

### **BOARD POLICY EXPECTATION**

With respect to evaluation of employees, the Superintendent shall not cause or allow an evaluation system that does not measure employee performance in terms of achieving the Board's Ends policies and complying with the Board's Executive Limitations policies.

### **CERTIFICATION**

I hereby present my monitoring report on Executive Limitations Policy EL-6 "Staff Evaluations" in accordance with the monitoring schedule set forth in board policy. I certify that the information contained in this report is true as of June 23<sup>rd</sup>, 2015.

Dr. Mark Mansell, Superintendent

### **SUPERINTENDENT'S INTERPRETATION OF POLICY**

I interpret this expectation regarding staff evaluations to mean the Board expects staff evaluations to be both an instrument ensuring compliance in meeting the Board's Ends and Executive Limitations as well as using the process as a structure to support professional learning efforts of our teachers. To accomplish these expectations, it is required that the evaluation instrument meet state requirements for certificated staff members as part of the Teacher-Principal Evaluation Process (TPEP).

### **REPORT**

There are two specific areas described in this policy. The following will address each specific area of EL-6 as best as possible. At the time of this report, I believe that the district is in compliance with the Board's expectations.

- 1. *The superintendent shall not fail to develop and administer an evaluation system that is designed to:***
  - a. Improve instruction.**
  - b. Measure professional growth, development, and performance.**
  - c. Document unsatisfactory performance as well as distinguished performance.**
  - d. Assure that scheduled instructional time is used to students' maximum advantage.**

### **IN COMPLIANCE**

We have continued our work to transition into the state's new Teacher-Principal Evaluation Project (TPEP) for all of our certificated staff (teachers and principals) across the district. This new evaluation process is built upon the Danielson Instructional Framework (for teachers) or the Association of Washington School Principals (AWSP) Leadership Framework. More information on these two frameworks can be found online at [www.tpep-wa.org/](http://www.tpep-wa.org/). As you know, the Board

has also worked to create a similar structure for evaluating the superintendent as a way to create a parallel process using similar nomenclature.

All these moves in the evaluation process have really been a good extension of our previously used evaluation models (used with teachers and principals) that was set at a higher standard than the previous state requirements for evaluation. Therefore, the transition from the old state system to the new TPEP requirements has not caused any real challenges through the migration process.

There are several key changes that are part of the TPEP change that have been helpful in our continued work to support our individual and collective learning. These changes include a broader and clearer ranking system (Unsatisfactory, Basic, Proficient and Distinguished). This has allowed for a better description of where a teacher or principal is at in their performance over the previous state required unsatisfactory/satisfactory rating system.

The other key change was the evaluation rubric that provides descriptors for each rating level relative to the expected standard. This rubric has helped us be more specific in our efforts to support the learning and growth for each of our teaching and administrative staff relative to their performance. Additionally, this tool has helped us calibrate our rating system between schools through a process we use to establish inter-rater reliability.

With all that in mind, we have worked very hard to link the Danielson Rubric to our learning model by clearly showing the more we strive to achieve the district's mission, the greater the likelihood that evidence of a distinguished learning environment will be present. In short, TPEP and the Danielson Instructional Framework has been a source of validation for the work we have done on our Learning Model for the past decade.

2. ***The superintendent shall not fail to implement supervisory procedures for evaluators that ensure an accurate and complete evaluation of each certified and classified employee. IN COMPLIANCE***

Throughout the spring, I worked to support our administrative staff that completes teacher evaluations in learning how to use TPEP as a learning process rather than simply a tool for accountability. Again, the district's learning model is the foundation of this work, which is designed to create learning environments aimed at accomplishing the district mission.

District staff have worked hard to meet all required processes and timelines called for in state law and/or the CBAs for both our classified and certified employees. Considering all that went on this spring with our work to transition to our own special education program along with all the new Smarter Balanced testing work, I am very pleased to report that all the evaluations were completed by our principals and supervisors within the timelines called for in our collective bargaining agreements.