



***SCHOOL IMPROVEMENT LEADERSHIP
TEAM MEETING***

Tuesday, February 16, 2021; 4:00 p.m., Via Zoom Meeting
Minutes

Members Present: Superintendent Shon Hocker, Assistant Superintendent Keith Harris, Director of Instruction Melanie Kathrein, Board Member David Wilkie, Mrs. Melanie Hanel, Ms. Magdalyn Rauser, Mrs. Carla Schaeffer, Mrs. Amanda DeMorrett, Ms. Morgan Kathrein, Mrs. Elizabeth Kuelbs, Ms. Nicole Weiler, Mrs. Robin Swenson, Mrs. Tracy Leco, Mrs. Tammy Peterson, Mrs. Kristy Goodall, Mrs. Kandace King, Mrs. Sarah Olson, Mrs. Jennifer Nokes, Mr. Randy Muffley, Mrs. Amanda Hlibichuk, Mrs. Amber Berg, Mrs. Sara Steier, and Dr. Marcus Lewton.

Members Absent: Mr. Kevin Hoherz, Mrs. Desirae Tibor, Ms. Audrey Bergeron, Mr. Dan O'Brien, Mrs. Sara Streeter, Mr. Henry Mack, Mrs. Sarah Trustem, and Mrs. Stacy Kilwein.

Call to Order – Superintendent Hocker called the meeting to order at 4:00 p.m.

Teacher Evaluation System – Committee members were requested before this meeting to view a webinar from Marzano regarding the Marzano teacher evaluation model. Dr. Hocker said he wanted the committee to review Marzano to provide input if this model could make things better for the teachers. The Marzano model may be more in line with the High Reliability Schools (HRS). He reinforced the administration was not requiring a change in the evaluation model. This was an opportunity to review if Marzano's model was more distinct for the teachers.

Dr. Hocker reviewed the status of the District's HRS level. The District is preparing to complete the Level II status. Dr. Hocker shared positive comments about the District provided to him by Dr. Tammy Heflebower from Marzano. Dr. Heflebower was impressed with the work being done by Dickinson Public Schools.

Superintendent Hocker inquired if the current evaluation system was helping the teachers and if it was helping the teachers to become better. He asked if the current evaluation system could be better and if Marzano's model aligns with effective classroom teaching strategies.

Mrs. Olson responded, after meeting with Dr. Heflebower, it might work more smoothly to change to the Marzano evaluation model. She inquired if the Dickinson Education Association would need to approve a change. She added the language in the Marzano model seemed to align with the elements the District was focusing on.

Mrs. Peterson referenced videos that were submitted by teachers as evidence. She said the evaluation tool needs to be an accurate reflection of the day-to-day classroom experience. It should not be an over-staged teacher performance.

Mrs. King inquired if the video library could become part of the evaluation. She added as a classroom teacher, she would like solid and instant feedback.

Superintendent Hocker reiterated the District could continue to keep using the Danielson evaluation model. He inquired if Marzano could be streamlined and viewed as easier. It cannot be viewed as just another change.

Mrs. Kuelbs said that the District she taught at several years ago introduced the Marzano evaluation model. She suggested if Marzano was rolled out, introduce one element per year. Dr. Hocker agreed to make it as easy as possible as the District does not wish to overwhelm the teachers and administration.

Ms. Weiler thought the language in Marzano was the common language they were already familiar with in the Danielson model. The next step she suggested would be to focus on the ten design areas and where the actions of the students could be recognized.

Mrs. Kathrein said when the District Teacher Evaluation Committee was researching the models, they asked committee members if they felt they could see themselves in it. Mrs. Kathrein said we have changed as individuals since then. She inquired what was the avenue they could get better in their practice and which instrument would be the most useful to them.

Mrs. Nokes said she liked the Marzano evaluation tool. She said the language was easy to understand. Also, the hard work in the instructional model lines up with the elementary. With the Danielson model, the teacher would have to look at the chart to see where they were at. She thought there were a lot of ideas. She could see where she could become better in different areas and could also self-evaluate herself with the rubrics and tools.

Mrs. DeMorrett referenced the professional development that will be attached no matter which evaluation model. She said it needs to be meaningful and to take into consideration if the professional development would be the same for the first-year teacher as the veteran teacher. Ms. Rauser added the teacher is often evaluated once or twice or sometimes three times a year. If a teacher has a bad day and is evaluated, that needs to be taken into consideration. Assistant Superintendent Harris agreed. Students have days when they don't perform as well as they could. We don't put them in tier 2 intervention; therefore, teachers should not be docked for having a bad day.

Dr. Hocker asked the committee, based on the conversation today, what was their recommendation for the next steps. Mrs. Peterson suggested a gradual transition process; review the domains and the professional development. Mrs. Kathrein noted the Marzano model does not provide a rubric for specialty areas. It might be helpful to have a subcommittee that could do some research and bring information back to the group. She wouldn't suggest a subcommittee unless there was a great deal of interest in the Marzano model. Dr. Hocker asked for the committee's thoughts on a subcommittee. Mrs. DeMorrett suggested researching what a rollout would look like and see if it would be worth the time to change. Mrs. Swenson concurred and also agreed with Mrs. Peterson to have a good, slow process. Mrs. Schaeffer added that the rollout needs to be done right and explained and presented to the teachers how this was going to make the process better. Superintendent Hocker concurred and wanted to keep the process transparent.

Dr. Hocker referenced Mrs. Kathrein's suggestion for a subcommittee to be organized to do research. He proposed the subcommittee take the month of March to research and then the School Improvement Leadership Team reconvene in April. Mrs. Kathrein thought that timeline was workable. She added it would be nice to have representation from the elementary, middle school, and high school levels and to be diverse as well. She thought it would take a couple of intense meetings for the subcommittee.

Next Meeting – The next meeting was proposed for mid-April after the subcommittee has had enough time to meet and research and bring back information to the next School Improvement Team meeting.

Adjournment – At 4:53 p.m., the meeting adjourned.

Minutes by Twila Petersen.