

Huntington Union Free School District

Annual Professional Performance Review Plan



2011 - 2012

Annual Professional Performance Review Process

A. PHILOSOPHY

Professional performance encompasses a variety of academic, social and personal efforts toward the education of children. The fundamental goal of the Annual Professional Performance Review is to encourage the growth of the educator, which, in turn, supports student achievement. An essential component of professional growth is periodic, critical review of professional practice. The reflection and self-directed inquiry involved in professional performance review is an opportunity for the educator to realize his or her fullest potential. The process must be a positive, collaborative activity that encourages a continual exploration of best practices and their implementation, rather than a process designed only to evaluate competence.

The pathways for professional development are, and should be, as diverse as the staff itself. Growth takes place within a community of educators, and the performance review should be designed so that all members of that community can help one another in an environment where they feel safe to take risks. Because growth is not limited to what takes place within the classroom, professional performance review should consider the educator's activities outside the classroom, including interactions with students, parents, other educators and the larger community.

B. REQUIRED COMPONENTS OF EDUCATION LAW § 3012-C APPR PLAN

1. Details of the evaluation system for teachers and principals. (Section E & G)
2. Description of how the district will provide timely and constructive feedback to teachers and principals on their Annual Professional Performance Review. (Section C, E & G)
3. Description of the appeal procedure to be utilized in the event a teacher or principal wishes to challenge their annual professional performance review. (Section K)
4. Description of the process to insure lead evaluators maintain inter-rater reliability and the process for periodically recertifying lead evaluators. (Section H)
5. Description of the process for ensuring that the State Education Department receives accurate teacher and student data and verification of rosters and course linkage data. (Section J)
6. Description of the process for reporting to the State Education Department individual subcomponent scores and the total composite effectiveness score for each classroom teacher and building principal. (Section J)

7. Description of local measures of student achievement selected and/or developed to be used in teacher evaluations, including security and scoring process. (Section E)
8. Description of local measures of student achievement selected and/or developed to be used in principal evaluations, including security and scoring process. (Section G)
9. Name(s) of the approved teacher and principal practice rubrics used by the district (Section E & G)
10. Scoring methodology for the assignment of points to the locally selected measures of student achievement subcomponent (20%) and other measures of effectiveness subcomponent (60%) (Sections E & G)

C. ANNUAL PROFESSIONAL PERFORMANCE REVIEW GUIDELINES

1. Criteria, performance, and means of measurement have been developed in alignment with the requirements of Education Law and the Commissioners Regulations.
2. These criteria will be clearly communicated to all instructional staff.
3. The status of a probationary teacher's progress toward tenure will be clearly communicated semi-annually.
4. The review process will provide and encourage opportunities for professional growth and development.
5. Collegial support will be available to all instructional staff through the district's mentoring program. Continued support will be encouraged and provided, as needed.
6. Education regarding criteria and training in the application of the criteria will be provided to all instructional staff through faculty meetings and the district's professional development program.
7. All teachers and principals shall receive a copy of this document at the beginning of each school year.
8. The Annual Professional Performance Review Plan will be available posted on the district's website by September 10th of each year. To the extent that any items of the Plan are not finalized by September 1st of each year, as a result of collective bargaining negotiations, the Plan shall identify those specific parts and the district shall file an amended plan upon completion of negotiations.

9. Annual Professional Performance Review forms shall be used to record the results of each review (see appendix).

D. FRAMEWORK FOR TEACHING

Huntington UFSD has adopted Charlotte Danielson's *Framework for Teaching*. The *Framework for Teaching* is a research-based set of components of instruction, aligned to the Interstate Teacher Assessment and Support Consortium (InTASC) standards, and grounded in a constructivist view of learning and teaching. In this framework, the complex activity of teaching is divided into 22 components (and 76 smaller elements) clustered into four domains of teaching responsibility: planning and preparation (Domain 1), classroom environment (Domain 2), instruction (Domain 3), and professional responsibilities (Domain 4). Each component defines a distinct aspect of a domain; two to five elements describe a specific feature of a component. Levels of teaching performance (rubrics) describe each component and provide a roadmap for improvement of teaching.

Domain 1: Planning and Preparation

- Demonstrating Knowledge of Content and Pedagogy Demonstrating
- Knowledge of Students
- Setting Instructional Outcomes
- Demonstrating Knowledge of Resources
- Designing Coherent Instruction
- Designing Student Assessments

Domain 2: The Classroom Environment

- Creating an Environment of Respect and Rapport
- Establishing a Culture for Learning
- Managing Classroom Procedures
- Managing Student Behavior
- Organizing Physical Space

Domain 4: Professional Responsibilities

- Reflecting on Teaching
- Maintaining Accurate Records
- Communicating with Families
- Participating in a Professional Community
- Growing and Developing Professionally
- Showing Professionalism

Domain 3: Instruction

- Communicating with Students
- Using Questioning and Discussion Techniques
- Engaging Students in Learning
- Using Assessment in Instruction
- Demonstrating Flexibility and Responsiveness

E. ANNUAL PROFESSIONAL PERFORMANCE REVIEW FOR TEACHERS

Pursuant to Commissioners Regulations Subpart 30-2, beginning with the 2011-2012 school year, all English Language Arts and Math teachers' grades 4 – 8 will receive an annual performance review rating linked to a State Education Department approved teacher practice rubric. Huntington UFSD has selected the *Danielson's Framework for Teaching (2011 Revised Edition)* as its rubric for the evaluation of classroom teachers.

The annual review ratings of Highly Effective, Effective, Developing, and Ineffective (HEDI) will be applied to the four domains and 22 components listed above, as well as student performance. A composite score of 1-100 will provide the basis for the HEDI rating:

- 20% will be based on student growth on SED assessment and will be provided by the State Education Department.
- 20% will be based on student achievement on locally selected measures
- 60% will be based on multiple measures including at least 40 points of the 60 points in this subcomponent is based on observation of classroom instruction using the district selected rubric for teacher evaluation.

Student Growth - The 20% for “student growth” will be based on SED assessment and will be provided by the State Education Department. In the 2011-2012 school year, the state assessments to be used are the State ELA and Math assessments in grades 4-8,

Student Achievement – The 20% for “student achievement” will be based on local measures. A description of the local measures of “student achievement” selected and/or developed to be used in teacher evaluations, including security and scoring process – **“WILL BE DETERMINED”**

Multiple Measures – The criteria for the 60% “multiple measures” of effectiveness and scoring ranges – **“SUBJECT TO NEGOTIATIONS”**

Annual Evaluation Overall Rating/Score - For the 2011-12 school year, the Commissioner has set the following scoring ranges (Table 2) for the overall rating categories and the rating categories for the State assessment and other comparable measures subcomponent and the locally selected measures subcomponent.

Table 2: Teacher Subcomponent and Composite Scoring Ranges

Level	Subcomponents			*Overall Composite Score
	Student Growth on State Assessments or Other Comparable Measures	Locally Selected Measures of Student Achievement	Other 60 pts Subject to Negotiations	
Ineffective	0-2	0-2	Enter Total Points for Overall Rating	0-64
Developing	3-11	3-11		65-74
Effective	12-17	12-17		75-90
Highly Effective	18-20	18-20		91-100

** The scoring ranges are prescribed in the regulations of the Commissioner. They are currently under review and may be modified.*

Probationary Teachers - Each probationary teacher will receive an overall summative rating/composite score each year. It is understood that probationary teachers in their

first year may receive an overall summative rating of *Developing* as they are emerging towards *Effective*. Whenever a teacher receives a rating of *Developing* or lower in a year-end evaluation, a Teacher Improvement Plan (TIP) will be developed. After receiving the appropriate mentoring and supports during year 1, probationary teachers are expected to demonstrate improvement in year 2. In year 3, probationary teachers are expected to maintain an overall summative rating of *Effective* or higher.

Tenured Teachers – Each tenured teacher is expected to maintain an overall summative rating of *Effective* or higher each year. If a tenured teacher receives an overall summative rating of *Developing* or lower, a *Teacher Improvement Plan (TIP)* will be developed.

Timeline – The statute provides for a phase-in of the new evaluation system (Subpart 30-2 from the old system (100.2(o))).

Phase I: Evaluations conducted for the 2011-2012 school year:

- New System - Subpart 30-2
- Teachers of English language arts Grades 4 – 8
- Teachers of Math Grades 4 – 8
- Old System – 100.2(o) + student growth component and HEDI quality rating
- All other teachers
- All guidance counselors, school psychologists, social workers, and deans

Phase II: Evaluations conducted beginning with the 2012-2013 school year:

- New System - Subpart 30-2
- All classroom teachers
- All school librarians and career and technical teachers
- All guidance counselors, school psychologists, and social workers are excluded from the regulations. These groups and deans will be evaluated annually using the district criteria.

F. DIMENSIONS OF LEADERSHIP

Huntington UFSD has adopted Douglas Reeves' *Leadership Performance Matrix*. There are ten dimensions of the *Reeves' Leadership Performance Matrix*. A narrative defines each dimension and two to five elements further describe a specific feature of the dimension. Levels of leadership performance (rubrics) describe each element and provide a roadmap for improvement of leadership performance.

Dimension 1.0: Resilience

Leaders in education bounce back quickly from adversity and stay focused on the vision of the organization. They bring together people and resources with the common belief that the organization can grow stronger in tough times when it applies certain knowledge, skills, and attitudes in the face of adversity.

1.1 Constructive Reactions

- 1.2 Willingness to Admit Error
- 1.3 Disagreement
- 1.4 Dissent
- 1.5 Improvement of Specific Performance Areas

Dimension 2.0: Personal Behavior and Professional Ethics

Leaders in education demonstrate personal behaviors consistent with community values and morals. They keep commitments, work with students, and act in service of the best interest of students, staff and community.

- 2.1 Integrity
- 2.2 Emotional Self-Control
- 2.3 Ethical and Legal Compliance with Employees
- 2.4 Tolerance
- 2.5 Respect

Dimension 3.0: Student Achievement

Leaders in education make student learning their top priority. They direct energy and resources toward data analysis for instructional improvement, development and implementation of quality standards-based curricula and evaluate, monitor, and provide feedback to staff on instructional delivery.

- 3.1 Planning and Goal Setting
- 3.2 Student Achievement Results
- 3.3 Instructional Leadership Decisions
- 3.4 Student Requirements and Academic Standards
- 3.5 Student Performance

Dimension 4.0: Decision Making

Leaders in education make decisions based on the vision and mission using facts and data. They use a transparent process for making decisions and articulate who makes which decisions. The leader uses the process to empower others and distribute leadership when appropriate.

- 4.1 Factual Basis for Decisions
- 4.2 Decision making Structure
- 4.3 Decisions Linked to Vision
- 4.4 Decisions Evaluated for Effectiveness

Dimension 5.0: Communication

Leaders in education understand communication as a two-way street. They seek to listen and learn from students, staff, and community. They recognize individuals for good work and maintain high visibility at school and in the community. Regular communication to staff and community keep all stakeholders engaged in the work of the school.

- 5.1 Two-Way Communication with Students
- 5.2 Two-Way Communication with Faculty and Staff
- 5.3 Two-Way Communication with Parents and Community
- 5.4 Analysis of Input and Feedback

Dimension 6.0: Faculty Development

Leaders recruit, hire, and retain effective and highly effective teachers. In their efforts to retain effective and highly effective teachers, leaders focus on evidence, research, and classroom realities faced by teachers. They link professional practice with student achievement to demonstrate the cause and effect relationship. Leaders also facilitate effective professional development, monitor implementation of critical initiatives, and provide timely feedback to teachers so that feedback can be used to increase teacher professional practice.

- 6.1 Faculty Proficiencies and Needs
- 6.2 Leading Professional Development
- 6.3 Formal and Informal Feedback
- 6.4 Modeling Coaching and Mentoring
- 6.5 Recruitment and Hiring of Faculty

Dimension 7.0: Leadership Development

Leaders in education actively cultivate and grow other leaders within the organization. They also model trust, competency, and integrity, which positively impacts and inspires growth in other potential leaders.

- 7.1 Mentoring Emerging Leaders
- 7.2 Identification of Potentially Future Leaders
- 7.3 Delegation and Trust

Dimension 8.0: Time/Task/Project Management

Leaders in education manage the decision making process, but not all decisions. They establish personal deadlines for themselves and the entire organization. Additionally, leaders understand the benefits of going deeper with fewer initiatives as opposed to superficial coverage of everything. They also effectively manage and delegate tasks and consistently demonstrate fiscal efficiency.

- 10.1 Organization of Time and Projects
- 10.2 Fiscal Stewardship
- 10.3 Project Objectives and Plans

Dimension 9.0: Technology

Leaders in education are technically savvy.. They process changes and capture opportunities available through social networking tools and access and process information through a variety of online resources. They incorporate data-driven decision making with effective technology integration to analyze school results. Furthermore, leaders develop strategies for coaching staff as they integrate technology into teaching, learning, and assessment processes.

- 9.1 Use of Technology to Improve Teaching and Learning
- 9.2 Personal Proficiency in Electronic Communication

Dimension 10.0: Personal Professional Learning

Leaders in education stay informed on current research in education and demonstrate their understanding. They engage in professional development opportunities that improve their personal professional practice and aligned with the needs of the school system. In addition, leaders generate a professional development focus in their schools and districts that is clearly linked to the system-wide strategic objectives.

- 10.1 Personal Understanding of Research Trends
- 10.2 Personal Professional Focus
- 10.3 Professional Development Focus
- 10.4 Application of Learning

G. ANNUAL PROFESSIONAL PERFORMANCE REVIEW FOR PRINCIPALS

Pursuant to Commissioners Regulations Subpart 30-2, beginning with the 2011-2012 school year, all building principals of English Language Arts and Math teachers' grades 4 – 8 will receive an annual performance review rating linked to a State Education Department approved principal practice rubric. Huntington UFSD has selected the *Reeves' Leadership Performance Matrix* as its approved rubric for the evaluation of building principals. The annual review ratings of Highly Effective, Effective, Developing, and Ineffective (HEDI) will be applied to the ten dimensions listed above, as well as student performance. A composite score of 1-100 will provide the basis for the HEDI rating:

- 20% will be based on student growth on SED assessment and will be provided by the State Education Department.
- 20% will be based on student achievement on locally selected measures
- 60% will be based on multiple measures including at least 40 points of the 60 points in this subcomponent based on a broad assessment of leadership and management actions using the district selected rubric for administrator evaluation.

Student Growth - The 20% for “student growth” will be based on SED assessment and will be provided by the State Education Department. In the 2011-2012 school year, the state assessments to be used are the State ELA and Math assessments in grades 4-8,

Student Achievement – The 20% for “student achievement” will be based on local measures. A description of the local measures of “student achievement” selected and/or developed to be used in teacher evaluations, including security and scoring process – **“WILL BE DETERMINED”**

Multiple Measures – The criteria for the 60% “other measures” of effectiveness and scoring ranges – **“SUBJECT TO NEGOTIATIONS”**

Annual Evaluation Overall Rating/Score - For the 2011-12 school year, the Commissioner has set the following scoring ranges (Table 4) for the overall rating categories and the rating categories for the State assessment and other comparable measures subcomponent and the locally selected measures subcomponent.

Table 4: Administrator Subcomponent and Composite Scoring Ranges

Level	Subcomponents			Overall Composite Score
	Student Growth on State Assessments or Other Comparable Measures	Locally Selected Measures of Student Achievement	Other 60 pts Subject to Negotiations	
Ineffective	0-2	0-2	Enter Total Points for Overall Rating	0-64
Developing	3-11	3-11		65-74
Effective	12-17	12-17		75-90
Highly Effective	18-20	18-20		91-100

Probationary Administrators - Each probationary administrator will receive an overall summative rating/composite score each year. It is understood that probationary administrators in their first year may receive an overall summative rating of *Developing* as they are emerging towards *Effective*. Whenever a principal receives a rating of *Developing* or lower in a year-end evaluation, a Principal Improvement Plan (PIP) will be developed. After receiving the appropriate mentoring and supports during year 1, probationary administrators are expected to demonstrate improvement in year 2. In year 3, probationary administrators are expected to maintain an overall summative rating of *Effective* or higher.

Tenured Administrators - Each tenured administrator is expected to maintain an overall summative rating of *Effective* or higher each year. If a tenured administrator receives an overall summative rating of *Developing* or lower, a *Principal Improvement Plan (PIP)* will be developed.

Timeline - The statute provides for a phase-in of the new evaluation system (Subpart 30-2 from the old system (100.2(o))).

Phase I: Evaluations conducted for the 2011-2012 school year:

- New System - Subpart 30-2
- Building Principals of English language arts Grades 4 – 8
- Building Principals of Math Grades 4 – 8
- Old System – 100.2(o)
- All Other Building Principals
- All Directors, Assistant Directors, Assistant Principals, Administrative Assistants, and Chairpersons

Phase II: Evaluations beginning with the 2012-2013 school year:

- New System - Subpart 30-2
- All Building Principals
- All Directors, Assistant Directors, Assistant Principals, Administrative Assistants, and Chairpersons - **“Subject to Negotiations”**

H. TRAINING FOR EVALUATORS AND LEAD EVALUATORS

The district has an obligation to provide the appropriate training for all evaluators and lead evaluators prior to the completion of any 2011-12 annual evaluations. For the purpose of this plan all personnel involved in the writing of an annual evaluation for teachers and administrators will be included in such training.

The process for ensuring that lead evaluators maintain inter-rater reliability over time and the process for recertification of lead evaluators... **"WILL BE DETERMINED"**

Training will be arranged through the office of the Superintendent and will follow the guidelines suggested in the June 15, 2011 APPR guidance document. Through this training, the district will certify all evaluators and lead evaluators. Resources for this training and certification will be included annually in the district's budget development process.

I. TEACHER AND PRINCIPAL IMPROVEMENT PLANS

Teacher Improvement Plan (TIP) is a structured plan designed to identify specific concerns in instruction and outlines a plan of action to address these concern. The purpose of a TIP is to assist teachers to work to their fullest potential. The TIP provides assistance and feedback to the teacher and establishes a timeline for assessing its overall effectiveness.

A TIP will be initiated whenever a teacher receives a rating of *developing or ineffective* in a year-end evaluation. Both the teacher and the administrator will meet for an evaluation conference at the end of the school year where the *developing or ineffective* evaluation is discussed. A TIP is designed by the building principal and/or curriculum supervisor in collaboration with the teacher and the president of the ATH or his/her designee. The TIP must be in place no later than ten days after the date on which the teacher is required to report for the first class they are assigned for the school year.

Principal Improvement Plan (PIP) is a structured plan designed to identify specific concerns in leadership and outlines a plan of action to address these concern. The purpose of a PIP is to assist principals to work to their fullest potential. The PIP provides assistance and feedback to the principal and establishes a timeline for assessing its overall effectiveness.

A PIP will be initiated whenever a principal receives a rating of *developing or ineffective* in a year-end evaluation. Both the principal and his/her direct supervisor will meet for an evaluation conference at the end of the school year where the *developing or ineffective* evaluation is discussed. A PIP is designed by the Superintendent's Cabinet in collaboration with the principal and the president of DSPA or his/her designee. The PIP

must be in place no later than ten days after the date classes are scheduled to begin for the school year.

Tip and PIP elements are **“Subject to Negotiations”**

J. DATA VERIFICATION AND REPORTING

a) Description of the process for ensuring that the State Education Department receives accurate teacher and student data and verification of rosters and course linkage data:

A. eSchoolData is the student management system of Huntington UFSD.

In eSchoolData...

- All of our teachers are assigned a “Teach ID”
- Teachers will be assigned to students with specific start and end dates
- Teachers who are assigned to students for a specific percentage of time (integrated co-teachers, ESL teachers, teachers on LOA, Long Term Substitutes, etc.) will be assigned through the student management “dosage” component
- All courses that end in a Regent’s exam or a 3-8 assessment will have a NYS Course Code entered
- The CIO will send files which link the teachers/students/courses to the principals/directors 3 times a year, to verify that all teachers and all students are reported accurately.
- eSchoolData creates files which are uploaded to SIRS by the CIO

b) Description of the process for reporting to the State Education Department individual subcomponent scores and the total composite effectiveness score for each classroom teacher and building principal... **“WILL BE DETERMINED”**

K. ANNUAL PROFESSIONAL PERFORMANCE REVIEW APPEALS

The appeal mechanisms associated with the results of the Annual Professional Performance Review are **“SUBJECT TO NEGOTIATIONS”**