Tuesday, August 9, 2016 – Principal Evaluation System – Meeting Notes

Follow-up to August 8, 2016 meeting: Mr. Erspamer shared that he was outlining what to present to staff and how it should look.

Kent reviewed Balanced Leadership Framework and the 21 responsibilities with the administrative team: Do principals make a difference?

- Mr. Davis spent time discussing first order and second order change.
- Redundancy: Doing more of the one thing that is already going well. For example Building has minimal issues and you keep tweaking discipline/policy to address the small number of kids having issues/behavior problems. You will always have a 3%.
- Discussed implementing things without quality and fidelity. This is an indication of too many things going on and not spending enough time on planning and follow-through....or not implementing as originally intending.
- Research: We are better about implementing research-based practices, but not necessarily aligned with the actual problem we have with the identified gap area.
- Mr. Davis recommended filling out the self-evaluation with a building initiative in mind What are my goals (as administration) to help my staff reach that initiative?
- Goals have to be aligned with what staff needs and what you are going to do to help reach that goal. Conversation revolved around using the terminology in McREL in the actual goal area. The goals we have been using would be an outcome. For example, Mr. Erspamer has a goal of "employability Rubric" for 2016-17. Mr. Davis stated this is a great target, but the goal should be the McREL standard. "Employability Rubric" would be the outcome. Goals Mr. Davis shared that another concept is "what are you not doing that you need to do".

Principal Evaluation:

- Mr. Hamlin worked with Mr. Davis on the McREL principal tool and the teacher evaluation process. Reviewed completed teacher evaluations by each principal to check for rating consistency.
- Mr. Davis showed the Summary report in McREL that can offer a snapshot view of each building and a district overview. Can be used to show consistency across the district among evaluators.
- Mr. Davis questioned the number of distinguished staff members as that should be very challenging to reach.
 - Mr. Davis looked at several evaluations and reflected on a conversation from Monday on critical thinking. When he looked at the evaluations, they were all accomplished...doesn't seem to go along with what he is hearing.
 - He referred to discussions on Monday from 21st Century learning and looked at ratings.
 Our outcomes aren't reflecting what we are saying.
 - Question: Are we really doing what we are saying we are doing on the evaluations? Are we overinflating our ratings in McREL?

- Question for admin: We had the conversation with Kent about needing to improve in Critical thinking....yet 11 out of 12 evaluations reviewed were accomplished with all boxes checked.
- o Ideas to support administration:
 - Run an evaluation report by building
 - Take 2 or 3 items out of evaluation to help shape evaluations for next year:
 - Pick 3 or 4 elements.
 - Create meaning/define the elements on what we are expected to see.
 Use a focus, such as MTSS Take on 3 or 4 elements that support that. –
 IV A, Target standards for MTSS and use on teacher evaluations for the year.
 - Do the walk-through. Discuss what we see
 - What are our recommendations for change
 - When the evaluation is said and done, there should be comments in every section. Jotting notes in "Not demonstrated" is fine, but there should be comments to support each standard and the respective ratings
 - Suggestion: What percentage of staff is implementing effectively...what is her monitoring plan.
- How do I monitor their goals: Suggestion Have them give me a list of the evidence and artifacts that prove that they accomplish their goals.
- Bring Kent Davis back in the fall to do walk-throughs with us and a presentation to the Board.
- o States we are doing better than most places on our use of the evaluation tool.