



## Teacher Evaluation Instrument Committee

### Minutes

Thursday, May 12, 2016; 4:00 p.m.

Central Administration Office

Present: Superintendent Douglas Sullivan, Mrs. Melanie Kathrein, Ms. Michelle Jaeger, Mrs. Shawna Knipp, Mrs. Trina Kudrna, Mrs. Mandy Lubken, Mrs. Mary Ann Reisenauer, Mrs. Diana Stroud, Ms. Alisha Webster, Mr. Scott Schmidt, Dr. Becky Pitkin, and Dr. Marcus Lewton.

Absent: Mrs. Kathy Mavity, Mrs. Betsy Brandvik, Ms. Naomi Thorson, Mrs. Kay Poland, and Mrs. Tanya Rude.

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

**Additions/Deletions to Agenda Items** – There were no additions or deletions to the agenda.

**Approval of the April 20, 2016, Meeting Minutes** – Dr. Pitkin moved to approve the amended April 20 meeting minutes. Mrs. Lubken seconded the motion. The motion carried unanimously.

### **Business Topics**

**Implementation Updates** – Principal Pitkin from Jefferson Elementary said that she has been re-enforcing that student engagement will be the focus of the implementation in the fall. Mrs. Stroud said she had nothing new to report for Berg Elementary. Mr. Schmidt said at the high school there has been discussion regarding the components and the specialists rubric. Mrs. Kudrna explained at Lincoln they have looked at some possible evidence that could be used. It is compiled so that it can be used as a reference. Mrs. Lubken had nothing new to report for Prairie Rose Elementary. Ms. Webster had nothing new to report from Hagen Junior High. Ms. Jaeger and Mrs. Knipp felt everything was up to date at Heart River Elementary. Dr. Lewton explained at Hagen Junior High they were using 3C out of the book and making recommendations or asking questions for clarity.

**Components for Specialists Rubrics** – Mrs. Kathrein noted the components this year in the evaluation for the classroom teachers were selected by this committee. There are individual administrators touching base with the specialists to review the rubric and comparing the specialist rubric to the teacher rubric. Teacher engagement will be introduced into the evaluation this fall. There will be similar components for the specialists so that they can connect that to the professional development. There has been post observation questions and feedback gathered. Mrs. Kathrein said the Cabinet has referred the specialist evaluation back to this committee to get their input. Dr. Pitkin said she has questioned the elementary counselor and they feel that the counseling would be different at the elementary level than at the high school. The elementary counselors are in the classroom more, sometimes four times a week. Dr. Pitkin explained the Jefferson counselor did not have many changes to the rubric but when visiting with Principal Dockter at the high school, those counselors have a different role. Dr. Pitkin inquired if there needs to be a different counselor rubric at the high school. Mrs. Kathrein said that grades 7-12 met and they liked the newer rubric. Instead of doing the pre-observation questions they would use the goal setting as their pre-observation tool. Dr. Pitkin inquired if the elementary principals would also be using the goal setting as the pre-observation tool. Mrs. Kathrein responded they could go that route but they should consider what is

most useful. Mrs. Kathrein inquired if the elementary counselors liked the newer rubric better. Dr. Pitkin responded they did, it was more in alignment with the PLC. Mrs. Knipp inquired if there was a special education rubric. Mrs. Kathrein thought that Mrs. Cook and Ms. Libis were looking into that rubric.

Implementation of New/Updated Rubrics – Mrs. Kathrein discussed the counselor rubric and a rubric for special education. The administrative team did not think everyone was going to agree to use the additional information. The scenarios are very specific to the type of student. It appears to be geared towards upper grades. She added some areas seemed very specialized and unreachable. Mrs. Kathrein inquired if the scenario that was being evaluated if it was a helpful tool to bring some support in understanding the special education classroom. Mrs. Knipp responded that she thought it would do that; the evaluator is going to look at it and put a lot of time into it and some areas do not apply. Ms. Jaeger added that there are a lot of lessons and it would not be possible on a day to day basis. There was discussion regarding reachable targets and proficiency.

Formal and Informal Evidence – Superintendent Sullivan asked Mrs. Kudrna if she would share with the group the work that has been done at Lincoln on gathering examples for evidence. Mrs. Kudrna said the Lincoln team looked at the components and came up with different ways of evidence that are showing the component as being met and different tools. The Lincoln team got together and discussed what would be a strategy. Dr. Sullivan said he has seen the document and thought it could be done very quickly in a brain storming session. He asked the committee if they thought it would be interested in doing something similar. It was his intention to take this idea back to Cabinet and have Ms. Praus talk about the process that the Lincoln team went through. He would take it to Cabinet at the July meeting. Dr. Sullivan wanted to reiterate that formal evidence is the formal observation of the classroom and provides specific evidence to the principal regarding the component. Informal evidence is the walk through. This group has said that the walk through should be underneath the informal evidence and the informal evidence is gathered anytime during the day.

New Teacher Phase In of Components – Superintendent Sullivan reviewed a previous discussion when comparing a new teacher with no experience and a new teacher with 13 years of experience. It was the sentiments of this group that a teacher with no experience would have less components on the evaluation. It was his understanding this group preferred to phase in the components for the new teacher with no experience. Dr. Sullivan explained the administrators needed to discuss the definition of a first year teacher. The committee has not decided when the phase in will be. It would be beneficial for the committee to make that decision as Mrs. Kathrein is putting together a handbook with information collected from this committee so that it doesn't have to be recreated. Dr. Sullivan wanted to make sure there was no objection to using the same sequence. Since everyone in the committee was a veteran teacher he wanted to get their input when they look back as their first year in the district. Mrs. Lubken said that she taught first grade for years and then changed to second grade. It was like it was brand new with new curriculum. She agreed with Dr. Sullivan that it should be phased in. Mrs. Reisenauer suggested adding on more components more rapidly. Mrs. Knipp suggested phasing in the components. Mrs. Kathrein said there could be a chance they could score higher. Mrs. Lubken responded that was the advantage of this year. She had hoped she scored higher than a first year teacher. Ms. Jaeger noted there are changes from school district to school district and from grade level to grade level; it is a new environment and a new setting. Mr. Schmidt inquired if it isn't so much about the score as it is the learning and the growth, why not have all the components. Why not have it in the back of their mind to go with all the components right away?

When he started teaching it was the same evaluation for him as someone with experience. Does it make a difference for an administrator or a teacher? If the teacher is told this is the evaluation and these are the components it would make it easier on the administrators and the teachers. Mrs. Kathrein felt if it was about growth and the components are all new it would be easier to achieve growth if there were fewer components at a time. She added grasping what the components say and then the principal giving an effective feedback on them would provide growth. Dr. Lewton added if that was the case then shouldn't it be differentiating in teachers; some of six and some of 16. Dr. Sullivan said this committee will address those questions this fall. When the 22 components are implemented are some of those components for every teacher with some just for the experienced teacher.

Other – Dr. Sullivan expressed his deepest appreciation for the time and commitment the committee members have dedicated to this process. He hopes they feel that their input has been included in the process and has made it more meaningful. The next meeting will be scheduled for the month of September. Twila will send an email in August to find a date for the September meeting. He wished everyone a great summer.

**Adjournment** – At 4:38 p.m. the meeting adjourned.