**SCDN**
**May 31, 2012**

**Ken Slentz, Deputy Commissioner**

**P-12 Updates and Initiatives Agenda**

**NCLB Waiver News**

Aligned to the work of the reform agenda:

* Adoption of CCLS
* use of CCR standards
* Change in use of AYP
	+ growth towards proficiency
		- by 2016 will cut in half the distance that the subgroups have in meeting proficiency (promise to Feds)
		- money will follow - how to best and better get subgroups on the path to college and career readiness
	+ college and career readiness scores
* Move from Qualified to Effective for teachers and principals and include student growth
	+ requirement that we are well on our way to implement
	+ any grant you see coming will have 3012-c attached to it
* Use of single diagnostic tool to determine district improvement
	+ will provide training this summer - designed to bring focus to the areas of improvement and what is needed to bring access to the students
	+ trying to mesh the various review protocols that are done and reduce the number of reports needed to be done by districts - integration is the the goal

**Changes to AYP**

* + Move away from direct measurement of proficiency
	+ Use School and District Accountability Standards that are better aligned to college-and-career readiness
	+ replace identification of Schools for Improvement, Corrective Action and Restructuring with identification of Priority and Focus Schools
	+ replace identification of Districts for Improvement and Corrective Action with Identification of Focus Districts
	+ Replace identification of Schools as High Performing/Rapidly Improving with identification of Reward Schools
	+ Use proficiency and growth measures to make accountability determinations for elementary and middle schools
	+ at HS - districts will get full accountability credit for meeting aspirational measures of 75 on ELA/80 on math; partial credit for other scores
	+ teacher/student data linkage is key to having the data come alive - tomorrow is the deadline
		- growth model gets better with larger n size
		- need to encourage districts to complete this by tomorrow!!! *(deadline was subsequently changed)*

**Assessment Update**

* Math pre/post
	+ important to notice that there is a shift in what is covered - priority concepts by grade
	+ while preparing for assessment this year - needed to ignore that.  Now officially in common core land and need to be spending these last few weeks of school preparing students for the “new” grade level
	+ be sure teachers are noticing about what is in next year’s grade that students will need pre-requisite knowledge/skills (principal’s task)
* Sample items will be released in the next two weeks - at least 10 items per grade level in ELA/Math
	+ what they are
		- what they will/can look like
		- have been constraints b/c needed to use materials in the public domain
		- greater understanding around unpacking the standards and then writing items once understand with greater depth the standard
	+ purpose
		- think about how you want to use them
		- can be real facilitated conversation around them and how people can use them
		- how can we use them to drive the change we know we need?

**Ken Wagner, Associate Commissioner**
**Office of Information, Reporting and Data Systems**

“the data systems mean nothing if they don’t help teachers drive instruction”
- this is a highly fraught, difficult and complicated policy arena
- trying to approach the field with entirely new set of vocab and procedures - know that all this takes years to set in

All of data starts at school level with electronic student management systems - problem for those who do not yet have them, including BOCES who may have them but not use them in the same manner

Linkage Data Elements

* Multiple teachers assigned to a course section
* Teacher-student linkage to be expressed as a proportion to reflect changes over time:
	+ Duration of student enrollment-teacher assignment linkage for course (minutes) - Field 14
	+ Duration of student attendance - teacher assignment linkage for course (minutes) - Field 15
	+ Duration of course (minutes) - Field 18
	+ Teacher-student linkage start/edn dates
* Teacher-student linkage duration adjustments (correction for hard-to-schedule situations)
* Guidance on how to deal with elementary school schedules issued on January 27th

Questions have come up around “leakage” in a student day

* If field trips and assemblies are viewed as leakage - should question why you have them!
* Questions have also come up around music lessons, etc.  That is a local call

Conceptual idea re: attendance and growth model (caution - has not been reviewed by the vendor):

* If student is present for 97% of the course, that score should count as 97% of the calculation
* NOT necessarily the same analogy to apply to SLO

Nothing gets verification of data faster than transparency

* Rolled out directly to teachers in March - about 80% of teachers who rec’d the PINS have logged in and created accounts (69000 teachers)
* average user clicking on 10 different pages of the system and sticking around for 10.96 minutes (running Google analytics)

How will the system account for teacher absences?

* Need to stop and then restart the system when teacher leaves and then returns (example is for extended absence)

Speech teacher vs. pathologist goes to the heart of the classroom teacher definition

**Anita Murphy, Associate Commissioner**
**Office of Curriculum, Instruction and Field Services**

Packet of SLO samples provided - not exemplars! From teachers who did the training at NYSED and they are still working on providing feedback to them so they can be posted on EngageNY

Third Party Assessments

* One issue: national assessment that vendor will never submit because they are “industry standards” (ex. NACTE or Project Lead the Way).  New RFQ - as long as have vendor permission, a district or BOCES can submit the assessment for approval
	+ should be strategic in how they are submitted to ensure that an important assessment does not get overlooked
* The testing police don’t exist - well they do but they aren’t policing that.  Be practicable.

**June 1, 2012**

**Allison Armour-Garb, Executive Director**
**Educator Effectiveness, Policy and Programs**

520 districts or more have already logged into Review Room

* Many taking the approach of downloading the Word version and using them as worksheets
* A number of districts are very close to submitting plans but also hearing there may be reluctance to be the ones to go first
* As soon as plans are approved - they will be posted and available for others to look at

Timelines

* This month, expect to post the list of approved survey tools and the RFQ for the assessments (assessments may be submitted by a district/BOCES that wants to use a particular assessment in APPR as long as there is a sign-off by the provider - turn around time on this RFQ will be tight)

Common Questions that have been sent to Educator Eval mailbox

* some people who submit questions clearly have not read or understood the Guidance Document - in that case will be pointed to the Guidance Document, some interpretation may be given to clarify; if many are mis-interpreting then they will work on clarification of document
* some have read and understood but have a “tricky” situation and want to know how it applies
* others are items that are meant to be locally negotiated or decided - SED will not be giving “rulings” but tell you that it should be locally decided

Questions re: plans due and length of review process

* **January deadline is NOT the submission deadline - it is an approval deadline**
* the approval process will take weeks and the timing will depend on volume and re-sumissions, you are encouraged to submit early and not plan to submit after Thanksgiving
* when a plan is submitted - if it need modification, once resubmitted there will be a 4-6 weeks turnaround time as well

Questions re: no increase in state aid anyway so do we need to submit by January?

* 3012-c is the law and you need an APPR plan

Questions re: interaction of the collective bargaining agreements and timelines for submission

* **Section K1 of Guidance Document**

Questions re: rubrics (Section H)

* Have clarified in guidance that if a district has chosen the observation only rubrics they will also need to chose a second rubric to enable them to assess and score the other parts of teacher practice that are not observable
	+ Must use the entire second rubric, not just the parts that don’t lend themselves to education
	+ Can weight pieces of the rubric differently
* TED materials - do you have to use these if choose NYSUT rubric?
	+ How you use a particular rubric and the materials/supports you choose to take advantage of are local decisions

Questions re: teachers that are covered

* Co-teaching and push-in/pull-out and instructional support services: need to really provide clarification on what these are
* Speech teachers/pathologist and librarians discussion - what is the role? What is the certification?
	+ Significant discussion on this topic – AAG will be looking into this and there may be additional clarification

UPDATED GUIDANCE DOCUMENT:

* Four new guidance questions in Section C

Questions re: APPR plans being posted on the web

* State will post approved plans
* Forms that are required to be uploaded will be tables/TIP/PIP forms so may not have the issue with posing electronically and the copyright licenses

Questions re: use of the form

* Important change made in drop down menus re: growth/local measure - added N/A because there may be situations where a district/BOCES does not offer a particular course or may offer the course but not offer the assessment (i.e. Physics)  Guidance is given on the site

Other questions:

* Long-term substitutes will not need to be evaluated under 3012-c
* If at any time you make a material change to your plan, even if submitted and approved - you must resubmit
* Questions re: K-12 principals who are also Superintendents had been raised - no solutions yet
	+ Superintendent is appointed by BOE and it needs to be dealt with by the BOE; role of the principal is subordinate to the role of the Superintendent - does that mean that no eval for principal?
* Language re: HEDI levels in Review Room:Jeff Craig did put out a sample
	+ System rejects you if you don’t complete
	+ What to put in?
	+ AAG - if it says “if needed” should be required to enter - will look into it
* Re: tables in the Review Room system - be general (look to case study - that is not rigorous enough but start from there)