



## Teacher Evaluation Instrument Committee

### Minutes

Wednesday, April 20, 2016; 4:00 p.m.

Central Administration Office

Present: Superintendent Douglas Sullivan, Mrs. Shawna Knipp, Mrs. Trina Kudrna, Mrs. Kathy Mavity, Mrs. Mandy Lubken, Mrs. Mary Ann Reisenauer, Mrs. Diana Stroud, Mrs. Betsy Brandvik, Ms. Alisha Webster, Mr. Scott Schmidt, and Dr. Becky Pitkin.

Absent: Mrs. Melanie Kathrein, Ms. Michele Jaeger, Ms. Naomi Thorson, Mrs. Kay Poland, 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 March 16, 2016, Meeting Minutes** – Mrs. Knipp moved to approve the March 16 meeting minutes, as presented. Mrs. Mavity seconded the motion. The motion carried unanimously.

### **Business Topics**

**Implementation Updates** – Dr. Sullivan asked for feedback regarding the implementation process. Mrs. Mavity reported that she thought things were going well at Jefferson. Information was being shared at faculty meetings. They have discussed different ways parents may communicate to the building and administration and compiling different ways to communicate with parents. Mrs. Stroud reported there has been no discussion at Berg. Mr. Schmidt reported that they are gathering information from specialists and counselors. Mrs. Reisenauer said there are questions regarding the walk throughs at Roosevelt. There seems to be no feedback and the faculty are questioning that. They would like more feedback on the walk throughs; however, they don't want to make it overwhelming for the principal. An email from the principal with suggested changes would be helpful. Mrs. Reisenauer said she was looking for things to improve on. Dr. Sullivan asked what kind of feedback they were getting. Mrs. Reisenauer responded that some individuals were receiving an email. She personally didn't get anything and would like something. Mrs. Brandvik reported at Hagen the administrator has printed off certain items and when the administrator is in her room he/she is taking notes on her rubric. At the end of the day Mrs. Brandvik received the rubric with comments. Mrs. Lubken said the teachers at Prairie Rose are more focused on what is happening. Ms. Webster said at Hagen they are color coding the documents; the first walk through is on yellow paper, the second one is on pink. There is feedback on where she was for the first walk through and where she is now. Mrs. Brandvik added that the feedback is helpful. It provides the administrators thoughts and suggestions. She added she appreciated the walk through before the evaluation; to be effective there needs to be communication and feedback. Mrs. Lubken explained the walk throughs didn't happen until the main evaluation. She didn't get any feedback before that; she only received her final walk through and found out it didn't mean anything at that point. Mrs. Reisenauer said she didn't want to be negative but her principal couldn't come to her scheduled evaluation because there were some students that he had to tend to. She said her evaluation didn't coincide with the pre-evaluation. Ms. Webster said at Hagen there has been some discussion on the specialists. Mrs. Brandvik added that they talked about the components for the walk throughs and

felt it wasn't an official evaluation. Mrs. Kudrna, from Lincoln, inquired about looking at the specialists. Mrs. Reisenauer said she sent feedback to Mrs. Kathrein regarding the counselor rubric. Mrs. Knipp said that other buildings are doing walk throughs and having the same discussion. At Heart River a survey was sent out to find out which way the staff prefer communicating the information from the principal. Previously the principal would have a conference with the teacher and Mrs. Cook would provide feedback at the conference. The survey requested if the teachers prefer to continue the face-to-face or change to an email. Staff will continue the discussion at the next Heart River staff meeting.

Implementation of New/Updated Rubrics – Dr. Sullivan noted there have been some concerns regarding the rubric for specialists. He asked for feedback. Mr. Schmidt reported at the high school there has only been a little information received. He asked if the process could be slowed down to get the specialists up to speed with the different information and different tools with the specialists and counselors using the same tools as the (classroom) teachers. He added it would be good to find something that covers more areas. Mrs. Reisenauer said she forwarded some information to Mrs. Kathrein that she had received. Ms. Webster reported she is a specialist. The document for the teacher fit some of her day. It would fit the specialist if they have one child. There are some concerns with co-teaching. Teachers are in the classroom with a teacher and not co-teaching. Specialists can't do that on their own. They would have to have the preparation time to set up for it. The specialists thought they might be docked for that. Mrs. Kudrna said she had nothing to report from Lincoln. Mrs. Lubken said two of the specialists from Prairie Rose got back to her and felt better. It didn't seem like it was a new rubric. Mrs. Mavity and Dr. Pitkin agreed. Mrs. Brandvik said she had gotten the same feedback. She inquired if there was an actual specialist rubric. The counselors were fine with the information. Mrs. Knipp said she reviewed the rubric with two of the specialists at Heart River and they thought it was more of a scenario, more for higher education instead of elementary education. The Domain 1 example videos seemed very extensive, the things that would be required in those scenarios were for a specific disability or another specific behavior. It should almost combine two and then look at the specialist's job and what they do. They talked about home visits which we don't do. Above and beyond each is different. Some of the wording seems unclear in their minds. The other part is it seemed the higher the needs for the student then the higher the points. If the teacher doesn't have those high needs that fit into the categories then their situation would fit in at a lower category. Mrs. Knipp had notations of every domain and every section. Domain 2 and 4 looked good, domain 3 was tough as far as IEP specific. Mrs. Knipp discussed teaching a lesson and differentiating the lesson to all the students. This is difficult with nine students in one group. Pinpointing every target in the IEP in the lesson to meet IEP would be very challenging. With her having 34 students it is hard to be proficient. Mrs. Lubken asked Mrs. Knipp if she felt the current rubric would be more beneficial to her. Mrs. Knipp responded that it would. Mrs. Knipp had gone through it page by page. Dr. Pitkin from Jefferson reported the PLC counselors were meeting on Friday. They had a preconference but not a post conference. The counselor at Jefferson felt the questions fit very well, they were fine and the rubric was evident in each area. They are going to take it to the PLC on Friday. Mr. Schmidt said there is a lack of understanding what those individuals really do. He suggested those individuals meet and go through it line by line in addition to this committee. Mrs. Knipp reported the speech pathologists are going to be meeting with Mrs. Martinson and going through the rubric. Dr. Sullivan said at a Cabinet meeting there was a discussion and the administrators have been assigned to specific groups. Dr. Sullivan listed the groups. The administrators will sit down and meet with the individuals and have a conversation regarding the rubric and what would be the best way to make it fit. Dr. Sullivan reminded the committee members they had been working on this for three years and it could

possibly be another three years. He added the committee knew there were going to be some bumps in the road. He asked the committee members to keep doing what they were doing and bringing feedback to this table. Hopefully there will be some good involvement and good work out of the groups so some of the concerns can be addressed from the specialists and others that don't completely align with the teacher evaluation. This item will remain on the agenda and hopefully more information can be shared at the next meeting.

Formal and Informal Evidence – Superintendent Sullivan said the administrators have discussed at Cabinet how the District is working with the teacher to gather evidence. This discussion included the formal and informal evaluation. The formal evidence gathering occurs during the classroom observation. Dr. Sullivan distributed a sheet with the implementation schedule on one side and the domains listed on the reverse side. He gave an example, when doing a formal evaluation or walk through, in certain instances such as SPED, the ability to gather information is limited. They are not teaching a classroom of parents but students. The conversation at Cabinet evolved and it was suggested to discontinue using the terminology of “walk through”. Some individuals commented to their principal that the walk through is where the information is gathered. The sentiment of the Cabinet members is that informal information could be gathered at any time. Dr. Sullivan used an example when Carson Wentz was being evaluated by the NFL. He asked the group when they thought he was being evaluated. Dr. Sullivan responded the minute Carson got off the airplane until he went back on the airplane. The discussion at Cabinet said the teacher could be down at the end of the hallway having a positive interaction with a student who has exploded during class. Dr. Sullivan felt that teacher would like that to be part of the evaluation. He referenced that 50% of the evaluation is gathered information which was previously called “walk throughs”. At the Cabinet level the formal observation was more about the classroom environment and instruction. Cabinet members felt that this committee needed to have a conversation regarding the term “walk throughs” no longer being utilized and how the District could go about gathering “informal” evidence on some of the indicators on the domains. Dr. Pitkin responded that she thought teachers are comfortable with examples of evidence. She gave examples of a teacher participating in school projects or initiating their own projects. There was lengthy discussion by committee members regarding not wanting to “ring their own bell” or constantly calling the administrator’s attention to special things they do or even reoccurring things they do, such as having students with them when they are eating lunch. There were many different examples shared. Mrs. Brandvik inquired what happens when there is no evidence gathered. Will that hurt the teacher’s evaluation? Should the administrator receive a copy of information sent home to parents? There are so many things teachers do behind the scenes that would go unnoticed and without evidence. This would solely rely on the principal gathering artifacts. Mrs. Kudrna said she feels she should be constantly improving and didn’t think she should “toot her own horn” because it is part of her job. Other committee members agreed. Mrs. Reisenauer added that the administrators are busy and may not see things throughout their day. Mrs. Knipp felt the committee should give more credit to the administrators. They know which teachers are doing things behind the scenes. They know those that come in early and stay late. They know which ones are coming in on weekends. She did agree there should be some sort of evidence for each teacher and the principal will have the mindset. Mrs. Brandvik referenced a domain where the scenario is a student correcting another student. There is no behavior, no evidence. It is very objective and very rubric driven. Where would her score fall? There is no misbehavior therefore there would not be a score of a “4”. Dr. Pitkin felt it was worded differently and it would be okay. Mrs. Mavity said she shows up for work and does her job. It wouldn’t make a difference if Dr. Pitkin would come in 57 times, she would still be doing her job. Mrs. Mavity asked for clarification; will it be bulleted points for the informal evaluation. There was discussion regarding the principal

seeing the informal information and if the principal is not seeing it to come and ask for the evidence. Dr. Sullivan reported there has been resistance in using the terminology of “walk through” and moving away from that terminology and use language similar to “formal” and “informal”. Ms. Webster suggested calling “walk throughs” “informal evidence”. Dr. Sullivan noted the goal of a minimum of four walk throughs a year is still in place. Mrs. Knipp understood that the informal evidence bullet was previously the walk throughs.

New Teacher Phase In of Components – Dr. Sullivan distributed a handout that listed the Danielson Teacher Evaluation Model Implementation Schedule. The chart was discussed at Cabinet and should be fully implemented by the 2017-2018 school year because there are two years identified with year three to be determined. In year three the entire instrument could be in place. Dr. Sullivan asked if there are new teachers hired in year three, would it be fair for them to be evaluated under the entire implementation schedule. Cabinet members thought maybe this committee could develop some guidelines regarding new teachers in the District. Mr. Schmidt noted that when he started he could get certified without a student teaching environment. When it came time for his evaluation his evaluation was the same as every other teacher. If all the areas are implemented the evaluator is not going to see everything in a 45 minute observation any way. He added that some of the teachers had comments on transition. He said on his particular day he did not have a transition and therefore would not hit every domain. He would like a “4” on every one and asked the administrator and was told that he didn’t think that was possible unless administration is half of the teaching time. Dr. Sullivan responded that Mr. Schmidt made a good point. Another conversation this committee needs to have is regarding the goal. Is the goal for the teacher to be evaluated on each domain or is the goal for the teacher to be evaluated on specific indicators in the domains. It becomes more personalized and more of a supervision model where the teacher and the administrator collaborate. Dr. Sullivan agreed with Mr. Schmidt that it is going to be difficult to see all of the areas. He reminded the committee that the trainer said “Four is where you visit, you don’t live there.” Mrs. Brandvik said she would like to see where the teacher sets goals. Dr. Pitkin agreed, they would like to see that as part of the evaluation. It would be a collaborative discussion between the administrator and the teacher, areas to improve and ask where they can grow. Mr. Schmidt said that communication with families is instantaneous with PowerSchool. As soon as a grade is posted the parent can see it. Mrs. Knipp did not feel that was a conversation with the parent.

Other – Dr. Sullivan thanked the committee for their input. The next meeting was scheduled for Thursday, May 12 at 4:00 p.m. The agenda would remain the same as this meeting.

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