

SED Learning Summit on Teacher & Principal Evaluation

May 7, 2015

Recommendations Submitted on the Behalf of School Administrators By:

-SAANYS-
School Administrators
Association of New York State

-ESSAA-
Empire State School
Administrators Association

-NYSFSA-
New York State Federation
of School Administrators

Part 1 – General Remarks

- Introductory remarks.
- Time to embrace what is right with education and move the accountability discussion beyond how heavily we must tie student testing to teacher and principal evaluations to include evidences of research based reform that lead to student achievement such as personalized learning, collaborative leadership, along with strong curriculum instruction and assessment (*Breaking Ranks*).
- Flexibility is essential. All schools and districts should have flexibility to comply with regulations in a way that supports their progress and does not require additional resources. Collective bargaining should be respected.
- Strong school leadership is essential to successful schools, instead of strengthening the role of principal in establishing a vision, building capacity and leading change, new legislation weakens it.
- We are here today to share our best thinking on how to mitigate the negative impact of new legislation and support our common goal of providing all children in New York State with the world class education they deserve.
- As principals and trained evaluators we know what highly effective teaching and learning looks like, and the research based practices that must be in place to make it happen. New regulations must ensure that all dimensions of excellence are valued, summative assessments of student performance are not valid measures of principals' performance.

- APPR regulations for principals must focus on holding school leaders accountable for a wide range of outcomes with a range of appropriate accountability measures that match the tools that are required to get the job done and done well.
 - No confidence in current legislation; intend to continue to lobby for an evaluation system we consider fair and valid. Counter to its intent. Can save poor teachers. [May be asked how] (We may need NYSED and the BOR as a partner.)
 - Acknowledge that implementing regulations may have to be modified in the near future.
- Regulations need to protect and enhance the authority of the principal to the greatest degree possible.
- Regulations should provide the greatest possible local flexibility. “One size fits all” does not serve us well. Collective bargaining should be respected.
- To the degree possible, all aspects of professional performance should be assessed through the review and consideration of multiple sources of evidence.
- Recommend September 1, 2016 due date extension for ALL districts/BOCES
- Opting out observations and recommendation in support of Truth in Testing legislation
 - No building or principal should suffer adverse consequences from parents opting their children out of the exams.

Part 2 – Teacher’s APPRs→Teachers APPR Impacts Principals

- Student Performance Category
 - Student growth measure concerns, especially for state-developed growth score
 - Enhanced adjustments for environmental/demographic factors, and far greater transparency in how those scores were arrived at.
 - Support test reduction for SLO development, especially for high school subjects and early childhood development.
 - Teacher Observations Category
 - Subcomponent 1, Principal/administrator observation has been demonstrated to be effective in New York State.
 - Rec 1, The number, frequency, duration and nature of principal/lead evaluator observations should be collectively negotiated – with consideration to rubric requirements and administrative capacity. SED should select a minimum number and duration, with anything beyond the minimum to be negotiated. We recommend a minimum of 2 observations utilizing at least a sum total of 40 minutes. Locally negotiated range so teachers who need more support can get it; this will increase manageability.
 - Rec 2, Selection of approved rubrics should continue to be negotiated.

- Rec 3, Across the 2 or 3 subcomponents, this subcomponent (principal/lead evaluator observations) should be weighted as heavily as possible.

- Subcomponent 2, Independent Observer – Is largely NOT regarded to be value added, can be counterproductive, and is an unfunded mandate. The role and authority of district and building administrators, as instructional leaders and supervisors, should be clear, protected and enhanced.
 - Rec 1, Evaluator training should include familiarity with the standards, evidence-based observation techniques and application to the rubrics.
 - Rec 2, the definition of *impartial independent trained evaluator* should require the use by the independent evaluator of the rubric selected by the teachers' CBA.
 - Rec 3, the work of the Independent observer should be given no required weighting, but should be provided to the principal/lead evaluator for serious consideration in determining the final observation rating. While subject to local collective bargaining, in no event should this observation be weighted more than 5% in the final Observation category rating.

- Subcomponent 3, Peer Observer
 - Rec 1, Peer observers should be trained as described in subcomponent 2, Rec 1, and be required to use the rubric selected by the teachers CBA, and their observations should be given to the principal/lead evaluator for serious consideration with no required weight.
 - Rec 2, While subject to local collective bargaining, in no event should this observation be weighted more than 5% in the determination of the final Observation category rating.

- Statutory/Regulatory Conflict
 - Rec 1, Establish parameters to address the contradictions in the law that require:
 - That approved teacher performance rubrics be utilized for assessment of professional performance, often including the instructional planning process.
 - That lesson plans are one of the sources of evidence specifically, and foolishly, “prohibited”.
 - Rec 2, Establish parameters that address the other contradictions contained in the list of “prohibited” sources of evidence to assess professional performance despite their being included in some of the approved rubrics. Setting goals, maintaining portfolios of

student work to assess progress over time, reviewing instructional materials and teacher-made formative assessments are all logical aspects of a teacher's continued efforts to monitor and adjust instruction. These are also logical sources of evidence to assess performance against various elements of the approved rubrics.

- Rec 3, Maximize the sources of evidence available to principal/lead evaluators for use consistent with approved rubrics and accepted research. They are valid assessment methodologies.

Part 3 – Principals' APPRs

- §3012-d.14 requires the adoption of regulations to align the principals' APPR system with the teachers' system. This should NOT be construed to require an identical evaluation system.
- Student Performance Category
 - Current procedures for assigning state-developed growth scores do not sufficiently recognize differences in the roles of school leaders and teachers, and are even more seriously flawed for principals than for teachers. No state generated measure should be incorporated into the determination of the HEDI rating of a principal for the Student Performance Category.
 - Rec 1: The Principal Student Performance category HEDI rating should be determined solely from locally determined measures based on a negotiated process to set growth targets.
 - Rec 2: Allow the use of a process to weight various measures of student achievement, as collectively bargained.
 - Rec 3: The potential use of the supplemental student performance subcomponent should be subject to local collective bargaining and not required.
 - Rec 4: Allow differentiation in student performance growth targets and measures used in principals' evaluations within a district. This will help account for the differences across a district in building demographics, grade configurations, historical performance, and needs. There should be no requirement that any principals in a district have the same growth targets as another principal to determine a rating for the Student Performance category.

- Principal Observations Category –
 - As is the case for teachers, the Other Measures subcomponent of the current APPR system is regarded to be the most effective and successful aspect of the APPR system for the evaluation of principals.
 - Rec 1: The number, duration, and nature of observations should be collectively bargained, with the proviso that at least two observations/supervisory visits be conducted.
 - Rec 2: Selection of the approved rubric should continue to be collectively bargained.
 - Rec 3: The independent observer subcomponent should not apply to principals, unless locally collectively bargained.
 - Rec 4: NYSED should develop, or approve, a principal professional performance rubric utilizing the research-based ISLLC standards themselves for the process to determine the “Observation” category rating.
 - Rec 5: The peer observation subcomponent should be included as a subject for local collective bargaining. If collectively bargained for implementation, peer observation should be weighted no more than 10 percent in the determination of the final Observation category rating.
 - Rec 6: Under collective bargaining, allow a goal setting process as part of the evidence to assess professional performance against the elements of a rubric.
 - Rec 7: Under collective bargaining, allow the review of school artifacts as part of the evidence to assess professional performance against the elements of a rubric.

Part 4 – Scoring of any locally determined measures of student performance for the “Student Performance” Category and for the “Observation” Category:

- Rec 1: With the adoption of the matrix, there is no need to require complex, multiple layers to determine a HEDI rating on either category. Regulations should identify a basic scoring process that is consistent across the sub-components and categories. However, other steps in the process, like the use of additional scoring bands (e.g., 0-20 or 0-60) should be allowed locally, as collectively bargained.
- Rec 2: Require that professional performance assessment (“Observation” Category) use a 1 to 4 rating scale for each element of the rubric (1=Ineffective, 2=Developing, 3= Effective, 4=Highly Effective) and that an average score across the rubric elements and components be determined to derive the overall “Observation” HEDI rating from a conversion chart.

- Rec 3: Allow the flexibility, through collective bargaining, for weighting of elements and/or components to use a weighted average score for conversion to a HEDI rating.
- Rec 4: Develop a conversion chart to determine an overall HEDI rating for the each category that is based on an average score (1 to 4) which provides a fair final rating.
- Rec 5: Each student performance growth target (SLO or other negotiated process) should be similarly scored based on the percentage of the growth target met. Where multiple targets are used to assess student achievement, the scores for each would be averaged. Weighting should be allowed, as collectively bargained, for each target. An “average” score (1 to 4) or “average weighted score” would determine the final rating for the Student Performance Category according to the conversion chart.
- Rec 6: Normal rounding should be consistently applied to determine an average score matching the conversion chart numbers when the actual average is between two points on the chart (e.g., 2.44 is rounded down to 2.4 to be within the 1.5 to 2.4 range, resulting in a “Developing” Rating; whereas, 2.45 is rounded up to 2.5 and results in an “Effective” Rating.)
- Rec 7: Suggested Growth Target Scoring Chart:

HEDI	POINTS	PERCENTAGE OF TARGET MET	
Highly Effective	4	85 – 100%	Highly Effective Well Above District Expectations
Effective	3	55 – 84%	Effective Meets District Expectations
Developing	2	26 – 54%	Developing Below District Expectations
Ineffective	1	0 – 25%	Ineffective Well Below District Expectations

- Rec 8: Suggested Average Score to Rating Conversion Charts for both performance categories:

Observation Category (Rubric): Average Score** to HEDI Rating Conversion	
<u>Average rubric score</u>	<u>Performance Level</u>
3.5 to 4.0	Highly Effective
2.5 to 3.4	Effective
1.5 to 2.4	Developing
1 to 1.4	Ineffective

Student Performance Category: Average Score** to HEDI Rating Conversion	
<u>Student Performance Average Target Score</u>	<u>Performance Level</u>
3.5 to 4.0	Highly Effective
2.5 to 3.4	Effective
1.5 to 2.4	Developing
1 to 1.4	Ineffective

** For all components or sub-components of a category, the Average Score may be a Weighted Average Score to determine the HEDI rating for a category, as collectively bargained.

Part 5 – Hardship Waiver of November 15, 2015 Deadline

- Rec 1, We support a uniform automatic extension of the November 15, 2015 deadline to September 2016 which acknowledges the untenable demands of this process in an unreasonable time frame; this is a “hardship” for all districts.
- Rec 2, In the event Rec 1 does not come to fruition, define “hardship” to mean: the unanticipated allocation of time and resources necessary to develop and implement revised APPR systems for teachers and principals prior to the start of the 2015-16 school year.
- Rec 3, Ask districts to identify specific issues related to time, human and fiscal resources to achieve the deadlines for 2015-16 implementation that adversely impact the resources of the district needed to complete other required tasks for 2015-16. Specifically, ask districts to identify whether the resources needed to plan, negotiate, and implement 3012-d requirements were included in the district approved budget for 2015-16.
- Rec 4, Grant an implementation extension until September 2016 for any district identifying “hardship” that fit the above definition supported by corroborating information related to the items in #2 above.

Part 6 – Waiver re the requirement that students not be assigned to “Ineffective” teachers for consecutive years

There are major capacity and manageability issues with a broad application of this provision. The law does not discern any specific category of teacher; all teachers in a building and district are to be considered, including special area teachers and teachers shared across buildings. There is no allowance in law for buildings or districts that have only one teacher for a subject, or single sections of a subject or elementary grade level. That could present serious issues for student placement and staff allocation. Too many districts and buildings have limited options for full implementation of this expectation.

- Rec 1: Allow a waiver for “hardship” to be defined as: as a result of meeting this expectation, there would be an unanticipated detrimental impact on finances, student placement, staff assignments, or scheduling.
 - No district should have to implement this provision where there is a resulting negative fiscal impact on the district.
 - No student should be reassigned to another building to meet this expectation where such reassignment is not in the overall best interest of the student.
 - No teacher should be transferred to meet this expectation when the district and/or building leadership determine that such transfer is not in the best overall interest of the district or school.
 - No building should be required to discontinue the practice of “looping” to meet this expectation, where, in the professional estimation of the principal, the “Ineffective” rating of a teacher was an anomaly and where the practice has been determined to be successful in fostering student achievement.

- Rec. 2: Grant an implementation waiver for any district identifying a “hardship” under the above criteria.

Closing: Delay implementation.
 Permit flexibility and local control.
 Empower principals.
 Promote student achievement.
 Reduce testing requirements with local control protected allowing the use of
 appropriate assessments as need or negotiated.
 Continue to seek a better law.