

APPENDIX M

Annual Professional Performance Review of Classroom Teachers

January 3, 2013

Introduction

Annual professional performance reviews shall be a significant factor for employment decisions including but not limited to, promotion, retention, tenure determination, termination, supplemental compensation, and professional development (NYS Ed. Law 3012c). The following staff members will not be evaluated using this plan but rather will be evaluated pursuant to the existing contract: nurses, librarians, counselors, psychologists, OT/PT, social workers.

Purpose: 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 based on current research on best practices and is aligned with New York State's Teaching Standards. It assures a common language and common expectations among all teachers and evaluators. It is intentionally linked to professional development 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 resources and support for teachers to improve instruction and professional practice.
- The goal of the evaluation process is that teachers and evaluators examine evidence obtained by multiple measures of teaching practice and student achievement to plan for meaningful professional learning and improvement of instruction.
- Evaluations will be conducted openly and objectively with the full involvement of the teacher.

Plan Requirements: Under Education Law 3012-c, each teacher must receive an APPR resulting in a single composite effectiveness score and a rating of "highly effective", "effective", "developing", or "ineffective".

The composite score will be determined as follows:

- 20 percent student growth on state assessments or a comparable measure of student growth (25 percent upon implementation of the value-added growth model)
- 20 percent other locally selected measures of student achievement that are determined to be rigorous and comparable across classrooms (15 percent following implementation of value-added growth model).
- 60 percent based on multiple measures of effective teaching practice aligned with the state's teaching standards. The measures are established locally through collective bargaining.

Duration and Applicability:

Duration: This APPR document shall be subjected to being reopened on an annual basis for the sole purpose of reviewing contents of the plan. Any subsequent changes will be made only with the agreement of both parties. All other terms and conditions will remain as specified in the APPR plan.

Evaluation of Probationary Teachers for Tenure: Nothing in this APPR plan document shall be construed to affect the right of the district to terminate a probationary teacher or to restrict the district's discretion in making tenure determinations pursuant to law for any constitutionally or statutorily permissible reason other than performance in the classroom.

Savings Clause:

1. If any provision of this APPR plan is or shall be at any time determined to be contrary to the law, Commissioner's regulations, Requirements of The New York State Education Department, Decision or Order of any Court of competent jurisdiction or other binding authority, then the conflicting authority shall be given force and effect and the conflicting provision of this agreement shall not be given force or effect. In that event, further, the remainder of this APPR plan, to the extent practicable, shall nonetheless continue with full force and effect.
2. Any dispute as to the meaning or applicability of this APPR plan shall be resolved in such a manner as to facilitate meaningful compliance with the letter and intent of all applicable laws, regulations and Department* guidance.

**The Department = State Education Department*

Negotiability:

1. The Parties recognize that certain aspects of the APPR are mandatorily negotiable while other plan aspects are determined at the management prerogative of the district.
2. In order to articulate the district's APPR plan as a comprehensible and coherent whole, this document articulates mandatorily negotiated aspects of the plan as well as aspects that may be determined at the management prerogative of the district. The Parties agree that in so doing neither this plan nor the process by which it was developed shall have the effect of converting a non-mandatory subject of bargaining into a mandatory subject of bargaining.

Evaluator Training and Inter-Rater Reliability:

Evaluator Training:

1. The district will certify lead evaluators annually as qualified to conduct teacher evaluations under 3012-c and Commissioner's Regulation 30-2.
2. The District will provide training to evaluators and lead evaluators through the BOCES RTTT Evaluator Training program, and other organizations' programs in accordance with SED procedures and processes.
3. However, classroom observations required by this APPR plan may be conducted immediately following training, provided of course, that the administrator performing such classroom evaluations are properly credentialed school administrators for such purpose.

Inter-Rater Reliability:

Lead evaluators will maintain inter-rater reliability over time and evaluators will be trained through the BOCES RTTT Evaluator Training Program and other organizations' programs in accordance with SED procedures and processes in maintaining inter-rater reliability over time.

Teacher Evaluation Process:

Data Submission to The Department:

The district will ensure that The 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 Commissioner's Regulations 30-2 in a format and on a timeline prescribed by the Commissioner. More particularly, the district student management system (currently E School Data) will be the source of this data. The Chief Information Officer is responsible for monitoring and submitting the data subsequent to District Personnel verification.

Teacher Verification of Subjects Taught and Students Assigned

Classroom teachers to whom this plan applies shall be provided an opportunity to verify the subjects and students assigned to them according to the verification procedures dictated by SED. Teachers will additionally have the opportunity to verify both student and their own attendance.

Reporting Teachers' Subcomponent and Composite Scores to the Department

The District will report to The Department the individual subcomponent scores and the composite effectiveness score for each teacher to whom this plan applies in a format and on a timeline prescribed by the Commissioner. More particularly, the District plans to use the current student data and personnel management software systems to establish and track the teacher/student course linkage as required by law and said data will be uploaded when the NYSED system is ready to receive the data.

The District shall be responsible for overseeing the assessment development, security, and scoring processes utilized under this APPR Plan, and shall take steps to ensure that any assessments and/or measures used to evaluate teachers and administrators are not disseminated to students before administration, and that teachers and administrators do not have a vested interest in the outcome of the assessments they score.

Assessments may be district developed, collaboratively developed in curricular teams, regionally developed (in our BOCES for example), or vendor developed. All assessments will be reviewed for

necessary rigor, comparability and alignment with the appropriate common core learning standards (CCLS) and New York State assessments

Composite Effectiveness Score: This term means the total effectiveness score out of 100 points assigned to each teacher for an annual performance review that is compiled by a building principal.

Ineffective: This term means a rating wherein a teacher receives a composite effectiveness score of 0-64 points as prescribed by the Commissioner of Education.

Developing: This term means a rating wherein a teacher receives a composite effectiveness score of 65-74 points as prescribed by the Commissioner of Education.

Effective: This term means a rating wherein a teacher receives a composite effectiveness score of 75-90 points as prescribed by the Commissioner of Education.

Highly Effective: This term means a rating wherein a teacher receives a composite effectiveness score of 91-100 points as prescribed by the Commissioner of Education.

Measures of Effectiveness Based on Student Learning (40)

NYSED provides scores for Growth on State Assessments. NYSED additionally requires that the district computes a score for Growth using “comparable measures” if no state test is available for a course. For teachers where there is no state –provided measure of student growth, comparable measures are the state determined district-wide growth goal setting process, called Student Learning Objectives.

A Student Learning Objective is an academic goal for a teacher’s student which is set at the start of a course. It represents the most important learning for the year. It must be specific and measurable, based on available prior student learning data, and aligned to the Common Core, State, or national standards, as well as any other school district priorities. Teachers’ scores are based upon the degree to which their goals were attained.

NYS SLOs must include the following elements:

- **Student Population:** Which students are being addressed?
- **Learning Content:** What students are being addressed?
- **Interval of Instructional Time:** What is the instructional period? Year, semester, quarter?
- **Evidence:** What assessment(s) or student work product(s) will be used to measure this goal?
- **Baseline:** What is the starting level of learning in the class?
- **Target:** What is the numerical expected outcome by the end of the instructional period?
- **HEDI:** How will evaluators determine what range of student performance “meets” the goal ie: “highly effective”, “effective”, “developing”, and “ineffective”.
- **Rationale:** Why choose this learning content, evidence, and target?

Staff will use the state provided template for reporting and monitoring SLOs. SLOs will be developed in the manner described in the chart below.

For Locally Selected Measures, the District shall utilize the same structured goal setting process developed by the state using Student Learning Objectives. The Locally Selected Measures component can measure achievement.

District-wide process for Setting, Reviewing, and Assessing SLO's And Local Measures of Achievement

Sept/Oct	May/June
<ol style="list-style-type: none"> 1. Schools review district academic priorities and district guidelines for targets and/or evidence to be used for specific grade/subject configurations. 2. Teachers determine the number of SLO's required to cover > 50% of their student load, starting with classes with greatest number of students 3. Pre-test assessments are administered. Pre-assessment roster is sent to building principal and Assistant Superintendent. 4. Assessments are scored by teachers with no vested interest in results, to the extent practicable. 5. Teachers compile baseline data for all students covered by SLO's 6. Teachers complete draft SLO(s) using appropriate District SLO Template(s) 7. Teachers and principal/lead evaluator meet to confirm the number of SLO's required and discuss the SLO's, including appropriate measureable targets based on baseline data and revise as necessary. The HEDI ratings shall be set as per the guidelines in the appendix. 8. District administration conducts a randomized audit of SLO's to check for rigor and consistency. 	<ol style="list-style-type: none"> 1. Students take summative assessments for their courses 2. Assessments are scored by teachers with no vested interest in results 3. Teachers compile baseline data and summative assessment results for each SLO based on students listed in attendance on pre-assessment roster 4. Teachers and principal meet to discuss the results of the summative assessments 5. Principal/lead evaluator provides the teacher with a final score for their SLO's based on student growth/achievement: <ol style="list-style-type: none"> a) Evaluator assesses the results of each SLO separately, arriving at a HEDI rating and point value between 0-20 points. b) Each SLO is then weighted proportionately based on the number of students included in all SLOs. c) The sum of the weighted scores results in one overall growth component score between 0-20 points. d) In calculating, the lead evaluator always rounds to the nearest whole number; $\geq .5$ rounds up and $< .5$ rounds down. 6. District administration conducts a randomized audit of final scoring of SLO's to check for rigor and consistency.

Student Learning Objectives (SLO's) and Local Measure of Achievement will be measured, in the

manner described below.

Faculty	Local Measures of Student Achievement (20/15)♣	State Provided Growth or Student Learning Objective (20/25)♠
Grades 9-12 faculty with Regents Exams, or local final exams	20 points of a teacher's composite score will be based upon the performance of students on a mutually selected assessment.	20 points of a teacher's composite score will be based upon the performance on a final exam or Regents examination as compared to baseline data. If Regents exists for the subject – must use Regents data.
Grades 4-8 ELA and Math Faculty	20 points of a teacher's composite score will be based upon the performance of students on a mutually selected assessment.	Student Growth Score – Provided by State.
Grades 5-8 Non-ELA and Math faculty	20 points of a teacher's composite score will be based upon the performance of students on a mutually selected assessment.	20 points of a teacher's composite score will be based upon the performance of students on an appropriately selected assessment (used in a different fashion than local measure if same assessment is used).
K-3 Faculty	20 points of a teacher's composite score will be based upon the performance of students on a mutually selected assessment.	20 points of a teacher's composite score will be based upon the performance of students on an appropriately selected assessment (used in a different fashion than local measure if same assessment is used).
Special Education/AIS faculty with non	20 points of a teacher's composite score will be based upon the performance of students on a mutually selected assessment.	Staff with a minimum of 16 points of data as the teacher of record will receive a state growth score in grades 4-8. For all others 20 points of a teacher's composite score will be based upon the performance of students on an appropriately selected assessment (used in a different fashion than local measure if same assessment is used).
All remaining Certified Faculty	20 points of a teacher's composite score will be based upon the performance of students on a mutually selected assessment.	20 points of a teacher's composite score will be based upon the performance of students on an appropriately selected assessment (used in a different fashion than local measure if same assessment is used).

- ♠ 20 percent student growth on state assessments or a comparable measure of student growth will change to 25 percent upon implementation of the value-added growth model)
- ♣ 20 percent other locally selected measures of student achievement will change to 15 percent following implementation of value-added growth model.

Scoring the Local Measure of Achievement and State Growth Score:

- Post assessment results \div target then multiplied by 100 = target percentage achieved.
- The following chart will then be used to award points for that target.

HIGHLY EFFECTIVE	20	> 110%
	19	106-110%
	18	101-105%
EFFECTIVE	17	98-100%
	16	96-97%
	15	92-96%
	14	88-91%
	13	84-87%
	12	80-83%
	11	76-79%
	10	72-75%
	9	68-71%
DEVELOPING	8	65-67%
	7	60-64%
	6	48-59%
	5	36-47%
	4	26-35%
	3	14-25%
INEFFECTIVE	2	7-13%
	1	1-6%
	0	< or = 0%

Examples:

- Target is 100 students (out of 120) will pass post assessment
 - 60 students pass assessment
 - $(60/100) * 100 = 60\%$
 - 7 points would be earned
- 60% of my students will pass the post assessment for the class
 - Teacher has 25 students, therefore 15 students passing the post assessment is the target
 - 13 students pass the post assessment
 - $(13/15)*100 = 87\%$
 - 13 points would be earned

Measures of Teacher Effectiveness Based on the NYS Teaching Standards (60)

The measures of teacher effectiveness are made up of three components. Two observations utilizing the Danielson's Teachscape Rubric each make up 20% of the total effectiveness score and the additional multiple measures make up the other 20% of the effectiveness score.

Procedures for Classroom Observations Teachscape Rubric

- First Observation (Announced)
- Second Observation (unannounced)
- No observations will be done on the day preceding or the day directly following a holiday or vacation unless mutually agreed on by teacher and observer.
- All probationary teachers will have their first observation completed by December 1st with the exception of 2012-2013.

Scoring an Observation:

- Each domain element is scored on a scale from 1-4.
- Each element that is observed and evidence provided will have a corresponding score of 1-4.
- Any element not observed will not count in the domain calculation.
- Each domain will be given a score based on the points earned for each of the elements within that domain divided by the number of elements observed.
- Each domain with any element observed will be calculated to create an overall observation score.

Examples:

- Domain 2 has five (5) elements.
 - All five are observed and a score 1-4 is given for each element
 - 2a = 3
 - 2b = 2
 - 2c = 4
 - 2d = 3
 - 2e = 2
 - Domain 2 score is: $(3+2+4+3+2)/5 =$ **2.80**
- Domain 3 has five (5) elements
 - 4 elements were observed and a score 1-4 is given for each element
 - 3a = 3
 - 3b = n/a
 - 3c = 3
 - 3d = 3
 - 3e = 2
 - Domain 3 score is $(3+3+3+2)/4 =$ **2.75**
- Domain 3 has five (5) elements.
 - Domain 3 score is: $(3+2+4+3+2)/5 =$ **2.80**
- Domain 4 has five (5) elements but was not observed **N/A**

Observation overall score would be:

$$(2.8+2.75+2.8+N/A)/3 = 2.78$$

Procedures for Additional Multiple Measures :

- Teachers will designate selections by Oct 1st- with the exception of 2012-2013
- Evidence of Additional Multiple Measures must be submitted to the evaluator by May 1st. Discussions related to the evidence will be concluded by May 31st.
- Selected Measures from the list below must add up 20 points.
 - Peer coaching (10 points)
 - Communication Log (10 points)
 - Progress Monitoring Data (10 points)
 - Instructional Modifications Made Due To Assessment Data (10 points)
 - Assessment Tools (10 points)
 - Structured review of unit/lesson plans (10 points)
 - Student portfolios and/or other teaching artifacts (10 points)
 - Committee Participation (10 points)
 - Community Service: Service to CA students outside of school day (10 points)
 - Teacher Maintained Website (10 points)
 - Communication with Peers (5 points)
 - Articles for Local Newspapers and School Newspaper (5 points)
 - Contributions to RTI and Enrichment Plans (5 points)
 - Goal setting (5 points)
 - Personal Reflection Narrative (5 points)

Example:

A teacher chooses the following three (3) measures to equal twenty (20) points:

- Structured review of unit/lesson plans = 10 points
- Goal setting = 5 points
- Personal Reflection Narrative = 5 points

Additional Multiple Measures
10 POINT RUBRICS

Additional Multiple Measures	Ineffective (0)	Developing (3)	Effective (7)	Highly Effective (10)
Scale Score	1	2	3	4
Peer Coaching	Teacher doesn't participate.	Teacher participates but makes no effort to apply suggestions made by peer coach.	Teacher makes some changes suggested by peer coach which will be shared with evaluator.	Teacher uses suggestions effectively, and creates new lessons and teaching methods as a result.
Communication Log	Teacher does not keep a log of communication.	Teacher keeps a communication log but only sporadically and includes only negative communication.	Teacher keeps a communication log with notes of discussions both positive and negative.	Teacher keeps a comprehensive communication log with notes of positive and negative discussions, and shares concerns with student.
Progress Monitoring Data	Teacher does not collect or monitor progress data.	Teacher collects progress monitoring data but does not use it.	Teacher collects progress monitoring data but uses it inconsistently to critique and change lessons plans and/or teaching methods	Teacher collects progress monitoring data and uses it effectively to critique and change lesson plans and teaching methods.
Instructional Modifications made due to Assessment Data	Teacher does not modify instruction due to assessment data	Teacher modifies instruction inconsistently due to assessment data	Teacher uses assessment data to modify instruction and can demonstrate minimal student growth.	Teacher uses assessment data to modify instruction and can demonstrate satisfactory student growth.
Assessment Tools	Teacher does not have copies of assessment tools	Teacher has assessment tools but inconsistently modifies them based on instructional needs	Teacher has assessment tools and consistently modifies them to meet instructional needs	Teacher has assessment tools and modifies them to meet instructional needs and to reflect what the teacher taught.
Structured Review of Lesson/Unit Plans	No lesson plans are available for the administrator.	Teacher hands in incomplete lesson plans or lesson plans that cannot be evaluated	Administrator review the lesson plans, and evaluates by an agreed upon criteria.	Lesson plans are reviewed by an administrator and evaluated by criteria agreed upon by both administrator and teacher. A two-way conversation ensues based on the review, leading to changes in instruction.

Additional Multiple Measures	Ineffective (0)	Developing (3)	Effective (7)	Highly Effective (10)
Scale Score	1	2	3	4
Student Portfolios/or other Teacher Artifacts	No artifacts available.	Teacher has some student portfolios/or other artifacts but does not use them for anything in particular.	Teacher has some student portfolios/or other artifacts from some students to use as exemplars.	Teacher collects portfolios/artifacts from all students from at least one activity during the year, and can demonstrate exemplary examples of the assignment(s).
Committee Participation	Teacher refuses to attend any meetings outside of his or her basic professional duties.	Teacher agrees to participate in a committee when asked but does not contribute or attend regularly.	Teacher agrees to participate in a committee and regularly contributes.	Teacher volunteers to participate in at least one committee and substantially contributes to the effective work of the committee and/or is on more than one committee.
Community Service to CA Students	Teacher refuses to participate in any event outside of school.	Teacher agrees to participate in one activity but only after being asked to do so.	Teacher volunteers to participate in activities but only rarely and only when asked.	Teacher engages in a substantial activity involving students such as but not exclusively: coaching, advising, chaperoning, direction of plays and musicals, food drives, poetry readings, etc.
Teacher Maintained Website	Teacher does not maintain a website.	Teacher has constructed a website but updates it only sporadically.	Teacher maintains a website on a regular basis that is user friendly.	Teacher maintains a website that is user friendly & greatly enhances communication with parent/guardian.

Additional Multiple Measures
5 POINT RUBRICS

Additional Multiple Measures	Ineffective (0)	Developing (1)	Effective (3)	Highly Effective (5)
Scale Score	1	2	3	4
Communication with Peers	Teacher makes no attempt to communicate with peers	Teacher only communicates with peers only when they approach him/her.	Teacher communicates with peers on a regular basis and provides examples of this communication to evaluator.	Teacher often communicates with peers, offering to help them with classroom, teaching, or other concerns and provides examples of this communication to evaluator.
Articles for Local Papers and for School Newspaper	Teacher does not write any articles	Teacher writes an article but does not submit it	Teacher writes at least one article that promotes school or community activities or concerns.	Teacher writes several articles that promote school or community activities or concerns.
Contributions to RTI and Enrichment Plans	Teacher makes no contributions to RTI or enrichment plans.	Teacher makes inconsistent contributions to RTI or enrichment plans.	Teacher makes some contributions to RTI and enrichment plans.	Teacher makes significant contribution to RTI and enrichment plans.
Goal Setting	No goals are set or considered.	Establishes vague goals for the coming year.	Teacher establishes a vague but workable goal for the next year based on at least one source of feedback.	Teacher establishes clear goals for the next year based on consideration of various sources of feedback.
Personal Reflection Narrative	No narrative is written.	Teacher writes a reflection but it is unreadable or off topic.	Teacher writes a narrative reflection but lacks details and genuine engagement in the process.	Teacher engages in a significant consideration of events from the year and is able to communicate clearly how his/her year went. This may be based on various sources of feedback or from simple self-reflection. Narrative is detailed and demonstrates genuine engagement in process.

Scoring Additional Measures:

- An overall score for additional measures will be calculated by taking the points earned and converting them to a 1-4 scale.
- Ten (10) point measures will be weighted twice when used with two five (5) point measures.

○ In the example below the final score would be 3.25

Measure	Possible Points	Points earned	Conversion to 1-4 scale	WEIGHTED SCALE
Structured review of unit/lesson plans	10 points	7	3	6
Goal setting	5 points	5	4	4
Personal Reflection Narrative	5 points	3	3	3

○ In the example below the final score would be: 3.5

Measure	Possible Points	Points earned	Conversion to 1-4 scale	WEIGHTED SCALE
Structured review of unit/lesson plans	10 points	7	3	3
Teacher Maintained Website	10 points	10	4	4

Scoring Overall Teacher Effectiveness:

- The average score of each observation conducted and the score earned for multiple measures will be used to calculate a final score based on a 1-4 scale.
- The final score will then be converted to points utilizing the sub-component conversion chart.

	OBSERVATION 1	OBSERVATION 2	ADDITIONAL MEASURES
DOMAIN 1	2.5	3	
DOMAIN 2	3.5	3	
DOMAIN 3	3	3.25	
DOMAIN 4	N/A	3.5	
TOTAL POINTS	9.0	12.75	
SCORE (1-4)	3.00	3.1875	3.25
FINAL SCORE	3.145		
TOTAL EFFECTIVENESS POINTS (OUT OF 60)*	58		

*See chart below for conversions

Coxsackie-Athens Central School District	
Rubric Score to Sub-Component Conversion Chart	
Total Average Rubric Score	Conversion Score for Composite
Ineffective 0-49	
1.000	0.000
1.008	1.000
1.017	2.000
1.025	3.000
1.033	4.000
1.042	5.000
1.050	6.000
1.058	7.000
1.067	8.000
1.075	9.000
1.083	10.000
1.092	11.000
1.100	12.000
1.108	13.000
1.115	14.000
1.123	15.000
1.131	16.000
1.138	17.000
1.146	18.000
1.154	19.000
1.162	20.000
1.169	21.000
1.177	22.000
1.185	23.000
1.192	24.000
1.200	25.000
1.208	26.000
1.217	27.000
1.225	28.000
1.233	29.000
1.242	30.000
1.250	31.000
1.258	32.000
1.267	33.000
1.275	34.000
1.283	35.000
1.292	36.000

1.300	37.000
1.308	38.000
1.317	39.000
1.325	40.000
1.333	41.000
1.342	42.000
1.350	43.000
1.358	44.000
1.400	45.000
1.500	46.000
1.600	47.000
1.700	48.000
1.800	49.000
Developing 50-56	
1.900	50.000
2.000	51.000
2.150	52.000
2.300	53.000
2.450	53.500
2.600	54.000
2.700	55.000
2.800	56.000
Effective 57-58	
2.900	57.000
3.000	57.250
3.150	57.500
3.250	57.750
3.400	58.000
3.500	58.000
3.600	58.000
Highly Effective 59-60	
3.700	59.000
3.725	59.000
3.750	59.000
3.775	59.000
3.800	59.000
3.825	60.000
3.850	60.000
3.875	60.000
3.900	60.000
3.950	60.000
4.000	60.000

Teacher Improvement Plans (TIP)

For any teacher whose performance, based on overall composite effectiveness score, is evaluated as “developing” or “ineffective” based upon evidence clearly documented in the Annual Professional Performance Review (APPR), a Teacher Performance Plan (TIP) will be developed between the supervisor and the teacher, using the form agreed upon in this article. The TIP shall be provided as soon as practical, but in no case later than ten (10) days after the date for the opening of classes for students for the school year. The TIP shall be developed in consultation with the teacher, and union representation shall be afforded at the teacher’s request.

All parties understand and agree that the sole and exclusive purpose of a TIP is the improvement of teaching practice and that the issuance of a TIP is not a disciplinary action. The TIP shall address areas identified as in need of improvement. Supportive interventions may include but are not limited to classroom observations, assignment of a peer mentor and in-service courses relevant to the areas of weakness. A peer mentor, if assigned, will maintain a confidential relationship with the teacher involved in the TIP. The District will cover the costs associated with the agreed upon aspects and implementation of the TIP. If agreed upon, a third person or persons may become part of the TIP.

The TIP will become part of the teacher’s plan for that school year, and generally will last for a period of one (1) school year. The supervisor and the teacher shall establish a schedule of meetings to periodically monitor progress in the areas in need of improvement. The Association President or Co-Presidents shall be informed whenever a teacher is placed on a TIP, and with the agreement of the teacher, shall be provided with a copy of the TIP. An improvement plan defines specific standards-based goals that a teacher must make measurable progress toward attaining within a specific period of time, and 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 these areas.

The plan should clearly describe the professional learning activities that the educator must complete. These activities should be connected directly to the areas needing improvement. The artifacts that the teacher must produce that can serve as benchmarks of improvement and as evidence for the final stage of the improvement plan should be described, and could include items such as lesson plans and supporting materials, including student work. The supervisor should clearly state in the plan the additional support and assistance that the educator will receive. In the final stage of the improvement plan, the teacher should meet with his or her supervisor to review the plan, alongside any artifacts and evidence from evaluations, in order to determine if adequate improvement has been made in the required areas outlined within the plan for the teacher.

Appeals Procedures:

The purpose of the APPR appeal process is to foster and nurture growth of a professional staff in order to maintain a highly qualified and effective work force.

A probationary teacher may submit a written rebuttal that will be attached to the Annual Professional Performance Review in the member's personnel file. Use of the appeal process outlined below is limited to those tenured teachers who receive a final composite effectiveness score of "developing" or "ineffective". The grounds for an appeal may be related to:

- The substance of the Annual Professional Performance Review.
- The District's failure to adhere to the standards and methodologies required for the Annual Professional Performance Review, pursuant to Education Law 3012-c, regulations set by the Commissioner of Education, or any locally negotiated procedures.
- A tenured teacher who believes that the terms of the TIP are arbitrary, unreasonable, inappropriate or defective, or that the District has failed to meet its obligation to properly implement the terms of a TIP, may seek relief through the APPR Appeal Process, as outlined in this article.

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 the petitioner receives relief.

The appeal procedure shall constitute the exclusive means for initiating, reviewing and resolving any and all challenges and appeals related to a teacher performance review and/or improvement plan. A teacher may not resort to any other contractual grievance procedures for the resolution of challenges and appeals related to a professional performance review and/or improvement plan, except as otherwise authorized by law.

Timeline and Process:

In order to be timely, the notification of the APPR appeal shall be filed, in writing, within fifteen (15) days after the teacher has received the APPR. Notification of the appeal shall be provided to the Superintendent of Schools, or his designee.

Step 1: Conference with the Supervising Administrator:

The bargaining unit member shall upon request be entitled to an Association representative being present. The conference shall be an informal meeting wherein the authoring administrator and employee are able to discuss the evaluation and the area(s) of dispute. **The conference must take place within five school days after receipt of the appeals notice.** Any documents or written materials that are specific to this appeal, which have not been previously shared, will be made available three (3) school days prior to this conference. The

supervising administrator shall render a written decision within three (3) school days. If the bargaining unit member is not satisfied with the outcome, he/she may proceed to the second step. Step two (2) shall be initiated by the unit member notifying the Superintendent and CATA co-presidents in writing, within five (5) school days of the receipt of the Step 1 decision.

Step 2: Annual Professional Performance Review Appeals Panel:

The panel shall consist of two (2) teachers selected by the CATA Co-Presidents and two (2) administrators (not inclusive of the administrator who authored the evaluation) selected by the Superintendent plus an additional person agreed upon by both the district and CATA. A list of agreed upon possible 5th persons will be mutually created by and reviewed by the CATA and the superintendent annually.

- A- The panel shall reach its finding using the consensus model. The panel, by means of consensus, has the authority to sustain the composite effectiveness rating/TIP or amend/remove it.
- B- The panel must meet within ten (ten) school days of receipt of notice that the teacher wishes to proceed to Step 2. At least three (3) days prior to the appeals panel meeting, the teacher and administrator who completed the APPR, must provide all documents or written materials that are specific to this appeal. The panel will review the written record. The teacher will not be present when the panel reviews the written records.
- C- **The panel must render and provide a written decision within 3 school days after the panel has met.**

The decision of the appeals panel is considered final. The teacher may rebut the appeal in writing, but may not appeal, or grieve the substance of the decision.

Coxsackie-Athens Central School District

Annual Professional Performance Review

Teacher Improvement Plan (TIP)

Teacher/Subject or Grade Area: _____

Building: _____ Date: _____

	Area For Improvement
Domain/Elements identified for improvement; Performance Goals	
Action Steps	
Support/Resources Provided	
Who is responsible for what? Teacher responsibilities? Administrator responsibilities?	
Evidence that will show growth towards identified goals/success indicators	
Timeline (for goal completion, as well as periodic meetings times to assess progress)	

Teacher Comments:

Administrator/Supervisor Comments:

Teacher Signature: _____ Date: _____

Administrator Signature: _____ Date: _____

APPENDIX Q

Total Effectiveness Score

Teacher:

Year: 2012-13

State Provided Growth or Student Learning Objective: (20) _____

Local Measures of Student Achievement: (20) _____

Teacher Effectiveness: (60) _____

OVERALL COMPOSITE SCORE: (100) _____

Highly Effective	91-100
Effective	75-90
Developing	65-74
Ineffective	0-64

PRE-OBSERVATION CONFERENCE INFORMATION

Coxsackie-Athens Central School District

Please complete this form and submit it electronically to your supervising administrator at least 48 prior to a scheduled pre-conference. Please be sure to attach a copy of your lesson plan and any other supporting materials.

Teacher name:

School:

- 1.) Please provide a general overview of the class. What is the general level of instruction? Are there special considerations based on religious/cultural/special needs/limited English, etc?

- 2.) What is the objective of the lesson? What do you intend for students to learn and be able to do demonstrate?

- 3.) What instructional materials will be used? How do they support or enhance the objectives?

- 4.) What instructional strategies will be used to engage students in the content?

5.) How will directions be communicated in the class (verbal, modeling, demonstration, hand-outs, etc)?

6.) What difficulties in content or management do you anticipate, and how do you plan to address them in this lesson?

7.) What procedures do you plan to use to assess student achievement of the objectives?

8.) Why have you chosen these assessment strategies? How will you make use of the results?

9.) Are there any specific aspects of the lesson, or your classroom in general, about which you would like to discuss and/or receive more detailed feedback?

CLASSROOM OBSERVATION REPORT
Coxsackie-Athens Central School District

Teacher's Name: _____

School: _____

Grade/Subject: _____

Date of Observation: _____

Supervising Administrator: _____

DOMAIN 1
Planning and Preparation

	<u>Ineffective (1)</u>	<u>Developing (2)</u>	<u>Effective (3)</u>	<u>Highly Effective (4)</u>	<u>NA</u>
1a. Demonstrating Knowledge of Content and Pedagogy	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
1b. Demonstrating Knowledge of Students	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
1c. Setting Instructional Outcomes	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
1d. Demonstrating Knowledge of Resources	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
1e. Designing Student Assessments	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>

OVERALL PERFORMANCE IN DOMAIN 1: _____

Evidence:

DOMAIN 2
The Classroom Environment

Ineffective (1) Developing (2) Effective (3) Highly Effective (4) NA

2a.	Creating an Environment of Respect and Rapport	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
2b.	Establishing a Culture for Learning	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
2c.	Managing Classroom Procedures	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
2d.	Managing Student Behavior	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
2e.	Organizing Physical Space	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>

OVERALL PERFORMANCE IN DOMAIN 2: _____

Evidence:

DOMAIN 3
Instruction

Ineffective (1) Developing (2) Effective (3) Highly Effective (4) NA

3a.	Communicating with Students	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
3b.	Using Questioning/Prompts and Discussion Techniques	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
3c.	Engaging Students in Learning	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
3d.	Using Assessment in Instruction	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
3e.	Demonstrating Flexibility and Responsiveness	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>

OVERALL PERFORMANCE IN DOMAIN 3: _____

Evidence:

DOMAIN 4
Professional Responsibilities

Ineffective (1) Developing (2) Effective (3) Highly Effective (4) NA

4a.	Reflecting on Teaching	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
4b.	Maintaining Accurate Records	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
4c.	Communicating with Families	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
4d.	Participating in a Professional Community	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
4e.	Growing and Developing Professionally	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
4f.	Showing Professionalism	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>

OVERALL PERFORMANCE IN DOMAIN 4: _____

Evidence:

Summary/Recommendations for Improved Practice:

Signature of Supervising Administrator: _____ **Date:** _____

Signature of Teacher: _____ **Date:** _____

The signature of the teacher in above space acknowledges that the teacher has received a copy of the report and was notified that the completed Classroom Observation Report would be placed in the teacher's file.

POST-OBSERVATION REFLECTION FORM
Coxsackie-Athens Central School District

Please complete these questions and submit this form electronically to your supervising administrator within 48 hours of the observation.

Teacher:

School:

- 1.) In general, how successful was the lesson? Did students learn what you intended for them to learn?

- 2.) To what extent were the lesson's goals and objectives appropriate to your students?

- 3.) To what extent were your assessment strategies effective? Would make changes in your approach to assessment? If so, what changes would you make, and why?

- 4.) Please comment on your classroom procedures, use of physical space, and student conduct. To what extent did the classroom environment contribute to student learning?

5.) Did you make any adjustments or modifications to your plan during the lesson? If so, what were they and what motivated these changes?

6.) To what extent was your feedback to students accurate, substantive, constructive, specific and/or timely? How might you have responded differently?

7.) Please describe an instance in which your feedback positively affected a student's learning?

8.) Please comment on the quality of your instructional delivery. What aspects were the most effective?

9.) If you had the opportunity to teach this lesson again to the same group of students, what would you do differently? Why?