

Islesboro School Committee
Ad Hoc Committee for Teacher/Principal Evaluation Meeting
Thursday, November 7 at 3:30 pm
ICS Supt Conference Room

AGENDA/MINUTES

Attendees: Donna Seymour, Rick Rogers, Heather Knight, Jen McFarland, Heather Sinclair, Laura Houle, Mike Boucher, and Supt Joe Mattos

1. Review revised Goal Setting Form (Heather S. and Heather K.)
 - *Heather S distributed a copy of a revised Teacher Goal Setting Form and reviewed it explaining how and why it was set up in this format, and how it would be used to identify and record teacher goals in four categories: teacher knowledge, teacher skills, individual student needs, school/administration needs.*
 - *The committee discussed the merits of this model, with all in agreement regarding the chart format, the focus on the four general categories as goal setting areas, and being able to use this information for identifying needed budgeted resources*
 - *The committee recommended that some additional changes be made to the chart which included: adding a column (named GOAL) after NEED, which would be used to identify the specific goal to be achieved. Also, it was recommended that a column be added at the end of the chart labeled EVIDENCE OF GROWTH. **Heather S will revise the chart based on this feedback.***
 - *It was recommended that teachers be provided with information on how to write SMART goals – Specific, Measurable, Attainable, Results Oriented and Time Bound. Samples of completed goal setting forms should be provided to teachers.*
 - ***Heather K/S will review the goal setting form with the Lead Team and solicit their feedback and comments.***

2. Review revisions in Teacher Supervision and Evaluation Model Documents

- *Joe reviewed with the committee revisions he had made to the Overview of Teacher Evaluation Model document and chart, which described the purpose and components of the model. Joe explained that the revisions he had made were mostly about formatting the information with few changes in the content. Specifically, the Overview was formatted to explain each of the components of the model in more detail. Joe asked that committee members review the revised Overview and chart and forward to him any recommendations for adding info to this document or chart, or making other changes to clarify this information.*

Joe pointed out one substantive revision made in sections containing information on the Continuing Contract Teacher Cycle and Professional Improvement Plan (PIP) Intervention. These revisions were intended to address the questions raised at the last meeting regarding how and when the PIP Intervention would be initiated. New language was added (underlined) explaining that if a continuing contract teacher's performance was deemed to be unsatisfactory in meeting any teaching standard domain, that the principal would have the authority to place the teacher on a one year evaluation cycle,

with Evaluation Summary Narrative to be completed at the end of the school year. Based on this Summary Narrative and Teacher Effectiveness Rating, a PIP may be initiated. There was tentative agreement by committee members that this may be one method for handling unsatisfactory performance issues for continuing contract teachers. More discussion to follow.

- ***It was agreed that committee members will review the Overview and chart and forward to Joe recommended edits, additions, etc. prior to the next committee meeting in December.***

3. Discuss Pilot Program's Purpose and Expected Outcomes

- *The committee discussed what they believed should be the purpose and expected outcomes for piloting the Teacher/Principal Evaluation system in 2013/14. The purpose was to solicit from teachers and school administration feedback in respect to supervision and evaluation processes (feedback, classroom observations, PD, etc.) and materials (goal setting form, teacher/principal performance standards, Evaluation Summary Narrative form, etc.). Some specific questions to be answered during the pilot include:*
 - *What domains and/or elements are most important for improving teacher performance and student learning?*
 - *What components of the supervision and evaluation process are working well or not meeting expectations?*
 - *Does the Evaluation Summative Narrative document effectively document the supervision and evaluation process and does the Teacher Effective Rating accurately reflect the teacher's performance?*
 - *Does this model have the potential of making an impact on teacher practice and student learning?*
 - *What resources do teachers and principals need to implement this model?*
- *The committee recommended starting the pilot in January 2014, which will include:*
 - *Providing teachers with supervision and evaluation model information (Overview, chart, goal setting form, standards, samples)*
 - *Working with teachers to complete goal setting form.*
 - *Providing teachers with PD for understanding standards, with a focus on Design Question #1.*
 - *Implementing all components of the model – performance feedback, PD activities, completion of Self-Reflective Narrative, principal classroom observations, and completion of Evaluation Summary Narrative (without Teacher Effectiveness Rating).*
- *The committee also discussed what potential issues would be addressed in the second year (14/15) of the pilot program. These issues included 1. identifying the value (%?) that each domain would contribute to the overall Teacher Effective Rating and 2. identifying the specific elements of each domain that would be used for evaluative purposes. No action or decisions were made at this time.*

4. Discuss Principal Evaluation Model

- *The committee first discussed their personal observations regarding information on principal evaluation that had been previously distributed to all committee members. Specific observations included concerns that MPA model is too general and is more*

- about “monitoring” systems and behaviors and not about “ensuring results” improved teacher performance or increase student learning. Similar to concerns with the Marzano teaching standards, there may be too many domains (7) and elements/standards (21), which may water down one’s focus and efforts to improve teaching and learning.*
- *It was pointed out in the Evaluating Principals article from the New Leaders for New Schools publication that a more focused model (page 14) would focus on three areas for principal evaluation: Student Achievement Outcomes, Teacher Effectiveness Outcomes, and Effective Leadership Actions (Vision for Results and Equity, Planning and Operations, Culture, Learning and Teaching, Staff Development/Management, and Personal Leadership and Growth). In respect to an overall effectiveness rating, a value of 70% would be given for Student Achievement Outcomes and Teacher Effectiveness Outcomes, and 30% for the leadership actions. There was some agreement (consensus?) that this model might be best for “ensuring results” rather than just monitoring processes.*
 - *A question was asked if the Supt’s evaluation should also be evaluated using similar criteria. Joe explained that he is in the process of asking the school committee to revise his evaluation to focus more on results that address teaching and learning goals and outcomes. This will be discussed at the November 12 school committee meeting.*
 - ***Joe will create a chart (ha, ha another chart!) that will try to align the components of the teacher, principal, and supt evaluation standards and processes. He will also try to see how the 3 areas mentioned in the New Leaders publication align with the ISLIC standards, which need to be done as part of the criteria for approving the Principal Evaluation model.***

5. Discuss other related teacher and principal evaluation issues

- *A question/perspective was raised about how the teacher and principal evaluation systems would be evaluated using some type of specific results or defined academic benchmarks for student achievement. It was pointed out that without defined outcomes to measure against, the supervision and evaluation system would only be defined by input (doing things) and not by results. The committee discussed various measures and data that might or might not be appropriate in measuring student achievement. It was agreed that looking at individual student progress in a year-by-year manner might be the best indicator to look at in determining student achievement. There was also some discussion on how to measure the academic growth of students who have IEPs for special education services. This topic will be put on the agenda for discussion at the next committee meeting.*
- *There was some discussion regarding what other school systems have done or are doing to implement the new Teacher/Principal Effectiveness statute. **Heather and Joe will see if they can identify sources that might have this information on a statewide or regional basis.***
- *Joe distributed a visual representation (I did not want to say chart!) of Marzano’s Art and Science of Teaching Framework, which the committee agreed would be used as the teacher performance standards. **Heather K. will arrange for PD (with Christine Morehouse?) for addressing Design Question #1.***
- *Mike brought up a concern regarding the role of parental involvement and support as a factor in student achievement. This topic will be discussed at a later meeting.*

6. Establish date/time and agenda for next Ad Hoc Committee meeting
 - *The committee agreed that the next committee meeting would be held on Tuesday, December 10 at 3:30 PM.*
 - *The tentative agenda for this meeting will include: 1. review teacher goal setting process and identify needed resources for teacher and principal to do this work; 2. review/discuss information prepared by Joe comparing teacher/principal and supt evaluation standards and processes; 3. discuss and identify student achievement measures and benchmarks that may be used to as part of teacher and principal supervision and evaluation models.*
7. Adjourn meeting
 - *Meeting adjourned at approximately 5:20 pm.*

Follow-up Action:

1. *Heather S will revise the goal setting chart based on committee feedback.*
2. *Heather K/S will review the goal setting form with the Lead Team and solicit their feedback and comments.*
3. *Committee members will review the Overview and chart and forward to Joe recommended edits, additions, etc. prior to the next committee meeting in December.*
4. *Joe will create a chart that will align the components of the teacher, principal, and supt evaluation standards and processes. He will also evaluate how the 3 areas mentioned in the New Leaders publication align with the ISLIC standards, which need to be done as part of the criteria for approving the Principal Evaluation model.*
5. *Heather and Joe will identify sources that might this information about what school systems are doing on a statewide or regional basis to implement the Teacher/Principal Effectiveness statute.*
6. *Heather K. will arrange for PD (with Christine Morehouse?) for addressing Design Question #1.*