## DEAC Meeting Agenda: 4.10.14

#### Technology

- Moving forward ... What Computer Works Best For Our Students?
- 2013-14 Course Roster Verification and Submission
- Update from each Building
  - Student Growth Objectives
    - SGO Checkpoints and Considerations, Administering and Scoring SGO Assessments)
  - Marzano
    - Observations
    - Final Evaluations

#### AchieveNJ

- Waiver Status
- Lessons from Educators
- 2014-15 Policy Updates and Evaluation Rubric Requirement
- Survey: March 2014

#### Professional Learning/Development

- o June 6
  - District & School PD Planning Templates for 2014-15

# What computer works best for our students next year?

• Try our two example models

• Thoughts?



## 2013-14 Course Roster Verification and Submission

- The *integrity of the mSGP* measure of the evaluation system relies on course roster accuracy, which can only be verified at the local level prior to the certification of their official submission.
  - Participate in the NJ SMART Course Roster Submission Practice Period from April 16 to June 30, 2014
  - Upload, correct, and certify the official Course Roster Submission between July 7 and August 4, 2014
  - The Department will link 2013-14 district Course Roster Submission data with 2014 student level SGP values for each qualifying individual teacher to determine his/ her mSGP score. These 2013-14 mSGP score reports will be accessible to districts along with final summative ratings in early winter 2015.



### Student Growth Objectives

#### • Checkpoints:

- Was the SGO assessment administered in a fair and accurate manner consistent with locally-approved policies?
- Was the student data for the teacher's SGO determined through a fair and accurate scoring process consistent with locally-approved guidelines?
- Does the teacher provide clear student-level evidence for student performance (both baseline data and assessment data) over the SGO period?
- Has the teacher provided an accurate SGO rating for each SGO using the data they have submitted?



### Student Growth Objectives

### • <u>Checkpoints</u>:

- Is it necessary to adjust the scoring of the SGO based on significant student attendance issues or changes in class roster?
- In the case of 2 SGOs, is the final SGO rating determined by a pre-determined simple or weighted average?
- Has the teacher reflected on lessons learned through this year's SGOs and developed an action plan for SGOs for next year?
- If SGO data is not available at the time of the annual conference, has time been set aside to discuss SGO performance and a summative rating with the teacher?



### Administering and Scoring SGO Assessments to Increase Reliability and Accuracy of Information

- Districts may use any or all of the components below as they develop or modify their own assessment policies.
  - A common test protocol is devised and agreed upon by a content/grade level department's teachers and supervisor.
  - Teachers are given a schedule for proctoring their colleagues' tests for the testing period. Strong classroom managers are assigned to the most challenging classes.
  - Tests are administered and collected by the supervisor.
  - The supervisor distributes the tests for grading by the teachers' department colleagues.
  - Teachers use an agreed upon scoring protocol and grade several tests together to "norm" themselves.
  - The supervisor acts as final arbiter in cases where a question arises during scoring.
  - All tests are submitted to the supervisor for final approval.
  - The supervisor may audit tests as needed to check for consistency and accuracy of scoring.



### <u>Marzano...</u>

Third Round Observations are wrapping up...
Final Evaluations
Domain 2 ...
Domain 3 ...

• Domain 4 ...



## Waiver for Marzano

- **Reality:** We increased from approximately 260 observations in 2012-13 to 550+ observations in 2013-14.
- **Proposal:** Administrative Team would like to decrease our tenured observations from 3 (1 full/2 half) to 2 full time observations. This would reduce formal observations by 144.
  - With our new "found" time, we will conduct monthly building walk throughs and short informal observations.
- **Rationale:** This would allow the Administrative Team to gain an even better understanding of daily curriculum planning (lesson/unit), instructional delivery, assessment practices, student engagement, and classroom climate.



## Lessons from Educators

1. High Quality Practice Instruments and Additional Conferences Improve Professional Dialogue.

### 6. SGOs Are Extensions of an Educator's Work, Not Additions to It.

 In an effort to simplify the process, many districts have mandated that teachers use a preassessment/post-assessment model for SGOs.
 However, educators are beginning to see the shortcomings of this approach.



## Lessons from Educators

### 6. Continued...

• Fortunately, districts are looking beyond the pre-/ post-model as they plan for next year and considering a combination of readily available measures of prior student learning such as test scores from previous years, grades to date, and test scores from the current year.

## 7. Leadership, Communication, and a Commitment to Growth are Key

• "We believe that the goals of the teacher evaluation system are **growth**, **learning**, and **accountability**... in this order."



## 2014-15 Policy Updates

### • Proposed Regulations for AchieveNJ

- Remove the December 1 deadline for completion of at least one co-observation to give districts more flexibility with implementation (note: two co-observations are still required at some point in the school year).
- Amend written requirements of the observation report so districts can use electronic versions to save time.
- Create an appeals process for procedural violations so that all districts will follow the same fair and impartial method to address educators' concerns in the evaluation process.
- Slightly delay the deadline for setting Student Growth Objectives (SGOs), changing it from October 15 to October 31.
- Amend the SGO personnel file procedure so SGOs are filed at the end of the year, not at multiple intervals to ease burden (note: SGOs remain part of the personal evaluation record that is confidential by law).



## 2014-15 Policy Updates

## 2014-15 Evaluation Components and Weights (Same as 2013-14)

• Percentage Weight of Teacher Evaluation Components (N.J.A.C. 6A:10-4.1) <u>Teachers with</u> <u>Teachers with</u> <u>Teachers with</u> <u>Teachers with</u> <u>Teachers without</u>

.:10-4.1)	Component	Teachers with mSGP	Teachers without mSGP
	Teacher Practice	55%	85%
	Student Growth		
	Objective (SGO)	15%	15%
	Median Student		
	Growth Percentile (mSGP)	30%	NA

- Teacher Observations (N.J.A.C. 6A:10-4.4)
  - Non-Tenured Teachers (1-2 yrs): 2 long observations, 1 short, multiple observers required
  - Non-Tenured Teachers (3-4 yrs): 1 long observations, 2 short, multiple observers required
  - Tenured Teachers: 3 short observations; multiple observers recommended\*



### <u>AchieveNJ Survey</u>

<u>http://www.research-surveys.org/</u>
 <u>AchieveNJ\_March2014/</u>
 <u>LEE\_AchieveNJ\_Survey\_March2014.asp?</u>
 <u>P1=6mt6-8200-xvn</u>

#### ACHIEVE NJ Survey The Practitioners' Perspective

The professional associations representing education practitioners, The NJ Association of School Administrators (NJASA), the NJ Education Association (NJEA) and the NJ Principals and Supervisors Association (NJPSA), recognize the importance of quality evaluation systems in New Jersey schools. Each association has agreed to work collaboratively to monitor the progress of ACHIEVE NJ, the new educator evaluation system being launched in all New Jersey districts in the 2013-2014 school year as authorized by the TEACH NJ statute.

We urge you to participate in this important project by responding to the second of three periodic surveys about ACHIEVE NJ.

Your insights will enable us to meet your professional needs as you go through the ACHIEVE NJ process, provide constructive input to the NJ Department of Education about ways in which the process is or is not meeting stated objectives, and make concrete recommendations for guidance and resources.

Start

The survey is brief and confidential--your input is critical.

Thank you!!









## **Professional Development**

#### o June 6

#### Oistrict, School, Teacher PDP for 2014-15

#### **Optional School Professional Development Plan (PDP) Template**

District Name	School Name	Principal Name	Plan Begin/End Dates

#### 1: Professional Learning Goals

#### ÷

TABLISHED 171

No.	Goal	Identified Group	Rationale/Sources of Evidence
1			
2			
3			

#### 2: Professional Learning Activities

	PL Goal No.	Initial Activities	Follow-up Activities (as appropriate)
	1		
	2		
Y			
	3		

## Professional Development

#### o June 6

#### • District, School, Teacher PDP for 2014-15

#### 3: Essential Resources

PL Goal No.	Resources	Other Implementation Considerations
1		
2		
3		

#### 4: Progress Summary

PL		
Goal	Notes on Plan Implementation	Notes on Goal Attainment
No.		
1		
2		
3		

#### Signature:

Principal Signature

Date



## Roles of ScIP for each school

- Each school is required to convene a **School Improvement Panel** (ScIP) that includes the principal, an assistant/vice principal, and at least one teacher.
- This group must ensure, oversee, and support evaluation, professional development, and mentoring policies within the school (see the AchieveNJ ScIP Overview).
- Educators should familiarize themselves with their ScIP and contact ScIP members with questions and feedback about school-level evaluation and support policies.

