



## **Teacher Evaluation Instrument Committee**

### **Minutes**

**December 14, 2016; 4:00 p.m.  
Central Administration Office**

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

Absent: Ms. Alisha Webster and Mrs. Kay Poland.

**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** – There were no additions or deletions to the agenda.

**Approval of the November 16, 2016, Meeting Minutes** – The November 16 meeting minutes were revised to reflect the committee's discussion regarding optional components (minimum of one and maximum of two optional components to be selected in the spring prior to the year of implementation.) Mr. Schmidt moved to approve the corrected meeting minutes. Dr. Lewton seconded the motion. The motion carried unanimously.

### **Business Topics**

**Annual Required Components and Implementation Updates-** Superintendent Sullivan requested committee members share discussions they have had at their buildings regarding the components and implementation. Mrs. Knipp reported Heart River has not had much discussion regarding next year. She added the speech pathologist questions were not open enough when they were doing their observation plan; there wasn't an area where they could answer the question. When they had visited with Mrs. Martinson they developed their own questions. They ended up answering the teacher questions because they couldn't find their own questions to answer. Mrs. Kathrein said she was checking with the technology specialists regarding that concern. Mrs. Knipp reported that most individuals at Heart River have had their first observation. Mrs. Lubken reported that she has not heard any concerns or issues at Prairie Rose. Teachers seemed to be pleased with the components that were chosen. There is a staff meeting at Prairie Rose on Friday. Mrs. Kudrna reported there have been no concerns at Lincoln. Mrs. Mavity reported the Jefferson teachers seemed to be in consensus with the component choices. Mr. Schmidt reported the high school teachers also had no concerns. There have been some walk throughs done and they seem to be going fine. Mrs. Stroud reported the teachers at Berg were satisfied with the components that were chosen. She knows there have been walk throughs done and she has not heard any concerns. Mrs. Reisenauer reported the only concern from Roosevelt was clarification regarding the number of optional components; now that the November minutes are revised she can report there are 1-2 optional components. Mrs. Brandvik reported she is on the agenda for the upcoming staff meeting at Hagen Junior High.

Teacher Evaluation Handbook – Superintendent Sullivan requested input from committee members regarding the draft teacher evaluation handbook. Mrs. Lubken suggested noting the core components with an asterisk. Dr. Sullivan said he would do that and additionally will put it within the contents and have it referenced. Mr. Schmidt inquired how much would change in the final draft and asked if the final draft could be emailed to the committee one more time. Dr. Sullivan responded he would make the change on page 6 regarding the optional components to reflect 1-2 and the optional components would be decided at the building level in the spring prior to the implementation. He would then send the handbook out to the committee members and if there was no feedback he would remove the “draft” watermark. Dr. Sullivan asked if there were more comments. There were none shared.

New Teacher Phase-In of Components – Dr. Sullivan said this committee had a discussion some time ago regarding the evaluation instrument and how it relates to the hiring of new teachers. Some new teacher hires have had experience and some have just graduated from college. The conversation regarding phasing in components for new teachers was not finalized. Superintendent Sullivan asked for input and questioned if eight components were too many for a brand new teacher. Mrs. Knipp said she is the mentor for Heart River. She has asked two of the new teachers how they feel about the teacher evaluation instrument. One is an experienced teacher and one just graduated from college. The brand new teacher felt that he would like to be evaluated the same as his peers and other employees in the building rather than to be held at a lower standard. The other teacher felt that, even though she was new to the District, each year is a growth and she didn’t feel a need to change the evaluation process. They both felt they would like to be evaluated like their peers. Mrs. Brandvik said when she reflects back to her first year she would have wanted it to be the same and be evaluated the same as others. Mrs. Lubken said she asked a new teacher in her building if it was difficult to be evaluated on the 12 components. The teacher responded that she was just trying to do the best that she could on a daily basis. There is so much to absorb and adjust. Mrs. Lubken thought the new teacher at Prairie Rose had a good growth mentality. Mrs. Lubken felt that going in with eight components instead of 12 might be better. Mrs. Knipp said that having all 22 components at one time is too much for anyone to grasp. With the fewer components it is putting them at a manageable amount and shows the true side of teaching, what the teachers are striving for and growing towards. The high school representatives felt that the professional development was something that should be reviewed. Dr. Sullivan asked if they were suggesting bringing the new teachers in before the school year begins and incorporating the teacher evaluation instrument into the agenda. Mrs. Brandvik felt that would be appropriate since the new teachers should know the building level goals. Mrs. Kathrein said they have done that with the new teachers. It was fairly minimal training during orientation. To consider going beyond that might be challenging for the new teachers since there is so much to absorb in such a short amount of time. There were some suggestions provided on how the information for the core components could be shared and tabbed for the new teachers. Mrs. Lubken thought it would be too much to go into great detail for the new teachers to absorb. The new teachers are already thinking about all the curriculum, learning the new faces, the elementary benchmarks, and more. The teacher wouldn’t have time to start thinking about the evaluation process, even if they were exposed to it earlier, until they are actually evaluated. Mrs. Kathrein agreed that the intent was not to stress the new teachers right away during orientation. She added the teacher evaluation information was minimally shared this fall with the new teachers and they were provided a booklet and information on Frontline.

Review Formal and Informal Evidence – Superintendent Sullivan noted on pages 6-7 of the evaluation handout there are portions regarding formal evidence. He asked for committee members

to comment on the formal evidence section. Dr. Lewton noted on page 7 there were roles of the administrator. He said he has not been giving feedback. Mrs. Brandvik and Mrs. Lubken both reported they have not received feedback until the post observation. Mrs. Lubken added she felt there would be a better discussion if she could have received the feedback, especially in areas where she needs to grow.

Dr. Sullivan asked for input regarding the informal evidence section on page 7. Mrs. Lubken inquired if teachers were to receive written feedback after each walk through. Dr. Sullivan responded that was something that was to be decided at the building level. Mrs. Kathrein noted it is included in Frontline.

Mrs. Kathrein reminded committee members to share with others in their building regarding the potential for the emails regarding the teacher evaluation to be in the junk email or from a non-identifiable sender.

Superintendent Sullivan thanked the committee members for their work and appreciated the efforts they have gone through and the communication they have shared with their building peers. Since a lot of work had been covered it was not necessary to have a January meeting.

The next meeting was scheduled for Tuesday, February 14 at 4:00 p.m.

Other – There were no other topics for discussion.

**Adjournment** – The meeting adjourned at 4:41 p.m.