

Mendoza Plaintiffs' Comments and Objections to TUSD's Principal Evaluation Plan

April 10, 2015

On February 19, 2015, the District provided the Plaintiffs and Special Master with its Principal Evaluation Plan ("PEP") under the Court's January 30, 2015 Order [Doc. 1760]. Mendoza Plaintiffs provided the District their comments on the PEP on March 20, 2015. On April 3, 2015, the District provided the Plaintiffs and Special Master with its revised PEP.

While Mendoza Plaintiffs find that the revised PEP is a substantial improvement over the February 19 PEP, they do have a few remaining concerns. On page 6 of the revised PEP, the District implies that "the superintendent, charter representative or designee" who will deliver the principal orientation will also be the principal evaluator. It is unclear to Mendoza Plaintiffs who will be the principal evaluator, whether there will be multiple evaluators, and the extent to which the evaluator(s) will receive training. Mendoza Plaintiffs request that the PEP be revised to better describe who will conduct principal evaluations, and what type of training they will receive.

The revised PEP indicates that principals will receive an orientation on "the evaluation process." While Mendoza Plaintiffs understand the importance of principals' understanding of the process by which they will be evaluated, they ask what kind of training principals will receive to understand and perform the tasks on which they will be evaluated? Mendoza Plaintiffs remain unclear as to how evaluation results will be used to identify underperforming principals, and about the kind of professional development and support underperforming principals will receive. They request that the PEP be revised to clarify these aspects of the evaluation process.

Mendoza Plaintiffs note that they did find the "TUSD Six Leadership Area Rubric," attached to the revised PEP as Appendix B, to incorporate assessments of the use of CRP practices much better than the rubric for the teacher evaluation plan. They also believe that the descriptions of principal practices corresponding to each performance classification are likely to provide principals with a good understanding of how their use and promotion of CRP will affect their evaluation. However, the rubric for evaluating principal performance makes no reference to race, ethnicity, or to linguistic minorities, and instead relies entirely on references to "culture" and "diversity" in its incorporation of CRP assessments. Mendoza Plaintiffs do not feel that this approach adequately captures responsive pedagogy to address racial, ethnic, and linguistic differences, as required by the USP. They therefore request that the District revise the rubric to expressly include such references.

Mendoza Plaintiffs also note that the weight the District indicates it will give to the various evaluation components in the chart on page 3 does not match up to the information on the evaluation breakdown immediately above the chart. Mendoza

Plaintiffs find that the various surveys the District intends to use for principal evaluations, attached as Appendix C, are likely to adequately capture principals' performance and use and promotion of CRP practices. They defer to Special Master Hawley on whether the total weight given to the surveys (7%) is adequate.