

APPR 2.0 Meeting
Monday, July 22, 2013

What we learned about **SLOs and LATs**:

- Will need to be more rigorous about target setting
- Hard to know if targets in some disciplines are reasonable and appropriate
- Connections/specificity for some assessments not “tight”
- In some cases SLOs and LATs did have a positive impact
- Doesn’t have to be pretest/posttest – we have enough tests without adding more
- Not using a pre-test but rather using baseline data stressed/valued “knowing your kids” which was also NYS Teaching Standard 1
- Process identified what we know/don’t know about assessments
- Building-wide scores, increased interest, easier, more broad attention to CCLS? Less system energy and less on students
- What is being flagged by reviewers at this time
- Baseline sources and what can be used/interpreted receiving attention
- Focus on percent meeting target
- Banded targets worked in some cases
- SLOs (targets) done: end of October
- Describe a tighter process
- Be more specific
- Focus to how data is used rather than 20 pts.
- Will have to avoid “easier” next year now that more are familiar with process
- Assessments not all great
- We will get better at it
- More careful look at baseline data
- People did look at practice more
- More consideration of school-wide measures
- Sometimes hard to ensure rigor in all subject areas
- Focus on percent of students that make the target. Other statements complicate/confound
- Individual targets could perpetuate the gap, expect acceleration for lower students

What we learned about **evidence collection**:

- SLOs and LATs
- Evidence submitted and tagged to OASYS
- Tagging/labeling evidence important- time spent on label pays off (include domain and element in title, spend time with teachers)
- Quality v. Quantity- spend time with teachers
- Overall increased attention to evidence on part of the teacher
- Principal guidance up front was a good investment (which is also evidence for the principal)

- Some teachers realized that they might have become stagnant
- What does evidence actually say
- Is having an impact!
- Limit size of physical binder!
- How to assess the many artifacts that were submitted- how to weigh it?
- Yes/No check-offs can be problematic

What we learned about **end-of-the-year meetings**:

- Bigger binders/more artifacts means more time
- District “calibration” of evidence review
- End-of-year meeting locations- if in classroom evidence is handy
- Evidence collection due date?
- Good conversations in meetings
- Hanging files v. binder
- Check points along the way to make sure evidence of all domains/standards (formative! Mid-year? May 1?)
- Mid-year meetings
- Make conversation be about the evidence and rubrics
- 45 minutes, 1 hour, sometimes longer
- What to review?
- Teacher reflection and how differs from lead evaluator perspective
- Teacher self-assessment before meeting provided better focus
- Can’t go over everything
- Focus on goal areas for next year
- Review APPR process, too
- 40-45 minutes
- Pre-work required (binders, artifacts, SLOs, LATs)
- Timeline for evidence review could schedule it to be completed earlier in the year
- Keep conversation on rubric and levels rather than total score, especially when using generous conversion