

QUESTIONS
TEACHER AND PRINCIPAL EVALUATION PANEL:
AREA SCHOOL DISTRICTS/CHARTER SCHOOL

1. Based on the PED approved plan for your school district/charter school, outline your school district/charter school implementation timeline of the Educator Effectiveness System (EES) for teachers and principals this school year.

The plans for school year 2014 – 15 are not due to PED until August 1, 2014. The following implementation timeline is based on our proposed plan that we are currently developing.

Pre – Test for student measure (testing window open Aug. 11 – 22, 2014)

Post – Test for student measure (testing window open May 18 – 22, 2015)

Professional Development Plans initiated by the 40th day.

PARCC Assessment Windows (student measure) March 9 – 27 and April 21 – May 8.

EOC exam windows (student measure) May 18 – 22.

Student surveys for group A and B teachers due March 15, 2015.

Parent surveys for group C teachers due March 15, 2015.

Observations for Domains 1 & 4: (two required)

1st due by December 19, 2014

2nd due by April 15, 2015

Observations for domains 2 & 3: (three required)

1st due by November 1, 2015

2nd due by December 19, 2014

3rd due by April 15, 2015

2. Which online system does your school district/charter school use to help implement the EES?

For 2013 – 14 the District used Teachscape and Discovery Ed.

For 2014 – 15 the District will use Teachscape and The Learning Institute (for student measures).

Does your school district/charter school plan on using this system next year?

Will use Teachscape and The Learning Institute (for student measures).

3. By licensure level, what is the number and percent of teachers in your school district/charter school in each of the following groups:

Group A: teachers who teach grades and/or subjects that can be meaningfully linked to the standards-based assessment;

Group B: teachers who teach grades and/or subjects that cannot be meaningfully linked to the standards-based assessment; and

Group C: teachers who teach in kindergarten, first, and second grades.

Please outline the number and percent of each group's effectiveness ratings (i.e., exemplary, highly effective, effective, minimally effective, or ineffective). See attached:

School Names	Group A					Group B					Group C					Total
	Ineffective	Min. effective	effective	highly effective	exemplary	Ineffective	Min. effective	effective	highly effective	exemplary	Ineffective	Min. effective	effective	highly effective	exemplary	
Chee Dodge Elementary	1	4	1	0	0	0	4	2	0	0	0	5	3	0	0	20
Chief Manuelito	1	6	9	2	0	1	1	10	3	0	0	0	1	0	0	34
Church Rock Elementary	1	3	3	0	0	0	0	5	0	0	0	2	8	0	0	22
Crownpoint Elementary	2	1	2	0	0	0	0	2	0	0	0	3	5	0	0	15
Crownpoint High	1	5	6	1	0	0	0	6	1	0	0	0	0	0	0	20
Crownpoint Mid	0	0	4	1	0	1	2	0	1	0	0	0	0	0	0	9
David Skeet Elementary	1	3	2	0	0	0	1	4	0	0	0	2	4	1	0	18
Gallup Central High	1	2	2	2	0	0	3	8	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	18
Gallup High	0	11	11	2	0	0	4	25	1	0	0	0	0	0	0	54
Gallup Mid	0	6	8	0	0	2	6	3	1	0	0	0	0	0	0	26
Indian Hills Elementary	1	1	6	2	0	0	1	4	1	0	0	0	2	6	0	24
Jefferson Elementary	0	0	5	0	0	0	1	4	1	0	0	2	5	1	0	19
Juan De Onate Elementary	0	4	2	3	0	0	0	6	0	0	0	3	5	1	0	24
Kennedy Mid	1	8	14	1	0	0	2	12	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	38
Lincoln Elementary	0	2	3	2	0	1	2	2	0	0	0	0	5	3	0	20
Miyamura High	9	6	9	2	0	13	8	12	0	0						59
Navajo Elementary	1	5	3	0	0	2	2	0	0	0	0	3	3	0	0	19
Navajo Mid	0	0	6	0	0	0	0	2	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	8
Navajo Pine High	0	2	4	0	0	2	1	2	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	11
Ramah Elementary	1	0	4	1	0	0	1	2	0	0	0	0	6	0	0	15
Ramah High	0	4	2	0	0	0	3	5	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	14
Red Rock Elementary	0	0	10	1	0	0	0	6	1	0	0	2	7	0	0	27
Rocky View Elementary	0	1	6	0	0	0	1	1	0	0	0	1	7	2	0	19
Roosevelt Elementary	1	3	2	1	0	0	0	4	0	0	0	0	3	3	0	17
Stagecoach Elementary	1	2	4	0	0	0	2	3	0	0	0	0	6	2	0	20
Thoreau Elementary	1	1	2	3	0	0	3	5	0	0	0	1	7	2	0	25
Thoreau High	1	1	8	1	0	0	0	8	1	0	0	0	0	0	0	20
Thoreau Mid	2	4	3	1	0	0	1	3	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	14
Tohatchi Elementary	0	3	3	0	0	0	1	1	0	0	0	1	6	0	0	15
Tohatchi High	1	1	5	2	0	0	2	7	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	18
Tohatchi Mid	2	6	1	0	0	0	4	1	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	14
Tse Yi Gai High School	0	3	2	0	0	0	2	3	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	10
Turpen Elem	0	1	8	0	0	0	1	3	0	0	0	0	9	0	0	22
Twin Lakes Elementary	0	1	4	0	0	0	2	3	0	0	0	0	7	0	0	17
Washington Elementary	0	1	3	2	0	0	1	3	0	0	0	1	4	1	0	16
District Totals	30	101	167	30	0	22	62	167	11	0	0	26	103	22	0	741
District Percents	4.05%	13.63%	22.54%	4.05%	0.00%	2.97%	8.37%	22.54%	1.48%	0.00%	0.00%	3.51%	13.90%	2.97%	0.00%	

4. For principals and assistant principals, what is the number and percent of these administrators in your school district/charter school in each of the following groups:

Group A: New Mexico licensed administrators (Level 3-B); serve as Principal/Director, Assistant Principal, Dean of Students, or Athletic Directors; and supervise and evaluate certified teachers; and

Group B: district-level administrators; and Athletic Directors and Deans of Students that do not have Level 3-B licenses.

Group A – 43 (100%)

Group B – 0 (0%)

Please outline the number and percent of each group’s effectiveness ratings (i.e., exemplary, highly effective, effective, minimally effective, or ineffective).

With the late roll out of the Administrator evaluation system, did not rate principals in this manner. We used the existing HOUSSE system and conference summaries.

5. Has your school district/charter school shared the data and results of the “District Educator Effectiveness Summative Report” with your teachers and principals? Why or why not?

We have shared the data with our teachers but used the existing Professional Development Plan (PDP) system for this year’s evaluations. The PDP’s were completed by the time we received the summary reports for the current Educator Effectiveness System. We also do not have enough people who are comfortable and knowledgeable with the system to explain the findings to the teachers. After the June 30 meeting with the PED, I am more comfortable working with my staff to explain the findings at the beginning of this school year. The main issue with the lack of understanding was in the graduated considerations.

6. Did your school district/charter school participate in the New Mexico’s Teacher and School Leader Evaluation Pilot Project for the EES? If so, outline any differences between the pilot and your most recent EES ratings, if any.

There were no graduated considerations when doing the pilot.

The schools used Teacher Compass to collect data rather than NM Teach.

7. Please add any other comments you might have addressing lessons learned in implementing your evaluation system.

1. Next year as the graduated considerations move towards using more of student data, the evaluation levels will decrease. It seems this year’s ratings are over-inflated.
2. Administration at larger schools need more help.
3. The graduated considerations are confusing to teachers and they feel it unfair that one teacher has a sub area count a larger percentage. An example is some teacher’s attendance was worth 26 points if they had student data scores. For teachers without student data scores, attendance could be 40 points.
4. The collective bargaining agreement negotiated with the union is being overwritten by PED rule in the area of attendance. This is a violation of the Public Employees Bargaining Act. For the school district to not be caught in the middle we will not be able to use attendance as one of the multiple measures.

TEACHER AND PRINCIPAL EVALUATION PANEL:

Demographic Information:

Total Number of Schools: 35

Number of Schools per Grade Level:

# of schools	Grades Served
19	Pre K – 5
7	6 – 8
1	6 – 12
1	8 – 12 (pending PED approval)
7	9 - 12

Total Number of Students by School and Grade Level:

LocationCode	1	2	3	4	5	6	7	8	9	10	11	12	KF	PK	Grand Total
Chief Manuelito Mid						222	207	204							633
Central High (Alternative)							8	13	26	46	39	126			258
Chee Dodge elem	61	50	65	38	54								65	61	394
Church Rock elem	52	56	50	53	42								64	46	363
Crownpoint elem	52	57	47	51	41								58	36	342
Crownpoint high									77	69	72	69			287
Gallup Mid						142	148	146							436
Gallup high									271	260	200	204			935
Indian Hills elem	42	49	41	54	52								41	67	346
Tohatchi high									68	83	79	79			309
Jefferson elem	61	42	39	43	41								54	29	309
Miyamura high									327	305	245	222			1099
Navajo Pine High									36	45	26	20			127
Lincoln elem	37	45	41	42	32								39	30	266
Navajo elem	42	37	37	37	31								46	32	262
Crownpoint mid						51	45	45							141
Tse' Yi Gai high									34	33	25	23			115
Turpen elem	59	57	50	51	57								66	36	376
Middle College Charter										16	18	32			66
Navajo Mid						32	38	47							117
Tohatchi Mid						86	52	65							203
Ramah High						23	36	29	32	16	19	25			180
Ramah elem	29	28	37	23	30								24	17	188
Red Rock elem	63	54	57	60	63								58	30	385
Roosevelt elem	34	46	39	41	31								41	27	259
Rocky View elem	63	57	60	43	45								53	58	379
Thoreau high									90	75	87	60			312
Stagecoach elem	48	52	51	48	55								51	29	334
Thoreau mid						67	97	93							257
Ocate elem	49	47	54	55	43								58	55	361
David Skeet elem	28	29	31	38	42								25	32	225
Thoreau elem	47	50	46	51	41								53	40	328
Tohatchi elem	41	31	31	30	39								28	23	223
Twin Lakes elem	28	31	22	33	31								22	28	195
Washington elem	33	33	31	37	34								43	26	237
Kennedy Mid						219	228	225							672
Grand Total	869	851	829	828	804	842	859	867	961	948	810	860	889	702	11919

Total Number of Students: 11919 based on 120th day of 2013 – 14 school year.

Total Number of Teachers per Grade Level:

Teachers by Licensure Level

Pre Level 1	52
Level 1	91
Level 2	404
Level 3	253
Total	800

Teachers by Grade Level

Grade	# of Teachers
Pre – K	24
K	49
1 st	49
2 nd	48
3 rd	46
4 th	41
5 th	43
Navajo Language and Culture	20
Elementary P.E.	19
Elementary Fine Arts	18
Secondary English	74
Secondary Math	69
Secondary Social Studies	49
Secondary Science	45
Secondary electives	106

Other teachers include special education which serve multiple grades and levels.

Number of Principals and/or Assistant Principals:

- Principals: 34
- Assistant Principals: 9