

## **Teacher Evaluation Instrument Committee**

### **Minutes**

**November 16, 2016; 4:00 p.m.**

**Central Administration Office**

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

Absent: Mrs. Kathy Mavity, Mrs. Mandy Lubken, Mrs. Betsy Brandvik, and Ms. Alisha Webster.

**Call to Order** – Superintendent Sullivan called the meeting to order at 4:03 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 October 11, 2016, Meeting Minutes** – Mrs. Knipp moved to approve the meeting minutes, as presented. Mrs. Reisenauer seconded the motion. The motion carried unanimously.

### **Business Topics**

**Annual Required Components** – Superintendent Sullivan displayed a spreadsheet template on the projector screen and input the results of the rankings by building from the list of non-core components. The non-core components were selected from a list of the October 2016 Prioritizing Components handout. There were mixed responses reported by the building representatives. Mrs. Kathrein suggested grouping together components that were related. Dr. Lewton concurred and added that 12 components would be overwhelming. Mrs. Kudrna also agreed to group together related components. Mrs. Knipp inquired what other districts that had selected the Danielson Framework were doing for structuring the evaluation system, such as Bismarck Public. Mrs. Kathrein responded that the consultant was using a national scope. The district needs to make its own decision that fit its needs. Mrs. Kudrna used an example from another school district that was using a total of 4-5 components; the district selected three components and the school or teacher/principal selected one or two additional components. Mrs. Streeter explained that if all the components were used then there would be more areas to be scored on and there might be higher scores. She added that maybe it is more of a growth model where the administrators are trying to grow the teacher and build on their capital. Mrs. Kathrein suggested maybe a different set of components for the new teachers. Dr. Sullivan asked the committee if they were suggesting to use the original five and, by looking at the spreadsheet, adding 1B which seemed to demonstrate strong support across the district. Consensus was to use those six as the core components. Dr. Sullivan noted the core six components could always be brought back to the table for further discussion. Consensus was there would be two to three components, in addition to the core six, that would be added and used for growth models. There was discussion if the growth-model components would be chosen at the teacher level or collectively at the building level. Because some buildings have goals in place and input from all teachers was preferred, the consensus was the additional components would be selected collectively at the building level in the spring. There was discussion if Frontline was capable of having different components at different buildings. It was apparent this committee would need to communicate with all teachers in their building so they understood, even though there

were possibly 22 components showing up on Frontline, they should only be concerned with the components they are being evaluated. Mrs. Kathrein asked that the specialists, such as the counselors, librarians, etc., also be included in the building-level discussions.

Implementation Updates – There was brief discussion regarding the pre-observation form, the email for the evaluation being sent to junk mail or from an unrecognizable sender, and the new software program not being as user friendly as before.

Teacher Evaluation Handbook – Due to time constraints this topic was tabled.

New Teacher Phase-In of Components – Due to time constraints this topic was tabled.

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

Teacher Evaluation Final Score – Due to time constraints this topic was tabled.

Future Meetings Schedule – The December meeting was scheduled for Wednesday, December 14 at 4:00 p.m. The January meeting was scheduled for Tuesday, January 10 at 4:00 p.m.

**Other** – Superintendent Sullivan thanked the committee and congratulated them on the advancement with today's meeting and the accomplishments.

**Adjournment** – The meeting adjourned at 4:55 p.m.