

Teacher Evaluation Instrument Committee

Minutes

Wednesday, March 16, 2016; 4:00 p.m.; Central Office

Present: Superintendent Douglas Sullivan, Mrs. Melanie Kathrein, Ms. Michele Jaeger, Mrs. Trina Kudrna, Mrs. Mandy Lubken, Mrs. Shawna Knipp, Ms. Naomi Thorson, Dr. Becky Pitkin, Mrs. Diana Stroud, and Mr. Scott Schmidt,

Absent: Mrs. Kathy Mavity, Mrs. Betsy Brandvik, Mrs. Mary Ann Reisenauer, Mrs. Kay Poland, Ms. Alisha Webster, Dr. Marcus Lewton, 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 February 24, 2016, Meeting Minutes – Mrs. Lubken moved to approve the February 24 meeting minutes, as presented. Ms. Jaeger seconded the motion. The motion carried unanimously.

Business Topics

Implementation Updates – Dr. Sullivan called on representatives from the schools and asked for feedback. Mrs. Stroud (Berg) reported she had not received any feedback. Ms. Jaeger and Mrs. Knipp (Heart River) presented to a group at Heart River. They thought it went very well. Ms. Jaeger said sometimes the teachers will hear from one building that it is a bad experience and then they find out they didn't have the right facts. Mr. Schmidt (DHS) felt that it should be made clear if it is part of the background or part of the evaluation. There was discussion regarding the principal communicating with the teacher. Committee members shared there were walk throughs anywhere from 1.5 minutes to 40 minutes. Dr. Sullivan agreed that it is important for the principal and teacher to communicate and discuss the process. He will have a conversation with Cabinet and make sure everyone is on the same page adding a shift of conversation from equitable instead of equal. Mrs. Knipp felt it was important for the principal to gather enough information to gain the insight they need to adequately observe the teacher's ability. There was discussion regarding viewing the classroom during the start of the lesson or only during the ending of a lesson. If the principal only picks up the beginning segment or only the ending segment of a lesson plan, he/she is missing an important portion of the lesson plan.

Committee members discussed the TeachScape program and its capabilities. Not all committee members were aware of the tabs to use for finding the summary or finding the written part. Mrs. Kathrein suggested putting together some help sheets and maybe a manual to explain the different pieces. That is maybe something this group could tackle over the summer and review by this group and say what needs to be changed and what is useful. Mrs. Lubken inquired what the training in the fall would include. Mrs. Kathrein explained the training is more on the components. Mr. Schmidt suggested removing some parts of TeachScape that are not being used. He mentioned the written evaluation and the goals. Mrs. Kathrein responded that some school are using the goals function. Mrs. Lubken (Prairie Rose) said at her building there were generally no concerns. Some of the teachers didn't realize that they had to complete the reflection part after the evaluation. Some clarification might be needed since the teacher may need to reflect on a lesson that they talked about some time ago. She added it looks like it is going well. Dr. Sullivan thanked the committee for the information they shared.

Components for Specialists Rubrics – The committee has talked about the components for classroom teachers and also those for the other specialist rubrics. Mrs. Kathrein said the committee tried to take the components used for classroom teachers and match it with components on the specialist’s rubrics that were similar. All rubrics had some components in each domain. How do we decide going forward what components will be on specialist rubrics? Professional development at the beginning of the year will focus on the components on the teacher rubric. Would they like to use the same process as last year in which the initial work was done at Cabinet? It would be possible to take the teachers’ components and try to match them up and maybe send them out to the specialists to see if they agree. Dr. Sullivan inquired if the components this year were uniform across when they were implemented. Mrs. Kathrein responded they were close but not identical. She added that she did not think the administrators found it hard to match. There is a comparable component on another rubric. Next year’s professional development is on student engagement. It is important that the components selected for specialists include that. Ms. Thorson inquired if the administration could make that comparison. Dr. Sullivan said the special education rubric is not available. There is a three year timeframe implementation as a teacher with a different group added next year. Mrs. Kathrein did not think the components were that different for special education. Dr. Sullivan asked if they would align with special education and still add the other component. Mrs. Kathrein thought it was out but it would need to be reviewed. Dr. Sullivan suggested taking it back to Cabinet. Mrs. Knipp thought the domains would fit her. Mrs. Kathrein suggested not thinking special education is just one entity. She thought Mrs. Martinson and Mrs. Twist could look at the rubric and see if it fits. Ms. Jaeger agreed. Dr. Sullivan said he would take it back to Cabinet and get recommendations.

Implementation of New/Updated Rubrics – Mrs. Kathrein thought the Danielson model looks at the rubric for the two specialists, reviews it and updates it over time. She added that maybe by 2019 there may be examples to review and revise to the District’s specifications. It is her understanding the counselor rubric and the special education rubric are almost identical. The rubrics are a free tool to use. They are part of the professional development and TeachScape tool. Mrs. Lubken thought it was a case-by-case and didn’t think it should be unilaterally adopted for DPS. Mrs. Kudrna agreed. Mrs. Kathrein said the new rubrics are on the website and suggested the committee members have a discussion at their buildings; review the rubrics, vote on them, and bring the input back to the next meeting. There was a discussion about when to make a switch. Dr. Sullivan agreed that the building representatives should sit down and meet with the counselors and the special education staff and review the material and bring back a summary from the discussion.

Student Achievement Data – Dr. Sullivan informed the committee there are some discussions going on outside of this committee and outside of DPS that may have implications. He will keep this item on the agenda. Until this committee can discuss it again it will be a tabled item.

Next Meeting Date Scheduled – The next meeting was scheduled for Wednesday, April 20 at 4:00 p.m. Dr. Sullivan noted that the April meeting would be the last meeting for this school year unless something unusual would happen. He told committee members that he appreciated their work and everything they are doing for the committee. He asked committee members to share information with other faculty in the building as that is an important part in the implementation process.

Other – There were no other topics for discussion.

Adjournment – The meeting adjourned at 4:37 p.m.