

## TEACHER EVALUATION WORK GROUP

JUNE 12 & 13, 2012

### MACKAY BUILDING - PIERRE, SOUTH DAKOTA

In attendance: Sharla Steever, Kristin Skogstad, Pat Moller, Nicole Keegan, Paul Kuhlman, Candy Ballard, Kym Johnston, Kevin Lein, Shayne McIntosh, Pam Haukaas, Rebecca Reimer, Amy Blum, Stacy Bauer Jones, Shauna Hoglund, Steve O'Brien, Wade Pogany

Not in attendance: Don Kirkegaard, Pete Anderson, John Pedersen

#### 1. Welcome and introductions -- Dr. Melody Schopp

--Background, overview and importance of this group's work

#### 2. Overview of the agenda

--There will be four meetings between now and December 2012 to achieve five objectives, with a report to Legislature in 2013.

#### 3. Objectives of the Teacher Evaluation Work Group

- a. Review a set of teacher performance standards that will be used as a foundation for the teacher evaluation instrument.
- b. Develop a teacher evaluation instrument for statewide implementation beginning with the 2014 – 15 academic year. (Pilot implementation – 2013 – 14)
- c. Develop the procedures to guide the teacher evaluation process. This includes information that addresses issues such as observation length and frequency.
- d. Determine strategies to incorporate levels of performance and student performance into the teacher evaluation process.
- e. Develop the teacher evaluation training program for administrators and teachers.
- f. *Consider adding a fifth objective: Stakeholders understand that the work group looked at research and produced a product of substance.*

#### 4. Teacher Evaluation Work Group Timeline

- a. June 12 & 13 – Work Group convenes and begins work
- b. July 23 & 24 – Work Group – Meeting II
- c. Set dates for Work Group Meetings III & IV  
--Late September and early November
- d. December 31, 2012 – Work Group concludes work
- e. Report to 2013 Legislature – January - 2013

#### 5. Approval process for Work Group objectives

- a. The work group will work towards consensus whenever possible on any/all decisions. If consensus is unattainable, votes will be taken to determine final proposal.
- b. Communication with colleagues, media, interested parties  
--Be open, honest and fair in representation. Ask for input from communities. Talk with work group about what you're hearing in between meetings.  
--If group members feel comfortable, talk with media. Be fair. Set personal opinion aside and present group's perspective.

- c. Other ground rules?
  - i. Meeting attendance/participation
  - ii. Commitment between work group meetings

**6. Review of materials**

- a. HB 1234 (pp. 15 – 18)

HB 1234 Summary -- <http://doe.sd.gov/secretary/documents/HB1234sum.pdf>

HB 1234 Bill -- <http://legis.state.sd.us/sessions/2012/Bills/HB1234ENR.pdf>

HB 1234 FAQ -- <http://doe.sd.gov/secretary/documents/HB1234FAQ.pdf>

- b. Review of Teacher Professional Performance Standards
  - i. Administrative Rule – Teacher Performance Standards 24:08:06:01

Administrative rules teaching standards --

<http://legis.state.sd.us/rules/DisplayRule.aspx?Rule=24:08:06:01>

- ii. Danielson Framework for Teaching (FFT)

4 components document -- [http://doe.sd.gov/secretary/documents/TS\\_RefCard.pdf](http://doe.sd.gov/secretary/documents/TS_RefCard.pdf)

- c. SD DOE Accountability (Waiver) Application
- d. Presentation related to Teacher Standards/Evaluation pilot
  - Led by representatives from TIE and Eastern Dakota Educational Cooperative (EDEC)
  - Pilot began July 2011 and ends July 2012
  - Task for TIE and EDEC was to provide the resources to grow the knowledge, skills and practice of the FFT in all South Dakota districts.
  - 700+ educators participated in online books studies.
  - Buy-in because FFT can help teachers become better teachers.
  - Still need to get word out because there are over 9,000 teachers in the state.

**12 Pilot Districts**

East Division (EDEC)	West Division (TIE)
Harrisburg	Custer
McCook	Wagner
Brookings	Stanley County
Webster	Kimball
Deuel	Todd County
Aberdeen	

--Suggestions from the pilot experience:

\*distinction between “observation” and “evaluation”

- \*districts stick with the FFT. *Don't add to it or subtract from it.*
- \*stick with the concept of *evaluation tracks*: novice, experienced, experienced self-study
- \*develop *schedules* that ensure the principal is in all classrooms
- \**observation certification*
- \*distinction between **THE TOOL**, which is the Framework, and final recording documents

### **Follow-up Discussion by Group**

- The work group could consider the use of portfolios.
- Application; districts will decide how to move groups of teachers forward.
- Gather principals by districts or regions and discuss “what are you seeing in your districts” and offer professional development around that.
- Important to use common terms and language so all stakeholders can be on the same page.
- Check and balance system with peer reviews and outside evaluators such as university staff, retired teachers, etc.
- Power of video taping
- Group needs to define evaluation. What does that look like?
- Clarification that standards are the Framework for Teaching.
- At higher education level, faculty members have to demonstrate competency. They have to produce data, and student evaluations are a big component and part of that portfolio.
- Administrators will spend more time in classrooms evaluating teachers and need to be cautious about balance.
- There'll be unintended consequences of legislation. Someone will need to take care of discipline while administrators are evaluating.
- Why do we need to have administrators evaluate teachers every year? Concern about time involved in doing all of these evaluations. Focus on growth of a portion of staff and quality of evaluations. There are 1,000 hours in a school year and part of it is being deliberate and scheduling observations and evaluations.
- In Watertown, for example, teachers stepped up and took care of discipline issues so principals could make it a priority and get into classrooms.
- There is merit in talking about different evaluation instruments.
- There might be other ways besides observation and evaluation, such as professional growth plans. Or bringing in retired teachers to help with formative evaluations.
- Every district will have to decide what will work for them. Group needs to set minimum yet effective requirements.

### **7. Development of Teacher Evaluation Instrument**

- a. Objective/Purpose of Teacher Evaluation
  - improving teaching
  - improve student achievement-primary goal
  - data based and evidentiary
  - source of relationship between teacher and administrator

- professional satisfaction
- \*goal setting and goal accomplishment
- employment retention, especially for newer to the profession teachers
- teacher compensation
- professional development-can really drive school goals
- preventive strategy-find out what's going on in classrooms whether it's behavior issues, teacher issues, common issues, etc.
- contribute to learning culture in school and can change whole culture; creates common language

b. Characteristics of a successful evaluation system

- multiple measures to determine effectiveness
- both parties know criteria; clear outcomes
- link to professional development
- consistency-common language, similar structure, timing, builds on itself, etc.
- flexibility-Framework used in a fluid way and able to make comparisons weekly, monthly, etc.
- objectivity
- lack of bias
- using data
- well-trained evaluators
- collaborative-goal setting is involved
- using technology to video tape, self-reflect, and take to administrator to discuss
- accountability

c. Barriers to the establishment of a successful model system

- limitations of the tool
- trust and buy-in of participants
- size and structure of school districts-small vs. large
- bias
- time
- evaluator training
- principals prepared to coach and move staff forward
- ongoing over time

d. Discussion of current options for instrument development

**8. Other items of interest**

a. For next month's meeting:

- view instruments and if possible, view ahead of meeting
- procedures-how long, how often, etc.
- multiple measures-what will work?, what are they?, what's working in other states?
- portfolios

- do some or one of the domains need to be weighted more than others?
- what does the final number mean? Quantify ranking.
- see other 50/50 models?
- funding mechanism for third party observers/evaluators?