



SYRACUSE CITY SCHOOL DISTRICT

Jaime Alicea, Superintendent of Schools

Office of Human Resources

Lisa A. Wade, Chief Human Resources Officer

MEMORANDUM

TO: Unit 1 Teachers & Ancillary Staff

FROM: Christopher Miller, Ed.D., Chief Human Resources Officer & William Scott, STA President

DATE: September 9, 2020

RE: **2020-2021 Student Performance Component of APPR, 3012-d**

In the Syracuse City School District, we believe that an effectiveness system should be grounded in growth and support. Effectiveness is about more than measurement; it is about measuring what matters most, using multiple perspectives to identify areas of strengths and areas in need of growth, and providing support structures to help all teachers, leaders and staff develop their practice.

In these extraordinary times, we are still required to engage in APPR as previously submitted to the New York State Education Department, ensuring we meet the requirements of Education Law 3012-d.

Given our current realities, we are able to make some adjustments to account for virtual and later hybrid teaching and learning. Please review the attached document to learn about these changes.

c: Timothy Moon, Chief Accountability Officer
Laura Kelley, Ed.D., Chief Academic Officer
Nicole Capsello, 1st Vice President, STA

Changes to Account for Virtual and Hybrid Learning

There have been many questions regarding how Teacher Evaluation will work this year. Given that NYSED is requiring APPR this year, the SCSD and STA have worked closely to modify our teacher evaluation model while remaining within the APPR guidelines. Our main goal is to ensure that teachers receive feedback and support that they need for continuously improving teaching and learning, especially given the unusual circumstances of starting the school year virtually with the plan to move to a hybrid-learning model. The following are changes that will be implemented:

- **September 14 – October 15** – Virtual walkthroughs will be conducted by leaders, coaches, independent evaluators and PAR Consultants. These walkthroughs do not count toward APPR in any way; they are simply a means to provide support and feedback.
- **After October 15**, virtual observations will take place in all situations where an in-person observation cannot take place. When we move to the hybrid teaching and learning model, all independent observations will remain virtual. (See Chart 1 below).
- All virtual observations will be a minimum of 20 minutes in length with an opportunity to upload evidence and demonstrate the virtual classroom environment to the evaluator, when possible, during pre-or post- conferences.
- The number of scored components will be reduced to focus on items that can be seen best in the virtual learning environment. These reductions still ensure that there is a score in every domain to meet APPR regulations. Attached is a document from the Danielson Group that provides examples of how these selected components look in the virtual/remote setting. (See Chart 2 below).
- In the event a component is not able to be observed, the evaluator may choose to leave it blank

Chart 1

Observation Format for Virtual and Hybrid Learning	
<p>Virtual Learning Only</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • All Observations – completed virtually <ul style="list-style-type: none"> ○ Video Conference or live video ○ Review of learning management system (e.g., Canvas, See Saw, etc.) teacher is using with students ○ No formal observations until after October 15 	<p>Hybrid Learning</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Lead Observation - completed in person when possible • All Other Observations – completed virtually <ul style="list-style-type: none"> ○ Video Conference or live video ○ Review of learning management system (e.g., Canvas, See Saw, etc.) teacher is using with students

Chart 2

Probationary Teachers' Evaluation Components			
Lead Announced	Lead Unannounced	Independent Announced	Independent Unannounced
1B – Demonstrating knowledge of students 1E—Planning Coherent Instruction 2A—Creating an Environment of Respect and Rapport 2C—Managing Routines and Procedures 3B—Using Questioning and Discussion Techniques 3C—Engaging Students in Learning 3D—Using Assessment for Learning 4C—Engaging Families and Communities 4F—Professionalism	1B – Demonstrating knowledge of students 1E—Planning Coherent Instruction 2A—Creating an Environment of Respect and Rapport 2C—Managing Routines and Procedures 3B—Using Questioning and Discussion Techniques 3C—Engaging Students in Learning 3D—Using Assessment for Learning 4C—Engaging Families and Communities 4F—Professionalism	1B – Demonstrating knowledge of students 1E—Planning Coherent Instruction 2A—Creating an Environment of Respect and Rapport 2C—Managing Routines and Procedures	2A—Creating an Environment of Respect and Rapport 2C—Managing Routines and Procedures 3B—Using Questioning and Discussion Techniques 3C—Engaging Students in Learning 3D—Using Assessment for Learning <i>For Teachers with PAR Consultants</i> 4C—Engaging Families and Communities 4F—Professionalism
Tenured Teachers' Evaluation Components			
Lead Announced		Independent Unannounced	
1B – Demonstrating knowledge of students 1E—Planning Coherent Instruction 2A—Creating an Environment of Respect and Rapport 2C—Managing Routines and Procedures 3B—Using Questioning and Discussion Techniques 3C—Engaging Students in Learning 3D—Using Assessment for Learning 4C—Engaging Families and Communities 4F—Professionalism		1B – Demonstrating knowledge of students 1E—Planning Coherent Instruction 2A—Creating an Environment of Respect and Rapport 2C—Managing Routines and Procedures 3B—Using Questioning and Discussion Techniques 3C—Engaging Students in Learning 3D—Using Assessment for Learning	

Observation for Unit 1 Members

Unit #	Unit Title	Unit Members	Tool	Details	Timeline
1	Syracuse Teachers Association (STA)	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • K-12 Teachers, including Resource Room Teachers (anyone who has students assigned to their care, whether full or part-time, including teachers on special assignments, see exceptions below) • Academic Intervention Teachers 	<p>SCSD Danielson Framework for Teaching</p> <p>Evaluation form is on the Staff Trac Platform</p>	<p>Probationary Teachers require 4 observations 2 by Lead Evaluator (1 announced, 1 unannounced) 2 by Independent Evaluator (1 announced, 1 unannounced)</p> <p>Tenured Teachers require 2 observations 1 by Lead Evaluator (announced) 1 by Independent Evaluator (unannounced)</p>	<p>Fri. Oct. 16: Teacher observations begin</p> <p>Fri. Dec. 11: 25% of required observations must be completed.</p> <p>Fri. Mar. 5: 50% of required observations must be completed</p> <p>Fri. May 7: 75% of required observations must be completed</p> <p>Fri. June 18: 100% of required observations must be completed</p>
1	Syracuse Teachers Association (STA)	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Instructional Coaches • Library Media Specialists • Occupational/Physical Therapists • PreK Teachers • School Counselors • School Psychologists • School Social Workers • Speech Language Pathologists • Teachers of the Hearing Impaired • Teachers of the Visually Impaired 	<p>SCSD Model for Practitioner Evaluation (MPE)</p> <p>Evaluation form is on the Staff Trac Platform</p>	<p>MPE staff follow the following steps in their evaluation process:</p> <p>Step 1: Exchange Conference Alternative Evaluation Option (tenured teachers only have this option) (status meetings January, March, April).</p> <p>Step 2: Individual Professional Growth Plan</p> <p>Step 3: Classroom Observation(s) (Probationary staff 2, Tenured 1)</p> <p>Step 4: Post Conference</p> <p>Step 5: Self-Reflection</p>	<p>Mon. Oct. 5: Must be completed by date. Step 1 Exchange Conference</p> <p>Exchange Conference: Status Meetings:</p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> 1. Exchange Conference by Monday, October 5 2. by Friday, February 8 3. by Friday, April 2 4. by Friday, June 18 <p>Mon. Oct. 12: Step 2 IPGP</p> <p>Fri. April 16: Step 3 Classroom Observation</p> <p>After observation(s): Step 4 Post Observation Conference</p> <p>Fri. May 28: Step 5 Self-Reflection</p> <p>Fri. June 11: Traditional/Alternative Evaluations Due</p>

Student Performance Component Explained for the District SLO

Summary

The district SLO score is calculated based on the percentage of students meeting or exceeding the target score on all Regents exams plus the 4th grade and 8th grade Science exams.

Target Setting

The target is calculated based on the performance for the previous three-year period on an exam by exam basis. The first step is to determine the anchor point, or what exam score at least 80% of the students met or exceeded for each of the previous three years.

If 78% of the students earned at least a score of 50 and 82% of the students reached at least a score of 49, then the score of 49 would be used in the calculation. This is due to the fact that there is no score in which student earn exactly 80% of the students reached.

For example:

Algebra Common Core Assessment:

- 2013- 81% of all valid exam scores met or exceeded a score of 49
- 2014- 82% of all valid exam scores met or exceeded a score of 47
- 2015- 82% of all valid exam scores met or exceeded a score of 47

The next step is to determine the Anchor Point Average by calculating the average of the exam anchor points from the previous step. Returning to our example, $(49+47+47)/3=47.6$

<i>Exam</i>	<i>Anchor Point</i>
2013 Algebra CC	49
2014 Algebra CC	47
2015 Algebra CC	47
<i>Anchor Point Average</i>	47.6

As the district SLO score is based on a growth methodology, the target score must exceed the three-year average of the anchor scores. Therefore, the final target score will exceed the Anchor Point Average by 1 point.

In our example, this would calculate to be $47.6 + 1 = 48.6$ rounded up to a 49.

The process outlined above is repeated for each assessment, creating a target score for each exam.

<i>Exam</i>	<i>2016 Target Score</i>
Common Core Algebra	49
Common Core Geometry	44
Trigonometry/Algebra 2	43
Common Core English	49
U.S. History & Government	51
Global History & Geography	43

Chemistry	53
Earth Science	49
Living Environment	48
Physics	51
4 th Grade Science	49
8 th Grade Science	36

Percent of Students Meeting Target

To determine the SLO scoring range and HEDI Rating, the number of students meeting the target must be determined first. This will be based on the total number of valid exam scores during the course of the same reporting year, (Regents from August, January, and June) compared to the target score identified for each exam.

<i>Exam</i>	<i>2016 Target Score</i>	<i>Exam Scores Meeting/Exceeding Target</i>
Common Core Algebra	49	2,564
Common Core Geometry	44	875
Trigonometry/Algebra 2	43	628
Common Core English	49	1,697
U.S. History & Government	51	1,158
Global History & Geography	43	1,982
Chemistry	53	221
Earth Science	49	659
Living Environment	48	1,893
Physics	51	93
4 th Grade Science	49	1,100
8 th Grade Science	36	676

This can now be compared to the number of valid exams to determine an overall percentage. In our example 13,546 exams met or exceeded the target score out of a possible 17,464 exams. This yields a final average of 77.565% rounded to 78%.

<i>Exam</i>	<i>2016 Target Score</i>	<i>Meeting/Exceeding Target</i>	<i>Total Exams</i>
Common Core Algebra	49	2,564	3,463
Common Core Geometry	44	875	1,202
Trigonometry/Algebra 2	43	628	784
Common Core English	49	1,697	2,071
U.S. History & Government	51	1,158	1,512
Global History & Geography	43	1,982	2,543
Chemistry	53	221	269
Earth Science	49	659	821
Living Environment	48	1,893	2,233
Physics	51	93	129
4 th Grade Science	49	1,100	1,432
8 th Grade Science	36	676	1,005
Total Percentage=77.565%		13,546	17,464

Determining the Final HEDI Rating

Once the total percentage has been determined, this percentage will then be compared to the state provided chart to determine the final rating. In our example, 78% meeting the target yields a score range of 15 and a final HEDI Rating of Effective.

Percent Meeting the Target	Scoring Range	HEDI Rating
0-4%	0	Ineffective
5-8%	1	
9-12%	2	
13-16%	3	
17-20%	4	
21-24%	5	
25-28%	6	
29-33%	7	
34-38%	8	
39-43%	9	
44-48%	10	
49-54%	11	
55-59%	12	
60-66%	13	Developing
67-74%	14	
75-79%	15	Effective
80-84%	16	
85-89%	17	
90-92%	18	Highly Effective
93-96%	19	
97-100%	20	

Student Performance Component Explained For Regents Exams

Summary

The independent teacher SLO score for courses ending in Regents exams is calculated based on the percentage of students meeting or exceeding the target score on the designated course ending in a Regents exam.

Target Setting

Full-year courses: The target roster is calculated based on the performance of any student with a midyear course average of at least 80%, calculated based upon the first two quarter grades and midterm exam, if provided. The target is then set from that roster of students at 65% or better on the course specific Regents exam. For ENL and special education students, the target is set from that roster of students at 55% or better on the course specific Regents exam. A minimum N size of at least 20 students should be available, otherwise the district SLO is used.

Calculating the percent of students meeting the target and determining the HEDI Rating will be calculated in a similar fashion to the above process for the district SLO.

ENL teachers' scores will be calculated based upon the calculated District SLO.

Half-year/Semester courses: The target roster is calculated based on the performance of any student with a first/third quarter (depending on if first or second semester) course average of at least 80%, calculated based upon the first quarter grades and midterm exam, if provided. The target is then set from that roster of students at 65% or better on the course specific Regents exam. For ENL and special education students, the target is set from that roster of students at 55% or better on the course specific Regents exam. A minimum N size of at least 20 students should be available, otherwise the district SLO is used.

Calculating the percent of students meeting the target and determining the HEDI Rating will be calculated in a similar fashion to the above process for the district SLO.

ENL teachers' scores will be calculated based upon the calculated District SLO.

Roster Verification

For teachers of special education students, ENL students and teachers who have courses ending with Regents exams, an opportunity will be afforded, during March, to review rosters within Staff Trac, our new web-based teacher observation system. Teachers must review and verify their rosters in March/April (for full-year courses) and in December for semester long courses, and report any discrepant data to the Office of Shared of Accountability through apprhelp@scsd.us. In the event that a teacher does not reply, then all rosters will be considered verified at close of business on April 30, 2021 for full-year courses and by January 8, 2021 for courses that are running the length of a semester.