

BEA Executive Board Agenda

1/12/17

Executive Board Members Present:

Allison Hammer, President
James McLernon, Treasurer
Tova Margolis, Secretary
Melissa Gonzalez-Becker, Vice President
Jill Beers, Davis
Lenore Zavalick, Lane
Jim Sunderland, BHS
Gretchen Dick, Lane
Jen Foster, Davis
Alli Lua, Davis
Lauren McCarthy, JGMS
Lael Piehl, BHS
Lynda McGraw, JGMS
Nicole d'Entremont, JGMS
Paul Harrington, JGMS

Meeting was called to order 3:41pm.

I. President's Report

- a. Educator Evaluation Proposed Regulations--public comment by 1/27--see back
**Please copy the back of this page to hand out at 10 minute meetings next week!
- b. Curriculum Feedback on ELA/Literacy, Math, and History/Social Sciences Curriculum Frameworks
- c. Next Generation MCAS
- d. Tell Senators to vote no on Betsy DeVos--See back!
- e. Negotiations--please plan a 10 Minute Meeting next week and include the Negotiations Team members at your building to share general information about how negotiations are going so far

II. Vice-President's Report

- a. Nothing to report. There are no grievances.

III. Secretary's Report

- a. Lynda made a motion to approve the December minutes, Lenore seconded. The minutes were approved unanimously.

IV. Treasurer's Report

- a. Allison made a motion to donate \$500 to the Revels program, Melissa seconded. The motion was approved unanimously.
- b. Mass Child: Three kids have received clothes through this program and there is still money available. We can be reimbursed up to \$1,000. We have spent almost \$500.

V. Building Reports

- a. Secretaries-No representative present.
- b. EAs/TAs-Nothing to report.
- c. Davis-Nothing to report.
- d. Lane-Nothing to report.
- e. JGMS-Proposed schedule changes at JGMS.
- f. BHS-Nothing to report.
- g. New Members-Nothing to report.

Allison made a motion to adjourn the meeting and Melissa seconded. The meeting adjourned at 4:08pm.

Minutes taken by Tova Margolis

Ten Minute Meetings:

1. Feedback and Survey about changes to the Curriculum Frameworks:

DESE is currently collecting feedback on proposed changes to the English Language Arts/Literacy and Mathematics frameworks. Copies of the proposed changes and a link to the comment tool can be found at www.doe.mass.edu/candi/StandardsReview/ela-math.html

Public comment for the ELA and math frameworks is open until February 17.

DESE has opened a survey for educators and other interested parties to comment on the format and structure of the current History and Social Sciences curriculum frameworks. More information on the revisions and other projects related to the History and Social Science curriculum frameworks, including the public survey, can be found at www.doe.mass.edu/candi/StandardsReview/hss.html.

The public survey for the History and Social Science standards will remain open until February 6.

2. Next-Generation MCAS – Plans for High School Assessments:

In December, Commissioner Mitchell Chester put together six policy recommendations for the BESE to consider. The recommendations were:

1. Provide clear and accurate signals to students about whether they are on track for the expectations of colleges, employers and civic engagement.
2. Keep the high school competency determination for English language arts and mathematics at grade 10 in the near future.
3. Add history and social science to the competency determination.
4. Eliminate the high school chemistry and technology/engineering tests.
5. Add an introductory physics retesting opportunity in February.
6. Convene a stakeholder workgroup to identify and recommend options for a grade 11/grade 12 assessment program to gauge students' readiness for success after high school.

Find out more at: <http://www.doe.mass.edu/boe/docs/fy2017/2016-12/item6.html>

3. Public Comment about proposed amendments to Student Impact Rating system:

Email address: edevalcomments@doe.mass.edu

Deadline: January 27, 2017

Problem:

The proposed changes fail to address the most significant problems caused by the invalid Student Impact Rating and they would continue the misguided practice of judging educators based on student test scores. Even worse, they would increase the negative impact of this rating by replacing it with a Student Learning Indicator and moving it to Standard 2, which informs the educator's overall summative rating. In other

words, student test scores could prevent an educator from receiving an overall rating of “proficient.”

EMAIL SUBJECT LINE: The subject line should say something like: Comments against Proposed Amendments to 603 CMR 35.00. (Or: Comments against proposed changes to ed eval regs)

BE CLEAR: At the outset, make it clear that you are opposed to both the current Student Impact Rating system and Commissioner Mitchell Chester’s proposal to replace it with a very similar Student Learning Indicator, which would be embedded in Standard 2 of an educator’s summative evaluation. This change would make a bad problem even worse.

USE YOUR OWN WORDS: Please use your own words and describe your own experiences in explaining reasons for your opposition. This also presents an opportunity for you to say what you think about the evaluation system and describe what changes you would like to see.

Ideas to help you write your comments:

- **New names, same problems.** The commissioner’s proposal is extremely similar to what already exists, with new terminology. Instead of “District-Determined Measures,” it calls for “common assessments.” (Both systems also include the use of Student Growth Percentiles.) Instead of rating educators’ impact on student learning as “low, moderate or high,” it would rate their impact as “less than expected” or “at least expected.” Educators are not fooled by this change in terminology. The bottom line is that it still uses test scores in a way that is invalid, unreliable and unhelpful.
- **Continued focus on test results.** The proposed new system would continue the emphasis on sanctions rather than support, and on test results over other measures of teaching and learning.
- **Duplicative and a waste of time.** Student learning is already embedded in other sections of the evaluation system, most notably in the creation of Student Learning Goals. Creating another Student Learning Indicator is duplicative, confusing and a waste of time.

ADDITIONAL COMMENTS: Describe what you think should happen instead. Some suggestions include:

- Eliminate the Student Impact Rating altogether, but keep the rest of the system the same.
- Do a major overhaul of the entire educator evaluation system. Explain what you think should be changed and why.
- Eliminate the requirement that districts create DDMs or “common assessments,” but encourage educators and their evaluators to look at and discuss student work with a goal of determining whether there are great practices and lessons that could be shared and/or ideas about changes needed to make sure students are learning and growing.

4. Please send a message to our senators telling them to vote no on Betsy DeVos for Secretary of Education. You can go to the NEA website and easily send a message to our senators: <http://edadvocacy.nea.org/>