

STATE OF NEW MEXICO
LEGISLATIVE EDUCATION STUDY COMMITTEE

REPRESENTATIVES

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

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

October 16, 2013

MEMORANDUM

TO: Legislative Education Study Committee

FR: LaNysha Adams

RE: STAFF REPORT: CUSTOM EVALUATION PLANS

INTRODUCTION

The September 30, 2013 issue of the *New Mexico Register* includes the final adoption of the new "Teacher and School Leader Effectiveness" rule promulgated by the Public Education Department (PED). Among its provisions, the rule includes the following definitions that are pertinent to the information included in this staff report and the oral presentations to the committee for this agenda topic:

- **EES** means effectiveness evaluation systems which are developed by school districts to measure the effectiveness of licensed school employees;
- **licensed school employee** means teachers and school leaders employed in a public school;
- **school district** means one of the 89 political subdivisions of the state created for the administration of public schools and includes those state-authorized charter schools that have not requested waiver of evaluation standards for school personnel. District-authorized charter schools are excluded from being considered a school district for purposes of this rule;
- **school leader** means a principal or assistant principal employed in a public school; and
- **teacher** means a person who holds a level 1, 2 or 3-A license and whose primary duty is classroom instruction or the supervision, below the school principal level, of an

instructional program or whose duties include curriculum development, peer intervention, peer coaching or mentoring or serving as a resource teacher for other teachers. “Teacher” must not include any person issued a Native American language and culture certificate pursuant to the *School Personnel Act* [Sections 22-10A-1 to 22-10A-39 NMSA 1978].

Other provisions of the rule require that:

- as soon as possible but not later than the commencement of school year 2013-2014, all school districts must develop and submit to PED for approval and for implementation during school year 2013-2014 school year, an effectiveness evaluation system for measuring performance of licensed school employee;
- each school district must report annually to PED the results of its effectiveness evaluations of its licensed school employees and the alignment of its effectiveness evaluation system with the three-tiered licensure system; and
- teacher and school leader effectiveness evaluation procedures for licensed school employees must be based on the performance of students assigned to their classrooms or public schools.

For the committee’s review, this staff report outlines:

- school district requirements for submitting custom plans to PED;
- PED-approved alternative options for multiple measures and student achievement;
- how the nine teacher competencies relate to the four domains of the NMTEACH Observation Protocol;
- three examples of PED-approved custom plans; and
- background.

This report also includes the following 9 attachments:

- Attachment 1, *Alternative Measures of Student Achievement*;
- Attachment 2, *List of PED-approved Teacher Evaluation Plans*;
- Attachment 3, *Alternative Measures for Multiple Measures*;
- Attachment 4, *New Mexico Teacher Competencies for Licensure Levels I, II, and III Assessment Criteria*;
- Attachment 5, *Moriarty-Edgewood Custom Plan*;
- Attachment 6, *Santa Fe Custom Plan*;
- Attachment 7, *Farmington New Mexico Virtual Academy Custom Plan*;
- Attachment 8, *Farmington Municipal Schools Position Paper*; and
- Attachment 9, *June 18, 2013, Education Secretary Letter to Chief State School Officers*.

Presenters

Two school districts will discuss their PED-approved custom plans for teacher and school leader evaluations and how they plan to align their EES with the three-tiered licensure system, including:

- Dr. Cindy Sims, Personnel and Staff Accountability Director, Moriarty-Edgewood Schools; and

- Dr. Joel Boyd, Superintendent, Santa Fe Public Schools (SFPS), Dr. Almudena Abeyta, Chief Academic Officer, SFPS, and Dr. Richard Bowman, Chief Accountability and Strategy Officer, SFPS.

SCHOOL DISTRICT REQUIREMENTS FOR SUBMITTING CUSTOM PLANS TO PED

According to PED's *State Evaluation System and Evaluation Workbook NMTEACH Outreach Calls* PowerPoint provided to districts during the summer of 2013, districts were given two options to fully adopt the state default plan or to develop custom plans and seek PED approval. Regardless of the option they chose, school district plans for teacher evaluation had to specify evaluations for teachers divided into three groups according to PED's Business Rules:¹

- **Group A teachers**, who teach in tested subjects and the following:
 - grades 3-5;
 - grades 6-8, and 10-11 for Language Arts or Math;
 - grades 6, 7 and 9, 10, 11 for Science; and
 - Special Education (except teachers of students who are severely or profoundly disabled);
- **Group B teachers**, who teach in non-tested subjects and the following:
 - grades 3-5 for non-tested subjects (music, art, physical education, etc.);
 - grades 6-8 for Social Studies;
 - grades 8, 9, and 12 Science; and
 - grades 9 and 12 for Language Arts or Math; and
- **Group C teachers** who teach in grades K-2.

In order to ensure implementation of the new evaluation model for school year 2013-2014, PED also requires schools to submit digital workbooks to serve as:

- a place for districts to view and plan their own evaluation models; and
- a way for districts across the state to communicate with the PED how educators will be evaluated.

By July 3, 2013, all digital workbooks were due to PED for review, along with any district developed measures for PED to review and approve.

¹ See Attachment 2, *PED's Business Rules*, in the LESC staff report for Agenda Item 1, *Observation and Feedback: Effectiveness Evaluation System*.

State Default Plan for Teacher Evaluation

An essential component of both the state default plan and districts' custom plans for teacher evaluation is the NMTEACH Observation Protocol. According to the NMTEACH section of PED's website, the NMTEACH Observation Protocol is based on the Danielson Framework for Teaching (FFT) observation instrument used in the Measures of Effective Teaching (MET) Project.² The Danielson FFT identifies aspects of a teacher's responsibilities that empirical studies have demonstrated as promoting improved student learning. Each of the four domains contains specific elements. In the NMTEACH Observation Protocol, these elements have indicators for five levels of performance (e.g., ineffective, minimally effective, effective, highly effective, and exemplary). The NMTEACH Observation Protocol contains the following four domains:

- Domain 1: Planning and Preparation;
- Domain 2: Classroom Environment;
- Domain 3: Instruction; and
- Domain 4: Professional Responsibilities.

For school year 2013-2014, the state default plan for evaluating teachers' effectiveness requires the three groups of teachers to be evaluated as follows:

- **Group A teachers** who teach grades and/or subjects that can be meaningfully linked to the standards-based assessment will have their evaluations based on:
 - 50 percent student achievement, with 35 percent based on the standards-based assessment and 15 percent based on their End-of-Course (EoC) exam;
 - 25 percent observations according to Domain 2 and Domain 3 of the NMTEACH Observation Protocol; and
 - 25 percent multiple measures, with 15 percent based on the NMTEACH Observation Protocol Domain 1 and Domain 4 and 10 percent based on teacher attendance;
- **Group B teachers** who teach grades and/or subjects that cannot be meaningfully linked to the standards-based assessment will have their evaluations based on:
 - 50 percent student achievement as measured by their EoC exam;
 - 25 percent observations according to Domain 2 and Domain 3 of the NMTEACH Observation Protocol; and
 - 25 percent multiple measures, with 15 percent based on the NMTEACH Observation Protocol Domain 1 and Domain 4 and 10 percent based on teacher attendance; and
- **Group C teachers** who teach in kindergarten, first, and second grades will have their evaluations based on:
 - 50 percent student achievement as measured by the Dynamic Indicators of Basic Early Literacy Skills (DIBELS);

² See "Summary of the MET Project" in LESC staff report for Agenda item 1, *Observation and Feedback: Effectiveness Evaluation System*.

- 25 percent observations according to Domain 2 and Domain 3 of the NMTEACH Observation Protocol; and
- 25 percent multiple measures, with 15 percent based on the NMTEACH Observation Protocol Domain 1 and Domain 4 and 10 percent based on teacher attendance.

PED-APPROVED ALTERNATIVE OPTIONS FOR MULTIPLE MEASURES AND STUDENT ACHIEVEMENT

The “Teacher and School Leader Effectiveness” rule allows customized plans to “encourage districts to stay focused on their particular goals” (see **Attachment 1, *Alternative Measures of Student Achievement***). Districts, as explained above, were allowed to submit a custom plan to PED or select the state default plan.

Attachment 2, *List of PED-approved Teacher Evaluation Plans*, shows all of the school districts and charter schools’ plans approved by PED. As shown in **Attachment 2:**

- of the 87 traditional public school districts with plans posted on the NMTEACH section of PED’s website:
 - 18 are following the state default plan; and
 - 69 have PED-approved custom plans for teacher evaluation;
- of the 49 state-authorized charter schools with plans posted on the NMTEACH section of PED’s website:
 - 18 are following the state default plan; and
 - 31 have PED-approved custom plans for teacher evaluation; and
- of the 39 district-authorized charter schools with plans posted on the NMTEACH section of PED’s website:
 - 13 are following the state default plan; and
 - 26 have PED-approved custom plans for teacher evaluation.³

In reference to student achievement, the NMTEACH section of PED’s website explains:

- “As public educators, we are tasked with teaching the Common Core State Standards (CCSS) to all our students. How do we know we’ve succeeded at our job? By measuring student learning. Fifty percent of every teacher’s evaluation will be based on student learning. Unfortunately, students don’t always come into the classroom at grade level readiness. Therefore, this calculation will be based on student achievement growth, which is accomplished by comparing each student on the achievement they are expected to attain at the end of the year against what they actually attained.”

³ According to PED’s *New Mexico Charter Schools 2013-2014*, there are 96 charter schools in New Mexico, 55 of which are state-authorized and 41 of which are district-authorized.

Attachment 1 details the following PED-approved alternative measures of student achievement:

- ACCESS from the World-Class Instructional Design and Assessment (WIDA) assesses English language proficiency;
- District Benchmark Assessment (DBA) is a type of short-cycle assessment that monitors students' progress within specific subject areas over the course of the school year;
- DIBELS used to assess early literacy and reading skills for students in grades K-6;
- Discovery Education Interim Assessment available for kindergarten through high school and are offered three to four times per school year;
- Measures of Academic Progress (MAP) from the Northwest Evaluation Association offers assessments aligned to the CCSS and in math, reading, language arts, and science; and
- the Riverside Interim Assessment from Houghton Mifflin Harcourt offers assessments in language arts/literacy and math for grades 2-6 and has content developed to the CCSS.

Additionally, **Attachment 1** explains the following measures involving calculations using a value-added model (VAM) that were approved by PED:

- content-level VAM;
- grade level VAM score;
- Quartile 1 (Q1) student growth;
- school letter grade; and
- subgroup student growth.

Based on findings from the MET Project,⁴ in reference to multiple measures, the NMTEACH section of PED's website states:

- “Student achievement and classroom observations do not tell the whole story. There are many other contributing factors to a teacher's performance. This category makes up the final 25 percent of a teacher's evaluation: domain's 1 and 4 combined equal 15 percent and Teacher Attendance equals 10 percent.”

Attachment 3, *Alternative Measures for Multiple Measures*, outlines the following PED-approved options:

- graduation rate;
- college and career readiness;
- middle/high school attendance;
- parent surveys; and
- student surveys.

⁴ See “Summary of the MET Project” in LESC staff report for Agenda item 1, *Observation and Feedback: Effectiveness Evaluation System*.

HOW THE NINE TEACHER COMPETENCIES RELATE TO THE FOUR DOMAINS OF THE NMTEACH OBSERVATION PROTOCOL

The “Performance Evaluation System Requirements for Teachers” rule governs the requirements for a high objective statewide standard of evaluation for teachers from early childhood through grade 12. Among its provisions, the rule:

- identifies the specific evaluation/supervision standards and indicators and requirements for a competency based evaluation system for teachers; and
- requires that:
 - all teachers of the core academic subjects must be highly qualified, as defined in the rule;
 - the school district must ensure, through proper annual teaching assignment and through annual professional development plans and evaluations that all teachers assigned to teach in core academic subjects are highly qualified;
 - every public school teacher must have an annual performance evaluation based on an annual professional development plan (PDP) that meets the requirements of the state’s high objective uniform standard of evaluation as provided in 6.69.4.10 NMAC; and
 - the format for this evaluation shall be established by PED and must be uniform throughout the state in all public school districts.

Other provisions in the rule detail the nine teacher competencies associated with each licensure level, as show in **Attachment 4, *New Mexico Teacher Competencies for Licensure Levels I, II, and III Assessment Criteria.***

Table 1, on the following page, presents a summary of the nine teacher competencies and the associated Professional Development Dossier strands. It is important to note that the competencies summarized in Table 1 vary for each level of licensure, which is detailed in **Attachment 4.**

**Table 1:
Nine Teacher Competencies and Associated Professional Development Dossier Strands**

Strand A: Instruction (Competencies 1, 2, and 5)
Competency 1: Teacher accurately demonstrates knowledge of the content area and approved curriculum.
Competency 2: Teacher utilizes a variety of teaching methods and resources for each area taught.
Competency 5: Teacher effectively utilizes student assessment techniques and procedures.
Strand B: Student Learning (Competencies 3, 4, 6, and 7)
Competency 3: Teacher communicates with and obtains feedback from students in a manner that enhances student learning and understanding.
Competency 4: Teacher comprehends the principles of student growth, development, and learning, and applies them appropriately.
Competency 6: Teacher manages the educational setting in a manner that promotes positive student behavior and a safe and healthy environment.
Competency 7: Teacher recognizes student diversity and creates an atmosphere conducive to the promotion of positive student involvement and self-concept.

Strand C: Professional Learning (Competencies 8 and 9)
Competency 8: Teacher demonstrates a willingness to examine and implement change, as appropriate.
Competency 9: Teacher works productively with colleagues, parents and community members.

According to PED:

- every aspect of the nine teacher competencies 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.

THREE EXAMPLES OF PED-APPROVED CUSTOM PLANS

Attachments 5-7 show three examples of PED-approved custom plans that differ from the state default plan for teacher and principal evaluation.⁵

Attachment 5, *Moriarty-Edgewood Custom Plan*, indicates that:

- **Group A elementary school teachers** who teach grades and/or subjects that can be meaningfully linked to the standards-based assessment will have their evaluations based on:
 - 50 percent student achievement, with 35.0 percent based on the standards-based assessment and 15.0 percent based on the Discovery Education Interim Assessment (if they teach third grade);
 - 25 percent observations according to Domain 2 and Domain 3 of the NMTEACH Observation Protocol; and
 - 25 percent multiple measures, with 15 percent based on the NMTEACH Observation Protocol Domain 1 and Domain 4 and 10 percent based on student surveys;
- **Group A middle school teachers** who teach grades and/or subjects that can be meaningfully linked to the standards-based assessment will have their evaluations based on:
 - 50 percent student achievement, with 35 percent based on the standards-based assessment and 15 percent on the Discovery Education Interim Assessment;
 - 25 percent observations according to Domain 2 and Domain 3 of the NMTEACH Observation Protocol; and
 - 25 percent multiple measures, with 15 percent based on the NMTEACH Observation Protocol Domain 1 and Domain 4 and 10 percent based on student surveys;

⁵ Each school district and charter school PED-approved default and custom plans for educator effectiveness can be retrieved from http://ped.state.nm.us/ped/NMTeach_EvaluationPlan.html.

- **Group A high school teachers** who teach grades and/or subjects that can be meaningfully linked to the standards-based assessment will have their evaluations based on:
 - 50 percent student achievement, with 35 percent based on the standards-based assessment, 10 percent based on End-of-Course (EoC) exam, and 5.0 percent based on the Discovery Education Interim Assessment;
 - 25 percent observations according to Domain 2 and Domain 3 of the NMTEACH Observation Protocol; and
 - 25 percent multiple measures, with 15 percent based on the NMTEACH Observation Protocol Domain 1 and Domain 4 and 10 percent based on college and career readiness;

- **Group B elementary school teachers** who teach grades and/or subjects that cannot be meaningfully linked to the standards-based assessment will have their evaluations based on:
 - 50 percent student achievement, with 35 percent based on the Discovery Education Interim Assessment (if they teach third grade) and 15 percent based on the school grade;
 - 25 percent observations according to Domain 2 and Domain 3 of the NMTEACH Observation Protocol; and
 - 25 percent multiple measures, with 15 percent based on the NMTEACH Observation Protocol Domain 1 and Domain 4 and 10 percent based on student surveys;

- **Group B middle school teachers** who teach grades and/or subjects that cannot be meaningfully linked to the standards-based assessment will have their evaluations based on:
 - 50 percent student achievement, with 35 percent based on the Discovery Education Interim Assessment and 15 percent based on the school grade;
 - 25 percent observations according to Domain 2 and Domain 3 of the NMTEACH Observation Protocol; and
 - 25 percent multiple measures, with 15 percent based on the NMTEACH Observation Protocol Domain 1 and Domain 4 and 10 percent based on student surveys;

- **Group B high school teachers** who teach grades and/or subjects that cannot be meaningfully linked to the standards-based assessment will have their evaluations based on:
 - 50 percent student achievement, with 35 percent based on EoC exam, 10 percent based on the Discovery Education Interim Assessment, and 5.0 percent based on the school grade;
 - 25 percent observations according to Domain 2 and Domain 3 of the NMTEACH Observation Protocol; and
 - 25 percent multiple measures, with 15 percent based on the NMTEACH Observation Protocol Domain 1 and Domain 4 and 10 percent based on college and career readiness; and

- **Group C teachers** who teach in kindergarten, first, and second grades will have their evaluations based on:
 - 50 percent student achievement, with 35 percent based on the Discovery Education Interim Assessment and 15 based on the school grade;
 - 25 percent observations according to Domain 2 and Domain 3 of the NMTEACH Observation Protocol; and
 - 25 percent multiple measures, with 15 percent based on the NMTEACH Observation Protocol Domain 1 and Domain 4 and 10 percent based on parent surveys.

Attachment 6, *Santa Fe Custom Plan*, indicates that:

- **Group A teachers** who teach grades and/or subjects that can be meaningfully linked to the standards-based assessment will have their evaluations based on:
 - 50 percent student achievement, with 35 percent based on the standards-based assessment, 10.0 percent based on the Group standards-based assessment, and 5.0 percent based on student surveys;
 - 25 percent observations according to Domain 2 and Domain 3 of the NMTEACH Observation Protocol; and
 - 25 percent multiple measures, with 20 percent based on the NMTEACH Observation Protocol Domain 1 and Domain 4 and 5.0 percent based on student surveys;
- **Group B teachers** who teach grades and/or subjects that cannot be meaningfully linked to the standards-based assessment will have their evaluations based on:
 - 50 percent student achievement, with 35 percent based on EoC exam, 10 percent based on Group standards-based assessment, and 5.0 based on student surveys;
 - 25 percent observations according to Domain 2 and Domain 3 of the NMTEACH Observation Protocol; and
 - 25 percent multiple measures, with 20 percent based on the NMTEACH Observation Protocol Domain 1 and Domain 4 and 5.0 percent based on student surveys;
- **Group C teachers** who teach in kindergarten, first, and second grades will have their evaluations based on:
 - 50 percent student achievement, with 25 percent based on DIBELS and 25 based on the Discovery Education Interim Assessment;
 - 25 percent observations according to Domain 2 and Domain 3 of the NMTEACH Observation Protocol; and
 - 25 percent multiple measures, with 20 percent based on the NMTEACH Observation Protocol Domain 1 and Domain 4 and 5.0 percent based on parent surveys.

For the committee’s information, the New Mexico Connections Academy, a state-chartered charter school in Santa Fe that provides virtual (online) curriculum for grades 4-12 statewide, is following the state default plan for teacher evaluations.

Attachment 7, *Farmington New Mexico Virtual Academy Custom Plan*, indicates that:

- **Group A teachers** who teach grades and/or subjects that can be meaningfully linked to the standards-based assessment will have their evaluations based on:
 - 50 percent student achievement, with 35 percent based on the standards-based assessment, 10 percent based on grade-level VAM, and 5.0 percent based on Quartile 1 (Q1) student growth;
 - 25 percent observations according to Domain 2 and Domain 3 of the NMTEACH Observation Protocol; and
 - 25 percent multiple measures, with 15 percent based on the NMTEACH Observation Protocol Domain 1 and Domain 4, 5.0 percent based on teacher attendance, and 5.0 percent based on student surveys;

- **Group B teachers** who teach grades and/or subjects that cannot be meaningfully linked to the standards-based assessment will have their evaluations based on:
 - 50 percent student achievement, with 35 percent based on EoC exam, 10 percent based on grade-level VAM, and 5.0 based on student surveys;
 - 25 percent observations according to Domain 2 and Domain 3 of the NMTEACH Observation Protocol; and
 - 25 percent multiple measures, with 15 percent based on the NMTEACH Observation Protocol Domain 1 and Domain 4, 5.0 percent based on teacher attendance, and 5.0 percent based on student surveys;

- **Group C teachers** who teach in kindergarten, first, and second grades will have their evaluations based on:
 - 50 percent student achievement, with 35 percent based on Q1 student growth, 10. percent based on EoC exam, and 5.0 percent based on Q1 student growth;
 - 25 percent observations according to Domain 2 and Domain 3 of the NMTEACH Observation Protocol; and
 - 25 percent multiple measures, with 15 percent based on the NMTEACH Observation Protocol Domain 1 and Domain 4, 5.0 percent teacher attendance, and 5.0 percent based on student surveys.

For the committee's information, the New Mexico Virtual Academy, a district-authorized charter school in Farmington that provides a virtual (online) curriculum for grades 6-12 statewide, has been approved for a custom plan of teacher evaluation by PED.

Also, in October 2013, in response to a Legislative Education Study Committee (LESC) staff request about the Farmington Municipal Schools (FMS) teacher evaluation plan compared to the district-authorized charter school, New Mexico Virtual Academy, the Superintendent and Assistant Superintendent of Human Resources at FMS provided LESL staff with an explanation of the differences between the two custom plans in Farmington. The primary differences between the two custom plans are how each school evaluates the three groups of teachers at the elementary, middle school, and high school levels. While FMS supports the teacher and principal evaluation system, glitches in the technological aspect of the evaluation through

Teachscape⁶ have caused the district to seek an alternative online provider, as explained in **Attachment 8, *Farmington Municipal Schools Position Paper***.

BACKGROUND

LESC Testimony

During the 2012 interim, the LESL heard testimony about the evaluation of teachers and principals. This testimony raised questions about the alignment between the “Teacher and School Leader Effectiveness” rule and evaluation provisions already in the *School Personnel Act* (see provisions, below) and about the use of student assessments, including standardized assessments, in the evaluation of teachers and principals.

School Personnel Act

Among its provisions, in Section 22-10A-19, the *School Personnel Act* requires:

- PED to adopt criteria and minimum highly objective uniform statewide standards of evaluation for the annual performance evaluation of licensed school employees;
- the professional development plan (PDP) for teachers to include documentation on how a teacher who receives professional development that has been required or offered by the state or a school district or charter school incorporates the results of that professional development in the classroom;
- the local superintendent to adopt policies, guidelines, and procedures for the performance evaluation process;
- evaluation by other school employees to be one component of the evaluation tool for school administrators;
- the school principal to observe each teacher’s classroom practice to determine the teacher’s ability to demonstrate state-adopted competencies, as part of the highly objective uniform statewide standard of evaluation for teachers;
- at the beginning of each school year, teachers and school principals to devise PDPs for the coming year;
- to base performance evaluations, in part, on how well the PDP was carried out;
- if a Level 2 or Level 3-A teacher’s performance evaluation indicates less than satisfactory performance and competency, the school principal to require the teacher to undergo peer intervention, including mentoring, for a period the school principal deems necessary. If the teacher is unable to demonstrate satisfactory performance and competency by the end of the period, the peer interveners may recommend termination of the teacher; and
- at least every two years, school principals to attend a training program approved by PED to improve their evaluation, administrative, and instructional leadership skills.

⁶ See “Teacher Feedback & The Online Evaluation System” (p. 9-10) in the LESL staff report for Agenda Item 1, *Observation and Feedback: Effectiveness Evaluation System*.

USDE Flexibility

During the 2013 interim, several superintendents have expressed support as well as concern for the teacher and principal evaluation system, particularly with the timeline for implementation. In a letter addressed to Chief State School Officers on June 18, 2013, US Department of Education (USDE) Secretary Arne Duncan allowed states that received a Race to the Top grant or flexibility under the *Elementary and Secondary Education Act* to “delay any personnel consequences, tied in part to the use of student growth data, until no later than 2016-2017” (see **Attachment 9, June 18, 2013 Education Secretary Letter to Chief State School Officers**). In the letter, USDE Secretary Duncan also acknowledges that “for many states, it will not make sense to request flexibility because they are already well ahead in successfully implementing these changes or have requirements in state law.”

Provisions in Current Law & PED Rule for Charter Schools

According to the *Charter Schools Act*:

“The department *shall waive* requirements or *rules* and provisions of the Public School Code [Chapter 22 [except Article 5A] NMSA 1978] pertaining to individual class load, teaching load, length of the school day, staffing patterns, subject areas, purchase of instructional material, *evaluation standards for school personnel*, school principal duties and driver education. The department may waive requirements or rules and provisions of the Public School Code pertaining to graduation requirements. Any waivers *granted* pursuant to this section shall be for the term of the charter granted but may be suspended or revoked earlier by the department.”⁷ (Emphasis added.)

These provisions suggest that the indicated waivers, including those for evaluation standards for school personnel, are automatic by virtue of a school’s status as a charter school, both locally or state-authorized, and are not subject to request as the rule’s definition of “school district” would indicate.⁸ Further, the word “granted” suggests that only discretionary waivers are subject to potential suspension or early revocation, as mandated waivers need not be requested and thus are not “granted.”

Under this interpretation, therefore, **all** charter schools would be exempt from the requirements of the adopted rule, including those that do not specifically request a waiver from those requirements.

However, when queried about this potential conflict, PED staff offered a differing interpretation of this section of the *Charter Schools Act*. According to a PED staff response received by LESC staff on September 14, 2012 related to this potential conflict:

⁷ Source: 22-8B-5(C) NMSA 1978.

⁸ In the “Teacher and School Leader Effectiveness” rule, school district means one of the 89 political subdivisions of the state created for the administration of public schools and includes those state-authorized charter schools that have not requested waiver of evaluation standards for school personnel. District-authorized charter schools are excluded from being considered a school district for purposes of this rule.

“Section 22-8B-5(C) NMSA 1978 does say that the Department shall waive rules or provisions of the Public School Code regarding evaluation standards for school personnel, however, as part of the application process, the locally authorized charter school and the state authorized charter school must tell the Department which waivers the charter applicant is requesting so it can be determined which waivers they will utilize and how they plan to implement them as part of a sound plan for that charter. See 6.80.4.9(M) NMAC; see also Section 22-8B-5.3 (a chartering authority shall evaluate charter applications). It must be noted that the last sentence of Section 22-8B-5(C) states as follows: “Any waivers granted pursuant to this section shall be for the term of the charter granted but may be suspended or revoked earlier by the department.” (Emphasis added) The underlined language does contemplate discretion in the Department to grant waivers as well as suspend or revoke any waivers. As a result, the definition of “school district” included those state-authorized charter schools that did not indicate a waiver for the evaluation standards for school personnel in their application which would then make that charter subject to the teacher evaluation rule.”

Legal Challenges

On November 7, 2012, the Albuquerque Teachers Federation (ATF), two state legislators, and nine teachers and education employees filed a Writ of Mandamus with the New Mexico Supreme Court, asking it to stop PED from implementing the new teacher and principal evaluation system on the basis that PED violated basic separation of powers principles. On November 27, 2012, the New Mexico Supreme Court denied the writ. An explanation from the New Mexico Supreme Court was not provided.

On September 6, 2013, ATF, three state legislators, and an individual teacher filed an Alternative Writ with the Second Judicial District Court, asking it to stop PED from implementing the new teacher and principal evaluation system on the basis that the PED regulation fails to satisfy statutory requirements to implement uniform teacher evaluations statewide and violate specific provisions in the *School Personnel Act*. On September 25, 2013, the Second Judicial District Court Judge required PED to issue the petitioners a response within 15 days and to appear in court in November in order to show a cause why PED should not be compelled to:

- cease and desist from implementing its new teacher evaluation system as codified under the “Teacher and School Leader Effectiveness” rule; and
- conduct teacher evaluations under the previously issued regulations at the “Performance Evaluation System Requirements for Teachers” rule.



Alternative Measures of Student Achievement

A sound evaluation plan allows for accurate portrayal of what teachers and schools are doing in their unique districts. As such, districts and charters in the state of New Mexico have a good deal of flexibility in choosing measures of student achievement. Customized plans encourage districts to stay focused on their particular goals.

Listed below are approved measures from which districts can choose and links to more information.

Access: <http://ped.state.nm.us/BilingualMulticultural/ACCESS-ELL/index.html>

Advanced Placement - <http://ped.state.nm.us/ped/AdvancedPlacement.html>

DBA -

<http://ped.state.nm.us/AssessmentAccountability/AssessmentEvaluation/InterimAssessments/InterimAssessments.html>

Dibels - <http://ped.state.nm.us/EarlyChildhood/k3plus.html>, look for DIBELS on the page

Discovery -

<http://ped.state.nm.us/AssessmentAccountability/AssessmentEvaluation/InterimAssessments/InterimAssessments.html>

MAP -

<http://ped.state.nm.us/AssessmentAccountability/AssessmentEvaluation/InterimAssessments/InterimAssessments.html>

Riverside -

<http://ped.state.nm.us/AssessmentAccountability/AssessmentEvaluation/InterimAssessments/InterimAssessments.html>



Alternative Measures of Student Achievement

Some measures involve calculations using a Value Added Model (VAM). A VAM provides an indication of the unique contribution of teachers to student learning by comparing what a student *should be* achieving at the end of the year to what a student *is actually* achieving. What a student should be achieving is based on each student's prior achievement and focuses on how much academic growth a student should exhibit over the course of an academic year.

Content Level VAM: This represents the average of each teacher's unique contribution to student learning for all students in a content area (Math, Reading, Science or others). Details can be found in *New Mexico School Grading Technical Guide: Calculation and Business Rules* that is available online (<http://webapp2.ped.state.nm.us/SchoolData/SchoolGrading.aspx>).

Grade Level VAM score: This represents the average of each teacher's unique contribution to student learning for all students in a specific grade.

Q1 (the lowest performing 25%) **Student Growth:** This represents the average change in the lowest 25% (Q1) of students' achievement per year over a three year period. Growth is measured by the change in scale score points and is not a VAM.

School Letter Grade: Schools are graded based on three basic components: current year performance, achievement growth, and other measures. Current performance consists of the percent proficient or above in Math and Reading and a VAM-based status indicator. Growth consists of three elements: individual student growth of the highest 75% of students (Q3) in Math and Reading; individual student growth of the lowest 25% of students (Q1) in Math and Reading; and, school growth based on a VAM. Other measures include Opportunity to Learn (OTL), measured by average survey scores of classroom practices; student attendance; and, in high school, the graduation rate and graduation rate growth, and student participation and success in College and Career Readiness (CCR) activities. Details can be found in *New Mexico School Grading Technical Guide: Calculation and Business Rules* that is available (<http://webapp2.ped.state.nm.us/SchoolData/SchoolGrading.aspx>).

Subgroup Student Growth: This represents the average change in a subgroup (e.g. English Language Learners) of students' achievement per year over a three year period. Growth is measured by the change in scale score points and is not a VAM.

The following **traditional public school districts are following the state default plan** for teacher evaluation:

1. ALBUQUERQUE PUBLIC SCHOOLS
2. CARLSBAD MUNICIPAL SCHOOLS
3. CARRIZOZO MUNICIPAL SCHOOLS
4. CLOUDCROFT MUNICIPAL SCHOOLS
5. COBRE CONSOLIDATED SCHOOLS
6. ESPANOLA PUBLIC SCHOOLS
7. EUNICE MUNICIPAL SCHOOLS
8. GALLUP-MCKINLEY SCHOOLS
9. GRANTS-CIBOLA COUNTY SCHOOLS
10. HOUSE MUNICIPAL SCHOOLS
11. JAL PUBLIC SCHOOLS
12. JEMEZ VALLEY PUBLIC SCHOOLS
13. LAS VEGAS CITY PUBLIC SCHOOLS
14. MOSQUERO MUNICIPAL SCHOOLS
15. ROY MUNICIPAL SCHOOLS
16. TATUM MUNICIPAL SCHOOLS
17. VAUGHN MUNICIPAL SCHOOLS
18. ZUNI PUBLIC SCHOOLS

The following **traditional public school districts have PED-approved custom plans** for teacher evaluation:

1. ALAMAGORDO PUBLIC SCHOOLS
2. ANIMAS PUBLIC SCHOOLS
3. ARTESIA PUBLIC SCHOOLS
4. AZTEC MUNICIPAL SCHOOLS
5. BELEN CONSOLIDATED SCHOOLS
6. BERNALILLO PUBLIC SCHOOLS
7. BLOOMFIELD SCHOOLS
8. CAPITAN MUNICIPAL SCHOOLS
9. CENTRAL CONSOLIDATED SCHOOLS
10. CHAMA VALLEY INDEP. SCHOOLS
11. CIMARRON MUNICIPAL SCHOOLS
12. CLAYTON MUNICIPAL SCHOOLS
13. CLOVIS MUNICIPAL SCHOOLS
14. CORONA MUNICIPAL SCHOOLS
15. CUBA INDEPENDENT SCHOOLS
16. DEMING PUBLIC SCHOOLS
17. DES MOINES MUNICIPAL SCHOOLS
18. DEXTER CONSOLIDATED SCHOOLS
19. DORA MUNICIPAL SCHOOLS
20. DULCE INDEPENDENT SCHOOLS
21. ELIDA MUNICIPAL SCHOOLS

LIST OF PED-APPROVED TEACHER EVALUATION PLANS

22. ESTANCIA MUNICIPAL SCHOOLS
23. FARMINGTON MUNICIPAL SCHOOLS
24. FLOYD MUNICIPAL SCHOOLS
25. FORT SUMNER MUNICIPAL SCHOOLS
26. GADSDEN INDEPENDENT SCHOOLS
27. GRADY MUNICIPAL SCHOOLS
28. HAGERMAN MUNICIPAL SCHOOLS
29. HATCH VALLEY PUBLIC SCHOOLS
30. HOBBS MUNICIPAL SCHOOLS
31. HONDO VALLEY PUBLIC SCHOOLS
32. JEMEZ MOUNTAIN PUBLIC SCHOOLS
33. LAKE ARTHUR MUNICIPAL SCHOOLS
34. LAS CRUCES PUBLIC SCHOOLS
35. LOGAN MUNICIPAL SCHOOLS
36. LORDSBURG MUNICIPAL SCHOOLS
37. LOS ALAMOS PUBLIC SCHOOLS
38. LOS LUNAS PUBLIC SCHOOLS
39. LOVING MUNICIPAL SCHOOLS
40. LOVINGTON MUNICIPAL SCHOOLS
41. MAGDALENA MUNICIPAL SCHOOLS
42. MAXWELL MUNICIPAL SCHOOLS
43. MELROSE PUBLIC SCHOOLS
44. MORA INDEPENDENT SCHOOLS
45. MORIARTY-EDGEWQOD SCHOOL DISTRICT
46. MOUNTAINAIR PUBLIC SCHOOLS
47. PECOS INDEPENDENT SCHOOLS
48. PENASCO INDEPENDENT SCHOOLS
49. POJOAQUE VALLEY PUBLIC SCHOOLS
50. PORTALES MUNICIPAL SCHOOLS
51. QUEMADO INDEPENDENT SCHOOLS
52. QUESTA INDEPENDENT SCHOOLS
53. RATON PUBLIC SCHOOLS
54. RESERVE PUBLIC SCHOOLS
55. ROSWELL INDEPENDENT SCHOOLS
56. RUIDOSO MUNICIPAL SCHOOLS
57. SAN JON MUNICIPAL SCHOOLS
58. SANTA FE PUBLIC SCHOOLS
59. SANTA ROSA CONSOLIDATED SCHOOLS
60. SILVER CONSOLIDATED SCHOOLS
61. SOCORRO CONSOLIDATED SCHOOLS
62. SPRINGER MUNICIPAL SCHOOLS
63. TAOS MUNICIPAL SCHOOLS
64. T OR C MUNICIPAL SCHOOLS
65. TEXICO MUNICIPAL SCHOOLS
66. TUCUMCARI PUBLIC SCHOOLS
67. TULAROSA MUNICIPAL SCHOOLS

LIST OF PED-APPROVED TEACHER EVALUATION PLANS

- 68. WAGON MOUND PUBLIC SCHOOLS
- 69. WEST LAS VEGAS PUBLIC SCHOOLS

The following **traditional public school district plans for teacher evaluation were not specified** on the NMTEACH section of PED's website:

- 1. MESA VISTA CONSOLIDATED SCHOOLS
- 2. RIO RANCHO PUBLIC SCHOOLS

LIST OF PED-APPROVED TEACHER EVALUATION PLANS

The following **state-authorized charter schools are following the state default plan** for teacher evaluation:

1. ALBUQUERQUE SCHOOL OF EXCELLENCE
2. ANTHONY CHARTER SCHOOL (Gadsden)
3. CORAL COMMUNITY CHARTER
4. COTTONWOOD CLASSICAL PREPARATORY SCHOOL
5. CREATIVE EDUCATION PREPARATORY INSTITUTE
6. ESTANCIA VALLEY CLASSICAL ACADEMY (Moriarty)
7. INTERNATIONAL SCHOOL AT MESA DEL SOL
8. J PAUL TAYLOR ACADEMY (Las Cruces)
9. LA RESOLANA LEADERSHIP
10. LA TIERRA MONTESSORI SCHOOL OF THE ARTS AND SCIENCES (Espanola)
11. NEW MEXICO CONNECTIONS ACADEMY (Santa Fe)
12. NEW MEXICO INTERNATIONAL SCHOOL
13. RED RIVER VALLEY CHARTER SCHOOL (Questa)
14. TAOS ACADEMY (Taos)
15. TAOS INTEGRATED SCHOOL OF ARTS (Taos)
16. THE GREAT ACADEMY
17. WALATOWA CHARTER HIGH CHARTER SCHOOL (Jemez Valley)
18. WILLIAM W & JOSEPHINE DORN CHARTER COMMUNITY SCHOOL

The following **state-authorized charter schools have PED-approved custom plans** for teacher evaluation:

1. ACADEMY OF TRADES AND TECHNOLOGY
2. ALBUQUERQUE INSTITUTE OF MATH & SCIENCE
3. ALDO LEOPOLD CHARTER SCHOOL (Silver City)
4. ALMA D'ARTE CHARTER HIGH SCHOOL (Las Cruces)
5. AMY BIEHL CHARTER HIGH SCHOOL
6. CIEN AGUAS INTERNATIONAL SCHOOL
7. EAST MTN HIGH SCHOOL
8. GILBERT L SENA CHARTER HS
9. HORIZON ACADEMY WEST
10. LA PROMESA EARLY LEARNING CENTER
11. MCCURDY CHARTER SCHOOL (Espanola)
12. MEDIA ARTS COLLABORATIVE CHARTER
13. MISSION ACHIEVEMENT AND SUCCESS
14. NEW AMERICA SCHOOL
15. NEW AMERICA SCHOOL - LAS CRUCES (Las Cruces)
16. NEW MEXICO SCHOOL FOR THE ARTS (Santa Fe)
17. NORTH VALLEY ACADEMY CHARTER SCHOOL
18. RALPH J BUNCHE ACADEMY
19. SAGE MONTESSORI CHARTER SCHOOL
20. SCHOOL OF DREAMS ACADEMY (Los Lunas)
21. SOUTHWEST AERONAUTICS MATHEMATICS AND SCIENCE ACADEMY

LIST OF PED-APPROVED TEACHER EVALUATION PLANS

22. SOUTHWEST INTERMEDIATE LEARNING CENTER
23. SOUTHWEST PRIMARY LEARNING CENTER
24. SOUTHWEST SECONDARY LEARNING CENTER
25. SOUTH VALLEY PREP
26. THE ASK ACADEMY (Rio Rancho)
27. THE LEARNING COMMUNITY CHARTER SCHOOL
28. THE MASTERS PROGRAM (Santa Fe)
29. THE MONTESSORI ELEMENTARY SCHOOL
30. TIERRA ADENTRO
31. UPLIFT COMMUNITY SCHOOL (Gallup-McKinley)

The following **state-authorized charter school plans for teacher evaluation were not specified** on the NMTEACH section of PED's website:

1. ALBUQUERQUE SIGN LANGUAGE ACADEMY
2. ACE LEADERSHIP HIGH SCHOOL
3. CESAR CHAVEZ COMMUNITY SCHOOL
4. HEALTH LEADERSHIP HIGH SCHOOL
5. LA JICARITA COMMUNITY SCHOOL (Penasco)
6. TAOS INTERNATIONAL SCHOOL (Taos)

LIST OF PED-APPROVED TEACHER EVALUATION PLANS

The following **district-authorized charter schools are following the state default plan** for teacher evaluation:

1. BATAAN MILITARY ACADEMY
2. CARINOS DE LOS NINOS CHARTER SCHOOL (Española)
3. CHRISTINE DUNCANS HERITAGE ACADEMY
4. DEMING CESAR CHAVEZ HIGH SCHOOL (Deming)
5. EL CAMINO REAL ACADEMY
6. JEFFERSON MONTESSORI ACADEMY (Carlsbad)
7. LA ACADEMIA DE ESPERANZA
8. LAS MONTANAS CHARTER HIGH SCHOOL (Las Cruces)
9. MIDDLE COLLEGE HIGH SCHOOL (Gallup-McKinley)
10. MONTE DEL SOL CHARTER SCHOOL (Santa Fe)
11. RIO GALLINAS SCHOOL (West Las Vegas)
12. ROBERT F. KENNEDY CHARTER
13. VISTA GRANDE HIGH SCHOOL (Taos)

The following **district-authorized charter schools have PED-approved custom plans** for teacher evaluation:

1. ACADEMY FOR TECHNOLOGY AND THE CLASSICS (Santa Fe)
2. ALICE KING COMMUNITY SCHOOL
3. ANANSI CHARTER SCHOOL (Taos)
4. CORRALES INTERNATIONAL SCHOOL
5. COTTONWOOD VALLEY CHARTER (Taos)
6. DIGITAL ARTS AND TECHNOLOGY
7. LA ACADEMIA DOLORES HUERTA (Las Cruces)
8. LINDRITH AREA HERTIAGE CHARTER SCHOOL (Jemez Mountain)
9. LOS PUENTES CHARTER
10. MOASAIC ACADEMY CHARTER (Aztec)
11. MONTESSORI OF THE RIO GRANDE
12. MORENO VALLEY HIGH (Cimarron)
13. MOUNTAIN MAHOGANY COMMUNITY SCHOOL
14. NATIVE AMERICAN COMMUNITY ACADEMY
15. NEW MEXICO VIRTUAL ACADEMY (Farmington)
16. NUESTROS VALORES CHARTER
17. PUBLIC ACADEMY FOR PERFORMING ARTS
18. ROOTS & WINGS COMMUNITY (Questa)
19. SAN DIEGO RIVERSIDE CHARTER SCHOOL (Jemez Valley)
20. SCHOOL FOR INTEGRATED ACADEMICS AND TECHNOLOGIES
21. SIDNEY GUTIERREZ MIDDLE SCHOOL (Roswell)
22. SOUTH VALLEY ACADEMY
23. TAOS MUNICIPAL CHARTER (Taos)
24. TIERRA ENCANTADA CHARTER SCHOOL (Santa Fe)
25. TURQUOISE TRAIL CHARTER SCHOOL (Santa Fe)
26. TWENTY FIRST CENTURY PUBLIC ACADEMY

LIST OF PED-APPROVED TEACHER EVALUATION PLANS

The following **district-authorized charter school plans for teacher evaluation were not specified** on the NMTEACH section of PED's website:

1. ALBUQUERQUE TALENT DEVELOPMENT ACADEMY
2. GORDON BERNELL CHARTER



Alternative Options for Multiples Measures

Graduation Rate: This represents the percent of students that graduated on time (i.e. the 4 year rate). Graduates are students who graduate with a standard diploma (not including GED). Details can be found in *Technical Manual of 4-Year and 5-Year Cohort Graduation Rates New Mexico's Shared Accountability Model* that is available (<http://ped.state.nm.us/Graduation/index.html>)

College and Career Readiness (CCR): This represents both the participation and success of student in CCR activities. Details can be found in *New Mexico School Grading Technical Guide: Calculation and Business Rules* that is available (<http://webapp2.ped.state.nm.us/SchoolData/SchoolGrading.aspx>).

Middle/High School Attendance: School attendance is calculated as the average of individual attendance rates of every student.

Parent Survey: Parent surveys will be scored on both response and participation. For example, if the average response (on a 1-5 scale) was 3, the average score is 60%. If 80% of parents responded, the average score of 60% multiplied by the parent response of 80% is 48%. That percentage would then be multiplied by the available points (10 points if this measure was entered at 5%) = 4.8 points.

Student Survey: The average score on the survey divided by the total possible score, multiplied by the available points for this measure. E.g. If the average response is 4 (on a 1-5 scale), the average percentage would be 4/5 or 80%, multiplied by the available points (10 points if this measure was entered at 5%) = 8 points.

New Mexico Teacher Competencies for Licensure Levels I, II, and III Assessment Criteria

New Mexico is one of the most diverse states in the nation, and this diversity is reflected in the strengths and needs of New Mexico's students. The ability of a highly qualified teacher to address the learning needs of all New Mexico's students, including those students who learn differently as a result of disability, culture, language, or socioeconomic status, forms the framework for the New Mexico Teacher Competencies for Licensure Levels I, II, and III-A Assessment Criteria Benchmarks.

1. The teacher accurately demonstrates knowledge of the content area and approved curriculum		
Provisional Teacher - LEVEL I	Professional Teacher - LEVEL II	Master Teacher - LEVEL III
A. Utilizes and enhances approved curriculum.	A. Enhances and extends approved curriculum.	A. Contributes to the refinement and development of the approved curriculum.
B. Gives clear explanations relating to lesson content and procedures.	B. Gives clear explanations relating to lesson content and procedures.	B. Provides clear explanations relating to lesson content and procedures in multiple ways and is aware of knowledge and preconceptions that students can bring to the subject.
C. Communicates accurately in the content area.	C. Communicates accurately in the content area.	C. Communicates accurately in the content area and can create multiple paths to the subject matter.
D. Shows interrelatedness of one content area to another.	D. Integrates other subjects into the content curriculum.	D. Can articulate to students the interrelatedness of the disciplines.

2. The teacher appropriately utilizes a variety of teaching methods and resources for each area taught.		
Provisional Teacher - LEVEL I	Professional Teacher - LEVEL II	Master Teacher - LEVEL III
A. Provides opportunities for students to work independently, in small groups, and in large groups.	A. Designs appropriate opportunities for large group, small group, and independent student learning experiences.	A. Designs and engages students in large group, small group, and independent work activities.
B. Uses a variety of methods, including demonstrations, lectures, student initiated work, group work, questioning, and independent practice.	B. Selects from a variety of teaching methods (demonstrations, lectures, student projects, group work, independent practice) for specific instructional goals and purposes.	B. Demonstrates effective selection and use of a variety of methods to make knowledge accessible to all students.
C. Uses a variety of resources such as field trips, supplemental printed materials, manipulatives, and technology.	C. Integrates a variety of resources into instruction, including field trips, supplemental printed materials, manipulatives, and technology.	C. Demonstrates effective integration of a variety of resources and learning experiences into the curriculum.

Assessment Criteria *Benchmarks* for New Mexico Teacher Competencies for Licensure Levels I, II, and III

II. The teacher appropriately utilizes a variety of teaching methods and resources for each area taught (continued)		
D. Provides opportunities for students to apply, practice, and demonstrate knowledge and skills learned through various modalities.	D. Demonstrates understanding and appropriate application of learning styles, modalities, and intelligences theories.	D. Designs opportunities for students to apply, practice, and demonstrate knowledge and skills based on knowledge of learning modalities, style preferences, and intelligences.
E. Implements necessary modifications and adaptations in instruction and curriculum so that students with disabilities have access to the general education curriculum in the least restrictive environment.	E. Designs and implements necessary modifications and adaptations in instruction and curriculum so that students with disabilities have access to the general education curriculum in the least restrictive environment.	E. Engages with colleagues and parents to collaboratively design and implement necessary modifications and adaptations in instruction and curriculum so that students with disabilities have access to the general education curriculum in the least restrictive environment.

3. The teacher communicates with and obtains feedback from students in a manner that enhances student learning and understanding.		
Provisional Teacher - LEVEL I	Professional Teacher - LEVEL II	Master Teacher - LEVEL III
A. Explains and/or demonstrates the relevance of topics and activities.	A. Effectively explains, demonstrates or communicates the relevance of topics and activities.	A. Engages students in explaining and/or demonstrating the relevance of topics and activities.
B. Communicates to students the instructional intent, directions, or plan.	B. Consistently communicates to students the instructional intent, directions, and plans.	B. Involves students in establishing instructional direction and plans.
C. Establishes and states expectations for student performance.	C. Establishes and states expectations for student performance	C. Establishes and states expectations for student performance.
D. Clarifies actions, directions, and explanations when students do not understand.	D. Presents directions and explanations in a variety of ways to insure student understanding.	D. Presents directions and explanations in a variety of ways to insure student understanding.
E. Actively solicits communication from students about their learning.	E. Solicits communication from students about their learning for the purposes of ongoing instructional planning.	E. Engages students in the analysis and evaluation of their learning and adjusts instruction based on student feedback.
F. Communicates regularly with students about their progress.	F. Communicates regularly with students about their progress.	F. Communicates regularly with students about their progress.

4. The teacher comprehends the principles of student growth, development and learning, and applies them appropriately.

Provisional Teacher - LEVEL I	Professional Teacher - LEVEL II	Master Teacher - LEVEL III
A. Instructs students in the use of cognitive thinking skills such as critical thinking, problem-solving, divergent thinking, inquiry, and decision-making.	A. Consistently integrates the use of cognitive thinking skills such as critical thinking, problem-solving, divergent thinking, inquiry, and decision-making into instruction.	A. Consistently integrates the use of cognitive thinking skills such as critical thinking, problem-solving, divergent thinking, inquiry, and decision-making into instruction.
B. Uses teaching techniques that address student learning levels, rates, and styles.	B. Adapts teaching techniques to accommodate a range of student learning levels, rates, styles and special needs.	B. Selects the most effective teaching techniques to address a variety of student learning levels, rates, styles and needs as well as diverse interests and backgrounds.
C. Uses materials and media that address student learning levels, rates, and styles.	C. Adapts materials and media to address a range of student learning levels, rates, styles and special needs.	C. Selects the most effective materials and media to address a variety of student learning levels, rates, styles and needs.
D. Uses resources such as community service agencies, school personnel, and parents to meet student learning levels, rates and styles.	D. Selects from a variety of community service agencies, specialized school personnel, and parents to address different learning levels, rates, styles, and needs.	D. Integrates community resources, service agencies, other school personnel, parents, and community members into the curriculum.

5. The teacher effectively utilizes student assessment techniques and procedures.

Provisional Teacher - LEVEL I	Professional Teacher - LEVEL II	Master Teacher - LEVEL III
A. Uses a variety of assessment tools and strategies.	A. Selects appropriate assessment tools and strategies for specific learning outcomes.	A. Designs and uses multiple methods of measuring student understanding and growth.
B. Uses information gained from ongoing assessment for remediation and instructional planning.	B. Uses formative and summative assessment for remediation and instructional planning.	B. Integrates assessment data from multiple sources into instructional planning and improvement.
C. Maintains documentation of student progress.	C. Maintains documentation of student progress.	C. Maintains documentation of student progress.
D. Communicates student progress to students and families in a timely manner.	D. Consistently maintains communication with students and families about student progress.	D. Develops a two-way system of communicating with students and families about student progress.

6. The teacher manages the educational setting in a manner that promotes positive student behavior and a safe and healthy environment.		
Provisional Teacher - LEVEL I	Professional Teacher - LEVEL II	Master Teacher - LEVEL III
A. Serves as a model for constructive behavior patterns.	A. Identifies, explains, and models constructive behavior patterns.	A. Integrates the teaching of constructive, pro-social behaviors into regular instruction.
B. Executes routine tasks effectively and efficiently.	B. Establishes and teaches effective and efficient routines.	B. Establishes and teaches effective and efficient routines.
C. Establishes and states expectations for student behavior.	C. Establishes and reinforces expectations for student behaviors that promote citizenship in a classroom community.	C. Engages students in establishing expectations for building a learning community in the classroom.
D. Handles transitions effectively.	D. Maintains smoothness and momentum during classroom transitions.	D. Maintains smoothness and momentum during instructional transitions.
E. Has materials and media ready for student use.	E. Prepares and arranges material in advance for easy student accessibility.	E. Establishes an environment where materials and media are available and ready for student use.
F. Minimizes distractions and interruptions.	F. Minimizes distractions and interruptions.	F. Minimizes distractions and interruptions.
G. Manages student behavior effectively and appropriately.	G. Monitors and directs student behavior effectively and appropriately.	G. Develops a classroom management system that promotes acceptable and appropriate student behavior.
H. Identifies hazards, assesses risks, and takes appropriate action.	H. Identifies hazards, assesses risks, and takes appropriate action.	H. Identifies hazards, assesses risks and takes appropriate action.

7. The teacher recognizes student diversity and creates an atmosphere conducive to the promotion of positive student involvement and self-concept.		
Provisional Teacher - LEVEL I	Professional Teacher - LEVEL II	Master Teacher - LEVEL III
A. Demonstrates sensitivity and responsiveness to the personal ideas, learning needs, interests, and feelings of students with disabilities and/or from culturally and linguistically diverse backgrounds (e.g., Native Americans, Hispanic Americans, African Americans, Asian Americans, as well as other recent immigrant groups).	A. Acknowledges and validates the ideas, learning needs, interests, and feelings of students with disabilities and/or from culturally and linguistically diverse backgrounds (e.g., Native Americans, Hispanic Americans, African Americans, Asian Americans, as well as other recent immigrant groups).	A. Adjusts practice based on observation and knowledge of students with disabilities and/or from culturally and linguistically diverse groups (e.g., Native Americans, Hispanic Americans, African Americans, Asian Americans, as well other recent immigrant groups).
B. Acknowledges student performance and achievement.	B. Consistently recognizes student performance and achievements.	B. Creates curriculum designs that include student performance and acknowledgment of achievement.
C. Acknowledges that every student can learn.	C. Understands how students differ in their approaches to learning and adjusts instruction to meet diverse needs.	C. Demonstrates an awareness of the influences of context, disability, language, and culture on student learning.
D. Provides opportunities for each student to succeed and understands how students differ in their approaches to learning based on diverse cultural and linguistic backgrounds and exceptionalities.	D. Designs opportunities for each student to succeed, based on individual learning needs.	D. Provides accommodations and interventions that allow each student to succeed based on individual learning needs.
E. Provides students with opportunities for active involvement and creativity.	E. Designs specific activities that require active involvement and creativity.	E. Engages students in learning experiences that promote creativity, critical and divergent thinking.
F. Provides opportunities for students to be responsible for their behavior and learning.	F. Designs opportunities that require and reinforce student responsibility for learning.	F. Designs opportunities that require and reinforce student responsibility for learning.
G. Promotes positive student/teacher relationships.	G. Develops students' self-esteem, motivation, character, and sense of civic responsibility.	G. Fosters the development of respect for individual, cultural, linguistic, disability, and religious differences.
H. Encourages high student expectations.	H. Establishes and communicates high expectations for all students.	H. Engages students in setting high standards for performance.
I. Demonstrates an awareness and respect for each student's background, experience, learning ability, language, and culture.	I. Demonstrates knowledge of different student backgrounds, experiences, learning abilities, languages, and cultures and incorporates this knowledge into curricular decisions and instructional methodology.	I. Treats all students equitably, recognizing and planning for individual differences in cultures, languages, learning abilities, backgrounds, and experiences.

8. The teacher demonstrates a willingness to examine and implement change, as appropriate.		
Provisional Teacher - LEVEL I	Professional Teacher - LEVEL II	Master Teacher - LEVEL III
A. Seeks out information on methodology, research and current trends in education to enhance and improve the quality of learning.	A. Seeks out information on methodology, research and current trends in education to enhance and improve the quality of learning.	A. Demonstrates the ability to reason, take multiple perspectives, be creative, and take reasoned risks to improve teaching.
B. Implements a variety of strategies to enhance learning.	B. Demonstrates knowledge of best practices that enhance learning.	B. Collaborates with colleagues in the research and design of improved instructional strategies
C. Recognizes that change entails risk and modifications may be needed.	C. Participates in instructional improvement and school reform initiatives.	C. Assumes a leadership role in the study and implementation of instructional improvement and school reform initiatives.

9. The teacher works productively with colleagues, parents and community members.		
Provisional Teacher - LEVEL I	Professional Teacher - LEVEL II	Master Teacher - LEVEL III
A. Collaborates with colleagues.	A. Actively promotes collegial relations with other school personnel.	A. Serves as a role model for collaborative working relations across the profession.
B. Communicates with parents on a regular basis.	B. Provides a system for interactive communication between teacher and parents.	B. Demonstrates knowledge of specific school, family, and community resources that can support student learning.
C. Uses conflict resolution strategies when necessary.	C. Uses conflict resolution strategies as appropriate.	C. Assists colleagues in the use of conflict resolution strategies.
D. Involves parents and community in the learning environment.	D. Promotes active roles for parents and community members in student learning.	D. Engages parents and community members productively in the work of the school.
E. Communicates in a professional manner with colleagues, parents, and community members regarding educational matters.	E. Communicates in a professional manner with colleagues, parents, and community members regarding educational matters.	E. Works collaboratively and creatively with colleagues, parents, and community members regarding educational matters.



MORIARTY-EDGEWOOD

Custom Plan

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 6, 7, 9, 10, and 11 for Science
- Special Education teacher in the grades and subjects above (Teachers who are severely or profoundly disabled are exempt from this group)

	Elementary		Middle School		High School	
Student Achievement	<u>SBA</u>	35	<u>SBA</u>	35	<u>SBA</u>	35
	Discovery	15	Discovery	15	EOC	10
					Discovery	5
Grade 3 only	DIBELS	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	10	St Svy	10	CCR	10

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 8, 9, and 12 Science
- Grades 9 and 12 for Language Arts/Math

	Elementary		Middle School		High School	
Student Achievement	Discovery	35	Discovery	35	EOC	35
	School Gr	15	School Gr	15	Discovery	10
					School Gr	5
Grade 3 only	DIBELS	35				
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	10	St Svy	10	CCR	10

Group C Teachers

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

	Elementary	
Student Achievement	Discovery	35
	School Gr	15
Observations	<u>Domain 2&3</u>	<u>25</u>
Multiple Measure	Domain 1&4	15
	Pt Svy	10

Abbreviations

SBA	Standards based Assessment
School Gr	School Grade
CCR	College Career Readiness
St Svy	Student Survey
EOC	End of Course
Pt Svy	Parent Survey



SANTA FE

Custom Plan

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 6, 7, 9, 10, and 11 for Science
- Special Education teacher in the grades and subjects above (Teachers who are severely or profoundly disabled are exempt from this group)

	Elementary		Middle School		High School	
Student Achievement	<u>SBA</u>	35	<u>SBA</u>	35	<u>SBA</u>	35
	Group SBA	10	Group SBA	10	Group SBA	10
	St Svy	5	St Svy	5	St Svy	5
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>
	<u>Domain 1&4</u>	20	<u>Domain 1&4</u>	20	<u>Domain 1&4</u>	20
	St Svy	5	St Svy	5	St Svy	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 8, 9, and 12 Science
- Grades 9 and 12 for Language Arts/Math

	Elementary		Middle School		High School	
Student Achievement	EOC	35	EOC	35	EOC	35
	Group SBA	10	Group SBA	10	Group SBA	10
	St Svy	5	St Svy	5	St Svy	5
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>
	<u>Domain 1&4</u>	20	<u>Domain 1&4</u>	20	<u>Domain 1&4</u>	20
	St Svy	5	St Svy	5	St Svy	5

Group C Teachers

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

	Elementary	
Student Achievement	DIBELS	25
	Discovery	25
Observations	<u>Domain 2&3</u>	<u>25</u>
	<u>Domain 1&4</u>	20
Multiple Measure	Pt Svy	5

Abbreviations

SBA	Standards based Assessment
St Svy	Student Survey
EOC	End of Course
Pt Svy	Parent Survey



FARMINGTON - NEW MEXICO VIRTUAL ACADEMY

Custom Plan

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 6, 7, 9, 10, and 11 for Science
- Special Education teacher in the grades and subjects above (Teachers who are severely or profoundly disabled are exempt from this group)

	Elementary	Middle School	High School
Student Achievement	<u>SBA</u> 35	<u>SBA</u> 35	<u>SBA</u> 35
	GLV 10	GLV 10	GLV 10
	Q1 Growth 5	Q1 Growth 5	Q1 Growth 5
Observations	<u>Domain 2&3</u> 25	<u>Domain 2&3</u> 25	<u>Domain 2&3</u> 25
	Multiple Measure	Multiple Measure	Multiple Measure
Multiple Measure	<u>Domain 1&4</u> 15	<u>Domain 1&4</u> 15	<u>Domain 1&4</u> 15
	Teach Att 5	Teach Att 5	Teach Att 5
	St Svy 5	St Svy 5	St Svy 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 8, 9, and 12 Science
- Grades 9 and 12 for Language Arts/Math

	Elementary	Middle School	High School
Student Achievement	EOC 35	EOC 35	EOC 35
	GLV 10	GLV 10	GLV 10
	Q1 Growth 5	Q1 Growth 5	Q1 Growth 5
Observations	<u>Domain 2&3</u> 25	<u>Domain 2&3</u> 25	<u>Domain 2&3</u> 25
	Multiple Measures	Multiple Measures	Multiple Measures
Multiple Measures	<u>Domain 1&4</u> 15	<u>Domain 1&4</u> 15	<u>Domain 1&4</u> 15
	Teach Att 5	Teach Att 5	Teach Att 5
	St Svy 5	St Svy 5	St Svy 5

Group C Teachers

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

	Elementary
Student Achievement	Q1 Growth 35
	EOC 10
	Q1 Growth 5
Observations	<u>Domain 2&3</u> 25
	Multiple Measure
Multiple Measure	Domain 1&4 15
	Teach Att 5
	St Svy 5

Abbreviations

Q1 Growth	Quartile 1 Growth
SBA	Standards based Assessment
St Svy	Student Survey
Teach Att	Teacher Attendance
EOC	End of Course
GLV	Grade Level VAM



Farmington Municipal Schools
2001 North Dustin Avenue – P.O. Box 5850
Farmington, New Mexico 87401

ADMINISTRATIVE OFFICES

TELEPHONE (505) 324-9840
FAX (505) 599-8806

October 10, 2013

Position Paper regarding the NMTEACH Evaluation System

With all due respect to the New Mexico Legislature and Public Education Department, I would like to present my perspective on the NMTEACH Evaluation System.

I believe the NMTEACH Evaluation System was intended to strengthen teacher instruction and therefore increase student achievement. But the result of hasty implementation has resulted in unnecessary anxiety for teachers, principals and administrators.

I believe that the school districts that piloted the new system spoke to the need to slow down the implementation process to:

1. Allow all districts to become knowledgeable about the system,
2. Assure that the technology was ready to receive all the information that is required, and
3. Continue training of teachers, principals and administrators so that the evaluations are a valid reflection of teacher performance.

To address my first concern: Knowledge of the system

The NMTEACH Domains are similar to the New Mexico Teacher Competencies and by themselves, do not cause concern. Educators saw the value in the competencies and they see the value in the Domains. However, observing teachers and connecting what principals see in the classroom with the new language of the domains is taking a significant amount of time and practice.

Educators see the value of looking at student growth scores obtained through assessments tied to their instruction. However, the requirement of transitioning to Common Core State Standards and yet having a “bridge” assessment used to rate their effectiveness that is not Common Core based is very concerning. How can this be valid if students are tested on topics that have not been taught? There is also the opportunity for error on the part of the collection system. What will the process be for teachers to protest the results?

Teachers, principals and administrators do not understand the Grade Level Value Added Model or School Grade formulas. What they don't understand, scares them.

Second concern: Technology

Technology can be difficult and even the most developed, tested technology can have issues (OS 7 is a perfect example). The state went out for RFP and picked a product for school districts to use to submit information related to the evaluation. As of today, the technology isn't ready and some districts have been told to wait until the "bugs" are worked out. The first observation is required by November 1, 2013 (deadline extended from October 15, 2013). Principals that have 30 or more teachers will have trouble meeting this time line if the system is not up and running.

Farmington Schools has been using the PD/OBS 360 product from School Improvement Network for several years. Teachers have used the professional development modules individually, in Professional Learning Communities and in large groups. FMS has worked with School Improvement Network for the last two years to develop our own protocol observations/walkthroughs based on the work of the district and Marzano and Associates. Teachers have seen the evaluation protocols completed by the principals and submitted to them. They understood that with every observation submitted to them by the principal, there were expectations to reflect on the information and strive to improve.

While the observations done by principals are now different following the NMTEACH requirements, FMS chose to continue using School Improvement Network. School Improvement Network has provided our district with an excellent product that is ready to go. We have easily added new staff or deleted teachers that left the district. If we have complications, the company is always responsive. We have principals that have completed up to 30 observations.

We understand that we will need to enter the information into the Teachscape system in order for it to be received and reviewed by the PED. To date, I have not had assistance from PED or Teachscape in developing the format needed and how the process will take place.

Third Concern:

The training provided by Ivy Alford (SERB) was excellent in June 2013. She did a great job of helping principals understand what to look for in regards to the Domains. However, for the training to be effective, the next step would be to include the technology. (PED should model good instruction.) Now principals are learning about the Domains and "look fors" while trying to learn the technology.

It has been difficult for principals to explain to teachers what they will be receiving as far as observations and final evaluation because it has never been completely put together for principals to see. It is my understanding that the final report that will be compiled from the

collection of information submitted to PED through Teachscape and given to teachers is not completed.

Either stop the new system until it is completely developed and ready for implementation (meaning that training continues so that the full evaluation system is understood) or allow districts to work with the system this school year without the expectation of submission to PED. I don't believe that those requiring this system really understand the full impact this is having on principals and teachers in particular.

Another note, I have 2 student teachers this semester and 2 for next semester. This number is significantly less than in the past. In order to recruit youth into education, we need to show that public education is a viable profession where we focus on being professionals and working collaboratively for the benefit of our students. I don't believe that is the message PED wants to deliver by rushing the evaluation system into use before the technology is ready and by not providing adequate training for principals. I also believe that we will soon encounter a severe shortage of teachers and principals because they do not feel supported by PED.

Thank you for your attention to this matter. Linda Schilz, Assistant Superintendent of Human Resources, Farmington Municipal Schools



Key Policy Letters from the Education Secretary and Deputy Secretary

June 18, 2013

Dear Chief State School Officers:

Over the last four years, state and local leaders and educators across America have embraced an enormous set of urgent and long-overdue challenges: raising standards and upgrading curricula to better prepare students to compete in the global economy, developing new assessments, rebuilding accountability systems to meet the unique needs of each state and better serve at-risk students, and adopting new systems of support and evaluation for teachers and principals. Meeting this historic set of challenges all at once asks more of everybody throughout the education sector, and it is a tribute to the quality of educators, leaders, and elected officials across this country that so many have stepped up.

Throughout this process, states and districts have established high goals for themselves: college- and career-ready standards for all; higher graduation rates and college enrollment rates; high expectations for critical thinking, problem-solving, and other 21st century skills; ambitious and achievable performance targets that really move the needle for kids at risk; and useful, rigorous systems of evaluation and support for teachers and principals based on multiple measures, including student growth. The Department has offered flexibility to enable states and districts to meet these goals. In a country as diverse as ours, where schools and students have different educational challenges, one-size-fits-all solutions have not worked. We have also aligned our grant programs to support states willing to lead this important work, and the result is that some states are further along than others, but all states are engaged in significant improvement efforts and students are better off for it.

In recent months, we have heard from many of you and from thousands of teachers, principals, and education advocates. While there is a broad sense that these far-reaching changes carry enormous promise for schools, children, and the future of our country, there is caution that too much change all at once could undermine our collective progress. I fully appreciate both the courage to tackle so many challenges at once and the burdens this imposes on front-line educators — teachers, principals, school boards, and administrators — who are committed to doing this work well.

With that in mind, the Department is open to additional flexibility for states in two critical areas: the first relates to one particular element of teacher and leader evaluation and support system implementation, and the second addresses "double-testing" during the transition to new assessments aligned with college- and career-ready standards.

First, I want to address the implementation of teacher and leader evaluation and support systems. States that have received a Race to the Top grant or flexibility under the Elementary and Secondary Education Act (ESEA) are responsible for working with districts to develop systems to evaluate and support principals and teachers based on multiple measures, including student growth. States have committed to different deadlines to implement these systems: some are implementing now; others will begin over the coming years. Given the move to college- and career-ready standards, the dramatic changes in curricula that teachers and principals are now starting to teach, and the transition to new assessments aligned to those standards, the Department will consider, on a state-by-state basis, allowing states up to one additional year before using their new evaluation systems to inform personnel determinations. To be specific, states that request and are given this flexibility may delay any personnel consequences, tied in part to the use of student growth data, until no later than 2016 — 2017. We recognize that, for many states, it will not make sense to request this flexibility because they are already well ahead in successfully implementing these changes or have requirements in state law.

States interested in this extension may request this change, before September 30, 2013, through the current ESEA flexibility amendment process. Details about the amendment process are available on the ESEA flexibility Web page (<http://www2.ed.gov/esea-flexibility>). As each state implements college- and career-ready standards, it must have a robust plan for supporting teachers and principals as they transition to the new standards and assessments. States will need to lay out those plans in detail in the ESEA flexibility renewal process, along with indicators of teacher and principal familiarity and comfort with

these new materials.

The second issue I want to address is that of "double-testing" during the transition from the current statewide assessments to new assessments aligned with college- and career-ready standards. During the 2013â€”2014 school year, some schools will be involved in the important work of field testing new assessments. We want to support states that would like to avoid double-testing students, which as you know often happens during the shift to a new test. Therefore, we would consider requests from states for a one-year waiver, to allow schools participating in these field tests to administer only one assessment in 2013â€”2014 to any individual student â€” either the current statewide assessment or the field test. We would also consider a request for those schools to retain their Federal accountability designations for an additional year during which the same targeted interventions would have to continue, with no relaxation of accountability requirements. Details about the Title I waiver process are available at <http://www.ed.gov/titlei-waiver>.

Our country continues to face challenges as we work together toward achieving educational excellence for all children, and the timing of these actions has real consequences for students in the real world. The point of raising standards is to prepare students for tomorrow's challenges rather than yesterday's. Their readiness has real consequences for their lives, and the nation's economic health. Yet this effort will only succeed if all parties have the time, resources, and support needed to make the journey from the inadequate standards of the past to the ambitious standards of tomorrow. As the highest-ranking education official in your states, you define the path and the pace for how states and schools will make that journey. Our job in Washington is to support you. In the coming days, the Department will provide more information on the flexibility discussed above; my staff will reach out to you and your teams to provide assistance.

On behalf of the Obama Administration, I deeply appreciate your leadership and courage. I also appreciate your honest feedback and the feedback of your principals and teachers. Above all, I salute your continuing determination to advance reforms that will benefit millions of students in states and across America. This is hard work and the need for change is urgent.

Sincerely,

/s/

Arne Duncan

cc: Council of Chief State School Officers

[Back to the College- and Career-Ready Transition Flexibility Main Page](#)

 Print

 Close
Window

Last Modified: 09/17/2013