

Norms:

- ✓ Ensure all voices are heard
- ✓ Stay on task and be aware of timeline
- ✓ Use thumbs up or down as consensus on group decisions
- ✓ Assume positive intent

Belief: The Joint Committee believes all children and staff can and will learn and grow together. The Joint Committee agreement will support the current district priorities and help the Staff to foster a growth mindset to collectively develop high expertise teaching and reflective practices that address the varying needs of students identified through analysis of student growth data.

Team:

April Capuder - Brooks 6th Gr AP	Cat Clarke - Longfellow Intermediate Special Education
Steve Cummins - D97 Senior Human Resource Director	Marion Ivey - Longfellow Kindergarten Teacher
Dr. Carrie Kamm - D97 Curriculum & Instruction Director	Ashley Kannan - Julian 8th Gr Humanities Teacher
Dr. Carol Kelley - D97 Superintendent	Paul Manus - Beye 4th Gr Teacher
Jason Morrell - Julian 6th Grade Science Teacher	Keshia Warner - Whittier Elementary Principal

Outcome/Task/Agenda item	TIME/ Facilitator	Notes/Dialog
Identify two types of assessments to use for each category of teacher (Type I or II and Type III) Cathy Thought Partner		Teacher Category and assessments
Identify a measurement model to use for each assessment Questions for Cathy (Thursday) What kind of process can we put into place for teachers? If common assessments will be used, what will be the pre-test methodology for these?		<p>IDEAS - No Decisions made simple growth, growth trajectory may apply to MAP (with consideration to the high end?), a divide by 2 model (below) for a percentage based assessment, looking at chunking for groups in particular this happening with IB rubrics, this has to be a dialog between the evaluator and evaluatee.</p> <p style="text-align: center;">Example</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Regular Education students pre-test scores <ul style="list-style-type: none"> – 60 to 80% <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • (100-80=20; 20/2=10; range is 70 to 90%) – 40 to 60% <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • (100-60=40; 40/2=20; range is 60 to 80%) – 20 to 40% <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • (100-40=60; 60/2=30; range is 50 to 70%) – 0 to 20% <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • (100-20=80; 80/2=40; range is 40 to 60%) • If 80% of students or higher make goal, teacher score is Excellent, if 60% to 79% teacher score is Proficient, if 40% to 59% teacher score is Needs Improvement, if less than 40% teacher score is Unsatisfactory
Determine how student characteristics fit into the determination of the student growth summative ratings		<p>IDEAS - No Decisions made Students must be present for both the pre- and post; , Collection of students grouped from some logical methodology; a representative population; ideas - whole class if you have a whole class, a single section if at the MS,</p>

Determine the weight of each type of assessment		
CLOSING MOVES: Review Action Items/Due Dates Process Facilitation	5 min	Agenda topics for 3/17 readiness <ul style="list-style-type: none"> ● Develop a process/chart for determining summative ratings ● Identify/develop a data management system to store assessment data over time and, if needed, to link students with multiple teachers
Revisit the student growth component, discuss what percent of the overall performance evaluation rating will be based on student growth (minimum of 25% the first two years and 30% thereafter) <ul style="list-style-type: none"> ● What are other districts doing and rationale 	Parking Lot	Continue to look at something between 30 and 50%. Discuss implications of other percentages (60/40, 50/50) and our capacity for an increased figure for student growth (or for this in the future) Other Districts - Evanston 65 example* from Cathy (50% student growth with a rationale) 10% School - Assessment of growth in reading informational text District initiative that an "all in" effort was decided 10% Team - Working as an interdependent team to ensure success of all student, sharing strategies and results among peers/teams to impact student success across the team 30 % Individual - (One Type II and One Type III assessment) Evanston kept the 30% in the individual process, but built upon this figure with the rationales above *Evanston has implemented student growth for several years already What rationales do we have related to our beliefs and vision? Determine an initial percentage for the 2016-17 school year.
K-5 Grade Level Chairs		Marion Ivey Longfellow Kindergarten Jessica Collela Holmes 1st Grade Cynthia Wilson Lincoln 2nd Grade Andrew Righeimer Hatch 3rd Grade Marianne Rehfield Holmes 4th Grade Melissa Manuel Holmes 5th Grade Kathy Sweeney Whittier Special Education
Grade 6-8 Department Chairs		John Colucci Julian Language Arts (split) Meghan VrynckBrooks Language Arts (split) Sharon Gunnell Julian Math (split) Amanda Meyers Brooks Math (split) Jason Morrell Julian Science (split) Tom Reising Brooks Science (split) Jeff Missman Brooks Humanities (split) Joe Parratore Julian Humanities (split) Tim Walsh Julian Design Lisa Lohman Brooks World Languages
Special Areas Department Chairs		Jenny Raia Longfellow Art Mark Bulger Beye GTD Ingrid Wilson Whittier LAS Mindi Maneck Holmes Librarians Katrina Beck Mann General Music Gabby Rosenblum Beye Instrumental Music

ACTION ITEMS	PERSON(S) RESPONSIBLE	DUE BY	UPDATE/NOTES
Identifying rubrics being used in the district SLOs that promote cross training / scoring			
Sample SLOs and processes (Amer Inst Research, WI, NJ, other)	ALL	2/29	Uploaded to folder for review

Attachments: