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 22nd, 2010.

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

   Over the past two years, our evaluation process has become less and less of an end of the year focused event and more of an on-going, almost weekly or sometimes daily conversation between administrators and teachers. Our collective efforts to focus on the district's learning model, Lab Classroom Project

team efforts and/or team learning walks by administrators has significantly altered the normal/formal evaluation process into more of a perpetual conversation about our practice as educators (both for administrators and teachers). This shift has significantly increased to an even greater degree our focus on improving instruction, expanding our real-time changes on how to better our individual and collective practices as educators as well as provided trust building (rather than the typical trust eroding) conversations on what needs to be improved during an end of the year write-up. We have asked ourselves, "Why wait for an end of the year evaluation when ongoing conversations and team learning as professionals can produce greater improvements in a shorter time span?" This work has not been easy, but I believe there is real ownership of this process by staff and that makes all the difference in producing real change.

To provide one simple, but unique example of how this change in our improvement process is making a real impact with students, I would offer the following topic that has come up over the past couple of years by students during the board/student linkage meetings. One topic students have raised is the need for better substitutes. They have said that at times they feel their learning "goes into neutral" when a substitute is leading the class. I see this not only as something that needs to be worked on, but also a sign that our teachers are creating better, more student-centered learning environments. This shift in how our teachers are creating learning environments is producing a stark contrast to what substitutes know how to create. Again, we are moving to address this new need through the creation of a substitute academy, but I do believe this evidence is a signal that our collective efforts to improve our practices as teachers is occurring in ways that is more powerful than simply evaluating staff once a year in a traditional format. Clearly we have much to improve on how we support substitutes (and volunteers), but none-the-less I see this student need as evidence that our teachers are making real improvements in creating better learning environments for them, which I see as the primary goal of the evaluation process as articulated in this executive limitation.

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, each administrator and supervisor is 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. As stated above, the weight of the written documentation of performance has changed in a significant way over the past couple of years. These evaluations are still important, but the day-in, day-out conversations are becoming much more impactful than a once a year written evaluation.