



**District Improvement Team (DIT)
Meeting
Thursday, October 2, 2014
5:30 – 7:30 p.m.**

ATTENDANCE:

In attendance:

Jennifer Blaine, Linda Buchman, Katherine Dawson, Ellen Green, Stephanie Hoang, Bob Houston, Penne Irvin, Kenneth Jones, Samuel Karns, Duncan Klussmann, Scott LeMaire, Benjamin Leung, Ester Loreda, Maria Luna, Ana Medrano, Georgia Polley, Karen Rodriguez, David Sablatura, Elaine Sorsby, Dmel Tatum, Shelly Tornquist, Kristina Van Arsdale, Becky Wuerth

Percent of DIT members in attendance: 53%

WELCOME:

Scott LeMaire, DIT Co-Chair called the meeting to order and turned the meeting over to Dr. Klussmann. Dr. Klussmann welcomed and thanked everyone for their service and reminded the group that when we meet in November on Election Day, the state will have a new slate of leaders. Dr. Klussmann noted that with new leadership at the governor, lieutenant governor, chair of Senate Education committee and new Appropriations chair in the House, there is potential for big impact on education. He does not anticipate a decision on the school finance lawsuit for at least 12-15 months.

Dr. Klussmann noted that a big question, with the state flush with cash, will be whether they hold back or send more funding to school districts. He predicts that HB5 will stay strong, though there may be some tweaks. For example, there may be resources for counseling and advising. There may be a push for more reductions in standardized testing where the big hang up is federal law. He noted that there already has been a reduction at the high school level from 15 tests to five. However, in grades 3-8 there is still same amount of high stakes testing. To receive federal dollars, districts are required to test in grades 3-8.

Dr. Klussmann noted that our current enrollment is approximately 35,100 and that we have not yet hit our enrollment projections. We have filed a waiver for class size, and Dr. Klussmann noted that if SBISD were to get dollars back from the state, salary increases and reducing class size would be likely priorities.

He noted the bond program is moving along nicely. Valley Oaks is being completed this fall, Rummel Creek is under construction, and in the months ahead, the design documents for SBEC will be reviewed by the Board of Trustees. Remaining savings in the bond program are being set aside for emergencies between now and the next bond program. Additionally, the Board of Trustees has authorized a bus a/c retrofit, which we will communicate out to our community as soon as the program is successfully underway. We hope to have this project completed by the

end of year. We believe this will help us not only improve the bus experience for our students, but also help us attract and retain bus drivers. In the next 12-18 months, we will make decisions for the next round of student technology earmarked in the current bond program.

In answering a question about high school enrollment, Dr. Klussmann noted that Stratford is under enrollment projections. Only Northbrook High is over projections, though all the high schools all within range of 20-30 students of projections. He further noted on enrollment that SBISD tends to be cyclical, and we may be at the top of an enrollment cycle. Relative to projections, we tend to have a one-year lag on either up-ticks or downturns. Pre-kindergarten enrollment is down across the board.

There was a question regarding science at high school and standards based grading vs Skyward conversions. Duncan does not think Skyward can convert the grades. It was also asked when Dual Language programming will reach high schools, which will be in the 2016-17 school year.

Dr. Klussmann thanked everyone for their work on academic calendars and teacher development and evaluation and then turned the agenda over to Jennifer Blaine for a discussion on the Teacher Development and Evaluation program.

- **TEACHER EVALUATION**

Dr. Blaine launched the DIT discussion around the development of a new Teacher Evaluation system by reminding the members that this topic will be on every DIT agenda this year. She updated the DIT on the rubric development process which the DIT worked on at the September meeting, noting that the draft rubric had been sent to the Campus Improvement Teams for their review. Principals have been asked to send feedback to Jennifer. She will compile the feedback and report back to the DIT.

The specific topic for DIT to discuss at this meeting is use of data in the evaluation system. The guidance from the state requires that 20% of the evaluation be based on student performance data. We are seeking feedback on the law from the state, and we are not sure if that will be actually implemented. At this point, we are trying to decide if we want to include data in our model.

Dr. Blaine introduced the members of the Teacher Development and Evaluation Cross Functional Team Data Subcommittee to lead the DIT conversation around the topic. CFT data committee representatives present included Edna Johnson, Dave Sablatura, Ellen Green, and Debbie Silber.

Dr. Sablatura led the discussion noting that their CFT subcommittee was asked to study how data could be used in the system. They did a lot of work last spring/summer including teacher panels and surveys. A teacher from Memorial Middle did research on instruments being used around the state. Debbie Silber, it was noted, served as an elementary principal in HISD, and she worked on that district's teacher evaluation system when she was in that role.

One question the group was addressing is whether data negates the feeling of coaching, if we are aspiring to develop an instrument that serves as a true coaching model, would including a data

piece negate the feeling of coaching? That was the sense from data used in the HISD instrument. Another issue within HISD was around transparency of data and how the calculations were made. It was noted that the State is doing the same work we are doing. T-TESS will be the state system. One thing state is doing that is in TEA rules we must do if we create our own. Our aim is to destigmatize observations from a focus on compliance to more of a focus on feedback and support. We aim to create a richer narrative around performance. We also hope to accomplish this for principal's appraisals as well.

Dr. Sablatura noted that this we have an ambitious goal and that we want to be sure whatever system implement will help our district get to T-2-4. From a culture perspective, we want to assure it is evident that we believe in our teachers. Another project aim is to connect what the appraiser observes and what kids actually learn. Possible measures include STAAR, Norm-referenced tests, EDL/DRA, locally developed assessments, etc.

Question -- If campuses are developing locally developed assessment, why should they not be included?

Answer -- The thinking is that we should not use formative assessments, but only summative assessments and that we are seeking data as close to school year-end as possible.

Question -- Isn't this just replacing one snapshot day with another? This is still only one day, not necessarily what a teacher is doing to prepare for student success.

Answer -- Using data points that show growth is the aim, so, perhaps pre-post measurements would work. An aim would be to focus on growth.

Dr. Sablatura noted that there are other ways of measuring growth including EVAS, and that STAAR also has a growth measure. He also noted that TEA references, "value added."

Dr. Sablatura noted that one recommendation is to use three measures weighted 10% each: individual teacher data, teacher team data (vertical), and school-wide data.

Question -- So for example, 8th grade language arts. I am still concerned that this is just based on a single score.

Answer --This would be just a part ...data over time would be most telling,

Question -- Are you proposing looking at students in class at one time, or all of the students over time? Is the data based on a particular student and set of students...which is it?

Answer -- There would be a formula that would address all of the students.

With regards to Team data, Dr. Sablatura noted that they first considered doing this horizontally, but decided vertically would help better to look at programs. A DIT member noted that while this sounds good in theory, we have students for whom we have no data. Another factor is where there is high teacher turnover. Sighted as an example is Spring Forest Middle School which has 17 new teachers this year. A noted concern is that a continuity model doesn't really exist. There are also students who arrive at middle school, for example, having never spoken English before.

Dr. Blaine noted that the Cross Functional Team needs this type of feedback to support the DIT in this work. All factors mentioned need to be considered. She affirmed that this should not be about one score on one day. The aim is to emphasize the coaching piece. Dr. Blaine reminded the DIT that the data portion of the instrument, as the CFT is developing recommendations now, would be just 30% of the whole.

Dr. Blaine affirmed that feedback from the teacher panel affirmed that there are students who struggle with language, come from other districts or are below level, etc. The teacher panel and survey feedback both affirmed that if we are going to consider data, we must have consideration of where child was when he/she came to us. In other words, growth can't just be about one number on a day. She affirmed that the feedback needed from the DIT now, is whether it is even fair/do we even want to have data included in the evaluation instrument.

Dr. Sablatura noted that it is good to have data there, but good to have to talk about.

Dr. Blaine noted that if we don't have to use weighting for data, we will set up so it meets our needs. We don't want a punitive system.

Question --- What to do with electives teachers? Feedback could come from these teachers along with their directors.

Question--- How will a pilot look?

Answer --Goal is to do mini pilots on pieces of rubrics within schools that would be willing to work with us in spring. In the fall of 2-15, we will do a bigger pilot. Kenneth volunteered to be a pilot teacher.

- **CALENDAR DEVELOPMENT PROCESS**

The agenda continued at this point with work on the 15-16 and 16-17 calendars. The DIT members divided into their two groups, with each focused on developing two draft calendars for each year. The groups continued their work until the meeting's end.

NEXT MEETING DATES:

Tuesday, Nov. 4

Thursday, Dec. 4