

STATE OF NEW MEXICO
LEGISLATIVE EDUCATION STUDY COMMITTEE

REPRESENTATIVES

Mimi Stewart, Vice Chair
Nora Espinoza
Jimmie C. Hall
Rick Miera
Dennis J. Roch
Sheryl M. Williams Stapleton

State Capitol North, 325 Don Gaspar, Suite 200
Santa Fe, New Mexico 87501
Phone: (505) 986-4591 Fax: (505) 986-4338
<http://www.nmlegis.gov/lcs/lesc/lescdefault.aspx>

SENATORS

John M. Sapien, Chair
Craig W. Brandt
Gay G. Kernan
Howie C. Morales

ADVISORY

Alonzo Baldonado
Nathan "Nate" Cote
George Dodge, Jr.
David M. Gallegos
Stephanie Garcia Richard
Timothy D. Lewis
Tomás E. Salazar
James E. Smith
Christine Trujillo
Bob Wooley



ADVISORY

Jacob R. Candelaria
Lee S. Cotter
Daniel A. Ivey-Soto
Linda M. Lopez
John Pinto
William P. Soules
Pat Woods

Frances Ramirez-Maestas, Director

November 17, 2014

MEMORANDUM

TO: Legislative Education Study Committee

FR: Heidi L. Macdonald

**RE: STAFF REPORT: TEACHER AND PRINCIPAL EVALUATION PANEL
SUMMARY REPORT: PUBLIC EDUCATION DEPARTMENT (PED)
RESPONSE**

INTRODUCTION

As a focus area of the 2014 Legislative Education Study Committee (LESC) workplan, the LESC requested testimony during interim meetings (June to October) from school district and charter school leaders regarding the implementation of the teacher and principal evaluation system. Staff was directed to compile general perceptions, issues, and concerns into a summary report, which is to be provided to the Secretary-designate of Public Education for review and comment.

Teacher and Principal Evaluation Panels

At each interim meeting from June to October, a panel comprised of surrounding area school districts and/or charter schools was assembled to provide testimony to the LESC regarding the implementation of the evaluation system. In each instance, each panel member was given a set of seven questions (see **Attachment 1**), which included the following:

1. school district/charter school implementation timeline of the evaluation system;
2. online system used to implement the evaluation system;

3. number and percentage of teachers in your school district/charter school from Group A, Group B, and Group C, as well as their effectiveness ratings;
4. number and percentage of principals and assistant principals in your school district/charter school from Group A and Group B, as well as their effectiveness ratings;
5. shared data and results of the summative reports with teachers and principals;
6. participation in the New Mexico's Teacher and School Leader Evaluation Pilot Project from school year 2012-2013; and
7. additional comments addressing lessons learned in implementing the evaluation system.

Each panel member was also requested to submit written responses to the set of seven questions prior to testifying before the LESC so that these responses could be included in the committee notebooks for review.

The following school districts and charter schools provided testimony as follows:

- ***June – Santa Fe***
 - New Mexico School for the Deaf;
 - New Mexico School for the Blind and Visually Impaired;
 - East Mountain High School (state-chartered charter school);
 - Los Alamos Public Schools;
 - Moriarty-Edgewood Schools; and
 - Pojoaque Valley Public Schools.
- ***July – Farmington***
 - Aztec Municipal Schools;
 - Bloomfield Schools;
 - Farmington Municipal Schools;
 - Gallup-McKinley County Schools; and
 - New Mexico Virtual Academy (locally chartered charter school).
- ***August – Las Vegas***
 - Cimarron Municipal Schools;
 - Des Moines Municipal Schools;
 - Las Vegas City Schools;
 - Raton Public Schools;
 - Santa Rosa Consolidated Schools; and
 - West Las Vegas Public Schools.
- ***September – Hobbs***
 - Artesia Public Schools;
 - Carlsbad Municipal Schools (submitted written materials, however, unable to testify due to flooding in his district);
 - Floyd Municipal Schools;
 - Hobbs Municipal Schools;
 - Lovington Municipal Schools;
 - Melrose Municipal Schools;
 - Roswell Municipal Schools; and
 - Texico Municipal Schools.

- **October – Santa Fe**
 - Albuquerque Public Schools;
 - Cuba Independent Schools;
 - Gadsden Independent Schools;
 - Rio Rancho Public Schools;
 - Santa Fe Public Schools; and
 - Silver Consolidated Schools.

In total, 27 school districts, two charter schools, and two special state-supported schools testified before the LESC. As special state-supported schools, the New Mexico School for the Deaf and the New Mexico School for the Blind and Visually Impaired are exempt from the evaluation process, and their data was not included in the Issues and Concerns section below.

This staff report includes information related to:

- agency rule and related points;
- general perceptions;
- issues and concerns; and
- next steps.

AGENCY RULE AND RELATED POINTS

Adopted in August 2012 and amended in September 2013, the Public Education Department (PED) rule, *Teacher and School Leader Effectiveness*, implements an evaluation program for public school teachers and administrators called the Effectiveness Evaluation System (EES). During the 2014 interim, the LESC heard testimony on the provisions and implementation of this rule and testimony from school districts and charter schools on the implementation of the EES within their respective districts.

LESC staff testimony began with a summary of the components of the PED rule. In general, this testimony explained, 50 percent of a teacher’s evaluation is based on student achievement measures, whether derived from the state standards-based assessments or some other student assessment. Details vary, however, depending upon whether a teacher is a member of Group A, Group B, or Group C.

- Group A teachers teach subjects tested by the standards-based assessments in those grades in which the assessments are administered;
- Group B teachers teach either non-tested subjects or tested subjects in grades in which the standards-based assessments are not administered; and
- Group C teachers teach in grades K-2.

For the remainder of a teacher’s evaluation, staff testimony continued:

- 25 percent is based on teaching observations by one of two types of observers – either “approved” or “certified” – using the New Mexico Teacher Evaluation Advisory Council (NMTEACH) rubric or protocol; and

- 25 percent is based on “multiple measures,” which vary, again, according to the group to which the teacher belongs.

Turning to the evaluation of administrators, LESC staff testified that the EES requires that every school leader have an annual effectiveness evaluation, which must be conducted by a qualified person approved by PED. For the EES rating itself:

- 50 percent is based on the change in the school’s letter grade;
- 25 percent is based on the school’s multiple measures; and
- 25 percent is based on “documented fidelity observations of the school leader.”

According to the PED business rules, unlike teachers, administrators are categorized into two groups:

- Group A Principals/School Administrators
 - 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.
- Group B School Administrators
 - district-level administrators; and athletic directors and deans of students that do not have Level 3-B licenses.

LESC staff testified that, prior to 2012, when the *Teacher and School Leader Effectiveness* rule was first codified by PED, the *Performance Evaluation System Requirements for Teachers* rule primarily governed the requirements for a highly objective uniform statewide standard of evaluation (HOUSSE) for teachers from early childhood through grade 12, which rated teachers as either meeting competency or not meeting competency.

According to PED, during the 2013 interim:

- every aspect of the nine teacher competencies in HOUSSE can be found in the four domains in the NMTEACH Observation Protocol; and
- each effectiveness rating aligns with the *School Personnel Act* because teachers who receive EES ratings of exemplary, highly effective, or effective will meet competency and teachers who receive minimally effective or ineffective EES ratings will not meet competency.

June 2014 Interim Meeting

During the June 2014 interim meeting, LESC staff presented an overview of the current EES program as well as provided information on the summative evaluations for the reported schools. According to a May 16, 2014 newspaper article, *76% Pass New Evaluations for Teachers*, PED sent school districts individual teacher evaluation scores for school year 2013-2014. According to the article, PED indicated that the remainder was not included either because their districts

missed a deadline for submitting evaluation materials or because they were not classroom teachers, such as librarians or instructional coaches.

The following scores, included in the referenced newspaper article, are composed of the number and the percentage of the teachers evaluated in five levels of performance as follows:

1. **exemplary:** 235 teachers, or 1.5 percent of the total teachers evaluated;
2. **highly effective:** 3,245 teachers, or 20.4 percent of the total teachers evaluated;
3. **effective:** 8,609 teachers, or 54.1 percent of the total teachers evaluated;
4. **minimally effective:** 3,288 teachers, or 20.7 percent of the total teachers evaluated; and
5. **ineffective:** 533 teachers, or 3.4 percent of the total teachers evaluated.

The scores reflect that 15,910, or 73 percent, of the state's 21,800 teachers were evaluated.

GENERAL PERCEPTIONS¹

In general, school leaders did not dispute the value of reviewing and possibly improving the new teacher and principal evaluation system. For example, one school leader stated that the school board, administration, and staff believe in accountability and support any viable and understandable system of evaluation. On the other hand, another school leader stated their district does support evaluating teachers with a better method. According to this school leader, the district certainly wants to be held accountable; however, the district does not believe the state is using a better method today than previously used.

Another school leader noted that the evaluation system is becoming a high stakes game when evaluating teachers' performance and attempting to interpret results that the district has little control over but are held liable. Validity, the school leader added, is the key because there is too much uncertainty when evaluating and interpreting results. This school district, the school leader added, supports accountability and will continue to have high expectations for teachers and administrators. Accountability, the school leader emphasized, is reflective of transparency, and this is not happening throughout the system. On a related matter, the school leader was concerned about the rushed implementation. According to one school leader, the new evaluation system appears to be a good start, but it is being implemented without enough stakeholder input. Due to the speed of implementation, one school leader noted, the district administrators have not been able to fully comprehend and effectively convey all aspects of the evaluation system to teachers, administrators, students, and parents. However, the school leader stated that, implementation of the Common Core State Standards, the PARCC assessment, and the new evaluation system simultaneously has been overwhelming to teachers, administrators, students, and parents.

Observation Component

In general, the school leaders stated that the observation component of the evaluation process has provided focus on best practices for both teachers and principals. In fact, according to one school leader, principals have the most impact on changing instruction and for that reason this

¹ The examples in this document attempt to reflect actual testimony and written responses.

particular school leader believes the observation portion of the evaluation system should have a heavier weighting.

Among other comments, school leaders reported that:

- observations have resulted in immediate feedback and support for struggling teachers;
- the observation portion of the evaluation system has improved the walkthrough component of the teacher evaluation system;
- calibration training of principals and the rubric being utilized across the state is helping to make the teacher observation component more fair, equitable, evidence-based, and uniform; and
- the observation component now pinpoints the lack of best teacher practices.

ISSUES AND CONCERNS

Among issues and concerns during the school leaders' presentations, the following points of interest are based on actual testimony from school leaders as well as from submitted documents:

Evaluation Contents

Student and parent surveys

Noting the following concerns as they relate to student and parent surveys, some school leaders indicated that they felt they could not release summative reports to teachers, primarily because:

- missing questionnaires;
- security issues regarding online student surveys; and
- flaws with the 2013-2014 system included:
 - lack of security;
 - late development;
 - survey points incorrectly credited;
 - lack of feedback;
 - incorrect data; and
 - timing.

Data

Noting the following concerns as they relate to missing and incomplete data, the school leaders indicated the following:

- Discovery data or DIBELS scores from the 2012-2013 school year were not used;
- EoC grades were not available, which meant that a number of teachers did not receive achievement scores;
- teachers that should have had SBA scores did not;
- no data was received for some current teachers;

- teachers had incorrectly identified licensure levels; and
- group C teachers were not provided Discovery data points on any of the evaluations in one district.

Noting the following concerns as they relate to inaccurate data, the school leaders stated the following:

- teachers were given value added scores and NM SBA data for classes that they did not teach;
- teachers originally in group A were not given their student achievement data as they were placed in groups B and C;
- inaccurate data in general;
- teachers were given data points not covered by their assignments;
- teachers receiving credit for courses they did not teach; and
- one school leader stated the district submitted 45 evaluations for review and appeal; however, when the corrected evaluations were sent back to the district from the PED, there were 34 evaluations with additional mistakes.

Coding of teachers

Noting the following concerns as they relate to the incorrect coding of teachers, the school leaders indicated the following:

- over 200 teachers were placed in the incorrect groups;
- after the “final” summative reports were released, new problems were discovered, such as some group C teachers placed as group A teachers;
- 59 identifiable errors in the coding of 339 teachers;
- there were discrepancies in how teachers were coded; and
- with 229 unresolved summative evaluations (most due to errors in group placement), the school leader is unclear as to who was placed in group A, B, or C. The school leader stated the problem with the group issue lies with the evolving dual use of the STARS system for tracking both highly qualified and for evaluation purposes. The school leader asked PED on different occasions for a complete list of assignments and groups and had not received any information.

Confidentiality issues

Raising concerns of confidentiality, some school leaders indicated that they received evaluations for teachers who were no longer employed in their school district.

Attendance

Among concerns noted by school leaders, the PED did not include teacher attendance data on the some evaluations. This is primarily an issue because absences are often attributed to the *Family and Medical Leave Act*, bereavement, jury duty, military leave, religious leave, professional development, and coaching. School leaders also mentioned that the PED attendance requirements create conflicts with local bargaining agreements.

Summative reports

School leaders stated that some teachers in their school districts did not receive their summative reports.

Observation component

Several school leaders indicated that they felt principals have the biggest impact on changing instructions and thus the observation portion of the evaluation system should receive more weight in the total evaluation score.

Special education

Noting the following concerns as they relate to special education, the school leaders said the following:

- one school leader indicated that special education teachers in the district did not receive summative reports and should have; and
- there have been concerns raised by special education teachers regarding the NMTEACH rubric and its inability to address educational plans and special needs to teachers in special education classrooms who are teaching a prescribed curriculum program. This situation could place principals in a difficult position when the rubric is taken literally. The district has added vocabulary to the NMTEACH rubric to address the situations specific to special education classrooms.

Implementation

Initial concerns

Noting the following concerns as they relate to the initial implementation of the evaluation system, the school leaders stressed the following:

- the system was being implemented when more time was needed for development, including PED trainings and timelines;
- deadlines were changed by PED;
- for a rural district, the time it takes to implement the program is consuming; and
- due to the speed of implementation, the district has not been able to fully comprehend and effectively convey all aspects of the evaluation system to teachers, administrators, students, and parents.

Implementation with other initiatives

In general, school leaders indicated the implementation of the Common Core State Standards, the PARCC assessment, and the evaluation system simultaneously has been overwhelming to teachers, administrators, students, and parents.

Administrator training

Among the concerns noted by the school leaders, administrators were not trained before the implementation of the new system. According to one school leader, the PED training in the 2013-2014 school year was not effective due to the fact that the training platform was not completed and accessible to participants during their trainings. Also many administrators were unable to login to the site due to limited internet capability.

Summative report reviews

Referring to the lack of time to review the summative reports, the school leaders indicated that districts received reports late in the year, and validation of the data was not complete before teachers left for the summer. Administrators were not able to meet with staff to thoroughly explain the contents of the summative reports.

Data Verification

Citing the lack of an opportunity for data verification, school leaders request an opportunity to verify data before calculations are made. This will help alleviate stress for teachers.

Observations

School leaders noted the observation component of the evaluation system was time consuming and sometimes overwhelming. In addition, school leaders reported the teacher observation protocol, along with reflection and targeted professional development embedded in Teachescape, has the potential to improve teaching and learning.

Communication

Concerning communication with PED, school leaders request the communication to be clear and timely.

Clarity

Value added model (VAM) or value added score (VAS)

Referring to concerns with the VAM or the VAS data, several school leaders indicated they had difficulty understanding and explaining both concepts.

Graduated considerations

Noting the following concerns as they relate to graduated considerations, the school leaders stated the following:

- all teachers in one district received graduated consideration points on their evaluations; and
- there is a lack of understanding in the application of graduated considerations.

Professional growth plans

School leaders noted the lack of clear direction as related to which personnel should be placed on a professional growth plan.

Hold harmless/baseline year

Several school leaders emphasized the first year of the teacher evaluation system was believed to be a hold harmless or baseline year.

Student achievement

Related to issues with the student achievement portion of the evaluation system, the school leaders noted the following:

- data points re-assigned teachers to the group associated with their data from the previous year. With changes in teaching positions from year to year, staff are not in the same group as their student achievement data;
- districts do not have access to specific calculations and procedures used to populate data in the summative evaluation reports. School leaders indicated if this information was available, it would greatly assist them in their ability to explain and substantiate ratings;
- several school leaders questioned why the evaluation of teachers was being based on three years worth of data;
- student achievement data is weighted too heavily in the NMTEACH framework. There is a perceived lack of transparency in the student achievement portion of the summative evaluation reports;
- teachers have student achievement measures included from years they were classified as a long term substitute prior to being hired as teachers; and
- current school year 2013-2014 data was not used.

Multiple measures

School leaders noted that the multiple measures component of the evaluation was being applied inconsistently.

Teachscape

Referring to Teachscape concerns, school leaders noted the system has potential to make the process more manageable, yet school districts continue to have significant problems in utilizing the system for its intended purpose.

For a complete list of concerns and issues raised by the school leader testimony, please see **Attachment 2**.

NEXT STEPS

On November 17, 2014 the Secretary-designate will provide a response to the Teacher and Principal Evaluation Panel Summary Report.

QUESTIONS

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

July 15, 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.
2. Which online system does your school district/charter school use to help implement the EES?

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

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).

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.*

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

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

Teacher and Principal Evaluation Panel Summary

7. Please add any other comments you might have addressing lessons learned in implementing your evaluation system.	Issues/concerns from superintendents' testimony during interim meetings
<p>Learning the interface and online reporting system, principals noted, caused frustration for teachers and principals due to a lack of familiarity with Teachscape. Three formal observations and two informal walkthroughs presented an onerous burden of time and effort for everyone involved. Regarding this problem, the district worked with PED. These discussions led to an agreement with PED for mid-year changes to the district's evaluation protocols, including a reduction in formal observations from three to two (if conducted by two different administrators). The opportunity to meet with PED also created an opportunity to gain more clarity. Elementary principals report the teacher observation protocol, along with reflection, and targeted/differentiated professional development embedded in Teachscape can lead to improvements in teaching and learning.</p>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • problems entering data on Teachscape • 59 identifiable errors in the coding of 339 teachers • hold harmless/baseline year • 27-28 percent error rate
<p>Student achievement data is from 2012-2013. These data points re-assigned teachers to the group associated with their data from the previous year. With changes in position from year to year, staff are not in the same group as their student achievement data. Teacher groups were changed, causing a disconnect with the appropriate Multiple Measure. Missing data due to re-assignment to the wrong group. Zero Discovery and DIBELS scores from the 2012-2013 school year were attached to teachers. All teachers received points under graduated considerations. 13 teachers did not receive their summative evaluation report. The district received 13 evaluations for teachers no longer with the district (breach of confidentiality issue raised). Overall error rate= 26%.</p>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • missing or incomplete data • evaluations received for teacher not employed in the district • missing points • 27-28 percent error rate
<p>The observation component of the evaluation process has greatly intensified focus on solid best-practices for both teachers and principals. Active “front-loading” of validation processes could be used to greatly increase the accuracy of summative reports prior to release. Specific</p>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • significant problems with Teachscape • questions regarding student achievement system • inaccurate data • missing summative reports

Teacher and Principal Evaluation Panel Summary

<p>calculations and procedures used to populate data in the summative evaluation reports. Districts do not currently have access to this information. This information would greatly assist administrators in their ability to explain and substantiate ratings, especially those produced from standardized test data. Teachscape has great potential to help make this process more manageable, yet the school district continues to have significant problems in utilizing the system to its intended potential.</p>	
<p>There were no EoC grades available, which meant that a number of people did not receive achievement scores. We wanted to input explore and plan achievement scores, but were given no way to do so. We wanted a different CCR score for our other ten percent; the state gave us a score they probably used to compute the school grade. The deadline for observations and domains 1 and 4 was not clear to me.</p>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • current rubric for evaluations does not provide a basis for how some of his teachers are to be evaluated, such as those who teach college level courses • inaccurate data • missing data • 65 percent error rate
<p>NMTEACH trainings are beneficial. We had a hard time implementing the full system in our district. I believe the new system is a great step in the right direction and far better than what we have had in the past, but I also believe that unless we had all the components ready to implement early in the school year we should have waited. The PED did communicate, please know that, but it was too late in the school year. We must be clear and timely with our communications. One thing has become very clear is how much being in the classroom matters. In fact, principals have the biggest impact on changing instruction and for that reason I believe the observation portion of our evaluation system should count the most. The other training that has been very beneficial to our principals that we have hosted twice in our district is the inter-rater reliability training. Through this practice we are able to share best practices and talk about the different approaches.</p>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • inaccurate data • inadequate time before end of school year to thoroughly review the summative reports • observation component weighted more • 30-35 percent error rate
<p>The new EES appears to be a good start, but it is being implemented without enough stakeholder input and it is being rushed through. We had approximately 40% erroneous</p>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • attendance issues • difficulty explaining the value-added model • 40 percent error rate

Teacher and Principal Evaluation Panel Summary

<p>reports, some our fault and some the fault of the PED and Teachscape.</p>	
<p>The biggest issue in implementing the EES was communication. Information did not come in a package, but in pieces. Other issues are trying to roll something out when it is still in development, there are questions that can't or weren't answered when asked, the final product was not available from the beginning, questions about data and a lack of understanding of the mathematical equations used to calculate scores. Deadlines were changed, reports arrived late, requests for information were not timely and data was incorrect. It is a system with value, but implementation has been difficult.</p>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • problems entering data on Teachscape • attendance issues • inaccurate data • missing or incomplete data
<p>Administration at larger schools need more help. The graduated considerations are confusing to teachers. 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.</p>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • issues with graduated considerations (difficult to understand and to explain) • attendance issues • evaluation of teachers being based on three years worth of data • district's collective bargaining agreement and how <i>Public Employees Bargaining Act</i> factors are included
<p>The evaluation rubric has to be aligned to the job description of a virtual teacher. The evaluation system as it stands requires a lot of work to complete along with all of the other responsibilities. Teachers are not opposed to being evaluated. They are opposed to the evaluation system not being meaningful. The teacher evaluation system is a tool and should be used as a tool.</p>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • observations overwhelming and time consuming • teacher attendance • student surveys
<p>My biggest lesson learned was to be aware of the data that the district is reporting. Although most of my summative reports were accurate, I am concerned that errors can easily happen with a few simple errors on my report data. I would appreciate an opportunity to verify data before calculations are made so I am not the cause of any stress for teachers when reports come out.</p>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • inaccurate data • no opportunity to check/verify data from previous years
<p>The most important lesson I learned was to ensure accurate reporting of data and make sure teachers are tied to the data they have contributed. I am appreciative of the data</p>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • stressed need for accurate data

Teacher and Principal Evaluation Panel Summary

<p>verifications that will be implemented this coming school year.</p>	
<p>Schools received data for teachers who were no longer employed at the school site. We did not receive data for some of our current teachers. We learned the process involves a lot of time. We learned that the tool can provide meaningful and useful data for influencing student achievement. We learned that the lack of human resources can prevent the system from attaining the intent. We learned that we must start implementing the evaluation plan very early in the school year. We learned that the tool is a good tool for improving instruction; unfortunately, the variable “test score” does not seem to support or reflect the level of professional growth on the part of the teacher or the quality of instruction.</p>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • data for some teachers no longer in the district • some teachers received no data • missing data
<p>Huge learning curve for all of us. Hurt morale in a big way. Appreciate PED making adjustments when reasonable.</p>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • problems with roll out of system • administrators not trained before roll out of system
<p>Creates accountability, is data based, objective, and unbiased. It is a fair rating system. All documents are stored in one centralized location. Enhances quality of instruction based on contact time and feedback requirements while including information on all teacher domains. Expectations for every teacher are uniform. Improves curricula development as there is ongoing teacher reflection based on follow up and feedback while providing professional development opportunities. Initially, especially for a rural district, the time it takes to implement the program is very consuming. Teacher buy-in is another factor. Lack of training is one thing that as the program is used more can easily be addressed.</p>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • frustration with so many initiatives happening at the same time • trouble understanding the value-added model
<p>Incomplete observations shouldn't reflect an effectiveness rating. There should be some notification or submit to state upon completion option.</p>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • teacher attendance should not be counted against a teacher's rating if it is used for professional development training or if the teacher is sick • system does not account for vital elements, such as parental involvement, how teachers interact with students, how valuable a teacher is within the school setting, and knowledge outside the rubric

Teacher and Principal Evaluation Panel Summary

<p>The thought and organization of the observation portion of EES has improved the walkthrough component of the teacher evaluation system. Calibration training of principals and the rubric being utilized across the state is helping to make the teacher observation component more fair, equitable, evidence-based, and uniform. The observation component now pinpoints the lack of best teacher practices. Implementation of Common Core Standards, the PARCC assessment, and the EES program simultaneously has been overwhelming to teachers, administrators, students, and parents. We are concerned that the VAS formula does not provide an accurate representation of student achievement. Additionally, until we are certain the high-stakes assessments align with the standards being taught, the student achievement results should be viewed with skepticism. Due to the speed of implementation, we have not been able to fully comprehend and effectively convey all aspects of the EES program to teachers, administrators, students, and parents. The options which districts have within the EES program are becoming more limited.</p>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • some teachers were not issued a summative report • district issued summative reports for teachers no longer in the district • missing data • multiple measures applied inconsistently • VAM data applied inconsistently and hard to explain • implementation of too many educational reforms simultaneously • observation portion should be given more weight • administrators not able to comprehend or effectively explain evaluations • options that district has with evaluations too limited
<p>Training in the 2013-2014 school year was ineffective for administrators due to the fact that the training platform was not completed and accessible to participants when PED had their trainings. Many of the administrators that attended the training were unable to login to the site and internet capability was limited. Due to the late business rules established for principals it was not fair to evaluate principals using the NMTEACH school leader evaluation system established by NMPED. Teachers should not be held to 50% of their evaluation results being tied to student achievement measures.</p>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • did not present due to flooding in his district
<p>The school board, administration, and staff believe in accountability and support any viable and understandable system of evaluation.</p>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • inadequate time for review of summative reports • 10 inquiries on 22 teachers • changed school names for teachers • one teacher's overall rating changed from

Teacher and Principal Evaluation Panel Summary

	<p>“effective” to “minimally effective” without notice</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • teachers changed from Group C to Group A although these teachers taught Kindergarten, first grade, or second grade • points given to teachers in areas not covered by that teacher’s assignment
None provided.	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • observation count for more percentage of total evaluation score
<p>Inconsistent and erroneous information communicated from PED to district. The Teachscape program is definitely browser sensitive. It has been a positive change allowing local districts to have user management control of Teachscape. We have seen a drastic increase in retirements and resignations citing EES as the motivation. Level 1 teachers rated as minimally effective on their third annual summative evaluation will be forced to exit the profession as a result of not being able to have three consecutive effective evaluations in their first five years.</p>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • 22 percent of original summative evaluations had inquiries and were submitted to PED for review, after he received the original 45 reports back from PED, there were an additional 34 reports that had to be resubmitted back to PED because of additional errors • inaccurate school names
<p>First and foremost, we do support evaluating teachers with a better method. We certainly want to be held accountable. We don't believe we are using a better method today than we were using before. We believe the observation piece is very good and the walkthroughs have really encouraged teacher-principals interactions. My biggest concern is the VAM portion of the evaluation plan. We knew about student achievement being a part of the plan, but 50 percent is way too much and with it being so hard to determine how to process scoring, it becomes a major issue.</p>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • discovery points not included on the evaluations • PED answered some, but not all of the district’s questions • district informed this was a baseline year • difficult to understand VAM
Not provided.	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • problems with uploading documentation • scheduling conflicts when principals are called to the district office during scheduled observations • partial observation of a lesson does not look at the whole picture • subjectivity (teachers doing same thing get different scores) • time consuming for observations
This is becoming a high stakes game when evaluating teachers’ performance and	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • security issues regarding online student surveys

Teacher and Principal Evaluation Panel Summary

<p>attempting to interpret results that the district has little control over but are held liable. Validity is the key and right now there is too much uncertainty when evaluating and interpreting results. The district supports accountability and will continue to have high expectations for teachers and administrators. Accountability is reflective of transparency and this is not happening all the way through the system.</p>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • inaccurate data
<p>There have been concerns raised by special education teachers regarding the NMTEACH rubric and its inability to address special circumstances, educational plans, and special needs to teachers in special education classrooms who are teaching a prescribed curriculum program. It can place principals in a difficult position when the rubric is taken literally. The district has added vocabulary to the NMTEACH rubric to address the special situations that occur in special education classrooms. Increased accountability for the principal to be in the classroom. Increased standardization in the expectations of observations resulting in more standardized feedback. More courageous conversations with teachers to increase student learning. Observations have resulted in immediate feedback and support for struggling teachers. Attendance has improved but the district questions the quality of instruction if teachers attend school ill. Trainings and timelines for implementation of the NMTEACH observation rubric and Teachscape system were rushed and made the observation process initially cumbersome. Implementation of NMTEACH and Teachscape required the district to hire additional staff. Student achievement data is weighted too heavily in the NMTEACH framework. There is lack of transparency in the student achievement portion of the summative evaluation reports. Students were double counted for teachers. There is no guidance on which course numbers assigned to teacher were pulled from STARS to attach student achievement information. Teachers have</p>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • initial implementation difficulties • not all summative reports available • teachers missing from the district master list • inaccurate data • attendance issues • district received reports for teachers in other districts • NMTEACH rubric's inability to address special circumstances, education plans, and special needs of special education teachers • rushed training and timelines for implementation of new system • district had to hire new staff • student achievement is weighted too heavily • lack of transparency in the student achievement portion • issues with graduated considerations • attendance requirements creating conflicts with local bargaining agreements and related absence policies • confidentiality issues due to districts having access to evaluations of teachers they do not supervise

Teacher and Principal Evaluation Panel Summary

<p>student achievement measures included from years they were classified as a long term substitute prior to being hired as teachers. Ninth grade teachers received value added scores based on SBA even though there is no SBA administered in 9th grade. Graduated considerations have created a confusing system where teachers receive more credit for different portions of their evaluation than their colleagues. Confidentiality issues raised. Attendance requirements create conflicts with local bargaining agreements and related absence policies.</p>	
<p>There may be flaws in the new evaluation system, but for the most part our district has benefitted with the evaluation as it is an excellent tool by which teachers can validate their great teaching and by which they can grow and improve in their practice.</p>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • difficulty with VAM scores • attendance issues
<p>The manner in which we implemented the new evaluation system was critical. Teachers appeared comfortable with the process. As with anything new, there were glitches in the use of the software.</p>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • first year of evaluations are viewed as a pilot program
<p>Concerns - incorrect groups. Over 200 teachers in the wrong groups. Failed student survey process for school year 2013-2014. Despite the fact that the district 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 school year 2014-2015 evaluations. Flaws with the 2013-2014 system include: lack of security; late development; survey points incorrectly credited; lack of feedback; incorrect data; assumptions; and timing. Student achievement data- inconsistent application of the graduated consideration rules; data attribution concerns; no mechanism for review or verification; and violations of good statistical practices. Summative evaluations - basic errors; too late to provide to teachers during the current instructional year; completely lacking in feedback for reflection and growth; and over 200 potentially flawed summative report remain.</p>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • unclear on business rules for assigning teachers to groups • teachers in incorrect groups • teacher surveys: lack of security; late development; survey points incorrectly credited; lack of feedback; incorrect data; and late timing • application of graduated considerations issues • teachers receiving credit for courses they did not teach • data attribution concerns • timing issues • understaffing at PED
<p>Clarification Request - NMPED Teacher</p>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • how the data was collected

Teacher and Principal Evaluation Panel Summary

<p>Evaluation Implementation - Letter from Superintendent Joel Boyd to Secretary-designate Hanna Skandera on October 13, 2014. Commentary: we need to get teacher evaluations right - published in the Santa Fe New Mexican on September 20, 2014.</p>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • adequate staffing to work with PED to correct the data • PED data system issues • timing of the data • school year 2013-2014 data not used • clear direction on which personnel should be placed on a professional growth plan
<p>We did the best we could despite the fact we were not adequately prepared by NMPED, and received miscommunication initially regarding the evaluation online instrument we could use. The district changed our plan for 2014-2017 to expedite and simplify the data collection and insure more accurate summative reports that are accurate, explainable, and complete.</p>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • difficulty understanding how data being collected • difficulty explaining to teachers