

ANNUAL PROFESSIONAL PERFORMANCE REVIEW PLAN

2013-2014

S-E APPR Committee Members:

Jennifer Moore, SETA President and Elementary Teacher

Karen Murray, SETA Vice-President and Elementary Teacher

Jacque Buddenhagen, Elementary Teacher

Sheila Cooman, Middle School Teacher

Liz Swistak, Middle School Teacher

Marie Hall, High School Teacher

Harmon Hoff, High School Teacher

Ginger Rinaldo, Chief Information Officer

John Douchinsky, Elementary Principal

Jolene Emhof, Middle School Principal

Kyle McFarland, High School Principal

Gayle Hellert, Superintendent

Review of Plan: Annually

Committee goal:

The overarching goal of the teacher evaluation system is to promote student learning and improve teaching and professional practice. The APPR encourages professional growth and development through a process that is aligned with New York State's Teaching Standards. It assures common expectations among all teachers and evaluators. It is intentionally linked with the District's Professional Development Plan

to ensure teacher-driven professional development and support.

The following principles will govern the APPR process:

- It is every teacher's responsibility to continue to grow professionally.
- It is the District's responsibility to provide the resources and support for teachers to improve instruction and professional practice.
- Evaluations will be conducted openly and objectively with the full involvement of the teacher.

Applicability:

Definition of Covered Teachers

1. As required by the Commissioner's regulations, the Sherburne-Earlville Central School BOE will formally adopt the APPR plan by September 1, of each school year for all of its classroom teachers and building principals.

To the extent that any of the items required to be included in the plan are not finalized by 9/1 of any subsequent year, as a result of pending collective bargaining negotiations, the plan shall identify those specific parts of the plan and the school district shall file an amended plan upon completion of such negotiations.

Filing and Publication of APPR Plan

2. The APPR plan will be approved by the NY State Education Department, the Sherburne-Earlville Board of Education, filed in the District Office and made available on the District's Web Site no later than 9/10 of each school year or within ten days after its adoption, whichever shall later occur.

APPR Committee

3. The District has formed a committee comprised of a majority of teachers with a minimum of two representatives from each building along with an administrator representative, the SETA President or designee, and the Superintendent or designee.

Content of the Plan

[A] Ensuring Accurate Teacher and Student Data

The District will ensure that the State Education Department receives accurate teacher and student data, including enrollment and attendance data and any other student, teacher, school, course and teacher/student linkage data necessary to comply with the Subpart, in a format and timeline prescribed by the Commissioner. This process will also provide an opportunity for every classroom teacher and building principal to verify the subjects and/or student rosters assigned to them.

Roster verification will take place every five weeks for teachers and principals in grades K-12. Grade verification will take place every ten weeks for grades K-5 and every five weeks for grades 6-12.

Reporting Individual Teacher Subcomponent Scores:

The District will report to the State Education Department the individual subcomponent scores and the total composite effectiveness score for each classroom teacher and building principal in the district in a format and timeline prescribed by the Commissioner.

The District will combine multiple locally selected measures, each scored from 0-15 or 0-20 points as applicable, into a single

subcomponent HEDI category and score following State Education guidelines utilized in determining State Growth Measures.

Any release of information regarding written assessment, sub-component, or composite rating of an individual teacher to any outside agency or person will follow the guidelines set forth by the NY State Education Department.

[B] Development, Security and Scoring of Assessments

Summative assessments and/or measures used to evaluate teachers and principals under this section will not be disseminated to students, teachers or principals before administration. In addition, teachers and principals will not have a vested interest in the outcome of the summative assessments they score.

The Superintendent will ensure developed assessments will be rigorous and comparable across grade levels and aligned with the Common Core/NYS Standards. All summative assessments will be kept secure.

[C] Student Growth

State Growth Measure:

For teachers in grades 4-8 Common Branch, ELA, and Math, NYSED will provide a value-added growth score.

The District will assure that the value-added growth score provided by NYSED will be used, where applicable and the State-provided growth measure will be used.

Student Learning Objectives will be the other comparable growth measures for teachers without a state assessment. For teachers with more than one grade and subject, SLOs must cover the courses taught with the largest number of students, combining sections with common

assessments, until a majority of students are covered. The development of an SLO will follow the guidelines prescribed by the SED guidelines.

Local Growth Measure:

Local measures of student achievement that will be used for the evaluation of teachers and principals will be determined on an annual basis before the beginning of the school year by grade levels and/or departments to include, but not be limited to: State Assessments (or Regents or Regent equivalents) and/or District, regional or BOCES-developed assessments provided that it is rigorous and comparable across classrooms.

[D] Measures of teacher effectiveness

The selection of the teacher practice rubric and multiple measures of teacher effectiveness shall be determined by the APPR Committee.

The following guiding principles will inform the work of the committee:

- Evidence of professional practice shall be obtained through multiple measures. Observations will be one of these measures.
- Individual professional development plans focusing on Domain 4 should include professional growth goals that are individually established by both the teacher and the evaluator. (Form D1)
- The process of evaluation should foster continual growth and development.
- Evidence of teacher effectiveness will be based on the teacher-practice rubric aligned with the seven NYS Teaching Standards.

The SED approved practices rubric that will be used for the evaluation of teachers is Danielson's Framework for Teaching (2013 Revised Edition).

The observation/evaluation process for probationary staff will continue to be implemented as described in the SETA contract.

The following is the scoring methodology for the assignment of points to the following subcomponents: State growth/comparable measures and other measures of teacher or principal effectiveness.

Level	State 20% State Growth or Comparable Measures	20 % Locally Selected Measures	Other 60 % measures of effectiveness	Composite Score
Ineffective	0-2	0-2	0-48	0-64
Developing	3-8	3-8	49-50	65-74
Effective	12-17	12-17	51-54	75-90
Highly Effective	18-20	18-20	55-60	91-100

The local growth measure of student achievement may be determined by grade levels and by subject areas.

- Locally selected measures should help the teacher add value to classroom instruction. There needs to be a purpose/use other than solely for evaluation.
- Local measures should be aligned with the state’s student learning standards and performance indicators.
- The Superintendent shall certify that the measures meet the requirements for rigor and comparability.
- It is understood that this is a system for individual teacher evaluation. State test results can be used for evidence for the development of the local growth measure, but State tests results will not be used for the local growth score.

Details of Timely and Constructive Feedback Provided:

Timely and constructive year-end feedback will be provided to teachers on their APPR by June 30 of each school year. Extenuating

circumstances are to be resolved between the administrator and teacher, with SETA representation, which will be mutually agreed upon in writing if the aforementioned date is not able to be met.

[E] Professional Development

The District and SETA agree that the purpose of conducting an APPR is to improve professional practice and improve student performance. The APPR must therefore be a significant factor in shaping the professional development opportunities provided to teachers.

The Professional Development Committee (as required by Part 100.2) shall be responsible for developing all aspects of the professional development plan to ensure the continued implementation of effective professional development opportunities for all District staff.

[F] Appeals Process

Teachers:

The following is the developed Appeal Procedure that the District is using under the NYSED regulations: section 30-2.11 for teachers:

Appeals are limited to tenured teachers who have received an overall rating of ineffective or developing.

A teacher may not file more than one appeal on the same component of the composite score.

Appeal Committee membership will consist of:

- a. The Superintendent or his/her designee
- b. The SETA President or his/her designee
- c. One tenured administrator, certified to conduct evaluations, appointed by the Superintendent. The administrator appointed shall not be the administrator who authored the evaluation.

d. Two tenured teachers appointed by the SETA president.

The three SETA members involved in the Appeals Committee will receive additional training in the observation-evaluation process by the Superintendent or designee. Training will be provided in a timely manner to insure a thorough understanding of the observation/evaluation process.)

The committee shall reach its finding using the consensus model.

The appeals process is not subject to the grievance or other dispute resolution process included in the SETA contract. The rating of the evaluator is not a basis for an appeal. However, inability to follow the specified timeline may be subject to the filing of a grievance.

Notification of the Appeal:

The tenured teacher has five school/business days from receipt of the written observation to appeal in writing to the established Appeals Committee. In addition, an appeal may be filed upon the receipt of the composite score.

Level 1:

Within ten school days, upon receipt of the appeal, the Appeals Committee will meet with the teacher and may meet with the Evaluator. During this time period, the Evaluator must respond in writing to the appeal. The response must include any and all additional documents or written materials that are specific to the point(s) of disagreement and/or are relevant to the resolution of the appeal. Material not submitted at the time the response is filed shall not be considered in the deliberations related to the resolution of the appeal.

If the Appeal is unable to be resolved at Level 1 within ten school days, the Appeal will proceed to Level 2.

Level 2:

Within twenty school/business days of the Level 1 determination from the initial filing date of the Appeal, a final determination will be made by the Appeals Committee. The decision shall set forth the reasons and factual basis for each determination on each of the specific issues raised in the appeal.

The Appeals Committee shall have the authority to rescind, modify, or affirm the rating. A new evaluation may be ordered.

The appeals committee will be the final determiner of all appeals. A written determination from the Superintendent on behalf of the committee will be a final and binding decision.

Principals

An administrator may challenge the overall rating (**ineffective rating only**) on the Summative Evaluation or an unsatisfactory rating on an administrator improvement plan.

Process

- A principal may appeal his/her performance review rating by written notice of appeal within ten (10) school/business days to the Superintendent of Schools upon receipt of their composite score. The notice of appeal must state specifically the grounds for appeal and include any documents relevant to the appeal.
- The appeal will be reviewed by a neutral third party within five (5) school/business days. By February 1, 2013, the District and the Association will jointly develop a list of three (3) reviewers in order of mutual preference. The reviewer will be selected according to availability.
- Within fifteen (15) school/business days after the appeal has been received by the neutral third party, the reviewer will interview both the principal and the lead evaluator together. Each party may present written and verbal information in support of the challenge and the

rating. The parties may ask questions of each other, and the reviewer may ask questions of both parties. There is no provision for witnesses. Each party may have one (1) representative present at the review.

- A written decision on the merits of the appeal shall be rendered no later than thirty (30) school/business days from the date on which the principal filed his/her appeal. The reviewer may uphold the rating, raise the rating, or vacate the rating.
- The decision of the reviewer shall be final and binding.

[G] Development of Improvement Plans for Identified Professionals

As per the regulations for the APPR Plan all school districts must include provisions for the development of a Teacher Improvement Plan (TIP).

Teacher Improvement Plan:

Teachers rated as “ineffective” or “developing” on the composite score must have a TIP developed by the school district in consultation with the teacher.

Teachers as “ineffective or “developing” based on the observation may have a TIP developed by the school district in consultation with the teacher.

Intensive supervision is characterized by the recognition on the part of the staff member and the administrator that the individual needs assistance to be successful. Observations and supervision will be frequent (a minimum of monthly) and all observations will be used as the basis for summative evaluation. Feedback will be immediate and specific. All available and appropriate resources will be utilized to support the teacher.

The development of a Teacher Improvement Plan regarding any teacher rated as “developing” or “ineffective” should be

collaborative. It should maintain the supportive climate inherent in the supportive supervision process for as long as is feasible to foster growth.

The TIP will include the following:

- Identification of the specific areas in need of improvement
- The expectation is that the goals will be met in accordance with the specified timelines
- Monthly benchmarks will be identified and monitored according to the timeline
- Improvement is measured by the use of the designated rubric (Danielson 2013)

The following is a timeline for development and review of the TIP:

- In the event a teacher's performance is found to be "ineffective" or "developing", the teacher shall be given written notice to such effect within ten (10) school days of the post observation meeting.
- Within five (5) school days of the receipt of the written notice a meeting will be set up between the teacher, mentor if applicable, Principal, Association President, and Superintendent of Schools or designee. The purpose of the meeting is to develop specific recommendations that, if satisfactorily implemented by the teacher, should lead to continuous professional improvement. All members participating in the conference can provide input.
- The administrator will observe the teacher and review the TIP every four (4) weeks until deficiencies are corrected. Revisions to the plan can be discussed at any of these meetings. The administrator will provide written feedback and specific suggestions after each set of formal observations as indicated in the SETA contract. In addition, monthly meetings will also be held with the teacher,

Superintendent, evaluator, mentor, and Association President.

- The TIP will be signed and dated by the professional and the evaluator after each monthly review and placed in the professional's permanent record folder.
- Adjustments and refocusing of the TIP can occur at anytime during the above process in response to the staff member's growth.
- If it is determined that the staff member is not able to meet the District's professional standards, the administrator will share his/her recommendation with the staff member, the Superintendent and the Association President.
- The TIP process is to be kept confidential among the members of the improvement team. The effort is a cooperative commitment to professional growth and development.

The APPR is to be a significant factor for termination and tenure determinations. In the event that an evaluator is concerned with the competence of a tenured teacher, it is agreed that the teacher will be invited to a conference with the evaluator, appropriate administrator (if different from the evaluator), and the Association President or his/her designee as early in the school year as reasonable. The conference may result in an intervention and/or TIP being developed.

[H] Training Process for Teachers and Evaluators

Teachers:

All teachers will be trained on the observation-evaluation system and its components including the NYS Teaching Standards and the designated performance rubric, prior to implementation of the APPR process.

Training and support will be conducted on the approved rubric for

newly hired staff prior to their first observation.

Administrators:

Lead evaluators and evaluators will complete a training course that meets the requirements prescribed in Chapter 103 and Section 30-2.9. Such training shall include application and use of the state approved practice rubrics as selected by the District. Once trained, the evaluator will be deemed certified as a lead evaluator.

Evaluators and lead evaluators will participate in recertification programs to insure inter rater reliability every two years.

[I] Definitions of Commonly Used Terms

Classroom Teacher:

Defined as a teacher in the classroom teaching service with teaching certification who is the teacher of record.

Common Branch Subjects:

Defined as those subjects that are included in the daily program of an elementary school.

Composite Effectiveness Score:

Defined as a score based on a 100-point scale assigned to a teacher or principal that includes three subcomponents – student growth, locally selected measures, and other measures.

- Student Growth – as measured on State Assessment or other comparable measures, 0-20 points and 0-25 points in subsequent years for those grades/subjects where a value-added growth model is approved by the Board of Regents.

- Locally Selected Measures of Student Achievement – Based on locally selected measures, 0-20 points and 0-15 points in subsequent years for those grades/subjects where a value-added growth model is

approved by the Board of Regents.

- Other Measures of Teacher Effectiveness – Defined as 0-60 points.

Evaluator:

An individual who conducts an evaluation (observation) of a classroom teacher or building principal.

Lead Evaluator:

The primary individual responsible for conducting and completing an evaluation of a classroom teacher or building principal. To the extent practicable, the building principal, or his or her designee, will be the lead evaluator of a classroom teacher.

Leadership Standards:

These are the Educational Leadership Policy Standards (ISLLC 2008) used to evaluate Principals.

Principal:

Defined to mean the principal of a registered public school or an administrator in charge of an instructional program of the school district.

Ratings – HEDI:

H – HIGHLY EFFECTIVE

A rating received by a teacher or principal that falls in the range for the composite effectiveness score.

E – EFFECTIVE

A rating received by a teacher or principal that falls in the range for the composite effectiveness score.

D – DEVELOPING

A rating received by a teacher or principal that falls in the range for the composite effectiveness score.

I – INEFFECTIVE

A rating received by a teacher or principal that falls in the range of the

composite effectiveness score.

Rubric:

The District will utilize an approved teacher or principal practice rubric that has been approved by the Commissioner and included on the State's list of approved rubrics.

The approved teacher rubric ~ Danielson's Framework for Teaching 2013.

The approved principal rubric ~ Multidimensional Principal Performance Rubric.

Student Assessment:

A standardized student assessment on the list approved by the Commissioner for the locally selected measures subcomponent and/or the measures of student growth in non-tested subjects for the State assessment or other comparable measures subcomponent.

Student Growth:

Student growth is the change in student achievement for an individual student between two or more points in time.

Student Growth Percentile Score:

This percentile score is the result of a statistical model, that calculates each student's change in achievement between two or more points in time on a State Assessment or other comparable measure and compares each student's performance to that of similarly achieving students.

Subcomponents of the Composite Effectiveness Score:

Defined as the three subcomponents of a Teacher's or Principal's evaluation (student growth on State Assessment, locally selected measures, and other measures of teacher/principal effectiveness) of the composite effectiveness score.

Teacher or Principal Student Growth Percentile:

Defined as a measure of central tendency of the student growth

percentile scores for a teacher's or principal's students after one or more of the following student characteristics are taken into consideration: poverty, students with disabilities, and English language learners.

Teacher of Record:

Defined in a manner as prescribed by the Commissioner, as an individual, or individuals (such as in co-teaching assignments) who has been assigned responsibility for a student's learning in a subject/course with aligned performance measures.

Testing Standards:

Means the "standards for educational and psychological testing."

The Governing Body of the School District:

Defined as the Board of Education.

Value – Added Growth Score:

The result of a statistical model that incorporates a student's academic history and may use other student demographics and characteristics, school characteristics and/or teacher characteristics to isolate statistically the effect on student growth from those characteristics that are generally not in the teacher's or principal's control.

The 2013-2014 APPR plan was approved by the State Education Department on September 26, 2013.