



State of New Jersey

DEPARTMENT OF EDUCATION

PO BOX 500

TRENTON, NJ 08625-0500

CHRIS CHRISTIE
Governor

KIM GUADAGNO
Lt. Governor

CHRISTOPHER D. CERF
Commissioner

January 22, 2013

TO: Chief School Administrators
Charter School Lead Persons

FROM: Peter Shulman, Assistant Commissioner/Chief Talent Officer *PS*
Division of Teacher and Leader Effectiveness

SUBJECT: **Educator Evaluation System Implementation Update**

IN THIS MEMO:

- I. **[Requirements and Resources for All New Jersey Districts \(p. 2-8\)](#)**
 - A. [Deadlines and Reporting Requirements \(p. 2-3\)](#)
 - B. [Educator Practice Evaluation Instruments: State Approval/District Selection \(p. 3\)](#)
 - C. [Regulations, Policy Decisions, and Communications about 2013-14 \(p. 3-4\)](#)
 - D. [Data Distribution: Growth and Course Roster Data \(p. 4-7\)](#)
 - E. [Professional Development Information \(p. 7-8\)](#)
- II. **[Evaluation Update from the Office of Charter Schools \(p. 8\)](#)**
- III. **[2012-13 Evaluation Pilots \(p. 8-10\)](#)**
 - A. [Teacher Evaluation Pilot \(p. 8\)](#)
 - B. [Principal Evaluation Pilot \(p. 8-9\)](#)
 - C. [Spotlights from the Field: Haddonfield and Rockaway Township \(p. 9-10\)](#)
 - D. [State and External Advisory Work \(p. 10\)](#)
- IV. **[Office of Evaluation Information \(p. 10\)](#)**
- V. **[Appendix A: Questions for February Reporting Survey \(p. 12\)](#)**

The New Jersey Department of Education (“the Department”) continues to prepare for statewide implementation of reformed educator evaluation systems. Please share the information in this update broadly with your school and local community.

I. REQUIREMENTS AND RESOURCES FOR ALL DISTRICTS

A. Deadlines and Reporting Requirements

The following chart depicts deadlines and reporting procedures as districts prepare to implement new teacher and principal evaluations in 2013-14:

Requirement	Deadline	Reporting Process
Form District Evaluation Advisory Committee*	October 31, 2012	February 2013 survey
Adopt educator evaluation rubrics that include state-approved teaching and principal practice evaluation instruments	December 31, 2012	February 2013 survey; August 2013 survey**
Begin to test and refine evaluation rubrics	January 31, 2013	February 2013 survey
Form School Improvement Panel	February 1, 2013	February 2013 survey
Thoroughly train teachers on teaching practice evaluation instrument	July 1, 2013	August 2013 survey
Thoroughly train evaluators on teaching practice evaluation instrument	August 31, 2013	August 2013 survey
Thoroughly train principals and evaluators on principal practice evaluation instrument	October 31, 2013	TBD

*The District Evaluation Advisory Committee is described in the presentation and previous memos posted at <http://www.state.nj.us/education/EE4NJ/presources/>.

**The Department will collect specified information about rubric adoption in both surveys.

1. School Improvement Panel

As described in previous memos, the charge of the School Improvement Panel (ScIP) is to ensure the effectiveness of the school's teachers. Specific duties are as follows:

- Oversee mentoring;
- Conduct evaluations, including a mid-year evaluation of any teacher rated ineffective or partially effective in the most recent annual summative evaluation; and
- Identify professional development opportunities.

Members of the ScIP must include the school principal or designee, an assistant/vice principal, and a teacher. The principal will have final responsibility for ScIP membership but must consult with the majority representative in determining a suitable teacher to participate. To do this, the association might submit suggested names for the principal to consider, or the principal might meet with association representatives to discuss teacher selection. Principals will not be limited to choosing from among any suggested names.

Pending a State Board decision on the [revised professional development regulations](#), the principal may decide how the school-level professional development committee will interface with the ScIP during this school year.

2. February Reporting Requirement

As described in the [December 18, 2012 memo](#), all districts must report on progress toward required evaluation activities by February 15, 2013. The Department will use an electronic survey to collect this information. The survey will be available as of Monday, February 4 and must be completed by Friday, February 15. District web administrators will receive the link to access the survey. In order to help you prepare to complete this survey, the questions are attached as Appendix A for your reference. *Please do not submit responses until you receive the link to the electronic version on February 4.*

B. Educator Practice Evaluation Instruments: State Approval/District Selection

The Request for Qualifications (RFQ) process for state approval of teaching and principal practice evaluation instruments is complete for 2012, and the [2012 State-Approved Teaching and Principal Practice Evaluation Instruments Lists](#) have been posted.

We recognize that districts may wish to change selected instruments in the future as new and updated instruments become available. We anticipate adding instruments to the approved lists through a future RFQ process in the spring or summer of 2013. Districts will have the opportunity to share information about instrument changes through annual evaluation reporting procedures.

C. Regulations, Policy Decisions, and Communications About 2013-14

On March 6, 2013, the Department of Education plans to propose regulations to the State Board of Education providing rules for educator evaluation and professional development as outlined in the [TEACHNJ Act](#). These regulations are scheduled to become effective at the beginning of SY13-14 and will include greater details about several elements of evaluation, including:

- Calculation of the annual summative ratings for teachers, principals, assistant principals, and vice-principals;
- Observation requirements for teachers;
- Objective measures of student achievement for teachers of subjects and grades tested by the New Jersey Assessment of Skills and Knowledge (“NJ ASK”) as well as for teachers of non-tested grades and subjects;
- Measures of practice and student achievement for principals;
- Mentoring;
- Individualized professional development;
- Corrective action plans; and
- The role and duties of the School Improvement Panel.

The *tentative* 2013 timeline for State Board review of these proposed regulations is as follows:

Date	Action
March 6	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Regs proposed by NJDOE at State Board meeting • Public comment period begins (to submit comments, follow the “comments” link next to the proposed regs at http://www.state.nj.us/education/code/proposed/)
April 3	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Regs proposed for second discussion (including amendments incorporating State Board/public input, if applicable) • State Board to hear public testimony
May 1	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • State Board to discuss regs at proposal level
June 3	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Proposed code published • Beginning of 60-day comment period
August 2	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Close of 60-day comment period
September 4	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • State Board to consider final version of regs at adoption level
October 7	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Office of Administrative Law (OAL) to publish final regs • Final regs go into effect

When proposed regulations are presented to the State Board, the Department will launch a statewide outreach initiative to communicate information about evaluation requirements for 2013-14. Over the course of several weeks, we will conduct regional presentations, post a variety of resources on our website, and provide opportunities for educators and others to share questions and feedback. Materials for various audiences (teachers, principals, etc.) and on various topics (evaluation system overview, student achievement and teaching practice measures, training, etc.) will be available for districts to tailor and use. Any educator interested in providing input on topics to include in this outreach initiative should send an email to educatorevaluation@doe.state.nj.us.

D. Data Distribution: Growth and Course Roster Data

As part of the pilot stage of developing new evaluation systems, the Department is in the developmental stage of establishing growth measures for math and language arts teachers across the state. To prepare for statewide implementation of improved evaluations in 2013-14, we are conducting several steps to provide the highest possible quality growth data to all districts. More detail about these processes follows this list:

- All districts began providing Course Roster Submission data through NJSMART as of SY11-12. This data is used to link individual teachers to students as appropriate. In the coming weeks, all districts will receive reports summarizing the data they provided in their SY11-12 Course Roster Submission in order to improve this process for subsequent years.
- Using Course Roster Submission data and relevant Student Growth Percentile (SGP) scores from the 2011-12 NJ ASK, the Department calculated [median Student Growth Percentile \(mSGP\) scores](#) for qualifying individual teachers in Cohort 1 (2011-12) evaluation pilot districts. The mSGP scores were sent to the pilot districts earlier this

month, and those districts have been asked to examine the data and share questions, concerns, and any other feedback with the Department.

- All districts will provide Course Roster Submission data for SY12-13 at the end of this school year.
- The Department will use SY12-13 Course Roster Submission data and 2012-13 NJ ASK SGP scores to calculate mSGP scores for all qualifying teachers, and will provide that data to all districts in early 2014. Guidance on how teachers' mSGP scores will be used in calculating summative evaluation scores for SY13-14 will be provided in forthcoming regulations.

1. Measures of Growth for Students and Teachers

While each district is responsible for developing the contours of their new evaluation system, the state has committed to developing measures of student growth based on NJ ASK, where applicable, for students, teachers, schools, and districts. By using growth to calculate student outcomes, the Department recognizes that our students enter each grade level at different starting points with unique challenges. We believe we should focus on constant improvement at every point in the continuum of achievement, rather than merely how many students attain proficiency. This is a recommendation that we have heard continuously from educators, school and district leaders, and national experts, and we are committed to ensuring that achievement measures accurately and fairly account for growth.

New Jersey measures growth for an *individual student* by comparing the change in his or her NJ ASK achievement from one year to the next to that of all other students in the state who had similar historical results (the student's "academic peers"). This change in achievement is reported as Student Growth Percentile (SGP) and indicates how high or low that student's growth was as compared to that of his/her academic peers.

For a school or district, the SGPs for all students are compiled to identify the median Student Growth Percentile (mSGP) for the school or district. The mSGP is a representation of "average" growth for students in the school or district. Half of the students had growth percentiles higher than the median; half had lower. For an *individual teacher*, the score represents the mSGP for all of a given teacher's qualifying students in a school year. To calculate this score, the Department creates an ascending list of SGP scores of the qualifying students for an individual teacher. The median score on this list becomes that teacher's mSGP score.

2. Course Roster Submissions

Each district is required to use NJSMART to submit information detailing the assignment of students to individual teachers in a given school year. This Course Roster Submission is essential for attributing student growth to teachers, among other uses. After receiving roster data, the Department can link individual teachers to their identified students' SGPs to determine the [mSGP](#).

The quality of the mSGP data that the Department produces depends entirely on the accuracy of Course Roster Submissions by districts at the end of each school year. If students are attributed to a teacher incorrectly, that teacher's mSGP score will be incorrect.

Districts are responsible for ensuring that their data is accurate when submitted to NJSMART. Every year, from approximately mid-May to the end of June, a six-week “practice” submission window occurs for all NJSMART data submissions. This practice window gives districts sufficient time to prepare their data and reach out for technical assistance to the NJSMART Help Desk as needed. This helps to ensure district data meets the appropriate technical quality when the official submission window opens in the summer. We strongly encourage all districts to submit data in the practice window later this spring.

3. Distribution of Course Roster Submission Data to all Districts

If the new evaluation system had been in place for SY11-12, over 16,500 teachers statewide would have received [mSGP](#) data as one measure for their annual evaluation. In the coming weeks the Department will provide each district with a report summarizing their SY11-12 Course Roster Submission data. Our goal for this exercise is to help all districts better prepare for accurate Course Roster Submissions for SY12-13 and beyond.

Course Roster Submission summary reports will include the following:

- Names and Staff Member IDs (SMIDs) of all teachers who *would have received* mSGP data for the previous school year under the parameters of the new evaluation system;
 - *Please note: reports will not include the actual mSGP information, but simply a list of those to whom the data would apply, and*
 - *The Department has not calculated mSGP data for teachers in non-pilot districts, and thus we are unable to provide such information for SY11-12.*
- The overall percent proficient in math and language arts; and
- The district-level mSGP.

We encourage districts to use the summary reports to check the accuracy of your roster data. As part of this process, districts should consider developing systems to ensure that data submitted is thoroughly vetted. The following resource from the Data Quality Campaign, entitled: “Effectively Linking Teacher and Student Data,” might be helpful as you examine these processes: http://www.tsdl.org/resources/site1/general/White%20Papers/DQC_TSDL_7-27.pdf.

4. Distribution of Growth Data to Pilot Districts

Earlier this month we provided [mSGP](#) data to qualifying districts that participated in the SY11-12 teacher evaluation pilot. This data was only distributed to pilot districts that submitted student-teacher attribution link data through NJSMART, and we are working with all pilot districts to ensure their data submissions are complete and accurate. The purpose of this data distribution is to help pilot districts and the Department to learn more about this student achievement measure as part of the piloting process. The methodology used to provide this

mSGP data was employed for the purposes of the pilot, and is not intended to signal the methodology to be used in future years as such policy decisions will be proposed in forthcoming regulations.

Consistent with the objectives of the pilot *the state is not prescribing individual or school-based actions – either consequences or recognition – based on this data.* We have asked pilot districts to identify ways in which the data could inform individual teachers' professional development and to share these ideas – along with any other suggestions, concerns, and feedback – with the Department. If a pilot district chooses to use the data in any manner related to personnel actions, it must be done confidentially per N.J.S.A 18A:6-121(d).

5. Distribution of Growth Data to All Districts

Beginning with SY13-14, [mSGP](#) data for all qualifying teachers across the state will be provided to all districts not only as part of educator evaluations, but as a useful measure of students' academic progress. The Department will detail the use of mSGP scores in calculating teachers' summative evaluation ratings in forthcoming regulations. Lessons learned from the distribution of this data to our pilot districts will inform decisions, and we will share more information when it is available.

6. Additional Resources

As part of the [outreach initiative to be conducted this spring](#), we will provide additional information about growth measures for students and teachers in various formats. In the meantime, please view our FAQ at http://www.state.nj.us/education/genfo/faq/faq_eval.htm#growth or view the video about SGP methodology at <http://survey.pcgus.com/njgrowth/player.html>. If you have questions about this data and its use, please contact the Evaluation Office at educatorevaluation@doe.state.nj.us.

E. Professional Development Information

As communicated in a [December 18, 2012 broadcast memo](#), the professional development planning process at the school and district levels for SY13-14 will remain the same as it was for the SY12-13. However, instead of submitting the district professional development plan to the County Professional Development Board for review the chief school administrator should hold the district plan, pending action by the New Jersey State Board of Education and further guidance from the Department to be issued in the coming months. Please refer to the memo for more information.

As schools and districts consider enhancements to their professional development structures to support teacher and principal growth, creating sustained time for collaborative teams to meet during the school day is a key concern. The following resources, including sample elementary and secondary school schedules, can assist administrators in planning time to support a collaborative school culture focused on student outcomes:

- **Dr. R. Lynn Canady: School Scheduling Associates**
<http://schoolschedulingassociates.com/>
Sample schedules: <http://schoolschedulingassociates.com/cds.php>
- **All Things PLC (Resources Website for Solution-Tree**
www.allthingsplc.info
Sample schedules: <http://allthingsplc.info/tools/print.php#22>

For more information, please visit the Office of Professional Development website (<http://www.state.nj.us/education/profdev/pd/teacher/>) and direct any questions about professional development requirements to teachpd@doe.state.nj.us.

II. EVALUATION UPDATE FROM THE OFFICE OF CHARTER SCHOOLS

Every charter school must develop and implement a high-quality, rigorous educator evaluation system, which must be approved by their board of trustees (subject to the review and approval of the Commissioner). The Office of Charter Schools will review educator accountability within the parameters established by the Department's Performance Framework and develop and disseminate guidelines for the establishment of charter schools' educator effectiveness evaluation systems in the coming months. Please visit the [NJDOE Charter Schools Website](#) for more information.

III. 2012-13 EVALUATION PILOTS

A. Teacher Evaluation Pilot

Participants in the teacher evaluation pilot are conducting observations according to their selected teaching practice evaluation instruments. With training complete, many districts are focusing on inter-rater reliability, assessments for non-tested grades and subjects, and goal-setting. Many of the Cohort 1 districts (those that began piloting in 2011) are assisting the newer Cohort 2 districts by sharing lessons learned and strategies for successful implementation.

Districts are also committed to providing clear and frequent communication about evaluation activities. Many are using a variety of media – videos, email, in-person meetings, etc. – to share details and solicit feedback.

B. Principal Evaluation Pilot

In principal evaluation pilot districts, district administrators have participated in training opportunities to guide implementation of evaluation procedures, which include multiple school visits by each principal's evaluator and the use of newly adopted principal evaluation rubrics. Principals and superintendents are working together to identify measures of student learning that will connect to the year-end summative evaluation.

Districts are not only executing the requirements of the pilot, many are also devoting time to studying national research and examples. By learning more about best practices outside New Jersey, they are tackling implementation challenges with additional information and examples to improve their experiences.

C. **Spotlight from the Field: Haddonfield and Rockaway Township**

The **Haddonfield School District** continues to forge ahead in one of the most challenging areas of teacher evaluations: **calculating the summative rating**.

- The district has developed a specialized committee to examine how observational data and evidence of student learning can be combined to reach one overall summative rating.
 - An algorithmic approach allows for the differentiation of weights and measures and provides for the use of multiple measures of student learning to count towards each teacher’s summative evaluation.
 - Student learning outcomes will interface with ratings assigned from observational practice and the combined scored will be derived from a mathematical calculation and a four- point scale.
 - The committee includes administrators and teacher leaders who also serve on the District Evaluation Advisory Committee.
- To guide this process, the group worked to clarify some core district values prior to beginning complex decision-making. District Assistant Superintendent and Project Director Michael Wilson said “It has been important to clarify some of our key beliefs about teacher evaluation in Haddonfield. We affirmed the importance of seeing teacher evaluation as a formative process, recognized the high degree of collaboration and trust in the process, and restated our desire to keep the process as transparent as possible.”

Other districts can learn from the practice of creating such specialized subcommittees from their DEACs to tackle specific evaluation issues – and to affirm district values. Haddonfield’s example demonstrates a commitment to collaboration and transparency.

Rockaway Township School District is in the unique and challenging position of **training for and implementing new teacher and principal evaluations** in the current school year – and the district views this challenge as a positive.

- Superintendent Deborah Grefe stated, “By implementing teacher and principal evaluation frameworks at the same time, both groups have established significant camaraderie, which led to a positive culture around this initiative.”
- Following the initial vendor-sponsored training, turnkey trainers have each “adopted” a building, where they conduct monthly trainings.
- Principals have also completed training, including the selection of building-level student achievement goals that will link to each principal’s summative rating.
- The structure of faculty meetings has been altered so teachers and principals can collectively focus on the goals and requirements of each pilot.

As the majority of New Jersey districts prepare to implement new teacher and principal evaluations in the next school year, Rockaway's example highlights how the inherent links between these systems aid such efforts.

D. State and External Advisory Work

1. Evaluation Pilot Advisory Committee

The state Evaluation Pilot Advisory Committee (EPAC) has convened several times since the beginning of the school year. The two most recent sessions included:

- Focus groups to discuss lessons learned by pilot districts and EPAC members;
- Presentations on Student Growth Objectives, Student Growth Percentiles, school-wide measures, and elements of teaching practice; and
- Small group discussions to produce recommendations for decision points on the topics listed above. The Department is using these recommendations to help inform the forthcoming regulations.

In addition, an interim report detailing pilot activities and EPAC recommendations for 2011-12 is being finalized and will be published in the coming weeks.

2. External Researchers

Rutgers University has extended its agreement with the Department as the external researcher for the teacher evaluation pilot through 2012-13. Rutgers researchers shared some of their findings at the January EPAC meeting, and a report on their work thus far will be made public in the coming weeks and posted on the [evaluation website](#). The Department is now working with a researcher for the principal evaluation pilot and will communicate that information when available.

IV. OFFICE OF EVALUATION INFORMATION

We are continuing to update the educator evaluation website, and we invite you to visit <http://www.state.nj.us/education/evaluation> and view our [FAQ](#) for additional information. If you have questions that are not addressed in our communications or the FAQ, please call our Evaluation Help Line at 609-777-3788, or send them directly to our email inbox at educatorevaluation@doe.state.nj.us.

PS/TM/JP/E:\Communications\Memos\012213 Educator Evaluation Update-Final.doc

Attachment

c: Members, State Board of Education
Christopher Cerf, Commissioner
Senior Staff
Diane Shoener
Marie Barry

Karen Campbell
Mamie Doyle
Jeff Hauger
Robert Higgins
Mary Jane Kurabinski
Timothy Matheney
Peggy McDonald
Cathy Pine
Megan Snow
Ellen Wolock
Amy Ruck
Nancy Besant
William Firestone
Todd Kent
Joel Zarrow
CCCS Staff
Executive County Superintendents
Executive Directors of Regional Achievement Centers
Executive County School Business Administrators
Garden State Coalition of Schools
NJ LEE Group

Appendix A: Questions for February Reporting Survey

1. Does your district have a District Evaluation Advisory Committee (DEAC)?
 - Yes
 - NoIf no, please explain.
2. Evaluation Instruments:
 - a. Has your district chosen a teaching practice evaluation instrument?
 - If yes, select instrument from the list below
 - If no, please explain
 - b. Has your district chosen a principal practice evaluation instrument?
 - If yes, select instrument from the list below
 - If no, please explain
3. Ratings:
 - a. Does the teaching practice evaluation rubric include the following ratings: Highly Effective, Effective, Partially Effective, and Ineffective?
 - Yes
 - No
 - b. Does the principal practice evaluation rubric include the following ratings: Highly Effective, Effective, Partially Effective, and Ineffective?
 - Yes
 - No
4. Has the teaching practice evaluation instrument been field tested in your district or is it in the process of being field tested?
 - Yes
 - NoIf no, please explain
5. What percent of teachers have been fully trained in the teaching practice evaluation instrument?
(Whole Numbers)
6. What percent of evaluators have been fully trained in the teaching practice evaluation instrument?
(Whole Numbers)
7. Were teachers present at any of the evaluator training sessions?
 - Yes
 - No
8. Have you used or do you intend to use teachers as turnkey trainers for the teaching practice evaluation instrument?
 - Yes
 - No
9. How many of the schools in your district have formed the School Improvement Panel?