

McREL Teacher Evaluation PD Notes, August 8, 2016

Take-Aways from August 8, 2016:

- Importance of Self-assessment - We all thing about our craft. Just an opportunity to re-think about your goals and what you picked up over the summer/year. We can use this to relook at goals.
- Weighing the standards of the evaluation to give more “weight” to certain standards.
- Review of Standards
 - Standard 1:
 - Tim brought up Standard 1E, “Models ethical behavior” – The group discussed clarifying our Artifact document to provide more concrete examples of “ethical” – Lounge behavior, staff meeting behavior, FERPA, Treating Students fairly, believing all students can succeed.
 - Kent mentioned that Standard IA had a strong Classroom management component
 - Standard II: Spoke about II A and E - Diversity (exchange students, poverty), opening diverse opinions (global warming, politics). How intentional is our staff on addressing, incorporating diversity and diverse opinions? How are we addressing “nurturing environment”. How does technology fit in for “nurturing” environment? Recommends that we have staff define this standard.
 - Standard III: Mr. Wilcox discussed his concern about Soft Skills. Students are coming to school less and less prepared with these needed skills (personal responsibility). How do you help your teachers understand math content? Mr. Davis shared this is one of the toughest areas to help your teachers in. How do you help a new teacher coming in on teaching content? Principals aren’t prepared to be content experts....but are expected to be content experts. Have to be familiar with content and to know who to ask about curriculum if there is an issue?
 - III B Distinguished....Above and Beyond the required coursework in the classroom. Projects and lesson structure could lead to Distinguished. Taking an assignment and expanding beyond the basic concepts.
 - Standard IV:
 - IV A: Abreast of current research, emerging resources and encourages the school to adopt/adapt them – What are you reading professionally and how are you bringing that back to your building? Kelly, Tom ad Tim shared their view of IV A and gave examples of when they marked this category for their teachers.
 - IV C: Ensures the success of ALL students – Discussion revolved around “success”
 - IV E: Question on how we mark/monitor IV E (Accomplished) – Mrs. Nielsen shares that she marks them as she sees them. Tim shared that it is a challenging standard to mark. Many of the areas are hard to prove.
 - IV F: Fostering student leadership to be used beyond the classroom. A discussion took place on developing leadership qualities. Mr. Davis mentioned an older group of students in a planned program as an example. This program is an example of fostering the development of student leadership.

- Standard V: Processes in school to promote reflection –
 - V C (Accomplished) – Investigates and considers alternative research to improve teaching and learning.
- Teacher leading in the classroom – We have opportunities in each building to structure Early Release to give staff ownership of leading and being part of the SI process.
- Tool Share: Hess Rigor Matrix – Combines Bloom and DOK
- What do we need to start the year with teachers?
 - Administration shared that they feel like we have better defined a few areas that we can share.
 - Kelly mentioned aligning our evaluations, artifact and SI plan. What standards will help us reach our SI goals?
 - Defining nurturing environment.
 - Make the evaluation personal....their goals, what they want to improve upon.
 - Discussion took place on end-of-year rating versus beginning of year first observation rating – Why am I rated lower now compared to end-of-year. Mr. Davis suggested giving them a focus for completing their self-evaluation. Where are you in your self-evaluation compared to supporting our school goals?
 - We want to do MTSS. These standards and elements align with this implementation.
 - Evaluate yourself based on the elements aligned with MTSS. Complete all of the elements, but the MTSS elements are most critical.
 - Mr. Davis shared that we need to look at our Goal setting process – Should be putting in Goals verbatim from the McREL Rubric. We are choosing standards from the MCREL Rubric in Goals as THE Goal. Add the activities/strategies from there.
 - Should use Verbiage from the rubric, use the lens of MTSS, and create strategies/activities from there in connection to goals in gap areas.
 - Perhaps choosing a SI goal and a personal goal for the year.
 - Revisit in April before we set goals....phone conference in March/April
- Goal Selection Process:
 - Define what MTSS is and what are we looking for?
 - Divide groups up across district to see what elements align with MTSS
 - Once we have our list, do we need to define/decide what that means with our staff
 - Once we have done that.....complete self-evaluations. Do it on MTSS....
 - When they come in with goals/self-evaluation.....if it has nothing to do with MTSS you can leave it.....but strike a conversation to set the future stage.
 - End-of-Year: Set goals for next year and use summary evaluation as a focus for filling that out.
 - At least One personal, one SI goal
 - A year from now, they will do their self-evaluation on their new goal and against the SI goal.
- Tom brought up the process we developed in August of 2015 to ensure consistency. Using Summary evaluation to set goals for the next year. We will use the self-evaluation to confirm or change/redefine the goal when we return.

Other Notes:

Kent Davis went around the room to discuss thoughts about McREL and how evaluations went.

- Tom shared that his evaluations went well last year. Had great conversations about teaching/learning.
- Tim shared that he struggled with leaving the McREL Target sheet and did refer to it at times. Found it helpful to review and discuss this with teachers while reminding them that the Artifact sheet isn't the end-all.
- Kelly shared that she has had good conversations and has aligned goals/discussions with the SI plan.

The group had conversation about including data in the final evaluation. Including data has been a challenging process as the state test, M-STEP, has not been helpful (and may be on the way out). Group shared that NWEA is our other data tool and provides more information.

Kent brought up the evaluation tool and asked about weighing the evaluation components. He suggested that 3 and 4 are the most critical and could be weighted versus the other. Kent recommended not skipping bullets in the evaluation, but sharing with staff that there are standards we would be weighing more heavily.

Discussion: Mr. Wilcox shared his concern about the lack of classroom management in the evaluation tool. A teacher could end up with a higher rating due to not being able to rate a teacher as thoroughly as possible on the evaluation tool. Kent Davis shared that 1A has classroom management reference.

Kent shared that McREL has a walk-through platform.

Discussion: Working on the Standard of teachers "leading the profession"

Early Release: Mr. Wilcox asked the building principals about their Early Release time (collaboration).

Kent suggested requiring the following roles during meetings: Facilitator, Note taker, Time keeper, and process-observer.