



Mountain View
Whisman
School District

Review of Evaluation Process for District Leaders





Mountain View
Whisman
School District

Why a new Evaluation Process

District Quality Review 2015-16

- People are working very hard in schools and at the District level, but they are not all working toward the same goals, limiting the quality of the outcomes.
- The District functions as a system of individual schools rather than a school system. Schools work in isolation and have excessive autonomy, without appropriate checks and balances/accountability, because there are no specific district goals and no guidance from the Board for schools to align their work. As a result, each school focuses on different topics that may or may not be the appropriate areas to target, and student achievement significantly varies.

DQR findings, con't...

- Systems of accountability for all departments, teams and schools are not well established. Information about the impact of policies and initiatives is inconsistently collected for analysis. Systems for ensuring departments' work is aligned to District goals and that their work is impactful are not established. As a result, many schools and the District continue to invest time, energy and resources into initiatives without knowing what impact they are having.
- There are no systems in place for evaluating the work of District Office staff. They do not receive regular feedback on their job performance or guidance of what they need to improve upon or what they are doing well. Any additional professional learning is generally self-initiated.

SP2021 goal

- Strategy 4.2 - Provide growth and leadership opportunities for all staff by providing meaningful, high-quality, and strategic professional development as well as valuable feedback on performance.
 - 4.2d - Consistent and well-designed individual performance evaluations and professional learning plans aligned with district goals.

SP2021 goal 4.2d: 1-3

- Redesign evaluation systems of all staff through a comprehensive research analysis of current best practices
- Provide training on evaluation system for all staff
- Develop a structure for ongoing, job-embedded feedback into the evaluation process for all staff

Evaluation process 1.0 - 2016-17

- New instrument that mirrors Superintendent Evaluation
- Meets 3 times a year (Sept, Feb, June)
- Relied heavily on person being evaluated to show evidence
- No rubric to define the difference between a 6 and a 1 rating.
- One person from District Office is responsible for the process; no other members contribute to the writing of the evaluation



Mountain View
Whisman
School District

Process 2.0

What We Want to Accomplish

- End of 2016-17 school year - Cabinet met and determined that our purpose is to...
 - Remove barriers, create pathways and open doors for all staff.
- During summer retreat of 2017-18 school year
 - Leadership team requested more feedback and visits from all members of Cabinet.

New Process

Using a collaborative approach, members of Cabinet:

- Visit schools on a regular basis to provide support in focused areas
- Provide year-long professional development that leads to growth
- Create a protocol in which principals can openly ask for support in various areas

New Process (con't...)

New this year:

- Two lead evaluators
- Directors as non-evaluative coaches
- Outside coaching to assist with alignment to SP2021
- Possibility for travel to select conferences throughout the year



Mountain View
Whisman
School District

Review of the Instrument

Introduction of Evaluation Instrument

- 2016
 - Trustees and Superintendent held a retreat with Bill Attea, from Hazard Young and Attea (HYA)
 - Adopted a new evaluation matrix for the Superintendent (winter 2016)
 - Developed the first set of annual goals
 - Board goals then comprise part 1 of the three-part evaluation
- 2016-17, the document was adopted to evaluate all members of the Leadership Team

Evaluation Instrument, continued

- Document has three sections
 - Part 1: Board goals that create alignment to SP2021 (Performance Goals)
 - Goals reflect the responsibility of the evaluatee (i.e. - middle school schedule = middle school administrators).
 - Part 2: General Job Performance Goals
 - Part 3: Characteristics, Skills, and Knowledge.
 - Part 3 is used as an self-assessment tool for District Office staff and administrators
 - Evaluation process utilizes qualitative and quantitative measures

Evaluation Instrument, continued

- The instrument is viewed as a growth model
 - Administrators should demonstrate ownership, reflective growth, ability to make decisions based on data, and solution orientation
 - i.e. - quality of presentations
 - Board feedback around quality of presentations
 - **Ownership** - Build time into schedule to meet with staff and personally train all leaders
 - **Reflection** - which presentations were successful and why
 - **Data** - number of questions raised during meetings, questions raised in 1:1, number of times Trustees and staff noted frustration around information
 - **Solution orientation** - develop standards and review process for all presentations

Data Points - this list is not meant to be exhaustive

- Quantitative
 - CAASPP results (including subgroup)
 - Budget
 - Exit survey results
 - Benchmark data
 - Staff hiring / retention data
 - LCAP surveys
 - Discipline
 - Alignment survey results
 - Student and staff attendance
 - Site plan goals
 - Climate surveys
 - Evaluation completion rate
 - Number of communications sent to stakeholders
- Qualitative
 - Walk through feedback sessions
 - Observations
 - Union reported issues and resolution
 - SIOp and RTI implementation
 - Adherence to state mandates
 - Leadership /ownership on BOT / District goals & initiatives
 - Presentations
 - Quality of evaluations
 - Community engagement
 - Communication (school, discipline, parents)



Mountain View
Whisman
School District

Feedback process

Timeline

November, January, February and June

LT meeting

Devoted to creating a rubric that defines the difference between 1 and 6

Review of the Evaluation process

Self Reflection

Principals will turn in a self-reflections - Due 9/1

Collection of Evidence

Principals should collect evidence that demonstrates progress toward goals

November and February are check-in meetings

January - Mid Year review (full written eval)
June - Final Eval (Full written eval)

Aug.

Sept.

Sept. - May

Nov - June

Collection of Data

Members from Executive Cabinet will review Data and Principals Strengths / Opportunities for Growth

Goal Setting meetings

Principals will meet with members of Cabinet to review data, site plans and set goals with Executive Cabinet

Cabinet Visit

At minimum every other Tuesday a member of Cabinet will visit a school

Superintendent will also hold group visits on the Friday after Board meetings

Review of Progress

Cabinet will discuss strengths and opportunities for growth for schools in Cabinet meetings based on visits

Only Executive Cabinet discusses personnel

Review of Meetings

- Principals give quick overview of school data, share artifacts and evidence
- Discussion
 - with Cabinet to:
 - Determine how Cabinet supports sites to meet SP2021 goals
 - with Executive Cabinet to:
 - Review self evaluation
 - Develop and review goals
 - Receive formal ratings / next steps

Review of Meetings (con't...)

September

- Turn in self-reflection by 9/1/17 including 3 strengths and 3 opportunities for growth
- Review school data
- Bring slides 33-40 from school summit presentation
- Discuss site plan actions to meet SP2021
- Set leadership goals based on self-reflection and summit slides

Review of Meetings (con't...)

November

Cabinet

- Review trimester 1 data
- Discuss any adjustments
- Point out opportunities for support from Cabinet

Executive Cabinet

- Discuss progress toward goals

Review of Meetings (con't)

January

- Mid-year review with lead evaluator & superintendent
 - Share evidence of progress toward goals
- Receive formal write-up one week after meeting

Review of Meetings (con't...)

February

Cabinet

- Review trimester 2 data
- Discuss any adjustments
- Point out opportunities for support from Cabinet

Executive Cabinet

- Discuss progress toward goals

Review of Meetings (con't)

June

- Final review with lead evaluator & Superintendent
 - Share evidence of progress toward goals
- Receive formal write-up one week after meeting

Roles

- Cabinet
 - provide support for principals and schools
- Coach
 - provides non-evaluative support for principal
- Executive Cabinet
 - provides input to formal evaluation
- Lead Evaluator
 - regularly visits schools, provides feedback to principals, point person for issues, lead writer for formal evaluation
- Superintendent
 - reviews all formal evaluations, works with lead evaluator to determine ratings