



JENC Newsletter

FY17 Final Evaluations Release

- Teacher Evaluations from the FY17 (2016-17) school year will be released on 11/27/2017 through PeopleSoft. You can view and sign your evaluation by following this pathway: **Portal → PeopleSoft → My Evaluations → 2017**
- Evaluations must be signed by the teacher and the principal/director by Friday, **December 8th, 2017**.
- Teacher Evaluations are made up of 3 scoring components:
 - * Instructional Practice (57%)
 - * Student Performance (33%)
 - * Deliberate Practice (10%)

Instructional Practice Rating (57%)

- Based on the Palm Beach Model of Instruction's Domains 1, 2, 3, 4.
 - * Category 1A: At least 1 Walkthrough, 1 Informal, 1 Formal, 15 Data Marks
 - * Category 1B/2: At least 1 Walkthrough, 1 Informal, 1 Formal, 10 Data Marks
 - * Instructional Practice Scoring Rubric:

	Highly Effective (4)	Effective (3)	Developing (2)	Unsatisfactory (1)
CATEGORY 1A	≥51% of Ratings are at Level 4 (Innovating)	≥51% of Ratings are at Level 3 (Applying) or higher	≥51% of Ratings are at Level 2 (Developing) or higher	≥51% of Ratings are at Level 1 (Beginning) or Level 0 (Not Using)
CATEGORY 1B	Highly Effective (4)	Effective (3)	Developing (2)	Unsatisfactory (1)
	≥51% of Ratings are at Level 4 (Innovating)	≥51% of Ratings are at Level 3 (Applying) or higher	≥51% of Ratings are at Level 2 (Developing) or higher	≥51% of Ratings are at Level 1 (Beginning) or Level 0 (Not Using)
CATEGORY 2	Highly Effective (4)	Effective (3)	Needs Improvement (2)	Unsatisfactory (1)
	≥60% of Ratings are at Level 4 (Innovating)	≥60% of Ratings are at Level 2 (Developing) or higher	≥60% of Ratings are at Level 1 (Beginning) or Level 0 (Not Using)	≥60% of Ratings are at Level 0 (Not Using)

The Joint Evaluation Negotiations Committee is comprised of representatives from the Palm Beach County Classroom Teachers Association and the School District of Palm Beach County.

This team works together to construct contract language and the Classroom Teacher Evaluation System (CTES).

This newsletter will share tentative decisions and clarifications that have been made by this committee.

This newsletter contains information specifically related to the discussion on November 3rd, 2017.



Student Performance Rating (33%)

- Survey 2 & 3 students must match with the exception of semester long acceleration courses
- Students must have both a pre and post-test
- Assessments Used in Teacher Evaluations:

GRADE/COURSE	PRE-TEST	POST-TEST
Kindergarten	i-Ready Diagnostic ELA and/or Math <i>(First Administration)</i>	i-Ready Diagnostic ELA and/or Math <i>(Third Administration)</i>
Grade 1	i-Ready Diagnostic ELA and/or Math <i>(First Administration)</i>	i-Ready Diagnostic ELA and/or Math <i>(Third Administration)</i>
Grade 2	i-Ready Diagnostic ELA and/or Math <i>(First Administration)</i>	i-Ready Diagnostic ELA and/or Math <i>(Third Administration)</i>
Grade 3	i-Ready Diagnostic ELA and/or Math <i>(First Administration)</i>	FSA ELA and/or Math Assessment
Grade 5 & 8 Science	Prior FSA ELA Assessment	State Science Assessment
Civics	Prior FSA ELA Assessment	Civics EOC Exam
Geometry	Prior EOC Math Assessment	Geometry EOC Exam
Algebra 2	Prior EOC Math Assessment	Algebra 2 EOC Exam
Biology	Prior FSA Reading Assessment	Biology EOC Exam
US History	Prior FSA Reading Assessment	US History EOC Exam
AP, AICE, IB Courses	Aligned Prior FSA Assessment	AP, AICE, or IB Exam
Grades 4-10 Other	Expected Score Based on State VAM Model	Non-FSA VAM
Grades 11-12 Reading	Prior ELA Assessment	Students meeting the Graduation Requirement <i>(FCAT, FSA, ACT, SAT)</i>
Grade 11 Other	Grade 10 FSA ELA Assessment	Combined SAT Score
School/District Score	Prior FSA Assessment	School/District FSA Performance
Grades 4-10 ELA	FSA Expected Score Based on State VAM Model	FSA ELA Assessments
Grades 4-8 Math	FSA Expected Score Based on State VAM Model	FSA Math Assessments
Grades 8 & 9 Algebra 1	FSA Expected Score Based on State VAM Model	Algebra 1 EOC Exam

Deliberate Practice Rating (10%)

- Professional Growth Plan Scoring Rubric:

Highly Effective (4)	Effective (3)	Needs Improvement / Developing (2)	Unsatisfactory (1)
Grows 2 Levels	Grows 1 Level	No Growth	Element Not Rated During Any Observation
<u>Or</u> Rated Innovating			

Overall Final Evaluation Ratings

- The rating scale depicted in the first chart below indicates the final evaluation ratings possibilities. The charts underneath it identify the weights of the three components along with the component rating scale and all possible scoring scenarios for the final evaluation rating.

Highly Effective	Effective	Needs Improvement / Developing	Unsatisfactory
3.2 - 4.0	2.1 - 3.1	1.2 - 2.0	1.0 - 1.1

IP (57%)	SP (33%)	DP (10%)	Final Rating
4	4	4	4.0
4	4	3	3.9
4	4	2	3.8
4	4	1	3.7
4	3	4	3.7
4	3	3	3.6
4	3	2	3.5
4	3	1	3.4
4	2	4	3.3
4	2	3	3.2
4	2	2	3.1
4	2	1	3.0
4	1	4	3.0
4	1	3	2.9
4	1	2	2.8
4	1	1	2.7
3	4	4	3.4
3	4	3	3.3
3	4	2	3.2
3	4	1	3.1
3	3	4	3.1
3	3	3	3.0
3	3	2	2.9
3	3	1	2.8
3	2	4	2.8
3	2	3	2.7
3	2	2	2.6
3	2	1	2.5
3	1	4	2.4
3	1	3	2.3
3	1	2	2.2
3	1	1	2.1

IP (57%)	SP (33%)	DP (10%)	Final Rating
2	4	4	2.9
2	4	3	2.8
2	4	2	2.7
2	4	1	2.6
2	3	4	2.5
2	3	3	2.4
2	3	2	2.3
2	3	1	2.2
2	2	4	2.2
2	2	3	2.1
2	2	2	2.0
2	2	1	1.9
2	1	4	1.9
2	1	3	1.8
2	1	2	1.7
2	1	1	1.6
1	4	4	2.3
1	4	3	2.2
1	4	2	2.1
1	4	1	2.0
1	3	4	2.0
1	3	3	1.9
1	3	2	1.8
1	3	1	1.7
1	2	4	1.6
1	2	3	1.5
1	2	2	1.4
1	2	1	1.3
1	1	4	1.3
1	1	3	1.2
1	1	2	1.1
1	1	1	1.0

Teacher Reports

- Teacher reports available in **Principal Resource Center** at the school site of FY17 evaluation. Reports provided are:
 - * Teacher evaluation letter (also posted in PeopleSoft).
 - * Teacher rosters for each model that applies. The report also includes teacher ranking within Model and which cohort (low, low-moderate, high-moderate, high) they are in as far as comparison to others. Teachers can request rosters from their principals if they desire.
 - * Percent meeting expectations level graphs and rosters for non-evaluative data chats.

Cohort Model Teacher Rosters

```

Student Roster for: ████████████████████
Model: FCAT Science
School: ████████████████████
Teacher Cohort Based On Average Student Prior Performance: Moderate-High
Average Student Current Performance: 2.7
Teacher Rank: 33.33
Final Student Rating: 3-Effective
  
```

Student ID	Last_Name	First_Name	Post Scale	Post Level
██████████			193	2
██████████			216	4
██████████			226	5

- Example teacher roster:
- If a teacher has moved from their previous work site, then they must contact their previous principal/director to receive their reports.

Additional Resources & Support

- Questions Regarding Your Evaluation:
⇒ <https://form.jotform.com/53334320443950>
- FDOE Performance Evaluation:
⇒ <http://www.fldoe.org/teaching/performance-evaluation/>
- FDOE Student Growth:
⇒ <http://www.fldoe.org/teaching/performance-evaluation/student-growth.html>
- SDPBC Teacher Evaluation:
⇒ <https://www.palmbeachschools.org/staffdev/teacherevaluation/>
- SDPBC Student Performance:
⇒ <https://growth.palmbeachschools.org/>
- SDPBC Deliberate Practice:
⇒ <https://www.palmbeachschools.org/staffdev/deliberatepractice/>
- JENC Newsletters & CTES Handbook:
⇒ <https://www.palmbeachschools.org/staffdev/jenc/>

