

**Stakeholder Teacher Evaluation Meeting**  
**Clovis, NM**  
**June 18, 2019**

**District Administrators**

Should have a balance between subjective and objective measures

Greater emphasis on classroom practices (2&3) than the professional practices (1&4)

Uniformity across grade levels, types of teachers, regular and special ed

Evidence to be captured in informal and formal observations (all year long)

Multiple, internal (within building so that they know the teacher) observers

Comprehensive training for all observers

Eval results tied to professional development – differentiate professional development to support teachers in their area of need

Objective data- based on schoolwide achievement in the aggregate, everybody in the school gets the same result/grade

**Building Administrators**

Observation model that is continuous, authentic, and simple

Small percentage of student data with local control

Summative reports based on 2 and 3 domains incorporate 1 and 4

Provide timely feedback with reports given by the end of the year

Principal to be the expert doing the observation

**Secondary Educators 1**

Content specific, content related data

Variance in content areas across grades

Give more local control to district

Timely and useful feedback

Constructive not punitive

Community evaluations need to be reexamined closely – need to get valid data, security issue

How it is used- for growth (tied to local control) for punishment

## **Secondary Educators 2**

About authentic teaching, more than one to three snapshots

Multiple observations per semester

With genuine comprised of multiple viewpoints

Level III teachers trained to give feedback/do observations

Offer opportunities to improve and demonstrate that improvement in a timeline

Training opportunities for evaluators and teachers

Opportunities for teachers to be able to level up by being a part of the eval process

Training for evaluators should be refined and calibrated (equitable)

Clear comprehensive rubric

Replace survey with PD and/or CEU

Attendance should **not** be part of the eval

Student achievement should be valued but should be formative not summative

Evaluation should be opportunity to support growth and recognize teacher achievement

Should contribute to but not determine licensure advancement

## **Elementary Educators 1**

Student data as part of the eval, but only BOY, MOY and EOY

Concrete, not portfolio

Similar across the state

\*\*Special ed teachers/pre-school/electives currently can only advance licensure through dossier

should be part of the eval process (Need clarification)

Student attendance is an issue-mandate at state level

Peer evaluation should only be for coaching, not for the evaluation process

Minimum of one admin eval each year, teacher can request an additional eval from another admin, out of the building

Scaffolded intervention for struggling teachers

Rubric to help teachers grow and advance at all levels

Multiple weighted components

## **Elementary Educators 2**

Purpose- support for teachers, not punitive

Clear and concise expectations (taking into account ALT)

Observations as needed to support the teacher

Evaluators trained at that grade level/content area (keeping in mind small districts, etc.)

Not micro-managed

Consistent

Educators to make decisions, not politicians

Opportunity to demonstrate student growth through documentation, not state testing

Keep it in-house, local level

### **Community**

Different developmental levels for the continuum from teacher candidacy/ed prep to classroom teacher

Alignment with InTASC standards

Evaluation should stand on its own without having to rely on yearly testing, over testing

System that is supportive by establishing remediation processes rather than being punitive

Collaborative system that includes self-assessment using technology-- what am I doing well and/or where do I need to improve?

Multiple data points and triangulation of timely and appropriate data

System that doesn't hold the learning/teaching process hostage