

QUESTIONS
TEACHER AND PRINCIPAL EVALUATION PANEL:
AREA SCHOOL DISTRICTS
Rio Rancho Public Schools
October 14, 2014

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.

Date	Task
August 11 – October 7, 2014	Meetings between teachers and principals to draft Professional Development Plans. These meetings would simultaneously be a Pre-Observation Conferences for new teachers.
October 8, 2014	All Professional Development Plans complete and signed off in PDP meetings.
August 11 – December 5, 2014	Complete First Observations
Within 10 days of first observation	Post-Observation Conferences with Multiple Measures ratings.
December 19, 2014	Completion of: <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • First Observation • Post-Observation Conferences • First Multiple Measures Scoring
January 6 – March 24, 2015	Complete Second Observation
With 10 days of second observation	Post-Observation Conferences with Multiple Measures ratings.
April 15, 2015	All ratings due in TEACHSCAPE
April 15, - May 22, 2015	Meetings to review Professional Growth Plans for low rated teachers.

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

TEACHSCAPE

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

Yes. We didn't know there were other options.

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

With 229 unresolved summative evaluations (most due to errors in group placement), we are still unclear as to who is really Group A, B, or C. For example, since the engineering teacher (Group B) teaches one section of math, the teacher is considered Group A. Is the Reading Resource teacher Group A or Group C? It depends on how many students at each grade level for literacy groups. Plus we would have to go back through rosters for SY11-12 through SY13-14. We don't know of any quick ways of gathering this data, especially when we are still unclear on all of the business rules for assigning teachers to groups. We believe the problem with the "Group" issue lies with the evolving dual use of the STARS system for tracking both highly qualified and evaluation. PED's recommendations to improve highly qualified data conflicts with the data for teacher evaluation.

Highly qualified status recommendations from PED included the use of Teachers of Record.

Examples:

Elementary music, art, PE classes that include special education students require inclusion teachers to satisfy the highly qualified criteria. To address this, PED recommended the use of teachers of record (who didn't actually teach most of the students rostered). However, now the teacher of record is assigned the student achievement data for evaluation purposes.

Result: Teacher of Record gets put in the wrong group.

First period Art may have Art I, II, III, IV and one special education student rostered. That student shows in STARS as requiring a self-contained special education teacher. To address this, PED recommended teachers of record (who didn't actually teach most of the students rostered). However, now the teacher of record is assigned the student achievement data for evaluation purposes. Result: Teacher of Record gets put in the wrong group.

We have asked PED, repeatedly, for a complete list of assignments and groups and have not received this information. Lists provided last year were not followed by PED and were simplistic as they did not address the many and varied scheduling assignments that teachers in schools receive. Therefore, we have no accurate list that we can offer at this time.

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

Due to the high number of inaccurate evaluations, 229, we have not yet aggregated any of the teacher effectiveness data by effectiveness rating, by school, by grade level, etc. and do not plan to until we are satisfied the evaluations are accurate.

Since the first round of summative evaluations were provided to districts on May 16, 2014, at the height of the end-of-year crunch with only a week to appeal inaccuracies, we do not have a count of the number of inaccurate evaluations provided then. We were too busy just trying to get the information back to the state for corrections. We have publicly stated with the original group of evaluations that the number that had inaccuracies of some sort could be as high as 50%.

The inaccuracies in the second round of evaluations issued on June 18, 2014 were in some cases different from those in the first round (i.e. some things that were correct in the first round were incorrect in the second).

For example, all teachers at two school were listed under the wrong school name - the school names appearing on the evaluations were old “construction” names used during planning and construction before the schools were officially named (in one case at least 17 years ago).

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*

NM Licensed Principals, Assistant Principals, Athletic Directors who supervise and evaluate certified teachers: 48

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

District Level Administrators with Level 3-B licensure: 16

Athletic Directors, Executive Director/Directors, and Deans of Students without LEVEL 3-B licensure: 10

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

	Principals	Assistant Principals	Total
Exemplary	1		
Highly Effective	8	14	
Effective	7	10	
Minimally Effective	1		
Ineffective	1		
	2 retired and were replaced by assistant principals	2 new, not evaluated last year	

Please note: Two principals have retired and were replaced by two of our assistant principals.

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?

Yes, since we want teachers and principals to be aware of what is in their evaluations and to have the opportunity to point out issues and errors so we can work with the Public Education Department to resolve them.

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.

No.

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

There are many. Please see attached Powerpoint presentation.

Teacher and Principal Evaluation Panel: Rio Rancho Public Schools

Demographic Information:

1. Number of schools: **19 schools**
2. Number of schools per grade level: **1 Pre-school, 10 elementary schools, 4 middle schools, 2 comprehensive high schools and 4 alternative schools and programs (see chart, below)**
3. Total Number of Students by School and Grade Level:

Student Totals	Grds																
School	-2	-1	0	1	2	3	4	5	6	7	8	9	10	11	12	Grand Total	
Cielo Azul Elementary School			126	146	148	137	139	157								853	
Cleveland High School												687	623	547	546	2403	
Colinas del Norte Elementary School			105	129	104	112	128	113								691	
Eagle Ridge Middle School									258	281	265					804	
Enchanted Hills Elementary School			123	113	115	117	125	102								695	
Ernest Stapleton Elementary School			149	146	147	162	145	155								904	
Independence High School													8	49	151	208	
Lincoln Middle School									313	293	344					950	
Maggie Cordova Elementary School			127	152	151	186	165	162								943	
Martin Luther King Jr. Elementary School			124	179	128	168	156	144								899	
Mountain View Middle School									283	272	289					844	
Puesta del Sol Elementary School			130	127	117	121	136	125								756	
Rio Rancho Cyber									25	30	25	20	26	18	15	159	

Academy																	
Rio Rancho Elementary School			115	89	110	109	106	126									655
Rio Rancho High School												640	625	622	584		2471
Rio Rancho Middle School									440	385	397						1222
Sandia Vista Elementary School	5	15	98	118	109	103	82	100									630
Shining Stars Preschool	104	420															524
Vista Grande Elementary School			98	544	95	114	119	138									665
Grand Total	109	435	1195	1300	1224	1329	1301	1322	1319	1261	1320	1347	1282	1236	1296		17276

4. Total Number of Students: **17,276**
5. Total Number of Teacher per Grade Level: **See chart, below.**
6. Number of Principals and/or Assistant Principals:

	Schools per Grade Level	Principals per school	Assistant Principals per school	Total Building Admin	Teachers per Level
Pre-Kindergarten	1	1	0	1	50.5
Elementary K - 5	10	1	1	20	594
Middle School 6 - 8	4	1	1	8	262
High School 9 - 12	2	1	6	14	280
Alternative Schools 7 - 12	2	1	0	2	25.5
Programs	2	1	0	2	8
TOTALS	21	21	24	45	1220



Rio Rancho Public Schools

TEACHER AND PRINCIPAL EVALUATION PANEL

RRPS DEMOGRAPHICS

- × 19 schools and 2 programs
 - 1 Pre-Kindergarten
 - 10 Elementary
 - 4 Middle
 - 2 Comprehensive High School
 - 2 Alternative Schools
 - 2 Programs

STUDENT ENROLLMENT

Level	Number of Students
Pre-Kindergarten	524
Elementary	7691
Middle	3820
Comprehensive High	4874
Alternative High	376
TOTAL	17,276

TEACHERS PER SCHOOL LEVEL

Level	Teachers
Pre-Kindergarten	50.5
Elementary	594
Middle School	262
High School	280
Alternative Schools	25.5
Programs	8

PRINCIPALS

Level	Principals/School	Asst. Principals/School	Total School Administration
Prek-Kindergarten	1	0	1
Elementary	1	1	20
Middle	1	1 (2 at RRMS)	9
High	1	6*	14
Alternative Programs	1	0	2

* Includes administratively licensed Athletic Coordinators.

CONCERNS WITH ADMINISTRATIVE WORKLOAD

SPAN OF CONTROL (SUPERVISION)

Number of subordinates a supervisor has.

“Span of Control”

a.k.a

“Span of Management”

a.k.a.

“Span of Authority”

a.k.a

“Span of Supervision”

RRPS SPAN OF SUPERVISION

Instructional Staff Only

These number *do not* include classified staff: Custodians, secretaries, educational assistants, etc.

Level	Supervision Ratio per Administrator	Number Observations & Meetings per Administrator
Pre-Kindergarten	1: 50.23	301.38
Elementary	1:29.64	177.84
Middle	1:29.24	175.44
High	1:19.98	119.88
Alternative High	1: 12.61	75.66

*Meetings include: 1 PDP, 2 Observations, 2 Post-Observations, 1 Summative Conference, and 1 Pre-Observation meetings for new teachers.

SPAN OF SUPERVISION - HISTORY

- × 1900–1960: Consensus formed around the number 6
- × 1960–2000: Consensus rose to 15 – 25 with General Electric limiting to 15.
- × 2000–present: Virtual organization (not us); span of control can be larger.

Source: The Economist, November 9, 2009, online extra.

SPAN OF SUPERVISION - RESEARCH

Source	Ratios
U.S. Department of Commerce International Trade Commission website	Recommend 1:10 ratio, but are struggling to move beyond their current 1:6 ratio.
Department of Defense	The objective is 1:14.
Schroder, Lombardo, and Strollo. 1995. <u>Management and Supervision of Law Enforcement Personnel.</u> Binghamton, NY: pg. 34-36	“The optimal span of control most often recommended at the level of operations varies but rarely exceeds 1:12.”
Average for City Departments, nationwide, website.	1:3.2 – 1:12.8. A review and justification is recommended for outside of the 2- 12 range.
Juneja, Himanshu. “Span of Control in an Organization. SelfGrowth.com., December 26, 2008.	“An ideal span of control to modern authors is around 15 to 20 subordinates per manager while according to traditional authors the ideal number is around 6.”
Meier, Kenneth J. and John Bohte. 2000. “Ode to Luther Gulick” Span of Control and Public Organizational Performance.” Administration and Society, 32(2):115-137.	Texas schools with more than 500 students: “The mean administrator-teacher span is 13.8...”
Intel Corporation, Rio Rancho, NM	

RRPS SPAN OF SUPERVISION

Average Span of Supervision of *All Staff* by School Level per Individual Administrator

These numbers include instructional staff and classified staff (custodians, secretaries, educational assistants, security staff, etc.)

Level	All Staff
Pre-Kindergarten	1:86.96
Elementary	1:43.50
Middle	1:40.55
High	1:29.70
Alternative High	1:17.10

ADDITIONAL PRINCIPAL RESPONSIBILITIES

Coordinates instructional programs	Attends/monitors evening/weekend events	School Meetings: PTA, school counsel, grade level, content, PLC
Student discipline, attendance, truancy	Oversees school grading and homework	District Meetings: Leadership, board, curriculum
Hires staff	Attends to parent needs	Coordinates staff training
Master scheduling	Oversees special education compliance	Staff discipline
Oversees school budget	School events (graduation, open house, conferences)	Enforce school board policy, regulation, laws
Facility oversight	Monitors student safety	Develop procedures
Authorizes staff leave/monitors attendance	School inventory, data collection/deletion, accounting	Implement the requirements of the negotiated agreement

DEPENDENT VARIABLES

- × Nature of the organization
- × Nature of the job
- × Skills and competencies of the managers
- × Employees skills and abilities
- × Nature of interactions required between superiors and subordinates

FACTORS ENABLING INCREASED SPAN OF SUPERVISION

- × Simplicity of work
- × Efficient use of information technology
- × High quality skills and capabilities of subordinates
- × High quality skills and capabilities of supervisors
- × Quality of training program
- × Harmony of the workforce

Disadvantages: Supervisors become overloaded with work, have more trouble making decisions, loss of control over productivity.

FACTORS INHIBITING INCREASED SPAN OF SUPERVISION

- × Change in the work environment
- × Dispersed workforce, either by time or geography
- × New/inexperienced workforce
- × Rigorous administrative requirements
- × Extent of coordination
- × Employee need for assistance

Note: There is point of diminishing returns. Too many supervisors working with fewer employees is expensive and can lead to micro-managing.

CONCERNS WITH THE EVALUATION IMPLEMENTATION & RESULTS

CONCERNS - INCORRECT GROUPS

- × Over 200 teachers in the wrong groups.
- × Each group had specific requirements that were addressed by teachers given their understanding of their group assignment.
- × Those groups were incorrectly assigned by PED, we believe, because of the evolving use of the STARS system and previous guidance from PED. STARS is now used for two different purposes:
 - Highly qualified tracking
 - Evaluation

CONCERNS – INCORRECT GROUPS

- × Highly qualified status recommendations from PED included the use of **Teachers of Record**.

Examples:

Elementary music, art, PE classes that include special education students require inclusion teachers to satisfy the highly qualified criteria. To address this, PED recommended the use of teachers of record (who didn't actually teach most of the students rostered). However, now the teacher of record is assigned the student achievement data for evaluation purposes. Result: Teacher of Record gets put in the wrong group.

First period Art may have Art I, II, III, IV and one special education student rostered. That student shows in STARS as requiring a self-contained special education teacher. To address this, PED recommended teachers of record (who didn't actually teach most of the students rostered). However, now the teacher of record is assigned the student achievement data for evaluation purposes. Result: Teacher of Record gets put in the wrong group.

CONCERNS – FAILED STUDENT SURVEY PROCESS 13-14

Despite the fact that RRPS values the data we would get from a well-constructed student survey system, we have chosen not to use this aspect of the system for SY 14-15 evaluations.

Flaws with the SY 13-14 system include:

- × Lack of Security – Anyone could sign on and rate multiple times
- × Late Development – Teachers were never informed of the criteria and the survey system was not completed until March
- × Survey Points Incorrectly Credited – PED's assignment of teachers to incorrect groups required teachers to have given surveys they didn't know they had to give.
- × Lack of Feedback – No resulting feedback to teachers for reflection or growth
- × Incorrect Data – PED decided to assign certain teachers points when they had not given the survey based on a percentage of other points earned. This resulted in some teachers who did not give the survey receiving more points than others who had.
- × Assumptions – Incorrectly assumed that all parents had internet access
- × Timing – Despite that we requested multiple times, parent surveys were implemented too late to for parents to take the survey manually during parent teacher conferences

CONCERNS – STUDENT ACHIEVEMENT DATA

- ✘ Inconsistent application of the graduated consideration rules

Example: some teachers with 3 years of SBA data were given 70 possible points while others were given 35.

- ✘ Data attribution concerns

Example: Some scores calculated for courses teacher had not taught. Some long-time K-2 teachers had SBA data (test not given to K-2) attributed to them.

CONCERNS – STUDENT ACHIEVEMENT DATA (CONTINUED)

- × No mechanism for review or verification.

Example: Teachers need access to data used to evaluate them – need to drill down to the individual student name.

- × Violations of good statistical practices

Example: Some teachers evaluated on a very small percentage of overall student enrolled (one out of six classes taught)

CONCERNS – SUMMATIVE EVALUATIONS

- × Basic errors (i.e., every teacher for two schools had 10+ year old construction names on them)
- × Too late to provide to teachers during the current instructional year
- × Completely lacking in feedback for reflection and growth
- × Over 200 potentially flawed summatives remain

URGENTLY REQUESTED OF PED

- × Clear, unambiguous, correct, and *unchanging* business rules, tags, rubrics and calculations
- × Timely communication of evaluation trainings that include the requested audience, level of requirement, and description of content to be presented.
- × Districts are trying to implement the system correctly. Emails and phone calls with questions regarding the system need the courtesy of a response.
- × Corrections to 2013-14 district summative concerns needed immediately

CONCERNS WITH FUTURE NEW MEXICO TEACHER APPLICANT POOL

CONCERNS WITH APPLICANT POOL

New Mexico University Undergraduate Enrollment Trends
Consistently Downward Trajectory
Down 532 (17.5%) Education Majors in 4 Years

	2010	2011	2012	2013
NMHU	299	270	213	262
ENMU	508	330	376	354
NMSU	1722	1675	1655	1591
UNM	1054	1015	948	844
TOTALS	3583	3290	3192	3051

QUESTIONS?



RIO RANCHO

Group A Teachers

Group A Teachers are teachers that teach grades and/or subjects that can be meaningfully linked to the SBA.

This includes the following teachers:

- Grades 3–5
- Grades 6–8, 10–11 for Language Arts/Math*
- Grades 7, 9, 10, and 11 for Science
- Special Education teacher in the grades and subjects above (Teachers of students with severe and profound disabilities are exempt from this group.)

	Elementary		Middle School		High School		
Student Achievement	<u>SBA</u>	35	<u>SBA</u>	35	<u>SBA</u>	35	
	MAPs	15	MAPs	15	EOC	15	
Observations	<u>Domain 2&3</u>	<u>25</u>	<u>Domain 2&3</u>	<u>25</u>	<u>Domain 2&3</u>	<u>25</u>	
	Multiple Measure	<u>Domain 1&4</u>	15	<u>Domain 1&4</u>	15	<u>Domain 1&4</u>	15
		St Svy	5	St Svy	5	St Svy	5
		Teach Att	5	Teach Att	5	Teach Att	5

Group B Teachers

Group B Teachers are teachers that teach in subjects and grades that cannot be meaningfully linked to the SBA.

This includes the following teachers:

- Grades 3–5 for non-tested subject (CTE, Art, Music, etc.)
- Grades 6–8 for Social Studies
- Grades 6, 8, 9, and 12 for Science
- Grades 9 and 12 for Language Arts/Math

	Elementary		Middle School		High School		
Student Achievement	EOC*	35	EOC	35	EOC	35	
	SBA	15	SBA	15	SBA	15	
Observations	<u>Domain 2&3</u>	<u>25</u>	<u>Domain 2&3</u>	<u>25</u>	<u>Domain 2&3</u>	<u>25</u>	
	Multiple Measures	<u>Domain 1&4</u>	15	<u>Domain 1&4</u>	15	<u>Domain 1&4</u>	15
		St Svy	5	St Svy	5	St Svy	5
		Teach Att	5	Teach Att	5	Teach Att	5

Group C Teachers

Group C Teachers are teachers that teach Grades K, 1, and 2

	Elementary	
Student Achievement	MAPs	35
	SBA	15
Observations	<u>Domain 2&3</u>	<u>25</u>
	Multiple Measure	Domain 1&4
	Pt Svy	5
	Teach Att	5

Abbreviations

EOC	End of Course
EOC*	At the elementary level, this may be interim assessments
MAPS	Measure of Academic Progress
Math*	Includes 9th Grade Algebra I & Geometry Teachers
Pt Svy	Parent Survey
SBA	Standards Based Assessment
St Svy	Student Survey
Teach Att	Teacher Attendance