**Recommendations of the APPR Committee**

**NUMBER OF SCHOOL VISITS**

1. Although, it is recommended that more than two (2) observations be conducted. The committee understands that units may not want to agree to more than two. Therefore, the committee suggests that if a unit agrees to two (2) observations it does so with the condition that any principal rated developing or ineffective would be provided two additional. **The evaluation timeline would need to allow accommodation of these additional observations, so the formal observation would need to be completed by end of March.** [ See CAS evaluation procedures] \*\* *The formal “observation score” under the law must be provided by the last day of the school year the committee recommends that all plans comply with this requirement.*

**DURATION OF SCHOOL VISITS**

1. **The committee understands that the units may be reluctant to agree to school visits in excess of thirty (30) minutes; however, it is recommended that all plans require school visits to be 45 minutes are longer.** [ See CAS evaluation procedures]

**INDIVIDUAL CONDUCTING OBSERVATION**

**3.** The committee recognizes that the statute states that to the “extent practicable” the lead evaluator should of building principals should be the Superintendent. It is recommended that all plans include the Superintendent as part of the evaluation process**.** However, the committee understands that local units may prefer to have other central office administrators conduct the evaluations.

1. The committee does not recommend using peer evaluators and further strongly advises units to agree as part of the evaluation procedure that all observations of principals will be conducted by a non-bargaining unit central office administrator, **such as the Superintendent conducting the informal (unannounced).**

**OBSERVATION WEIGHTING**

1. The committee agrees that the formal (announced) observations should constitute 80-90 percent, and the informal (unannounced) should comprise the 20-10%. The committee defers to the individual local association in regards to the 80/20 or 90/10 structure. [ See CAS evaluation procedures]

**NOTE:** The teachers in certain districts are insisting on a 90/10 split with the formal announced being 90%. The committee will defer to each local association; however, it is strongly recommended that the plan specifies that **the formal is the announced** and shall consist of 90 or 80.

**OBSERVABLE AND NON-OBSERVABLE DOMAINS WITHIN MPPR**

1. The committee believes that each local unit should agree with the district as to what domains are and are not observable. This likely will vary from district to district. The committee found that the following domains/performance indicators within the MPPR rubric could **“possibly”** be viewed as observable;

Domain 1: Shared Vision of Learning- [all four (4) sub-domains]

Domain 2: School Culture and Instructional Programs – [all ten (10) sub-domains]

Domain 3: Safe, Efficient, Effective Learning Environment- [all five (5) sub-domains]

Domain 4: Community- Strategic Planning Process; Inquiry [1 sub-domain]

Domain 5: Integrity, Fairness, Ethics- 1st sub domain within Culture [1 sub-domain]

**NON-OBSERVABLE**

The following the committee found to be non-observable;

Domain 4: Culture and Sustainability

\*Domain 5- Sustainability & last two (2) sub domains within Culture

Domain 6- Political, Social, Economic, Legal and Cultural Context (all sub domains)

**\*Committee recommends that third (3rd) sub domain within Domain 5 Sustainability not be used or scored in any way.**

**\*\* The committee recognizes that the majority of the above “possibly” observable sub-domains are in fact unlikely to be observed during the course of one, two, or even three school visits. However, rather than removing them from scoring entirely it is recommended that units agree to utilize evidence and the pre and post observation process during the multiple visits to capture as many sub domains as possible.**

**DOMAIN SCORING**

1. The committee acknowledges that there are several ways that an observation/school visit can be scored. One possibility examined by the committee would be to assign the following point total to each rated sub-domain;

HE 4; E 3:49; D 2:49; I 1:49--The total score then will be divided by the total number of sub-domains rated. A rating of Ineffective in all observable sub-domains will be given an overall rating of 0.

* Each local unit of course can agree that fewer domains are actually observable *and are scored*, ***but the committee advises that no unit agrees to less than ten (10), if they intended to use the above scoring methodology.***

**NON-OBSERVABLE DOMAIN SCORING:**

1. There exists several options in relation to the non-observable sub-domains, including but not limited to:
2. The local unit can elect to not issue a rating for the non-observable sub-domains
3. The local unit can agree that all non-observable sub-domain will be given a HE if all observable sub-domains within that domain are rated HE or E. This one would require excluding domain 6 from scoring entirely. If the observables are not rated HE or E evidence could be submitted to help rate the non-observable in that instance.
4. Agree that they will be rated during the course of the formal visit using the pre and post observations would be the “natural conversations” used to rate them.\*

*\*****If the unit agrees to non-observable domains scored should include language in regards to defining or detailing “natural conversations”*** as well as the use of evidence.

[ See CAS evaluation procedures]

**OBSERVATION HEIDI RANGE**

1. The committee recommends the following HEDI scoring range:

Ineffective: 0-1.49

Developing: 1.5-2.49

Effective: 2.5-3.49

Highly Effective: 3.5-4

**USE OF EVIDENCE**

1. Committee strongly recommends that each plan require the district produce evidence in support of any developing or ineffective rating. It is also recommend that evidence be used to allow for ***rating adjustments*** within “observable” sub-domains, as well as for non-observable scoring, if non-observable is agreed to be rated. [ See CAS evaluation procedures]

***NEED FOR SEPARATE MOA***

1. ***COMMITTEE RECOMMENDS THAT UNITS DO NOT USE THE APPR PORTAL AS GUIDANCE FOR THEIR NEGOTIAITONS****.* The portal does not provide for a section detailing the evaluation procedures, timelines, etc. A separate MOA with the district detailing all components of the evaluation plan must be entered into simultaneous to submitting the plan in the portal.. [ See CAS MOA template]

**APPEAL PROCESS**

1. The committee ***strongly recommends*** that each unit attempt to secure an appeals that allows for an outside review and determination of any developing or ineffective. This can be accomplished through a panel, retired administrator or arbitrator. The local unit can agree to limit such review to only “ineffective” ratings or the second ineffective rating, however, all plans should allow for outside review. The committee puts forth that its highly unlikely that an Assistant Superintendent would rate a tenure Principal “Ineffective” without first running it past the Superintendent. Therefore, all “ineffective” and ideally developing should be subject to outside review and determination other than the Superintendent. Also, but all plans should allow for probationary principal to appeal their rating and for the reviewer to have the authority to modify the rating. [See CAS appeal plans]

**PIP PLANS**

1. The committee recommends that each local unit ensures that the district will honor their obligation to negotiate all changes in the PIP plan as set forth under the Taylor law. [ See CAS MOA template]

If you have any questions about the above guidance or attached templates please contact the CAS office for further direction.