South Dakota Education Reform Advisory Council
Sept. 13, 2012

In attendance: Jim Hanson, Sen. Mark Johnston, Cooper Garnos, John Julius, Rep. Larry Lucas, Sen. Jim Bradford, Jeff Nelson, Sandy Arsenault, Jeff Holcomb, Paula Weeldreyer, Rob Monson, Dean Christensen, Mark Greguson, Heath Larson, Samantha Walder , Wade Pogany, Joe Graves, Kristin Morse, Sen. Bruce Rambelberg

- Dr. Schopp reviews the agenda.
- Larry Lucas asks for SD Incentives+ report, which is an alternate form of compensation for teachers.
- Sen. Mark Johnston suggests talking about dual credit at a future meeting.

<u>Open Conversation:</u>

- 16 schools now participating in the work that Innovative Lab Schools project is doing, including 4 tribal schools
- What are the Catholic schools (eg., Red Cloud) doing that some of the other schools are not? They have some of the highest scores on the reservation.
- Moving students on when they're ready, as opposed to when completed a grade
    - How can state/feds change to allow districts to make some of these changes
    - Allow schools to design their own change, allow them time to do it, and fund it appropriately
- Each pot of money comes with its own restrictions, putting schools in difficult position to make change. Federal Title I has most restrictions.
- Question: Use the capital outlay fund for other purposes? What would superintendents do if they had more flexibility with their funds?
    - One superintendent responds that he likes the separation of capital outlay fund, as buildings will suffer without it. Instead, we could talk about removing the barriers in the master agreements, rather than paying every teacher the same?
    - Teacher explains that her district is capital outlay rich – with two new buildings recently – but then had to cut 14 positions last year
    - Another superintendent says didn't use the capital outlay flexibility for the first few years, but did take advantage once the last cut was made
- Complexity of negotiated agreement with teachers is difficult to work with as a board member
- Discussion about the sales tax initiative – if schools were properly funded, we would be able to talk about doing innovative things
- Discussion about technology – it can be a great thing, but can be challenging if not working
- HB 1234 brings about a fear among teachers, closes them off from being creative. Another work group member disagrees.

- <u>Summary of Teacher Evaluation Work Group, Dr. Rick Melmer</u>

- <u>Summary of Principal Evaluation Work Group, Dr. Rick Melmer</u>

- <u>Summary of Local Reward Plan Advisory Council, Jarod Larson</u>

- Review of HB 1234
    - Bill has five main areas
    - COMMENTS:
        - Dakota Corps doesn't address rural aspect. HB1234 is only for juniors and seniors in college. Turns into a loan if you do not meet your commitment. Add rural aspect to HB1234.
        - Page 12 section 28 re: teacher must be proficient to qualify for incentive for local teacher reward program is not in the law. Not specific to any evaluation criteria.

- Break into small groups to address the five main areas of HB 1234. Group members to discuss and report back pros, cons, suggestions.

Group #1: Critical Needs Scholarship Group
Pros: Decrease cost for students; student will be focused by year 3. This may help to direct students to the critical needs areas. Lead to better instruction. Accountability - to fulfill the focus of the student.

Cons: Limited number of scholarships; attract wrong type of person because it is a scholarship; could just create a loan program; funded with tax payer money.

Suggestions: Why don't they just put the money in Dakota Corps? Answer: Because it is funded by College Access Fund.

Group #2: Math & Science Incentives
Pros: May attract students into the specialty area; great deal of importance globally; addresses critical need. STEM was mentioned. Opportunity for future employment; Address shortage area; Voluntary in nature.

Cons: Will money continue to be there? Public and private completion measured? Program causes competition; limited opportunity; non math and science excluded. English, Health and PE not included. Too limited in scope; morale among staff.

Group #3: Top Teacher Reward
Pros: Additional dollars for teachers; flexibility; local control; voluntary.

Cons: Morale and longevity. How long will it last? Could it be carried over?

Group #4: Teacher Evaluation
Pros: Common throughout state; Danielson model is holistic; better teachers and better students.

Cons: Too much time for principals; too many irons in the fire; should focus entirely on the common core; too much based on test scores.

Group #5: Continuing Contract
Pros: Currently we have a grandfather clause; will encourage negotiation of longer term contracts. Will make it easier to remove incompetent teachers.

Cons: Fired up teachers unnecessarily; poor publicity for education; loss of respect for a profession that is expected to continually do more with less. Creative and innovative work stifled. Vendettas played out among staff.

- Thoughts:
  - Single salary schedule decided by merit and market.
  - Locally – communication.
  - Relationship building.
  - Breakdown of American family.
  - Professional development.
  - Bridge and closer ties from pre-k to 16.
  - More time to teach all things.
  - Quality of teaching.
  - Technology.
  - Not much trust among teachers, principals, superintendents, legislators.
  - Money went into reserves instead of to teachers.
  - Reform overload.
  - This not only addresses Education but Global Economic development as well.
  - Should be focusing on tools to teach rather than incentive dollars.
  - Innovation schools, group students in alternative ways other than age or grades.

- Future Meeting Focus:
  - Innovative and creativity through pilots, additional learning time, other compensation methods (for example tools to teach)
  - More information on what parents want
  - Do schools and teachers have what they need to teach globally?
  - How do we open this up to public input?
  - Public perception of education
  - Other compensation methods
  - Extended learning time
  - Health insurance benefits (collaborative effort)

- Final Notes
  - Next meeting is October 9
  - SDI+ report
  - Focus of the group – draft report
  - What are other places doing
  - Group policy
  - Demographics
  - Expectation of this group is to write a report and to make recommendations