

Stakeholders Teacher Eval Conversation
Ruidoso, NM
June 12, 2019

District Administrators

Differentiate the measures of growth- what looks like growth in one classroom might not look like growth in another, example classroom with students with special needs

Domains need to be more connected, currently in isolation, how are they connected with each other to provide snapshot

About the journey, not the destination- what happens from point to point

Importance of videotaping so that teacher can self-assess, observer assesses, and teacher assesses then come together to discuss before it is scored

Use evaluation to support teacher

Connect teacher, building admin and district admin- build community with teacher and amongst teachers

Teacher mentors or lead teachers could have a piece of the evaluation (not in the scoring)

Use walkthroughs, not as scheduled evals, what are we looking for in improvement- what supports do you need?

Differentiate the evaluation tools (some teachers need only once per year, other teacher might need more coaching via classroom walkthrough) don't silo

Teachers need a voice in the system

Authentic – real-time feedback, not scheduling observations and walkthroughs

Self-assessment/evaluation from the teacher—needs to be collaborative with the teacher

Building Administrators

Rubrics available for all subjects and levels

Primary versus secondary versus middle school

Differentiate where people are developmentally and what people are actually teaching

Data must be equitable and differentiated (PE EOCS/PARCC)

Data must be tied to time in class (absences, behaviors- percentage based, how much is the student there)

Domains need to be modified and simplified

Incorporate walkthrough data, should be continuous conversation throughout school year
Observations and feedback can be done and given quickly

Growth data for 1 year not 3 years (not have it tied to you for three years)

New teachers – giving them a three-year grace period for learning, mentored by experienced teachers, go through orientation, etc. before data starts impacting them

Roll out new system in sections and increments – concern to do everything by August, let teachers have a voice

Tie data to item plot analysis

Ability to compile an evaluation quickly- current system time consuming
Able to see info in a snapshot

Statewide accountability to teacher evaluation tool- people should be held accountable throughout the state to implement what the state asks them to, some measure

No monetary ties to data

Simplistic data analysis, user friendly for teachers

Align PDP, evaluations, and licensure—more continuity, principal is the person who does the review

Domains need to be reevaluated (the % attached to each one)

Secondary Educators

Non-punitive PDP for growth – outliner to which observations should be tied

Authentic evaluations

Various styles of evaluations

Peer or colleague observations, giving feedback to aid in growth

Differentiation of the evaluation (evaluate different types of classrooms and content areas)

- CTE/alternative education/academics

Focus on college and career readiness

Formative student surveys – use it to show teacher growth

Clear standards and expectations – everybody is clear on what they are going to be evaluated on and in the domain language, what this looks like

Collective training across the board- train the evaluators (district admin, community, etc)

Lower value of administration observation

Comprehensive evaluation to show growth

Celebrate what teachers are good at- need to know where your strengths are and maximize them as well as find the areas where growth is needed

Video-taping for self-reflection

Redo how the observations are done to avoid the dog and pony show, needs to be authentic and real – small snapshot of small areas at multiple times

Get another chance to redo a bad evaluation or that we feel was not our best

Observations aligned to PDP- align them to when we are writing the PDP and doing the self-reflective pieces

Flexible

Elementary Educators

Simplicity of design and implementation

Authentic -interaction between the evaluators and teacher should be ongoing

Streamlined evidence

Building of relationships- principal to teacher, teacher to teacher, teacher to student/parent

Authentic input by teacher on evaluation instrument

Three informal points of contact that are positive (development of trust) prior to the observation (positive)

Supportive not punitive

Small enough and simple enough in scope that it can be used with all teachers, feedback timely

Principal should be knowledgeable- should be the instructional leader who has knowledge of appropriate practices in different types of classrooms and at different levels of teaching

Flexibility that lends itself to differentiation for grade level and licensure level

Board Member

Teacher input on whole evaluation system

Teachers should be trained on all aspects of the system (structure, what the evaluator is looking for)

Administration input and training on all aspects of the system

Multi-faceted- supervisor review for the things that are not visible when you walk into the classroom

Interview and/or artifacts or portfolios (teachers want input- what I did and why,etc)

Focus is on the content of the evidence and not the structure

Evaluation should be followed by effective PD based on teacher need as evidenced by evaluation (differentiation of PD for teachers)

Manageable for administration

Available on a database so that building and district admin can provide skill-based PD to those who need it (filter by skills needed so that admin does not have to dig for it)