

## Welcome – Marcy Driscoll, FSU Dean and Daniel Reyes-Guerra, FAPEL President

- In addition to welcome, Marcy thanked FAPEL for its service and urged attention to proposed leadership prep program legislation paralleling teacher prep program legislation.
- Daniel echoed Marcy's comments and commended her for setting the stage for the meeting's focus on proposed/pending legislation and related matters.

Daniel then reviewed logistics (folder items, etc.)

## Business Meeting

Rhonda Blackwell-Flanagan reviewed the financial report from the meeting packet

Jerry Johnson reported that current membership is at 87 (representing 7 institutional memberships, individual memberships, and student memberships) from 19 different higher education institutions.

Valerie Storey reported on election results and announced the new FAPEL board members that will assume duties in July 2016 (at the board retreat). Following will be the 2016-2018 FAPEL Board:

- Valerie Storey – President
- Daniel Reyes-Guerra – Past President
- Jerry Johnson – President-Elect
- Fern Aefsky – Secretary
- Olivia Hodges – Treasurer

Julie Gray reported on the progress of the new FAPEL newsletter. Daniel explained that the newsletter editor role will be an ex officio member of the board.

## FAPEL President's Report and Group Discussion

Daniel provided background and context related to proposed legislation and FAPEL's involvement in the process to date, and highlighted areas of concern identified by FAPEL members in the draft bills (with handout *FAPEL's Attempt at Florida Legislation*).

Daniel then opened the floor for discussion and several members contributed insights and suggestions.

Daniel and Marytza Gawlick then reviewed reports shared prior to the meeting (*Professional Standards for Educational Leaders review*, *Manna Report* [Wallace Foundation], *UCEA State Policy Report*).

## Presentation: State Board-approved Legislative Agenda: Solidifying the Statutory Framework for School Leader Preparation and Development in Our State

Brian Dassler reviewed a pending bills (title: Education Personnel) with a handout. Considerable emphasis was placed on changes in processes for investigating and acting upon allegations of professional standards violations (e.g., allowing for a "letter of caution" when probable cause cannot be established).

With regard to educational leadership certification programs, Brian explained that the proposed legislation fills the gap resulting from the lack of a statutory framework for level I and level II certification. Brian referenced the Manna report and stated that the proposed legislation is intended to bring coherence to the preparation process as well as fill the gap. Brian then opened the floor for

questions and discussion. Brian explicitly stated the FDOE's appreciation for FAPEL's input into the proposed bill.

Walt Doherty asked for clarification on why higher education institutions are required to partner with school districts but school districts are not required to partner with higher education institutions. Brian made a distinction between level I and level II programs and stated that because level II is optional, more flexibility for districts is in order.

Walt then asked about the use of outcome measures for completers as an indicator of program quality and the problematic (citing the lack of time for some completers between graduation and initial placement as a leader, the fact that some completers work in other roles that are not directly addressed by the programs). Brian referenced the Manna report, acknowledged the vagueness in the term "educational leader" and made the argument that principal preparation program completers should be "better teachers" as a result. Brian also made the claim that completers should be placed in administrative roles sooner/more quickly when there is a substantive district-university partnership.

Julie Gray then asked about including the FELE pass rate of completers as a program outcome measure (specifically, citing that all programs require passing the FELE as a graduation requirements and asking whether that makes the pass rate irrelevant as an outcome measure). Eileen McDaniel responded that pass rates for teacher certification examinations and FELE examinations are not 100% for every institution (which could be a data issue or a university policy/process issue—the underlying cause is not clear).

Rebecca Ogletree asked Brian whether there might be an opportunity for us to collaborate in developing amendments addressing some of the identified issues in the proposed legislation. Brian responded by clarifying that he does not view the proposed legislation as flawed; rather, he and the department support it as written.

Daniel then reiterated for Rebecca the process followed by FAPEL over the past 18 months in attempting to influence the legislation (pointing out that the draft bill is essentially the same bill as last year, despite the suggested changes from FAPEL), and asked Brian about the use of school outcome measures (e.g., VAM scores) to measure completers regardless of the specific roles held (e.g., assistant principal versus principal).

Additional discussion involving multiple participants focused on the possibility of creating separate standards for assistant principals and principals.

#### Presentation: FELE Updates and the FELE Holistic Scoring Process

Phil Canto

Phil reviewed current state of FELE and expected upcoming activity (no changes are planned beyond revision of some individual items).

Louis Blessing (Leon County administrator and a chief scorer for the FELE written assessment) shared his perspectives on where examinees are falling short on the written assessment. According to Louis, failing examinees typically are not specific enough in their interpretation of data (e.g., "overall, reading scores increased" when the data indicates up and down trends) or they interpret data incorrectly.

Suleyman Olgar then reviewed research analyzing FELE results. Phil encouraged meeting participants to share experiences working with students and programs to color/contextualize results. Several participants responded.

### Discussion

Daniel opened the discussion by asking for input on whether we should proceed/how we should pursue continuing to influence legislation around leadership preparation programs. There was consensus that we should continue to pursue this, and that we should work directly with legislators and our deans. Other suggestions included encouraging institutional memberships to add “weight” to our voice.

Daniel then asked for input related to FELE content and results. Daniel described the work that a Pearson staffer (Rebecca Pfeiffer) can do for programs related to Results Analyzer (and referencing her work with FSU).