



Enlarged City School District

"Committed to Excellence"

Kaufman Center
1 Valley View Dr.
Cortland, NY 13045
Phone: 607-758-4100
Fax: 607-758-4128
www.cortlandschools.org

September 4, 2014

Superintendent

Michael J. Hoose

Board of Education

Melissa Davis-Howard
President

Janet S. Griffin
Vice-President

Donald A. Colongeli

Judith E. Murphy

John A. Natoli, Jr.

Daniel R. Sidebottom

Alane M. Van Donsel


Dear CUT Members,

The APPR Committee has completed its annual review of the current APPR Plan. I would like to thank all of the members for their open and honest dialogue, professionalism, and suggestions. Everything that we learned from the previous two years was discussed and considered for the final document. I think that you will find the changes to the plan to be in the best interest of the teaching and learning process.

The major change is that we are going to be using a district-wide Local Achievement Target (LAT) tied to student performance. Our goal is to reduce the amount of time that teachers and administrators were spending on creating LATs, making them consistent in rigor across the district, and reducing the amount of testing. In addition, you will notice that the LAT directly relates to one of our five Aim High Targets from our work with Results First.

The APPR Committee will meet over the course of this year and, once again, make recommendations for the 2015/16 APPR plan. Your feedback and suggestions will help us meet our goal of continuous improvement.

Sincerely,



Michael J. Hoose

MJH/b H:\Supt Office\docs\APPR\2014 Cover Letter.doc

Cortland Enlarged City School District
Teacher Annual Professional Performance Review Plan (APPR)

Introduction

On May 28, 2010, the Governor signed Chapter 103 of the Laws of 2010, which added a new section 3012-c to the Education Law, establishing a comprehensive evaluation system for classroom teachers and building principals.

By July 1, 2012, the governing body of each school district and BOCES shall adopt a plan, which may be an annual or multi-year plan, for the annual professional performance review of its teachers providing instructional services or pupil personnel services.

This plan was developed collaboratively by the Cortland United Teachers and the District. Once approved by the governing body of the school district, the plan will be filed in the district office and posted to the district website no later than September 10th of each year. If work on the development of the plan needs to continue after September 10th, revisions to the plan will be posted as recommended by the district committee to the negotiations teams.

The governing body of each school district and BOCES shall ensure that the performance of all teachers providing instructional services is reviewed annually. This plan is intended to ensure the full application of the APPR regulations for all staff as mandated by the 3012-c amendments to Education Law pertaining to evaluation of teachers. The new APPR plan will incorporate all staff subject to this regulation and will cover the 2014-2015 school year. PGAP will remain in effect for non-included staff. The District committee will continue to meet throughout the year and recommend revisions as necessary for future years.

Teacher Effectiveness

Annual professional performance reviews, APPRs, shall differentiate teacher effectiveness using a composite effectiveness score. Based on such a composite effectiveness score a classroom teacher shall be rated as Highly Effective, Effective, Developing, or Ineffective. The composite score is determined as follows:

Composite Scoring (No Value Added Model)

| Level | Growth on State Assessments (20 points) (Req'd. Ranges) | Locally Selected Measures (20 Points) (Req'd. Ranges) | Other Measures of Teacher Effectiveness (60 points) | | Totals (100 Points) (Req'd. Ranges) |
|------------------|---|---|---|-----------------------|-------------------------------------|
| | | | Observations (31 Points) | Artifacts (29 Points) | |
| Highly Effective | 18-20 | 18-20 | 30.5-31.0 (3.5-4.0) | 28.5-29 (3.5-4.0) | 91-100 |
| | | | Total = 59-60 | | |
| Effective | 9-17 | 9-17 | 29.5-30 (2.5-3.4) | 27.5-28 (2.5-3.4) | 75-90 |
| | | | Total = 57-58 | | |
| Developing | 3-8 | 3-8 | 25.5-29 (1.5-2.4) | 24.5-27 (1.5-2.4) | 65-74 |
| | | | Total = 50-56 | | |
| Ineffective | 0-2 | 0-2 | 0-25 (0-1.4) | 0-24 (0-1.4) | 0-64 |
| | | | Total = 0-49 | | |

Composite Scoring (Value Added Model)

| Level | Growth on State Assessments (25 Points) (Req'd. Ranges) | Locally Selected Measures (15 Points) (Req'd. Ranges) | Other Measures of Teacher Effectiveness (60 Points) | | Totals (100 Points) (Req'd. Ranges) |
|------------------|---|---|---|-----------------------|-------------------------------------|
| | | | Observations (31 Points) | Artifacts (29 Points) | |
| Highly Effective | 22-25 | 14-15 | 30-31.0 (3.5-4.0) | 28.5-29 (3.5-4.0) | 91-100 |
| | | | Total = 59-60 | | |
| Effective | 10-21 | 8-13 | 29.5-30.38 (2.5-3.4) | 27.5-28 (2.5-3.4) | 75-90 |
| | | | Total = 57-58 | | |
| Developing | 3-9 | 3-7 | 25.8-29.1 (1.5-2.4) | 24-27 (1.5-2.4) | 65-74 |
| | | | Total = 50-56 | | |
| Ineffective | 0-2 | 0-2 | 0-25.3 (0-1.4) | 0-23 (0-1.4) | 0-64 |
| | | | Total = 0-49 | | |

Student Growth Measures

Twenty percent (20%) is based on student growth on State assessments or other comparable measures of student growth (increased to 25% upon implementation of a value-added growth model). Student growth means the change in student achievement for an individual student between two or more points in time. Student growth percentile score shall mean 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. Value-added growth score shall mean 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 control.

Data that are provided by SED will provide the number of points (out of the possible 20 or 25) toward the composite score a teacher will be awarded for the student growth portion. The State will assign a score of 0-20 points for this subcomponent, which will contribute to the teacher's composite effectiveness score using the standards and scoring ranges for this subcomponent as prescribed in regulation.

Assessments will be secure and not disseminated to students prior to the assessment administration. Teachers will not score their own students' work if the results of the assessments will factor into their evaluation.

Student Achievement Measures

Twenty percent (20%) of the composite effectiveness score is based on locally-selected measures of student achievement that are determined to be rigorous and comparable across classrooms as defined by the Commissioner (decreased to 15% upon implementation of value-added growth model).

The district committee recommends utilizing a district-wide local measure of student achievement.

Assessments will be secure and not disseminated to students prior to the assessment administration. Teachers will not score their own students' work if the results of the assessments will factor into their evaluation.

*2014 – 2015 – Final ratings of Ineffective or Developing, that are determined in part by State assessment scores, will be recalculated with State assessment scores removed. The highest rating will be the final rating provided.

Multiple Measures of Effectiveness

The remaining 60% (or 60 out of the total 100 point composite score) of the composite effectiveness score is based on other measures of teacher effectiveness consistent with standards prescribed by the Commissioner in regulation.

Based on its inclusion in the SED-approved list of rubrics, A Framework for Teaching (Danielson, 2011) will be used to evaluate all teachers consistent with the Commissioner's regulations. (Appendix B: Danielson, 2011 rubric can be located on the district website or http://usny.nysed.gov/rtt/teachers-leaders/practicerubrics/Docs/Teachscope_Rubric.pdf). In order to support continuous professional growth, 31 of these 60 points shall be based on classroom observations, which consist of a combination of formal (period-length) and shorter (classroom visits and walk-through) observations. For the formal evaluation(s), a pre and post observation conference will occur, at which time the teacher will provide the evaluator with evidence of planning and preparation.

Observation Structure for Staff (31 of 60 Points)

| | | |
|----------------------|--------------------|---|
| Observations | Tenured Staff | <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • 1 Formal Observation <ul style="list-style-type: none"> ▪ Pre and Post Conferences |
| | Probationary Staff | <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • 3 Formal Observations <ul style="list-style-type: none"> ▪ Pre and Post Conferences |
| Walk Throughs | Tenured Staff | <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • 1 Evaluative <ul style="list-style-type: none"> ▪ Feedback Provided |
| | Probationary Staff | <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Informal Walk Throughs <ul style="list-style-type: none"> ▪ Feedback Provided |

*1 Formal request for re-visit available

| Teacher Observations | Observation/Evidence | Point Total |
|---|-----------------------------------|----------------------------------|
| Danielson's FFT, 2011 Rubric | Domain Scores | |
| Domain 1 Planning and Preparation | 1-4 | |
| Domain 2 The Classroom Environment | 1-4 | |
| Domain 3 Instruction | 1-4 | |
| Domain 4 Professional Responsibilities | 1-4 | |
| Total of Rubrics/4= Rubric Average | 1-4 | |
| Rubric Average-to-60 Point Scale (see chart below) | Total Points (out of 60) → | |
| | <u>X 31/60 =</u> | *Total Points (out of 31) |
| *This number is used on Composite Score Worksheet | | |

The remaining 29 out of the 60 points will be used to assess other areas of desired quality that are not addressed through direct observation and use of the rubric. The classroom teacher will prepare a collection of artifacts that will serve as evidence for these points. The criteria for the evaluation of artifacts is identified below.

Examples of Artifacts a Teacher May Choose to Submit (29 of 60 Points)

The following list is a sample of artifacts. There are many other types of artifacts not mentioned on the list that teachers may use if they align with components and/or elements within the Danielson Domains. Teachers will provide 7 artifacts for a total of 28 points: One artifact each for Domains 1-3, two artifacts for Domain 4, one artifact for the Domain aligned with staff member's annual goal, and the final artifact is staff member's choice and may align with any Domain (1-4). There is one point awarded to the teacher for attending the mid-year meeting to review the artifacts. This is a total of 29/60 points.

| Annual Goal: | Domain __ | Component __ | Element __ | |
|---|---|-----------------------|--|---------------------------------|
| Danielson's EFT 2011 Rubric | Examples of Artifacts | # of Artifacts | Points | |
| Domain 1 Planning and Preparation | Lesson plans, reading levels, grouping strategies. | 1 | 0-4 | |
| Domain 2 The Classroom Environment | Evidence of routines & structures established in the classroom, anchor charts, rules, photos, classroom maps, schedules, etc. | 1 | 0-4 | |
| Domain 3 Instruction | Samples of student work that demonstrate differentiated instruction, samples of student work with meaningful feedback. Sample formative assessment used in class, rubrics, student data used to modify instruction. | 1 | 0-4 | |
| Domain 4 Professional Responsibilities | Evidence of participation in learning groups, book reads, staff development, MLP, etc. Parent phone logs, meeting agenda(s), written communication, attendance at school & district functions and student clubs. | 2 | 0-4 | |
| | | 2* | *Additional artifacts: one aligned with staff member's goal and 1 staff choice | |
| Total of Rubrics/4=Rubric Average | | | | |
| Rubric Average-to-60 Point Scale | *Model to be discussed | | Total Points (out of 60) | |
| | | | X 29/60 = | Total Points (out of 29) |
| *This number is used on Composite Score Worksheet | | | | |

Scoring Methodology for 60% of Teacher Effectiveness

A formula has been developed locally to calculate the number of points for the teacher effectiveness composite score consistent with standards prescribed by the Commissioner in regulation.

Teacher Effectiveness Conversion Scale

| Level | Overall Rubric Average Score | 60 Point Distribution Composite |
|------------------|------------------------------|---------------------------------|
| Ineffective | 1.0 - 1.4 | 0-49 |
| Developing | 1.5 - 2.4 | 50-56.3 |
| Effective | 2.5 - 3.4 | 57-58.8 |
| Highly Effective | 3.5 - 4.0 | 59-60 |

Converting Points to a Rating

The teacher's rating will drive how many points the teacher will receive toward the composite score. In this subcomponent, the teacher should first be rated according to the rubric, that rating would determine where the teacher falls in the HEDI categories, and then the points are applied. For example, a teacher that scores 3.0 on the rubric would translate to a score in the "effective" range. The teacher would then receive 58 points toward the composite score.

Rubric Score for 60 Points, 31 Points and 29 Points Conversion Chart

The detailed conversion chart below allows the district to convert any average rubric score to a specific conversion score for that sub-component.

| Rating | Rubric | 60 Points | 31 Points | 29 Points | Rating | Rubric | 60 Points | 31 points | 29 Points |
|-------------|--------|-----------|-----------|-----------|------------------|--------|-----------|-----------|-----------|
| Ineffective | 1.0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | Effective | 2.5 | 57 | 29.5 | 27.5 |
| | 1.1 | 12 | 6.2 | 5.8 | | 2.6 | 57.2 | 29.6 | 27.6 |
| | 1.2 | 25 | 12.9 | 12.1 | | 2.7 | 57.4 | 29.7 | 27.7 |
| | 1.3 | 37 | 19.1 | 17.9 | | 2.8 | 57.6 | 29.76 | 27.84 |
| | 1.4 | 49 | 25.3 | 23.7 | | 2.9 | 57.8 | 29.86 | 27.94 |
| Developing | 1.5 | 50 | 25.8 | 24.5 | | 3.0 | 58 | 29.96 | 28.03 |
| | 1.6 | 50.7 | 26.2 | 24.6 | | 3.1 | 58.2 | 30.07 | 28.13 |
| | 1.7 | 51.4 | 26.6 | 24.8 | | 3.2 | 58.4 | 30.17 | 28.23 |
| | 1.8 | 52.1 | 26.9 | 25.2 | | 3.3 | 58.6 | 30.28 | 28.32 |
| | 1.9 | 52.8 | 27.3 | 25.5 | | 3.4 | 58.8 | 30.38 | 28.42 |
| | 2.0 | 53.5 | 27.6 | 25.9 | Highly Effective | 3.5 | 59 | 30.48 | 28.52 |
| | 2.1 | 54.2 | 28.0 | 26.2 | | 3.6 | 59.3 | 30.64 | 28.67 |
| | 2.2 | 54.9 | 28.4 | 26.5 | | 3.7 | 59.5 | 30.74 | 28.76 |
| | 2.3 | 55.6 | 28.7 | 26.9 | | 3.8 | 59.8 | 30.90 | 28.9 |
| | 2.4 | 56.3 | 29.1 | 27.2 | | 3.9 | 59.93 | 30.95 | 28.98 |
| | | | | 4.0 | | 60 | 31 | 29 | |

A Framework for Teaching Danielson Performance Levels and SED Performance Levels

| Danielson Performance Level | SED Performance Level | Rating |
|------------------------------------|------------------------------|---------------|
| Unsatisfactory | Ineffective | 1 |
| Basic | Developing | 2 |
| Proficient | Effective | 3 |
| Distinguished | Highly Effective | 4 |

Professional Development

In addition to school and/or district priorities, professional development objectives for the teacher will be based on the evaluation.

Timely Provision of Feedback

Formal observations will include a pre and post conference. The post observation conference will be held within five school days of the observation. Walk-Through observations will result in written feedback provided to the teacher on a district form. The feedback from Walk-Throughs will be provided within three school days of the event. A post-conference for a Walk-Through may be scheduled at the request of either party within five school days of receipt of the feedback form.

Evaluator Training

The Superintendent will ensure that all evaluators have been trained and that all lead evaluators have been trained and certified in accordance with regulation. The District will utilize BOCES Network Team evaluator training and lead evaluator training and certification in accordance with SED procedures and processes. Lead evaluator training will include training on:

- 1) The New York State Teaching Standards, and their related elements and performance indicators and the Leadership Standards and their related functions, as applicable;
- 2) Evidence-based observation techniques that are grounded in research;
- 3) Application and use of the student growth percentile model and the value-added growth model;
- 4) Application and use of the teacher or principal rubric(s), including training on the effective application of such rubrics to observe a teacher or principal's practice;
- 5) Application and use of any assessment tools that the school district or BOCES utilizes to evaluate its classroom teachers or building principals, including but not limited to,

structured portfolio reviews; student, parent, teacher and/or community surveys; professional growth goals and school improvement goals, etc.,

- 6) Application and use of any locally selected measures of student achievement used by the district to evaluate its teachers or principals;
- 7) Use of the Statewide Instructional Reporting System;
- 8) The scoring methodology including how scores are generated for each subcomponent and the composite effectiveness score and application and use of the scoring ranges prescribed by the Commissioner for the four designated rating categories used for the teacher's or principal's overall rating and their subcomponent ratings; and
- 9) Specific considerations in evaluating teachers and principals of English Language Learners and Students with Disabilities.

The superintendent will ensure that lead evaluators participate in annual training and are re-certified on an annual basis. The BOCES Network Team will be utilized to provide the training and recertification. Any individual who fails to achieve required training or certification or recertification, as applicable, shall not conduct or complete evaluations.

Data Linkage

Working with the Central New York Regional Information Center, the District will provide all of the data elements described by SED. Data will be submitted to the SED through the portal each year.

Professional Improvement Plans

Upon rating a teacher as Developing or Ineffective through APPR, the District is required to develop a teacher improvement plan (TIP) for the teacher (Appendix C). The TIP must be developed and implemented no later than 10 school days from the opening of classes in the school year following the school year for which such teacher's performance is being measured.

A TIP shall include the identification of areas that need improvement, a timeline for achieving improvement, the manner in which improvement will be assessed, and where appropriate, differentiated activities to support improvement in the identified areas.

The plan shall describe the professional learning activities the educator must complete that are directly related to areas needing improvement and identify artifacts the teacher must produce that will serve as documentation of improvement and as evidence for the final stage of the improvement plan. In addition, the plan will clearly state the additional support and assistance the educator will receive.

The existing PGAP Individual Support Plan (Appendix D) can be implemented for teachers at the request of a principal or teacher. The ISP is not associated with a composite rating.

Appeals

Appeals of APPRs should be limited only to those that rate a teacher as Ineffective.

Appeal procedures should limit the scope of appeals under Education Law §3012-c to the following subjects:

- (1) the District's adherence to the standards and methodologies required for such reviews, pursuant to Education Law §3012-c;
- (2) the adherence to the Commissioner's regulations, as applicable to such reviews;
- (3) compliance with any applicable locally negotiated procedures applicable to annual professional performance reviews or improvement plans; and
- (4) the District's issuance and/or implementation of the terms of the teacher improvement plan under Education Law §3012-c.

A teacher may not file multiple appeals regarding the same performance review or teacher improvement plan. All grounds for appeal must be raised with specificity within one appeal. Any grounds not raised at the time the appeal is filed shall be deemed waived. In an appeal, the teacher has the burden of demonstrating a clear legal right to the relief requested and the burden of establishing the facts upon which petitioner seeks relief.

Nothing in this section shall be construed to alter or diminish the authority of the governing body of the district to grant or deny tenure to or terminate probationary teachers during the pendency of an appeal pursuant to this section for statutorily and constitutionally permissible reasons other than the teacher's performance that is the subject of the appeal.

Timeframe for Filing an Appeal

Notification of an Ineffective or Developing rating as a result of the composite score will be sent via registered, return receipt required mail. An appeal of an Ineffective rating must be submitted in writing no later than 15 calendar days of the date when the teacher receives his or her notification of APPR rating. A teacher may request a meeting with the principal or evaluator to seek clarification or resolution regarding the evaluation at any time.

If a teacher is challenging the issuance of a TIP, an appeal must be filed with 15 calendar days of issuance of such plan. (Appendix E). The failure to file an appeal within these time frames shall be deemed a waiver of the right to appeal and the appeal shall be deemed abandoned. The teacher will remain on a TIP throughout the appeal process.

When filing an appeal, the teacher must submit a detailed written description of the specific areas of disagreement over his or her performance review, or the issuance and/or implementation of the terms of his or her improvement plan and any additional documents or materials relevant to the appeal. The performance review and/or improvement plan being challenged must also be submitted with the appeal. Any information not submitted at the time the appeal is filed shall not be considered.

Within 15 calendar days of receipt of an appeal, the administrator who issued the performance review or is responsible for either the issuance and/or implementation of the terms of the teacher's improvement plan must submit a detailed written response to the appeal.

The response must include any and all additional documents or written materials specific to the point(s) of disagreement that support the District's response and are relevant to the resolution of the appeal. Any such information that is not submitted at the time the response is filed shall not be considered in the deliberations related to the resolution of the appeal. The teacher initiating the appeal shall receive a copy of the response filed by the District, and any and all additional information submitted with the response, at the same time the District files its response.

Appeals Process

Level I: Principal Review

After receipt of the appeal documentation, an Appeal Meeting will be scheduled between the teacher and principal within 10 calendar days.

A written decision shall be rendered by the principal regarding the appeal within 10 calendar days. If the appeal is sustained, the reviewer may set aside a rating if it has been affected by substantial error or defect, modify a rating if it is affected by substantial error or defect or order a new evaluation if procedures have been violated. A copy of the decision shall be provided to the teacher and forwarded to the teacher's personnel file.

Level II: Superintendent Review

If the appeal is not sustained, the teacher may request a review by the Superintendent. The request for a superintendent review must be made in writing within 5 calendar days of receipt of the principal's decision. All materials submitted at the time of the original appeal will be forwarded to the Superintendent by the teacher.

A written decision shall be rendered by the Superintendent within 10 calendar days except that an appeal may not be decided by the same individual who was responsible for making the final rating decision. In such case, the board of education shall appoint another person to decide the appeal. If the appeal is sustained, the reviewer may set aside a rating if it has been affected by substantial error or defect, modify a rating if it is affected by substantial error or defect or order a new evaluation if procedures have been violated. A copy of the decision shall be provided to the teacher and forwarded to the teacher's personnel file.

Level III: Mediation

If the appeal is not sustained, the teacher can request mediation in which case, the cost will be shared by the District and the Association. The request for mediation must be submitted in writing within 5 calendar days of the receipt of the Superintendent's decision.

A written recommendation on the merits of the appeal shall be rendered by the mediator no later than 30 calendar days from the date of mediation. The appeal shall be based on the documentation requested by the mediator. The mediator's recommendation shall set forth the reasons and factual basis for each determination on each of the specific issues raised in the teacher's appeal and shall be advisory in nature to the Superintendent. A written decision shall be issued by the Superintendent within 10 calendar days after receipt of the mediator's recommendation. The Superintendent's decision shall be final and binding.

Appendix A

Charlotte Danielson's FRAMEWORK FOR TEACHING

| | |
|---|--|
| <p>DOMAIN 1: Planning and Preparation</p> <p>1a Demonstrating Knowledge of Content and Pedagogy</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Content knowledge • Prerequisite relationships • Content pedagogy <p>1b Demonstrating Knowledge of Students</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Child development • Learning process • Special needs • Student skills, knowledge, and proficiency • Interests and cultural heritage <p>1c Setting Instructional Outcomes</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Value, sequence, and alignment • Clarity • Balance • Suitability for diverse learners <p>1d Demonstrating Knowledge of Resources</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • For classroom • To extend content knowledge • For students <p>1e Designing Coherent Instruction</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Learning activities • Instructional materials and resources • Instructional groups • Lesson and unit structure <p>1f Designing Student Assessments</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Congruence with outcomes • Criteria and standards • Formative assessments • Use for planning | <p>DOMAIN 2: The Classroom Environment</p> <p>2a Creating an Environment of Respect and Rapport</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Teacher interaction with students • Student interaction with students <p>2b Establishing a Culture for Learning</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Importance of content • Expectations for learning and achievement • Student pride in work <p>2c Managing Classroom Procedures</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Instructional groups • Transitions • Materials and supplies • Non-instructional duties • Supervision of volunteers and paraprofessionals <p>2d Managing Student Behavior</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Expectations • Monitoring behavior • Response to misbehavior <p>2e Organizing Physical Space</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Safety and accessibility • Arrangement of furniture and resources |
| <p>DOMAIN 4: Professional Responsibilities</p> <p>4a Reflecting on Teaching</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Accuracy • Use in future teaching <p>4b Maintaining Accurate Records</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Student completion of assignments • Student progress in learning • Non-instructional records <p>4c Communicating with Families</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • About instructional program • About individual students • Engagement of families in instructional program <p>4d Participating in a Professional Community</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Relationships with colleagues • Participation in school projects • Involvement in culture of professional inquiry • Service to school <p>4e Growing and Developing Professionally</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Enhancement of content knowledge and pedagogical skill • Receptivity to feedback from colleagues • Service to the profession <p>4f Showing Professionalism</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Integrity/ethical conduct • Service to students • Advocacy • Decision-making • Compliance with school/district regulations | <p>DOMAIN 3: Instruction</p> <p>3a Communicating With Students</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Expectations for learning • Directions and procedures • Explanations of content • Use of oral and written language <p>3b Using Questioning and Discussion Techniques</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Quality of questions • Discussion techniques • Student participation <p>3c Engaging Students in Learning</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Activities and assignments • Student groups • Instructional materials and resources • Structure and pacing <p>3d Using Assessment in Instruction</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Assessment criteria • Monitoring of student learning • Feedback to students • Student self-assessment and monitoring <p>3e Demonstrating Flexibility and Responsiveness</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Lesson adjustment • Response to students • Persistence |

www.danielsongroup.org

Appendix B

http://usny.nysed.gov/rttt/teachersleaders/practicrubrics/Docs/Teachscape_Rubric.pdf



Appendix C

Locally Selected Measures of Student Achievement

Twenty percent (20%) of the composite effectiveness score is based on State assessments or other locally-selected measures of student achievement that are determined to be rigorous and comparable across classrooms as defined by the Commissioner (decreased to fifteen [15%] upon implementation of value-added growth model).

The District wide local score will be based on the average percent of all students scoring proficient or better on State testing identified below. The average for each year will be calculated by adding the average percent proficient in each of the areas tested and dividing that number by the number of tests administered. This average will be compared to the previous year's average using the following formula:

(This year's average – last year's average = Growth Score Percentage)

K-12 All Subjects

Assessments

ELA 3, ELA 4, ELA 5, ELA 6, ELA 7, ELA 8, Math 3, Math 4, Math 5, Math 6, Math 7, Math 8, Science 4, Science 8, Chemistry, Physics, English, Global Studies, Living Environment, Earth Science, US History, Integrated Algebra, Algebra 2/Trigonometry, and Geometry

The average shall then be converted to a HEDI score using the chart below:

20 Point Local Growth Measure

| | % of Student Growth | Points for NYS Student Growth Measure |
|------------------|----------------------------|--|
| Highly Effective | 7% | 20 |
| | 6% | 19 |
| | 5% | 18 |
| Effective | 4% | 17 |
| | 3% | 16 |
| | 2% | 15 |
| | 1% | 14 |
| | 0% | 13 |
| | -1% | 12 |
| | -2% | 11 |
| | -3% | 10 |
| | -4% | 9 |
| Developing | -5% | 8 |
| | -6% | 7 |
| | -7% | 6 |
| | -8% | 5 |
| | -9% | 4 |
| | -10% | 3 |
| Ineffective | -11% | 2 |
| | -12% | 1 |
| | -13% or more | 0 |

Or

15 Point Local Growth Measure

| | % of Student Growth | Points For NYS Student Growth Measure |
|------------------|----------------------------|--|
| Highly Effective | 5% | 15 |
| | 4% | 14 |
| Effective | 3% | 13 |
| | 2% | 12 |
| | 1% | 11 |
| | 0% | 10 |
| | -1% | 9 |
| | -2% | 8 |
| | -3% | 7 |
| Developing | -4% | 6 |
| | -5% | 5 |
| | -6% | 4 |
| | -7% | 3 |
| | -8% | 2 |
| Ineffective | -9% | 1 |
| | -10% or more | 0 |

**Scale to be determined annually and may be further modified if significant adjustments are made at the State level to exam content, format or scales.

Appendix D

APPR Teacher Improvement Plan

(To be developed collaboratively and implemented no later than 10 school days from the opening of classes in the school year following the school year for which such teacher's performance is being measured.)

Teacher Name: _____ School: _____

Principal/Evaluator: _____ Initial Meeting Date: _____

Rubric Domain: _____ Rubric Element: _____ State Assessment: _____ Local Assessment: _____

| | |
|---|--|
| Area in Need of Improvement | |
| Desired Outcomes | |
| Activities to Support Reaching Desired Outcomes | |
| Timeline for Completion | |
| Resources to be Provided by District | |
| Evidence to Support Achievement of Goal | |

APPR Teacher Improvement Plan, continued

Teacher Name: _____ School: _____

Rubric Domain: _____ Rubric Element: _____ State Assessment: _____ Local Assessment: _____

| | |
|---|--|
| Area in Need of Improvement | |
| Desired Outcomes | |
| Activities to Support Reaching Desired Outcomes | |
| Timeline for Completion | |
| Resources to be Provided by District | |
| Evidence to Support Achievement of Goal | |
| Was Desired Outcome Achieved? Yes/No & Date | |

Appendix E

Cortland Enlarged City School District Individual Support Plan (ISP)

EXPLANATION:

The purpose of this option is to provide a more structured and mode of supervision. This may include probationary staff who require greater specificity to meet tenure status, or a staff member whose competence is in question. The administrative supervisor will specify timelines and objectives, and may request involvement of others.

Ideally individual support is characterized by 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 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 for support.

The decision about implementation of an Individual Support Plan should be collaborative, but may be directive. Individual support is intended to provide the best possible likelihood for professional growth; but it may lead to a recommendation for dismissal or non-tenure. It should maintain the supportive climate inherent in the supportive supervision process for as long as is feasible to foster growth.

STEPS IN THE PROCESS:

STEP 1: Placement

- A. Based on administrative summative documentation of the lack of employee effectiveness, the administrator will assign the staff member to the *Individual Support Plan* option. A letter will be sent to the staff member to formally notify him/her of placement into the *Individual Support Plan* option. A copy of the letter will be forward to the superintendent and the personnel file.
- B. The staff member will opt to have a team or one-on-one approach to the plan. A team approach is highly recommended if an *Individual Support Plan* is recommended beyond one year. The employee's selection will be verified in writing and a copy will be forwarded to the superintendent, CUT representative, team participant, and personnel file. In addition to the staff member and administrator the team will be comprised of the following:

| <i>Team Composition</i> | <i>Selected By</i> | <i>Role</i> |
|------------------------------------|----------------------|--|
| <i>Building Colleague</i> | <i>Staff member</i> | <i>Instructional support</i> |
| <i>Building CUT Representative</i> | <i>Staff member</i> | <i>Offers instructional support and monitors process</i> |
| <i>Administrator Colleague</i> | <i>Administrator</i> | <i>Offers instructional support and monitors process</i> |

Step 2: Conference and Goal Setting

- A. A conference will be held with the staff member, administrator and the review team (if selected) to develop the employee's annual goals.
- B. The administrator, with input from the staff member and the review team (if selected), will write the staff member's Annual Action Plan. The Action Plan will be specific and detailed, and written within ten days of the conference. Copies will be distributed to team members.
- C. A specific and detailed timeline will be worked out for the teacher and administrator to review progress. This should be in intervals of no longer than three to four weeks.

STEP 3: Feedback and Review

- A. Formal observations and evaluations will be conducted by the administrators.
- B. Administrators will provide written feedback and specific suggestions after each set of formal observations and evaluations.
- C. The administrator will share a written, mid-year progress report with staff member and the review team (if selected). The conference will be an analysis of performance and the degree of achievement of previously stated goals.
- D. Copies of this document will be added to the staff member's personnel file.
- E. Adjustments and refocusing of the plan can occur at anytime in response to the staff member's growth.

STEP 4: Evaluation Report

- A. The staff member will write a self-reflective narrative and the administrator will write a summative narrative. Both will be reviewed with staff member and the review team (if selected). This must be completed by April 1st and 15th for non-tenured employees, and June 1st for tenured employees.
- B. Evaluations will be performance-based and will discuss the degree of attainment of the annual goals, including significant professional activities.
- C. Staff member and/or administrator comments related to the conference should be attached to evaluations to form the evaluation report.
- D. The evaluation report will include the supervision-evaluation option recommended. The administrator will recommend continuation in the Individual Support Plan or staff member selected option.
- E. 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 and the superintendent.
- F. Copies of this evaluation report will be forwarded by the administrator to the central office and a copy given to the staff member.

Appendix F

**Cortland Enlarged City School District
Appeal Form**

Teacher's Name: _____

Evaluator's Name: _____

All supporting documentation for appeal shall be attached to this form at the time it is submitted to the District. Any information not submitted attached to the appeal may not be considered at a future time. **An appeal must be filed by registered mail (return receipt) within fifteen (15) calendar days of receiving notification (signing receipt) of an Ineffective Rating or issuance of TIP.**

Form of Appeal: (Please check one.)

- Overall Composite Rating of "Ineffective" TIP (Developing on Ineffective Rating)

Date Ineffective Rating received: _____ **Date TIP issued:** _____

Basis of the Appeal: (Please check one.)

- The District's adherence to the standards and methodologies required for such reviews; pursuant to Education Law §3012-c.
- The adherence to the Commissioner's regulations, as applicable to such reviews.
- Compliance with any applicable locally negotiated procedures applicable to annual professional performance reviews or improvement plans.
- The District's issuance and/or implementation of the terms of the teacher improvement plan under Education Law §3012-c.

Date appeal with supporting documentation submitted to the District: _____

Evaluator's written response with all supporting documentation relevant to appeal must be filed within 15 calendar days of receipt of appeal.

Date of Evaluator's Response: _____

Level I: The teacher may request an Appeal Meeting with Principal within 10 calendar days.

- Yes, I request an Appeal Meeting.** **No, I waive my right to an Appeal Meeting.**

Date Appeal Meeting Requested: _____

A written decision on the merits of the appeal shall be rendered no later than 10 calendar days from receipt of the teacher's appeal.

Appeal Sustained **Appeal Not Sustained** **Date Response Issued:** _____

Level II: The teacher may request an Appeal Meeting with Superintendent within five calendar days of receipt of Principal's Response.

- Yes, I request an Appeal Meeting Meeting.** **No, I waive my right to an Appeal Meeting.**

Date Level II Appeal Meeting Requested: _____

Date Superintendent Response Issued: _____ (within 10 calendar days of Request)

Level III: Request for Mediator Recommendation within five calendar days of receipt of Superintendent's Response.

- Yes, I request Mediation** **No, I am not requesting Mediation**

Mediation Date: _____

Mediator's Recommendation:

Date Recommendation Received: _____

Level IV: Superintendent's final and binding decision shall be rendered in writing within ten (10) calendar days of receipt of Mediator's recommendation.