

Teacher Evaluation Instrument Committee

Minutes

October 11, 2016; 4:00 p.m.

Central Administration Office

Present: Superintendent Douglas Sullivan, Mrs. Melanie Kathrein, Mrs. Shawna Knipp, Mrs. Kathy Mavity, Mrs. Mandy Lubken, Mrs. Mary Ann Reisenauer, Mrs. Diana Stroud, Mrs. Sara Streeter, Ms. Naomi Thorson, Mrs. Kay Poland, Mrs. Tanya Rude, Dr. Marcus Lewton, and Mrs. Betsy Brandvik.

Absent: Mrs. Trina Kudrna, Ms. Alisha Webster, and Mr. Scott Schmidt.

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

Meeting Norms – The meeting norms were available on the agenda.

Additions/Deletions to Agenda Items – Superintendent Sullivan added the topic of “Annual Required Components.”

Approval of the September 13, 2016, Meeting Minutes – Mrs. Rude moved to approve the September 13 meeting minutes, as presented. Mrs. Brandvik seconded the motion. The motion carried unanimously.

Business Topics

Implementation Updates – Most buildings reported there had been an introductory discussion or completed the discussion regarding choosing the top ten core components. Some buildings have started the pre-observation conferences.

Teacher Evaluation Handbook – Superintendent Sullivan thanked Ms. Thorson for her input on revising the July version of the Teacher Evaluation Handbook. He referenced some changes that had been made. Dr. Sullivan noted at the bottom of page 7 there was a modification based on the conversation at the September meeting. Mrs. Rude said that she and Mrs. Schwartz had reviewed the handbook and questioned the minimum of four walk-throughs and felt this would be cumbersome. Mrs. Brandvik responded at Hagen Junior High there was a paper copy that the administrator used to take notes and then a copy was provided to the teacher by the end of the day. She appreciated the prompt feedback. Mrs. Kathrein noted that one of the new components of Frontline is additional computerized forms which puts everything in one place. It will be challenging for a while until administrators become familiar with the process. She noted that the walk-throughs are a minimum of five minutes. Administrators may decide to stay for more than five minutes which is acceptable. It may take additional time to look for certain components and therefore there is no maximum amount of time set for the walk throughs/informal evidence. Mrs. Rude shared that there are a lot of students and a lot of teachers. She felt that requesting the administrator to review a classroom for at least five minutes or more was a lot of time and involvement for both the administrator and the teacher. Teachers are also disciplining the students in the classroom. Dr. Lewton explained that the paper version of the walk throughs/informal evidence was done at Hagen to give the teachers a trial example of the process of the walk throughs/informal evidence. In the future the Hagen administrators will be utilizing the forms on the computer. He felt the committee needed to focus on how many components and appreciated the 5-10 minutes he gets to watch the teacher in the classroom as he can then listen and then type and then listen some more and type some more and finalize his form. He felt that four

sessions at five minutes or more was attainable for him as an administrator. He will be more proficient with more experience. Mrs. Rude inquired if Dr. Lewton felt that four walk throughs/informal evidence was enough. He responded that the number one job of the principal is instructional leadership. He couldn't speak for the other administrators but he would like at least four and plans to do more than four. He will do more but some will not be written down. Mrs. Lubken said as a teacher she would want at least four. When testing students in her classroom they are given different tests. She would want the same opportunity and would want to be formally assessed from someone else's perspective so she can be better as a teacher. She thought the walk throughs/informal evidence were really important; that it is the heart and soul of why they are here.

Superintendent Sullivan referenced back to the handbook and the revisions. He explained on page 8 and 9 there were last minute modifications prior to the last meeting. Dr. Sullivan asked if there were any additional changes or corrections. There were no additional changes or corrections noted. Superintendent Sullivan said the handbook would be sent out one more time and then will be considered for adoption at the meeting as a guiding handbook for the teacher evaluation instrument implementation. He noted the handbook will be a work in progress as this committee makes conditions or make changes that will affect the content of the handbook.

New Teacher Phase in of Components – Dr. Sullivan said there had been extensive discussion the second semester of last school year regarding the components that new teachers would be evaluated. The discussion was whether to use the same schedule from the veteran teachers for the new teachers right out of college. Mrs. Reisenauer inquired if the new teacher and the principal could come up with two or three components for them to work on. Superintendent Sullivan felt that having just two or three a year would make it difficult. He was hoping this committee would have the discussion about what to do with the ten or eight components or the amount of six components that Dr. Lewton used as an example. There was discussion regarding comparing differentiating students on a daily basis and also doing this for new teachers. The consensus of the committee was to move the discussion towards the annual required components and then come back to this topic.

Annual Required Components – Dr. Sullivan reminded the committee there were 22 components that they were requested to take back to their building and narrow it down to a maximum of ten core components. Superintendent Sullivan collected the input from the building representatives and displayed them on an easel. He also included the Cabinet's feedback for the ten core components. One outlying component was reported by Cabinet and Mrs. Lubken inquired the reasoning as it could be something the teachers had not thought about. Dr. Lewton responded 1f (Designing Student Assessments), which was the outlier, was important to the Cabinet due to the PLC process of foundationally tying it to 3d (Using Assessment in Instruction). Mr. Leiss had explained at Cabinet that the core components of the foundation of teaching were 1c (Setting Instructional Outcomes), 1f (Designing Student Assessments), and 3a (Communicating with Students). Mrs. Kathrein added that Cabinet talked at length about what were the foundational things the District was working on; such as PLC, PBIS, etc. The PLC addressed the common formative assessment. Mrs. Lubken explained there is no control over the assessments and the standards based report cards. There was discussion regarding formative assessments and why 3d (Using Assessment in Instruction) may or may not be more important. There was additional discussion by the committee regarding communication. Teachers communicate with parents, counselors, and other individuals. There are different modes of communication. Committee members justified why certain components made it into the top ten components from their school. Consensus from the committee was to accept the following as five of the top ten core components.

- 2a (Creating an Environment of Respect and Rapport)
- 2c (Managing Classroom Procedures)

- 2d (Managing Student Behavior)
- 3a (Communicating with Students)
- 3c (Engaging Students in Learning)

There were six components temporarily removed as potential consideration for the top ten core components (1d, 1f, 2e, 3b, 4b, and 4e). Committee members were asked to review these six components with the teachers in their building and rank them from 1-6 with “1” being the most important of the six.

Additionally, committee members were asked to go back to the buildings and out of the remaining 11 components (1a, 1b, 1c, 1e, 2b, 3d, 3e, 4a, 4c, 4d, and 4f) they were to choose and rank the remaining 11 components. These rankings from each building would be brought to the next meeting and the top components may be added to the five agreed upon core components. Rankings would be from 1-11 with “1” being the most important of these 11.

Update on Specialist Rubrics and Forms - Due to time constraints this agenda topic was tabled.

Review Formal and Informal Evidence – Due to time constraints this agenda topic was tabled.

Future Meetings Schedule – The next meeting is scheduled for November 16. The December meeting is scheduled for December 14.

Other – Superintendent Sullivan thanked the committee members for their time and commitment.

Adjournment – The meeting adjourned at 5:00 p.m.