not mean that evaluations should not be ongoing or used or issued annually or that a principal could not be dismissed for various reasons. It means that a principal have sufficient time to shape the culture of the school before terminal evaluation based upon incompetence. In summary I'd like to emphasize six points. Consideration of the time necessary for a principal to properly use the evaluation instruments with staff and self. Use of the test scores for 50% of the portion evaluation with related to student achievement not the entire

evaluation. There should be a defined appeal or challenge process for evaluations. This will insure confidence at all ends of the process. With responsibility must come the equivalent authority to make judgments and to act. Responsibility without authority equals inertia at best and disaster at worst. That more time, at least an additional year for evaluation systems to be in place to work out the issues and become familiar with the process before implementation. And finally, any principal evaluation should be fair regardless of size and makeup of the school. There are schools in the Commonwealth that are very small and do not have any sub groups versus schools that are extremely large and have every sub group. I would hope that this would be taken into consideration as the evaluations are developed. The playing field should be level for all principals. Thank you for allowing the school principals to provide commentary on this proposed bill. Thank you.

CHAIRMAN CLYMER: Thank you very much for the testimony. Dr. Purvis, I'll start with you. You've questioned the 50% of the overall rating must be based upon testing the student achievement test; what percentage would you recommend to the committee if 50% is kind of unfair, where would you draw the line?

DR. BARRY PURVIS: As principals we believe that is should be divided up among all the other areas equally. That would be about 20 to 25%.

CHAIRMAN CLYMER: Okay. Well I guess that's something that certainly the committee will look at. That's the question I had so are there any other questions? The Chair recognizes Representative Truitt.

REPRESENTATIVE TRUITT: Thank you Mr. Chairman and thank you both for your testimony. Dr. Purvis, in listening to your testimony and your appeal to lower the percentage from 50%, one of the thought I had; I hear a lot of antidotal stories of principals that don't spend

enough time in the classroom and I feel like the 50% requirement on principals would help to keep them focused on what really matters in schools. I mean it's, even in the private sector I had jobs where I worked in sales and sometimes we would joke around and say, you know, if we didn't have all these customers, we could get a lot more done. And I feel like in the schools at the administrative level a lot of times people get caught up in the minutia of running the school and forget about the students. Don't you think it would help to focus the principal's priorities on monitoring teachers, monitoring classrooms, spending more time in the classroom environment as opposed to getting caught up in the paperwork and all the other administrative hassles of running the school?

DR. BARRY PURVIS: I think any percentage that you place in there will require them to be in the school classrooms more often. We just feel that 50% would be detrimental because there other issues that a school principal deals with in the course of a day. I know for example, in my building I have 2400 kids and there's never a day, there's never several major issues that we're dealing with drugs, weapons, alcohol consumption, various other things; stealing, that's going on that you have to deal with during the course of that day; something that can't go away. So any percentage that you put on there, I think will help increase the principals in the classrooms.

REPRESENTATIVE TRUITT: Thank you.

CHAIRMAN CLYMER: I do have a question for Mr. Fry. And that is; we were talking about; you mentioned that in testimony that some school districts already have a teacher evaluation. Do you have one in your school?

RICHARD FRY: We actually have one different than PDE. Yes, then the 5501. We give satisfactory and unsatisfactory and provisionally satisfactory. We have a third.

CHAIRMAN CLYMER: And is done yearly or...

RICHARD FRY: It is done; we do it twice a year for non tenured and they are observed a minimum of four times. And what we've done with that; the provisionally satisfactory; if you get a provisional satisfactory, you're immediately put into a plan. And what we've done with our teachers in years one through three years; eleven of them have not moved on to a permanent contract. So there are districts out there that are. Now that wouldn't be reported in state data.

CHAIRMAN CLYMER: Yes. How many of the 500 school districts, since you, I mean a ballpark figure of those that have a good effective teacher evaluation plan in place? And I am not going to hold you to a number.

RICHARD FRY: I think at least, probably 25 to 30% have gone out on their own. Don't quote me on that. I believe it's probably about that.

CHAIRMAN CLYMER: Yea, okay. I see no further questions. The Chair thanks the gentlemen for joining us this afternoon. Thank you for your patience and for your important testimony. Okay, at this point in time we conclude our testimony and this was a very informative and helpful public hearing and we thank every person; the testifiers for being with us today and for our guests as well. Thank you very much and have a good day.

Whereupon, the meeting adjourned at 1:49 PM

The above is a full and accurate transcript of proceedings produced by the Chief Clerk's Office of the Pennsylvania House of Representatives.

Kathy J. Carl, Chief Clerk's Office