

Connetquot Central School District The Annual Professional Performance Review Plan (APPR)

Table of Contents of the APPR

I.	Statement of Purpose	1
II.	Plan Requirements and Amending APPR	2
III.	Collection and Reporting of Teacher and Student Data	2
IV.	Internal Assessment Development and Assessment Security	3
V.	Training for Evaluators and Staff	3
VI.	Student Growth Measures (State Selected Measures)	4
VII.	Locally Developed Measures of Student Achievement	4
VIII.	Measures of Teacher Effectiveness - NYS Teaching Standards	12
IX.	Composite Scoring	16
X.	Appeals Procedures	18
	TIP Forms (Appendix A)	20

I. Statement of 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 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 with the district's Professional Development Plan to ensure teacher-driven professional development and support.

The Connetquot Central School District ("District") and the Connetquot Teachers Association ("Association") agree that the following principles will govern the APPR process:

- a) It is every teacher's responsibility to continue to grow professionally.
- b) It is the Connetquot School District's responsibility to provide the resources and support for teachers to improve instruction and professional practice for District directed items.
- c) The overarching goal of the evaluation process is that teachers and evaluators examine the evidence obtained by multiple measures of teaching practice and student achievement to plan for meaningful professional learning and improvement of instruction.
- d) Evaluations will be conducted openly and objectively with the involvement of the teacher.

Nothing in the APPR will be construed to abrogate any provisions of the collective bargaining agreement between the Connetquot Central School District and the Connetquot Teachers Association except as indicated in this document.

II. Plan Requirements and Amending APPR

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:

- a) 20 percent student growth on state assessments or a comparable measure of student growth (25 percent upon implementation of a value-added growth model). For those assessments that do not utilize the value added growth model, the student growth portion will remain at 20 percent; and
- b) 20 percent other locally selected measures of student achievement that are determined to be rigorous and comparable across classrooms (15 percent following implementation of a value-added model). For those assessments that do not utilize the value added growth model, the student growth portion will remain at 20 percent. Local Assessments are to be developed locally through collective bargaining; and
- c) 60 percent based on multiple measures of effective teaching practice aligned with the state's teaching standards. The measures are to be established locally through collective bargaining.

The intent of the evaluation system is to foster a culture of continuous growth for professionals as well as to provide for assessment of teacher performance. The APPR is required to be a significant factor in employment decisions including, but not limited to: retention, tenure determination, termination and professional development. Each decision is to be made in accordance with locally developed procedures collectively bargained.

The Connetquot Central School District will adopt an APPR plan in accordance with §3012-c and NYSED regulations. The district shall submit the plan on a form prescribed by the commissioner, to the State Education Department for approval. Should the plan be rejected, any deficiencies that are subject to negotiations shall be resolved through collective bargaining, and the plan resubmitted.

Amending the APPR:

All portions of the APPR Plan adopted by the Connetquot Central School District's Board of Education and subject to collective bargaining shall be subject to review by the parties on an annual basis. Any necessary revisions shall be accomplished through collective bargaining. It is understood that the 20 percent student growth on state assessments or a comparable measure of student growth (25 percent upon implementation of a value-added growth model) shall not be subject to the collective bargaining.

III. Collection and Reporting of Teacher and Student Data

Verification of State Growth Measures

A. General Procedures for Roster Verification:

Teacher of record review and data verification dates shall be subject to these procedures set forth herein. The District and the Association have collaboratively developed a verification procedure as follows:

Each teacher shall be responsible for reviewing his/her roster as presented by the State Education

Department. Any changes or corrections will be submitted to the principal or the principal's designee. The principal or designee, after reviewing the changes, will submit corrections to the District's Data Manager. The Data Manager will then forward the corrections to the State. Teachers can verify the change on the State provided website.

- a) Teachers shall be notified by the District via postings and notification to the CTA to verify their rosters.
- b) Teachers will not be held accountable for errors regarding student of record in cases where the District has failed to follow the above procedure.

The above procedure was developed to ensure that all teacher-of-record determinations shall be made accurately and in a manner consistent with the standards established by the Commissioner's regulations prior to using student growth and/or achievement data in an APPR.

B. Teacher of Record Review

Any classroom teacher who believes that the list is incorrect and/or inconsistent with the standards established by the Commissioner's regulations for making teacher-of-record determinations shall be entitled to seek review of this determination by a representative of the Association and the District. The parties agree to reconvene on or after January 1, 2013 to review the options for notification and feedback consistent with SED requirements and timing.

C. Reporting

No personal identifying data related to the APPR will be released by the District or its agents to any outside agency except as required by any law or regulation.

IV. Internal Assessment Development and Assessment Security

A. Assessment Development

District-developed and teacher-created assessments of student achievement provide opportunities for professional development. The Connetquot Central School District will encourage the development of assessments by teams of teachers through collaboration with BOCES or other consortiums. The final determination of comparability and rigor shall be at the Superintendent's sole discretion.

B. Assessment Security

It is understood that any assessments and/or measures used for the purpose of teacher evaluation will not be disseminated in advance to students. Scoring of assessments must be done by educators who do not have a vested interest in the outcome of the assessments they score.

V. Training for Evaluators and Staff

Any administrator or supervisor who evaluates teachers for the purpose of determining an APPR rating shall be fully trained and/or certified as required by Education Law §3012-c and the implementing

Regulations of the Commissioner of Education prior to conducting a teacher evaluation. Any observation or APPR rating that is determined in whole or in part by an administrator or supervisor who is not fully trained and/or certified to conduct such evaluations shall not be counted in the APPR scoring. Any challenge to the validity of the observation based upon the evaluator's credentials must be made in writing to the Superintendent within ten (10) business days. The invalidation of an observation or APPR rating for this reason shall also preclude its use in the cumulative APPR score.

The Association shall be furnished with a list of all administrators and supervisors who have been trained including the date approved by the Board of Education for said training.

Superintendent's conference day (approximately two hours) will be used at the beginning of the 2012-2013 school year to train all staff in the APPR evaluation procedures including, but not limited to: a review of the content and use of the evaluation system, the NYS Teaching Standards, evaluation rubric, forms and the procedures to be followed consistent with the approved APPR plan. Probationary teachers hired during the school year will be provided training within ten (10) school days.

VI. Student Growth Measures (State Selected Measures)

For classroom teachers of grades 4-8 ELA and Math, state assessments will be used for the growth component.

Teachers of subjects where there is no state-provided measure of student growth on state assessments (i.e., subjects without a state assessment and subjects where a state-provided growth measure has not yet been created based on the state assessment), must use other comparable measures of growth. These teachers will have a growth measure based on a methodology prescribed by SED. SED has determined that these teachers will have a growth measure based on Student Learning Objectives (SLOs). SLOs, by definition, require an understanding of local needs and objectives.

It is anticipated that SED will score and report the state-provided growth measure (or value added measure after the VAM system is approved by the Regents) no later than September 1 following the year the teacher is evaluated. Teachers will not be penalized in any way because of such data not being received in a timely manner, which results in an incomplete rating.

VII. Locally Developed and Selected Measures of Student Growth or Achievement

K-8: A building-wide measure covering all students in the school will be used to measure student achievement. The building measure will be a combination using State provided scores on ELA, math, and science exams. Using the State proficiency rate (students at a level 3 or 4) as a baseline, the average deviation on all ELA, math, and science scores for the building will be calculated. This average deviation in the proficiency rate will be compared to the average deviation rate on all said exams from

2005-2006 to 2011-2012 to determine the HEDI bands.

On occasion, a Special Education or English as a Second Language program is moved from one school building to another. The District and the CTA agree to evaluate the impact of inclusion of these students on the local measures for the teachers in both buildings and allocate the scores between the two in an equitable manner.

HEDI Ranges:

HEDI Classification and Scoring Bands for Locally-Selected Measures K-8

Classification	Without Value Added Model 20 Points	With Value Added Model 15 Points
Highly Effective	18-20	14-15
Effective	9-17	8-13
Developing	3-8	3-7
Ineffective	0-2	0-2

Points for the local measure will be assigned according to following procedure and tables.

Description of the Local 20% for the APPR for Grades K-8 (15% for Grades with a VAM)	
Step	Description
1	The percent reaching proficiency (i.e., level 3 and 4) were listed for each grade (i.e., 3, 4 and 5 for elementary and grades 6, 7 and 8 for middle school) and subject area (i.e., ELA, math and science) within each school for years 2005-2006 through 2011-2012.
2	The state proficiency for each subject within each grade was gathered for school years 2005-2006 through 2011-2012.
3	The difference between each school's proficiency rate and the State's proficiency rate within each subject and grade and for each year was calculated. The comparison to the State was included in the calculation to control for the State's change in the criteria that determined proficiency in the school year 2009-2010 and the possibility that this will occur in the future.
4	The mean and standard deviation for the differences calculated in step 3 were computed utilizing all subject areas, grades and years (i.e., 2005-2006 through 2011-2012) within each school. This was done within each school to determine an overall level of proficiency in comparison to the State proficiency rate for the particular school. The mean and standard deviation calculated for each school will be used for comparison purposes for the school year 2012-2013 to determine local achievement.
5	The overall mean proficiency rate in comparison to the State for the 2012-2013 school year within each school will be calculated utilizing the same procedure outlined in step 3, except it will only be for the 2012-2013 school year (i.e., not across multiple years). This mean proficiency rate in comparison to the State will be indicative of achievement for the local part of the APPR.
6	The 20 points for the local measure (15 points for those grades that have a value-added model) will be based on a comparison (in standard deviation units) between the overall proficiency rate in comparison to the State within each school for year 2012-2013 and average proficiency rate in comparison to the State for school years 2005-2006 through 2011-2012 within the same school.
	EXAMPLE: The Cherokee Elementary School was on the average 5.08% above the State in proficiency rate across grades 3, 4 and 5 for subjects ELA, math and science for school years 2005-2006 through 2011-2012. The standard deviation was 5.25%. If in 2012-2013, the overall proficiency rate in comparison to the State was 7.00%, then Cherokee would receive a score of .366 standard deviations. This number indicates that for the school year 2012-2013, overall Cherokee's proficiency rate was .366 standard deviations above the average proficiency for school years 2005-2006 to 2011-2012. This .366 would be converted to a point value and HEDI category using the following table.

Point Assignment for Local Measure for Grades K-8 Without Value Added Model				
Points Assigned (without VAM)			Points Assigned (without VAM)	
0	3.41 or more than standard deviations below the historic mean for the building		11	Between 1.76 and 2.0 standard deviations below the historic mean for the building
1	Between 3.26 and 3.40 standard deviations below the historic mean for the building		12	Between 1.51 and 1.75 standard deviations below the historic mean for the building
2	Between 3.16 and 3.25 standard deviations below the historic mean for the building		13	Between 1.51 and 1.50 standard deviations below the historic mean for the building
3	Between 3.01 and 3.15 standard deviations below the historic mean for the building		14	Between 1.26 and 1.50 standard deviations below the historic mean for the building
4	Between 2.86 and 3.00 standard deviations below the historic mean for the building		15	Between .76 and 1.25 standard deviations below the historic mean for the building
5	Between 2.76 and 2.85 standard deviations below the historic mean for the building		16	Between .01 and .75 standard deviations below the historic mean for the building
6	Between 2.66 and 2.75 standard deviations below the historic mean for the building		17	Between .00 and .75 standard deviations above the historic mean for the building
7	Between 2.51 and 2.65 standard deviations below the historic mean for the building		18	Between .76 and 1.25 standard deviations above the historic mean for the building
8	Between 2.41 and 2.50 standard deviations below the historic mean for the building		19	Between 1.26 and 2.0 standard deviations above the historic mean for the building
9	Between 2.26 and 2.40 standard deviations below the historic mean for the building		20	2.01 standard deviations or greater above the historic mean for the building
10	Between 2.01 and 2.25 standard deviations below the historic mean for the building			

Point Assignment for Local Measure for Grades K-8 With Value Added Model			
Points Assigned (with VAM)			Points Assigned (with VAM)
0	3.51 or more than standard deviations below the historic mean for the building		8
1	Between 3.26 and 3.5 standard deviations below the historic mean for the building		9
2	Between 3.16 and 3.25 standard deviations below the historic mean for the building		10
3	Between 3.01 and 3.15 standard deviations below the historic mean for the building		11
4	Between 2.86 and 3.0 standard deviations below the historic mean for the building		12
5	Between 2.76 and 2.85 standard deviations below the historic mean for the building		13
6	Between 2.66 and 2.75 standard deviations below the historic mean for the building		14
7	Between 2.51 and 2.65 standard deviations below the historic mean for the building		15
			Between 2.01 and 2.5 standard deviations below the historic mean for the building
			Between 1.51 and 2.00 standard deviations below the historic mean for the building
			Between 1.26 and 1.5 standard deviations below the historic mean for the building
			Between .76 and 1.25 standard deviations below the historic mean for the building
			Between .01 and .75 standard deviations below the historic mean for the building
			Between .00 and .75 standard deviations above the historic mean for the building
			Between .76 and 2.00 standard deviations above the historic mean for the building
			Greater than 2.01 standard deviations above the historic mean for the building

Grades 9-12: A building-wide measure covering all students in the school will be used to measure student achievement. The building measure will be the percentage of graduates receiving a diploma with the Advanced Regents Designation.

HEDI Ranges:

HEDI Classification and Scoring Bands for Locally-Selected Measures 9-12

Classification	Without Value Added Model 20 Points	With Value Added Model 15 Points
Highly Effective	18-20	14-15
Effective	9-17	8-13
Developing	3-8	3-7
Ineffective	0-2	0-2

Points for the local measure will be assigned according to following procedure and tables:

Description of the Local 20% for the APPR for Grades 9-12 (15% for Grades With a VAM)	
Step	Description
1	The percent of students receiving the advanced regents diploma (ARD) per school year will be calculated for the school years 2004-2005 to 2011-2012.
2	The mean and standard deviation for the percent of students receiving the ARD per school year for school years 2004-2005 to 2011-2012 will be calculated.
3	The percent receiving the ARD for the school year 2012-2013 will be calculated.
4	Based on the difference in standard deviation units of the ARD in 2012-2013 from the mean ARD calculated in step 2, the school will be assigned a point value and a HEDI band. The difference from the mean (in standard deviation units) for 2012-2013 will be calculated as follows: $(\text{percent receiving ARD 2012-2013}) - (\text{Mean ARD per year for 2004-2005 to 2011-2012}) / (\text{Standard Deviation of ARD for 2004-2005 to 2011-2012})$
5	The 20 points for the local measure (15 points for those subjects that have a value-added model) will be based on the magnitude and direction of the difference between the ARD obtained in 2012-2013 and the mean ARD calculated in step 2 in standard deviation units.
	EXAMPLE: On the average, Connetquot High School graduated 54% of its students with an ARD per year from 2004-2005 to 2011-2012. The standard deviation for these school years was 3%. In 2012-2013, 57% of the students at Connetquot High School received an ARD. Therefore, in 2012-2013, Connetquot High School was one standard deviation unit above (i.e., $(57\% - 54\%) / 3\%$) the mean for school years 2004-2005 to 2012-2013. This calculation would be used to determine the point value and HEDI category for the local 20% (15% with VAM) utilizing the attached conversion chart.

Point Assignment for Local Measure for Grades 9-12 Without Value Added Model

Points Assigned (without VAM)			Points Assigned (without VAM)	
0	3.71 or more than standard deviations below the mean ARD rate for CHS		11	Between 2.26 and 2.50 standard deviations below the mean ARD rate for CHS
1	Between 3.61 and 3.70 standard deviations below the mean ARD rate for CHS		12	Between 2.01 and 2.25 standard deviations below the mean ARD rate for CHS
2	Between 3.51 and 3.60 standard deviations below the mean ARD rate for CHS		13	Between 1.76 and 2.00 standard deviations below the mean ARD rate for CHS
3	Between 3.41 and 3.50 standard deviations below the mean ARD rate for CHS		14	Between 1.26 and 1.75 standard deviations below the mean ARD rate for CHS
4	Between 3.31 and 3.40 standard deviations below the mean ARD rate for CHS		15	Between .76 and 1.25 standard deviations below the mean ARD rate for CHS
5	Between 3.21 and 3.30 standard deviations below the mean ARD rate for CHS		16	Between .75 and .01 standard deviations below the mean ARD rate for CHS
6	Between 3.11 and 3.20 standard deviations below the mean ARD rate for CHS		17	Between .00 and .50 standard deviations above the mean ARD rate for CHS
7	Between 2.96 and 3.10 standard deviations below the mean ARD rate for CHS		18	Between .51 and 1.00 standard deviations above the mean ARD rate for CHS
8	Between 2.81 and 2.95 standard deviations below the mean ARD rate for CHS		19	Between 1.01 and 2.00 standard deviations above the mean ARD rate for CHS
9	Between 2.66 and 2.80 standard deviations below the mean ARD rate for CHS		20	2.01 standard deviations or greater above the mean ARD rate for CHS
10	Between 2.51 and 2.65 standard deviations below the mean ARD rate for CHS			

If the determination is made in the future to use locally developed pre and post assessments, it is agreed that teachers will be permitted to use, at their discretion, professional periods, prep periods and/or receive up to sixteen (16) hours of PDP credit for work done other than during the work day. In the event additional time is needed, the District at its sole discretion may provide additional release time during the school day. All such assessments need to be completed and approved by the State assigned BEDS day.

If an SLO, or like thereof, is to be used as a locally developed measure, the Association shall have the right to collectively bargain the said use of SLOs for the local component and the procedures pertaining to the SLO process and local assessments to the degree and extent required by regulation. SLOs or the like thereof that make up the 20% local assessment measures will need to be developed collaboratively between principals and an individual teacher, or groups of teachers.

VIII. Measures of Teacher Effectiveness - NYS Teaching Standards - 60%

A. Rubric

Critical to this sub-component is the selection of the rubric that will be used to collect evidence of teacher effectiveness. The District and the Association have agreed that the Charlotte Danielson 2007 Rubric, selected from the list of SED approved rubrics, will be used. Either the District or the Association may initiate a reopener to negotiate the use of another rubric or variation of the Charlotte Danielson 2007 Rubric.

B. Multiple Measures

Evidence of professional practice shall be obtained through multiple measures. Specifically teacher effectiveness shall be derived from, but not limited to, classroom observations, student portfolios, and other artifacts of teacher practices.

- These measures will include at least two observations. One of these will be unannounced. It is a prime purpose of observations and evaluations to highlight a teacher's strengths and weaknesses so that a teacher will benefit from the observation/evaluation. The process of evaluation should foster continual growth and development.
- Teachers must be made aware of observations as they are occurring. All monitoring or observation of the work performance of a teacher shall be conducted openly with full knowledge of the teacher.
- The use of eavesdropping, public address, audio/video systems, and similar surveillance shall be strictly prohibited.
- Outside companies or agencies shall not be contracted by the district to conduct observations or any evaluations.
- The teacher will be notified prior to the week in which the unannounced observation will be conducted unless otherwise agreed to by the teacher. There will be one unannounced observation per school year.
- Observations will not occur the day before or after a vacation period.
- Teachers will be notified at least two (2) weeks prior of their announced observation, where possible. If not possible, an effort will be made to ensure that not less than one week of notice is provided.

- Probationary teachers will be observed at least three (3) times per year.
- Teachers and administrators may request a pre or post observation discussion.
- Observation reports will be submitted to the teacher for his/her signature as soon as possible, preferably within one (1) week of each observation. Unless there is a specific reason to the contrary, teachers should not be subsequently observed until they have received the written results of their prior observation. Following the observation, the teacher or administrator may request a conference to discuss the evaluation. The teacher shall also have the right to submit a rebuttal and a statement pertaining to the evaluation/observation.
- If the evaluator finds an area of concern or concerns with the teacher's lesson, the evaluator will assist the teacher in identifying specific ways in which the teacher can improve.
- Written classroom observations will be limited to classroom activities which take place during the school day and will be based only upon direct and objective observations. Additional information regarding planning, follow-up, long term assignments, etc. may be acquired other than through the classroom observation.
- Written classroom observation and reports shall include HEDI ratings on subcomponents, elements and/or domains if observed.
- It is understood that certain elements of the Danielson Rubric are not immediately observable through traditional classroom observation. These elements can best be evaluated through the use of artifacts and the discussion thereof. The use of artifacts in the evaluation process does not imply that the teachers will be required to submit tangible items for review.

C. Assigning Points for the Danielson Model

There are three hierarchical levels to the Danielson Model:

The Domain Level: The model includes four different domains that address separate aspects of the teaching process. These Domains include Planning and Preparation, Classroom Management, Instruction and Professional Responsibility.

The Component Level: Each of the four domains listed above contains a certain amount of components. These components relate to their assigned Domains. Teachers will receive a score on each of the 22 components that are contained in the four domains. This will be discussed further below.

The Element Level: Each component has several elements that provide a measure of the component at a more granular level. Each element contains specific school and classroom-based behaviors and/or teaching-relevant behaviors that can be evaluated based on observation or through artifacts.

The manner in which the scoring of each element is arithmetically combined to determine the teachers' score on each component and their overall rubric score, which in turn is converted to the 60 point scale, is explained below.

D. Scoring of the Danielson Model

Element Level Scoring: Teachers will receive a score 0 (ineffective), 3 (developing), 4 (effective), 4.5 (highly effective), NO Score (Not Assessed)

Component Level Scoring: Elements will receive a weighting of 1, .5 or 0 to determine how much

influence each has in the component score.

Each element score is then multiplied by their weight and a product is obtained. These products are added together and divided by the sum of the weights. This will result in each component receiving a score between 0 and 4.5.

Example:

Domain 4, Component 4 has 20 elements: 15 receive full weighting, two receive .5 weighting and three receive 0 weighting. The sum of the weightings is 16 (i.e., $(15 \times 1) + (2 \times .5) + (3 \times 0)$).

If the teacher was effective in all areas, then she would receive a total component score of 64 (i.e., $(15 \times 4) + (.5 \times 4) + (.5 \times 4)$). This number would then be divided by the sum of the weights discussed above (i.e., 16). Her component score for Domain 4, Component 4 would be a 4 (i.e., $64/16$).

Rubric Scoring: The component scores computed above are then added together to compute the teachers' performance on a 99 point scale. The 99 point scale was created by multiplying the 22 components of the Danielson Model by 4.5. 99 points is the highest score a teacher can receive. Based on the teacher's score out of the 99 points, they will be assigned a score and HEDI band based on a 0 to 60 scale (see conversion chart)

E. Weights of Elements and Delineation of Observation and Artifact Based Components of the Danielson Model

Domain I: Planning and Preparation						
Component	Element	Weight		Component	Element	Weight
IA (O)	1	1		IE (O)	1	1
	2	1			2	1
	3	1			3	1
IB (A)	1	1			4	1
	2	1		IF (A)	1	1
	3	1			2	1
	4	1			3	1
	5	1			4	1
IC (A)	1	1				
	2	1				
	3	1				
	4	1				
ID (A)	1	1				
	2	1				
	3	1				

Domain II: Classroom Environment		
Component	Element	Weight
IIA (O)	1	1
	2	0
IIB (O)	1	.5
	2	1
	3	0
IIC (O)	1	1
	2	1
	3	1
	4	1
	5	.5
IID (O)	1	1
	2	1
	3	1
IIE (O)	1	1
	2	1

Domain III: Instruction		
Component	Element	Weight
IIIA (O)	1	1
	2	1
	3	1
	4	1
IIIB (O)	1	1
	2	1
	3	1
IIIC (O)	1	1
	2	1
	3	1
	4	1
IIID (O)	1	1
	2	1
	3	1
	4	1
IIIE (O)	1	1
	2	1
	3	1

Domain IV: Professional Responsibilities						
Component	Element	Weight		Component	Element	Weight
IVA (A)	1	1		IVE (A)	1	1
	2	1			2	1
IVB (A)	1	1			3	1
	2	1		IVF (A)	1	1
	3	1			2	1
IVC (A)	1	1			3	1
	2	.5			4	1
	3	0			5	1
IVD (A)	1	1				
	2	.5				
	3	0				
	4	0				

F. Conversion Chart

The Danielson Rubric is broken down into 22 components. 12 of these components are directly observable during a lesson observation. The other 10 may not be as easily observed, and may be better evaluated through artifact collection. It must be noted that the term artifacts is understood to mean the collection of evidence through professional conference and does not refer to a list of documents or items that are collected by an evaluator. The observable components represent 54 of the 99 total points available (54.5%). The artifact based components represent the remaining 45 points (45.5%). Together these components will determine the score out of 60 for this portion of the APPR.

Raw (out of 99)	HEDI Band	Score (out of 60)	Raw (out of 99)	HEDI Band	Score (out of 60)	Raw (out of 99)	HEDI Band	Score (out of 60)
95-99	H	60	39	I	39	19	I	19
89-94	H	59	38	I	38	18	I	18
79-88	E	58	37	I	37	17	I	17
67-78	E	57	36	I	36	16	I	16
65-66	D	56	35	I	35	15	I	15
60-64	D	55	34	I	34	14	I	14
56-59	I	54	33	I	33	13	I	13
53-55	I	53	32	I	32	12	I	12
52	I	52	31	I	31	11	I	11
51	I	51	30	I	30	10	I	10
50	I	50	29	I	29	9	I	9
49	I	49	28	I	28	8	I	8
48	I	48	27	I	27	7	I	7
47	I	47	26	I	26	6	I	6
46	I	46	25	I	25	5	I	5
45	I	45	24	I	24	4	I	4
44	I	44	23	I	23	3	I	3
43	I	43	22	I	22	2	I	2
42	I	42	21	I	21	1	I	1
41	I	41	20	I	20	0	I	0

IX. Composite Scoring

A. HEDI Classification and Scoring Bands for the Total Composite Score

Classification	100 Point Composite Score
Highly Effective	91-100
Effective	75-90
Developing	65-74
Ineffective	0-64

B. Procedures

The complete composite (total) score for the APPR shall be provided to the teacher by September 1, or as soon as practicable, and the District will make every reasonable effort to make it available no later than ten (10) school days after the release of the state provided 20 percent. The teacher's rating and score on the 60 percent other measures of teacher effectiveness shall be computed and provided to the teacher, in writing, by no later than June 15. Teachers must supply all artifacts to the building principal no later than May 15. The teacher's rating and score on the 20 percent locally-selected measures of teacher effectiveness shall be computed and provided to the teacher, in writing, preferably within ten (10) school days after the test data is made available to the District. The purpose of this notification is to give teachers sufficient time to assess their practice and plan accordingly.

The District and the CTA will develop a procedure to confirm the receipt of the composite End-of-Year Evaluation. It is the teacher's decision and responsibility as to the sharing of their observations and/or evaluations with the CTA.

C. Teacher Improvement Plans (TIP)

Upon rating a teacher as Developing or Ineffective through an annual professional performance review, a teacher improvement plan (TIP) shall be developed and commence as soon as practicable but in no case later than 10 school days after the opening of classes for the school year.

The format of the TIP is provided in the appendix and will include, but need not be limited to, identification of needed areas of improvement, a timeline for achieving improvement, the manner in which the improvement will be assessed, and, where appropriate, differentiated activities to support a teacher's improvement in those areas.

Upon receiving a rating of "developing" or "ineffective", a teacher shall be provided with a TIP. The Parties understand and agree that the issuance of a TIP is not a disciplinary action. The TIP shall be developed in consultation with the teacher, and an Association representative shall be afforded at the teacher's request. The District shall inform the teacher of the right to such representation.

A TIP shall clearly specify:

- 1) the area(s) in need of improvement
- 2) the performance goals, expectations, benchmarks, standards and timelines the teacher must meet in order to achieve an effective rating
- 3) how improvement will be measured and monitored, and provide for periodic reviews of progress
- 4) any appropriate differentiated professional development opportunities, materials, resources and supports the District will make available to assist the teacher, as well as any independent activities that are chosen by the teacher, and where appropriate, the assignment of a mentor teacher.

After the TIP is in place, the teacher and administrator, and an Association representative (if requested by the teacher) shall meet, according to the schedule identified in the TIP, to assess the teacher's progress, and the effectiveness and appropriateness of the TIP, for the purpose of assisting the teacher to achieve the goals set forth in the TIP. Based on the outcome of such assessment(s), the TIP may be modified by mutual agreement.

A teacher who believes that the terms of a TIP, as proposed by the evaluator, 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 appeals process indicated below.

The costs associated with the implementation of a TIP for items mandated by the District including, but not limited to, tuition, fees, books and travel, shall be borne by the District in their entirety; however, if the District agrees to include items chosen by the teacher in place of or in addition to District mandated items, the District at its sole discretion may cover some or all of the associated costs of the items chosen by the teacher. Such agreement shall not be unreasonably withheld.

D. Termination and Tenure Determinations for Probationary Teachers

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 probationary 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. It is agreed that it is useful to convene these meetings as early in the school year as practical. The conference may result in an intervention and/or TIP being developed.

E. Initial School Year Implementation

For the 2012-13 school year, a rating of ineffective or developing will not give cause to the District for pursuing an expedited 3020a and will not be used as a basis for an expedited 3020a in 2013-14 if the same teacher were to be again rated ineffective and/or developing.

X. Appeals Procedures

A. General

The appeal procedures shall provide for the timely and expeditious resolution of the appeal. All tenured teachers who meet the appeal process criteria identified below may use this appeal process. A teacher may not file multiple appeals regarding the same performance review or TIP. All grounds for appeal must be raised within one appeal.

B. Grounds for an Appeal

An appeal may be filed challenging the APPR based upon one or more of the following grounds:

1. The substance of the Annual Professional Performance Review;
2. The district's failure to adhere to the standards and methodologies required for the APPR, pursuant to Education Law §3012-c and applicable rules and regulations;
3. The district's issuance and/or implementation of the terms of a teacher's TIP;
4. The district's failure to comply with locally negotiated procedures pertaining to the APPR.

C. Notification of the Appeal

1. Within ten (10) business days, occurring during the school year including summer recess, of the receipt of a teacher's annual evaluation, the teacher may request, in writing, a review by the Superintendent of Schools or his/her designee.
2. The appeal writing shall articulate in detail the basis of the appeal to the Superintendent of Schools or his/her designee. Failure to articulate a particular basis for the appeal in the aforesaid

appeal writing shall be deemed a waiver of that claim. The evaluated teacher may only challenge the substance, rating, and/or adherence to the parties' annual professional performance review plan adopted pursuant to 8 NYCRR 30-2 and Education Law 3012-c.

D. Decisions on Appeal

Within ten (10) business days, occurring during the school year including summer recess, of receipt of the appeal, the Superintendent of Schools or his/her designee shall render an initial determination, in writing, respecting the appeal. Thereafter, within ten (10) days of receipt of the Superintendent's initial determination, the affected teacher may elect review of the appeal papers by one outside expert who will be chosen from a panel of three persons selected by the District and CTA. In the event the affected teacher fails to elect review by a panelist within said timeframe, the Superintendent's initial determination shall be final. The panel shall be as follows:

i) Alan Gerstenlauer ii) Candy Swensen iii) Les Black

- 1) The panel composition shall be reviewed annually beginning on July 1, 2013. The panelists shall be selected in rotating order; if a panelist is unavailable, the next listed panelist will be chosen. The cost of expert review shall be shared equally between the District and the CTA. The expert may recommend a modification of the TIP, or a modification of the rating, along with his/her rationale for the same. Expert review shall be completed within ten (10) days of delivery of the written request for review to the panel member. No hearing shall be held and the review shall be based solely upon the original appeal, the Superintendent's initial determination, supporting papers submitted by the teacher and/or a response to the appeal by the teacher's evaluator. The panelist written review recommendation shall be transmitted to the Superintendent and appellant upon completion. The Superintendent shall consider the written review recommendation of the panelist and shall issue a written decision with ten (10) days thereof. The determination of the Superintendent of Schools, or his/her designee, shall be final and shall not be grievable, arbitral, nor reviewable in any other forum; however, the failure of either party to abide by the above agreed-upon process shall be subject to the grievance procedure.
- 2) An overall performance rating of "ineffective" on the annual evaluation is the only rating subject to appeal. Teachers who receive a rating of "highly effective" or "effective" or "developing" shall not be permitted to appeal their rating. Tenured teachers who are rated effective, highly effective or developing may elect to submit a written response to their overall rating, which response shall be appended to the APPR evaluation and filed in the teacher's personnel file. Such response shall be filed within ten (10) business days, occurring during the school year including summer recess, of the teacher's receipt of the APPR evaluation.
- 3) Non-tenured teachers shall not be permitted to appeal any aspect of their annual evaluation, but may appeal the school district's issuance and/or implementation of the terms of a teacher improvement plan. Probationary teachers who are rated ineffective, effective, highly effective or developing may elect to submit a written response to their overall rating, which response shall be appended to the APPR evaluation and filed in the teacher's personnel file. Such response shall be filed within ten (10) business days, occurring during the school year including summer recess, of the teacher's receipt of the APPR evaluation.

Appendix A

Connetquot CSD Teacher Improvement Plan (TIP) Forms

The sole purpose of the TIP is the improvement of teaching practice. The goal is to provide resources and support for teachers who have been rated as “developing” or “ineffective” on their summative evaluation. The evaluator and teacher will jointly determine the strategies to be undertaken to correct the deficiencies. No disciplinary action shall be taken by the district against the teacher until the TIP has been implemented and its effectiveness in improving the teacher’s performance has been evaluated.

Teacher: _____

Date: _____

Grade/Subject: _____

Evaluator: _____

CTA Representative: _____

List the area(s) needing improvement. If there are several, indicate the priority order for addressing them.

Priority	Area Needing Improvement	Performance Goal

Describe the plan for improvement with specific, measurable objectives, timeline, and process the teacher must meet in order to achieve an effective rating.

Appendix A

Connetquot CSD Teacher Improvement Plan (TIP) Forms

Describe the professional development opportunities (which will be included in the teacher's contractually obligated PD hours), materials, resources, and supports the District will make available at no cost to the teacher.

Assignment of a mentor teacher? Yes No

If yes, name of mentor: _____

If yes, describe the frequency and structure of the meetings between the mentor and teacher.

The teacher, evaluator, mentor (if applicable), and a CTA representative (if requested by the teacher) shall meet:

_____ (indicate specific dates/times) to assess the effectiveness and appropriateness of the TIP in assisting the teacher to achieve the goals set forth in the TIP. Based on the outcome of this assessment, the TIP shall be modified accordingly.

Evaluator's Signature _____

Date _____

Teacher's Signature _____

Date _____

Appendix A
Connetquot CSD Teacher Improvement Plan (TIP) Forms
Meeting Log

Meeting Date: _____

Present: _____

Initials of those present:

Evaluator Comments:

Teacher Comments:

Meeting Date: _____

Present: _____

Initials of those present:

Evaluator Comments:

Teacher Comments:

Meeting Date: _____

Present: _____

Initials of those present:

Evaluator Comments:

Teacher Comments:

Appendix A
Connetquot CSD Teacher Improvement Plan (TIP) Forms

Recommendation for Results of TIP

The teacher has met the performance goals identified through the TIP and there shall be no further action required.

The teacher has not met the performance goals.

Next Steps:

Evaluator's Signature _____ Date _____

The District has upheld their responsibilities as listed herein. If not, details may be included in the written response as indicated below.

Teacher's Signature _____ Date _____

Teacher's signature does not constitute agreement, but merely signifies he/she has examined and discussed the materials with his/her evaluator. Teachers shall have the right to insert written explanation or response to written feedback of the evaluator within 10 days, which may be considered during the Appeals process.