

**QUESTIONS**  
**TEACHER AND PRINCIPAL EVALUATION PANEL:**  
**AREA SCHOOL DISTRICTS**  
**FLOYD MUNICIPAL SCHOOLS**

September 23, 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.**
  - 1) We have 22 teachers in the system. We have chosen the “one observer/three observations” format. This seems to be called “V-3” in teachscape.
  - 2) Attached is a copy of the EES Plan that was approved for Floyd Municipal Schools.

In regard to implementation, currently (as of September 8, 2014), we have received little-to-no direction regarding the use of/implementation/set-up of TeachScape. As of last Friday, my principal did not have administrative rights to even begin assigning teachers to various buildings, etc.... as (newly) required in teachscape this year. He had intended to begin observations, this week, but cannot do so until he is confident the assignments are correctly input.

We are trying to avoid the (major) issues we had last year with mis-assignments, reporting errors, grouping problems, etc....

The first round of observations are due October 15<sup>th</sup> and my principal fully intends to have all first rounds done in that time frame. We will follow all state timelines related to implementation.

2. **Which online system does your school district/charter school use to help implement the EES?**  
 The Floyd Municipal School uses the following to implement EES:

- Teachscape
- JMAC (student information systems) for STARS submittal
- STARS (PED) reporting system for input and drawdown of staff/student information
- PED “EUI” system for drawing down reports
- SOAP for any testing upload/download of specific information

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

Yes

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.*

AS PER FINAL PED REPORT

GROUP A	17	77%
GROUP B	4	18%
GROUP C	0	0%

WHAT THE DISTRICT BELIEVES IT TO BE:

GROUP A	14	64%
GROUP B	4	18%
GROUP C	3	14%

GROUP U	1	5%
TOTAL:	22	100%

GROUP U	1	5%
TOTAL	22	100%

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

Below contains a summary, by group, and then by entire district.

Grp. A	EXEMPLARY	0	0.00%
Grp. A	HIGHLY	3	21.43%
Grp. A	EFFECTIVE	10	71.43%
Grp. A	MINIMAL	1	7.14%
Grp. A	INEFFECTIVE	0	0.00%
TOTAL GROUP A		14	100.00%

Grp. B	EXEMPLARY	0	0.00%
Grp. B	HIGHLY	3	21.43%
Grp. B	EFFECTIVE	10	71.43%
Grp. B	MINIMAL	1	7.14%
Grp. B	INEFFECTIVE	0	0.00%
TOTAL GROUP A		14	100.00%

Grp. C	EXEMPLARY	0	0.00%
Grp. C	HIGHLY	0	0.00%
Grp. C	EFFECTIVE	2	66.67%
Grp. C	MINIMAL	1	33.33%
Grp. C	INEFFECTIVE	0	0.00%
TOTAL GROUP C		3	100.00%

Grp. U	EXEMPLARY	0	0.00%
Grp. U	HIGHLY	0	0.00%
Grp. U	EFFECTIVE	1	100.00%
Grp. U	MINIMAL	0	0.00%
Grp. U	INEFFECTIVE	0	0.00%
TOTAL GROUP U		1	100.00%

All Groups	EXEMPLARY	0	0.00%
All Groups	HIGHLY	5	22.73%
All Groups	EFFECTIVE	14	63.64%
All Groups	MINIMAL	3	13.64%
All Groups	INEFFECTIVE	0	0.00%
TOTAL All Groups		22	100.00%

**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.*

Floyd Municipal Schools has the following:

1.0 (FTE) Principal/Curriculum Coordinator.

1.0 (FTE) Superintendent

Between these two positions are handled all of the administrative operation of the district.

The district does pay small stipends to coordinators to assist in the validation of data, calendars, and programs for Federal/Bilingual Programs, Special Education Programs, and Athletic/Activity Programs.

These are not administrative positions and all final decisions are made by the district administration and school board.

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

The principal's rating for 2013-2014 is "Highly Effective", based on the procedure outlined and used on the Summative rating for principals. This is the only position in this group.

The evaluation process for last year was a combination of "HOUSSE" and summative report, calculated "in-district", using the PED Principal Summative Form posted on NMTEACH for our use.

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

The summative evaluations were released on May 23<sup>rd</sup>, which was the last day of contract for teachers. I downloaded the summatives, again, on July 14<sup>th</sup>, after a conversation with a teacher and noticed some minor changes, one of which was "substantive", as a teacher went from "effective" to "minimally effective", without any notice (and this was before any of the "inquiries" had been considered).

Then, when the "final" summatives were released in early August, "new problems" were discovered, such as group C teachers (who were originally labeled correctly as Group C) were now "group A".

Because we had submitted several inquiries, we had decided to wait until the final summatives before reviewing them with staff. Once the finals came in, there were many concerns with the report. Though most might be considered "minor" (mis-labels on schools and levels), several seemed significant, giving data points in areas that are not even covered by that teacher's assignment. So, I met with my teachers and invited them in one-by-one to review. I did not make them sign the reports, but have reviewed them.

Teachers received their formal evaluations from their principal, based on his observations throughout the year and pre and post conferences, as well as final summatives in-district.

The principal received his final HOUSSE evaluation and we did review HOW future principal evaluations will be calculated. Included in this was the teacher survey data available through PED site.

**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.**

We did not participate in the original pilot (2012-2013), but consider the 2013-2014 to be a "statewide pilot" and, as with every other district, we participated.

Our board, administration, and staff committed fully to the process and despite problems with the summative reports and lack of understanding of groups, levels, assignments, tags, etc...

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

The Floyd Municipal School Board, administration and staff believe, greatly, in accountability and support any viable and understandable system of evaluation. We have used (and continue to use) SBA/State Testing, MAP, DIBELS, QES, and ELL/Testing data extensively and exhaustively over the years to analyze group and individual needs of students. Teachers are held, in-district, accountable for progress their classes make, as well as using this data to inform instructional decisions for daily lessons/teaching.

