



New York State Education Department

APPR Monitoring

Summary Report

Buffalo Public Schools Site Visit
December 2, 2014

Date of Report: February 11, 2015

Table of Contents

Executive Summary	3
District Description	4
Student Demographics	4
Racial/Ethnic Origin	4
Attendance/Suspension Rates	4
Teacher Qualifications	4
Teacher Evaluation (2013-14 School Year).....	5
Teacher Evaluation (2012-13 School Year).....	5
Principal Evaluation (2013-14 School Year).....	5
Principal Evaluation (2012-13 School Year).....	5
Analysis.....	6
Processes for Developing and Completed SLOs	7
Developing High Quality SLOs.....	7
Communicating APPR to Stakeholders	11
Providing Data to Educators	11
Communicating with Stakeholders	12
Processes for Conducting and Completing the Other Measures of Effectiveness.....	15
Ensuring Timely Completion of the Other Measures Subcomponent	15
Monitoring of APPR Processes	18
Monitoring Fidelity of Implementation	18
Office of Teacher and Leader Effectiveness Recommendations	22
Appendix A.....	27
Appendix B.....	42
Appendix C.....	45

Executive Summary

Based on the staff evaluation data submitted to the Department for the 2012-13 school year, as well as communications between Department staff and the district and information contained in public reports, the New York State Education Department (NYSED) had serious concerns that Buffalo Public Schools (BPS) did not implement its approved APPR plan with fidelity in the 2012-13 school year.

As a result of these concerns, NYSED initiated an enhanced monitoring cycle for the 2013-14 and 2014-15 school years. The purpose of this monitoring was to determine the status of implementation in the 2013-14 school year, ensure that the problems that developed in the 2012-13 school year were not carrying over into the 2013-14 school year and beyond, and assist the district's new administration in identifying any issues that would prevent the full implementation of the APPR plan.

To date, this enhanced monitoring process has included auditing of documentation submitted by the district, a two-year APPR data analysis, and a formal monitoring site visit by NYSED. Based on all of the evidence collected, NYSED is releasing an APPR Monitoring Report. This report is divided into four overall areas related to proper implementation of the district's APPR plan:

- 1) processes for developing and completing SLOs;
- 2) communicating APPR to stakeholders;
- 3) processes for conducting and completing the Other Measures of Effectiveness subcomponent; and
- 4) monitoring of APPR processes

These overall areas are divided into smaller components intended to assess both the completeness and quality of implementation. In all instances, BPS was rated in the "red" rating category, which indicates that the Department has serious concerns that the district either is not currently implementing a component of its APPR plan or where evidence shows there are clear barriers that will impact the district's ability to implement its APPR plan with fidelity.

The issues that prevented BPS from fully implementing its approved APPR plan in the 2012-13 school year are numerous and severe such that they have created system-wide barriers to implementation. As a result, these issues carried over into the 2013-14 school year. Because of the severity of the issues we have identified, NYSED recommends a number of system-wide actions that must be taken by the district to ensure successful implementation of its APPR plan for this school year and beyond.

The current district leadership demonstrates an understanding of the issues that are preventing the district from fully implementing its approved APPR plan and has already identified ways in which the district is working to remedy the myriad issues. NYSED will continue its enhanced monitoring for the remainder of this school year and next year. If the findings in the report are not properly addressed by the district, the Department recommends a number of progressive interventions, culminating in the withholding or redirecting of funds to the district.

District Description

These data were collected from the 2012-13 School Report Card

Student Demographics

Number of Students	Eligible for Free Lunch	Eligible for Reduced Lunch	Limited English Proficient
30,750	23,270 (76%)	1,433 (5%)	3,670 (12%)

Racial/Ethnic Origin

American Indian or Alaskan Native	Black or African American	Hispanic or Latino	Asian/Native Hawaiian/Other Pacific Islander	White	Multiracial
388 (1%)	15680 (51%)	5,176 (17%)	1,994 (6%)	6,804 (22%)	708 (2%)

Attendance/Suspension Rates

Annual Attendance Rate	Student Suspensions
87%	6,159 (20%)

Teacher Qualifications

Percent No Valid Teaching Certificate	Percent Teaching Out of Certification	Turnover Rate for Teachers under 5 Years Experience	Turnover Rate all Teachers
1%	3%	22%	16%

Teacher Evaluation (2013-14 School Year)				
Presented as % by rating category	Composite Rating	State Growth or Other Comparable Measures	Locally-Selected Measures of Student Achievement	Other Measures of Educator Effectiveness
Highly-Effective	65%	46%	60%	63%
Effective	28%	44%	31%	32%
Developing	5%	6%	5%	4%
Ineffective	3%	4%	4%	0%

Teacher Evaluation (2012-13 School Year)				
Presented as % by rating category	Composite Rating	State Growth or Other Comparable Measures	Locally-Selected Measures of Student Achievement	Other Measures of Educator Effectiveness
Highly-Effective	59%	37%	51%	52%
Effective	32%	50%	39%	44%
Developing	5%	7%	5%	3%
Ineffective	4%	6%	5%	0%

Principal Evaluation (2013-14 School Year)*				
Presented as % by rating category	Composite Rating	State Growth or Other Comparable Measures	Locally-Selected Measures of Student Achievement	Other Measures of Educator Effectiveness
Highly-Effective	--	--	--	--
Effective	29%	78%	16%	49%
Developing	49%	10%	--	--
Ineffective	--	--	69%	--

Principal Evaluation (2012-13 School Year)*				
Presented as % by rating category	Composite Rating	State Growth or Other Comparable Measures	Locally-Selected Measures of Student Achievement	Other Measures of Educator Effectiveness
Highly-Effective	13%	--	21%	--
Effective	70%	79%	57%	58%
Developing	17%	11%	--	--
Ineffective	0%	--	--	--

* Data provided here are consistent with publicly reported data, available at <http://data.nysed.gov>. Dashes indicate data that have been suppressed in order to protect personally identifiable information.

Analysis

Based on the staff evaluation data submitted to the Department for the 2012-13 school year, as well as communications between Department staff and the district and information contained in public reports, the New York State Education Department (NYSED) had serious concerns that Buffalo Public Schools did not implement its approved APPR plan with fidelity in the 2012-13 school year. As a result of these concerns, NYSED initiated an enhanced monitoring cycle for the 2013-14 and 2014-15 school years. The purpose of this monitoring was to determine the status of implementation in the 2013-14 school year, ensure that the problems that developed in the 2012-13 school year were not carrying over into the 2013-14 school year and beyond, and assist the district's new administration in identifying any issues that would prevent the full implementation of the APPR plan.

The information contained in this report is based on the formal submission of documentation to the Department on September 26, 2014, communications between district staff and staff from the Office of Teacher and Leader Effectiveness, data that were submitted to the Department by the district for the October 17th deadline, and information collected during the December 2, 2014 site visit.

The report is divided into four overall areas related to proper implementation of the district's APPR plan:

- 1) processes for developing and completing SLOs;
- 2) communicating APPR to stakeholders;
- 3) processes for conducting and completing the Other Measures of Effectiveness subcomponent; and
- 4) monitoring of APPR processes

These overall areas are divided into smaller components intended to assess both the completeness and quality of implementation. Each component is assigned one of three color ratings:

- green, which indicates a high likelihood that the district is implementing its APPR plan with fidelity;
- yellow, which indicates that the district is undertaking promising practices, but where the Department has concerns and feels that continued monitoring and adjustment may be necessary to ensure full implementation; or
- red, which indicates that the Department has serious concerns that the district either is not currently implementing a component of its APPR plan or where evidence shows there are clear barriers that will impact the district's ability to implement its APPR plan with fidelity.

Processes for Developing and Completed SLOs

Developing High Quality SLOs	
Standard	The district should have a process in place to ensure that Student Learning Objectives (SLOs) are appropriately rigorous and used to drive student improvement. Training and guidance should be provided to educators on the selection and development of assessments used for the SLO and SLO growth targets. Further, these efforts should be tailored to support college and career ready standards.
Technical Assistance Resources	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • SLO Field Samples from Year 2 Implementation (2013-14) provide annotated examples of high quality SLOs that use multiple sources of baseline data and illustrate the interdependent nature of learning content, assessment, and instructional practice through their rationale statements. • The Draft Multi-State SLO Rubric can be used to measure the quality of the information provided by educators on the NYS SLO Template. • The Student Learning Objectives Landing Page on EngageNY contains a number of resources on developing high quality SLOs that can be used to drive student improvement.
Areas of Concern	
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • The district does not have processes in place to ensure that SLOs are rigorous or used to improve student achievement. • The district does not provide support to educators or evaluators on developing high quality SLOs, selecting assessments for SLOs, or setting SLO targets. • The district does not provide targeted support to administrators where concerns arise surrounding SLO development or implementation. • Few SLO samples have performance targets that are defined based on multiple measures of student performance. • SLO samples do not illustrate that targets are ambitious, measure growth, and/or help ensure students are prepared to advance in future coursework (e.g., require students to exceed past performance, demonstrate a year’s worth of growth, or achieve some other significant outcome). 	

There is significant confusion in Buffalo Public Schools surrounding the development of SLOs. The sample SLOs that were provided by the district ahead of the site visit presented a number of very serious concerns (see Appendix A):

- In many cases, there were a number of students on the course roster who did not have any baseline data or growth targets set for them. This directly contradicts the requirement that SLOs in the Growth or Other Comparable Measures subcomponent measure growth for all students on a teacher’s class roster.

- Where growth targets were set, they often seemed unrelated to students' baseline performance levels. In fact, a number of records show growth targets lower than students' baseline performance levels and so it is unclear if these targets are measuring growth.
- Almost universally, the rationale section was used to explain why students could not meet growth targets instead of providing the reasoning behind the choices regarding learning content, evidence, and target and how they will be used together to prepare students for future growth and development in subsequent grades/courses, as well as college and career readiness. As one principal explained it, "if a teacher can justify it [referring to the negative growth targets], how can you penalize them?" This question and the information provided in the SLOs shows a clear lack of understanding about the purpose of the rationale section of the SLO.

Throughout our site visit, we took the opportunity to question teachers, principals, Chiefs of School Leadership, and Assistant Superintendents about their familiarity with the SLO process. From these interviews, we made a number of findings:

- Universally, the only training required by the district on SLOs was a "three hour PowerPoint presentation." This presentation was informational only and did not include a workshop or any other interactive component. While principals indicated that there were occasionally support webinars, these are voluntary and are not well attended. When speaking to teachers, they similarly expressed frustration about the "guessing game" of setting targets for their SLOs and the inability of their evaluators to assist them with this process. In fact, teachers and principals whom we spoke to indicated that they were advised to set targets on a 1-4 scale similar to the State's performance levels and to include decimals in those values (e.g., a target of 3.2). However, the PGS system that is used for completing SLOs and determining whether targets were met does not account for decimals, which results in students being identified as not meeting targets when they actually might have. Based on our conversations with district staff, principals, and teachers it appears that the lack of training on developing SLOs and using the online data platform are issues that began in the 2012-13 school year.
- Principals consistently noted that there are no district level expectations for developing SLOs. In fact, a number of principals noted that they were asked by district administration to approve teacher set growth targets, even where they felt that those targets were not appropriate. Similarly, a number of principals indicated that if teachers refused to participate in developing SLOs, they did not have the power to set growth targets on their behalf and so no SLOs were developed for these teachers. This directly contradicts the information contained in the district's APPR plan and the documentation that was submitted to us prior to the site visit, both of which give final approval of SLO targets to the principal. Further, by not ensuring that SLOs were ever developed or completed for these teachers, the district failed to ensure that evaluations were completed for all teachers subject to APPR. This directly contradicts the assurances made in the APPR Certification Form that is part of the district's approved APPR plan as well as the

Implementation Certification Form that the superintendent and board of education president sign each school year as a condition for the district’s State aid increase. The principals with whom we spoke as well as district staff who were still in administrative positions in the new district leadership team noted that these issues stem from the 2012-13 school year and are the result of a misunderstanding by the previous administrative team and the teacher’s union about the requirements of SLOs.

- We consistently heard that SLOs have become “a numbers game” where teachers are more concerned with maximizing the number of points they earn, rather than using SLOs as a tool to drive instruction. As one principal put it, it is hard to tell whether students are achieving “because of or in spite of their teachers.”
- Principals noted that they felt like the district was still struggling with the implementation side of the APPR process and was not providing them with any opportunities to collaborate and problem solve with their colleagues.

Implementing SLOs with Fidelity	
Standard	The district should be able to articulate the exact number of SLOs that are required in a particular school year. A process should be in place that ensures all required SLOs are completed near the beginning of a teacher’s course. This process should address SLOs that, for any reason, were not completed near the beginning of a teacher’s course. Sample SLOs provided to the Department should be complete, with appropriate information entered for all sections of the SLO.
Technical Assistance Resources	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • The Student Learning Objective Guidance Document provides resources and guidance on creating and implementing SLOs consistent with statutory and regulatory requirements. • Section D of the APPR Guidance Document also provides guidance from the Department on SLO rules for teachers and principals. • The Student Learning Objectives Landing Page on EngageNY contains a number of resources on developing high quality SLOs that can be used to drive student improvement.
Areas of Concern	
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • The district does not have sufficient processes in place to identify all educators who require SLOs and ensure that their SLOs are developed. • The district is unable to articulate the exact number of educators who required SLOs for the 2013-14 or 2014-15 school years. • For the 2013-14 and 2014-15 school years, the district was not able to ensure that all educators who required SLOs developed them near the start of their courses. • Sample SLOs were not completed using the appropriate information for all components of the State’s SLO template. 	

During the 2013-14 school year, the district did not have SLOs completed for a significant number of its teachers. In speaking with the Assistant Superintendents and Chiefs of School

Leadership during the site visit, it was revealed there have been a number of problems with the various data systems that are used to track whether teachers are subject to evaluation under §3012-c of the Education Law as well as the courses for which they need to develop SLOs. These issues are an extension of the issues that led to incomplete staff evaluation data in the 2012-13 school year. This confirms the information that was provided to the Department on numerous occasions by the Supervising Principal of APPR and the Assistant Superintendent of Shared Accountability.

Similarly, in preparation for our site visit, we requested current year SLOs for teachers whose classrooms we were to visit. After repeated requests for this information, we were provided with these SLOs; however, they contained student information and assessments for the 2013-14 school year rather than the current school year. What's more, they referenced the anticipated decline in performance due to the first year of the Common Core State assessments – these were first administered in the 2012-13 school year. When asked why these SLOs contained information from the prior two school years, the Assistant Superintendent of Shared Accountability stated that when she went into their online system, these were the SLOs that were present and that neither she nor anyone else would be able to answer this question. She also indicated that due to continuing issues with their data platform, a significant number of teachers had not developed SLOs by the date of our site visit and that they would not do so until a district set deadline of December 19th. Indeed, we were informed by the Assistant Superintendent that class rosters were only preliminary entered in the PGS data system as of that morning. This directly contradicts the information provided to the Department, which stated that teachers would develop SLOs within the first five weeks of their course.

In addition to difficulties with the district's data systems, the widespread confusion about the need to set SLO targets for all students on a course roster as well as the ability of principals to set growth targets where teachers refuse to develop SLOs has contributed to teachers not having SLOs, having a number of students excluded from the SLOs, and/or having targets of negative growth. Further, in one of the sample SLOs that was provided by the district to the Department, there was a statement by a teacher indicating that the SLO for the Local subcomponent was signed under duress, that the teacher had not been properly trained to complete the SLO, and that he considers "...any adverse consequences resulting from this LMA a violation of [his] rights under the Collective Bargaining agreement and *other agreements* (emphasis added) between the BTF and Board of Education/School District." Based on this statement, our interviews with a number of principals who suggested that the district and the union often place pressure on principals to approve SLOs that are not rigorous, and previous correspondence with the district regarding side agreements with its teachers union to hold teachers harmless, we have significant concerns that the district and teachers union are still utilizing side agreements entered into in the 2012-13 school year, despite explicit guidance by the Department not to do so.

Communicating APPR to Stakeholders

Providing Data to Educators	
Standard	<p>Data systems should be able to provide educators (both teachers and principals) with data on student performance, teacher performance (e.g., observation/SLO results), and principal performance (e.g., school visit/SLO results) as needed/allowable under the law. This information should be available in a timely and easy to use manner and should be able to be disaggregated at multiple levels. Concerning observations and school visits, the district should have a process that promotes timely and constructive feedback from evaluators to educators. The district should provide educators with resources that demonstrate instructional expectations and highly effective practice (e.g., a video library, training on best practices, etc.) Where applicable, differentiated resources should be provided to educators on TIPS/PIPs/PPDPs.</p>
Technical Assistance Resources	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • The Data Quality Campaign’s 10 Essential Elements of Statewide Longitudinal Data Systems provides an overview of key elements necessary to successfully implement statewide evaluation systems. The recommendations here can be tailored to support implementation at the district level. • The MET Project report on Gathering Feedback for Teaching discusses the need for LEAs to collect accurate and reliable data related to observations, student achievement, and student growth and to share that data with educators in a timely manner in order to inform teacher practice that drives improved student achievement outcomes. • The Carnegie Foundation’s report on Enhancing the Impact of Post-Observation Feedback discusses the importance of collecting data on teacher observations and using that data as part of a cycle of targeted feedback to help improve educator practice. • The Professional Development Turnkey Kit on Data Driven Instruction on EngageNY contains a number of resources that districts can use to train educators and administrators on using DDI to adjust and tailor their practice throughout the year to ensure that students are meeting their goals.
<p>Highlights</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Educators have access to formative and summative assessment data for their students through electronic platforms. <p>Areas of Concern</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Educators do not have access to data related to their observations during the school year (e.g., observation reports, ratings on the practice rubric). • Data are not consistently available to educators in a timely and easy to use throughout the school year. 	

- The process for providing feedback to educators on their practice is minimal and is not aligned with the district’s professional development opportunities.
- The district does not have processes in place for providing educators with timely and constructive feedback on their practice throughout the school year.

According to the documentation submitted by Buffalo Public Schools, there are two forms of feedback that evaluators provide to teachers. For informal observations, the district’s aspirational goal is for educators to receive feedback within 24 hours. In speaking with principals, it appears that this process is generally followed, though no oversight or support is provided by the district to ensure that this happens consistently. Further, principals were not consistently able to articulate exactly how they provide feedback or if that feedback is aligned to the NYSUT rubric. When pressed further about providing feedback to teachers and aligning that feedback with professional development opportunities that are provided by the district, principals expressed frustration surrounding the inability to require teachers to attend professional development, even where it is aligned to areas that have been identified as needing improvement. As they noted, under the existing collective bargaining agreement, teachers are not obligated to attend professional development or other activities that fall outside of their normal work hours. District scheduled professional development almost always occurs in the afternoons and on weekends. Thus, principals have no power to require that teachers attend any of these sessions. It is important to note that in some buildings across the district, principals have developed building-wide expectations for their teachers and have created a culture whereby teachers choose to participate in these offerings in order to improve their practice. However, the district administration has not been able to disseminate these practices across buildings.

The second form of feedback that is provided to educators is the feedback from formal observations. Rather than creating a feedback cycle throughout the year, the district process is for principals to provide feedback after the two required formal observations occur, which may not happen until late in the year. Ratings on the NYSUT rubric are never compared to student achievement outcomes, nor do evaluators look at student work across those teachers whom they evaluate to help identify consistent standards for all educators in their buildings. Here again, the district has not provided professional development to principals on their role as evaluators and instructional leaders for their buildings.

Communicating with Stakeholders	
Standard	There should be a systematic approach for allowing educators (both teachers and principals) to raise concerns about their district’s approved APPR plan as well as the implementation of their own APPRs. Further, the district should have a process in place to address and/or consider these concerns. In some cases, the district may have taken formal steps (e.g., submitted a material change request to NYSED) to address large scale issues. Additionally, district administration should have processes in place for communicating the status of APPR implementation to the Board of Education.
Technical Assistance Resources	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • The Teacher and Leader Evaluation Roadmap from Education Counsel provides case studies on using stakeholder feedback to make continuous improvements to evaluation systems.

	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> The Reform Support Network Communications Toolkit includes guidance and resource on communicating with stakeholders about the evaluation system.
<p>Highlights</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> For the 2014-15 school year, the district indicates that it has developed a “Professional Council” where representatives of the teachers and administrators union can bring concerns to the district. For the 2014-15 school year, the district indicates that the Superintendent and Supervising Principal of APPR have monthly committee meetings to discuss APPR with the board of education. <p>Areas of Concern</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> The district does not have any formal processes for using educator feedback to make decisions regarding APPR. The Supervising Principal of APPR is currently a vacant position in the district, so it is unclear if the board of education is still receiving consistent updates on the status of APPR implementation. Based on interviews with the Chief Academic Officer, Chiefs of School Leadership, and other district officials, it is unclear if the Professional Council is meeting regularly. It is also unclear if the monthly committee meetings with the board of education are occurring. 	

Prior to the 2014-15 school year, the district did not have any processes in place for educators to formally present concerns to district administrators on the evaluation system. Similarly, there were no processes in place for district administrators to convey concerns regarding APPR matters to the board of education. In its September 26th submission of documentation, the district indicated that it had developed new processes for the 2014-15 school year that would enable educators to raise concerns to the district and for the district to regularly report on the status of APPR to the board of education. However, during the December 2nd site visit, district administrators revealed that the September 26th submission, which was drafted by the Supervising Principal of APPR, was intended as a “proposed action plan” and so the majority of the information that was provided in that documentation was not actually being implemented at the district level. Thus, it is unclear if the district actually has processes for stakeholders to raise concerns regarding APPR implementation and when this will actually be implemented.

Additionally, the only example that district administration was able to provide of using educator feedback to adjust implementation related to the complexity of PGS, one of the data systems used to track implementation, develop SLOs, and maintain information related to the Other Measures subcomponent. However, according to the Assistant Superintendent of Shared Accountability, the district continues to have issues with the PGS platform despite regular meetings with the vendor. According to the Assistant Superintendent of Shared Accountability and the Chiefs of School Leadership, issues with this system are what led to delays in the creation of SLOs in the 2014-15 school year, and so, at the time of our visit, it appears that the district has yet to resolve educator concerns around this issue.

A further issue that arose in interviews with district officials and principals surrounds the lack of consistent communication between the various stakeholder groups involved with APPR. A

number of principals informed us that the teachers union and the district negotiate matters related to APPR “all of the time,” but exclude principals from the process. More than one principal who we spoke to noted that the district initially gave principals the power to approve or reject SLO targets for teachers. However, when targets are rejected or a teacher and principal cannot agree to a target, principals are often required to attend conferences with district staff, the teacher, and a representative of the teachers union where they are asked to approve the teacher’s targets. Principals noted that they felt that the teachers union and the district had reached an agreement about this because of the way it is handled, but that this was never communicated directly to principals or their union. Based on the feedback we received from principals, it is unclear if the Professional Council, which is supposed to bring members of the district administration, teachers union, and administrative union together to discuss issues surrounding APPR, is being used to address these concerns.

Additionally, the information provided to us by the district indicated that the Superintendent and Supervising Principal of APPR are responsible for reporting to the board of education on the status of APPR implementation at monthly committee meetings. However, the Supervising Principal of APPR is a vacant position in the district, and so it is unclear if the Board of Education is receiving any updates on APPR at its monthly meetings.

Processes for Conducting and Completing the Other Measures of Effectiveness

Ensuring Timely Completion of the Other Measures Subcomponent

Standard	<p>The district should have policies and procedures in place to ensure that all teacher and principal observations/school visits, and any additional measures utilized to derive subcomponent scores, occur in the manner specified in the approved APPR plan. Correspondingly, there should be a system in place to monitor the completion of all necessary activities by the end of the school year. Further, the district should be able to describe the training that is received by all evaluators and lead evaluators to address the nine areas specified in §30-2.9(b) of the Rules of the Board of Regents, how those trainings specifically align with the local determinations made for completing the Other Measures subcomponent, and how often those training are offered to ensure that new evaluators can be trained and certified as needed and existing evaluators can remain calibrated and re-certified as needed.</p>
Technical Assistance Resources	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • The MET Project’s brief on Foundations of Observation discusses the need for evaluation systems that consistently and accurately score teachers during classroom observations. It also provides information on developing processes for training, certifying, and calibrating evaluators. • The MET Project’s brief on Building Trust in Observations provides additional information around the need to properly train and calibrate evaluators in order to improve evaluation systems. • TNTP’s report on Fixing Classroom Observations includes recommendations for using teacher practice rubrics as part of a system of continuous improvement and how to align those rubrics to Common Core Learning Standards.
<p>Areas of Concern</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • The district is unable to identify the exact number of observations/school visits that must be completed for all educators for the current school year. • The district does not require buildings to develop calendars or other processes to ensure that each building is on track to meet required deadlines. • The districts own APPR implementation calendar is not in use because the dates specified in the calendar conflict with other district priorities. • The district does not have any processes in place to monitor observations and school visits to ensure fidelity or quality. • Observations are not completed for all teachers by the end of the school year • The district does not review Other Measures subcomponent documentation for quality • It is unclear if the district has a process for calibrating evaluators or ensuring that their ratings are accurate. • It is unclear if all lead evaluators that are completing APPRs have been certified prior to 	

the end of the school year.

Based on the information that was provided by the district on September 26th concerning the training and certification of evaluators by Teaching Learning Solutions (Appendix B), it appears that only approximately 20% of evaluators in the district were fully certified to conduct evaluations based on the vendor's criteria. When district administrators were questioned about this document during the site visit, they indicated that they were unaware of it. When asked for additional information about the local procedures that the district uses to certify its evaluators, the district indicated that so long as an evaluator completes the training, they will be certified by the district to conduct evaluations. Similarly, when asked about specific records that showed evaluators with as low as 17% discrete item accuracy, district administrators indicated that they had no threshold requirement for rater accuracy in order to be certified or recertified to complete evaluations. Additionally, there were a number of evaluators whose records were marked as not completing calibration and for whom no training records were provided. It was unclear if these evaluators would be completely certified prior to the end of the school year. As principals and district staff consistently noted, the training and certification process has been in place since the 2012-13 school year and reflects what was collectively bargained between the district and the teacher's union at that time.

Principals confirmed the inadequacy of the processes that the district uses to train and certify its evaluators. They noted that following their training with Teaching Learning Solutions (TLS), they received a letter that specified the areas where they were rating consistently enough to be certified and areas where they needed continuing practice to improve their performance. However, rather than provide additional training and support, principals were instead instructed by the district to conduct a "self-reflection" on their performance. While the district noted that it was going to follow-up with additional training based on the broad areas that were identified as needing improvement, that follow-up training had not happened by the time of our site visit, and it was unclear if the district had any plans to offer further training in the near future.

Similarly, when asked about their own evaluations, which are conducted by the Chiefs of School Leadership, principals noted that there is a lack of expertise on the part of the Chiefs surrounding the Marshall rubric and its use in evaluating principals. A number of principals noted that their evaluations consisted of them setting three instructional goals to implement in their building. It was unclear to all parties how these goals were then translated into scores on the Marshall rubric. As one principal put it, the evaluation consisted of a self-reflection, with him looking "at where I was last year and where I want to be this year." It was unclear what support or guidance is provided by the Chiefs to help principals implement their goals or improve as building leaders. As one principal noted, the day of our site visit, December 2nd, was the first time that he had seen his evaluator all year.

In addition to a lack of training and support from the district for evaluators on their role in the evaluation process, there is also a lack of processes at the district level to ensure that all necessary observations and school visits are completed and properly documented by the end of each school year. First, neither the Chiefs of School Leadership nor anyone in the district administration reviews the documentation that is completed by teacher or principal evaluators for the Other Measures subcomponent. When asked about the process for reviewing this

documentation, the Assistant Superintendent for Shared Accountability said that this information is uploaded by evaluators electronically through the PGS, where it is then available for teachers and principals to view. No one at the district level reviews this information. Similarly, the Chiefs who were present said that they do not look at this documentation in relation to the principals who they are charged with evaluating, despite the fact that they are responsible for oversight of the APPR process. Second, the district has been consistently unable to identify the number of observations and school visits that need to be completed in a given school year. This was an issue in the 2013-14 school year and has continued into the current school year, raising serious concerns about the district's ability to ensure that all teachers and principals subject to evaluation are being evaluated according to the approved APPR plan. As we noted in our review of the district's SLO processes, this inability is likely due to the issues with the district's data system for tracking which educators are subject to evaluation. Third, while the district provided us with a district-wide calendar that specified when certain components of the evaluation system should be completed, they do not require buildings to develop their own calendars or use the district's calendar. Even more surprisingly, the Chiefs and Assistant Superintendents actually noted that the calendar provided to us, which was first developed in the 2012-13 school year, was not currently being used in the district because it contained dates that "conflicted with other district priorities." It was unclear why the calendar was developed using dates that conflicted with other existing district priorities. While they acknowledged the importance of having such a calendar and indicated that they would work to develop a revised version, no timeframe was provided for when this work would happen.

Monitoring of APPR Processes

Monitoring Fidelity of Implementation

Standard	<p>The district should have a monitoring process in place to ensure that the evaluation system complies with the law and regulations. This process should cover all facets of evaluation and should be overseen by staff members who are dedicated to this work. These individuals should receive training on the requirements of their district’s APPR plan. Further, data systems should be in place for collecting and reporting evaluation data. The district must be able to provide all educators with their composite scores and ratings by September 1 and should be able to ensure that all educators who require a TIP/PIP receive one within 10 days of the start of the school year. Additionally, the district should be able to clearly articulate how APPR is used as a “significant factor” in employment-related decisions.</p>
Technical Assistance Resources	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • The APPR Guidance Document is a comprehensive resource for districts on the statutory and regulatory requirements of the APPR system. • Harvard University’s Strategic Data Project has developed a comprehensive toolkit on Effective Data Use that provides guidance on using evaluation data to support human capital decisions related to professional development, hiring, retention, and tenure. • AIR’s Center on Great Teachers and Leaders has developed a series of Professional Learning Modules intended to help build district capacity in developing and implementing evaluation systems.
<p>Highlights</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • The district employs a Chief Academic Officer, a Supervising Principal of APPR (currently vacant), and Chiefs of School Leadership to monitor APPR implementation at the building and district level. <p>Areas of Concern</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • The Supervising Principal of APPR, who is in charge of most district APPR oversight, was removed from that position and a replacement has not been identified. • Chiefs of School Leadership, who are responsible for oversight of implementation across buildings, report that at the time of the visit they had not been properly trained on the district’s SLO, Local Measures, or Other Measures of Effectiveness processes. • The district has a number of different data systems that are intended to collect information and track the status of implementation throughout the year, but these systems are prone to error and at the time of the visit, the district has been unable to work with its vendors to ensure that the systems are functioning properly. • The district was unable to provide composite scores and ratings to all educators subject to evaluation under §3012-c of the Education Law by the September 1 deadline. • It is unclear if the district has processes in place to ensure that all educators who require 	

TIPs/PIPs receive them within 10 days of the start of the school year.

- It appears that the district failed to provide a number of teachers with TIPs within 10 days of the start of the school year.

On paper, the district appears to have the ability to track and monitor the completion of APPRs throughout the school year. According to district administrators, there are data systems that:

- identify which teachers are subject to evaluation under §3012-c of the Education Law;
- collect and track SLO and Local Measure development and completion electronically for all teachers and principals that are subject evaluation;
- collect and track observations and school visits throughout the school year;
- collect and track Teacher and Principal Improvement Plans; and
- compile scores and ratings so that they can be reported by statutory deadlines

Despite all of these systems, the district has been unable to meet a number of statutory and regulatory requirements. The most serious concerns we identified were:

- Despite a number of adjustments over the last few years, the district's system for identifying educators that are subject to evaluation under APPR is consistently unable to do so accurately. According to district administrators, this has led to teachers not developing SLOs until very close to the end of the school year or at all in prior school years. Correspondingly, this has also created situations where observations were not able to be completed by the end of the school year. This appears to be the reason that the district has been unable to provide complete data to the Department for all educators in prior school years.
- At the time of our site visit, the district was still in the process of identifying educators who were subject to evaluation for the current school year, and it was unclear whether this process would be completed by the end of the first semester. This raises serious concerns about whether observations can be completed by the end of the school year and whether SLOs can be completed for all educators who require them (e.g., teachers of semester length courses).
- At the time of our site visit, course rosters had just been preliminary loaded into the PGS data system, and district administrators indicated that these rosters would have to be verified and adjusted before they were completely accurate. Thus, even in cases where the district is aware that an educator is subject to evaluation under APPR, that educator is not able to officially start examining baseline data and writing SLOs until December. In prior communication, the district indicated that all SLOs were set within the first five weeks of the start of classes. However, the evidence on the site visit indicated this was not the case. In speaking with teachers and principals, they indicated that they often attempt to gather baseline data and start creating growth targets even before the district's online platform is available because they recognize the importance of having SLOs completed near the start of their courses.
- The district was unable to provide composite scores and ratings to certain educators by September 1, 2014. In fact, at the time of our site visit, we were told by principals and teachers that scores and ratings had been recalculated on multiple occasions, and that this was very common in the district. Thus, teachers

were well into the 2014-15 school year and were still unaware of their actual score and rating for the 2013-14 school year. Both principals and teachers noted their frustration with this process and expressed their concern about the validity of any scores and ratings that are provided by the district office because of the constant changes and recalculations, which are never explained to the parties. One principal noted that he has had to take teachers on and off of improvement plans numerous times, which has created an attitude of distrust on the part of affected educators toward the district office.

- The district was unable to provide certain educators who were rated Developing or Ineffective in the 2013-14 school year with a Teacher or Principal Improvement Plan within 10 days of the start of the 2014-15 school year. Even more concerning, it appears that the district did not have any intention of doing so as they chose to implement a “safety net” that provided for alternate scores and ratings that were not calculated based on the approved APPR plan. They did so despite numerous written and verbal communications with the Department where they were explicitly told not to do so. During our site visit, we received a correspondence (Appendix C) that was provided to all principals by the district that informed them of this recalculation, told them that they should not develop TIPs for affected teachers, and that a district deadline for TIP development was set for September 17th (7 days after the statutory deadline). When questioned about this, the Assistant Superintendent of Shared Accountability indicated that more than 100 teachers may have been impacted by this correspondence. The district was currently in the process of auditing its records to determine the total number of teachers who were impacted and to proceed with developing Improvement Plans for those necessary.

The district employs a Chief Academic Officer, a Supervising Principal of APPR (currently vacant), two Assistant Superintendents, and many Chiefs of School Leadership who have been tasked with monitoring APPR implementation at the building and district level. In speaking with these individuals, we consistently heard that their job overseeing APPR was “new” and that they were “still struggling with the implementation” of the district’s plan. These individuals expressed to us that they had only received minimal training on their role, and that they were still confused about “what is meant by rigor, what the regulations and rules require, and what the expectation is for them when auditing and reviewing the district’s implementation.” According to principals and the Chiefs of School Leadership, prior to the current school year, the district had done little to articulate the role of the Chiefs in the APPR process or to provide them with training. This is especially concerning given that the district is in its third year of implementing the same APPR plan.

Further, when questioned about the communication we received surrounding Teacher Improvement Plans and the inability of the district to provide us with the number of teachers and principals on improvement plans, the Assistant Superintendent of Shared Accountability informed us that they were only now going through PGS on a teacher-by-teacher basis to identify who should be on a TIP/PIP, and that the district still needed to establish a process for monitoring TIPs/PIPs and setting an internal deadline for their submission and development. She

indicated that they were hoping to use this coming summer to review all aspects of the APPR plan to ensure that they are able to fully implement their plan in future years.

Office of Teacher and Leader Effectiveness Recommendations

Given the severity and number of concerns surrounding the district's implementation of the approved APPR plan, the Office of Teacher and Leader Effectiveness makes the following recommendations in an effort to address the system-wide issues that have led to the concerns identified in this report. The issues we have identified are multidimensional and stretch across all facets of APPR implementation. A number of actions must be taken to create a pathway for the district to successfully implement its APPR plan.

1. The Commissioner should consider progress interventions that if not adequately addressed, could culminate in the withholding or redirecting of the portion of Title IIA funding allocated to providing professional development activities that improve the knowledge of teachers and principals and improve the quality of principals.

Based on the information provided by the district, there are very few standards or expectations for developing and reviewing SLOs. As reported above, SLOs provided to the Department by the district contain information that is copied and pasted across multiple school years, do not have rationales that explain how teachers will ensure growth for all students, include targets of negative growth, and do not account for all students on teachers' course rosters (see Appendix A). This is concerning as it is unclear how the district is ensuring that all students grow each school year and have an opportunity to succeed as they progress through the school system.

Similarly, there are no district expectations for the level of accuracy or calibration of evaluators who are charged with assessing the effectiveness of a teacher's practice in the classroom. Research consistently shows that accurate ratings on teacher practice rubrics, when combined with targeted feedback, can allow teachers to improve their practice. This improved practice is correlated to improved student achievement outcomes. By not having a system in place that promotes accurate ratings or feedback to teachers, the district is losing an incredible opportunity to grow its teachers and ensure that students are able to succeed. This lack of training extends to principal evaluators, and impacts the ability of each building in Buffalo Public Schools to have a strong leader.

Given the inability of the district to implement an evaluation system that helps improve educator practice and thereby ensures that students are able to grow toward college and career ready standards, the Commissioner should consider progress interventions that if not adequately addressed, could result in withholding or redirecting Title IIA funds related to providing professional development to teachers and principals as a future step to ensuring that the district is able to use the federal resources that are available to it in a purposeful and effective manner. With guidance and assistance from the Department, Buffalo Public Schools must first develop a cohesive plan for using these funds to ensure that it has an evaluation system that promotes improved student achievement outcomes and improves the knowledge and quality of teachers and principals.

2. The Superintendent should appoint independent validators to help monitor ratings on the

NYSUT rubric and provide elbow coaching to principals. Validators should come from outside of the district, should be selected based on their expertise, and should be supervised by the Chief Academic Officer.

Throughout our site visit, we were consistently informed by district administration, principals, and teachers that no one in the district has received sufficient training on the use of the teacher or principal practice rubrics. This information confirmed the record provided by the district which showed evaluators with accuracy as low as 17%, evaluators who did not complete calibration, and evaluators who did not meet the preliminary certification level set by the vendor. Despite all of this, we were told by district administrators that anyone who completed training, regardless of their performance or level of accuracy, was certified and recertified to complete evaluations. Relatedly, principals and Chiefs of School Leadership expressed to us that the district does not provide them adequate training on providing feedback to the educators whom they are responsible for evaluating.

Research consistently shows that in order for observations to be effective, they must be accurate and part of a system of continuous feedback and improvement. The principals that we interviewed by and large understood the value of using the rubric and providing feedback to educators, but were very frustrated about the lack of training and support that the district provides. The majority of them want to do the work well, but no one is supporting them in doing so.

By bringing in independent validators who are experts in the work of using rubrics and providing feedback to educators, and enabling them to provide one-on-one coaching and support to principals as they conduct their observations and provide feedback, principals will receive the necessary training to conduct observations accurately and provide effective feedback to teachers. This, in turn, will enable them to be instructional leaders in their buildings. All of this work is necessary to ensuring that students are on a trajectory to be college and career ready when they leave Buffalo Public Schools.

3. Revise the district's processes for developing and approving SLOs.

The current processes for developing and approving SLOs have reduced SLOs to a compliance exercise. Based on the information we received, the district has no expectations and provides no oversight for SLOs. Among the concerns we identified were SLOs that did not account for all students on a teacher's course roster, targets that provided for negative growth, and SLOs that were completed using information that was up to two school years old. Additionally, these SLOs are not being developed near the start of teachers' courses and so cannot be used to drive instruction throughout the school year. Clearly, the systems that are currently in place are not leading to SLOs that comply with regulations or NYSED guidance.

In order to ensure that SLOs are appropriately rigorous and useful in guiding a teacher's instruction throughout the school year, we recommend:

- SLOs must be set by the first week of November of each school year for full year courses and no later than the third week of classes for semester length courses. This

will ensure that SLOs are set near the start of teachers' courses and can be used to help teachers plan their courses.

- All SLO targets must be set with a minimum rigor expectation of one year's grade level growth. Because students must be able to succeed in future coursework, it is essential that growth targets encompass a year's worth of growth. Otherwise, students will fall further behind and will not be able to meet college and career ready standards.
- SLOs must include all students on a teacher's course roster, targets must be set for all students, and the determination of a teacher's HEDI score must be based on the performance of all students on his or her course roster. This is a regulatory requirement for SLOs that are used in the Growth subcomponent, and the district must follow it. Based on our interviews, there appears to be confusion at the district level about the difference between the "target" percentage of students who meet or exceed their growth targets and the requirement that all students on a teacher's roster have a growth target set for them.
- The district should provide comprehensive training to all principals on the SLO process and their role as the approver of SLO targets. Further, the district should specify a default process in the event that teachers refuse to participate in the SLO process or if the teacher and principal cannot come to agreement about what the target should be. In the documentation provided to us, the district indicated that principals have final approval of growth targets and are authorized to set the target themselves if they cannot come to agreement with teachers on what the target should be. This is consistent with the language in the district's approved APPR plan. However, from speaking with principals and district administrators, it appears that this process is not being followed in the district. It is essential for districts to have a default process on setting SLOs and that process must give authority for someone supervisory to a teacher to make the final decision on SLOs.

4. The district should retrain the Chiefs of School Leadership or, in the alternative, overhaul the system for evaluating its principals.

A significant source of frustration for all of the principals with whom we spoke was the lack of guidance, support, or involvement on the part of their evaluators, the Chiefs of School Leadership. In many cases, principals expressed frustration that individuals with little to no building management experience had been appointed to district level positions and placed in charge of their evaluations. A number of principals with whom we spoke indicated that they neither respected their evaluators as educators nor felt like they knew what they were doing. Surprisingly, the Chiefs were in agreement about their lack of expertise or training on evaluating principals or overseeing APPR. During our interviews, the Chiefs indicated that they sat through the same three hour presentation on SLOs as everyone else, had some training on the Marshall rubric, and were then asked to perform evaluations and oversee implementation for 20 buildings each with little to no support from the district. If the district chooses to continue to employ the Chiefs at the district level, they must receive intensive training and support to ensure that they are equipped to evaluate principals and oversee implementation.

5. All evaluators and lead evaluators should be retrained and certified on the use of the NYSUT

and Marshall practice rubrics, and calibration levels should be provided to the Department.

According to district administration, there are no threshold performance requirements for principals or chiefs to be certified as lead evaluators. Similarly, there is no way for a lead evaluator to not be recertified so long as they attend the training. The records that were submitted to us (Appendix B) indicate that evaluators who did not meet the vendor's preliminary certification level were certified and allowed to conduct reviews, as were evaluators with as low as 17% accuracy and evaluators who had not completed calibration.

Further, both teachers and principals expressed their frustration at a process that they felt was arbitrary and nothing more than a "numbers game." Given the lack of training and support provided by the district, these feelings are unsurprising. In order to change the culture around evaluation in Buffalo Public Schools, evaluators must be experts at using the practice rubric, providing their teachers or principals with feedback, and helping them to set SLOs that are consistent with their vision for student learning. This cannot be achieved without significant training and support from the district.

6. The district should appoint an independent data consultant to assist the Assistant Superintendent of Shared Accountability with streamlining and coordinating the data systems used by the district to collect data related to evaluations.

Both teachers and principals expressed a severe distrust for the processes that the district uses to track who is subject to evaluation, collect data related to APPR, and report composite scores and ratings. By all accounts, the data systems that are used to track implementation and collect APPR results are not working properly. Further, the current processes for collecting and reporting data have led to numerous violations of statutory and regulatory requirements. The most severe issues we identified were:

- The district is consistently unable to identify all educators who are subject to APPR due to miscommunications between the HR data platform and the APPR data platform, which has led to delays in teachers being identified and/or evaluations never being completed for a significant percentage of the district's educators in prior school years.
- Teachers and principals have limited access to the data portals that control their course rosters, calculate SLO results, and provide composite effectiveness scores and ratings. On numerous occasions, we heard from teachers and principals that scores and ratings are changed multiple times after the September 1 deadline with little notice from the district and no explanation for the changes to scores and ratings. This often requires teachers to go on and off of improvement plans which principals have difficulty justifying or explaining.
- Despite consistent guidance from the Department to the contrary, the district chose to implement a "safety net" that led to the recalculation of scores and ratings for teachers and principals whose composite effectiveness scores were based in whole or part on Common Core State assessments.
- While TIPs and PIPs are currently housed in an online platform, district administrators are unable to easily access this information and there is no process in

place to monitor whether TIPs and PIPs are being developed.

While the Assistant Superintendent of Shared Accountability recognizes the severity of these issues and indicated that one of her primary goals is “data validation,” it was unclear at the time of our visit if the district has the ability to correct these issues in the current school year. First, she noted that the district has had consistent issues with getting its vendors to make the necessary corrections to the data platforms despite numerous communications about these issues. Second, she was unable to explain why composite scores and ratings changed throughout September. Third, she was unable to explain why teachers and principals were not on improvement plans despite the fact that the data submitted to the Department showed a number of teachers and principals who should have been on improvement plans.

Given the magnitude of the data issues in the district and the impact that these issues have had on the district’s ability to meet the fundamental requirements of the law and regulations, employing an outside data expert as a consultant for the district may help to address the issues that the district does not seem to have the internal capacity to address.

Appendix A

NY State Student Learning Objectives

1. Review these materials to familiarize yourself with the Local Measures of Achievement process.:

*SLO NYSED Guidance Document
SLO NYSED Roadmap
SLO Webinar series
SLO Samples
SLO Annotated Rubric*

Review your student data in preparation for developing your LMA:
Edvantage - Data Dashboard

Population:
The population for my 8th grade LMA is my roster of all of my 8th grade Math students and Algebra students.

Learning Content:
*Course: Grade 8 Mathematics
Source of Standards: NYS P12 Common Core Learning Standards for Mathematics*

Interval of Instructional Time:
School Year 2013-2014

Evidence:
*Pre-assessment: NYS 7th Grade Math Assessment (2013)
Summative Assessment: NYS 8th Grade Math Assessment (2014)
Offers accommodations as legally required and appropriate? Yes*

Data Field 1:
nys Math 4 Assessment 2006 stds

Data Field 2:
nys Math 5 Assessment 2006 stds

Data Field 3:
nys Math 6 Assessment 2006 stds

Data Field 4:
nys Math 7 Common Core Assessment

Data Field 5:
nys ELA 7 Common Core Assessment

Baseline:
*Using NYS Math assessment data from the previous year (grade 7) as well as one more before that, I was able to look for student performance and the beginnings of trends in data. This gave me a more realistic look at what their baseline performance should be.
Students are coming in with experience in solving some equations and math skills related to combining integers, graphing, and working with percents and fractions.*

Target(s):
*Students will achieve the NYS Grade 8 Common Core Standards in mathematics. They will become proficient with graphing, solving equations of any kind, solving proportions, modeling with mathematics, and solving equations that they make to solve parallel line problems. They will use their skills with solving equations to solve more rigorous problems and become ready to meet the standards for Algebra and Geometry.
My targets for each child are contained below.*

HEDI Scoring:
50% HEDI Chart

Rationale:
My targets were set with multiple factors in mind. Having received a document from Commissioner King that asserts an expected drop in student test scores due to using new Common Core Standards-based assessments, I had to factor that in to determine realistic targets. The pre-test is the 7th grade NYS Math Assessment that is historically less challenging than the eighth grade assessments. Other data points are from NYS Math assessments that were written to the old 2006 NYS Mathematics Standards and allowed each item to assess only one performance indicator, while giving direction as to when to use which tool. Those data points were useful for me to see trends in each individual's performance over time. The new assessments are written to a higher standard, allow for multiple standards to be assessed within one test item, and provide no direction as to which tool to use or when to use it. Given the tougher standards and more rigorous assessment, it is difficult to use pre-2013 NYS Math assessment on-par to compare. Due to the level of questioning, I also had to consider 7th grade NYS ELA data points as well. For this reason, I developed a spreadsheet and implemented a formula to compensate and assist in target setting. Based on factors such as attendance, suspensions, and historical classroom performance, I adjusted the values on an individual basis.

Other considerations that must be addressed:

Key in consideration is the use of newly produced common core math modules that are being produced for the state and implemented experimentally for the first time. The shift from traditional textbook use to modules that are works in progress will have an impact on student achievement. Most of the regular Math 8 students will be heavily impacted by this, and my ct students will likely be even more heavily impacted.

Every student in the Algebra class went from a seventh grade math class directly into a high school level Regents Integrated Algebra course without having any eighth grade math prior to entry. Of the students who enrolled in Algebra, many scored a level 2 on the 2013 NYS 7th Grade Mathematics Assessment. These students did not meet the standards for 7th grade that were tested at a lower level of rigor and difficulty than the new 2014 Common Core Grade 8 Mathematics Assessments will be.

Typically, there is a drop off from 7th to 8th grade data due to the differing levels at which the NYS tests were historically written. The content and level of questioning have historically been more challenging, thereby causing a trend where many students experience a drop in their score when comparing the NYS Math 7 to NYS Math 8 results. This trend will be compounded by the fact that the assessments at grade 8 are written on a higher level to the new NYS Common Core State Standards.

In addition to the standards, the very construct of the assessment in grade 8 will also be a factor. The old assessments contained direction to students as to which tool to use and when to use it. Formulas were embedded into questions along with reference tables being provided. Test items were only allowed to assess one performance indicator. The new assessments allow for multiple standards to appear within one test item. There is no direction to students as to which tool to use or when to do so. Though a reference sheet is provided, formulas are not given within the problems and many of them are expected to be known. The level of questioning on the Grade 8 assessments will require more careful reading, interpreting, and modeling.

One of the most important factors to consider in setting the target is that throughout the whole year, the Algebra students are working towards a completely

different set of standards (NYS Algebra Common Core Stds). Most of their attention is towards other content. The 8th grade standards have some overlap with the Algebra, however, many of them had to be covered as supplements during Algebra Instruction. This has an effect on fluency and 8th grade skills acquisition.

I am completing this LMA only because I have been directed to by an administrator.

I have not been, or have been inadequately, trained during my hours of service to complete this LMA and/or have not been supplied with the data required to complete the LMA form e.g. $\hat{\sigma}$ population $\hat{\sigma}$.

In addition to this, due to the timing of the new deadline that coincides with an extremely busy time of year, I felt pressured and rushed to complete this document.

Therefore, I consider any adverse consequences resulting from this LMA a violation of my rights under the Collective Bargaining agreement and other agreements between the BTF and Board of Education/School District. The BTF has filed a grievance on this issue.

Signature _____ Date _____ School _____

Student Population

studentNumber	studentFirstName	studentLastName	courseCode	courseName	sectionNumber	Data Field 1 (Numbers only)	Data Field 3 (Numbers only)	Data Field 2 (Numbers only)	Data Field 4 (Numbers only)	Data Field 5 (Numbers only)	Target (Numbers only)	Include
[REDACTED]	[REDACTED]	[REDACTED]	MAEBG	GENERAL MATH 8	83	2		3	1.7	1	1.1	Yes
[REDACTED]	[REDACTED]	[REDACTED]	MAEBG	GENERAL MATH 8	83			2	1.5	1	1.1	Yes
[REDACTED]	[REDACTED]	[REDACTED]	MAEBG	GENERAL MATH 8	83	2	2	3	1.7	1	1.1	Yes
[REDACTED]	[REDACTED]	[REDACTED]	MAEBG	GENERAL MATH 8	83	3	2	3	2	2	1.3	Yes
[REDACTED]	[REDACTED]	[REDACTED]	MAEBG	GENERAL MATH 8	83	3	2	3	1.7	2	1.3	Yes
[REDACTED]	[REDACTED]	[REDACTED]	MAEBG	GENERAL MATH 8	83	2	2	3	1.7	1	1.1	Yes
[REDACTED]	[REDACTED]	[REDACTED]	MAEBG	GENERAL MATH 8	83	2	1	1	1.5	1	1	Yes
[REDACTED]	[REDACTED]	[REDACTED]	MAEBG	GENERAL MATH 8	83	1	1	2	1.5	1	1.1	Yes
[REDACTED]	[REDACTED]	[REDACTED]	MAEBG	GENERAL MATH 8	83	1	1	2	1.7	1	1.1	Yes
[REDACTED]	[REDACTED]	[REDACTED]	MAEBG	GENERAL MATH 8	83			3	1.7	2	1.1	Yes
[REDACTED]	[REDACTED]	[REDACTED]	MAEBG	GENERAL MATH 8	83	2	1	2	1.5	1	1.1	Yes
[REDACTED]	[REDACTED]	[REDACTED]	MAEBG	GENERAL MATH 8	83	2	2	3	1.7	1	1.3	Yes
[REDACTED]	[REDACTED]	[REDACTED]	MAEBG	GENERAL MATH 8	83	2	2		1.7	1	1.1	Yes
[REDACTED]	[REDACTED]	[REDACTED]	MAEBG	GENERAL MATH 8	83	3	3	3	1.7	1	1.1	Yes
[REDACTED]	[REDACTED]	[REDACTED]	MAEBG	GENERAL MATH 8	83	2	3	3	2.5	2	1.7	Yes
[REDACTED]	[REDACTED]	[REDACTED]	MAEBG	GENERAL MATH 8	83	2	2	2	1.5	1	1.1	Yes
[REDACTED]	[REDACTED]	[REDACTED]	MAEBG	GENERAL MATH 8	83							Yes
[REDACTED]	[REDACTED]	[REDACTED]	MAEBG	GENERAL MATH 8	83	2	2	2	1.7	2	1.3	Yes
[REDACTED]	[REDACTED]	[REDACTED]	MAEBG	GENERAL MATH 8	83	1			1.5	1	1	Yes
[REDACTED]	[REDACTED]	[REDACTED]	MAEBG	GENERAL MATH 8	83	1	2	2	1.5	2	1.1	Yes
[REDACTED]	[REDACTED]	[REDACTED]	MAEBG	GENERAL MATH 8	83	2	1	2	1.7	1	1.1	Yes

[REDACTED]	AISBG	ACADEMIC INTERVENTION- 82 TUTORIAL	3	3	4	3	2	2.7	Yes
[REDACTED]	AISBG	ACADEMIC INTERVENTION- 82 TUTORIAL	3	3	3	2.1	2	1.9	Yes
[REDACTED]	AISBG	ACADEMIC INTERVENTION- 82 TUTORIAL	3	2	4	2.5	2	1.9	Yes
[REDACTED]	AISBG	ACADEMIC INTERVENTION- 83 TUTORIAL							No
[REDACTED]	AISBG	ACADEMIC INTERVENTION- 83 TUTORIAL							No
[REDACTED]	AISBG	ACADEMIC INTERVENTION- 83 TUTORIAL							No
[REDACTED]	AISBG	ACADEMIC INTERVENTION- 83 TUTORIAL							No
[REDACTED]	AISBG	ACADEMIC INTERVENTION- 83 TUTORIAL							No
[REDACTED]	AISBG	ACADEMIC INTERVENTION- 83 TUTORIAL							No
[REDACTED]	AISBG	ACADEMIC INTERVENTION- 83 TUTORIAL							No
[REDACTED]	AISBG	ACADEMIC INTERVENTION- 83 TUTORIAL							No
[REDACTED]	AISBG	ACADEMIC INTERVENTION- 83 TUTORIAL							No
[REDACTED]	AISBG	ACADEMIC INTERVENTION- 83 TUTORIAL							No
[REDACTED]	AISBG	ACADEMIC INTERVENTION- 83 TUTORIAL							No
[REDACTED]	AISBG	ACADEMIC INTERVENTION- 83 TUTORIAL							No
[REDACTED]	AISBG	ACADEMIC INTERVENTION- 83 TUTORIAL							No
[REDACTED]	AISBG	ACADEMIC INTERVENTION- 83 TUTORIAL							No
[REDACTED]	AISBG	ACADEMIC INTERVENTION- 83 TUTORIAL							No
[REDACTED]	AISBG	ACADEMIC INTERVENTION- 83 TUTORIAL							No
[REDACTED]	AISBG	ACADEMIC INTERVENTION- 83 TUTORIAL							No
[REDACTED]	AISBG	ACADEMIC INTERVENTION- 83 TUTORIAL							No
[REDACTED]	AISBG	ACADEMIC INTERVENTION- 83 TUTORIAL							No
[REDACTED]	AISBG	ACADEMIC INTERVENTION- 8403 TUTORIAL							No
[REDACTED]	AISBG	ACADEMIC INTERVENTION- 8403 TUTORIAL							No
[REDACTED]	AISBG	ACADEMIC INTERVENTION- 8403 TUTORIAL							No

[REDACTED]	AIS8G	ACADEMIC INTERVENTION- 8403 TUTORIAL	No
[REDACTED]	AIS8G	ACADEMIC INTERVENTION- 8403 TUTORIAL	No
[REDACTED]	AIS8G	ACADEMIC INTERVENTION- 8403 TUTORIAL	No
[REDACTED]	AIS7G	ACADEMIC INTERVENTION- 71 TUTORIAL	No
[REDACTED]	AIS7G	ACADEMIC INTERVENTION- 71 TUTORIAL	No
[REDACTED]	AIS7G	ACADEMIC INTERVENTION- 72 TUTORIAL	No
[REDACTED]	MAE7G	GENERAL MATH 72 7	No
[REDACTED]	AIS7G	ACADEMIC INTERVENTION- 72 TUTORIAL	No
[REDACTED]	AIS7G	ACADEMIC INTERVENTION- 72 TUTORIAL	No
[REDACTED]	AIS7G	ACADEMIC INTERVENTION- 72 TUTORIAL	No
[REDACTED]	AIS8G	ACADEMIC INTERVENTION- 8403 TUTORIAL	No
[REDACTED]	MAE7G	GENERAL MATH 72 7	No
[REDACTED]	MAE7G	GENERAL MATH 72 7	No
[REDACTED]	MAE7G	GENERAL MATH 72 7	No

NY State Student Learning Objectives

1. Review these materials to familiarize yourself with the Local Measures of Achievement process.:

SLO NYSED Guidance Document
SLO NYSED Roadmap
SLO Webinar series
SLO Samples
SLO Annotated Rubric

Review your student data in preparation for developing your LMA:
Edvantage - Data Dashboard

Population:

There are 43 students in my 2013-2014 Math classes.

Learning Content:

Course: Grade 6 Mathematics
Source of Standards: NYS P12 Common Core Learning Standards for Mathematics Grade 6

Interval of Instructional Time:

Grade 6 Math: 2013-2014 school year

Evidence:

Pre-assessment: NYS 5th Grade Math Assessment (2013)

Summative Assessment: NYS 6th Grade Math Assessment (2014)

Offers accommodations as legally required and appropriate? Yes
Ensures that those with vested interest are not scoring summative assessments? Yes; our district process for scanning/scoring and reporting will be used.

Data Field 1:

NYS grade 5 2012-2013 Math Assessment

Data Field 2:

Teacher Made Assessment

Data Field 3:

2012-2013 Grade 5 CFA EOY Revised

Data Field 4:

NYS Grade 5 2012-2013 ELA Assessment

Data Field 5:

2013 Grade 6 End of Selection Comprehension Assessment

Baseline:

2012-2013 NYS Grade 5 Math Assessment

Level 4 - 6

Level 3 - 6

Level 2 - 16

Level 1-11

Unknown- 4

Math fluency, illuminate, marking period grades, attendance, discipline, homework

Target(s):

50% of my students will meet and succeed or exceed our goal.

HEDI Scoring:
50% HEDI Chart

Rationale:

This year's 2014 state assessments will be based on the Common Core standards. The learning content described above used during instruction will enable my students to increase their knowledge of the content and allow them to demonstrate growth at a level deemed effective or better. The learning content will prepare students for future course work, as well as college and career readiness.

I chose to include ELA in my Math LMA because of the complexity of the word problems. Today's test encompasses many lengthy word problems for the students to solve. If students are not able to comprehend the words in the problem, and what is being asked of them, then there is very little chance that they will be able to accurately answer the math problem.

I chose my target scores based on many factors. The first being previous years test scores (stated in above section). The next is going to be on attendance. Twelve of my 42 students have attendance percents of less than 88%. Of those students, five of these have an attendance percent in the 70% range. I also took into account that five of my students have an IEP/504.

Lastly, since this is the first year that the engageNY modules have been used in 6th grade, there is no way to gauge how successful the students will do because of them.

Student Population

System Error

Error: null

NY State Student Learning Objectives

1. Review these materials to familiarize yourself with the Student Learning Objectives process:

SLO NYSED Guidance Document
SLO NYSED Roadmap
SLO Webinar series
SLO Samples
SLO Annotated Rubric

Review your student data in preparation for developing your SLO:

Edvantage - Data Dashboard

Population:

Course sections: All AA25 students (13-boys; 12-girls) in my 1st Grade Integrated co-teaching classroom.

(8 students with IEPs; 6 students who receive Speech services; 17 students who receive AIS support for math)

Learning Content:

Course: Grade 1 Mathematics

Source of Standards: NYS P12 Common core Learning Standards for Mathematics

Operations and Algebraic Thinking (OA):

1.OA.1 Use addition and subtraction within 20 to solve word problems involving situations of adding to, taking from, putting together, taking apart, and comparing, with unknown in all positions, e.g., by using objects, drawings, and equations with a symbol for the unknown number to represent the problem.

1.OA.2: Solve word problems that call for addition of three whole numbers whose sum is less than or equal to 20, e.g., by using objects, drawings, and equations with a symbol for the unknown number to represent the problem.

1.OA.3: Apply properties of operations as strategies to add and subtract.

1.OA.4: Understand subtraction as known addend problem.

1.OA.5: Relate counting to addition and subtraction.

1.OA.6 Add and subtract within 20, demonstrating fluency for addition and subtraction within 10. Use strategies such as counting on; making 10 (e.g., $8+6=8+2+4=10+4=14$); decomposing a number a number leading to a 10 (e.g., $13-4=13-3-1=10-1=9$); using the relationship between addition and subtraction (e.g., knowing that $8+4=12$, on knows $12-8=4$); and creating equivalent but easier sums (e.g., adding $6+7$ by creating the known equivalent $6+6+1=12+1=13$).

1.OA.7: Understand the meaning of the equal sign, and determine if equations involving addition and subtraction are true or false.

1.OA.8 Determine the unknown whole number in an addition or subtraction equation relating to three whole numbers. For example, determine the unknown number that makes the equation true in each of the equations $8+?=11$, $5=-3$, $6+6=$.

Number in Operations Base Ten (NBT):

1.NBT.2: Understand that the two digits of a two-digit number represent amounts of tens and ones.

1.NBT.2a: 10 can be thought of as a bundle of ten ones-called a "ten."

1.NBT.2b.: The numbers from 11 to 19 are composed of a ten and one, two, three, four, five, six, seven, eight, or nine ones.

1.NBT.4 Add within 100, including adding a two-digit number and a one-digit number, and adding a two-digit number and a multiple of 10, using concrete models or drawings and strategies based on place value, properties of operations, and/or the relationship between addition and subtraction; relate the strategy to a written method and explain the reasoning used. Understand that in adding two-digit numbers, one adds tens and tens, ones and ones, and sometimes it is necessary to compose a ten.

1.NBT.5: Given a two-digit number, mentally find 10 more or 10 less than the number, without having to count; explain the reasoning used.

1.NBT.6 Subtract multiples of 10 in the range 10-90 from multiples of 10 in the range 10-90 (positive or zero differences), using concrete models of drawings and strategies based on place value, properties of operations, and/or the relationship between addition and subtraction; relate the strategy to a written method and explain the reasoning used.

Interval of Instructional Time:

September 2013-June 2014 (one academic year)

Math instruction encompasses approximately 75 minutes a day, 5 days a week.

Evidence:

Summative Assessment BPS-developed 1st Grade Math Summative Assessment

Offers accommodations as legally required and appropriate? Yes

Ensures that those with vested interest are not scoring summative assessments? Yes; our district process for scanning/scoring and reporting will be used.

Data Field 1:

Math CFA 1 Grade 1

Data Field 2:

Module -End-of-Module Assessment

Data Field 3:

Module 2-Mid-Module Assessment

Data Field 4:

Data Field 5:

Baseline:

Data Field 1: Math Common Formative Assessment (CFA) 1 created by the district given in November 2013. This assessment measures the Common Core Learning Standards (CCLS) in Math for grade 1. It is a multiple choice test that is read to students. The levels are as follows:

Level 1: 0-69% correct

Level 2: 70-75% correct

Level 3: 76-84% correct.

Level 4: 85-100% correct

Data Field 2: Module 1-End-of-Module Assessment:

The End-of-Module 1 Assessment was given in November 2013 and consists of 4 short answer questions. The assessment covers the topics in Module 1: Sums and Differences to 10. In Module 1 students work on making significant progress towards fluency of addition and subtraction of numbers to 10. The assessment measures the following (CCLS) Common Core Learning Standards for Math in Grade 1: 1.OA.1;1.OA.3;1.OA.4;1.OA.5;1.OA.6;1.OA.7;1.OA.8. The assessment is based on a 4 point scale and levels are as follows:

- 1 Point (0-25): Little evidence of reasoning without a correct answer.
- 2 Points(26-50): Evidence of some reasoning without a correct answer.
- 3 Points(51-75): Evidence of some reasoning with a correct answer or evidence of solid reasoning with and incorrect answer.
- 4 Points(76-100): Evidence of solid reasoning with a correct answer.

Data Field 3: Module 2-Mid-Module Assessment:

The Mid-Module Assessment for Module 2 was given in December 2013 and consisted of 5 short answer questions. The assessment covers the topics up until Mid-Module for Module 2: Introduction to Place Value Through Addition and Subtraction to 100. Module 2 serves as a bridge from problem solving with 10 to work with 100 as students begin to solve addition and subtraction problems involving ten numbers. The assessment covers the following (CCLS) Common Core Learning Standards for Math in Grade 1: 1.OA.1,1.OA.2,1.OA.3,1.OA.6. The assessment is based on a 4 point scale and levels are as follows:

- 1 Point (0-25): Little evidence of reasoning without a correct answer.
- 2 Points(26-50): Evidence of some reasoning without a correct answer.
- 3 Points(51-75): Evidence of some reasoning with a correct answer or evidence of solid reasoning with and incorrect answer.
- 4 Points(76-100): Evidence of solid reasoning with a correct answer.

Target(s):

50% of students will reach their individual goals. The goal for each student was set individually based on available data sources, namely the pre-assessment scores and End of Module 1 Assessment and Module 2 Mid- Assessment (Individual and target scores are shown in the attached roster).

HEDI Scoring:

50% HEDI Chart

Rationale:

My integrated classroom consists of 8 students with IEPs, 6 students who receive Speech services, 18 students receiving AIS, 87.25% of my students have chronic absenteeism, and 100% of my students receive free lunch. Due to maternity leave I was not here for the first portion of the year. All of these factors and the Common Formative Assessment 1, Module 1-End-of-Module Assessment, and Module 2-Mid-Module Assessment were used to determine student's target scores.

The majority of our students are coming to kindergarten not prepared for school, thus putting them already a grade behind. Many of the students entered first grade without mastering number identification and counting skills. Students were given the Common Formative Assessment 1 in November 2013. The learning content is based on the CCLS for first grade in Mathematics. The data from the CFA 1 in Math shows that 88% of my students scored a level 1 putting the majority of my class well below grade level. Because the majority of the students have not mastered the skills on the formative assessments, targeted interventions and extensive support will be given to students to accelerate their learning and close the achievement gap.

Student Population

Student ID	Student first Name	Student Last Name	Course ID	Course Name	Section ID	Data Field 1 (Numbers only)	Data Field 2 (Numbers only)	Data Field 3 (Numbers only)	Data Field 4 (Numbers only)	Data Field 5 (Numbers only)	Target (Numbers only)	Include
[REDACTED]	[REDACTED]	[REDACTED]	SSE1G	SOCIAL STUDIES	2							No
[REDACTED]	[REDACTED]	[REDACTED]	SSE1G	SOCIAL STUDIES	2							No
[REDACTED]	[REDACTED]	[REDACTED]	SSE1G	SOCIAL STUDIES	2							No
[REDACTED]	[REDACTED]	[REDACTED]	SSE1G	SOCIAL STUDIES	2							No
[REDACTED]	[REDACTED]	[REDACTED]	SSE1G	SOCIAL STUDIES	2							No
[REDACTED]	[REDACTED]	[REDACTED]	SSE1G	SOCIAL STUDIES	2							No

Appendix B

Training	OVERALL CERTIFICATION	OBJECTIVITY	ALIGNMENT	REPRESENTATION	ACCURACY*	Score Differential	Volatility Index	Discrete Item Accuracy
4/10/2014	CC	CC	CC	CC	C	-0.02	0.04	58%
4/10/2014	CC	C	C	CC	C	0.04	0.05	56%
4/10/2014	N/A - Did Not Complete Calibration							
4/10/2014	N/A - Did Not Complete Calibration							
4/10/2014	N/A - Did Not Complete Calibration							
4/10/2014	CC	C	C	CC	C	-0.04	0.01	64%
4/10/2014	CC	CC	CC	CC	C	0.11	0.14	53%
4/10/2014	CC	C	CC	CC	NYC	-0.07	0.31	25%
4/10/2014	CC	C	C	CC	C	0.16	0.07	56%
4/10/2014	NYC	C	NYC	NYC	NYC	0.02	0.31	33%
4/10/2014	CC	C	CC	NYC	CC	0.18	0.22	33%
4/10/2014	N/A - Did Not Complete Calibration							
4/10/2014	NYC	CC	NYC	CC	NYC	0.58	0.27	31%
4/10/2014	N/A - Did Not Complete Calibration							
4/10/2014	NYC	C	NYC	NYC	NYC	0.64	0.37	36%
4/10/2014	N/A - Did Not Complete Calibration							
4/10/2014	N/A - Did Not Complete Calibration							
4/10/2014	N/A - Did Not Complete Calibration							
4/10/2014	CC	C	C	CC	C	0.12	0.04	53%
4/10/2014	CC	C	C	CC	C	-0.15	0.04	69%
4/10/2014	CC	C	C	CC	CC	-0.42	0.21	50%
4/10/2014	N/A - Did Not Complete Calibration							
4/10/2014	CC	C	C	CC	NYC	-0.27	0.26	39%
4/10/2014	CC	C	CC	NYC	CC	0.33	0.17	42%
4/10/2014	NYC	C	NYC	NYC	NYC	-0.70	0.52	22%
4/10/2014	CC	C	C	CC	C	-0.10	0.11	58%
4/10/2014	N/A - Did Not Complete Calibration							
4/10/2014	CC	C	CC	CC	NYC	-0.69	0.42	33%
4/10/2014	CC	C	C	CC	NYC	0.40	0.20	39%
4/10/2014	CC	CC	C	CC	CC	0.35	0.12	53%
4/10/2014	CC	C	C	CC	NYC	-0.45	0.40	33%
4/10/2014	CC	C	CC	CC	CC	0.32	0.00	56%
4/10/2014	NYC	C	NYC	NYC	NYC	-0.07	0.29	33%
4/10/2014	N/A - Did Not Complete Calibration							
4/10/2014	CC	C	C	CC	CC	-0.43	0.22	50%
4/10/2014	CC	C	CC	CC	NYC	0.51	0.31	31%
4/10/2014 (Completed 7/3)	NYC	NYC	NYC	NYC	C	0.09	50%	0.13
4/10/2014 (Completed 7/3)	NYC	NYC	NYC	NYC	NYC	-0.10	22%	0.37
7/2/2014	N/A - No accuracy scores	C	NYC	CC	N/A	N/A	N/A	N/A
7/3/2014	CC	C	CC	CC	PC	0.07	56%	0.21
7/3/2014	NYC	CC	NYC	NYC	NYC	0.35	25%	0.40
7/3/2014	NYC	CC	NYC	NYC	NYC	-0.11	25%	0.46
7/3/2014	NYC	CC	NYC	NYC	NYC	0.29	19%	0.46
7/3/2014	NYC	C	NYC	NYC	NYC	0.01	22%	0.41
7/3/2014	NYC	CC	NYC	NYC	NYC	0.07	47%	0.28
7/3/2014	NYC	CC	NYC	NYC	NYC	0.07	28%	0.41
7/3/2014	CC	C	CC	CC	NYC	-0.34	22%	0.40
7/3/2014	NYC	CC	NYC	NYC	NYC	-0.10	31%	0.36
7/3/2014	NYC	CC	NYC	NYC	NYC	0.39	44%	0.17
7/3/2014	NYC	C	NYC	NYC	NYC	0.37	33%	0.34
7/3/2014	NYC	C	NYC	NYC	NYC	-0.61	28%	0.39
7/3/2014	NYC	C	NYC	NYC	NYC	0.04	14%	0.45
7/3/2014	CC	C	CC	CC	NYC	-0.02	28%	0.37
7/3/2014	CC	C	CC	NYC	C	-0.10	67%	0.09
7/3/2014	NYC	C	NYC	NYC	NYC	-0.25	36%	0.32
7/3/2014	NYC	CC	NYC	NYC	NYC	0.80	19%	0.49

7/3/2014	NYC	NYC	NYC	NYC	NYC	-0.29	19%	0.48
7/3/2014	NYC	C	NYC	NYC	NYC	0.88	17%	0.53
7/3/2014	NYC	CC	NYC	NYC	NYC	1.05	6%	0.65
7/3/2014	NYC	CC	NYC	NYC	PC	0.01	47%	0.22
7/4/2014	CC	C	CC	CC	C	-0.12	56%	0.13
7/4/2014	NYC	C	NYC	NYC	NYC	0.02	31%	0.36
7/4/2014	NYC	C	NYC	NYC	PC	0.11	33%	0.24
7/4/2014	NYC	C	NYC	NYC	NYC	0.35	8%	0.52
7/30/2014	NYC	C	CC	NYC	NYC	0.56	19%	0.48
7/31/2014	CC	CC	CC	NYC	NYC	0.23	33%	0.38
7/31/2014	CC	CC	CC	CC	CC	0.37	44%	0.19
7/31/2014	NYC	NYC	NYC	NYC	NYC	0.43	22%	0.41
7/31/2014	NYC	C	NYC	NYC	NYC	0.32	25%	0.32
7/31/2014	NYC	C	NYC	NYC	NYC	-0.13	31%	0.28
7/31/2014	CC	C	CC	CC	NYC	-0.27	25%	0.27
7/31/2014	CC	CC	NYC	CC	CC	0.36	42%	0.12
7/31/2014	CC	C	CC	CC	CC	-0.25	50%	0.27
7/31/2014	NYC	CC	NYC	NYC	CC	0.04	47%	0.27
7/31/2014	CC	C	CC	CC	C	0.11	56%	0.09
7/31/2014	CC	CC	CC	CC	CC	0.02	50%	0.16
7/31/2014	NYC	CC	CC	NYC	NYC	0.39	47%	0.20
7/31/2014	NYC	CC	NYC	NYC	NYC	-0.12	47%	0.31
7/31/2014	NYC	C	NYC	NYC	NYC	-0.04	25%	0.39
8/1/2014	NYC	C	NYC	NYC	NYC	-0.75	22%	0.55
8/1/2014	NYC	C	NYC	NYC	NYC	0.04	36%	0.26
8/1/2014	NYC	CC	NYC	CC	NYC	0.57	42%	0.28
8/21/2014	NYC	C	NYC	NYC	NYC	-0.07	11%	0.50
8/21/2014	PC	C	CC	CC	NYC	-0.21	22%	0.44
8/21/2014	PC	C	CC	CC	NYC	0.29	22%	0.37
8/21/2014	PC	C	NYC	CC	NYC	0.11	42%	0.27
8/21/2014	PC	C	CC	CC	NYC	-0.83	22%	0.57
8/21/2014	PC	C	CC	CC	NYC	-0.21	39%	0.33
8/21/2014	NYC	CC	NYC	NYC	NYC	-0.18	33%	0.35
8/21/2014	PC	C	CC	CC	NYC	0.07	33%	0.36
8/21/2014	NYC	C	NYC	NYC	NYC	0.04	22%	0.40
8/21/2014	PC	C	CC	CC	PC	0.11	47%	0.20
8/21/2014	NYC	C	CC	NYC	NYC	0.28	31%	0.34
8/21/2014	NYC	C	NYC	NYC	NYC	-0.50	19%	0.48
8/21/2014	PC	C	CC	CC	NYC	-0.39	36%	0.31
8/21/2014	NYC	CC	NYC	NYC	NYC	0.18	28%	0.32
8/21/2014	NYC	CC	NYC	NYC	NYC	-0.17	22%	0.47
8/21/2014	PC	C	NYC	NYC	NYC	-0.20	3%	0.54
8/21/2014	NYC	C	CC	CC	NYC	0.01	17%	0.45
8/21/2014	NYC	C	CC	NYC	NYC	-0.07	22%	0.45
8/21/2014	PC	C	NYC	NYC	NYC	0.05	36%	0.34
8/21/2014	PC	C	CC	CC	NYC	0.04	33%	0.40
8/21/2014	PC	C	CC	CC	PC	-0.25	53%	0.25
8/21/2014	PC	C	CC	CC	PC	-0.28	50%	0.31
8/21/2014	PC	C	CC	CC	NYC	-0.16	39%	0.33
8/22/2014	NYC	C	CC	NYC	NYC	-0.35	36%	0.39
8/22/2014	PC	C	CC	NYC	PC	-0.03	47%	0.24
8/22/2014	NYC	CC	CC	NYC	NYC	0.37	28%	0.44
8/22/2014	N/A - No accuracy scores	C	NYC	NYC				
8/22/2014	PC	C	CC	NYC	C	-0.02	58%	0.15
8/22/2014	NYC	C	CC	NYC	NYC	0.17	42%	0.31
8/22/2014	NYC	CC	NYC	NYC	NYC	-0.69	33%	0.50
8/22/2014	NYC	C	CC	NYC	NYC	-0.50	14%	0.57

Appendix C

Please read CAREFULLY – Sept. 3, 2014

On September 4, Principals and Content Area Directors and Supervisors will receive teachers' CES and HEDI ratings for 13-14.

This will not represent teachers newly assigned to your school. Please email me the name AND employee number if you need the score of a newly assigned 3012c teacher. Please email the PGS help desk to have the teacher attached to your school.

TIPS –Due - Sept. 17 No extensions will be approved (as per NYS 3012c regulations)

- TIPS are to be written for a teacher that is rated INEFFECTIVE or DEVELOPING.
- However, teachers who are rated D or I **AND** their post assessment was either or both the 3-8 NYS ELA and/or 3-8 NYS Math, Safety Net will be applied. Write TIPS for those who Safety Net will apply **ONLY** when their *Other Measures score* is 44 or below. This may apply to:
 - ESL teachers assigned to grades 3-8
 - Common Branch 3-6 teachers
 - SPED teachers assigned to 3-8
 - Reading Support teachers assigned to 3-8
 - ELA teachers/ ELA AIS grades 7-8
 - Math/Math AIS teachers grades 7-8
- All other teachers rated D or I will still be required to have a TIP collaboratively written in PGS.
- Do not write TIPS for teachers that do NOT have a final CES and HEDI.

Information on writing and entering TIPS in PGS is available in the APPR Resources for Administrators Dropbox. Email me to schedule an appointment for on-site support.

Missing Scores Reasons

Missing NYS Growth Scores

- A teachers was not correctly attached to courses in Infinite Campus. This has be seen mostly in an integrated co-teaching situations such as ESL, Sped and reading support teachers.
- Not enough data points (students with scores from 12-13 and 13-14) AND an SLO was not written.

Missing SLO and/or LMA scores

- Students were not checked included in the population section for each SLO and/or LMA.
- Scores from the post assessments are in the process of being imported to PGS.

Missing Other Measures Score (60 points)

- The required number of observations was not completed and/or artifacts were not submitted. This would be due to a leave of absence or a probationary appointment was granted after February 1, 2014.

CES/ HEDI – Unable to Determine

One or more of the three APPR components had a missing score (see reasons above).

Q. APPR Safety Net Calculations (Chapter XX of the Laws of 2014) – From the APPR Guidance Document July, 2014

Eligibility and Usage

Q1. Which teachers/principals in my district/BOCES must have a safety net calculation under the new law in addition to the evaluation score and rating calculated pursuant to Education Law §3012-c?

For the 2013-14 and 2014-15 school years, the following rules apply:

- Districts/BOCES must calculate all educators' APPR scores and ratings based on their currently approved APPR plan.
- In order for a teacher/principal to be eligible for a safety net calculation, the following must apply:

1. A teacher/principal must receive an **overall rating** of either Ineffective or Developing based on their performance on the district's/BOCES' currently approved APPR plan **AND**
2. The teacher's/principal's State Growth or Other Comparable Measures subcomponent relies on one or more grades 3-8 ELA/math State assessments aligned to the Common Core, **AND/OR**
3. The teacher's/principal's Locally Selected Measures subcomponent relies on one or more grades 3-8 ELA/math State assessments aligned to the Common Core.

Please see the subsection, *Safety Net Calculation*, and the Appendix for more information about the safety net calculation.

Q2. Is this safety net calculation a permanent change to teacher/principal evaluations?

No. The safety net calculation provisions take effect July 1, 2014 and will only apply to a specific subset of employment decisions based on APPR ratings received by a specific subset of classroom teachers and building principals for the 2013-14 and 2014-15 school years. 157

Q4. What happens if the safety net calculation is higher than the evaluation rating calculated pursuant to Education Law §3012-c?

If the safety net calculation is higher than the evaluation rating calculated pursuant to Education Law §3012-c, the evaluation rating calculated pursuant to Education Law §3012-c will not be used for the following specific employment related decisions:

- A termination pursuant to sections 2509, 2573, 3012, 3014, 3020, 3020-a, or 3031 of the Education Law;
- A granting or denial of tenure pursuant to sections 2509, 2573, 3012, 3014, or 3031 of the Education Law;
- Expedited hearings pursuant to section 3020-a of the Education Law;
- Decisions related to retention; and
- The requirement for teacher or principal improvement plans pursuant to §3012-c of the Education Law

For TIPs and PIPs **only**, the safety net calculation is to be used in place of the actual evaluation rating – e.g., if a teacher/principal is rated Ineffective but his/her safety net calculation would be Developing, the teacher/principal will be required to have a teacher/principal improvement plan. Concordantly, if a teacher/principal is rated Developing but his/her safety net calculation would be Effective or Highly Effective, the teacher/principal will not be required to have a teacher/principal improvement plan. **Other than for TIPs and PIPs, the safety net calculation shall not be substituted for the rating calculated pursuant to Education Law §3012-c.**

Safety Net Calculation

Q7. How is the safety net calculated?

This calculation is only to be made for teachers or principals who receive an overall composite rating of Developing or Ineffective. For eligible teachers/principals:

If grades 3-8 ELA/math State assessments aligned to the Common Core are the only assessments used to calculate the State Growth or Other Comparable Measures subcomponent score and the Locally Selected Measures subcomponent does use any 3-8 ELA/math State assessments, the teacher's safety net calculation would exclude her State Growth or Other Comparable Measures and Locally Selected Measures subcomponent scores, and her Other Measures of Effectiveness subcomponent score, would be scaled up to 100 points and would represent her final safety net calculation.

For example, a teacher has both her State Growth and Locally Selected Measures subcomponent scores based on a grade 3-8 ELA and/or Math State assessments. At the end of the school year, her State Growth or Other Comparable Measures subcomponent score is 5, her Locally Selected Measures subcomponent score is 2, and her Other Measures of Effectiveness subcomponent score is 45. Using the above calculation, the teacher's safety net calculation would exclude her State Growth or Other Comparable Measures and Locally Selected Measures subcomponent scores, and her Other Measures of Effectiveness subcomponent score, which represents 75% of the available points for that subcomponent (45 points / 60 points), would be scaled up to 75 points (100 points x 75%) and would represent her final safety net calculation.

Please instruct teachers to email the APPR-SLO question line rather than me or Ebony Bullock directly.

APPR-SLO@buffaloschools.org