

A stylized graphic on a dark blue background. It features two hands, one light grey and one dark grey, cupping a glowing white sphere. A bright blue light emanates from the point where the hands meet the sphere, creating a lens flare effect.

CITE/LEAD TASK FORCE DAC Presentation

April 12, 2016

How the CITE/LEAD Focus Group came to be?



- DCSD Principals were asked to seek volunteers for the CITE/LEAD Focus Group to review the evaluation tool*
- Volunteers sent interest emails to Tammy Taylor and Ian Wells for participation*
- A committee of 25 volunteers was assembled – balanced between all levels, various tenures within the district, and roles within district*



What the panel represents:



- *A voice for the masses*
- *Belief in growth through feedback*
- *User friendly, positive impact on the system*
- *Desire for a more purposeful evaluation tool and process to lead toward pedagogical growth*
- *Clarity within the system*



PURPOSE OF THE WORK....



To achieve success, accomplishing our district's mission outlined within the Douglas County School District's strategic plan, we continue to review the DCSD Evaluation system and processes. Our goal is to achieve educational excellence through individual educators reaching their ultimate potential, regardless of their role in our system.

In reviewing our evaluation system, we recognize the need to have a streamlined process in place surrounding InspirED Innovation and various educators' roles within the system. In an effort to meet expectations, we have created an annual review process to streamline changes and/or get feedback from stakeholders.

So...



MISSION DEFINED BY FOCUS GROUP



Make proposals to revise the CITE/LEAD documents into more user friendly and valuable tools to support teacher growth, improve climate and culture, and create a more effective and meaningful evaluation system.



PROCESS OF THE FOCUS GROUP



Constructivist Approach:

Collaboration/Discussion (all voices in the room)

Session 1:

- *SB 191 – Differences between state and CITE rubrics for teacher evaluation*
- *Initial brainstorm – all potential topics*

Session 2:

- *Prioritized items that were ‘realistic’ to amend– weighing pros and cons of various topics.*

Session 3:

- *Titles of 4 descriptors – HE, E, PE, I*

Session 4 and 5:

- *Deconstructing the language of CITE Standards*
- *Evaluating language choices*
- *Making recommendations for changes– Proposal Imminent.*



RECOGNIZED CHALLENGES...

- *Dispelling rumors within the system – myth busting*
- *SB191 – the weight of its impact– changes to evaluation practices and philosophy*
- *Alignment – inter–rater reliability*
- *Understanding of the rubric language – Defined*
- *Differences between needs at various schools, feeders, and academic levels*
- *Recognition of domino effect of change*



BIG ROCKS/PRIORITIES?



- *Retitling ratings*
- *Define/refine terminology– Clarity needed within the system*
- *Reduce/Remove backward planning– Change to Purposeful Planning*
- *4 to 5 categories shift or at least in final rating calculation (i.e. Upper Effective/Lower Effective)*



NEXT STEPS OR RECOMMENDATIONS FROM TEAM...



Next Steps:

- *Present formalized proposal for systematic review to PK-12.*
- *Continue conversation and work in Fall.*

Recommendations:

- *Consistent professional development around the CITE tool- Definition of terms.*
- *District initiated communication to dispel rumors and address FAQ.*





QUESTIONS?

