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“Smart” Retention
We know there are big differences in outcomes for students depending on their teachers’ levels of effectiveness.

Average Student Growth in One Year by Level of Teacher Effectiveness

Source: Boston Public Schools, “High School Restructuring” – March 9, 1998
Dallas students who begin 2nd grade at about the same level of math achievement…

…may finish 5th grade math at dramatically different levels depending on the quality of their teachers.

With so much evidence of teachers’ impact on outcomes, improving effectiveness in the aggregate should be a priority.
Consistently retaining far fewer of the worst teachers than the best teachers could significantly improve average performance.

### Simulated Teacher Retention Patterns in 10 Low-Performing Schools, Each with 20 Teachers

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>(200 teachers total)</th>
<th>Start</th>
<th>Year 1</th>
<th>Year 2</th>
<th>Year 3</th>
<th>Year 4</th>
<th>End*</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>Negligent Retention</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>High Performers</td>
<td>14% Leave Annually</td>
<td>24</td>
<td>3 leave</td>
<td>4 leave</td>
<td>4 leave</td>
<td>4 leave</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Low Performers</td>
<td>14% Leave Annually</td>
<td>38</td>
<td>5 leave</td>
<td>5 leave</td>
<td>5 leave</td>
<td>5 leave</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Smart Retention</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>High Performers</td>
<td>4% Leave Annually</td>
<td>24</td>
<td>1 leaves</td>
<td>1 leaves</td>
<td>1 leaves</td>
<td>1 leaves</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Low Performers</td>
<td>33% Leave Annually</td>
<td>38</td>
<td>13 leave</td>
<td>10 leave</td>
<td>7 leave</td>
<td>7 leave</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Schools that show less tolerance for poor performers are more successful in retaining top performers longer.

Teachers Agreeing: “My school leaders take action with teachers who perform poorly in the classroom.”

Source: “The Irreplaceables,” TNTP: Data from 4 unnamed districts
However, across the nation, many schools retain all teachers – high and low performers alike – at strikingly similar rates.

Source: “The Irreplaceables,” TNTP: Data from 4 unnamed districts
Preliminary data on 2012-13 to 2013-14 retention show that SCSD mostly follows this disappointing pattern district-wide.

Retained by Professional Practice HEDI Rating

- Highly Effective: 100%
- Effective: 90%
- Developing: 80%
- Grand Total: 70%

Retained by Composite HEDI Rating

- Highly Effective: 100%
- Effective: 90%
- Developing: 80%
- Ineffective: 70%
- Grand Total: 60%

Sources: Preliminary 2012-13 APPR data; 2013-14 Staff List
Multiple analyses confirm that while we keep most of our strongest teachers, we also keep most of the weakest.

**Retention by Professional Practice Score Quintile**

- **5th (top)**: Returned 95%, Separated 0%
- **4th**: Returned 95%, Separated 0%
- **3rd**: Returned 95%, Separated 0%
- **2nd**: Returned 95%, Separated 0%
- **1st (bottom)**: Returned 95%, Separated 0%
- **Grand Total**: Returned 95%, Separated 0%

**Retention by Composite Score Quintile**

- **5th (top)**: Returned 95%, Separated 0%
- **4th**: Returned 95%, Separated 0%
- **3rd**: Returned 95%, Separated 0%
- **2nd**: Returned 95%, Separated 0%
- **1st (bottom)**: Returned 95%, Separated 0%
- **Grand Total**: Returned 95%, Separated 0%

*Sources: Preliminary 2012-13 APPR data; 2013-14 Staff List*
Removing persistently low-performing teachers is among three co-equal, targeted tactics for improving overall performance.

**Tactics for Improving Overall Teacher Effectiveness**

A. Boost effectiveness of all teachers through effective evaluation and targeted professional development.

C. Improve or exit persistently less effective teachers to be replaced with more effective teachers.

B. Retain and leverage the most effective teachers.

**Teacher Effectiveness in Improving Student Achievement**

- **Current teacher performance**
- **Potential teacher performance**
SCSD school administrators have indicated interest in the topic of – and concern regarding – removing low performers.

**Talent Management Topics of Most Interest to Principals**

- **Top 5**
  - Low Performers: 18%
  - School-wide PD: 46%
  - Differentiated PD: 54%

- **Top 3**
  - Low Performers: 20%
  - School-wide PD: 46%
  - Differentiated PD: 54%

- **Top 1**
  - Low Performers: 22%
  - School-wide PD: 28%
  - Differentiated PD: 50%

**Concerned by Removing Low Performers?**

- **Principals**
  - 64%

- **All School Administrators**
  - 65%
Probationary Teachers
With a significant number of probationary teachers, we can make an impact by focusing on these newer teachers.

- **Total probationary teachers in the District currently**: 250+
- **Average number of probationary teachers per school**: 8.5
- **Schools with at least 10 new probationary teachers**: 23%
The probationary period is also the time when we have the most authority to remove low-performing teachers.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Teachers</th>
<th>Probationary Period</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Regular Substitute for Full 2-Year Period</td>
<td>1 year</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Previously Tenured in SCSD</td>
<td>2 years</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Previously Tenured in Other NYS District</td>
<td>2 years</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>All Others</td>
<td>3 years</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

- The service of a probationary teacher may be discontinued at any time during the probationary period as long as the decision is not arbitrary or capricious.

- Tenure shall be granted at the end of the probationary period to a teacher who has been found “competent, efficient and satisfactory.”

- Where more time is needed to determine if a teacher should be granted tenure, SCSD and the teacher may agree to extend the probationary period to allow more time. There is no specific limit on the length of such an extension (or the number of extensions).

Source: New York State Education Law § 3012(a)
Our ability to end employment for an underperforming teacher decreases significantly once tenure is granted.

**Before Granting Tenure:**
“...may be discontinued at any time during the probationary period on the recommendation of the superintendent of schools, by a majority vote of the board of education.” (Education Law Section 3012(1))

**After Granting Tenure:**
“...shall not be removed except for any of the following causes, after a hearing, as provided by section three thousand twenty-a of such law: (a) insubordination, immoral character or conduct unbecoming a teacher; (b) inefficiency, incompetency, physical or mental disability, or neglect of duty; (c) failure to maintain certification.” (Education Law Section 3012(2))
Given the commitment tenure represents, we should require **two years** of effectiveness before granting tenure.

**Potential Tenure-Earning Performance Trajectories**

- Minimum expectations for teacher to earn tenure – “effective”
- Effectiveness

![Graph showing tenure earning performance trajectories over different durations.](image)

- **Duration of Teacher’s Probationary Period**
  - 1 Year
  - 2 Years
  - 3 Years

Note: The graph illustrates the potential trajectories for teachers to earn tenure based on their effectiveness over varying periods.
A decision matrix for principals can guide retention and tenure recommendations each year during probation.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Year</th>
<th>Ineffective</th>
<th>Developing</th>
<th>Effective</th>
<th>Highly Effective</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1</td>
<td>Do not retain unless very positive trajectory</td>
<td>Retain only if positive trajectory</td>
<td>Retain</td>
<td>Retain</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2</td>
<td>Do not retain</td>
<td>Retain only if positive trajectory</td>
<td>Retain</td>
<td>Retain</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3+</td>
<td>Deny tenure / Do not retain</td>
<td>Extend probationary period and retain only if this is the first year teaching the subject/grade. Otherwise deny tenure and do not retain.</td>
<td>Retain. Grant tenure only if at least 2 years of effectiveness. Otherwise extend probationary period.</td>
<td>Retain. Grant tenure only if at least 2 years of effectiveness. Otherwise extend probationary period.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Meanwhile, a separate *(advisory)* matrix for reviewing recommendations could be based on multiple APPR ratings.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Year</th>
<th>Current Year's Weighted Average Observation Rating</th>
<th>Prior Year's Composite HEDI Rating</th>
<th>Retention Presumption</th>
<th>Tenure Presumption</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Before End of Original Probationary Period</td>
<td>H</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>Retain</td>
<td>-</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>E</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>Retain</td>
<td>-</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>D</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>Retain</td>
<td>-</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>I</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>Terminate</td>
<td>-</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>At End of Original Probationary Period</td>
<td>H</td>
<td>H/E</td>
<td>Retain</td>
<td>Grant</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>D/I or n/a</td>
<td>Retain</td>
<td>Extend</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>E</td>
<td>H/E</td>
<td>Retain</td>
<td>Grant</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>D/I or n/a</td>
<td>Retain</td>
<td>Extend</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>D/I</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>Terminate</td>
<td>Deny</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>At End of Extended Probationary Period</td>
<td>H</td>
<td>H/E</td>
<td>Retain</td>
<td>Grant</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>D/I/ or n/a</td>
<td>Retain</td>
<td>Extend</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>E</td>
<td>H/E</td>
<td>Retain</td>
<td>Grant</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>D/I/ or n/a</td>
<td>Retain</td>
<td>Extend</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>D/I</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>Terminate</td>
<td>Deny</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
• Which stakeholders should we engage to determine policies and/or guidance regarding teacher retention and tenure determinations?

• What are the barriers to raising the performance bar for retaining probationary teachers and granting tenure at the end of the probationary period?

• Are there data that we have analyzed or need to analyze to inform policies, guidance, and/or annual decisions by principals and the Superintendent?
Context
“Great Expectations” and the NYS Regents reform agenda both call for higher standards for teacher retention and tenure.

**Strategic Plan Goal 2:**
Recruit, develop, support and retain effective teachers and school leaders.

**Strategic Plan Goal 4:**
Build a district culture on high expectations, respect and co-accountability for performance that recognizes and rewards excellence at all levels of the organization.
Improving retention and tenure decisions for probationary teachers is one part of a broader teacher talent strategy.

1. Design and implement a **rigorous, transparent, and fair evaluation systems** for teachers and school leaders that accurately differentiates effectiveness and aligns more than historical evaluation data with student outcomes.

2. Provide **professional development and coaching** for teachers and school leaders that is appropriate, intensive, and differentiated based on examination of student achievement data and evaluation data.

3. Implement **integrated and aligned performance management structures** and supports that use evaluation data to inform the development and equitable distribution of effective educators.
1. Implementation of **rigorous, transparent, and fair evaluation systems** gives us meaningful data to act on.

- Develop **District-specific frameworks for teaching practice and school leadership** through refinement and collaboration

- Increase the number of observers who meet the highest standards for certification to conduct teacher observations while increasing the number of teachers who say APPR helps them improve

- **Align APPR ratings and other performance indicators:** Decrease gaps between APPR composite ratings and (1) APPR professional practice ratings and (2) student proficiency rates
2. One next step is targeting *professional development and coaching* based on information gained from evaluations.

- Provide **monthly reports to all teacher evaluators** providing aggregated and disaggregated data to inform professional development

- By the end of the 2013-14 school year, all teachers will have completed at least 6 hours of **differentiated professional development based specifically on evaluation ratings**

- Embedded talent management coaches will provide **1-1 coaching for principals** to support goals of recruiting, developing, supporting, and retaining great teachers and support staff
3. Integrated and aligned performance management structures may include retention/tenure policies or guidance.

- Restructure the former "Personnel" department to create an Office of Talent Management that integrates activities across the teacher and leader effectiveness continuum.

- Develop and implement at least 3 strategic policies for decision-making based on evaluation results:
  - Retention and tenure policy/guidance

- Improve the equitable distribution of effective and highly effective teachers: Reduce the number of teachers previously rated Ineffective or increase the number of teachers previously rated Effective or Highly Effective in the lowest-performing schools.