

IPAT Minutes

October 24, 2017

Those present were Carl Auckerman, Pat Barber, Kara Carney, Mirjam Darley, James Horner, Tony Losada, Kim Organek, Mike Rio, Michele Romeo, and Dawn Walker. Also present: Evan McCarthy and Miranda Scznsny. The meeting was called to order at 9:01 a.m.

I. Welcome, introductions and review of minutes –The minutes of 6/19/17 were moved by Tony and seconded by Dawn. Motion carried.

II. MCTES 2016-2017/2017-2018

A. Review of 2016-2017 data – Pat asked for spread of ratings on each category and for comparison of 2015-2016 to 2016-2017 data to determine what impact the changes had on the spread of ratings. 2016-2017 overall summative ratings:

2016-2017 Overall Summative Ratings	
Highly Effective (HE)	1353
Effective (E)	1295
Need Improvement/Developing (NI/D)	77
Unsatisfactory (U)	0

Suggest modeling changes to see what impact will be before publishing.

IPS Scores		
	2015-2016	2016-2017
Highly Effective (HE)	64%	69%
Effective (E)	35%	31%
Need Improvement/Developing (NI/D)	1%	1%
Unsatisfactory (U)	0%	0%

Student Growth Scores		
	2015-2016	2016-2017
Highly Effective (HE)	32%	28%
Effective (E)	51%	46%
Need Improvement/Developing (NI/D)	8%	13%
Unsatisfactory (U)	8%	13%

There was a discussion about being able to pull teacher data by grade level. That data is not available by grade level but rather by school or by level. Pat asked if changing from confidence bands to intervals had a positive or negative impact.

Mike asked if grade levels can be put into MyPGS so that information can be disaggregated.

B. Imagine data for 2016-2017 – There was a discussion about the state removing the requirement of using VAM; however, there is still a requirement to have a student learning growth score. It is up to the district to determine what the student learning growth score should be. At the elementary level there is a slightly negative impact at 2nd grade. Kindergarten and 1st grade both had an insignificant but positive impact. If there was a negative impact of students on Imagine on their iReady scores the scores would be adjusted. Mike moved to continue using Imagine for the 2017-2018 school year. Seconded by James. Motion carried.

C. Teachers who are hired mid-year - Tony stated that the state scrutinizes the district when a teacher is not rated even though the reason is that the teacher was hired mid-year. Tony’s recommendation would be to work with the vendor to have a modified “A” cycle where the teacher would return to A the following school year.

D. Student growth ratings for '17-'18 – Evan asked for a listing of within the instructional coaches area. For example – teacher, science, elementary; teacher, science, resource – elementary; teachers, science/technology, elem. Who is getting SSA score and if they are not what should they get? Evan will contact principals to determine which science teachers are departmentalized and get the SSA scores. Otherwise they get the 3-year aggregate school VAM.

There was a conversation about “Coordinators” and whether they are doing evaluations. If they are SAMP they can do evaluations.

Resource people who do not have own students are not teachers of record and have no students assigned to them. Need to determine what measure to use for them.

Elementary school - There was a motion by James with a second by Carl to adopt elementary student growth rating with changes with the caveat that we revisit for ESE Resource.

Middle school – There was a motion by Michele with a second by Mirjam to adopt the middle school student growth measures as modified. Motion carried.

High school – Take off non-FSA people and update anything that needs to be updated on the back. There was a motion by Tony and a second by Michele to adopt the high school student growth measures as modified.

Horizons – TBD. More data collection is needed.

Process to determine and assessment model needs to be the same across the board

E. Request for change of observer – Currently our plan is silent on this issue. “Teachers may request a change of observer.” Insert in procedures section of the system. Pat will send an example of where the language will be inserted. Pat will propose some permissive language and will send to committee.

III. Other Business – Update 17-18 cycles and send out.

IV. Future Agenda Items – There has to be 4 categories, not necessarily a 4-point scale. The conversation concerned changing the size of the scale.

Proposed student growth scores

U: 2-2.49

NI/D: 2.5 – 2.9

E: 3-3.49

HE: 3.5 – 4

15-16: 16 teachers below E

16-17: 16 teachers below E

Evan will run the data to see how proposed student growth scores would be impacted.

No action was taken. 3 years of data would only be applied to school ratings.

V. Future dates – Thursday, November 30th. 9 a.m. SSC TBD.

Meeting adjourned at 2:51 p.m.