

KPBSD Administrator Evaluation Committee Meeting

December 9, 2010

Member Name/Group	Present	Absent
Sean Dusek, Assistant Superintendent of Instruction	X	
Tim Peterson, Director of Human Resources	X	
Christine Carlson, Community Representative	X	
Tim Navarre, School Board Member		X
Lynn Hohl, School Board Member		X
Trevan Walker, Principal at Seward High School	X	
John O'Brien, Principal at Nikiski Middle/High School	X	
Melissa Linton, Principal at K-Beach Elementary School	X	
Christine Ermold, Principal at Sterling Elementary School	X	

Agenda

- Purpose
- Goals/Outcomes
- Requirements
- Research- WIN (What's Important Now)
- Review
- Improvements- Going Forward

Purpose

- Sean stated his personal goal is for the evaluation revision to be complete by next year, however, he recognizes the new evaluation may take longer to develop and implement.

Goals and Outcomes

- An article from Ed Leadership was distributed for later reading. The article identifies the purpose of Administrator Evaluation as two-fold:
 - Ensure administrator quality
 - Consistent definition

- Shared understanding
 - Skilled evaluators
 - Promote professional learning
- Specific goals for the group include:
 - Produce a quality, updated and relevant administrator evaluation system
 - Provide a framework for professional development

Requirements & Research

- Teacher Evaluation, 21st Century Skills, Collaborative Environment are all things that are important now and will likely need to be considered in the District’s administrator evaluation process. Sean also pointed out that AS 14.20.149 requires that administrator evaluations be based on standards- which in Alaska are the “Standards for Alaska’s Administrators.” As a result, we currently have almost two separate evaluation systems in place in the District (Form I- which is the evaluation of the administrator based on the Standards for Alaska’s Administrators, and Form II- which is the evaluation of WIN in the District.) Sean led the committee through a review of the Alaska Administrative Codes that are relevant to the administrator evaluation process. He also explained that the Board representatives, the Community representative, the principal representatives, and input from the teacher’s professional association will all be considered in revision of the evaluation system. The committee then reviewed research from School Leadership that Works that identified 21 responsibilities that positively impact student achievement.

Review & Improvements

After reviewing the current KPBSD administrator evaluation handbook, those present created the following plus/delta chart with their findings:

+	Δ
Under the definition, there were some important things highlighted.	There was contradictory language in the definition.
The Form II process (focused on District initiatives, self-reflection, and progress)	Form I is vague and is often rushed.
The monthly journals that were a part of a new administrator’s requirements under Superintendent Peterson served as a regular avenue of communication between the new principal and the Superintendent.	Form I is superficial and not backed by research
Forms seeking input from community/parents/students/staff ask for both	Form I and II are disconnected to one another

strengths and needs and gather a good variety of information.	
	Lack of annual administrator training on their evaluation model.
	Timelines are vague in practical application
	Administrators writing their own- TEP like (evidence collection)
	No incentive for community feedback- people often only comment when they're upset.
	Directors- loss of communication
	Anonymity on community/staff/student parent/input forms.

To-Do List (or needs identified for the revision of the tool)

Revised definition/philosophy/mission statement
Form I → Form II (PEP: Principal Enrichment Pathway allowing for a formal evaluation once every three years when there have been no performance concerns with a principal for several consecutive years and allowing a PEP project in the non-formal evaluation years) → School Development Plan → Reflection
Feedback → Community → Enhance
Consolidate the standards and move toward Domains
Tool Development: <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Rubric • Levels of Performance continuum
Manual needs to become transparent
Professional development component (that could become tied to career development activities)
Determine who the evaluators would be
Glossary
Visual Organizer illustrating the domains and components
Create a crosswalk alignment of the new Kenai Components for Administrators with the AK

Standards and the ISLLC Standards

The group considered administrative appraisal systems from Washoe and Delaware. The group found that Washoe's Tool is:

- Has rubrics that could be helpful, language may also be helpful
- Too big- is like Form I super-sized
- Lacks a summarizing tool
- Needs a summarizing tool

Delaware's Tool is:

- Well laid out and a clear overview and criteria
- Could have Component 1 broken out among components 2 and 5
- Has a lot of forms, a few of which would be redundant for us- e.g., rather than having an individual Goal Form, the School Development Plan and goals could replace the individual form.
- Their reflection form is minimal, but at least it has reflection
- Formative Feedback Form is used to document meetings

Components for consideration:

Student achievement (driven by, and possibly defined by the feds?) as indicated by student growth
Management
Leadership (change, collaboration)

Idea!:

Adopt a cycle of appraisal where new principals or principals who have recently had unsatisfactory performance in an area are evaluated with a standard evaluation. Principals who have been determined effective for a few consecutive years could be on a PEP. This would help decrease the load of standard evaluations on the Supt. & Asst. Supt., while Directors could work with principals on PEPs. This would both help preserve the relationship between principals and directors and facilitate collaborative work among principals doing PEPs together. Every three years, a principal would be evaluated with a standard evaluation, which, if satisfactory, could be followed by two years on a PEP. New Administrators would be evaluated on the standard plan for at least one to three years- depending on whether they're new to administration, and it would be at the discretion of the Superintendent- before they move to a PEP.

Next Steps:

1. Crosswalk the Delaware Components with the Alaska Standards (John)

2. Crosswalk the Delaware Components with the Marzano Research (Trevan)
3. Crosswalk the Delaware Components with ETS (Melissa)
4. Gather feedback from groups on “What do you believe principals should be doing? What are your most important functions?”
 - a. Christine E. will focus on the principals
 - b. Christine C. will focus on the community, including Site Councils and PTA Groups
 - c. Sean will focus on the student groups
5. All committee members should continue overall research on principal evaluations