Contents

Section 1. Tools Used
1. Salesforce
2. Selection rubric
3. Selection Committee Takeaways document – for important selection decisions

Section 2. Overview of the Process

RISE attempts to identify teachers who have demonstrated effectiveness in schools serving low-income populations within the bounds of our application process. The current operative definition of effectiveness is evidenced from application, selection rubric and interview questions:

- Proactively evaluated areas
    - Teaching Strategies- Describes substantive strategies s/he has used to help all students learn.
    - Growth - Uses assessment to evaluate student growth and can describe growth with some details based on this.
    - Ability to Reflect – Draws lessons from experiences and takes action for improvement based on those areas.
    - Presentation – Writes clearly, with care, and follows standard English grammar, usage and spelling conventions.
- Reactively evaluated areas (areas that are explored if flags are raised by the candidate's application or comments in an interview)
    - Commitment to low income teaching
    - Classroom management

Section 3. Note on Reactivators

- Reactivators are teachers who have used RISE in the past and are signing up again to be an Active Job Seeker; these teachers already have an application on file.
- Reactivators needed to update their applications/profiles to reflect new profile questions and other changes made to the application.
- Reactivators to update their references. *Reference forms need to be manually resent once a reactivator appears in the AJS In Box*
- Repeated reactivators (over several years) may be a quality issue – red flag to be considered.

Section 4. Steps of the Process
Reactivators only: Resend references

1. Determine if application meets minimum criteria:
    a. 1 year in a low-income school –
        i. Download and view resume to confirm minimum 1 full year experience is met
        ii. Check free and reduced-price lunch requirement on Greatschools.net if needed (may also be able to use senior reference for confirmation)
    b. Credential – currently holds valid credential or is in progress
2. Evaluate application based on RISE Selection Rubric

a. Enter rubric rating for each category – include examples from the profile statements to support the ratings
    i. Instruction – based on Profile Statement #1
    ii. Growth – based on Profile Statement #2
    iii. Reflection – Based on Profile Statement #3
    iv. Presentation - # of spelling and grammar errors in application
b. +1 SAT or ACT score in top 20%
3. Check that application is complete
    a. Senior reference - Application includes a senior reference with valid email address; cannot approve candidate until senior reference has been completed
    b. Resume complete – confirm that contains required information for most recent five years of teaching (schools, locations, supervisors); resume has no holes for dates
    c. Follow up if there is information needed with appropriate email template
        i. Meet FRPL
        ii. Need senior reference
        iii. Need information for resume
4. Determine next step: fast-track, reject, or interview.

Fast-track – **Gold/High Silver candidates (9-12; 6-9 on rubric)** that do not need follow up interview; accept immediately (assuming application is complete – Step #3).

1. Enter RISE Rating in Salesforce
2. Clean resume by removing contact information and re-upload to teacher application.
3. Convert lead record if needed.
4. Accept with Fastrack acceptance email or reactivator email – copy regional Executive Director

Reject – Candidates scoring below 7 or 5 on rubric.
1. Identify specific red flags in application notes if needed.
2. Convert lead record if needed.
3. Enter rating in Salesforce – not suitable, not qualified, not qualified/deny with encouragement.
4. Send appropriate rejection email.
    1. Not Suitable
    2. Not qualified
    3. Not qualified, deny with encouragement
    4. No response to request for follow up - "application withrdrawn from consideration"

Interview - Interview candidates **(5-7; 4-5 on rubric)** – schedule time for phone interview
1. Identify specific red flags/probe areas in application notes.
2. Send interview scheduling request.
3. Conduct interview (see procedure below) and determine final accept/reject.
    1. If accept, follow process above. Use interviewed accept email.
    2. If reject, follow process above. Use interviewed reject email.

Section 5. Interviews

Interviews are designed to provide an additional layer of screening, when needed, to make a final determination for the candidate relative to the six evaluation areas. There are two types of interviews – confirmation and full interviews.

Confirmation Interviews

Purpose: Quick follow up to confirm information that is believed to be correct but not clear (e.g. strange wording in profile statement response, question about reference, etc.).

Expected Time: 8 minutes

Probe Areas: Specific confirmation on questions determined in initial screening

Full Interviews

Purpose: Candidate shows potential but requires deeper level of screening. Determination is based on rubric score (see rubric details) or screener's discretion.

Expected Time:
Interview Prep – 5 minutes
Interview – 15 minutes
Post Interview Activities (notes, rescoring) – 8 minutes

Overview of Process
Preparation
- Review specific probe areas identified.
- Check references for differences between candidate's statements and their statements.

Interview
- Focus on 2-3 areas.
- Seek concrete examples.
- Record notes about how candidate grew.
- Identi

Post-Interview
- Re-evaulate rubric
- Notes for schools? – time intensive, worth the investment? How can we trim them down?

Probe Areas –
Probes are aligned around the six Evaluation Areas. Below are stock interview questions but questions should be tailored to specific probes arising from candidate's application.

Strategies
Give me an example of a unit/lesson when some of the students weren't getting it. What happened? What did you do then? (differentiation, ability to adapt for student needs)

Growth
Talk me through a unit of instruction in which your students made significant growth. What assessment tool did you use? Where did your students begin? Where did they end up? How did you get them there?

Give an example of student who made significant academic progress. What did you do to help him/her achieve this? Give an example of student who did not make significant academic progress. What did you do to work with him/her?

Give me an example of a time when some students weren't making the progress they needed to. How did you know? (assessment) What did you do? (reflection/corrective strategies) – What did you learn from this experience/what would you have changed? (reflection)

Reflection
What have you learned that you did not know relative to (insert area here)? What do you still need to learn?

Classroom Management
What classroom management skills have you developed that you did not have your first year (or at the beginning of the year)? What else do you need to learn?

Commitment to Low-Income Teaching
Level 1. What about the information you read about RISE led you to complete the application? <u>OR</u> As you know, RISE's focus is on schools serving low-income communities. Why is this attractive to you?
Level 2. What you see as the unique challenges of teaching in low-income community? How are you equipped to meet these challenges?
Level 3. Give an example of a time you've gone above and beyond to meet your students' needs in the classroom.

<u>Post Interview</u>
1. Clean up notes taken during interview.
2. Currently not including notes from interview - Add any additional notes for principal on relevant items that came up during the interview. Notes for principal – disclaimer that there is no reference confirmation
3. Revise rubric scoring to reflect substance of the interview.
4. Make final decision for candidate or refer to Selection Committee.

Pre Selection Committee (PSC) and Selection Committee (SC)
Candidates are brought to PSC or SC if there are questions that the selector cannot determine.
Candidates are tracked in Salesforce.

Pre Selection
- Done within National Program Team
- Twice weekly (Tu, Fri)
- For questions not related to overall rubric scoring of candidate
- Specific questions: objectionable statements, presentation, questions about a teacher's experience/fit with RISE

Selection Committee
- Weekly (Wednesdays)
- For larger candidate rubric review, larger selection questions
- Preparation: Irregular Send out candidates by EOD day before
- Discuss given 8 minutes/candidate – 5 min. process check

Takeaways
- Notes from each PSC/SC posted on Salesforce in RISE Teacher Processing: Operations fold
- Larger takeaways were added to Selection Committee Takeaways document which was updated after each meeting and kept in same Salesforce folder

Outstanding Questions

1. TK feedback on the interview process
2. Selection criteria
    a. 12+ years of experience – Jim indicated that he thought our niche is something we could speak about explicitly; we need to discuss exactly what that niche is and how we should present it
        i. <mark>TK:</mark> Note that over 12 is a no go; if someone really wants to be part, they will apply anyway
    b. 3+ years out of a (low-income classroom) – Because the application asks for growth info, we are again running into the problem we had in 2006 of not having teachers who can speak in enough detail or provide references to support their growth information if they have been out of the classroom for 3+ years. Should this be an explicit criterion?
        i. <mark>TK:</mark> how many people does this apply to? MC: 4 viable candidates /10 overall
            1. Could apply the same rule – have the rule on the website and anyone who disagrees can come to us
3. Selection refinements
    a. Amount of growth (example below) –
        i. Do we want to set a guideline here? – e.g. minimum of 75% of students meeting guidelines set
        ii. Should we consider other factors as mitigating limited growth:
            1. Early in experience but clear understanding of importance of evaluation growth
            2. strong ability to reflect and identify how to improve
            3. taking responsibility for growth that was not achieved
    b. Belief that all students can achieve at high levels (examples below under the potentially objectionable statements) – need more definition to be sure are on the same page; I took as stab on the updated rubric document.
4. Operational questions
    a. Jim and I discussed two short term fixes with the back log so we avoided interviews – reject the following candidates if we were on the fence. Is this something to keep?
        i. LA – elementary teachers
        ii. Chicago – any non-high needs teachers
    b. I have not been strictly following the rubric guidelines (interview if score is 5-7), given other potential flags like the amount growth or belief that all students can achieve. That said, our acceptance rate is currently ~5% below where it was projected in each metro. There are several teachers who were rejected 6+ rubric scores that would merit another pair of eyes. I don't feel there is good quality control on my process right now. In the notes on each teacher,
    c. If a teacher is accepted who has not completed the optional reflection question, should we follow up to encourage them to do so?

Examples from teachers who were rejected

( ) Final number in parentheses reflects candidate's rubric rating.

Amount of growth:

By the end of the year, many students showed an improvement in all three areas of the five paragraph essay. However, many students showed little to no improvement at all from where they began (Jason Perkins – 8)

9th graders reading at 2nd/3rd grade level; the class average was at least a half-grade improvement (Dixie Wilson (sp.ed.) – 6)

Objectionable Statements (e.g. do they believe all students can achieve at high levels)?

I know that more and more the use of data and assessment needs to inform some instructional decisions, but I believe that this is only a small part of the academic picture of a student (Rebecca Jelen - 8)

Depending on the student's efforts at focusing, effort, and commitment to understanding the project, most students showed some modest to significant gains in learning the basics in organization and structure of the basic paragraph form requirements and essay coherence; after 9 weeks, showed marked improvement
Interview notes: *Cicero - wide range of abilities; Powerpoint project - half got to point where could organize ideas; # didn't get there though tried many things (doing work out of school - "good luck with that") (Thomas Jakovlic – 7)

Seniors' research papers - broke everything down into steps, brought to library with questions to model how they should research, taught them how to do outlines; adapted papers by reducing length of writing requirement; did they put their heart and soul into it; if it wasn't exactly a research paper, would still give them credit (Mary Grace Halatsis – 7)