

Data Collection for Members Facing Tenure Charges for Inefficiency

Part I: District Level Questions

Adoption of Evaluation Rubrics

Has the model evaluation rubric been approved by the local board of education then reviewed and accepted by the Commissioner of Education? 6A:10-2.1

Has the model evaluation rubric been revised since it was accepted by the Commissioner of Education?

Do each of the observers meet the statutory observation requirements? 6A:10-2.2 (a) 7

- Individual employed in the district in a supervisory role and capacity
- possesses a school administrator certificate, principal certificate, or supervisor certificate

Training of teaching staff members 6A:10-2.2

Has there been annual training on each component of the evaluation rubric including detailed descriptions of student achievement measures and all aspects of the educator practice instrument 6A:10-2.2 (b) 1

How did supervisors demonstrate competency in the practice instrument? 6A:10-2.2 (b) 5

Has each evaluator received training in the practice instrument? 6A:10-2.2 (b) 2

Has the training of each observer been completed before he or she completed their first observation? 6A:10-2.2 (b) 2

Has each observer completed two co-observations each year? 6A:10-2.2 (b) 4

How was the co-observation used to promote accuracy in scoring and continually train on the instrument 6A:10-2.2 (b) 4 i

Has each observer received annual update training? 6A:10-2.2 (b) 3

DEAC

Has the District established a District Evaluation Advisory Committee? 6A:10-2.2 (a) 1

Has the DEAC actually met?

Does the DEAC actually work in an advisory capacity?

Does the DEAC include the following representation? 6A:10-2.2 3 (a)

- Teachers from each school level represented in the school district
- Central office administrators overseeing teacher evaluation
- Supervisors involved in evaluation
- Administrators conducting evaluations
- Minimum of one administrator serving on a SciP
- Chief school administrator
- Special education administrator
- Parent
- Board of Education member
- Others

Notification of Evaluation Policies and Procedures

Has the district notified teaching staff of policies and procedures of evaluation by October 1?
6A:10-2.2 (a) 3

Has the district informed those employed after October 1st of the policies and procedures at the time of their employment? 6A:10-2.2 (a) 3

Has the district notified the staff members of any amendments to the policies and procedures within 10 days of their adoption? 6A:10-2.2 (a) 3

Did that notification include? 6A:10-2.4 (b)

- Roles and responsibilities of evaluation policies and procedures
- Job Descriptions
- Evaluation rubrics for all teaching staff members
- Process for calculating summative ratings and each component
- Methods of data collection and reporting appropriate to each job description including the process for student attribution to teachers, principals, assistant principals and vice principals for calculating the median and school wide student growth percentile
- Processes for observations for the purpose of evaluation and post-observation conferences by a supervisor
- Process for preparation of individual professional development plans
- Process for preparation of an annual written performance report and an annual summary conference
- Number of announced and unannounced observations 6A:10-4.4 (c)

Components of Teacher Evaluation

Did anyone from the NJDOE communicate to administrators in the district that teacher practice scores should be lowered because they do not reflect test scores or that student test scores were too low to justify teacher practice scores, or that SGO scores were too high and needed to be more “rigorous?”

6A:10-4.1 (e) Standardized tests, used as a measure of student progress, shall not be the predominant factor in determining the teacher’s annual summative rating.

Part II: School Level Questions

School Improvement Panel

Was the school improvement panel named each school year by August 31st? 6A: 10-3.1 (d)

Did teachers make up at least 1/3 of the School Improvement Panel? 6A: 10-3.1 (a)

How did the ScIP identify professional development responsibilities for teaching staff members based on a review of aggregate school level data? 6A: 10-3.2 (a) 4

PART III: Individual Level Questions

Annual Summary Conference

Was an annual summary conference held on or before June 30? 6A:10-2.4 (c)

Was the conference held before the report was written? 6A:10-2.4 (c)

Did the conference include a review of the following?

- Performance of the teaching staff member based on job description

- Scores or evidence compiled from practice instrument

- Progress of teaching staff member toward meeting the goals of the PDP or CAP

- Available indicators of student achievement or growth when applicable

- Preliminary annual written performance report

For 2014-15, was the annual performance report prepared by the designated supervisor? 6A:10-2.4 (e)

Does the annual performance report include the following 6A:10-2.4 (e)
Summative rating based on the evaluation rubric including a total score for each available component
Performance areas of strength and areas needing improvement
Development of PDP or CAP

Student Achievement Components

Did the SGO for 2013-14 negatively impact the summative rating score? 6A:10-4.2 (f)

If yes, did the teacher file an appeal?

Was the SGO developed entirely by the teacher in consultation with a supervisor? 6A:10-4.2 (e) 3

If no, was the proposed SGO created by the teacher, but there was disagreement with the final SGO determined by the principal? 6A:10-4.2 (e) 3

If no, which of these describes the process?

- Entire SGO was developed by an administrator without teacher input
- Assessments were developed by administrators without teacher input
- Target scores were predetermined by administrators without concern for starting points data

Was there an attempt to revise the SGO before February 15th by administration? 6A:10-4.2 (e) 5

Was there an attempt to revise the SGO before February 15th by the teacher?

Was that revision accepted?

Was the SGO assessment created to reflect work through the end of the school year and then given earlier than expected?

Student Growth Percentile

Did the mSGP score negatively impact the summative rating score?

6A: 10-4.1 (e) Standardized tests, used as a measure of student achievement, shall not be the predominant factor in determining a teacher's annual summative rating.

Did the mSGP cause the teacher to fall into the partially effective or ineffective range?

Did the teacher teach the course for 60% of the time from the first day of school to the first day of testing? 6A:10-4.2 (b) 2

Did the teacher have an opportunity to review the SGP student roster for accuracy?

Were the students on the roster enrolled in the class at least 70% of the time from the first day of school until the first day of testing?

Was the SGP student roster score accurate?

Teacher Observations 6A:10-4.4

Did each observation last a minimum of 20 minutes?

For announced observation: was the teacher staff member notified of the date and class period that the observation was conducted? 6A:10-1.2 Definitions

Was each announced observation preceded by a preconference no more than 7 teaching staff member working days not including the day of the observation? 6A:10-4.4 (b) 4

Was the preconference in person? 6A: 10-4.4 (b) 3

Was each observation followed by a post conference within 15 teaching staff member working days? 6A:10-4.4 (b) 1

Was each observation conference followed by a written or electronic evaluation report? 6A:10-4.4 (c) 5

Were two of the observations held in two separate semesters? 6A:10-4.4(c)

Did any of the observations include a co-observation by two observers of the same lesson? 6A:10-4.1 (c) 3 i

If there were co-observers, how was the score for that observation determined?

Was the teacher instructed to complete the pre-observation or post-observation conference in written electronic form? 6A:10-4.4 (b) 3

Did each post observation conference include the following?

- Review of the data collected at the observation
- Connections between the data and teacher practice instrument
- Connection between the data and the teacher's professional development plan or progress toward goal(s) of the corrective action plan
- Collection of other information needed for the evaluation
- Suggestions for improving effectiveness

Corrective Action Plan 6A:10-2.5

If the teacher received the ineffective or partially effective summative rating before the end of the school year, was a Corrective Action Plan written by September 15th of the following year? 6A: 10-2.5 (b)

If the teacher received the CAP by September 15th, was there a mid year evaluation conducted by February 15th to discuss progress towards the goals on the CAP (this conference may be combined with a post-observation conference)? 6A: 10-2.5 (j)

If the teacher received the summative rating during the school year, was the CAP developed within 15 teaching staff member working days of the school district's receipt of the summative rating? 6A: 10-2.5 (c)

If the CAP was developed after September 15th was there a mid-year evaluation conference to discuss the teacher's progress towards the goals of the CAP midway between the development of the CAP and the annual summary conference? 6A: 10-2.5 (j)

Did the CAP include:

- Areas in need of improvement identified in the educator evaluation rubric
 - Specific, demonstrable goals for improvement
 - Responsibilities of the evaluated employee
 - Responsibilities of the school district for the plan's implementation
 - Timelines for meeting the goal(s)
- 6A: 10-2.5 (e)

Did the teacher receive one additional observation from the minimum required for teachers in the district followed by a post observation conference? 6A: 10-2.5 (k)

Was the teacher observed by more than one observer over the course of the year? 6A: 10-2.5 (l)

Was the teacher's designated supervisor present at each post-observation conference as well as any supervisor present at the observation? 6A: 10-2.5 (f) AND 6A: 10-4.4 (b) 1

Was the teacher given opportunity to present data and evidence to demonstrate the teaching staff member's progress toward the goals of the CAP? 6A: 10-2.5 (g)

Did the CAP replace the Professional Development Plan (PDP)? 6A:10-2.5 (d)