

DEPAC-1\11\13

Jen Miller presented information from the recent state meeting.

- December meeting focused on student performance
- The NJAsk will be used for tested areas for grades 2 and 4-(at the minimum 35% of the student performance piece)
- For non-tested areas, student growth objectives will be created. They can be for the whole class, focus on certain areas. Portfolios are an option, but they would be more difficult for teachers. Teachers may use assessments that are already in place.

Discussion ensued regarding how to determine what "successful" would mean for each teacher, i.e. setting goals for each teacher, setting goals for each student, having different goals for the students who scored lower on the pre-test and different goals for students who scored higher.

Teachers of non-tested areas should create 2 SGOs (this would be the only assessments for non-tested areas), but teachers of tested areas should add one SGO in addition to the standardized tests. All of these together make up the student growth profile (SGP)

SLO (terminology used by Stronge) is the same as SGO. Stronge will be changing their terminology to match the state.

Not only teachers, administrators will also be evaluated on student performance.

SLOs are already part of the Stronge system. DEPAC is trying to be as transparent as possible throughout the process. On the teacher page of the website are the minutes for the DEPAC meetings.

A study conducted by Bill and Melinda Gates (which was presented at the state meeting) cited characteristics of effective teacher evaluation systems:

- multiple observers
- student achievement is a part of the evaluation
- inclusion of feedback from students

The format of student feedback can vary. Stronge already has this included in their model: the teacher collects the results and then reflects on them and hands in a reflection on the students' comments. Administrators do not see the comments, only the teacher's reflection.

Our principals will be subject to the Stronge evaluation at the end of this year.

Assuming SGOs will be required for all teachers in 2013-14, what work should non-pilot districts specifically be doing to prepare for this:

1. Information should be shared.
2. In-services to better explain SGOs to the staff. (Mr. Cohen has already lined up a half-day in-service for teachers on May 24th for this)
3. Administration should be trained. (A full-day training is being arranged presently)
4. SGOs will be developed by teachers. (Other states have done different things. In Virginia the teachers did them, in Georgia the administrators did them; both practices worked well)

SGPs...

SGPs are the tested part of the system

Question was posed whether HSPAs would be used for the high school. Since there are no standardized tests in grades prior to the 11th grade HSPA, it cannot be used.

Slide was presented on the breakdown of the evaluation:

First half:

40-45%-the Stronge observation system,
5-10%-has not yet been decided

Second half (performance piece):

35-45%-measured by SGP
5-10%-school wide measure
0-10%-other performance

(These were the original measures, but due to feedback from pilot districts, the state has said that for 2013-14, schoolwide performance data will be not required. Everybody will have time the first year to learn the SGO. Other performance measures will be introduced during the 2014-15 school year.)

A video was presented covering the following:

SGPs enable us to understand student growth from one year to the next. They tell us whether a student grew faster or slower than similar students in the state.

- performance = achievement + growth
- uses a percentile rank (1-99)
- reference group is academic peers

The change in performance is based on similar students' change in performance. We look at students who are growing at the same rate.

Different ranges of growth are then identified:

34 or below...lower growth
35-65...typical growth
66 or above...higher growth

The student gets a number and the teacher gets a number as well which is the median of all of the students.

Discussion ensued regarding the state's decision to use the median score. Some felt it is unfair to teachers who teach smaller populations of students.

The question was raised as to how new programs being introduced into a curriculum that could possibly have negative effects on scores would be considered. For example, a new reading is introduced that proves to be ineffective, are the teachers going to be blamed for the lower scores or is the ineffective program taken into account?

We have multiple ways to show student growth.

Question: Has there been discussion regarding the conflicting time frames of when the test results are released and when we are required to evaluate teachers: A: The state is aware of that, but does not have an answer yet.

Q: Aren't SGOs like the APAs that we do for our special education students? A: Yes, we formulate an assessment, pre-assess, teach and post-test to find growth.

Q: Where does Virginia fall in regards to educational performance? A: NJ has always been high, but our tests were found to be rather easy. Once the tests were changed, achievement went down. The state is aware that adding all of these requirements for teachers may have a negative effect on student performance.

New slide: When developing goals, the following characteristics need to be considered: rigor, validity, reliability, comparability, practicality. (We will be trained in this.)

New Slide:

Examples of assessment:

National tests, state-developed tests, LEA-developed tests

Portfolio assessments, i.e....writing a reflection, lab work, projects, etc.

New Slide:

SGO process

Goal setting at the start of the year will be collaborative. The goals will be developed by the teachers, approved by the administrator, revisited and scored.

Suggestion by Mr. Cohen:

We will start looking at SGOs and consider the process and training that needs to take place (we already are planning this).

Mr. Cohen reminded the group that assessments are key to the process, best practices encourages teachers to take a backwards design approach, which we do, and we are better prepared for this system next year than most other districts.

Next meeting in March. We will take a closer look at the SGOs at this meeting.