

ANNUAL PROFESSIONAL PERFORMANCE REVIEW (APPR)



Fact Sheet 15-13 *UPDATED*

January 2016

The 2015 state budget included replacing the current Annual Professional Performance Review (APPR) law section 3012-c of the Education Law with a new section 3012-d. The state budget also included language that requires districts to have new APPR plans approved by the State Education Department (SED) by November 15, 2015 in order to receive the district's scheduled increase in state aid for the 2015-2016 school year. The new APPR law gave SED authority to make important decisions about implementation of the law through commissioner's regulations. The following is an overview of the new law and SED's regulations that were adopted by the Board of Regents through emergency action on June 15, 2015, as well as revisions to the regulations adopted by the Board of Regents through emergency action on September 16, 2015 and again on November 9, 2015.

On December 15, 2015 the Board of Regents voted to implement a four year moratorium on the consequences of using the 3-8 ELA and math Common Core State Assessments, in any form, and state-provided growth scores on Regents exams in teacher and principal evaluations. The revisions contained in this APPR Fact Sheet update involve the new transition regulations. The new regulation replaces APPR ratings containing outcomes from these assessments/metrics with a transition rating. During the transition period only the transition rating will be used for purposes of APPR (3012-c or 3012-d) employment decisions, including tenure determinations and for purposes of proceedings under Education Law 3020-a and 3020-b and teacher and principal improvement plans and a teacher's official employment record. During the transition period State-provided growth scores will continue to be computed for advisory purposes and overall HEDI ratings compliant with the districts approved APPR plan will continue to be provided to teachers and principals. **It is important to note that the December 15 Regents transition period decision does not change the requirement to negotiate an APPR plan compliant with 3012-d by September 1. It does however, give districts some relief in that the Department is granting an automatic renewal of existing Hardship Waivers for all districts currently implementing a 3012-c plan under a waiver.**

SED has released a FAQ that addresses questions relating to the transition ratings. The FAQ can be found at the following link: <http://www.engageny.org/resource/guidance-on-new-york-s-annual-professional-performance-review-law-and-regulations>.

Transition Rating (NEW)

Districts operating under 3012-c

For the 2015-2016 school year for districts that have received a hardship waiver and are operating under 3012-c, the transition rating will be determined based on the remaining subcomponents of the APPR that are not based on the grade 3-8 ELA or math State assessments and/or a State –provided growth score on Regents examinations.

The following three examples illustrate how the Transition Rating will be determined:

- Mrs. Morgan is a 5th grade Common Branch teacher, she receives a growth score from the state based on her student's ELA and Math State assessments and her local portion of the APPR is based on student achievement outcomes on a third party assessment. Mrs. Morgan will receive a transition score and rating that removes the grade 3-8 tests. Her original score and rating will be provided for advisory purposes.

- Mr. Adams is a high school Regents teacher with the majority of his students taking Living Environment. His SLO is based on student outcomes on the Living Environment Regents exam. His local is based on achievement measures using the Living Environment Regents exam. Since neither of his student measures include 3-8 ELA or math outcomes or the state provided growth score on Regents exams (the high school principal score) his HEDI score will not be changed by the transition rules.
- Ms. Glen is a music teacher in a K-5 building. Her SLO is based on a school-wide measure utilizing the results of the grades 3-5 ELA and math State assessments and her local portion is based on a school-wide achievement measure based on proficiency rates on the grade 3-5 ELA and Math State assessments. Ms. Glen will receive a transition score and rating that removes the grade 3-8 tests. Her original score and rating will be provided for advisory purposes.

How their Transition scores will be determined:

	Mrs. Morgan	Transition	Mr. Adams	Transition	Ms. Glen Music teacher in a K-5 building	Transition
20% State or SLO	17/20	Drop because it is based on 3-8 ELA/math State tests	17/20	NA	12/20	Drop because it is based on 3-8 ELA/math State tests
20% Local	16/20	16	15/20	NA	14/20	Drop because it is based on 3-8 ELA/math State tests
60% Evidence of teaching practice	Rubric Score of 56/60	56	56	NA	56/60	56
Calculation	17+16+56	16+56 = 72 out of 80 available points = 90% 90% of 100 points = 90	17+15+56	NA	12+14+56	56 out of 60 available points = 93% 93% of 100 points = 93
Score	89	90	88	NA	82	93
Rating	Effective	Effective	Effective	NA	Effective	Highly Effective

Districts operating under 3012-d

Similar to the 3012-c rule, for the 2015-2016 school year, for districts that are operating under 3012-d, the transition rating will be determined based on the remaining subcomponents of the APPR that are not

based on the grade 3-8 ELA or math State assessments and/or a State –provided growth score on Regents examinations. If there are no remaining measures for the Student Performance Category in the required or optional subcomponents, the district shall not utilize this Category and the teacher’s overall composite transition rating will be based solely on their Teacher Observation Category Rating.

During the 2016-17, 2017-18 and 2018-19 school years in instances where no scores or ratings in the subcomponents of the Student Performance Category can be generated, an alternate SLO shall be developed by the district using assessments approved by SED that are not State assessments. Such SLO can include a school or district-wide measure based on State assessments other than the grades 3-8 ELA and math assessments.

The following three examples illustrate how the Transition Rating will be determined:

- Mrs. Morgan is a 5th grade Common Branch teacher, she receives a growth score from the state based on her student’s ELA and Math State assessments for her required student performance measure and her optional student performance measure is a supplemental assessment with corresponding growth model for ELA and math (not based on the State assessments). Mrs. Morgan will receive a transition score and rating that removes the grade 3-8 tests. Her original score and rating will be provided for advisory purposes.
- Mr. Adams is a high school Regents teacher with the majority of his students taking Living Environment. His required student performance measure is an SLO based on his student growth outcomes on the Living Environment Regents exam. The optional subcomponent of student performance is a second State-provided growth score based on the student growth percentiles assigned to the high school building as part of the State-provided growth score. Mr. Adams will receive a transition score and rating that removes the High school growth model. His original score and rating will be provided for advisory purposes.
- Ms. Glen is a music teacher in a K-5 building. Her required student performance measure is an SLO is based on a school-wide measure utilizing the results of the grades 3-5 ELA and math State assessments and her optional student performance measure is based on a building-wide state provided growth score based on the results of the 4-5 ELA and math State assessments. Ms. Glen will receive a transition score and rating that removes the grade 3-8 tests. Her original score and rating will be provided for advisory purposes. Since both of her Student performance measures used the 3-8 ELA and math State assessments she is left with no Student Performance score. Her transition score will require an alternative SLO to be developed by her district, in her case the district has determined that all music teachers who require an additional SLO will use the results of the students’ summative performance task, the final exam already administered in those classrooms, as the underlying evidence for the SLO.

How their Transition scores will be determined:

	Mrs. Morgan	Transition	Mr. Adams	Transition	Ms. Glen Music teacher in a K-5 building	Transition
Mandatory State or SLO	18/20	Drop because it is based on 3-8 ELA/math State tests	18/20	18= Highly Effective	15/20	Drop because it is based on 3-8 ELA/math State tests Alt SLO 17 Effective
Optional	16/20	16 =	16/20	Drop	17/20	Drop

Growth		Effective		because it utilizes the high school building’s state provided growth score		because it is based on 3-8 ELA/math State tests
Teacher Observation	Rubric Score of 3.4 = Effective	3.4 = Effective	3.4 = Effective	3.4 = Effective	3.4 = Effective	3.4 = Effective
Calculation	Student performance = 18 and 16 combined with the locally negotiated 50%/50% weighting = 17 = Effective and 3.4 = Effective, apply to matrix	Apply the resulting Effective student performance and the Effective teacher observation to Matrix	Student performance = 18 and 16 combined with the locally negotiated 50%/50% weighting = 17 = Effective and 3.4 = Effective, apply to matrix	Apply the resulting Highly Effective student performance and the Effective teacher observation to Matrix	Student performance = 15 and 17 combined with the locally negotiated 50%/50% weighting = 16 = Effective and 3.4 = Effective, apply to matrix	Apply the resulting Effective student performance based on the Alternate SLO and the Effective teacher observation to Matrix
Rating	Effective	Effective	Effective	Highly Effective	Effective	Effective

TIMELINE

Putting together a timeline requires combining dates from the law, regulations and the waiver process. Below is the timeline based on the dates from the three sources.

- Application of the new law begins with 2015-2016 evaluations. **New APPR plans approved on or before March 1, 2016 will apply to the 2015-2016 school year.**
- **New plans approved after March 1, 2016 will apply to the 2016-2017 school year.**
- APPR plans that were in effect on April 1, 2015 remain in place until a new plan is agreed to by the district and local.
- New plans must be locally negotiated and approved by SED by November 15, 2015, or the district will receive no increase in state aid for the 2015-2016 school year and thereafter until a new plan is in place. **SED offered a hardship waiver process that extends the November 15 deadline for plan approval up until September 1, 2016 based on a district’s demonstration of good-faith efforts to negotiate a new APPR plan.**
- The final deadline for plan approval to secure 2015-2016 state aid increases is September 1, 2016.

THE NEW APPR SYSTEM

The new system replaces the three subcomponent system (20% state growth or Student Learning Objectives (SLO); 20% student achievement or growth on locally selected measures; and 60% evidence of teaching practice) with a two category matrix system that includes student performance and teacher observation. (Note: The matrix appears on page 6).

APPR Plan Requirements

The regulations require districts to submit the APPR plan to SED for approval. The plan must describe:

- The district's process for submission of data;
- How the district will report individual teacher scores and ratings;
- The assessment development, security and scoring processes utilized by the district;
- The details of the district's evaluation system; and
- How the district will provide timely and constructive feedback to classroom teachers on their APPR.

Student Performance Category

The student performance category has one required and one optional subcomponent. State growth is a required component, and a second assessment selected through collective bargaining is an option. Here is how it will look for the two types of teachers:

Grade 4-8 Common Branch, ELA and Math Classroom Teachers:

- Continue to receive a State-provided growth score based on the growth model; and all of these teachers will also be required to have a back-up SLO in place in case the state cannot produce a growth score.
- Optional second state-provided growth score on a state-created or administered test provided it uses a different measure, or a supplemental assessment selected from SED's approved list.

All Other Classroom Teachers:

- Continue the Student Learning Objectives (SLO) process with either a state assessment or state approved assessment. SED has posted an RFQ for SLO assessments; currently approved assessments do not automatically meet the new SED requirements.
- Optional second state-provided growth score on a state-created or administered test provided it uses a different measure, or a supplemental assessment selected from SED's approved list.

SLO Target Setting

Superintendents or their designees have sole discretion to use pedagogical judgment to determine SLO targets. The current process for target setting in the 2014-2015 plans may be continued.

- These targets must reflect a year of expected growth, which can vary by a student's academic preparedness (i.e., prior achievement) and learning needs (i.e., economic disadvantage, disability, English language learner status). This means targets can factor in these characteristics.
- SLOs may incorporate group measures, including school-wide measures.

Optional Locally Selected Measure or Assessment Subcomponent

Use of an optional second measure must be agreed to through collective bargaining and can be a growth measure based on existing state exams or on new assessments approved by the state. The decision on which measure or assessment to use is also collectively bargained. Under the regulation, many of the group measures based on state assessments currently used in the local subcomponent will be available for use as this optional subcomponent. **During the transition, these measures cannot be used.**

Achievement measures are not allowed at this time. Currently, the SED definition of a growth model narrowly defines it as a statistical model. Some examples of measures or assessments for this subcomponent are:

- Measure computed by the state of the percent of students who achieve a state-determined level of growth on a state assessment.

- State-calculated school-wide results based on the state provided growth scores of all students in the school taking the 4-8 state ELA or math assessment.
- Locally computed school-wide results based on all or a subset of state provided growth scores.
- Locally selected, state-designed supplemental assessment with a state-provided or approved growth model.
 - These would be locally negotiated and come from a state provided list of assessments.
 - SED has posted an RFQ for supplemental assessments; currently approved assessments do not automatically meet the growth model requirement.
 - If a teacher is rated ineffective on the student performance category and a supplemental assessment is used as the optional student growth component, then the teacher can be rated no higher than ineffective overall. (Note: If one of the first three options above is used in this subcomponent this provision does not apply).

Calculating a Student Performance Rating

The law gave the Board of Regents the authority to set weights for the two subcomponents of the student performance category, combining the scores into one rating and determining how teachers receive a rating of Highly Effective, Effective, Developing or Ineffective.

The commissioner’s regulations state that each measure used in the student performance category must result in a score between 0-20. The state will generate a 0-20 score for the state provided growth score. Districts will calculate scores for SLOs using the following table designed by SED. All other measures shall be computed locally in accordance with the state-provided or approved growth model used.

SLO Score Setting

<i>Percent of Students meeting target</i>	<i>Score</i>	<i>Percent of Students meeting target</i>	<i>Score</i>
0-4%	0	49-54%	11
5-8%	1	55-59%	12
9-12%	2	60-66%	13
13-16%	3	67-74%	14
17-20%	4	75-79%	15
21-24%	5	80-84%	16
25-28%	6	85-89%	17
29-33%	7	90-92%	18
34-38%	8	93-96%	19
39-43%	9	97-100%	20
44-48%	10		

A local may negotiate the use of a second measure in the student performance rating.

- If a local chooses to use only the required state growth or SLO component, it would count as 100% of the student performance category.
- If a local agrees with the district to use the optional student growth subcomponent along with the mandatory growth/SLO subcomponent, then the mandatory subcomponent must be weighted at a minimum of 50% and the optional subcomponent must be weighted no more than 50% of the student performance category. (Note: Section 3012-d requires that if a teacher is rated ineffective on the student performance category and a supplemental assessment is used as the optional student growth component, then the teacher must be rated ineffective overall).

An overall score of 0-20 shall be generated for the student performance category. If an optional second measure is used, the two scores will be combined using a weighted average to produce an overall score.

Overall Student Performance Category Score and Rating

<i>Rating</i>	<i>Minimum</i>	<i>Maximum</i>
Highly Effective	18	20
Effective	15	17
Developing	13	14
Ineffective	0	12

Teacher Observation Category

The new law requires a minimum of two observations: one by a principal or other trained administrator, and another by an impartial independent trained evaluator. If locally negotiated, observations by trained peer observers are also allowed.

- Independent evaluators must be trained and selected by the district:
 - May include other administrators, department chairs, or peers (such as teacher leaders on career ladders).
 - Cannot be from the same school building as the teacher being observed but may be from another school in the district (same building is defined as same BEDS code).
 - Hardship waivers may be available for rural schools and one-building districts.
- Peer evaluators must have been rated effective or highly effective on his/her overall rating the prior school year and can be from the same school or another school in the district.
- Commissioner’s regulations allow for local flexibility on frequency and duration of observations. Plans may exceed the minimum of two observations. All of these procedures must be collectively bargained.
- Commissioner’s regulation requires one observation to be unannounced.
- Videotaped observations are allowed but must be collectively bargained.

Teacher Practice Rubrics

The selection of the teacher practice rubric to be used in the teacher observation category must be locally negotiated from a menu of state-approved rubrics. The currently approved list of rubrics will remain available until the new menu is issued.

- All observations for a teacher for the school year must use the same approved rubric.
- However, the parties may locally negotiate whether to use different rubrics for teachers who teach different grades and/or subjects.
- Observations must be based only on observable rubric subcomponents and all observable teaching standards must be addressed across the total number of annual observations. However, not every element or indicator needs to be observed or included in each observation.
- Teaching standards that are part of the rubric but are not observable during the classroom observation may be observed during any optional pre-observation or post-observation review or other natural conversations between the teacher and evaluator and incorporated into the observation score.
- Under Education Law 3012-d, artifacts are a prohibited element of teacher evaluations. However, an artifact may be documented as part of an observation cycle (e.g., a lesson plan viewed during the course of the observation cycle may constitute evidence of professional planning).

Evaluator Training

The regulations continue the requirement for evaluators to be trained. All lead evaluators, independent observers and peer observers must complete training.

The training course for lead evaluators shall include:

- The New York State Teaching Standards;
- Evidence-based observation techniques that are grounded in research;
- Application and use of the student growth percentile model and any other growth model approved by SED;
- Application and use of the state-approved teacher practice rubrics;
- Application and use of any assessment tools the district utilizes to evaluate classroom teachers;
- Application and use of any locally selected measures of student growth used in the optional assessment subcomponent;
- Use of the statewide instructional reporting system;
- The scoring methodology used by the district to evaluate a teacher; and
- Specific considerations in evaluating teachers of English language learners and students with disabilities.

The training course for independent evaluators and peer evaluators shall include:

- The New York State Teaching Standards;
- Evidence-based observation techniques that are grounded in research; and
- Application and use of the state-approved teacher practice rubrics.

Overall Teacher Observation Score and Rating

- Each observation type (principal/supervisor, independent, peer) would be completed using a 1-4 rubric scale, producing an overall score between 1-4.
 - In the event that a teacher earns a score of 1 on all rated components of the practice rubric across all observations, a score of 0 will be assigned.
- Observation types would be combined using a weighted average, producing an overall observation category score between 1-4. The weights are determined locally through collective bargaining using parameters established by SED.
 - The weight of the principal/supervisor observation is established locally, but must be at least 80% and could be as high as 90%.
 - The weight of the independent observation is established locally, but must be at least 10%.
 - The weight of the optional peer observation is established locally within these constraints.
- This overall observation category score of 1-4 would be converted into a HEDI rating using the locally bargained ranges, that meet the overall rubric score conversion guidelines below. The NYSUT recommended scoring ranges are included in the SED regulations and are bolded in the chart below.
- The resulting rating will be the teacher observation rating used in the matrix to determine a teacher’s overall rating.

Overall Rubric Score Conversion

	<i>Permissible Statewide Ranges (actual cut scores determined locally)</i>	
	<i>Minimum</i>	<i>Maximum</i>
Highly Effective (H)	3.5 to 3.75	4.0
Effective (E)	2.5 to 2.75	3.49 to 3.74
Developing (D)	1.5 to 1.75	2.49 to 2.74
Ineffective (I)	0	1.49 to 1.74

Overall Rating

The final rating will be determined using the following matrix. The teacher’s rating for each category is applied to the rubric to determine the overall rating.

Matrix

		<i>Teacher Observation</i>			
		<i>Highly Effective (H)</i>	<i>Effective (E)</i>	<i>Developing (D)</i>	<i>Ineffective (I)</i>
Student Performance	Highly Effective (H)	H	H	E	D
	Effective (E)	H	E	E	D
	Developing (D)	E	E	D	I
	Ineffective (I)	D*	D*	I	I

*If a teacher is rated ineffective on the Student Performance category, and a local selected state-designed supplemental assessment was included as an optional subcomponent of the Student Performance category, the teacher must be rated Ineffective overall.

Prohibited Elements

The new law contained a list of elements prohibited from being used in teacher evaluation. These include:

- Evidence of student development and performance derived from lesson plans and student portfolios that are not part of an approved rubric;
- Parent and student surveys;
- Professional goal setting;
- Any district or regional assessment not approved by SED; and
- Any growth or achievement target that does not meet minimum standards.

Use of APPR Results

- A student may not be instructed, for two consecutive years, in the same subject by teacher(s) who received a rating of ineffective. If a district feels it is impractical to comply, the district can request a teacher-specific waiver from SED. Waivers may be granted if the district cannot make alternate arrangements, a true hardship is demonstrated and the district has an improvement and /or removal plan in place for the teacher in question.
- If a teacher receives two consecutive ineffective ratings, the district may bring a 3020-a proceeding and the burden of proof shifts to the teacher with the hearing completed within 90 days.
- If a teacher receives three consecutive ineffective ratings, the district must bring a 3020-a and the only defense a teacher can use is fraud or mistaken identity with the hearing completed within 30 days.

Privacy Law

- SED’s June 15, 2015 regulations change the privacy law to allow parents to receive not only an overall rating for their child’s teacher but also the rating and score for the student performance category and the observation category. **This was reversed in the September 16, 2015 revised regulations to allow parents to receive the overall rating only.**

Teacher Improvement Plans (TIPs)

According to the regulations, a district must develop and implement a teacher improvement plan for teachers receiving a rating of Developing or Ineffective from an APPR conducted under section 3012-d by October 1, in the school year following the school year the teacher received the rating. The improvement plan “shall be developed by the superintendent or his or her designee in the exercise of their pedagogical judgment” and must include at a minimum:

- 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.

Notwithstanding language in the regulations and guidance, the TIP process should not change without the District bargaining any changes with the union.

New Appeals Process for Growth Scores

September 16, 2015 regulations include a new appeals process for teachers who wish to challenge their State-provided growth score, which **begins with 2014-15 scores** and future years until the growth model has been re-examined.

- Teachers should send challenges to their state provided growth score to the department and the district within 20 days of receipt of the overall annual rating. For appeals of 2014-15 scores, the appeal must be filed by **October 19, 2015**. In order to appeal the growth score, the teacher must provide sufficient documentation that he/she meets the following criteria:
 - Teacher was rated Ineffective on his/her state provided growth score and Highly Effective on the other measures of teacher/leader effectiveness subcomponent in the current year and was rated either Effective or Highly Effective on his/her state provided growth score in the previous year.

The district has 10 days from receipt of appeal to submit a reply to the department, confirming the teacher meets the criteria. Based on the documentation received, if the department overturns a rating on the state provided growth score, the district shall substitute the teacher’s back-up SLO score for the growth score. If a back-up SLO is used, a teacher shall not receive a score/rating higher than developing on such SLO. If a back-up SLO was not developed, then the teacher’s overall composite score and rating will be based on the portions of their APPR not affected by the nullification of the state provided growth score.

Please note that during the transition period, the growth score will not be used to calculate the transition rating.

Appeals

The regulations continue the appeals process requirements from section 3012-c. The district’s APPR plan must describe the appeals process through which a teacher may challenge her or his APPR rating. A teacher may only challenge the following in an appeal:

- The substance of the APPR which includes:
 - Where a teacher is rated Ineffective on the student performance category but rated Highly Effective on the observation category based on an anomaly, as determined locally.
- The district’s adherence to the standards and methodologies of the APPR.
- The adherence to the regulations and compliance with locally negotiated procedures.

- District's issuance and /or implementation of the terms of the teacher improvement plan.

In response to our request to allow teachers on group measures to use the state growth score appeals process, the state education department issued the following response which indicates these scores can be challenged in a local appeals process under 3012-d.

"With respect to scores based on school-wide/group/team measures, the [state-provided growth score] appeal process was intended to allow teachers or principals to challenge only state-provided growth scores. In the case of school-wide/group/team measures, these scores are not generated by the State, but instead are assigned by the district. Therefore, these scores cannot be challenged through the State appeal process. However, depending on a district/BOCES local appeal process, such scores may be appealed locally." - According to the November 9, 2015, Department Response to public comment in the Regents item on APPR.

Corrective Action Plans

In the new regulations, SED is claiming to have the authority as part of a corrective action plan, to require school districts and their local unions to return to the bargaining table to change negotiated parts of the plan.

New Workgroup

The regulations create a new assessment and evaluation workgroup comprised of stakeholders and experts in the field to make recommendations on assessments and metrics that could be used for APPRs in the future. Topics SED has suggested would be appropriate for this workgroup to consider:

- The growth model - including the impact that students with very high and very low scores may have on the growth model.
- The definition of "growth model" as a statistical calculation in the optional subcomponent.

Next Steps

NYSUT will continue to take all actions necessary to return local control to teacher evaluation.