



Meeting Date	July 20, 2023
Attendees	<p>Working Group: Chris Moss, Brandi Williams, Laura Shelton, Melissa Moore, Bryan Duffie, Nathan Morris, William Burfield, Beth Shumate, Holley Anderson; Suzanne Rogers</p> <p>ADE: Andy Sullivan, Joan Luneau, Sharlee Crowson, Melissa Jacks, Matthew Sutherlin</p> <p>Others: Denise Airola, Hannah Jolibois, Hannah Dietsch,</p>

Draft Rule/Policy Component	Work Group Feedback
	<p>Educator Support Rules draft was shared, specifically the definition of “data.” What does “student success” mean? Concern was raised over the flexibility districts have in determining what evidence can be used to determine effectiveness. Concern that there will be many different measures of student success if it is a local decision.</p> <p>The statement in the draft rules that “other indicators determined by educational entity” was the concern.</p>
Merit Pay	<p>Legal provisions discussed.</p> <p>It was clarified that aspiring educators are eligible for merit pay.</p> <p>Scorecard example for distribution of merit incentives was shared. The first example showed if we maxed the categories and using last year’s teacher data, \$56 Million would have been paid out. The state is funding \$10 Million.</p> <p>There was a discussion on other eligibility requirements that could be considered for merit pay other than what is specifically outlined in law</p> <p>There was a discussion on how the distribution of funds will be done if it is decided to limit the number of teachers eligible for each category. It was also discussed if the state should consider bigger bonuses for less teachers or smaller bonuses for more teachers.</p>



It was recommended that funding be made available for administrators to receive training on how to determine salary incentives for their districts.

It was raised that outstanding growth and shortages should be the primary focus when determining funding distribution as mentors and aspiring teachers can be compensated in different ways.

It was discussed if cost for benefits would be considered with merit pay.

Discussion on how to prioritize shortage areas-subject or geographic. It was shared that the STEP program prioritizes with;
First – both geographical and shortage
Second – subject area
Third – geographic area

A discussion on how to handle teachers who do not have VAM score (K-2 and other non tested subjects) was held. The discussion included suggestions on how these teachers could be assigned growth score as a “contributor.”

Some teachers may not receive a merit bonus if they do not have a VAM score and do not have the opportunity to be a mentor.

Next Steps	Next meeting TBD
-------------------	------------------