

# RHEA General Assembly

New APPR Process

September 17 and 24, 2012



# Collaborative Negotiating Goal

- Both District and RHEA had as a primary interest to “do no harm” in navigating to an APPR agreement:
  - Minimize impact on students and instructional time,
  - Minimize the exposure of individual teachers or groups of teachers,
  - Mitigate the effect of the State determined 20% growth category, over which we have little or no control,
  - Be as equitable as possible; keep it as simple as possible



## State's Evaluation Formula

- A. State 20% - Student Growth
- B. Local 20% - Student Achievement
- C. Local 60% - “Multiple Measures” of Teacher Practice

**We will discuss each of these areas separately.**

# A. State 20% - Student Growth

- For ELA and Math Grades 4 – 8, State will assign growth score based on State tests. For courses giving a Regents, Districts must use Regents scores somehow.
- For all, other than ELA/Math 4-8, state allows choice of three methods to assign growth scores:
  - 1) Growth of cohort within year (requires pre-assessment)
  - 2) Growth of cohort year over year
  - 3) Growth in program year over year

**\*\*We agreed to a combination of methods 2) and 3).**

**This eliminates the need to use instructional time to administer pre-assessments.**



# Growth *Method* for You

Find your situation on the Handout titled:

“K-12 NYS APPR Measures (State 20/Local 20)”

This is a one-year agreement.

A District “Assessment Review” Committee, composed of 3 Administrators and 3 Teachers, will evaluate the tests and methods used, and recommend changes as/if needed for subsequent year(s).

## K-12 NYS APPR Measures (State 20/Local 20) One-year Plan (2012-13 School Year)

Grade level / Content Area (50% or more of teaching assignment)	Baseline	Growth Assessment (State 20)	Achievement Assessment (Local 20)
K-2	2012 Grade 5 NYS ELA Assessment	2013 Grade 5 NYS ELA Assessment	2013 Grade 5 NYS Math Assessment
3	2012 Grade 3 NYS ELA Assessment	2013 Grade 3 NYS ELA Assessment	2013 Grade 5 NYS Math Assessment
4-6 ELA/Math	Combined 2012 Grades 3-5 NYS ELA & Math Assessments	Combined 2013 Grades 4-6 NYS ELA & Math Assessments	2013 Grade 5 NYS Math Assessment (4-5) 2013 Grade 8 NYS Math Assessment (6)
7-8 ELA	2012 Grade 6, 7 NYS ELA Assessment (respectively)	2013 Grade 7, 8 NYS ELA Assessment (respectively)	2013 Grade 8 NYS Math Assessment
7-8 Math	2012 Grade 6, 7 NYS Math Assessment (respectively)	2013 Grade 7, 8 NYS Math Assessment (respectively)	2013 Grade 8 NYS Math Assessment
8 Algebra	2012 Grade 8 Math Assessment	2013 Grade 8 Math Assessment	2013 Grade 8 NYS Math Assessment
6 Science	2011 Grade 4 NYS Science Assessment	2013 Science 6 Final Exam	2013 Grade 8 NYS Math Assessment
7 Science	2012 Science 6 Final Exam	2013 Science 7 Final Exam	2013 Grade 8 NYS Math Assessment
8 Science	2012 Grade 8 Earth Science Regents Exam	2013 Grade 8 Earth Science Regents Exam	2013 Grade 8 NYS Math Assessment
6 Social Studies	2012 Social Studies 5 DBQ Assessment	2013 Social Studies 6 Final Exam	2013 Grade 8 NYS Math Assessment
7 Social Studies	2012 Social Studies 6 Final Exam	2013 Social Studies 7 Final Exam	2013 Grade 8 NYS Math Assessment
8 Social Studies	2012 Social Studies 7 Final Exam	2013 Social Studies 8 Final Exam	2013 Grade 8 NYS Math Assessment
K-5 Other Subject Areas: (Music, Art, PE, ESL, CT)	2012 Grade 5 NYS ELA Assessment	2013 Grade 5 NYS ELA Assessment	2013 Grade 5 NYS Math Assessment
6-8 Other Subject Areas: (Music, Art, PE, ESL, CT)	2012 Grade 8 NYS ELA Assessment	2013 Grade 8 NYS ELA Assessment	2013 Grade 8 NYS Math Assessment
K-8 AIS / ICT (Co-Teacher)	Follow subject area assignment above.	Follow subject area assignment above.	2013 Grade 5 NYS Math Assessment (K-5) 2013 Grade 8 NYS Math Assessment (6-8)



# Growth *Score* for You

- For teachers involved in ELA/Math 4-8, the State will assign a growth score computed by their metric.
- For all others, growth will be measured as the % increase in students scoring at 3 or above, OR 75% or above, on the test attached to you on the “K-12 NYS APPR Measures (State 20/Local 20)” chart.
- This will be year over year growth for the whole cohort of students for your building or course team, ***not*** for your own group of students.



## Questions...

Q: “Why use 3 or above, and 75% or above as the measuring point?”

A: The state is already moving to cut scores in ELA/Math 4-8 that represent “College and Career Ready” achievement (3’s). Similar cut scores will soon be used on Regents exams. Based on a recent study, Regents scores of 75% or higher predict a much more successful transition to college level work (80% in math).





## Questions...

Q: Why not use my own students scores instead of building or course team cohort scores?

A: In ELA/Math 4-8, your growth score will be based on your own students, as required by the State.

For all others, using cohort scores minimizes the exposure of any one teacher, since you have no control over which students you have. Further, it supports the District goal of collaborative work of grade level and course teams.



## Questions...

Q: It appears the “default” for areas not leading to State exams is an ELA exam. Why was this decided?

A: 1) It supports the District goal of improving literacy, which we know from research and experience is the #1 school based factor in academic success/struggle.

2) It supports the implementation of Common Core Learning Standards, which will infuse all curriculum areas, and can be supported by them.

3) It provides a vehicle for District-wide unity of purpose.



## Conversion Chart for State Growth Scores

Examine the Handout “APPR State Growth Score,” which is now Appendix K in the contract.

Again, this is a one year agreement, and the conversion chart may be modified as / if needed for future years.

### APPR STATE GROWTH SCORE

<b>Target</b>	Percent increase of students scoring a LEVEL 3/4 OR 75 or better as a measure of growth from one year's assessment to another																				
	HIGHLY EFFECTIVE					EFFECTIVE					DEVELOPING					INEFFECTIVE					
<b>HEDI</b>	20	19	18	17	16	15	14	13	12	11	10	9	8	7	6	5	4	3	2	1	0
	≥ 9.0%	8.0%	7.0%	6.0%	5.0%	4.0%	3.0%	2.0%	1.0%	0%	-1.0%	-2.0%	-3.0%	-4.0%	-5.0%	-6.0%	-7.0%	-8.0%	-9.0%	-10.0%	<-10.0%



# How was conversion chart derived?

Growth in cohort scores from June 2011 → June 2012 for all areas was examined, with consideration of these factors:

- Derive a scale as fair as possible to all grade/course teams.
- Derive a scale the State would approve.
- Derive a scale that accounts for the reality that in year over year cohort scores, growth can be positive, zero or negative.



## B. Local 20% - Student Achievement

Find your situation on the Handout titled:

“K-12 NYS APPR Measures (State 20/Local 20)”

This is a one-year agreement.

A District “Assessment Review” Committee, composed of 3 Administrators and 3 Teachers, will evaluate the tests and methods used, and recommend changes as/if needed for subsequent year(s).



# Questions...

Q: Will achievement scores be based on teacher, building or district cohorts?

A: Building cohorts. This is a State requirement, versus using a district cohort. For grades 9-12, NGA and SHS are considered one building.



# Questions...

Q: For Grades K-8, achievement scores for all teachers are linked to a math exam. Why?

A: For K-8, achievement is better on State Math tests than ELA.

Keeps it simple.

Unity of purpose.

Minimizes exposure of individual teachers.





# Questions...

Q: For Grades 9-12, the average of the 5 graduation required Regents exams is used for all teachers. Why?

A: District achievement is good here.

Keeps it simple.

Unity of purpose.

Minimizes exposure if individual teachers.



# Recent Achievement Results...

State Math 5 and Math 8 Exams:

For all buildings, current (2012) achievement average is between 2.9 and 3.1.

For the 5 graduation required Regents exams, average of all June 2012 scores was 84.6



# Achievement Score for You

See Handout titled:

Local 20

0-100 Point Scale Conversion & 1-4 Conversion Scale  
(now Appendix L in the Contract)

For an approximation of June 2013 achievement score for yourself, use a score of 3.0 if you are a K-8 teacher, and 84.0 if you are a 9-12 teacher, and determine the corresponding achievement score out of 20.

Local 20 0-100 Point Scale Conversion & 1-4 Conversion Scale		
Ineffective		
0-14	1	0
15-27	1.1	1
28-40	1.2	1.5
41-53	1.3	2.0
54	1.4	2.5
Developing		
55	1.5	3
56	1.6	3.6
57	1.7	4.2
58	1.8	4.8
59	1.9	5.4
60	2	6
61	2.1	6.6
62	2.2	7.2
63	2.3	7.8
64	2.4	8.4
Effective		
65-66	2.5	9
67-68	2.6	9.9
69-70	2.7	10.8
71-72	2.8	11.7
73-74	2.9	12.6
75-76	3	13.5
77-78	3.1	14.4
79-81	3.2	15.3
82-83	3.3	16.2
84	3.4	17.1
Highly Effective		
85-87	3.5	18
88-90	3.6	18.4
91-93	3.7	18.8
94-96	3.8	19.2
97-99	3.9	19.6
100	4	20

\*\* The 20 point conversion rounds down to the nearest whole number to assign the HEDI score.

#### APPENDIX L



## C. Local 60% - “Multiple Measures” of Teacher Practice

Consult the Handout Titled:

“APPR – 60% Local Evaluation Process”



# RHEA APPR Process:

## 5 Step Process:

- Goal Setting Meeting
- Unannounced Observation
- Announced Observation (including pre- and post-meeting)
- Mid-year Meeting
- End of Year Meeting



# Your Local 60% Score

All announced, unannounced and structured review data that is used in the evaluation process, per component area, will earn a “HEDI” rating, and then be converted to a numeric score:

H – Highly Effective = 4

E – Effective = 3

D – Developing = 2

I – Ineffective = 1



## Your Local 60% Score

The average (out of 4 points) of all component areas that are rated will be converted to a score (out of 60) using the “Rubric Score to Sub-Component Chart” (Appendix M in the Contract).

For Example:

Average Component Score = 3.1

Score = 58 (58.2 rounds down to 58)



1.367		45
1.375		46
1.383		47
1.392		48
1.400		49
Developing 50-56		
1.5		50
1.6		50.7
1.7		51.4
1.8		52.1
1.9		52.8
2		53.5
2.1		54.2
2.2		54.9
2.3		55.6
2.4		56.3
Effective 57-58		
2.5		57
2.6		57.2
2.7		57.4
2.8		57.6
2.9		57.8
3		58
3.1		58.2
3.2		58.4
3.3		58.6
3.4		58.8
Highly Effective 59-60		
3.5		59
3.6		59.3
3.7		59.5
3.8		59.8
3.9		60
4		60.25 (round to 60)

The 60 point conversion rounds down to the nearest whole number to assign the HEDI score.

### APPENDIX M



# Supports Available:

- APPR Support Team exists:
  - Brad (RHEA)
  - John (Teacher Center)
  - Dina Wilson (Network Team & Office of Instruction)
  - Joanne Mattiucci (Office of Professional Development)
- This team is currently meeting bi-weekly. Our purpose is to maintain consistent communication through all layers of the district, and to problem solve unexpected issues.
- At times we may need to dump a concern back into the negotiations process. (Brad, John and Dina all participated in APPR negotiations.)



## Supports Available:

- Principals will be presenting overviews each month of next step in the process, at monthly faculty meetings.
- APPR Teacher Leaders are available in every building to give support in the process.
- Building Reps are available to clarify details of contract language and timeline.



## Your Questions...?

Please ask what you need to  
about the APPR 60% Local  
Evaluation Process.