Monitoring Report - Executive Limitations Policy
EL-6, Staff Evaluations

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 11th, 2013.

Mark Mansell, Superintendent

SUPERINTENDENT'S INTERPRETATION OF POLICY

I interpret the board's staff evaluation expectations articulated in this policy to mean that the board expects a system to be in place to support staff efforts to improve their practice as learning environment leaders for students. I also understand this expectation to be that the Board values a system that has the capability to both recognize and encourage further development of quality instruction and work performance, as well as being powerful enough to provide focused assistance to any staff member who needs to provide higher quality instruction for students.

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 excellent performance.***
   - ***d. Assure that scheduled instructional time is used to students' maximum advantage.***

   IN COMPLIANCE

   This year was the last year of the old state criteria for teacher evaluations. Even though seven years ago we switched over to a much more rigorous evaluation criteria, there were significant changes to our process to meet the pending changes

for the 2013/14 school year. Therefore, we took this year (2012/13) as a transition year to bridge between our old updated evaluation criteria and model to the new model. This effort was significant and at times challenging even though much work was done previously. With that said, the shift to the new system was made much easier due to our many years of work with our learning model.

Last year we worked in partnership with a team of teachers and administrators to evaluate and determine which of the three state approved instructional frameworks we were going to implement (Marzano, the 5-Ds or Danielson). It was decided that the Danielson instructional framework would best align with our previous work to develop a learning model that is the foundation of all our learning environments we create for students.

From the Danielson instructional framework, we developed a plan to take what was formally approved by the state and not worry about the components of the new evaluation system that was still being determined. Approaching this transition in this manner would minimize the starts and potential "back-ups" that might occur otherwise. And since this year is the last optional year, we were not required to implement it all.

Another small, but very important facet of our transition plan was we decided that we as a collective staff would go through the process together. Other school districts are "phasing in" the new system so administrators and teachers are all on different evaluation systems. The work of this switch was significant enough, but to ask that administrators manage both the old and the new system as well as divide teachers into the old and new system is not something anyone of our team wanted.

I am very proud of how our staff moved through this transition in evaluation systems. I believe we did this the *La Center Way* by sticking together and moving forward with a learning mindset. I also believe we didn't "play the game" of evaluations, but really used the process to help us improve our practice for our students. With that said we have much more work to do as the upcoming school year will require further work especially in relation to student growth data.

Put another way, I believe we have made a huge step forward in our conversation about how to improve the learning environments for students through more detailed conversation about our performance. The implementation of a rating rubric has been essential to the deepening of the conversation. More work is needed in this area to be sure, but I believe the hard work done this year will pay even greater dividends down the road for students.

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

   At the start of each school year, all administrators and supervisors are provided a list of all employees they are responsible to supervise and evaluate. The specific deadlines for completing these evaluations are also provided, especially for those staff that must be evaluated within specific timelines as delineated with the classified and certificated collective bargaining agreements.