

Ad Hoc Committee for Teacher/Principal Effectiveness
Thursday, October 3, 2013
ICS Supt's Conference Room
3:30 – 5:00 pm

AGENDA/MINUTES

Attendees: Donna Seymour, Rick Rogers, Heather Sinclair, Heather Knight, Laura Houle and Supt Joe Mattos.

1. Review Minutes from August 12, 2013 Ad Hoc Committee Meeting
 - *Accepted as presented. No comments.*

2. Review Teacher Evaluation Materials (model components, goal setting forms, etc.) prepared by Supt Mattos
 - *Supt Mattos reviewed with the committee drafts of a summary narrative and chart containing the purpose and key components for the Islesboro Teacher Supervision and Evaluation Model.*
 - *It was agreed that the purpose of this model was to:*
 - *Improve teachers' professional knowledge, skills, and classroom practice;*
 - *Improve student learning;*
 - *Provide for a fair and equitable system for making teacher employment decisions.*
 - *The committee agreed with the key elements of the model which included:*
 - *Goal Setting*
 - *Performance Feedback*
 - *Professional Development*
 - *Self- Reflection*
 - *Required Documentation*
 - *Goal Setting - The committee had considerable discussion on how goals would be identified, what info would be used in setting goals, when goals would be set, as well as what type of form would be used to articulate goal setting information. It was recommended that although goals are created in October of the school year, teachers should use data and information from multiple sources from past and present experiences to identify the area of need on which goal(s) will be based. It was also recommended that the draft Goal Setting Form that was presented be revised to allow teachers to address not only student learning needs but also teacher practice issues. Samples of completed Goal Setting Forms will need to be created as models for teachers in helping them complete their own goal setting form. **Joe will meet with Heather K and Heather S to revise the goal setting form. Joe will also revise the Goal Setting information section in the teacher supervision and evaluation summary narrative.***
 - *Performance Feedback – It was agreed that providing teachers with ongoing specific feedback about their instructional practices is critical for teacher*

improvement. Heather S remarked that having Heather K in her classroom for short visits/observations seems to be working well. Heather K stated that she is still working on ways of providing teachers with timely and meaningful written feedback following these classroom visits. Lastly, Donna recommended that the assignment of mentors be vetted and approved by the principal.

- Professional Development Activates and Resources – Agreed that these need to be available and focused on helping teachers achieve their goals. No recommended changes.
- Self-Reflective Narrative - Agreed that teacher self-reflection is a critical component for improving instructional practices. No recommended changes. Samples narratives will need to be created as models for teachers in helping them write their own personal narratives.
- Required Documentation – A summary evaluation form will need to be created for providing teachers with feedback that addresses identified teacher practice standards (Marzano), as well as for determining the teachers Summative Effectiveness Rating. Samples summary evaluation forms will need to be created as models for the principal.
- Differentiated Evaluation Cycles – There was considerable discussion on the differentiated evaluation cycles – Probationary Teacher, Continuing Contract Teacher. The draft document stated that the Probationary Teacher cycle would be 3, one-year evaluation cycles. For continuing contract teachers it would be a 3 year cycle. Joe stated that a 3 year cycle would be more manageable for the principal to handle and provide more focused time for the principal to work with probationary teachers or other teachers who might require more support. Rick asked what would happen to a continuing contract teacher who demonstrated unsatisfactory performance during the first or second year of their continuing contract period. Would you have to wait until the end of the 3 year in the cycle before documenting and addressing this issue? Connected to this question was the fact that there was a lack of clarity as to how and when the Performance Improvement Plan (PIP) Intervention would be initiated for a continuing contract teacher? It was agreed that more clarity (criteria, timelines, etc.) and specific details would need to be crafted to address this issue. **Joe will work with Heather S and Heather K to draft options and language to address this.**
- **Joe will revise the summary narrative and chart to reflect recommended changes, clarifications, etc.**

3. Begin Discussion on Principal Evaluation Model

- Joe distributed information on a proposed model for Principal Evaluation that had been developed by the Maine Principals Association. This model is based on the ISLLC Standards. Joe recommended that committee members review this information for discussion at the next committee meeting
- Rick provided the committee with additional information on Principal Evaluation from the Wallace Foundation and from New Leaders for New Schools. Joe will make copies of this information for all committee members.

*Committee members are encouraged to read this information. **Joe will review this information and summarize and highlight key elements of these models which might be beneficial to discuss.***

4. Establish Next Meeting Date, Time and Agenda

- *The next meeting of the Ad Hoc Committee for Teacher/Principal Effectiveness is scheduled for Thursday, November 7 at 3:30 to 5 pm in the supt's conference room. The agenda for this meeting will include: 1. review revised materials (Teacher Supervision and Evaluation Model info and chart), 2. discuss and identify key elements of principal evaluation model, 3. discuss other related teacher or principal evaluation issues.*

5. Adjourn Meeting

- *Meeting adjourned at 5:22 pm.*