



**Professional Standards Council for Teachers
Meeting Notes
April 4, 2023
4:00 – 5:30 p.m.**

Attendees

- **Members**
 - Eric Dimmit
 - Meg Erler
 - Barbara Herzog
 - Julie Horvath
 - Monica Lopez
 - Kabby Hong
 - Sydney Bueno
 - **Department of Public Instruction (DPI) Staff**
 - Jake Hollnagel, Education Consultant, LEAD Team
 - Jennifer Kammerud, Director, LEAD Team
1. Roll Call by Jennifer Kammerud.
 2. Call to Order by Jennifer Kammerud.
 3. Approval of Minutes
 - a. Motion to approve the January and February draft minutes by Meg Erler, seconded by Barb Herzog.
 - b. Motion passed.
 4. Discussion and Recommendations on EE
 - a. Discussion on new 2022 Danielson Framework for Teaching
 - i. Monica Lopez posed the question of cost-effectiveness of adopting new framework given the relatively small scope of the changes.
 1. Jennifer Kammerud remarked that much of the cost would fall to DPI to implement the new rubric.
 - ii. Ms. Lopez commented that the opportunity to train new teachers could make the change worth the cost of new materials.
 - iii. Sydney Bueno suggested whether the question at hand was to adopt the new rubric or adopt the new rubric or potentially others.
 1. Kammerud clarified that the question was to adopt the new rubric or keep the existing rubric.
 - iv. Kabby Hong commented that he is less concerned with whether or not to adopt the new rubric since the rubrics are well-intentioned and

purposefully designed but is more concerned with the way the Wisconsin Educator Effectiveness System has been implemented.

1. Jennifer Kammerud clarified that we will be having discussion on other potential recommendations.
 - v. Herzog concurred with Kabby Hong about the importance of implementation and added her support for adopting the rubric with well-planned implementation and training.
 - vi. Eric Dimmit commented that the changes were more of a “redecorating than a remodel,” and with that in mind would be best to adopt.
 1. Eric asked how many districts use the state model to better know how big of a shift this would represent.
 - vii. Julie Horvath posed a question about how well social-emotional learning was reflected in the new rubric.
 - viii. Meg Erler concurred with Kabby Hong regarding the importance of implementation. Expressed a desire to have the differences and unique circumstances of each district.
 - ix. Jacob Hollnagel noted that 236 districts and independent charter schools use the state model of EE out of 458 in the state, representing 63 percent of educators.
- b. Jennifer Kammerud temporarily closed the question on the new rubric and opened the question to include reflection on the WI EE System as a whole, specifically how the 6 implementation requirements of the system are articulated.
- i. No questions raised by the council for discussion. Question closed.
- c. Transitioned to the question of what additional training or communication re: the System does the council recommend.
- i. Eric Dimmit commented that the DPI’s recommendation to implement EE as a learning-centered system may need more articulation.
 - ii. Monica Lopez suggested emphasizing and making primary the motivation to use the system as a continuous improvement system.
 - iii. Kabby Hong commented that he, as a teacher, did not feel that the system was “educator-driven”. He commented that professional development and evaluation are still separate things and that professional development is self-directed.
 1. Question? Why can’t we work as a PLC, with similar goals, collect evidence, perhaps in a non-summative year?
 2. Comment by Meg Erler: Ensuring evaluations are not just one-time events, creating more collaboration and conversation, and less a system of identifying weakness. How can EE take into account all the things going into the evaluation?
 3. Comment from Jacob Hollnagel about revisions to the system to attempt to address some of these concerns, including supporting more teacher autonomy (link to new flexibilities document).

4. Monica Lopez commented that in Milwaukee, perhaps due to the influence of the teacher association, that student learning objects and professional learning goals in the system are teacher driven, with administrator input and support.
5. Julie Horvath raised the National Board Certification process and how teacher-driven it is. Feels that writing up goals in more than one place creates confusion about what is allowed.
- iv. Transitioned to question on guidance for aligning individual educators' goals with school and district goals.
 1. Monica Lopez suggested she preferred keeping options open for goal alignment, rather than direction.
 - a. Kabby Hong concurred.
 2. Eric Dimmitt concurred with Lopez and Hong and added that flexibility allowed for differentiation.
 3. Barb Herzog suggested reemphasizing the role and expectations of principals and evaluators in the system (something about prescription for teachers).
 4. Meg Erler said that from the board perspective there should be a way to recognize district and school goals in EE and vice versa.
 5. Kabby Hong commented that the Danielson model seems difficult to do with fidelity given the evidentiary requirements. Administrators also come in with different ability levels and experiences, many having never taught.
 6. Eric Dimmitt affirmed Kabby's statement and wanted to emphasize support for addressing the administrator role in EE.
- v. Transitioned to the question of what does how and when to provide feedback.
 1. Jennifer Kammerud opened by asking what would "meaningful" mean to members of the council?
 2. Monica Lopez commented that often the most meaningful learning was in choice and collaboration with other staff.
 3. Julie Horvath affirmed the importance of collaboration and choice. Using PLC time to support SLO and PPG work could be extremely beneficial.
5. Jennifer Kammerud summarized the recommended topics for next meeting's continued discussion prior to adjournment.
 - Increase the focus on the learning centered system. This should be the first focus.
 - Change approach based on whether an educator is meeting expectations. If meeting expectations, educators should be able to direct their own or collaborative goals.
 - Build mentoring systems more explicitly into the system.

- Emphasize that teachers are drivers of their development with administrators supporting teachers in this work.
 - Define the flexibility available in the system more clearly.
 - Provide options not directions for those looking to combine work (e.g., national board and EE work).
 - Clarify what a meaningful evaluation includes. Give a menu for thinking about this so educator can choose what is meaningful to them.
 - Differentiate between new and experienced teachers in terms of required work.
 - Examine the role of evidence to lessen burden and focus on what is necessary.
 - Rethink the time commitments and expectations of administrators.
 - Move to the Danielson 2022 Framework.
6. Motion to Table Discussion to next meeting and adjourn.
- a. Moved by Barb Herzog
 - b. Seconded by Meg Erler
 - c. Motion passed with unanimous consent.

Meeting adjourned.