

DEPAC Meeting 10/23/2012

1. Review of DEPAC
 - a. Goal of: 2- Way communication
 - b. Journal of Our Journey
 - c. Link notes to the website for all faculty and community

2. Non-funded Pilot
 - a. Gives flexibility
 - b. Will allow for a voice at the table for final evaluation process
 - c. Invited to sit on EPAC
 - d. Choices of models were discussed
 - e. Number of observations
 - f. Non-tested areas need guidelines
 - g. Open process
 - h. Two way communication and trust

3. EPAC
 - a. More conversation between administrators and staff
 - b. Administrators learning more about their staff outside of the classroom
 - c. Easier to notice special programs in the teachers' classrooms
 - d. Discussion between teachers and administrators was more fluid because of common language in the evaluation process
 - e. Align teacher-created assessments, (Assessment of the Assessments)
 - f. Process not as bad as they thought it was going to be from the start
 - g. Increased use of rubrics with the faculty members (Trust of staff)
 - h. Peer observations to help each other
 - i. Some difficulties that were found include: start date, how to assess non-tested areas of instruction, teachers that have nobody to collaborate with (only teacher teaching a course), finding time for teachers to collect evidence for student growth profile, how to handle the child that is absent regularly.
 - j. NJASK scores percentages may vary
 - k. What would be acceptable evidence for growth (Thought it would be best if teachers came up with ways to collect evidence for growth model)
 - l. Assessment committee
 - m. Suggestion: Calculate student growth through formulas in non-tested school year
 - n. Teachers self-evaluation first
 - o. Workshops before and after implementation of the system
 - p. "Time" was a returning theme during the meeting

4. Stronge model-
 - a. Tool for teacher reflection and growth
 - b. Teachers can upload evidence for Stronge model

- c. Teachers who volunteer to implement student surveys can reflect upon results to identify areas to improve on
 - d. Upload a summary of student growth
 - e. Teachers evaluation built on multiple sources
 - f. Teachers can explore option of survey this year
 - g. Stronge has built-in survey system
 - h. Student survey summary: Continuous professional growth
5. Cohort 2 – Discussion about measures of student achievement for non-tested subjects and grades
- a. Regulations from state (percentage of eval to include student achievement)
 - b. December 19th EPAC meeting to discuss student achievement
 - c. What was learned from Cohort 1? The suggestion was made you have to use what will work for your district,
 - d. Can't we learn from experience? No other Cohort's 1 used the student achievement aspect of the evaluation process, no recommendation on how to include student achievement
 - e. Discuss student achievement data for our district and what we feel would work best for our district
 - f. Eventual meeting with other districts in Middlesex County that are also using the Stronge Model (Held November 12, 2012 with Spotswood and south Brunswick)
 - g. Teacher performance piece for our district is well ahead of other districts
6. Student growth percentile
- a. Student's growth profile from State data measure 1-99, under 35- low, 35-65 typical growth, above 65 high growth (70-75 percent in non-tested areas) : results won't be available till the next year
 - b. How do we keep documentation on each student? Portfolio for the teacher? Or the student? As of right now student growth has yet to be determined.
 - c. Tested area: 35 -45% Testing results
 - d. Non-tested : 15% Student Practice, 85% teacher practice maximum on option in Cohort 2
 - e. Four ratings : Highly effective, effective, partially effective, and ineffective(2 years in a row teacher must be let go)
 - f. Stronge Standard 7: Student performance, developed a four rating growth system (Weightings put together by the teachers and agreed upon collectively) to measure how much have students grown through the year
7. What do the ratings mean?
- a. Breakdown difference between Highly Effective and Effective
 - b. Effective is what is expected level of performance
 - c. Highly effective: "In addition to meeting the standard....." (Above and beyond effective)
 - d. Rating system and how we relate most things to a grading system of A to F; Highly effective "A+", effective is an "A"

- e. Fear factor with the staff that effective is just above partially effective in the rating system
 - f. Student driving their own learning goals inclusion of Naviance as a possibility
 - g. Students should know what scores they want to meet, and have data driven goals
8. Conclusion
- a. November 6th : Teacher leaders for half of the in-service day will provide a turn-key training
 - b. Video link of teacher lesson: Have teachers observe and write up a mock evaluation
 - c. Teachers come together and have a discussion on what they will be evaluated, discuss important aspects and what artifacts can be included as evidence by the teacher
 - d. Self-evaluation for teachers (reflective thought)