TEACHNJ Regulations
Informing Schools on the Act
History: Intersect of Act & Reg

- 2 Rounds of Regulation
  - **1st Round**
    - Meant to help districts prepare to launch improved evaluations in 2013-14
    - Adopted in February of 2013 (2/7/2013)
  - **2nd Round**
    - Proposed March 6, 2013
    - Is meant to contain “more details on evaluation policies and procedures”
    - To be effective for the 2013-14 school year
    - Projected adoption date November 2013

- **Practice Point**: What is operative at the beginning of the school year will change mid-year
### Parameters of the Act

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Support</th>
<th>Evaluation</th>
<th>Tenure</th>
</tr>
</thead>
</table>
| • **Required training** on the evaluation system  
• Targeted feedback to drive professional development  
• **School Improvement Panel** conducts evaluations, leads mentoring, and identifies professional development opportunities  
• **Corrective Action Plan** for Ineffective/Partially Effective rating | • Implementation in **2013-2014**  
• **Four levels** of summative ratings  
• Educator practice instruments used for **multiple observations**  
• **Multiple objective measures** of student learning for teachers, principals, VPs/APs | • Teachers earn **tenure after 4 years based on effectiveness**  
• Effective ratings required to maintain tenure  
• Dismissal decisions decided by **arbitrators** |
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Year Range</th>
<th>Description</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>2010 - 2011</td>
<td>NJ Educator Effectiveness Task Force work - Teacher evaluation pilot opportunity announced</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2011 - 2012</td>
<td>Teacher evaluation pilot in progress - Capacity-building requirements announced for all districts to follow in 2012-13</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2012 - 2013</td>
<td>Cohort 2 teacher evaluation/new principal evaluation pilots in progress; districts building capacity - New tenure legislation in effect</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2013 - 2014</td>
<td>Statewide Implementation of New Evaluation System</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
## 2013–14 Implementation Timeline

To build capacity leading up to statewide implementation in 2013–14, districts were required to form District Evaluation Advisory Committees and School Improvement Panels, select evaluation instruments, and begin training during SY12–13. The following timeline depicts additional implementation deadlines for SY13–14:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Train teachers on teacher practice instrument</th>
<th>All teachers hired after May 1, 2013, must be trained on instrument</th>
<th>Train principals and evaluators on principal practice instrument</th>
<th>Make adjustments to SGOs with approval from a principal and CSA</th>
<th>Complete all observations for teachers</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>By July 1</strong></td>
<td><strong>By Aug. 31</strong></td>
<td><strong>By Oct. 31</strong></td>
<td><strong>By Nov. 15</strong></td>
<td><strong>By Apr. 30</strong></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Districts report to state Department on progress of implementation</td>
<td>Teachers participate in goal-setting conference with their supervisor, finalize SGO(s)</td>
<td>Complete required observations for non-tenured teachers</td>
<td>Have annual summary conference to review available component scores</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
**Training Requirements**

The following chart outlines initial training requirements for teaching staff members, evaluators, and administrators in 2013-14:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Staff Member</th>
<th>Training Requirements</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>All Teaching Staff Members</td>
<td>Must be trained on all components of the evaluation rubric.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>All Observers</td>
<td>Must be trained in the practice instrument before observing for the purpose of evaluation.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Must participate in 2 co-observations (at least 1 before December 1). Co-observers will use the double observation to calibrate teacher practice instruments and promote accuracy in scoring.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Must annually participate in refresher training for the purpose of increasing accuracy and consistency among observers.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Superintendents/Chief School Administrators (CSAs)</td>
<td>Must certify each year that observers have been trained and can apply the educator practice instruments accurately and consistently.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Remaining Dates for Training Completion:**
- By July 1, 2013: Thoroughly train teachers on evaluation rubric
- By August 31, 2013: Thoroughly train evaluators on evaluation rubric
- By October 31, 2013: Thoroughly train administrators and principals/assistant/vice principals on principal evaluation rubric

Want more info on Training Requirements? Visit [http://www.state.nj.us/education/AchieveNJ/resources/TrainingImplementationOverview.pdf](http://www.state.nj.us/education/AchieveNJ/resources/TrainingImplementationOverview.pdf)
Changes to Chapter 3

Controversies & Disputes

• Inefficiency Charge Changes based on TEACHNJ Act
  • Elimination of 90 Day Improvement Period
  • Referral to Arbiter
  • Changes in Filing Deadlines:

For more information the Department’s TEACHNJ Guide:
http://www.state.nj.us/education/AchieveNJ/intro/TeachNJGuide.pdf
Why Adherence to Process Matters?

TEACHNJ defines 4 criteria that arbitrators may consider in rendering decisions.

• **Whether the evaluation failed to adhere to the evaluation process;**
• **There is a mistake of fact in the evaluation;**
• The charges would not have been brought but for considerations of political affiliation, nepotism, union activity, discrimination, or other conduct prohibited by State or federal law; and
• The district's actions were arbitrary and capricious
• Act applies to all teaching staff members
  • Changes in tenure dismissal proceedings
• Regulatory Framework and Inclusion of Student Performance Metrics Apply to:
  • Teachers
  • Principals
  • Vice / Assistant Principals
  • Superintendents*
• Future revisions will incorporate other titles (e.g. Supervisors, Directors, Specialists, Guidance Counselors, etc.)

* Changes in plan and new requirements as to assuring district compliance with Act and regulations
Goals of New Evaluation and Supports

- Accurate and differentiated levels of performance
- Timely, actionable, data-driven feedback
- Common language and clear expectations
- Aligned and targeted professional development

Improved student achievement
Impact: Tenure Acquisition

Educators are eligible to earn tenure after four years — one year longer than it took under the previous law. In addition, for teachers, principals, APs and VPs, TEACHNJ links the earning and keeping of tenure to the results of the employee’s annual summative evaluation.
Impact: Tenure Dismissal

To maintain tenure, all teachers, principals, APs, and VPs (regardless of hire date) have to continue to earn a rating of Effective or Highly Effective. As required in the TEACHNJ Act, a superintendent has discretion to file a charge of inefficiency (tenure charge) against any tenured teaching staff member who is rated Ineffective or Partially Effective in two consecutive years.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Year A Rating</th>
<th>Year B (Consecutive) Rating</th>
<th>Action</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Ineffective</td>
<td>Ineffective</td>
<td>The superintendent <strong>shall file</strong> a charge of inefficiency.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Partially Effective</td>
<td>Ineffective</td>
<td>The superintendent <strong>may file</strong> a charge of inefficiency or <strong>may defer</strong> the filing until next year; in the following year (i.e., the third consecutive year), the superintendent <strong>shall file</strong> a charge of inefficiency if the annual rating is Ineffective or Partially Effective.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Ineffective</td>
<td>Partially Effective</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Partially Effective</td>
<td>Partially Effective</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
2013-14: Districts will be granted considerable latitude in evaluating staff members in these roles. Districts can choose to continue existing practice, adopt or adapt their selected teaching or principal practice instruments, or create their own instrument – but will need to meet the statutory requirements listed above.

Moving forward, the Department pledges to:

• Identify informal pilots in 2013-14, provide support, and share lessons learned;
• Identify and share best practices from other states and large districts;
• Partner with stakeholder organizations in the development of evaluation recommendations;
• Make resources available through web site links, broadcast memos, and other communications; and
• Consider possible additions to regulations for 2014-15 or future years.
NJDOE does recommend evaluation for other titles include the following components:
Collective bargaining agreements or other employment contracts in effect on July 1, 2013, will not be overridden by the rules in this chapter.

Collective bargaining agreements made after the chapter’s effective date must not conflict with the rules of the chapter, any other statute or regulation, or matters of educational policy or managerial prerogatives.
Teacher Evaluation

Evaluations Use Multiple Measures

- The TEACHNJ Act requires evaluations to include multiple measures of student progress and multiple data sources.

**Practice**

- Teacher Practice
  - Based on classroom observations

**Student Achievement**

- Student Growth Objective (SGO)
  - Set by teacher and principal

- Student Growth Percentile (SGP)
  - Based on NJ ASK performance
  - Less than 20 percent of teachers

= Summative Rating
  - Overall evaluation score
Teacher Evaluation: Practice

Districts Choose Their Own Observation Measure

Teacher Practice Instruments

- Danielson 2011: 42%
- Danielson 2007: 11%
- Stronge: 16%
- McREL: 9%
- Marzano: 7%
- Marshall: 9%
- Rhode Island Model: 5%
- Other: 1%

Note: Districts may choose their own model but must seek approval through NJDOE. For more information visit: http://www.state.nj.us/education/AchieveNJ/resources/RFQ.shtml
## Teacher Observations Vary

- **Long:** 40 minutes, with post-conference
- **Short:** 20 minutes, with post-conference

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Teacher Categories</th>
<th>Total # of Observations</th>
<th>Observers</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Non-Tenured</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Years 1–2</td>
<td>3 (2 long, 1 short)</td>
<td>Multiple Observers Required</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Years 3–4</td>
<td>3 (1 long, 2 short)</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Tenured</td>
<td>3 (0 long, 3 short)</td>
<td>Multiple Observers Recommended</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Notes:**
- Corrective Action Plans: After the first year, teachers who receive an Ineffective or Partially Effective rating are required to have one additional observation, and multiple observers are required.
- **Within the minimum requirements, all teachers must have at least one unannounced and one announced observation.**
# Observers Will Be Well-Trained

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Staff Member</th>
<th>Training</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>All teaching staff members</strong></td>
<td>Must be trained on all components of the evaluation rubric</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>All observers</strong></td>
<td>Must be trained in the practice instrument before observing for the purpose of evaluation</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Must participate in two “co-observations” (double-scored observations)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Must participate in yearly refresher training</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Superintendents/Chief school administrators (CSAs)</strong></td>
<td><strong>Must certify</strong> every year that observers have been trained</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Teacher Observations Vary

- Pre-conference required at least 7 days prior
- Observation conference must occur within 15 working days of the observation
- Supervisor may conduct post-observation conference electronically, if the observed teacher has been rated effective or highly effective and grants his or her consent.
- Final post-observation conference may be combined with a summary conference
Teacher Evaluation: SGP

Student Growth Percentile Overview

**Practice**

Teacher Practice
Based on classroom observations

**Student Achievement**

Student Growth Objective (SGO)
Set by teacher and principal

Student Growth Percentile (SGP)
Based on NJ ASK performance
Less than 20 percent of teachers

Summative Rating
Overall evaluation score
Student Growth Percentiles (SGPs) measure how much a student has learned from one year to the next compared to peers with similar academic history from across the state.

Growth baseline information is established by a student’s prior learning as measured by all of student’s NJ ASK results.
Example: Identifying Academic Peers

In order to figure out what that growth means, we first identify Albert’s “Academic Peers”; these are students who performed similarly to Albert in the past.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Albert’s Prior Scores</th>
<th>Academic Peers’ Prior Scores</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>3rd Gr. 150</td>
<td>3rd Gr. ≈150</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4th Gr. 160</td>
<td>4th Gr. ≈160</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

These “Academic Peers” are represented by students from across the state in many different school districts.
Example: Assigning an SGP

This comparison helps us put Albert’s growth into context, and assign him a Student Growth Percentile on a scale from 1 to 99.

Albert’s academic peers scored between 130 and 185 on the 5th grade NJ ASK, with the majority of them scoring below Albert’s score of 165.

Albert’s SGP score is 70, which conveys that his 5th grade score is higher than 70% of his academic peer group.
Teacher Evaluation: SGP

**Teachers Receive Median SGP Score on Roster**

**Median SGP Score**

Albert’s SGP score is then placed on Ms. Jones’ course roster so that we can see how she did with all of her students.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Student</th>
<th>SGP Score</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Hugh</td>
<td>12</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Eve</td>
<td>16</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Clarence</td>
<td>22</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Clayton</td>
<td>24</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Earnestine</td>
<td>25</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Helen</td>
<td>31</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Clinton</td>
<td>35</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Tim</td>
<td>39</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Jennifer</td>
<td>44</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Jaquelyn</td>
<td>46</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Lance</td>
<td>51</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Roxie</td>
<td>53</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Laura</td>
<td>57</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Julio</td>
<td>61</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Selena</td>
<td>65</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Ashlee</td>
<td>66</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Albert</td>
<td>70</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Mathew</td>
<td>72</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Maria</td>
<td>85</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Charles</td>
<td>89</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Milton</td>
<td>97</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Ms. Jones would then receive an *effectiveness* rating by taking the median SGP score on her roster.

In this scenario, Ms. Jones would receive a rating of 51.
Ms. Jones can only receive a median SGP score if the following is true:

- She has at least **20 student scores** on her roster;
  - If she does not have 20 students in year 1, she may receive an SGP score if she accrues 20 student scores over a period of up to 3 years.
- Students are enrolled in class at least **70 percent of the time** before the test; and
- She has worked for at least **60 percent of the time** before the test.
Teacher Evaluation: SGP

If two or three years of data are available, the Department will use the best available score — either the teacher’s median score of their current roster or the median of all student scores over the years available.

- The SGP Score is placed on a Sliding 4 point scale
- Guidance is yet to be developed on this conversion

Note: Want more info on SGP? Check out the NJDOE’s Video, PowerPoint, or Overview.
Teacher Evaluation: SG0

Understanding Student Growth Objectives

Practice

Teacher Practice
Based on classroom observations

Student Growth Objective (SGO)
Set by teacher and principal

Student Achievement

Student Growth Percentile (SGP)
Based on NJ ASK performance

Less than 20 percent of teachers

Summative Rating
Overall evaluation score

All teachers will set academic goals for their students at the beginning of each school year – called Student Growth Objectives (SGOs).
### All Teachers Set Student Growth Objectives (SGOs)

| Teachers with an SGP score | 1 - 2 SGOs |
| Teachers without an SGP score | 2 SGOs |

- **SGOs:** Annual, specific, and measureable academic goals for groups of students that are *locally developed and assessed*
- **Creating an SGO:**
  - Collaborative process between teacher and immediate supervisor
  - Principal has final decision
- **SGOs can be based on:**
  - Appropriate national, state or LEA-developed assessments
  - Rubric-measured portfolios or performance assessments
Teacher Evaluation: SGO

Basic Steps for Creating an SGO

In setting SGOs, teachers should take the following steps:

1. Choose or develop a quality measurement tool (examples follow) that is aligned to applicable standards.
2. Determine students’ starting points based in available data.
3. With supervisor input and approval, set ambitious yet achievable student learning goals.
4. Track progress and refine instruction accordingly.
5. Review results and discuss score with supervisor.
Teacher Evaluation: SG0

The SGO Process

Step 1: Choose or develop a quality assessment aligned to state standards

Teachers, supervisors meet to discuss and set SGO w/ principal’s approval

Step 2: Determine students’ starting points

Step 3: Set ambitious and feasible student growth objectives

Step 4: Track progress, refine instruction

Adjustments to SGOs can be made with approval

Step 5: Review results and score

*For 2013-14 only. In subsequent years, SGOs must be set by Oct. 15.
# Teacher Evaluation: SG0

## SGOs: Some Possible Assessment Types

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Traditional Assessments</th>
<th>Portfolio Assessments</th>
<th>Performance Assessment</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>• National/State tests (e.g., Advanced Placement exams, DIBELS, EOC Biology)</td>
<td>• Gold® (pre-K, K)</td>
<td>• Lab Practicum (sciences)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>• District, school and departmental tests (e.g., final exams, benchmark tests)</td>
<td>• Writing and reflection samples (ELA)</td>
<td>• Sight reading performance (music)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>• Laboratory research notebook (sciences)</td>
<td>• Dramatic performance (drama)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>• Student project-based assessments (all subjects)</td>
<td>• Skills demonstration (physical education)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>• Portfolio of student work (art, photography, graphic design, etc.)</td>
<td>• Persuasive speech (public speaking)</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

*Note: The use of the New Jersey Assessment of Skills and Knowledge (NJ ASK) for SGOs is prohibited for teachers who will also receive SGP scores based on those tests.*
## Types and Examples of SGOs

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Type of SGO</th>
<th>Definition</th>
<th>Examples (from Algebra I class)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>General</td>
<td>Focused on the teacher’s entire student population for a given course. Includes large proportion of curriculum standards.</td>
<td>Covers all students in a teacher’s Algebra I classes and aligned comprehensively with course standards.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>General-tiered goal</td>
<td>Same as above, but with student goals tiered by preparation levels</td>
<td>Same as above, but with student goals tiered by preparation levels.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Specific — student group</td>
<td>Focused on a subgroup of students that need specific support.</td>
<td>Covers a group of students that scored below 45 percent on the pre-test.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Specific — content/skill</td>
<td>Focused on specific skills or content that students must master.</td>
<td>Covers New Jersey Common Core State Standards related to quadratic functions and modeling.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
## General SGO: Elementary Literacy

**Goal**

80% students increase at least one proficiency level on the Text Reading and Comprehension (TRC) assessment.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Measuring Progress</th>
<th>4</th>
<th>3</th>
<th>2</th>
<th>1</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>*90% or more students met goal</td>
<td>*80% or more students met goal</td>
<td>*70% or more students met the goal</td>
<td>*Less than 70% of students met goal</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

*These numbers will be determined by teacher and principal based on knowledge of students to create a rigorous and attainable goal.*
Teacher Evaluation: SG0

Specific Goal: Targeted Biology Standard

The average student score on questions related to Standard 5.1.12.B (scientific thinking and design) will increase from 40% to 80% on final exam.

| Measuring Progress | For a teacher to earn a rating of ...
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>90% or more students met goal</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>80% or more students met goal</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>70% or more students met the goal</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Less than 70% of students met goal</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Note: Want more info on SGO? Check out the NJDOE’s PowerPoint, Overview or Guidebook.
Tested Grades and Subjects (Currently grades 4-8, LAL and math):
- 55% teacher practice
- 45% student achievement

The Department will look to incorporate other measures where possible and percentages may change as system evolves.
Teacher Evaluation: Weights

Component Weighting: Non-Tested Grades

**Teacher in Non-Tested Grades and Subjects:** Student Achievement will be 15% in SY13-14, Teacher Practice will be 85%.

**2013–14**

- 15% Student Achievement
- 85% Teacher Practice

**Future Target***

- 50% Student Achievement
- 50% Teacher Practice

**Teacher Practice**

- Student Growth Objectives
- Other Measures of Student Learning

*The Department will look to incorporate other measures where possible and percentages will change as the system evolves.
## Teacher Evaluation: Weights

### Teachers’ Summative Ratings

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Component</th>
<th>Raw Score</th>
<th>Weight</th>
<th>Weighted Score</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Teacher Practice</td>
<td>3.0</td>
<td>x 55%</td>
<td>1.65</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Student Growth Percentile</td>
<td>2.2</td>
<td>x 30%</td>
<td>.66</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Student Growth Objective</td>
<td>3.0</td>
<td>x 15%</td>
<td>.45</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Sum of the Weighted Scores</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>2.76</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

*This is a sample scale. The NJDOE will determine the actual scale prior to September 2013.*

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Ineffective</th>
<th>Partially Effective</th>
<th>Effective</th>
<th>Highly Effective</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1.0 Points</td>
<td>1.75 Points</td>
<td>2.5 Points</td>
<td>3.5 Points</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>4.0 Points</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

[Graphic indicating the calculation of the weighted scores]
Teacher Evaluation: Timeline Change

**Summative Rating Timeline Details**

- At the summative conference, all available component scores (teacher practice, SGO results) will be discussed.
- SGP data will be available on the following timeline.

**Annual summary conference includes:**
- available component measures.

**NJASK scores released.**
- Department calculates SGP data and sends to districts the SGP and summative rating of each teacher with an SGP score.

**Timeline:**
- **June:** Department collects all other component measures for teachers with SGP.
- **October:** Summative rating added to personnel file.
Teacher Evaluation: Response

Implications of Ratings

- Teachers rated Ineffective or Partially Ineffective receive support through Corrective Action Plans.
- Once the system is fully implemented, districts will be able to identify Highly Effective teachers for recognition such as:
  - Differentiated observation protocols
  - Expanded career pathways and leadership opportunities
  - Awards and recognition initiatives
**Teacher Evaluation: Response**

### Teachers on Corrective Action Plans

- **June – December:** If SGP isn’t available, teachers use Practice measure until data is ready.
- **May – September:** Non-SGP Teachers, CAP is developed by September 15.
- **By February 15:** Extra observation done if CAP was created at beginning of school year.

**Plan content:**
- Clear improvement needs
- Specific goals and timeline

**Progress toward goals in plan:**
- One extra observation and conference required mid-year
- Tenured teachers must have multiple observers
Principal Evaluation

Multiple Measures for Principals

Practice
- Principal Practice
  - Observation instrument
- Evaluation Leadership
  - Implementation and training on evaluation

Student Achievement
- SGO Average
  - Average of teacher SGOs
- Admin. Goals
  - Set towards measure of student achievement
- School SGP
  - Average of school-wide ELA and Math SGP scores

Summative Rating
- Overall Evaluation Score

All principals

Only schools with SGP grades receive this score
Principal Practice Requirements

- 2 observations for tenured principals, 3 for non-tenured.
- Observations may be completed using a variety of information sources.
- Observations conducted with lens of principal practice instrument, which is locally-adopted, and may include:
  - School walk-through
  - Case studies
  - Observation of staff meeting, school assembly
  - Parent conference observation
  - Teacher conference observation
Observation conference must occur within 15 working days of the observation.

Supervisor may conduct post-observation conference electronically, if the observed administrator who is not on a corrective action plan grants his or her consent.

Final post-observation conference may be combined with a summary conference.
Principal Evaluation

**School SGP for Principals**

- Principals will be broken into 3 categories:
  - **Multi-Grade SGP Schools:** 2 or more SGP grades in school
  - **Single-Grade SGP Schools:** 1 SGP grade in school
  - **Non-SGP Schools:** No SGP grades in school
### SGO Average for Principals

Principals are rated on how well their teachers do on their SGOs each year through a calculated average of teachers’ aggregate scores.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Number of SGOs in School</th>
<th>SGO Score</th>
<th>Aggregate for School</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>2</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>8</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>16</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>14</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>42</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>16</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>28</td>
<td>Total Score: 76</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

\[ \text{SGO Average for Principal: } \frac{76}{28} = 2.71 \]
In consultation with the superintendent, a principal sets achievement goals for the students in his/her building (Administrator Goals).

- Advanced Placement scores
- SAT, ACT scores
- College acceptance rates
- HSPA scores
- Annual measurable objectives (AMOs)
- Graduation rates (in schools under 80 percent)
- Nationally norm-referenced tests
## Principal Evaluation

### Evaluation Leadership

Principals are rated on their effectiveness in implementing the new evaluation system at the school level, using a state rubric:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Domain 1: Building Knowledge and Collaboration</th>
<th>Domain 2: Executing the Evaluation System Successfully</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>Component 1a:</strong> Preparing teachers for success</td>
<td><strong>Component 2a:</strong> Fulfilling requirements of the evaluation system</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Component 1b:</strong> Building collaboration</td>
<td><strong>Component 2b:</strong> Providing feedback, coaching, and planning for growth</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td><strong>Component 2c:</strong> Ensuring reliable, valid observation results</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td><strong>Component 2d:</strong> Ensuring high-quality SGOS</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

---

---
State Practice Instrument for Evaluation Leadership: Principal Evaluation

Principal Evaluation is a preliminary version of New Jersey’s Evaluation Leadership Practice Instrument for use in principal evaluation; the preliminary version for assistant and vice principals will be posted in the coming weeks. The final versions for use during the 2013-14 school year will be published on the AchieveNJ website by August 1, 2013.

### Domain 1: Building Knowledge and Collaboration

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Component</th>
<th>Highly Effective Exceptional Practice and Outcomes</th>
<th>Effective Consistent Practice and Outcomes</th>
<th>Partially Effective Inconsistent Practice and Outcomes</th>
<th>Ineffective Unacceptable Practice and Outcomes</th>
<th>Examples of Evidence</th>
</tr>
</thead>
</table>
| 1A. Preparing Teachers for Success | Actively solicits teacher input and involvement in providing ongoing opportunities to increase teachers’ knowledge of evaluation instrument and shared understanding of effective teaching | Provides ongoing opportunities to increase teachers’ knowledge of evaluation instrument and shared understanding of effective teaching | Inconsistently provides opportunities to increase teachers’ knowledge of evaluation instrument and shared understanding of effective teaching | Fails to provide opportunities to increase teachers’ knowledge of evaluation instrument and shared understanding of effective teaching | - Teacher surveys following training  
- Written communication to teachers and school community  
- Faculty meeting agendas |
| | Utilizes available resources effectively to support the creation of rigorous, measurable SGOs and identifies new resources to support this effort | Utilizes available resources effectively to support the creation of rigorous, measurable SGOs | Utilizes available resources inconsistently to support the creation of rigorous, measurable SGOs | Fails to utilize available resources effectively to support the creation of rigorous, measurable SGOs | |
| | Articulates vision of effective teaching clearly and frequently; vision is widely shared by stakeholders | Articulates vision of effective teaching | Inconsistently articulates vision of effective teaching | Fails to articulate vision of effective teaching | |
| 1B. Building Collaboration | Provides effective, collaborative leadership to School Improvement Panel (ScIP), ensuring the group exceeds required responsibilities | Ensures ScIP fulfills required responsibilities | Holds ScIP accountable inconsistently for fulfilling required responsibilities | Fails to ensure ScIP fulfills required responsibilities | - ScIP meeting agendas  
- Written communication to teachers  
- Survey results  
- Aggregate evaluation data  
- Teacher team meeting agendas, logs, and other documents |
| | Enables shared learning from aggregate evaluation data | Shares aggregate evaluation data with ScIP | Inconsistently shares aggregate evaluation data with ScIP | Fails to share aggregate evaluation data with ScIP | |
| | Loads evaluation process with transparent, regular communication | Provides regular communication on evaluation issues | Provides limited communication about evaluation issues | Fails to communicate about evaluation issues | |

(Continued on next page)
## Principal Evaluation

### Weights for Principals in 2013-14

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Components</th>
<th>Multi-Grade SGP Schools</th>
<th>Non-SGP Schools</th>
<th>Single Grade SGP Schools</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Principal Practice Instrument</td>
<td>30%</td>
<td>30%</td>
<td>30%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Evaluation Leadership</td>
<td>20%</td>
<td>20%</td>
<td>20%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>SGO Average</td>
<td>10%</td>
<td>10%</td>
<td>10%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>School SGP</td>
<td>30%</td>
<td>0%</td>
<td>20%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Principal Goals</td>
<td>10%</td>
<td>40%</td>
<td>20%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total Percentage</td>
<td>100%</td>
<td>100%</td>
<td>100%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

*Shaded percentages are the same across all principal types.*
Weights for Principals in 2013-14

Multi-Grade SGP Principals
- 50% Student Achievement: 30%
- 50% Principal Practice: 30%
- SGO Average: 10%
- Administrator Goals: 10%
- School SGP: 20%

Single-Grade SGP Principals
- 50% Student Achievement: 20%
- 50% Principal Practice: 30%
- SGO Average: 10%
- Administrator Goals: 20%
- School SGP: 10%

Non-SGP Principals
- 50% Student Achievement: 40%
- 50% Principal Practice: 30%
- SGO Average: 10%
- Administrator Goals: 20%
- School SGP: 10%

Principal Evaluation

Achieve.NJ
Teach. Lead. Grow.
### Principals’ Summative Ratings

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Component</th>
<th>Raw Score (1–4 Scale)</th>
<th>Weight</th>
<th>Weighted Score</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Principal Practice</td>
<td>3.4</td>
<td>x 30%</td>
<td>1.02</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Evaluation Leadership</td>
<td>3.0</td>
<td>x 20%</td>
<td>.60</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Student Growth Percentile</td>
<td>3.1</td>
<td>x 30%</td>
<td>.93</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Student Growth Objective</td>
<td>3.7</td>
<td>x 10%</td>
<td>.37</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Administrator Goals</td>
<td>3.6</td>
<td>x 10%</td>
<td>.36</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Sum of the Weighted Scores**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Ineffective</th>
<th>Partially Effective</th>
<th>Effective</th>
<th>Highly Effective</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1</td>
<td>1.5</td>
<td>2.5</td>
<td>3.5</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

This is a sample scale. The NJDOE will determine the actual scale prior to September 2013.
Is Your District’s Ducks in a Row?

**School Improvement Panel**

- Authorized by TEACHNJ
- Every school must establish
- Role of the ScIP is to ensure, oversee, and support the implementation of the district's evaluation, professional development (PD), and mentoring policies at the school level.
- Includes the school principal, an assistant/vice principal or a designee if the school does not have one, and a teacher.
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Year</th>
<th>Who Creates the Plan?</th>
<th>Who Implements the Plan?</th>
<th>Additional Information</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>SY12-13 (Planning completed)</td>
<td>SPDC</td>
<td>Principal with assistance from SPDC</td>
<td>School-level plans summarized/shared with LPDC to inform creation of district-level plan</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>SY13-14 (Planning in process)</td>
<td>SPDC with input from ScIP</td>
<td>Principal with assistance from ScIP</td>
<td>School-level plans summarized/shared with superintendent and considered in development of district-level plan</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Subsequent Years (Under proposed requirements)</td>
<td>Principal in consultation with ScIP/other staff</td>
<td>Principal with assistance from ScIP</td>
<td>Principal has flexibility to: (1) use ScIP in place of former SPDC; (2) maintain SPDC to support ScIP; or (3) maintain SPDC and appoint qualified member(s) to serve on ScIP</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Is Your District’s Ducks in a Row?

School Improvement Panel

• As of SY15-16, teachers serving on ScIPs must have earned a rating of Effective or Highly Effective in the most recent evaluation.
• Until then, the teacher must meet local standards for having “a demonstrated record of success in the classroom.”
In order to conduct observations for the purpose of evaluation, the teacher member must
(1) Have the consent of the local teacher association to conduct observations;
(2) Possess an administrative or supervisory certificate; and
(3) Be assigned by the principal to conduct the observation.
School Improvement Panel

• The principal has final responsibility for ScIP membership but must consult with the local association representative in determining a suitable teacher to participate; and
• Additional staff may be added to the ScIP, provided that teachers represent at least one-third of the total membership.
School Improvement Panel

Responsibilities under the TEACHNJ Act:
• Ensuring that evaluation procedures are implemented;
• Ensuring that procedures for Corrective Action Plans are implemented;
• Identifying PD opportunities for staff members; and
• Overseeing the mentorship of new teachers at the building level

District Evaluation Advisory Committee

• Each district convenes a District Evaluation Advisory Committee to discuss challenges and opportunities and to provide feedback about program development and implementation.
• Comprised of individuals representing important stakeholders in the evaluation system and school community.
### District-Level Professional Development Planning

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Year</th>
<th>Who Creates the Plan?</th>
<th>Who Implements the Plan?</th>
<th>Additional Information</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>SY2012-13</td>
<td>LPDC</td>
<td>Superintendent with assistance from LPDC</td>
<td>District-level plans reviewed by county PD board, returned to district for approval by local board, filed with county</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(Planning completed)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
| SY 2013-14    | LPDC                  | Superintendent with assistance from other staff/in collaboration with ScIP at school level | - Superintendents have flexibility to:  
  1. maintain LPDC;  
  2. re-purpose DEAC; or  
  3. create new structures to oversee PD at district level  
 - District-level plans held in district; local board approves financial elements |
| (Planning in process) |                        |                                                                 |                                                                                      |
| Subsequent Years (Under proposed requirements) | Superintendent in consultation with other staff | Superintendent with assistance from other staff/in collaboration with the ScIP at school level | - Superintendents have flexibility to  
  1. maintain LPDC;  
  2. re-purpose DEAC; or  
  3. create new structures to oversee PD at district level  
 - District-level plans expanded to address school leaders |
|               |                       |                                                                 |                                                                                      |
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Do you need flexibility?

- Department is now recognizing that district’s may have unique circumstances and as such certain components of a district's evaluation rubric may conflict with proposed regulations.
- School districts may seek the Department's guidance for navigating conflicts between the evaluation rubrics and the rules.
- Due July 12

Available at: http://www.state.nj.us/education/AchieveNJ/resources/FlexibilityMeasuresForm.pdf
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Items to consider going forward

• Training – evaluators & evaluated
• # of evaluations
• Staff authorized to evaluate & calibration requirement
• Time commitment required (short/long)
• Who can conduct evaluations
• Data timing issues
• OPRA
Is Your District’s Ducks in a Row?

Future item to consider:

• Sole authority of DOE to modify weights and address process. Department will post required percentage weights of each component rating by April 15 prior to the school year the evaluation rubric applies.
Additional Resources and Contact Information

The AchieveNJ Website includes several resources about the new evaluation system, including a comprehensive presentation; overviews for teachers, principals, and FAQs:

www.nj.gov/education/AchieveNJ