

Minutes
Watertown Board of Education
Curriculum and Instruction Sub Committee Meeting
Monday May 11, 2015 – 6:30 p.m.
Watertown High School
Lecture Hall

Members Present: Ray Nardella, Chairman of Policy & Labor Committee
Cathie Rinaldi, Committee Member
Janelle Wilk, Committee Member
Jim Gambardella, Committee Member

Members Absent: None

Others Present: Leslie Crotty, Chairman, Board of Education
Vic Vincenzi, Board of Education
Dr. Bridget Carnemolla, Superintendent of Schools

1. Convene Meeting

Mr. Nardella, Chairman of the Curriculum and Instruction Committee, convened the meeting at 6:34 p.m. and then immediately turned the meeting over to Dr. Carnemolla to discuss the update to the 2015 – 2016 Teacher Evaluation plan for Watertown Public Schools

2. Review of the Meeting

Dr. Carnemolla – Ms. Parlato, who was supposed to present tonight, could not make it. With the Board’s permission, we will conference her in via phone. (She was conferenced in). It was noted that Ms. Parlato runs the committees for Dr. Carnemolla and would better be able to answer questions and in turn bring questions back to the committee, if need be.

Since 2012, we have been required to adopt an evaluation plan as a district, bring it to the Board of Education for approval, and submit it to the state for their approval. We can create our own plans using the state’s guidelines. The plan defines excellent practice for teachers, gives accurate and useful information about educators’ strengths and development areas, and also provides opportunities for professional learning growth and recognition. By statute, every district is required to have a committee to create the plan and we have large and involved committee. There are 18 people on the committee, with all schools and departments represented. As part of the meetings, the bargaining units were also spoken to, along with the educators’ association. From here, we hope to have the Board of Education’s approval and then

submit it to the state for their approval. Once the plan is approved, it will be distributed to everyone.

40% of a teacher's score is based on student growth and development. It is related to their learning objectives which are tied to student growth. 5% is the whole school learning indicator and 5% is parent engagement. The final 50% is observation of teacher performance and practice and likewise the administrator evaluations are based on the same percentages and items. In category one, we have been doing calibration meetings with everyone so that the rubrics are the same. There are two rubrics: the common core of teaching rubric and the common core of service delivery rubric. There are two rubrics because it is not possible to evaluate everyone under the same standards. For example, a speech pathologist does not function the same as a teacher so they would be evaluated under the service delivery rubric.

The types of observations were gone over with review of practice being up front. This is where the teacher and administrator will go over a portfolio containing lesson plans, student work, assignments, assessment results, etc...Ms. Crotty asked what time of assistance we are giving the teachers in regards to time management to prepare for this. Dr. Carnemolla felt this way might take up less time than in the past, as the portfolio is assembled throughout the year. There is other time also devoted to the teachers throughout the year to help with this. Towards the end of the year, more time is also given to write their reflections on the year.

There are observations for teachers in years one and two, then observations for teachers beyond those years. In the first two years (not just in Watertown, but full career), there would be at least three observations, two of which have to have a pre and post conference. Two reviews of practice, once in mid-year and once at year's end. Teachers beyond the second year must have at least two observations that include at least one with a pre and post conference. There is also an informal observation and two reviews of practice. Mr. Nardella asked if these observations changed if a teacher changes, for instance, their certification. The answer was that it is career driven. Only the first two years of any career is what we are talking about. Change of certification or towns would not change this. This is only for novice teachers.

Moving on to the parent piece, a parent will be given a survey and it will be sent back. Typically there are two or three areas that need to be improved upon and we work on that. In category 3, 40% is student growth and development. This is based upon the district and school's learning goals. It will become easier as we now have a district plan we are working from. It measures progress decided on at the school level. At this point, the smarter balanced testing is not used, but may be in the future. The final 5% is the whole school learning indicator. This is a state requirement, supposed to be based on standardized tests, but as of now, they are not tied to this. Because of this, we have to determine this with the average of each student learning score from each teacher. We do have everyone on board with this and it seems the fairest way to do so without using the smarter balanced tests. Mr. Nardella asked if the design of that last 5% differs in every district and the answer was yes. While we have to have this whole school indicator, we can define what that is. Every town is doing their own, which is why they have to be submitted for approval. Ms. Parlato added that once smarter balance testing is integrated, this section may be used for school and district performance.

In the categories for the final ratings, the numbers have not changed, but the category names have changed. We have changed the language a bit to be more in line with our student report cards.

Mr. Vincenzi asked if the teachers are notified about the observations in advance. For formals, they have to be. For informals, they do not have to be and our standard is that they are not. There are cases where we may need to, for example for scheduling purposes. We may need to inform them to make sure they are actually doing something that should be observed vs. a testing time or when that teacher may not have an observable class. It has to be in a setting that makes sense for an observation. Ms. Parlato noted that if it is or is not planned, it really doesn't make a difference in the way the teachers are in class. Mr. Vincenzi asked also how we came up with the amount of evaluations for the novice teachers. The answer is because these are the most critical years and it's totally different when they hit the class room vs. interning and such. It's when they need the most support from us. Their craft is honed now and by the third year, they should have it down. It is also state regulated. Ms. Crotty asked if there is a place to self-evaluate. The answer was yes, in the post conference and in the year end reflection that is needed to be done.

3. Adjournment

Mr. Nardella adjourned the meeting at 7:09 p.m.

He then called for a motion to adjourn.

Subject: Motion to Adjourn

Motion Presented by: Ms. Wilk

Motion Seconded by: Mr. Vincenzi

Motion Passed

Respectfully submitted by,

Mindi Davidson

Recording Secretary