

DISTRICT ADVISORY COMMITTEE MEETING MINUTES
May 26, 2011

Members Present: Natalie Abrameit, Rosa Villatoro-DeAnda, Andy Dewey, Earl Jimmison, Rhonda Jones, John Lengers, and Brent McCowan.

Dr. Chip Zullinger began the meeting at 4:30 p.m. and introduced Christina Masick from Policy Administration to discuss the revisions to the 2011-2012 Student Code of Conduct.

2011-2012 Student Code of Conduct – Christina Masick

Christina Masick reviewed each page that had revisions:

Page 3 and 5 – technology language added;

Page 9 – restraint language was moved to page 22;

Page 11 – possession of pepper spray or mace. Possession of these items is a Level 3 offense and the use of these items is a Level 4 offense.

Comment: They're considered weapons but they're not illegal.

Q: Is there a distinction among age groups?

A: No distinction.

Page 11 – cyberbullying “at or away from campus”

Q: Even during vacation? Winter Break?

A: Yes, if they bring it back to the classroom.

Q: Has the Legal Dept. looked at this?

A: Yes.

Q: What about employees?

A: That's addressed in policy; this is a student code of conduct. There's a fine line between freedom of expression and bullying.

Pages 12 and 13 – timelines on action; language around Title 5 felonies.

Q: Why don't we define corporal punishment? If a teacher has to intervene physically, does the district look at this as corporal punishment?

A: If you're protecting yourself it's different than when used as a discipline measure.

Page 28, section d – changes will continue to be made in this section.

Page 31 – non-discriminatory language;

Page 35 – links bullying and harassment;

Page 36 – extension of bullying language pursuant to statutory change.

Q: If a student engages in bullying, the option is there to be moved to another campus?

A: Depends on how pervasive it was. They could be moved to another classroom, campus, or alternative setting.

Q: Who makes that determination?

A: The office of School Choice transfer process, parent conference, etc. Will have to look at our transfer policies.

Comment: Bullying victims need to have counseling offered to them before they do something tragic like commit suicide as a result of the bullying.

Q: Do we offer self-defense since right now both students are suspended if they're involved in an altercation?

A: We remain silent on that issued because philosophically what works in one family doesn't work in another.

Q: Do we still have zero tolerance?

A: Yes; we're only discussing the changes/revisions to the code of student conduct.

Comment: Cheating and plagiarism need to be addressed in the Code.

School Leader Appraisal System – Bill Horwath

Bill mentioned that today's meeting is a follow-up from last week. The School Leader Appraisal System is a more consolidated and compact process than the teacher evaluation system but still need to get feedback from the various groups.

Bill discussed the Appraisal Process Overview that was included in the handout:

1. Orientation – training for school leaders
2. Principal Self-Assessment and Pre-Assessment
3. Meeting between principal and evaluator – beginning of year conference to set goals, etc.
4. Mid-Year Evaluation Discussion
5. Consolidated Performance Assessment – overall body of work for evaluator to evaluate
6. End-of-year Performance Discussion
7. Final Evaluation and Goal Setting Meeting

Principal Evaluation Rubric Discussion:

1. Managing Change

a. Change Agent

Comment: The whole rubric seems so vague. All the educational buzzwords have been used.

Bill stated that the skills build on each other and one can't move to the next level unless all the skills from the previous level have been met.

Q: If they're not developing, are they put on a growth plan?

A: This is a five-point scale.

Q: So they get a five-point scale that the teachers didn't get?

A: We could make this a four-point scale.

Q: What if some of these skills don't apply to the deans or the assistant principals?

A: We want to know this so that it can be adjusted.

Q: Since we're already piloting this, how will the changes be made because this process isn't as transparent as the teacher evaluation system?

A: We're looking at all the feedback from SDMC, DAC, field testing, etc.

Q: How was this sent to the SDMCs?

A: The survey was sent to the principals last week.

b. Flexibility

Q: How do you measure “understands that different change initiatives may be perceived differently by various stakeholders?”

A: Good point; not sure how it would be measured.

Comment: This is very vague. Needs to be more explicit. The wording is very ambiguous.

Q: What if the skill under “Accomplished” is witnessed by my assessor but it wasn’t witnessed in the “Developing” box?

A: This is an important point for training. Need to start from the left and move to the right.

Comment: Somewhere in this rubric we need to have the number of complaints and grievances filed against a principal, that they’re not following policy, etc. Leadership by fear doesn’t “encourage teachers and staff to express opinions...”

Comment: The wording under “Distinguished, Effectively managing change” needs to be clarified.

c. Ideal and Beliefs – no discussion

d. Intellectual Stimulation

Comment: It seems to be duplicated with page 6 and if you don’t meet this skill, you’re struck twice; gives it an unfair weight.

e. Knowledge of Curriculum

Comment: It’s hard for an administrator to have knowledge of everything, especially in a large high school.

Comment: More duplication under the “Developing” category.

f. Monitor and Evaluate

Comment: “Understands impact...” is a duplication of “Change Agent.”

g. Optimize

Comment: There’s nothing here about community surveys. Need feedback from the community.

Q: How do you measure “Distinguished?” This isn’t challenging enough. Define “challenging times.”

A: This could mean budget cuts, the test scores went down, a hurricane hit and schools were closed for 11 days, etc.

Comment: Change the word “promote” to “instill” under “Distinguished.”

Q: How does an SIO know this? A teacher would know.

A: Teacher surveys are there to provide feedback to the SIOs.

Comment: There’s a fear of confidentiality with surveys. The district should use an outside company.

2. Focus of Leadership

a. Contingent Rewards

Comment: Nowhere does anything measure timelines. Put more time frames.

a. Learning Environment

Comment: The last box is an exact duplication of the other three.

b. Focus – no discussion

c. Involvement in Curriculum, Instruction and Assessment

Comment: There's duplication under "Accomplished."

e. Order

Comment: How do you measure "sustains" under "Distinguished?"

f. Outreach

Q: Under "Effective," some principals may not have a role. Do all the boxes have to be checked to be moved to the next category?

A: We'll work on the wording.

Comment: Need to add "business community" to the list under "Effective."

g. Resources – no discussion

3. Purposeful Community

a. Affirmation

Comment: Acknowledges them to whom? Maybe the word "failure" shouldn't be used. Lack of clarity on this.

b. Communication – no discussion

c. Culture – no discussion

d. Input

Q: Does this go beyond the SDMC?

A" Yes

Q: What if the principal has a leadership team they depend on. How would the evaluator know this?

A: Through the teacher survey,

e. Relationships

Comment: Be more specific on "acknowledges significant events in the lives of teachers and staff."

Comment: This ties in with "Situational Awareness."

f. Situational Awareness – no discussion

g. Visibility – no discussion

Bill stated that once the revisions have been made to the document, he'll send it out to the committee. He'll also re-circulate the Measures of Student Learning that were in the survey the DAC members received on Monday.

The meeting adjourned at 6:00 p.m.