



THE STATE EDUCATION DEPARTMENT / THE UNIVERSITY OF THE STATE OF NEW YORK

Commissioner of Education
President of the University of the State of New York
89 Washington Ave., Room 111
Albany, New York 12234

E-mail: commissioner@mail.nysed.gov
Twitter: @JohnKingNYSED
Tel: (518) 474-5844
Fax: (518) 473-4909

January 10, 2013

Kathleen Maerten, Superintendent
Alexander Central School District
3314 Buffalo Street
Alexander, NY 14005

Dear Superintendent Maerten:

Congratulations. I am pleased to inform you that your Annual Professional Performance Review Plan (APPR) meets the criteria outlined in Education Law §3012-c and Subpart 30-2 of the Commissioner's Regulations and has been approved for the 2012-2013 school year. As a reminder, we are relying on the information you provided on your APPR form, including the certifications and assurances that are part of your approved APPR. If any material changes are made to your approved APPR plan, your district/BOCES must submit such material changes to us for approval. Please see the attached notes for further information.

Please be advised that, pursuant to Education Law §3012-c, the Department will be analyzing data supplied by districts, BOCES, and/or schools and may order a corrective action plan if there are unacceptably low correlation results between the student growth subcomponent and any other measures of teacher and principal effectiveness and/or if the teacher or principal scores or ratings show little differentiation across educators and/or the lack of differentiation is not justified by equivalently consistent student achievement results.

The New York State Education Department and I look forward to continuing our work together, with the goal of ensuring that every school has world-class educators in the classroom, every teacher has a world-class principal to support his or her professional growth, and every student achieves college and career readiness.

Thank you again for your hard work.

Sincerely,



John B. King, Jr.
Commissioner

Attachment

c: Michael Glover

NOTES: If your district/BOCES has provided for value-added measures (15 points vs. 20 points scale and categorization of your district/BOCES's grade configurations) in your APPR and no value-added measures are approved by the Board of Regents for a grade/subject and/or grade configuration for the 2012-13 school year, your district/BOCES will be required to revise and resubmit its APPR accordingly. Conversely, if your district/BOCES has not provided for value-added measures in your district/BOCES's APPR submission and value-added measures are approved for the 2012-13 school year, your district/BOCES will be required to revise and resubmit its APPR accordingly.

Only documents that are incorporated by reference in your APPR have been reviewed and are considered as part of your APPR; therefore, any supplemental documents such as memorandums of agreement or understanding that were uploaded with your APPR but are not incorporated by reference in your APPR have not been reviewed. However, the Department reserves the right to review the uploaded attachments at any time for consistency with your APPR form and/or to ensure compliance with applicable laws and regulations; and as a result of such review, the Department may reject your APPR plan and/or require corrective action.

Annual Professional Performance Reviews: 2012-13

Created Monday, May 21, 2012

Updated Tuesday, December 11, 2012

1

Disclaimers

The Department will review the contents of each school district's or BOCES' APPR plan as submitted using this online form, including required attachments, to determine if the plan rigorously complies with Education Law section 3012-c and subpart 30-2 of the Rules of the Board of Regents. Department approval does not imply endorsement of specific educational approaches in a district's or BOCES' plan.

The Department will not review any attachments other than those required in the online form. Any additional attachments supplied by the school district or BOCES are for informational purposes only for the teachers and principals reviewed under this APPR plan. Statements and/or materials in such additional attachments have not been approved and/or endorsed by the Department. However, the Department reserves the right to request further information from the school district or BOCES, as necessary, as part of its review.

If the Department reasonably believes through investigation or otherwise that statements made in this APPR plan are not true or accurate, it reserves the right to reject this plan at any time and/or to request additional information to determine the truth and/or accuracy of such statements.

1. SCHOOL DISTRICT INFORMATION

1.1) School District's BEDS Number : 180202040000

If this is not your BEDS Number, please enter the correct one below

180202040000

1.2) School District Name: ALEXANDER CSD

If this is not your school district, please enter the correct one below

ALEXANDER CSD

1.3) School Improvement Grant (SIG) Districts Only

SIG districts only: Indicate whether this APPR plan is for SIG schools only or for the entire district. Other districts and BOCES, please skip this question.

(No response)

1.4) Award Classification

Please check if the district has applied for and/or has been awarded any of the following (if applicable):

(No response)

1.5) Assurances

Please check all of the boxes below:

1.5) Assurances Assure that the content of this form represents the district/BOCES' entire APPR plan and that the APPR plan is in compliance with Education Law §3012-c and Subpart 30-2 of the Rules of the Board of Regents	Checked
1.5) Assurances Assure that this APPR plan will be posted on the district or BOCES website by September 10, or within 10 days after approval, whichever is later	Checked
1.5) Assurances Assure that it is understood that this district/BOCES' APPR plan will be posted in its entirety on the NYSED website following approval	Checked

1.6) Is this a first-time submission, a re-submission, or a submission of material changes to an approved APPR plan?

Re-submission to address deficiencies

1.7) Is this submission for an annual or multi-year plan?

If the plan is multi-year, please write the years that are included.

Annual (2012-13)

2. Growth on State Assessments or Comparable Measures (Teachers)

Created Monday, May 21, 2012

Updated Thursday, January 10, 2013

Page 1

STATE-PROVIDED MEASURES OF STUDENT GROWTH

(25 points with an approved value-added measure)

For teachers in grades 4 - 8 Common Branch, ELA, and Math, NYSED will provide a value-added growth score. That score will incorporate students' academic history compared to similarly academically achieving students and will use special considerations for students with disabilities, English language learners, students in poverty, and, in the future, any other student-, classroom-, and school-level characteristics approved by the Board of Regents. NYSED will also provide a HEDI subcomponent rating category and score from 0 to 25 points.

While most teachers of 4-8 Common Branch, ELA and Math will have state-provided measures, some may teach other courses in addition where there is no state-provided measure. Teachers with 50 – 100% of students covered by State-provided growth measures will receive a growth score from the State for the full Growth subcomponent score of their evaluation. Teachers with 0 – 49% of students covered by State-provided growth measures must have SLOs for the Growth subcomponent of their evaluation and one SLO must use the State-provided measure if applicable for any courses. (See guidance for more detail on teachers with State-provided measures AND SLOs.)

Please note that if the Board of Regents does not approve a value-added measure for these grades/subjects for 2012-13, the State-provided growth measure will be used for 20 points in this subcomponent. NYSED will provide a HEDI subcomponent rating category and score from 0 to 20 points.

2.1) Assurances

Please check the boxes below:

2.1) Assurances Assure that the value-added growth score provided by NYSED will be used, where applicable.	Checked
2.1) Assurances Assure that the State-provided growth measure will be used if a value-added measure has not been approved for 2012-13.	Checked

STUDENT LEARNING OBJECTIVES AS COMPARABLE GROWTH MEASURES (20 points)

Student Learning Objectives will be the other comparable growth measures for teachers in the following grades and subjects. (Please note that for teachers with more than one grade and subject, SLOs must cover the courses taught with the largest number of students, combining sections with common assessments, until a majority of students are covered.)

For core subjects: grades 6-8 Science and Social Studies, high school English Language Arts, Math, Science, and Social Studies courses associated in 2010-11 with Regents exams or, in the future, with other State assessments, the following must be used as the evidence of student learning within the SLO:

State assessments (or Regents or Regent equivalents), *required if one exists*

If no State assessment or Regents exam exists:

District-determined assessments from list of State-approved 3rd party assessments; or

District, regional or BOCES-developed assessments provided that it is rigorous and comparable across classrooms

For other grades/subjects: district-determined assessments from options below may be used as evidence of student learning within the SLO:

State assessments, *required if one exists*

List of State-approved 3rd party assessments

District, regional, or BOCES-developed assessments provided that it is rigorous and comparable across classrooms

School- or BOCES-wide, group or team results based on State assessments

Please note: If your district or BOCES does not have grade/subject-specific teachers for one or more of the rows in questions 2.2 through 2.9, choose "Not applicable" from the drop-down box and type N/A in the assessment box. This would be appropriate if, for example, common branch teachers also teach 6th grade science and/or social studies and therefore would have State-provided growth measures, not SLOs; the district or BOCES does not have certain grades; the district does not offer a specific subject; etc.

Districts or BOCES that intend to use a district, regional, or BOCES-developed assessment must include the name, grade, and subject of the assessment. For example, a regionally-developed 7th grade Social Studies assessment would be written as follows: [INSERT SPECIFIC NAME OF REGION]-developed 7th grade Social Studies assessment.

2.2) Grades K-3 ELA

Using the drop-down boxes below, please first select the assessment that will be used for SLOs for the grade/subject listed. Then name the specific assessment, listing the full name of the assessment. State assessments must be used where applicable.

	ELA	Assessment
K	District, regional, or BOCES-developed assessment	GVEP regionally developed Kindergarten ELA Summative Assessment
1	District, regional, or BOCES-developed assessment	GVEP regionally developed 1st grade ELA summative assessment
2	District, regional, or BOCES-developed assessment	GVEP regionally developed 2nd grade ELA summative assessment

	ELA	Assessment
3	State assessment	3rd Grade State Assessment

For K-3 ELA: describe the district-adopted expectations for the level of performance required for each HEDI rating category and the process for assigning points to teachers based on SLO results consistent with regulations and assurances in the Comparable Growth Measures subcomponent. Include any district-determined expectations for student performance.

Use this box, if needed, to describe the general process for assigning HEDI categories for these grades/subjects in this subcomponent. If needed, you may upload a table or graphic at 2.11, below.	The district is using a general process for assigning HEIDI categories for all grades/subjects in this subcomponent. The process is set forth in the table and graphic at 2.11 below. Teachers will work collaboratively with their building principal to establish SLO targets using various data sources including past State assessments as well as regionally developed pre-assessments.
Highly Effective (18 - 20 points) Results are well-above state average for similar students (or District goals if no state test).	The work of the teacher results in extraordinary student academic growth beyond expectations during the school year. This is evidenced when 90% or more of the students meet or exceed the student learning objective.
Effective (9 - 17 points) Results meet state average for similar students (or District goals if no state test).	The work of the teacher results in acceptable, measurable, and appropriate student growth. This is evidenced when 80-89% of students meet the student learning objective.
Developing (3 - 8 points) Results are below state average for similar students (or District goals if no state test).	The work of the teacher results in student academic growth that does not meet the established standard and/or is not achieved with all populations taught by the teacher. This is evidenced when only 50-79% of students meet the student learning objective.
Ineffective (0 - 2 points) Results are well-below state average for similar students (or District goals if no state test).	The work of the teacher does not result in acceptable student growth. This is evidenced when less than 50% of students meet the student learning objective.

2.3) Grades K-3 Math

Using the drop-down boxes below, please first select the assessment that will be used for SLOs for the grade/subject listed. Then name the specific assessment, listing the full name of the assessment. State assessments must be used where applicable.

	Math	Assessment
K	District, regional, or BOCES-developed assessment	GVEP regionally developed kindergarten math summative assessment
1	District, regional, or BOCES-developed assessment	GVEP regionally developed 1st grade summative math assessment
2	District, regional, or BOCES-developed assessment	GVEP regionally developed 2nd grade math summative assessment

	Math	Assessment
3	State assessment	3rd Grade State Assessment

For Grades K-3 Math: describe the district-adopted expectations for the level of performance required for each HEDI rating category and the process for assigning points to teachers based on SLO results consistent with regulations and assurances in the Comparable Growth Measures subcomponent. Include any district-determined expectations for student performance.

Use this box, if needed, to describe the general process for assigning HEDI categories for these grades/subjects in this subcomponent. If needed, you may upload a table or graphic at 2.11, below.	The district is using a general process for assigning HEIDI categories for all grades/subjects in this subcomponent. The process is set forth in the table and graphic at 2.11 below. Teachers will work collaboratively with their building principal to establish SLO targets using various data sources including past State assessments as well as regionally developed pre-assessments.
---	--

Highly Effective (18 - 20 points) Results are well-above state average for similar students (or District goals if no state test).	The work of the teacher results in extraordinary student academic growth beyond expectations during the school year. This is evidenced when 90% or more of the students meeting or exceeding the student learning objective
Effective (9 - 17 points) Results meet state average for similar students (or District goals if no state test).	The work of the teacher results in acceptable, measurable, and appropriate student growth. This is evidenced when 80-89% of students meet the student learning objective.
Developing (3 - 8 points) Results are below state average for similar students (or District goals if no state test).	The work of the teacher results in student academic growth that does not meet the established standard and/or is not achieved with all populations taught by the teacher. This is evidenced when only 50-79% of students meet the student learning objective.
Ineffective (0 - 2 points) Results are well-below state average for similar students (or District goals if no state test).	The work of the teacher does not result in acceptable student growth. This is evidenced when less than 50% of students meet the student learning objective..

2.4) Grades 6-8 Science

Using the drop-down boxes below, please first select the assessment that will be used for SLOs for the grade/subject listed. Then name the specific assessment, listing the full name of the assessment. State assessments must be used where available.

	Science	Assessment
6	District, regional or BOCES-developed assessment	Alexander Central School District developed 6th grade summative science assessment
7	District, regional or BOCES-developed assessment	Alexander Central School District developed 7th grade summative science assessment
	Science	Assessment
8	State assessment	8th Grade State Science Assessment

For Grades 6-8 Science: describe the district-adopted expectations for the level of performance required for each HEDI rating category and the process for assigning points to teachers based on SLO results consistent with regulations and assurances in the Comparable Growth Measures subcomponent. Include any district-determined expectations for student performance.

Use this box, if needed, to describe the general process for assigning HEDI categories for these grades/subjects in this subcomponent. If needed, you may upload a table or graphic at 2.11, below.	The district is using a general process for assigning HEIDI categories for all grades/subjects in this subcomponent. The process is set forth in the table and graphic at 2.11 below. Teachers will work collaboratively with their building principal to establish SLO targets using various data sources including past State assessments as well as regionally developed pre-assessments.
Highly Effective (18 - 20 points) Results are well-above state average for similar students (or District goals if no state test).	The work of the teacher results in extraordinary student academic growth beyond expectations during the school year. This is evidenced when 90% or more of the students meeting or exceeding the student learning objective
Effective (9 - 17 points) Results meet state average for similar students (or District goals if no state test).	The work of the teacher results in acceptable, measurable, and appropriate student growth. This is evidenced when 80-89% of students meet the student learning objective.

Developing (3 - 8 points) Results are below state average for similar students (or District goals if no state test).	The work of the teacher results in student academic growth that does not meet the established standard and/or is not achieved with all populations taught by the teacher. This is evidenced when only 50-79% of students meet the student learning objective.
Ineffective (0 - 2 points) Results are well-below state average for similar students (or District goals if no state test).	The work of the teacher does not result in acceptable student growth. This is evidenced when less than 50% of students meet the student learning objective.

2.5) Grades 6-8 Social Studies

Using the drop-down boxes below, please first select the assessment that will be used for SLOs for the grade/subject listed. Then name the specific assessment, listing the full name of the assessment. State assessments must be used where available.

	Social Studies	Assessment
6	District, regional or BOCES-developed assessment	GVEP regionally developed 6th grade summative social studies assessment
7	District, regional or BOCES-developed assessment	Alexander Central School District developed 7th grade social studies assessment
8	District, regional or BOCES-developed assessment	GVEP regionally developed 8th grade social studies assessment

For Grades 6-8 Social Studies: describe the district-adopted expectations for the level of performance required for each HEDI rating category and the process for assigning points to teachers based on SLO results consistent with regulations and assurances in the Comparable Growth Measures subcomponent. Include any district-determined expectations for student performance.

Use this box, if needed, to describe the general process for assigning HEDI categories for these grades/subjects in this subcomponent. If needed, you may upload a table or graphic at 2.11, below.	The district is using a general process for assigning HEIDI categories for all grades/subjects in this subcomponent. The process is set forth in the table and graphic at 2.11 below. Teachers will work collaboratively with their building principal to establish SLO targets using various data sources including past State assessments as well as regionally developed pre-assessments.
Highly Effective (18 - 20 points) Results are well-above District goals for similar students.	The work of the teacher results in extraordinary student academic growth beyond expectations during the school year. This is evidenced when 90% or more of the students meeting or exceeding the student learning objective
Effective (9 - 17 points) Results meet District goals for similar students.	The work of the teacher results in acceptable, measurable, and appropriate student growth. This is evidenced when 80-89% of students meet the student learning objective.
Developing (3 - 8 points) Results are below District goals for similar students.	The work of the teacher results in student academic growth that does not meet the established standard and/or is not achieved with all populations taught by the teacher. This is evidenced when only 50-79% of students meet the student learning objective.
Ineffective (0 - 2 points) Results are well-below District goals for similar students.	The work of the teacher does not result in acceptable student growth. This is evidenced when less than 50% of students meet the student learning objective.

2.6) High School Social Studies Regents Courses

Using the drop-down boxes below, please first select the assessment that will be used for SLOs for the grade/subject listed. Then name the specific assessment, listing the full name of the assessment. Regents assessments must be used where available.

Note: Additional high school social studies courses may be listed below in the "All Other Courses" section of this form.

		Assessment
Global 1	District, regional, or BOCES-developed assessment	GVEP regionally developed Global 1 summative assessment
Social Studies Regents Courses		Assessment
Global 2	Regents assessment	Regents assessment
American History	Regents assessment	Regents assessment

For High School Social Studies Regents Courses: describe the district-adopted expectations for the level of performance required for each HEDI rating category and the process for assigning points to teachers based on SLO results consistent with regulations and assurances in the Comparable Growth Measures subcomponent. Include any district-determined expectations for student performance.

Use this box, if needed, to describe the general process for assigning HEDI categories for these grades/subjects in this subcomponent. If needed, you may upload a table or graphic at 2.11, below.	The district is using a general process for assigning HEIDI categories for all grades/subjects in this subcomponent. The process is set forth in the table and graphic at 2.11 below. Teachers will work collaboratively with their building principal to establish SLO targets using various data sources including past State assessments as well as regionally developed pre-assessments.
Highly Effective (18 - 20 points) Results are well-above District goals for similar students.	The work of the teacher results in extraordinary student academic growth beyond expectations during the school year. This is evidenced when 90% or more of the students meeting or exceeding the student learning objective
Effective (9 - 17 points) Results meet District goals for similar students.	The work of the teacher results in acceptable, measurable, and appropriate student growth. This is evidenced when 80-89% of students meet the student learning objective.
Developing (3 - 8 points) Results are below District goals for similar students.	The work of the teacher results in student academic growth that does not meet the established standard and/or is not achieved with all populations taught by the teacher. This is evidenced when only 50-79% of students meet the student learning objective.
Ineffective (0 - 2 points) Results are well-below District goals for similar students.	The work of the teacher does not result in acceptable student growth. This is evidenced when less than 50% of students meet the student learning objective.

2.7) High School Science Regents Courses

Using the drop-down boxes below, please first select the assessment that will be used for SLOs for the grade/subject listed. Then name the specific assessment, listing the full name of the assessment. Regents assessments must be used where available.

Note: Additional high school science courses may be listed below in the "All Other Courses" section of this form.

	Science Regents Courses	Assessment
Living Environment	Regents Assessment	Regents assessment
Earth Science	Regents Assessment	Regents assessment
Chemistry	Regents Assessment	Regents assessment
Physics	Regents Assessment	Regents assessment

For High School Science Regents Courses: describe the district-adopted expectations for the level of performance required for each HEDI rating category and the process for assigning points to teachers based on SLO results consistent with regulations and assurances in the Comparable Growth Measures subcomponent. Include any district-determined expectations for student performance.

Use this box, if needed, to describe the general process for assigning HEDI categories for these grades/subjects in this subcomponent. If needed, you may upload a table or graphic at 2.11, below.	The district is using a general process for assigning HEIDI categories for all grades/subjects in this subcomponent. The process is set forth in the table and graphic at 2.11 below. Teachers will work collaboratively with their building principal to establish SLO targets using various data sources including past State assessments as well as regionally developed pre-assessments.
Highly Effective (18 - 20 points) Results are well-above District goals for similar students.	The work of the teacher results in extraordinary student academic growth beyond expectations during the school year. This is evidenced when 90% or more of the students meeting or exceeding the student learning objective
Effective (9 - 17 points) Results meet District goals for similar students.	The work of the teacher results in student academic growth that does not meet the established standard and/or is not achieved with all populations taught by the teacher. This is evidenced when only 50-79% of students meet the student learning objective.
Developing (3 - 8 points) Results are below District goals for similar students.	The work of the teacher results in student academic growth that does not meet the established standard and/or is not achieved with all populations taught by the teacher. This is evidenced when only 50-79% of students meet the student learning objective.
Ineffective (0 - 2 points) Results are well-below District goals for similar students.	The work of the teacher does not result in acceptable student growth. This is evidenced when less than 50% of students meet the student learning objective.

2.8) High School Math Regents Courses

Using the drop-down boxes below, please first select the assessment that will be used for SLOs for the grade/subject listed. Then name the specific assessment, listing the full name of the assessment. Regents assessment must be used where available.

Note: Additional high school math courses may be listed below in the "All Other Courses" section of this form.

	Math Regents Courses	Assessment
Algebra 1	Regents assessment	Regents assessment
Geometry	Regents assessment	Regents assessment
Algebra 2	Regents assessment	Regents assessment

For High School Math Regents Courses: describe the district-adopted expectations for the level of performance required for each HEDI rating category and the process for assigning points to teachers based on SLO results consistent with regulations and assurances in the Comparable Growth Measures subcomponent. Include any district-determined expectations for student performance.

Use this box, if needed, to describe the general process for assigning HEDI categories for these grades/subjects in this subcomponent. If needed, you may upload a table or graphic at 2.11, below.	The district is using a general process for assigning HEIDI categories for all grades/subjects in this subcomponent. The process is set forth in the table and graphic at 2.11 below. Teachers will work collaboratively with their building principal to establish SLO targets using various data sources including past State assessments as well as regionally developed pre-assessments.
Highly Effective (18 - 20 points) Results are well-above District goals for similar students.	The work of the teacher results in extraordinary student academic growth beyond expectations during the school year. This is evidenced when 90% or more of the students meeting or exceeding the student learning objective.
Effective (9 - 17 points) Results meet District goals for similar students.	The work of the teacher results in student academic growth that does not meet the established standard and/or is not achieved with all populations taught by the teacher. This is evidenced when only 50-79% of students meet the student learning objective.
Developing (3 - 8 points) Results are below District goals for similar students.	The work of the teacher results in student academic growth that does not meet the established standard and/or is not achieved with all populations taught by the teacher. This is evidenced when only 50-79% of students meet the student learning objective.
Ineffective (0 - 2 points) Results are well-below District goals for similar students.	The work of the teacher does not result in acceptable student growth. This is evidenced when less than 50% of students meet the student learning objective.

2.9) High School English Language Arts

Using the drop-down boxes below, please first select the assessment that will be used for SLOs for the grade/subject listed. Then name the specific assessment, listing the full name of the assessment. Regents assessment must be used where available. Be sure to select the English Regents assessment in at least one grade in Task 2.9 (9, 10, and/or 11).

Note: Additional high school English courses may be listed below in the "All Other Courses" section of this form.

	High School English Courses	Assessment
Grade 9 ELA	District, regional or BOCES-developed assessment	GVEP regionally developed 9th grade ELA summative assessment.
Grade 10 ELA	District, regional or BOCES-developed assessment	GVEP regionally developed 10th grade ELA assessment.
Grade 11 ELA	Regents assessment	11th grade ELA Regents Assessment

For High School English Language Arts: describe the district-adopted expectations for the level of performance required for each HEDI rating category and the process for assigning points to teachers based on SLO results consistent with regulations and assurances in the Comparable Growth Measures subcomponent. Include any district-determined expectations for student performance.

Use this box, if needed, to describe the general process for assigning HEDI categories for these grades/subjects in this subcomponent. If needed, you may upload a table or graphic at 2.11, below.	The district is using a general process for assigning HEIDI categories for all grades/subjects in this subcomponent. The process is set forth in the table and graphic at 2.11 below.
---	---

graphic at 2.11, below.	below. Teachers will work collaboratively with their building principal to establish SLO targets using various data sources including past State assessments as well as regionally developed pre-assessments.
Highly Effective (18 - 20 points) Results are well-above District goals for similar students.	The work of the teacher results in extraordinary student academic growth beyond expectations during the school year. This is evidenced when 90% or more of the students meeting or exceeding the student learning objective
Effective (9 - 17 points) Results meet District goals for similar students.	The work of the teacher results in student academic growth that does not meet the established standard and/or is not achieved with all populations taught by the teacher. This is evidenced when only 50-79% of students meet the student learning objective.
Developing (3 - 8 points) Results are below District goals for similar students.	The work of the teacher results in student academic growth that does not meet the established standard and/or is not achieved with all populations taught by the teacher. This is evidenced when only 50-79% of students meet the student learning objective.
Ineffective (0 - 2 points) Results are well-below District goals for similar students.	The work of the teacher does not result in acceptable student growth. This is evidenced when less than 50% of students meet the student learning objective.

2.10) All Other Courses

Fill in, as applicable, for all other teachers in additional grades/subjects that have Student Learning Objectives. If you need additional space, duplicate this form and upload (below) as an attachment to your APPR plan. You may combine into one line any groups of teachers for whom the answers in the boxes are the same including, for example, "all other teachers not named above" .

Course(s) or Subject(s)	Option	Assessment
Algebra 1	District, Regional or BOCES-developed	GVEP regionally developed algebra 1 summative assessment
Technology 7	District, Regional or BOCES-developed	GVEP regionally developed grade 7 performance based technology summative assessment
Art K, 1, 2, 5, 7 8	District, Regional or BOCES-developed	GVEP regionally developed K, 1, 2, 5, 7th 8th grade performance based art summative assessment
Band grades 4,5, 9,10,11,12	District, Regional or BOCES-developed	GVEP developed grade 4,5, 9,10, 11 performance based instrumental music summative assessment
Technology 8	District, Regional or BOCES-developed	GVEP regionally developed grade 8 performance based summative technology assessment
Family and Consumer Science grade 7	District, Regional or BOCES-developed	GVEP regionally developed grade 7 summative family and consumer science summative assessment
Reading 6	District, Regional or BOCES-developed	GVEP regionally developed grade 6 reading summative assessment
Chorus grades 4,5,7 8	District, Regional or BOCES-developed	GVEP regionally developed grade 4,5,7 8 performance based vocal music summative assessment
	District, Regional or BOCES-developed	
French	District, Regional or BOCES-developed	GVEP regionally developed grade 8 summative French assessment
Spanish	District, Regional or BOCES-developed	GVEP regionally developed grade 8 summative Spanish assessment

	District, Regional or BOCES-developed	
	District, Regional or BOCES-developed	
	District, Regional or BOCES-developed	
Physical Education grades 2,3,4,5,6,7,8,9,10,11,12	District, Regional or BOCES-developed	GVEP regionally developed grade 2,3,4,5, 6,7,8,9,10,11 12 performance based summative physical education assessment
no response		no response

For all other courses, as applicable: describe the district-adopted expectations for the level of performance required for each HEDI rating category and the process for assigning points to teachers based on SLO results consistent with regulations and assurances in the Comparable Growth Measures subcomponent. Include any district-determined expectations for student performance.

Use this box, if needed, to describe the general process for assigning HEDI categories for these grades/subjects in this subcomponent. If needed, you may upload a table or graphic at 2.11, below.	The district is using a general process for assigning HEIDI categories for all grades/subjects in this subcomponent. The process is set forth in the table and graphic at 2.11 below. Teachers will work collaboratively with their building principal to establish SLO targets using various data sources including past State assessments as well as regionally developed pre-assessments.
Highly Effective (18 - 20 points) Results are well-above District goals for similar students.	The work of the teacher results in extraordinary student academic growth beyond expectations during the school year. This is evidenced when 90% of students meet or exceed the student learning objective.
Effective (9 - 17 points) Results meet District goals for similar students.	The work of the teacher results in acceptable, measurable and appropriate student growth. This is evidenced when 80-89% of students meet the student learning objective.
Developing (3 - 8 points) Results are below District goals for similar students.	The work of the teacher results in student academic growth that does not meet the established standard and/or is not achieved with all populations taught by the teacher. This is evidenced when only 50-79% of the students meet the student learning objective.
Ineffective (0 - 2 points) Results are well-below District goals for similar students.	The work of the teacher does not result in acceptable student academic growth. This is evidenced when less than 50% of students meet the student learning objective.

If you need additional space, upload a copy of "Form 2.10: All Other Courses" as an attachment for review. Click here for a downloadable copy of Form 2.10. (MS Word)

(No response)

2.11) HEDI Tables or Graphics

For questions 2.2 through 2.10 above, if you are using tables or other graphics to explain your general process for assigning HEDI categories, please combine all such tables or graphics into a single file, labeling each so it is clear which grades/subjects it applies to, and upload that file here.

assets/survey-uploads/5364/131678-TXEttx9bQW/District_Adopted_Expectations_for_HEDI_scores.[1]_5.doc

2.12) Locally Developed Controls

Describe any adjustments, controls, or other special considerations that will be used in setting targets for Comparable Growth Measures, the rationale for including such factors, and the processes that will be used to mitigate potentially problematic incentives associated with the controls or adjustments.

Note: The only allowable controls or adjustments for Comparable Growth Measures are those used in State Growth measures, which include: student prior academic history, students with disabilities, English language learners, students in poverty, and, in the future, any other student-, classroom-, and school-level characteristics approved by the Board of Regents.

(No response)

2.13) Teachers with more than one growth measure

If educators have more than one state-provided growth or value-added measure, those measures will be combined into one HEDI rating and score for the growth subcomponent according to a formula determined by the Commissioner. (Examples: Common branch teacher with state-provided value-added measures for both ELA and Math in 4th grades; Middle school math teacher with both 7th and 8th grade math courses.)

If educators have more than one SLO for comparable growth (or a State-provided growth measure and an SLO for comparable growth), the measures will each earn a score from 0-20 points which Districts must weight proportionately based on the number of students in each SLO.

2.14) Assurances

Please check all of the boxes below:

2.14) Assurances Assure the application of locally developed controls will be rigorous, fair, and transparent and only those used for State Growth will be used for Comparable Growth Measures.	Checked
2.14) Assurances Assure that use of locally developed controls will not have a disparate impact on underrepresented students in accordance with applicable civil rights laws.	Checked
2.14) Assurances Assure that enrolled students in accordance with teacher of record policies are included and may not be excluded.	Checked
2.14) Assurances Assure that procedures for ensuring data accuracy and integrity are being utilized.	Checked
2.14) Assurances Assure that district will develop SLOs according to the rules established by SED (see: http://usny.nysed.gov/rttt/teachers-leaders/slo/home.html).	Checked
2.14) Assurances Assure that past academic performance and/or baseline academic data of students will be taken into account when developing an SLO.	Checked
2.14) Assurances Assure that the process for assigning points for SLOs for the Growth Subcomponent will use the narrative HEDI descriptions described in the regulations to effectively differentiate educators in ways that improve student learning and instruction.	Checked
2.14) Assurances Assure that it is possible for an educator to earn each point, including 0, for SLOs in the Growth subcomponent scoring range.	Checked

2.14) Assurances | Assure that processes are in place to monitor SLOs to ensure rigor and comparability across classrooms.

Checked

3. Local Measures (Teachers)

Created Wednesday, May 30, 2012

Updated Wednesday, January 09, 2013

Page 1

Locally Selected Measures of Student Achievement or Growth

"Comparable across classrooms" means that the same locally-selected measures of student achievement or growth must be used across all classrooms in the same grade/subject in the district or BOCES.

Please note: If your district or BOCES does not have grade/subject-specific teachers for one or more of the rows in questions 3.1 through 3.11, choose "Not applicable" from the drop-down box and type N/A in the assessment box. This would be appropriate if, for example, the district does not have certain grades, the district does not offer a specific subject, etc.

Locally selected measures for common branch teachers: This form calls for locally selected measures in both ELA and math in grades typically served by common branch teachers. Districts may select local measures for common branch teachers that involve subjects other than ELA and math. Whatever local measure is selected for common branch teachers, please enter it under ELA and/or math and describe the assessment used, including the subject. Use N/A for other lines in that grade level that are served by common branch teachers. Describe the HEDI criteria for the measure in the same section where you identified the locally selected measure and assessment.

.Please note: Only one locally-selected measure is required for teachers in the same grade/subject across the district, but some districts may prefer to have more than one measure for all teachers within a grade/subject. Also note: Districts may use more than one locally-selected measure for **different** groups of teachers **within a grade/subject** if the district/BOCES verifies comparability based on Standards of Educational and Psychological Testing. This APPR form only provides space for one measure for teachers in the same grade/subject across the district. Therefore, if more than one locally-selected measure is used for all teachers in any grades or subject, districts must complete additional copies of this form and upload as attachments for review.

Districts or BOCES that intend to use a district, regional, or BOCES-developed assessment must include the name, grade, and subject of the assessment. For example, a regionally-developed 7th grade Social Studies assessment would be written as follows: [INSERT SPECIFIC NAME OF REGION]-developed 7th grade Social Studies assessment.

LOCALLY SELECTED MEASURES OF STUDENT ACHIEVEMENT FOR TEACHERS IN GRADES FOR WHICH THERE IS AN APPROVED VALUE-ADDED MEASURE (15 points)

Growth or achievement measure(s) from these options.

One or more of the following types of local measures of student growth or achievement may be used for the evaluation of teachers.

The options in the drop-down menus below are abbreviated from the following list:

Measures based on:

- 1) The change in percentage of a teacher’s students who achieve a specific level of performance as determined locally, on such assessments/examinations compared to those students’ level of performance on such assessments/examinations in the previous school year (e.g., a three percentage point increase in students earning the proficient level (three) or better performance level on the 7th grade math State assessment compared to those same students’ performance levels on the 6th grade math State assessment, or an increase in the percentage of a teacher’s students earning the advanced performance level (four) on the 4th grade ELA or math State assessments compared to those students’ performance levels on the 3rd grade ELA or math State assessments)

- 2) Teacher specific growth score computed by the Department based on the percent of the teacher’s students earning a State determined level of growth. The methodology to translate such growth into the State-established sub-component scoring ranges shall be determined locally

- 3) Teacher specific achievement or growth score computed in a manner determined locally based on a measure of student performance on the State assessments, Regents examinations and/or Department approved alternative examinations other than the measure described in subclause 1) or 2) of this clause

- 4) Student growth or achievement computed in a manner determined locally based on a State-approved 3rd party assessment

- 5) Student growth or achievement computed in a manner determined locally based on a district, regional or BOCES-developed assessment that is rigorous and comparable across classrooms

- 6) A school-wide measure of either student growth or achievement based on either:
 - (i) A State-provided student growth score covering all students in the school that took the State assessment in ELA or Math in Grades 4-8; or
 - (ii) A school-wide measure of student growth or achievement computed in a manner determined locally based on a State, State-approved 3rd party, or district, regional or BOCES developed assessment that is rigorous and comparable across classrooms.

3.1) Grades 4-8 ELA

Using the drop-down boxes below, select the assessment that will be used for the locally-selected measure for the grade/subject listed. Then name the specific assessment, listing the full name of the assessment.

	Locally-Selected Measure from List of Approved Measures	Assessment
4	5) District, regional, or BOCES–developed assessments	GVEP regionally developed 4th grade ELA assessment
5	5) District, regional, or BOCES–developed assessments	GVEP regionally developed 5th grade ELA assessment

6	5) District, regional, or BOCES–developed assessments	GVEP regionally developed 6th grade ELA assessment
7	5) District, regional, or BOCES–developed assessments	GVEP regionally developed 7th grade assessment
8	5) District, regional, or BOCES–developed assessments	GVEP regionally developed 8th grade ELA assessment

For Grades 4-8 ELA: describe the district-adopted expectations for the level of growth or achievement needed for a teacher to earn each of the four HEDI rating categories and the process for assigning points within rating categories that ensures it is possible for a teacher to earn any of the points in a scoring range, consistent with regulations and assurances.

Note: when completing the HEDI boxes below, it is not acceptable to just repeat the text descriptions from the regulations and/or assurances listed to the left of each box.

<p>Use this box, if needed, to describe the general process for assigning HEDI categories for these grades/subjects in this subcomponent. If needed, you may upload a table or graphic at 3.3, below.</p>	<p>Twenty (20) points (15 points if value added model is used) will be based on locally selected measures of student achievement that are determined to be rigorous and comparable across classrooms. For teachers with a mix of sections/courses resulting in the use of multiple locally selected measures, all of the student scores from the multiple sections/courses will be combined into one overall component score of 0-20 (0-15 if a value added model is being used) as applicable, weighted proportionally based on the number of students in each section/course.</p> <p>Teachers/Grade Levels/Departments will establish goals by November 1, 2012. Data from regionally developed/district developed assessments will be used to set rigorous goals. Goals will be developed collaboratively between teachers and building principals. Summative assessments will be scored in a manner which ensures that teachers do not score assessments in which they have a vested interest.</p>
<p>Highly Effective (14 - 15 points) Results are well above District- or BOCES-adopted expectations for growth or achievement for grade/subject.</p>	<p>The work of the teacher results in scores that are well above the achievement goal decided upon collaboratively between the teacher and principal. This is evidence when at least 85% of students meet the established achievement goal.</p>
<p>Effective (8- 13 points) Results meet District- or BOCES-adopted expectations for growth or achievement for grade/subject.</p>	<p>The work of the teacher results in scores that are acceptable, measurable and appropriate based on the achievement goal established collaboratively between the teacher and principal. This is evidenced when 65%-84% of the students meet the established achievement goal.</p>
<p>Developing (3 - 7 points) Results are below District- or BOCES-adopted expectations for growth or achievement for grade/subject.</p>	<p>The work of the teacher results in student academic achievement that does not meet the established standard based on the achievement goal established collaboratively between the teacher an principal. This is evidenced when only 55% to 64% of the students meet the established achievement goal.</p>

Ineffective (0 - 2 points) Results are well below District- or BOCES-adopted expectations for growth or achievement for grade/subject.

The work of the teacher does not result in acceptable student achievement based on the achievement goal established collaboratively between the teacher and principal. This is evidenced when less than 55% of the students meet the established achievement goal.

3.2) Grades 4-8 Math

Using the drop-down boxes below, select the assessment that will be used for the locally-selected measure for the grade/subject listed. Then name the specific assessment, listing the full name of the assessment.

	Locally-Selected Measure from List of Approved Measures	Assessment
4	5) District, regional, or BOCES–developed assessments	GVEP regionally developed 4th grade math assessment
5	5) District, regional, or BOCES–developed assessments	GVEP regionally developed 5th grade math assessment
6	5) District, regional, or BOCES–developed assessments	GVEP regionally developed 6th grade math assesment
7	5) District, regional, or BOCES–developed assessments	GVEP regionally developed 7th grade math assessment
8	5) District, regional, or BOCES–developed assessments	GVEP regionally developed 8th grade math assessment

For Grades 4-8 Math: describe the district-adopted expectations for the level of growth or achievement needed for a teacher to earn each of the four HEDI rating categories and the process for assigning points within rating categories that ensures it is possible for a teacher to earn any of the points in a scoring range, consistent with regulations and assurances.

Note: when completing the HEDI boxes below, it is not acceptable to just repeat the text descriptions from the regulations and/or assurances listed to the left of each box.

Use this box, if needed, to describe the general process for assigning HEDI categories for these grades/subjects in this subcomponent. If needed, you may upload a table or graphic at 3.3, below.

Twenty (20) points (15 points if value added model is used) will be based on locally selected measures of student achievement that are determined to be rigorous and comparable across classrooms. For teachers with a mix of sections/courses resulting in the use of multiple locally selected measures, all of the student scores from the multiple sections/courses will be combined into one overall component score of 0-20 (0-15 if a value added model is being used) as applicable, weighted proportionally based on the number of students in each section/course.

Teachers/Grade Levels/Departments will establish goals by November 1, 2012. Data from regionally developed/district developed assessments will be used to set rigorous goals. Goals will be developed collaboratively between teachers and building principals. Summative assessments will be scored in a manner which ensures that teachers do not score assessments in which they have a vested interest.

Highly Effective (14 - 15 points) Results are well above District- or BOCES-adopted expectations for growth or achievement for grade/subject.	The work of the teacher results in scores that are well above the achievement goal decided upon collaboratively between the teacher and principal. This is evidence when at least 85% of students meet the established achievement goal.
Effective (8- 13 points) Results meet District- or BOCES-adopted expectations for growth or achievement for grade/subject.	The work of the teacher results in scores that are acceptable, measurable and appropriate based on the achievement goal established collaboratively between the teacher and principal. This is evidenced when 65%-84% of the students meet the established achievement goal.
Developing (3 - 7 points) Results are below District- or BOCES-adopted expectations for growth or achievement for grade/subject.	The work of the teacher results in student academic achievement that does not meet the established standard based on the achievement goal established collaboratively between the teacher and principal. This is evidenced when only 55% to 64% of the students meet the established achievement goal.
Ineffective (0 - 2 points) Results are well below District- or BOCES-adopted expectations for growth or achievement for grade/subject.	The work of the teacher does not result in acceptable student achievement based on the achievement goal established collaboratively between the teacher and principal. This is evidenced when less than 55% of the students meet the established achievement goal.

3.3) HEDI Tables or Graphics

For questions 3.1 and 3.2 above, if you are using tables or other graphics to explain your general process for assigning HEDI categories, please combine all such tables or graphics into a single file, labeling each so it is clear which grades/subjects it applies to, and upload that file here.

[assets/survey-uploads/5139/136762-rhJdBgDruP/HEDI Ratings for Local Achievement_3.docx](#)

LOCALLY SELECTED MEASURES OF STUDENT ACHIEVEMENT FOR ALL OTHER TEACHERS (20 points)

Growth or achievement measure(s) from these options.

One or more of the following types of local measures of student growth or achievement may be used for the evaluation of teachers.

The options in the drop-down menus below are abbreviated from the following list:

Measures based on:

- 1) The change in percentage of a teacher's students who achieve a specific level of performance as determined locally, on such assessments/examinations compared to those students' level of performance on such assessments/examinations in the previous school year (e.g., a three percentage point increase in students earning the proficient level (three) or better performance level on the 7th grade math State assessment compared to those same students' performance levels on the 6th grade math State assessment, or an increase in the percentage of a teacher's students earning the advanced performance level (four) on the 4th grade ELA or math State assessments compared to those students' performance levels on the 3rd grade ELA or math State assessments)

2) Teacher specific growth score computed by the Department based on the percent of the teacher’s students earning a State determined level of growth. The methodology to translate such growth into the State-established sub-component scoring ranges shall be determined locally

3) Teacher specific achievement or growth score computed in a manner determined locally based on a measure of student performance on the State assessments, Regents examinations and/or Department approved alternative examinations other than the measure described in 1) or 2), above

4) Student growth or achievement computed in a manner determined locally based on a State-approved 3rd party assessment

5) Student growth or achievement computed in a manner determined locally based on a district, regional or BOCES-developed assessment that is rigorous and comparable across classrooms

6) A school-wide measure of either student growth or achievement based on either:

(i) A State-provided student growth score covering all students in the school that took the State assessment in ELA or Math in Grades 4-8; or

(ii) A school-wide measure of student growth or achievement computed in a manner determined locally based on a State, State-approved 3rd party, or district, regional or BOCES developed assessment that is rigorous and comparable across classrooms

7) Student Learning Objectives (only allowable for teachers in grades/subjects without a Value-Added measure for the State Growth subcomponent). Used with one of the following assessments: State, State-approved 3rd party, or a district, regional or BOCES-developed assessment that is rigorous and comparable across classrooms

3.4) Grades K-3 ELA

Using the drop-down boxes below, select the assessment that will be used for the locally-selected measure for the grade/subject listed. Then name the specific assessment, listing the full name of the assessment.

	Locally-Selected Measure from List of Approved Measures	Assessment
K	5) District, regional, or BOCES–developed assessments	GVEP regionally developed kindergarten ELA assessment
1	5) District, regional, or BOCES–developed assessments	GVEP regionally developed 1st grade ELA assessment
2	5) District, regional, or BOCES–developed assessments	GVEP regionally developed 2nd grade assessment
3	5) District, regional, or BOCES–developed assessments	GVEP regionally developed 3rd grade ELA assessment

For Grades K-3 ELA: describe the district-adopted expectations for the level of growth or achievement needed for a teacher to earn each of the four HEDI rating categories and the process for assigning points within rating categories that ensures it is possible for a

teacher to earn any of the points in a scoring range, consistent with regulations and assurances.

Note: when completing the HEDI boxes below, it is not acceptable to just repeat the text descriptions from the regulations and/or assurances listed to the left of each box.

<p>Use this box, if needed, to describe the general process for assigning HEDI categories for these grades/subjects in this subcomponent. If needed, you may upload a table or graphic at 3.13, below.</p>	<p>Twenty (20) points (15 points if value added model is used) will be based on locally selected measures of student achievement that are determined to be rigorous and comparable across classrooms. For teachers with a mix of sections/courses resulting in the use of multiple locally selected measures, all of the student scores from the multiple sections/courses will be combined into one overall component score of 0-20 (0-15 if a value added model is being used) as applicable, weighted proportionally based on the number of students in each section/course.</p>
<p>Highly Effective (18-20 points) Results are well above District- or BOCES-adopted expectations for growth or achievement for grade/subject.</p>	<p>The work of the teacher results in scores that are well above the achievement goal decided upon collaboratively between the teacher and principal. This is evidence when at least 85% of students meet the established achievement goal.</p>
<p>Effective (9-17 points) Results meet District- or BOCES-adopted expectations for growth or achievement for grade/subject.</p>	<p>The work of the teacher results in scores that are acceptable, measurable and appropriate based on the achievement goal established collaboratively between the teacher and principal. This is evidenced when 65%-84% of the students meet the established achievement goal.</p>
<p>Developing (3 - 8 points) Results are below District- or BOCES-adopted expectations for growth or achievement for grade/subject.</p>	<p>The work of the teacher results in student academic achievement that does not meet the established standard based on the achievement goal established collaboratively between the teacher and principal. This is evidenced when only 55% to 64% of the students meet the established achievement goal.</p>
<p>Ineffective (0 - 2 points) Results are well below District- or BOCES-adopted expectations for growth or achievement for grade/subject.</p>	<p>The work of the teacher does not result in acceptable student achievement based on the achievement goal established collaboratively between the teacher and principal. This is evidenced when less than 55% of the students meet the established achievement goal.</p>

3.5) Grades K-3 Math

Using the drop-down boxes below, select the assessment that will be used for the locally-selected measure for the grade/subject listed. Then name the specific assessment, listing the full name of the assessment.

	Locally-Selected Measure from List of Approved Measures	Assessment
K	5) District, regional, or BOCES–developed assessments	GVEP regionally developed kindergarten math assessment
1	5) District, regional, or BOCES–developed assessments	GVEP regionally developed 1st grade math assessment
2	5) District, regional, or BOCES–developed assessments	GVEP regionally developed 2nd grade math assessment
3	5) District, regional, or BOCES–developed assessments	GVEP regionally developed 3rd grade math assessment

For Grades K-3 Math: describe the district-adopted expectations for the level of growth or achievement needed for a teacher to earn each of the four HEDI rating categories and the process for assigning points within rating categories that ensures it is possible for a teacher to earn any of the points in a scoring range, consistent with regulations and assurances.

Note: when completing the HEDI boxes below, it is not acceptable to just repeat the text descriptions from the regulations and/or assurances listed to the left of each box.

<p>Use this box, if needed, to describe the general process for assigning HEDI categories for these grades/subjects in this subcomponent. If needed, you may upload a table or graphic at 3.13, below.</p>	<p>Twenty (20) points (15 points if value added model is used) will be based on locally selected measures of student achievement that are determined to be rigorous and comparable across classrooms. For teachers with a mix of sections/courses resulting in the use of multiple locally selected measures, all of the student scores from the multiple sections/courses will be combined into one overall component score of 0-20 (0-15 if a value added model is being used) as applicable, weighted proportionally based on the number of students in each section/course.</p> <p>Teachers/Grade Levels/Departments will establish goals by November 1, 2012. Data from regionally developed/district developed assessments will be used to set rigorous goals. Goals will be developed collaboratively between teachers and building principals. Summative assessments will be scored in a manner which ensures that teachers do not score assessments in which they have a vested interest.</p>
<p>Highly Effective (18-20 points) Results are well above District- or BOCES-adopted expectations for growth or achievement for grade/subject.</p>	<p>The work of the teacher results in scores that are well above the achievement goal decided upon collaboratively between the teacher and principal. This is evidence when at least 85% of students meet the established achievement goal.</p>
<p>Effective (9-17 points) Results meet District- or BOCES-adopted expectations for growth or achievement for grade/subject.</p>	<p>The work of the teacher results in scores that are acceptable, measurable and appropriate based on the achievement goal established collaboratively between the teacher and principal. This is evidenced when 65%-84% of the students meet the established achievement goal.</p>
<p>Developing (3 - 8 points) Results are below District -or BOCES-adopted expectations for growth or achievement for grade/subject.</p>	<p>The work of the teacher results in student academic achievement that does not meet the established standard based on the achievement goal established collaboratively</p>

between the teacher and principal. This is evidenced when only 55% to 64% of the students meet the established achievement goal.

Ineffective (0 - 2 points) Results are well below District- or BOCES-adopted expectations for growth or achievement for grade/subject.

The work of the teacher does not result in acceptable student achievement based on the achievement goal established collaboratively between the teacher and principal. This is evidenced when less than 55% of the students meet the established achievement goal.

3.6) Grades 6-8 Science

Using the drop-down boxes below, select the assessment that will be used for the locally-selected measure for the grade/subject listed. Then name the specific assessment, listing the full name of the assessment.

	Locally-Selected Measure from List of Approved Measures	Assessment
6	5) District, regional, or BOCES-developed assessments	Alexander Central School District created 6th grade science assessment
7	5) District, regional, or BOCES-developed assessments	Alexander Central School District created 7th grade science assessment
8	3) Teacher specific achievement or growth score computed locally	8th grade NYS Science assessment

For Grades 6-8 Science: describe the district-adopted expectations for the level of growth or achievement needed for a teacher to earn each of the four HEDI rating categories and the process for assigning points within rating categories that ensures it is possible for a teacher to earn any of the points in a scoring range, consistent with regulations and assurances.

Use this box, if needed, to describe the general process for assigning HEDI categories for these grades/subjects in this subcomponent. If needed, you may upload a table or graphic at 3.13, below.

Twenty (20) points (15 points if value added model is used) will be based on locally selected measures of student achievement that are determined to be rigorous and comparable across classrooms. For teachers with a mix of sections/courses resulting in the use of multiple locally selected measures, all of the student scores from the multiple sections/courses will be combined into one overall component score of 0-20 (0-15 if a value added model is being used) as applicable, weighted proportionally based on the number of students in each section/course.

Teachers/Grade Levels/Departments will establish goals by November 1, 2012. Data from regionally developed/district developed assessments will be used to set rigorous goals. Goals will be developed collaboratively between teachers and building principals. Summative assessments will be scored in a manner which ensures that teachers do not score assessments in which they have a vested interest.

Highly Effective (18 - 20 points) Results are well above District- or BOCES-adopted expectations for growth or achievement for grade/subject.

The work of the teacher results in scores that are well above the achievement goal decided upon collaboratively between the teacher and principal. This is evidence when at least 85% of students meet the established achievement goal.

Effective (9 - 17 points) Results meet District- or BOCES-adopted expectations for growth or achievement for grade/subject.	The work of the teacher results in scores that are acceptable, measurable and appropriate based on the achievement goal established collaboratively between the teacher and principal. This is evidenced when 65%-84% of the students meet the established achievement goal.
Developing (3 - 8 points) Results are below District- or BOCES-adopted expectations for growth or achievement for grade/subject.	The work of the teacher results in student academic achievement that does not meet the established standard based on the achievement goal established collaboratively between the teacher and principal. This is evidenced when only 55% to 64% of the students meet the established achievement goal.
Ineffective (0 - 2 points) Results are well below District- or BOCES-adopted expectations for growth or achievement for grade/subject.	The work of the teacher does not result in acceptable student achievement based on the achievement goal established collaboratively between the teacher and principal. This is evidenced when less than 55% of the students meet the established achievement goal.

3.7) Grades 6-8 Social Studies

Using the drop-down boxes below, select the assessment that will be used for the locally-selected measure for the grade/subject listed. Then name the specific assessment, listing the full name of the assessment.

	Locally-Selected Measure from List of Approved Measures	Assessment
6	5) District, regional, or BOCES–developed assessments	GVEP regionally developed 6th grade Social Studies summative assessment
7	5) District, regional, or BOCES–developed assessments	GVEP regionally developed 7th grade summative social studies assessment
8	5) District, regional, or BOCES–developed assessments	GVEP regionally developed 8th grade summative social studies assessment

For Grades 6-8 Social Studies: describe the district-adopted expectations for the level of growth or achievement needed for a teacher to earn each of the four HEDI rating categories and the process for assigning points within rating categories that ensures it is possible for a teacher to earn any of the points in a scoring range, consistent with regulations and assurances.

Note: when completing the HEDI boxes below, it is not acceptable to just repeat the text descriptions from the regulations and/or assurances listed to the left of each box.

Use this box, if needed, to describe the general process for assigning HEDI categories for these grades/subjects in this subcomponent. If needed, you may upload a table or graphic at 3.13, below.	<p>Twenty (20) points (15 points if value added model is used) will be based on locally selected measures of student achievement that are determined to be rigorous and comparable across classrooms. For teachers with a mix of sections/courses resulting in the use of multiple locally selected measures, all of the student scores from the multiple sections/courses will be combined into one overall component score of 0-20 (0-15 if a value added model is being used) as applicable, weighted proportionally based on the number of students in each section/course.</p> <p>Teachers/Grade Levels/Departments will establish goals by November 1, 2012. Data from regionally</p>
---	---

developed/district developed assessments will be used to set rigorous goals. Goals will be developed collaboratively between teachers and building principals. Summative assessments will be scored in a manner which ensures that teachers do not score assessments in which they have a vested interest.

Highly Effective (18 - 20 points) Results are well above District- or BOCES-adopted expectations for growth or achievement for grade/subject.

The work of the teacher results in scores that are well above the achievement goal decided upon collaboratively between the teacher and principal. This is evidence when at least 85% of students meet the established achievement goal.

Effective (9 - 17 points) Results meet District- or BOCES-adopted expectations for growth or achievement for grade/subject.

The work of the teacher results in scores that are acceptable, measurable and appropriate based on the achievement goal established collaboratively between the teacher and principal. This is evidenced when 65%-84% of the students meet the established achievement goal.

Developing (3 - 8 points) Results are below District- or BOCES-adopted expectations for growth or achievement for grade/subject.

The work of the teacher results in student academic achievement that does not meet the established standard based on the achievement goal established collaboratively between the teacher and principal. This is evidenced when only 55% to 64% of the students meet the established achievement goal.

Ineffective (0 - 2 points) Results are well below District- or BOCES-adopted expectations for growth or achievement for grade/subject.

The work of the teacher does not result in acceptable student achievement based on the achievement goal established collaboratively between the teacher and principal. This is evidenced when less than 55% of the students meet the established achievement goal.

3.8) High School Social Studies

Using the drop-down boxes below, select the assessment that will be used for the locally-selected measure for the grade/subject listed. Then name the specific assessment, listing the full name of the assessment.

Note: Additional high school social studies courses may be listed below in the "All Other Courses" section of this form.

	Locally-Selected Measure from List of Approved Measures	Assessment
Global 1	5) District, regional, or BOCES-developed assessments	GVEP regionally developed Global 1 summative assessment
Global 2	3) Teacher specific achievement or growth score computed locally	Global History regents exam
American History	3) Teacher specific achievement or growth score computed locally	US History Regents exam

For High School Social Studies: describe the district-adopted expectations for the level of growth or achievement needed for a teacher to earn each of the four HEDI rating categories and the process for assigning points within rating categories that ensures it is possible for a teacher to earn any of the points in a scoring range, consistent with regulations and assurances.

Note: when completing the HEDI boxes below, it is not acceptable to just repeat the text descriptions from the regulations and/or assurances listed to the left of each box.

<p>Use this box, if needed, to describe the general process for assigning HEDI categories for these grades/subjects in this subcomponent. If needed, you may upload a table or graphic at 3.13, below.</p>	<p>Twenty (20) points (15 points if value added model is used) will be based on locally selected measures of student achievement that are determined to be rigorous and comparable across classrooms. For teachers with a mix of sections/courses resulting in the use of multiple locally selected measures, all of the student scores from the multiple sections/courses will be combined into one overall component score of 0-20 (0-15 if a value added model is being used) as applicable, weighted proportionally based on the number of students in each section/course.</p>
<p>Highly Effective (18 - 20 points) Results are well above District- or BOCES-adopted expectations for growth or achievement for grade/subject.</p>	<p>Teachers/Grade Levels/Departments will establish goals by November 1, 2012. Data from regionally developed/district developed assessments will be used to set rigorous goals. Goals will be developed collaboratively between teachers and building principals. Summative assessments will be scored in a manner which ensures that teachers do not score assessments in which they have a vested interest.</p>
<p>Effective (9 - 17 points) Results meet District- or BOCES-adopted expectations for growth or achievement for grade/subject.</p>	<p>The work of the teacher results in scores that are well above the achievement goal decided upon collaboratively between the teacher and principal. This is evidence when at least 85% of students meet the established achievement goal.</p>
<p>Developing (3 - 8 points) Results are below District- or BOCES-adopted expectations for growth or achievement for grade/subject.</p>	<p>The work of the teacher results in scores that are acceptable, measurable and appropriate based on the achievement goal established collaboratively between the teacher and principal. This is evidenced when 65%-84% of the students meet the established achievement goal.</p>
<p>Ineffective (0 - 2 points) Results are well below District- or BOCES-adopted expectations for growth or achievement for grade/subject.</p>	<p>The work of the teacher results in student academic achievement that does not meet the established standard based on the achievement goal established collaboratively between the teacher and principal. This is evidenced when only 55% to 64% of the students meet the established achievement goal.</p>
<p>Ineffective (0 - 2 points) Results are well below District- or BOCES-adopted expectations for growth or achievement for grade/subject.</p>	<p>The work of the teacher does not result in acceptable student achievement based on the achievement goal established collaboratively between the teacher and principal. This is evidenced when less than 55% of the students meet the established achievement goal.</p>

3.9) High School Science

Using the drop-down boxes below, select the assessment that will be used for the locally-selected measure for the grade/subject listed. Then name the specific assessment, listing the full name of the assessment.

Note: Additional high school science courses may be listed below in the "All Other Courses" section of this form.

	Locally-Selected Measure from List of Approved Measures	Assessment
Living Environment	3) Teacher specific achievement or growth score computed locally	Living Environment Regents Exam
Earth Science	3) Teacher specific achievement or growth score computed locally	Earth Science regents exam
Chemistry	3) Teacher specific achievement or growth score computed locally	Chemistry regents exam
Physics	3) Teacher specific achievement or growth score computed locally	Physics regents exam

For High School Science: describe the district-adopted expectations for the level of growth or achievement needed for a teacher to earn each of the four HEDI rating categories and the process for assigning points within rating categories that ensures it is possible for a teacher to earn any of the points in a scoring range, consistent with regulations and assurances.

Note: when completing the HEDI boxes below, it is not acceptable to just repeat the text descriptions from the regulations and/or assurances listed to the left of each box.

<p>Use this box, if needed, to describe the general process for assigning HEDI categories for these grades/subjects in this subcomponent. If needed, you may upload a table or graphic at 3.13, below.</p>	<p>Twenty (20) points (15 points if value added model is used) will be based on locally selected measures of student achievement that are determined to be rigorous and comparable across classrooms. For teachers with a mix of sections/courses resulting in the use of multiple locally selected measures, all of the student scores from the multiple sections/courses will be combined into one overall component score of 0-20 (0-15 if a value added model is being used) as applicable, weighted proportionally based on the number of students in each section/course.</p> <p>Teachers/Grade Levels/Departments will establish goals by November 1, 2012. Data from regionally developed/district developed assessments will be used to set rigorous goals. Goals will be developed collaboratively between teachers and building principals. Summative assessments will be scored in a manner which ensures that teachers do not score assessments in which they have a vested interest.</p>
<p>Highly Effective (18-20 points) Results are well above District- or BOCES-adopted expectations for growth or achievement for grade/subject.</p>	<p>The work of the teacher results in scores that are well above the achievement goal decided upon collaboratively between the teacher and principal. This is evidence when at least 85% of students meet the established achievement goal.</p>
<p>Developing (3 - 8 points) Results are below District- or BOCES-adopted expectations for growth or achievement for grade/subject.</p>	<p>The work of the teacher results in scores that are acceptable, measurable and appropriate based on the achievement goal established collaboratively between the teacher and principal. This is evidenced when 65%-84% of the students meet the established achievement goal.</p>
<p>Effective (9 - 17points) Results meet District- or BOCES-adopted expectations for growth or achievement for grade/subject.</p>	<p>The work of the teacher results in student academic achievement that does not meet the established standard based on the achievement goal established collaboratively</p>

between the teacher and principal. This is evidenced when only 55% to 64% of the students meet the established achievement goal.

Ineffective (0 - 2 points) Results are well below District- or BOCES-adopted expectations for growth or achievement for grade/subject.

The work of the teacher does not result in acceptable student achievement based on the achievement goal established collaboratively between the teacher and principal. This is evidenced when less than 55% of the students meet the established achievement goal.

3.10) High School Math

Using the drop-down boxes below, select the assessment that will be used for the locally-selected measure for the grade/subject listed. Then name the specific assessment, listing the full name of the assessment.

Note: Additional high school math courses may be listed below in the "All Other Courses" section of this form.

	Locally-Selected Measure from List of Approved Measures	Assessment
Algebra 1	3) Teacher specific achievement or growth score computed locally	Algebra 1 regents exam
Geometry	3) Teacher specific achievement or growth score computed locally	Geometry regents exam
Algebra 2	3) Teacher specific achievement or growth score computed locally	Algebra 2 regents exam

For High School Math: describe the district-adopted expectations for the level of growth or achievement needed for a teacher to earn each of the four HEDI rating categories and the process for assigning points within rating categories that ensures it is possible for a teacher to earn any of the points in a scoring range, consistent with regulations and assurances.

Note: when completing the HEDI boxes below, it is not acceptable to just repeat the text descriptions from the regulations and/or assurances listed to the left of each box.

Use this box, if needed, to describe the general process for assigning HEDI categories for these grades/subjects in this subcomponent. If needed, you may upload a table or graphic at 3.13, below.

Twenty (20) points (15 points if value added model is used) will be based on locally selected measures of student achievement that are determined to be rigorous and comparable across classrooms. For teachers with a mix of sections/courses resulting in the use of multiple locally selected measures, all of the student scores from the multiple sections/courses will be combined into one overall component score of 0-20 (0-15 if a value added model is being used) as applicable, weighted proportionally based on the number of students in each section/course.

Teachers/Grade Levels/Departments will establish goals by November 1, 2012. Data from regionally developed/district developed assessments will be used to set rigorous goals. Goals will be developed collaboratively between teachers and building principals. Summative assessments will be scored in a manner which ensures that teachers do not score assessments in which they have a vested interest.

Highly Effective (18 - 20 points) Results are well above District- or BOCES-adopted expectations for growth or achievement for grade/subject.	The work of the teacher results in scores that are well above the achievement goal decided upon collaboratively between the teacher and principal. This is evidence when at least 85% of students meet the established achievement goal.
Effective (9 - 17 points) Results meet District- or BOCES-adopted expectations for growth or achievement for grade/subject.	The work of the teacher results in scores that are acceptable, measurable and appropriate based on the achievement goal established collaboratively between the teacher and principal. This is evidenced when 65%-84% of the students meet the established achievement goal.
Developing (3 - 8 points) Results are below District- or BOCES-adopted expectations for growth or achievement for grade/subject.	The work of the teacher results in student academic achievement that does not meet the established standard based on the achievement goal established collaboratively between the teacher and principal. This is evidenced when only 55% to 64% of the students meet the established achievement goal.
Ineffective (0 - 2 points) Results are well below District- or BOCES-adopted expectations for growth or achievement for grade/subject.	The work of the teacher does not result in acceptable student achievement based on the achievement goal established collaboratively between the teacher and principal. This is evidenced when less than 55% of the students meet the established achievement goal.

3.11) High School English Language Arts

Using the drop-down boxes below, select the assessment that will be used for the locally-selected measure for the grade/subject listed. Then name the specific assessment, listing the full name of the assessment.

Note: Additional high school English courses may be listed below in the "All Other Courses" section of this form.

	Locally-Selected Measure from List of Approved Measures	Assessment
Grade 9 ELA	5) District, regional, or BOCES–developed assessments	GVEP regionally developed ELA grade 9 summative assessment
Grade 10 ELA	5) District, regional, or BOCES–developed assessments	GVEP regionally developed ELA grade 10 summative assessment
Grade 11 ELA	3) Teacher specific achievement or growth score computed locally	ELA regents exam

For High School English Language Arts: describe the district-adopted expectations for the level of growth or achievement needed for a teacher to earn each of the four HEDI rating categories and the process for assigning points within rating categories that ensures it is possible for a teacher to earn any of the points in a scoring range, consistent with regulations and assurances.

Note: when completing the HEDI boxes below, it is not acceptable to just repeat the text descriptions from the regulations and/or assurances listed to the left of each box.

Use this box, if needed, to describe the general process for assigning HEDI categories for these grades/subjects in	Twenty (20) points (15 points if value added model is used) will be based on locally selected measures of
---	---

this subcomponent. If needed, you may upload a table or graphic at 3.13, below.

student achievement that are determined to be rigorous and comparable across classrooms. For teachers with a mix of sections/courses resulting in the use of multiple locally selected measures, all of the student scores from the multiple sections/courses will be combined into one overall component score of 0-20 (0-15 if a value added model is being used) as applicable, weighted proportionally based on the number of students in each section/course.

Teachers/Grade Levels/Departments will establish goals by November 1, 2012. Data from regionally developed/district developed assessments will be used to set rigorous goals. Goals will be developed collaboratively between teachers and building principals. Summative assessments will be scored in a manner which ensures that teachers do not score assessments in which they have a vested interest.

Highly Effective (18 - 20 points) Results are well above District- or BOCES-adopted expectations for growth or achievement for grade/subject.

The work of the teacher results in scores that are well above the achievement goal decided upon collaboratively between the teacher and principal. This is evidence when at least 85% of students meet the established achievement goal.

Effective (9 - 17 points) Results meet District- or BOCES-adopted expectations for growth or achievement for grade/subject.

The work of the teacher results in scores that are acceptable, measurable and appropriate based on the achievement goal established collaboratively between the teacher and principal. This is evidenced when 65%-84% of the students meet the established achievement goal.

Developing (3 - 8 points) Results are below District- or BOCES-adopted expectations for growth or achievement for grade/subject.

The work of the teacher results in student academic achievement that does not meet the established standard based on the achievement goal established collaboratively between the teacher and principal. This is evidenced when only 55% to 64% of the students meet the established achievement goal.

Ineffective (0 - 2 points) Results are well below District- or BOCES-adopted expectations for growth or achievement for grade/subject.

The work of the teacher does not result in acceptable student achievement based on the achievement goal established collaboratively between the teacher and principal. This is evidenced when less than 55% of the students meet the established achievement goal.

3.12) All Other Courses

Fill in for additional grades/subjects, as applicable. If you need additional space, complete additional copies of this form and upload (below) as attachments.

Course(s) or Subject(s)	Locally-Selected Measure from List of Approved Measures	Assessment
All other courses not mentioned above	5) District/regional/BOCES-developed	GVEP regionally developed grade and subject specific summative assessment

For all additional courses, as applicable: describe the district-adopted expectations for the level of growth or achievement needed for a teacher to earn each of the four HEDI rating categories and the process for assigning points within rating categories that ensures it is possible for a teacher to earn any of the points in a scoring range, consistent with regulations and assurances.

Note: when completing the HEDI boxes below, it is not acceptable to just repeat the text descriptions from the regulations and/or assurances listed to the left of each box.

Use this box, if needed, to describe the general process for assigning HEDI categories for these grades/subjects in this subcomponent. If needed, you may upload a table or graphic at 3.13, below.

Twenty (20) points (15 points if value added model is used) will be based on locally selected measures of student achievement that are determined to be rigorous and comparable across classrooms. For teachers with a mix of sections/courses resulting in the use of multiple locally selected measures, all of the student scores from the multiple sections/courses will be combined into one overall component score of 0-20 (0-15 if a value added model is being used) as applicable, weighted proportionally based on the number of students in each section/course.

Teachers/Grade Levels/Departments will establish goals by November 1, 2012. Data from regionally developed/district developed assessments will be used to set rigorous goals. Goals will be developed collaboratively between teachers and building principals. Summative assessments will be scored in a manner which ensures that teachers do not score assessments in which they have a vested interest.

Highly Effective (18 - 20 points) Results are well above District- or BOCES -adopted expectations for growth or achievement for grade/subject.

The work of the teacher results in scores that are well above the achievement goal decided upon collaboratively between the teacher and principal. This is evidence when at least 85% of students meet the established achievement goal.

Effective (9 - 17 points) Results meet District- or BOCES-adopted expectations for growth or achievement for grade/subject.

The work of the teacher results in scores that are acceptable, measurable and appropriate based on the achievement goal established collaboratively between the teacher and principal. This is evidenced when 65%-84% of the students meet the established achievement goal.

Developing (3 - 8 points) Results are below District- or BOCES-adopted expectations for growth or achievement for grade/subject.

The work of the teacher results in student academic achievement that does not meet the established standard based on the achievement goal established collaboratively between the teacher and principal. This is evidenced when only 55% to 64% of the students meet the established achievement goal.

Ineffective (0 - 2 points) Results are well below District- or BOCES-adopted expectations for growth or achievement for grade/subject.

The work of the teacher does not result in acceptable student achievement based on the achievement goal established collaboratively between the teacher and principal. This is evidenced when less than 55% of the

If you need additional space, upload a copy of "Form 3.12: All Other Courses" as an attachment for review. Click here for a downloadable copy of Form 3.12. (MS Word)

(No response)

3.13) HEDI Tables or Graphics

For questions 3.4 through 3.12 above, if you are using tables or other graphics to explain your general process for assigning HEDI categories, please combine all such tables or graphics into a single file, labeling each so it is clear which grades/subjects it applies to, and upload that file here.

assets/survey-uploads/5139/136762-y92vNseFa4/HEDI Ratings for Local Achievement_1.docx

3.14) Locally Developed Controls

Describe any adjustments, controls, or other special considerations that will be used in setting targets for local measures, the rationale for including such factors, and the processes that will be used to mitigate potentially problematic incentives associated with the controls or adjustments.

No controls

3.15) Teachers with More Than One Locally Selected Measure

Describe the district's process for combining multiple locally selected measures, each scored from 0-15 or 0-20 points as applicable, into a single subcomponent HEDI category and score. Examples may include: 4th grade teacher with locally-selected measures for both ELA and Math; High School teacher with more than 1 SLO.

Instances in which a teacher has more than one performance indicator, the indicators will be averaged based on the number of students that make up the teachers workload. For instance, if a teacher has 100 total students and 25 are in Health, 24 in Physical Education and 22 are in Outdoor Education, 25% of the teacher's score will be based on the local performance measure in Health, 24% will be based on the local performance measure in PE, and 22% will be based on the local performance measure in Outdoor Education.

3.16) Assurances

Please check all of the boxes below:

3.16) Assurances Assure the application of locally-developed controls will be rigorous, fair, and transparent.	Checked
3.16) Assurances Assure that use of locally-developed controls will not have a disparate impact on underrepresented students in accordance with any applicable civil rights laws.	Checked
3.16) Assurances Assure that enrolled students in accordance with teacher of record policies are included and may not be excluded.	Checked
3.16) Assurances Assure that procedures for ensuring data accuracy and integrity are being utilized.	Checked
3.16) Assurances Assure that the process for assigning points for locally selected measures will use the narrative HEDI descriptions described in the regulations to effectively differentiate educators' performance in ways that improve student learning and instruction.	Checked

3.16) Assurances Assure that it is possible for an educator to earn each point, including 0, for the locally-selected measures subcomponent.	Checked
3.16) Assurances Assure that locally-selected measures are rigorous and comparable across all classrooms in the same grade/subject in the district.	Checked
3.16) Assurances If more than one type of locally-selected measure is used for different groups of teachers within a grade/subject, certify that the measures are comparable based on the Standards of Educational and Psychological Testing.	Checked
3.16) Assurances Assure that all locally-selected measures for a teacher are different than any measures used for the State assessment or other comparable measures subcomponent.	Checked

4. Other Measures of Effectiveness (Teachers)

Created Tuesday, July 31, 2012

Updated Wednesday, January 09, 2013

Page 1

4.1) Teacher Practice Rubric

Select a teacher practice rubric from the menu of State-approved rubrics to assess performance based on NYS Teaching Standards. If your district has been granted a variance by NYSED through the variance process, select "district variance" from the menu.

The "Second Rubric" space is required for districts that have chosen an observation-only rubric (CLASS or NYSTCE) from the State-approved list.

(Note: Any district may use multiple rubrics, as long as the same rubric(s) is used for all classroom teachers in a grade/subject across the district.)

Danielson's Framework for Teaching (2011 Revised Edition)

Not Applicable

4.2) Points Within Other Measures

State the number of points (if any) that will be assigned to each of the following measures, making sure that the points total 60. If you are not using a particular measure, enter 0.

This APPR form only provides one space for assigning points within other measures for teachers. If your district/BOCES prefers to assign points differently for different groups of teachers, enter the points assignment for one group of teachers below. For the other group(s) of teachers, fill out copies of this form and upload as an attachment for review.

Is the following points assignment applicable to all teachers?

Yes

If you checked "no" above, fill in the group of teachers covered (e.g., "probationary teachers"):

(No response)

Multiple (at least two) classroom observations by principal or other trained administrator, at least one of which must be unannounced [at least 31 points]	40
One or more observation(s) by trained independent evaluators	(No response)
Observations by trained in-school peer teachers	(No response)
Feedback from students using State-approved survey tool	(No response)
Feedback from parents/caregivers using State-approved survey tool	(No response)
Structured reviews of lesson plans, student portfolios and other teacher artifacts	20

If the above points assignment is not for "all teachers," fill out an additional copy of "Form 4.2: Points Within Other Measures" for each group of teachers, combine them into a single file, and upload as an attachment for review. Click here for a downloadable copy of Form 4.2. (MS Word)

(No response)

4.3) Survey Tools (if applicable)

If you indicated above that 1 or more points will be assigned to feedback using a State-approved survey tool, please check the box below:

(No response)

If the district plans to use one or more of the following surveys of P-12 students from the menu of State-approved surveys, please check all that apply. If your district has been granted a variance by NYSED through the variance process, select "district variance" from the menu. Note: As the State-approved survey lists are updated, this form will be updated with additional approved survey tools.

[SurveyTools.0] Tripod Early Elementary Student Perception Survey K-2	(No response)
[SurveyTools.1] Tripod Elementary Student Perception Survey 3-5	(No response)
[SurveyTools.2] Tripod Secondary Student Perception Survey	(No response)
[SurveyTools.3] District Variance	(No response)

4.4) Assurances

Please check all of the boxes below:

4.4) Assurances Assure that all NYS Teaching Standards not addressed in classroom observations are assessed at least once a year.	Checked
4.4) Assurances Assure that the process for assigning points for the "other measures" subcomponent will use the narrative HEDI descriptions described in the regulations to effectively differentiate educators' performance in ways that improve student learning and instruction.	Checked
4.4) Assurances Assure that it is possible for an educator to earn each point, including 0, for the "other measures" subcomponent.	Checked
4.4) Assurances Assure that the same rubric(s) is used for all classroom teachers in a grade/subject across the district.	Checked

4.5) Process for Assigning Points and Determining HEDI Ratings

Describe the process for assigning points and determining HEDI ratings using the teacher practice rubric and/or any additional instruments used in the district. Include, if applicable, the process for combining results of multiple "other measures" into a single result for this subcomponent.

- *Non-tenured teachers will receive a minimum of two formal observations annually which will include a pre-conference, classroom observation (full block/period) and a post observation conference. In addition, non-tenured teachers will receive a minimum of two unannounced mini-observations. Post observation feedback of mini-observations will occur within one school day of the observation. Observers conducting formal observations will use a scripted lesson to provide feedback to the observed teacher. Formal observation feedback will be provided to the teacher within three school days of the observation. The total scores from the observations will be averaged and will account for 40 points of the 60 point other measures subcomponent.*
- *Tenured teachers will receive a minimum of two (at least one being unannounced) mini-observations annually. Feedback will be provided within one school day of the observation. In addition, the teacher and principal may mutually agree to conduct additional*

mini-observations. The scores from the observations will be averaged and will account for 40 points of the 60 point other measures subcomponent.

- The observer will make every attempt to schedule classroom observations during varied instructional periods.

Example of observation scoring:

Ratings will be converted to numerical values as follows:

Highly Effective = 4

Effective = 3

Developing = 2

Ineffective = 1

TOTAL POINTS FOR DOMAIN 2 $16/5=3.2$ average

TOTAL POINTS FOR DOMAIN 3 $15/5=3.0$

Total points for domains 2 and 3: $31/10= 3.1$ AVERAGE

In the above example, this tenured teacher will earn a total of sixteen points for domain two divided by the five areas observed the resulting score is 3.2. This teacher earned a total of fifteen points on domain three, divided by the five areas observed, results in a score of 3.0. These scores are added together and divided by 2 which results in a 3.1 average on the rubric.

Along with the composite scores from the observations, a composite score is needed for domains 1 and 4. In order to obtain this score, the evaluator will assign a numerical value between 1 and 4 for each of the 12 areas in Domains 1 and 4. Evaluators will use information gathered through the evidence documentation logs as well as observed behaviors throughout the school year in order to arrive at scores for domains 1 and 4. For illustrative purposes, a teacher who receives a total of 40 out of a possible 48 points on domains 1 and 4 would receive a score of 3.3 ($40 \text{ points earned} \div 12 \text{ total number of areas results in an average score of } 3.3$). This average score will account for 20 points of the 60 points other measures subcomponent.

In order to calculate a final composite score that will be used for this subcomponent, an average of all composite scores will be calculated weighting the average from domains 2 and 3 at 66.6% and domains 1 and 4 at 33.3%. The final average will be applied to the attached conversion chart to get a final score for the 60 points other measures subcomponent.

*General rounding rules will apply when computing a final composite score so that the product is always a whole number.

- Additional evidence collected by teachers may be submitted for consideration by the building principal. Located in the main office in the building of his/her primary assignment, there will be a file in which to place evidence of activities that a teacher has engaged in and are included in the Danielson rubric. This information will be considered during the year end evaluation.

If you are using tables or other graphics to explain your process for assigning points and determining HEDI ratings, please clearly label them, combine them into a single file, and upload that file here.

[assets/survey-uploads/5091/157240-eka9yMJ855/Conversion Chart for Other Measures of Effectiveness \(60%\).docx](#)

Describe the level of performance required for each of the HEDI rating categories, consistent with the narrative descriptions in the regulations for the "other measures" subcomponent. Also describe how the points available within each HEDI category will be assigned.

Highly Effective: Overall performance and results exceed NYS Teaching Standards.

Teachers whose composite score totals 59-60 points will earn a rubric score of 3.5 - 4 as described in the attached conversion chart.

Effective: Overall performance and results meet NYS Teaching Standards.

Teachers whose composite score totals 57-58.8 points will earn a rubric score of 2.5 - 3.4 as described in the attached conversion chart.

Developing: Overall performance and results need improvement in order to meet NYS Teaching Standards.	Teachers whose composite score totals 50-56.3 points will earn a rubric score of 1.5 - 2.4 as described in the attached conversion chart.
Ineffective: Overall performance and results do not meet NYS Teaching Standards.	Teachers whose composite score totals 49 or less points will earn a rubric score of 1-1.4 as described in the attached conversion chart.

Provide the ranges for the 60-point scoring bands.

Highly Effective	59-60 points
Effective	57-58 points
Developing	50-56 points
Ineffective	0-49 points

4.6) Observations of Probationary Teachers

Enter the minimum number of observations of each type, making sure that the number of observations "by building principal or other trained administrators" totals at least 2. If your APPR plan does not include a particular type of observation, enter 0 in that box.

By building principals or other trained administrators

4.6) Observations of Probationary Teachers Formal/Long	2
4.6) Observations of Probationary Teachers Informal/Short	2
4.6) Observations of Probationary Teachers Enter Total	4

By trained in-school peer teachers or other trained reviewers

Formal/Long	0
Informal/Short	0

Independent evaluators

Formal/Long	0
Informal/Short	0

Will formal/long observations of probationary teachers be done in person, by video, or both?

- In Person

Will informal/short observations of probationary teachers be done in person, by video, or both?

- In Person

4.7) Observations of Tenured Teachers

Enter the minimum number of observations of each type, making sure that the number of observations "by building principal or other trained administrators" totals at least 2. If your APPR plan does not include a particular type of observation, enter 0 in that box.

By building principals or other trained administrators

4.7) Observations of Tenured Teachers Formal/Long	0
4.7) Observations of Tenured Teachers Informal/Short	2
4.7) Observations of Tenured Teachers Total	2

By trained in-school peer teachers or other trained reviewers

Formal/Long	0
Informal/Short	0

Independent evaluators

Formal/Long	0
Informal/Short	0

Will formal/long observations of tenured teachers be done in person, by video, or both?

-
- In Person
-

Will informal/short observations of tenured teachers be done in person, by video, or both?

-
- In Person
-

5. Composite Scoring (Teachers)

Created Wednesday, August 01, 2012

Updated Monday, November 26, 2012

Page 1

Standards for Rating Categories

Growth or Comparable Measures

Locally-selected Measures of

growth or achievement

Other Measures of Effectiveness

(Teacher and Leader standards)

Highly

Effective

Results are well above state average for similar students (or District goals if no state test).

Results are well above District- or BOCES-adopted expectations for student growth or achievement for grade/subject.

Overall performance and results exceed NYS Teaching Standards.

Effective

Results meet state average for similar students (or District goals if no state test).

Results meet District- or BOCES-adopted expectations for student growth or achievement for grade/subject.

Overall performance and results meet NYS Teaching Standards.

Developing

Results are below state average for similar students (or District goals if no state test).

Results are below District- or BOCES-adopted expectations for student growth or achievement for grade/subject.

Overall performance and results need improvement in order to meet NYS Teaching Standards.

Ineffective

Results are well below state average for similar students (or District goals if no state test).

Results are well below District- or BOCES-adopted expectations for student growth or achievement for grade/subject.

Overall performance and results do not meet NYS Teaching Standards.

For the 2013-2014 school year and beyond, the Commissioner shall review the specific scoring ranges for each of the rating categories annually before the start of each school year and shall recommend any changes to the Board of Regents for consideration.

5.1) The 2012-13 scoring ranges for educators for whom there is no approved Value-Added measure of student growth will be:

2012-13 where there is no Value-Added measure

Growth or Comparable Measures

Locally-selected Measures of

growth or achievement

Other Measures of Effectiveness

(60 points)

Overall

Composite Score

Highly Effective

18-20

18-20

Ranges determined locally--see below

91-100

Effective

9-17

9-17

75-90

Developing

3-8

3-8

65-74

Ineffective

0-2

0-2

0-64

Insert district's or BOCES' negotiated HEDI scoring ranges for the Other Measures of Effectiveness subcomponent (same as question 4.5), from 0 to 60 points

Highly Effective	59-60
Effective	57-58
Developing	50-56
Ineffective	0-49

5.2) The 2012-13 scoring ranges for educators for whom there is an approved Value-Added measure for student growth will be:

2012-13 where Value-Added growth measure applies

Growth or Comparable Measures

**Locally-selected Measures of
growth or achievement**

Other Measures of Effectiveness

(60 points)

Overall

Composite Score

Highly Effective

22-25

14-15

Ranges determined locally--see above

91-100

Effective

10-21

8-13

75-90

Developing

3-9

3-7

65-74

Ineffective

0-2

0-2

0-64

6. Additional Requirements - Teachers

Created Wednesday, August 01, 2012
Updated Wednesday, January 09, 2013

Page 1

6.1) Assurances -- Improvement Plans

Please check the boxes below:

6.1) Assurances -- Improvement Plans Assure that teachers who receive a Developing or Ineffective rating will receive a Teacher Improvement Plan (TIP) within 10 school days from the opening of classes in the school year following the performance year	Checked
6.1) Assurances -- Improvement Plans Assure that TIP plans shall include: 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	Checked

6.2) Attachment: Teacher Improvement Plan Forms

As a required attachment to this APPR plan, upload the TIP forms that are used in the school district or BOCES. For a list of supported file types, go to the Resources folder (above) and click Technical Tips.

assets/survey-uploads/5265/157492-Df0w3Xx5v6/Teacher Improvement Plan and Guidance Document.docx

6.3) Appeals Process

Pursuant to Education Law section 3012-c, a teacher may only challenge the following in an appeal:

(1) the substance of the annual professional performance review

(2) the school district's or BOCES' adherence to the standards and methodologies required for such reviews, pursuant to Education Law section 3012-c

(3) the adherence to the regulations of the Commissioner and compliance with any applicable locally negotiated procedures, as well as the school district's or BOCES' issuance and/or implementation of the terms of the teacher or principal improvement plan, as required under Education Law section 3012-c

Describe the procedure for ensuring that appeals of annual performance evaluations will be handled in a timely and expeditious way:

Appeals of Annual Professional Performance Review

• Teachers who are covered under Education Law 3012-c (chapter 103 of the laws of 2010) may appeal evaluations that result in an overall rating of Ineffective or Developing. Teachers must notify the Superintendent in writing within ten (10) days of the receipt of the document on which the rating is finalized, but in no case later than September 1 of the year following the school year to which the

rating applies. (see appendix I for Appeal form)

- The Superintendent will render a decision based upon the information presented within ten (10) days of the submission of the appeal. Only the information presented at the time of the appeal will be considered, when rendering a decision. Both the teacher submitting the appeal and the evaluator will be notified in writing of the Superintendent's decision.
- In the event that the teacher filing the appeal is not satisfied with the decision of the Superintendent, he/she may appeal to a Labor Relations Committee within five (5) days of receiving the Superintendent's decision. The Labor Relations Committee will be comprised of two members appointed by the Alexander United Teachers (one of the two may be a NYSUT representative; others must be members of the AUT) and two members appointed by the District (at least one must be a District Administrator, one of the two may be a labor relations attorney or other BOCES administrator). The decision of this committee will be rendered within five (5) days of receiving the appeal and will be final. The decision shall not be subject to any further appeal through any other process including grievance or arbitration procedures contained within the parties' collective bargaining agreement, adjudication before an administrative body or individual (including, but not limited to the Commissioner of Education) or court action.
- If the decision of the Superintendent or the Labor Relations Committee favors on the side of the teacher, the Superintendent will work with the Evaluator to revise the annual professional performance review. The revised evaluation will be reflective of the information considered during the appeal. The teacher will receive a copy of the revised annual professional performance review within ten days of the final decision.

Written Appeal of Annual Professional Performance Review

Teacher Name: _____

Date of APPR meeting with Evaluator: _____

Date Appeal is submitted to Administrator: _____ Admin. Initials: _____

(Initials do not constitute a written response from administration; they simply show evidence of their receipt)

Did you receive a rating of ineffective or developing on your APPR? _____

Please specify the basis of this appeal by checking one of the following:

- Substance of the APPR
- District's adherence to the standards and methodologies required by such review
- District's compliance with its procedures for conducting the APPR

Please use the space provided below to explain in detail the specific basis for the appeal. Only the information provided at the time of submission of the appeal will be considered when rendering a decision. (Please include a copy of your APPR)

6.4) Training and Certification of Lead Evaluators and Evaluators

Describe the process by which evaluators will be trained and the process for how the district will certify and re-certify lead evaluators. Describe the process for ensuring inter-rater reliability. Describe the duration and nature of such training.

Duration and Nature of Training Provided to Evaluators and Lead Evaluators

a) The "lead evaluator" is the administrator who is primarily responsible for a teacher's evaluation under Chapter 103. The term "evaluator" shall include any administrator who conducts an observation or evaluation of a teacher.

b) All evaluators shall successfully complete a training course that meets the requirements prescribed in law and regulations. These trainings will include but are not limited to the following topics: evidenced based observation techniques, common core state

standards, application of the teacher practice rubric, the scoring methodology used by the District to evaluate teachers and considerations that are used when evaluating teachers of students with disabilities.

c) Once an evaluator has successfully completed a training course meeting the requirements prescribed in the law and regulations, he/she shall be certified by the Alexander Central School District Board of Education. These evaluators will be recertified on an annual basis.

d) Required Certificates: The District shall include with this APPR Plan any certifications required by the law or regulations upon the completion of collective negotiations with the bargaining agent of the covered teachers.

e) All lead evaluators will participate in a minimum of four (4) full days of training offered through GVEP BOCES and its joint management team.

f) All lead evaluators will participate in a minimum of one administrative meeting in which observations are discussed to ensure inter-rater reliability.

6.5) Assurances -- Evaluators

Please check the boxes below:

-
- Checked
-

(1) the New York State Teaching Standards, and their related elements and performance indicators and the Leadership Standards and their related functions, as applicable

(2) evidence-based observation techniques that are grounded in research

(3) application and use of the student growth percentile model and the value-added growth model as defined in section 30-2.2 of this Subpart

(4) application and use of the State-approved teacher or principal rubric(s) selected by the district or BOCES for use in evaluations, including training on the effective application of such rubrics to observe a teacher or principal's practice

(5) application and use of any assessment tools that the school district or BOCES utilizes to evaluate its classroom teachers or building principals, including but not limited to, structured portfolio reviews; student, parent, teacher and/or community surveys; professional growth goals and school improvement goals, etc.

(6) application and use of any State-approved locally selected measures of student achievement used by the school district or BOCES to evaluate its teachers or principals

(7) use of the Statewide Instructional Reporting System

(8) the scoring methodology utilized by the Department and/or the district or BOCES to evaluate a teacher or principal under this Subpart, including how scores are generated for each subcomponent and the composite effectiveness score and application and use of the scoring ranges prescribed by the Commissioner for the four designated rating categories used for the teacher's or principal's overall rating and their subcomponent ratings

(9) specific considerations in evaluating teachers and principals of English language learners and students with disabilities

-
- Checked
-

6.6) Assurances -- Teachers

Please check all of the boxes below:

6.6) Assurances -- Teachers Assure the entire APPR plan will be completed for each teacher as soon as practicable, but in no case later than September 1 of the school year next following the school year for which the classroom teacher's performance is being measured.	Checked
6.6) Assurances -- Teachers Assure that the district or BOCES will provide the teacher's score and rating on the locally selected measures subcomponent, if available, and on the other measures of teacher and principal effectiveness subcomponent for a teacher's annual professional performance review, in writing, no later than the last school day of the school year for which the teacher or principal is being measured.	Checked
6.6) Assurances -- Teachers Assure that the APPR will be put on the district website by September 10 or within 10 days after approval, whichever is later.	Checked
6.6) Assurances -- Teachers Assure that the evaluation system will be used as a significant factor for employment decisions.	Checked
6.6) Assurances -- Teachers Assure that teachers will receive timely and constructive feedback as part of the evaluation process.	Checked
6.6) Assurances -- Teachers Assure the district has appeal procedures that are consistent with the regulations and that they provide for the timely and expeditious resolution of an appeal.	Checked

6.7) Assurances -- Data

Please check all of the boxes below:

6.7) Assurances -- Data Assure that SED will receive accurate teacher and student data, including enrollment and attendance data, and any other student, teacher, school, course, and teacher/student linkage data necessary to comply with regulations, in a format and timeline prescribed by the Commissioner.	Checked
6.7) Assurances -- Data Certify that the district provides an opportunity for every classroom teacher to verify the subjects and/or student rosters assigned to them.	Checked
6.7) Assurances -- Data Assure scores for all teachers will be reported to NYSED for each subcomponent, as well as the composite rating, as per NYSED requirements.	Checked

7. Growth on State Assessments or Comparable Measures (Principals)

Created Wednesday, August 01, 2012

Updated Thursday, January 10, 2013

Page 1

7.1) STATE-PROVIDED MEASURES OF STUDENT GROWTH (25 points with an approved Value-Added Measure)

For principals in buildings with Grades 4-8 ELA, Math and/or High School courses with State or Regents assessments, (or principals of programs with any of these assessments), NYSED will provide value-added measures. NYSED will also provide a HEDI subcomponent rating category and score from 0 to 25 points.

In order for a principal to receive a State-provided value-added measure, at least 30% of the students in the principal's school or program must take the applicable State or Regents assessments. This will include most schools in the State.

Value-Added measures will apply to schools or principals with the following grade configurations in this district (please list, e.g., K-5, PK-6, 6-8, 6-12, 9-12):

K-5
6-12
(No response)

7.2) Assurances -- State-Provided Measures of Student Growth

Please check the boxes below:

7.2) Assurances -- State-Provided Measures of Student Growth Assure that the value-added growth score provided by NYSED will be used, where applicable	Checked
7.2) Assurances -- State-Provided Measures of Student Growth Assure that the State-provided growth measure will be used if a value-added measure has not been approved for 2012-13	Checked

7.3) STUDENT LEARNING OBJECTIVES AS COMPARABLE GROWTH MEASURES (20 points)

Student Learning Objectives will be the other comparable growth measures for principals in buildings or programs in which fewer than 30% of students take Grades 4-8 ELA, Math, and/or High School courses with State or Regents assessments. SLOs will be developed using the assessment covering the most students in the school or program and continuing until at least 30% of students in the school or program are covered by SLOs. District-determined assessments from the options below may be used as evidence of student learning within the SLO:

State assessments, *required if one exists*

District, regional, or BOCES-developed assessments that are rigorous and comparable across classrooms

List of State-approved 3rd party assessments

First, list the school or program type this SLO applies to. Then, using the drop-down boxes below, please select the assessment that will be used for SLOs for the school/program listed. Finally, name the specific assessment listing the full name of the assessment. Districts or BOCES that intend to use a district, regional, or BOCES-developed assessment must include the name, grade, and subject of the assessment. For example, a regionally-developed 7th grade Social Studies assessment would be written as follows: [INSERT SPECIFIC NAME OF REGION]-developed 7th grade Social Studies assessment.

Please remember that State assessments must be used with SLOs if applicable to the school or program type.

School or Program Type	SLO with Assessment Option	Name of the Assessment

Describe the district-adopted expectations for the level of performance required for each HEDI rating category and the process for assigning points to principals based on SLO results, consistent with regulations and assurances in the Comparable Growth Measures subcomponent. Include any district-determined expectations for student performance.

Use this box, if needed, to describe the process for assigning HEDI categories in this subcomponent. If needed, you may upload a table or graphic below.	Both principals will receive a growth score provided by SED.
Highly Effective (18 - 20 points) Results are well above state average for similar students (or District goals if no state test).	N/A
Effective (9 - 17 points) Results meet state average for similar students (or District goals if no state test).	N/A
Developing (3 - 8 points) Results are below state average for similar students (or District goals if no state test).	N/A
Ineffective (0 - 2 points) Results are well below state average for similar students (or District goals if no state test).	N/A

If you are using tables or other graphics to explain your process for assigning HEDI categories, please clearly label them, combine them into a single file, and upload that file here.

(No response)

7.4) Special Considerations for Comparable Growth Measures

Describe any adjustments, controls, or other special considerations that will be used in setting targets for Comparable Growth Measures, the rationale for including such factors, and the processes that will be used to mitigate potentially problematic incentives associated with the controls or adjustments.

Note: The only allowable controls or adjustments for Comparable Growth Measures are those used in State Growth measures, which include: prior student achievement results, students with disabilities, English language learners, students in poverty, and, in the future, any other student-, classroom-, and school-level characteristics approved by the Board of Regents.

(No response)

7.5) Principals with More Than One Growth Measure

If educators have more than one state-provided growth or value-added measure, those measures will be combined into one HEDI category and score for the growth subcomponent according to a formula determined by the Commissioner. (Examples: Principals of K-8 schools with growth measures for ELA and Math grades 4-8.)

If Principals have more than one SLO for comparable growth (or a State-provided growth measure and an SLO for comparable growth), the measures will each earn a score from 0-20 points and Districts will weight each in proportion to the number of students covered by the SLO to reach a combined score for this subcomponent.

7.6) Assurances -- Comparable Growth Measures

Please check all of the boxes below:

7.6) Assurances -- Comparable Growth Measures Assure the application of locally developed controls will be rigorous, fair, and transparent and only those used for State Growth will be used for Comparable Growth Measures.	Checked
7.6) Assurances -- Comparable Growth Measures Assure that use of locally developed controls will not have a disparate impact on underrepresented students in accordance with applicable civil rights laws.	Checked
7.6) Assurances -- Comparable Growth Measures Assure that procedures for ensuring data accuracy and integrity are being utilized.	Checked
7.6) Assurances -- Comparable Growth Measures Assure that district will develop SLOs according to the rules established by NYSED for principal SLOs: http://usny.nysed.gov/rttt/teachers-leaders/slo/home.html .	Checked
7.6) Assurances -- Comparable Growth Measures Assure that the process for assigning points for SLOs for the Growth Subcomponent will use the narrative HEDI descriptions described in the regulations to effectively differentiate educator performance in ways that improve student learning and instruction.	Checked
7.6) Assurances -- Comparable Growth Measures Assure that it is possible for a principal to earn each point, including 0, for SLOs in the Growth subcomponent scoring range.	Checked
7.6) Assurances -- Comparable Growth Measures Assure that processes are in place to monitor SLOs to ensure rigor and comparability across classrooms.	Checked

8. Local Measures (Principals)

Created Thursday, August 02, 2012

Updated Wednesday, January 09, 2013

Page 1

Locally-Selected Measures of Student Achievement or Growth

Locally comparable means that the same locally-selected measures of student achievement or growth must be used for all principals in the same or similar programs or grade configurations across the district or BOCES.

Please note: only one locally-selected measure is required for principals in the same or similar programs or grade configurations, but some districts may prefer to have more than one measure for principals in the same or similar programs or grade configurations. This APPR form therefore provides space for multiple locally-selected measures for each principal in the same or similar program or grade configuration across the district. Therefore, if more than one locally-selected measure is used for all principals in the same or similar program or grade configuration, districts must complete additional copies of this form and upload as attachments for review.

Also note: districts may use more than one locally-selected measure for **different** groups of principals **within the same or similar programs or grade configurations** if the district/BOCES prove comparability based on Standards of Educational and Psychological Testing. If a district is choosing different measures for different groups of principals within the same or similar programs or grade configurations, they must complete additional copies of this form and upload as attachments for review.

8.1) LOCALLY SELECTED MEASURES OF STUDENT ACHIEVEMENT FOR PRINCIPALS WITH AN APPROVED VALUE-ADDED MEASURE (15 points)

In the table below, list all of the grade configurations used in your district or BOCES (e.g., K-5, 6-8, 9-12). Then for each grade configuration, select a local measure from the menu.

Note: Districts and BOCES may select one or more types of growth or achievement measures for each grade configuration. If you are using more than one type of local measure for the evaluation of principals in a given grade configuration, list that grade configuration multiple times. If more space is needed, duplicate this portion of the form and upload additional pages (below) as an attachment.

The options in the drop-down menus below are abbreviated from the following list:

- (a) student achievement levels on State assessments in ELA and/or Math in Grades 4-8 (e.g., percentage of students in the school whose performance levels on State assessments are proficient or advanced)
- (b) student growth or achievement on State assessments in ELA and/or Math in Grades 4-8 for students in each specific performance level (e.g., Level 1, Level 2)
- (c) student growth or achievement on State assessments in ELA and/or Math in Grades 4-8 for students with disabilities and English Language Learners in Grades 4-8

- (d) student performance on any or all of the district-wide locally selected measures approved for use in teacher evaluations
- (e) four, five and/or six-year high school graduation and/or dropout rates for principals employed in a school with high school grades
- (f) percentage of students who earn a Regents diploma with advanced designation and/or honors for principals employed in a school with high school grades
- (g) percentage of a cohort of students that achieve specified scores on Regents examinations and/or Department approved alternative examinations (including, but not limited to, Advanced Placement examinations, International Baccalaureate examinations, SAT II, etc.), for principals employed in a school with high school grades (e.g., the percentage of students in the 2009 cohort that scored at least a 3 on an Advanced Placement examination since entry into the ninth grade)
- (h) students' progress toward graduation in the school using strong predictive indicators, including but not limited to 9th and/or 10th grade credit accumulation and/or the percentage of students that pass 9th and/or 10th grade subjects most commonly associated with graduation and/or students' progress in passing the number of required Regents examinations for graduation, for principals employed in a school with high school grades

Grade Configuration	Locally-Selected Measure from List of Approved Measures	Assessment
K-5	(d) measures used by district for teacher evaluation	GVEP regionally developed ELA assessments grades K-3
6-12	(c) results for swd and ELLs	NYS ELA assessment in grades 6,7, and 8

Describe the district-adopted expectations for the level of growth or achievement needed for a principal to earn each of the four HEDI rating categories and the process for assigning points within rating categories that ensures it is possible for a principal to earn any of the points in a scoring range, consistent with regulations and assurances.

Note: when completing the HEDI boxes below, it is not acceptable to just repeat the text descriptions from the regulations and/or assurances listed to the left of each box.

Use this box, if needed, to describe the process for assigning HEDI categories. If needed, you may upload a table or graphic below.	65% of the student population will improve their performance on the identified summative measure. Principals will collaborate with the Superintendent to establish targets using various data sources including past State assessment scores as well as regionally developed assessments.
Highly Effective (14 - 15 points) Results are well above District- or BOCES-adopted expectations for growth or achievement for grade/subject.	The work of the principal results in extraordinary student academic growth beyond expectations during the school year. This is evidenced when 85% or more of the students meet or exceed the target.
Effective (8- 13 points) Results meet District- or BOCES-adopted expectations for growth or achievement for grade/subject.	The work of the principal results in acceptable, measurable and appropriate student growth. This is evidenced when 65%-84% of the students meet the target
Developing (3 - 7 points) Results are below District- or BOCES-adopted expectations for growth or achievement for grade/subject.	The work of the principal results in student academic growth that does not meet the established standard. This is evidenced when only 55%-64% of the students meet the target

Ineffective (0 - 2 points) Results are well below District- or BOCES-adopted expectations for growth or achievement for grade/subject.

The work of the principal does not result in acceptable student growth. This is evidenced when less than 55% of the students meet the target.

If you need additional space, upload a copy of "Form 8.1: Locally Selected Measures for Principals with an Approved Value-Added Measure" as an attachment for review. Click here for a downloadable copy of Form 8.1. (MS Word)

(No response)

If you are using tables or other graphics to explain your process for assigning HEDI categories, please clearly label them, combine them into a single file, and upload that file here.

assets/survey-uploads/5366/158206-qBFVOWF7fC/HEIDI ratings for Principals_4.doc

8.2) LOCALLY SELECTED MEASURES OF STUDENT ACHIEVEMENT FOR ALL OTHER PRINCIPALS (20 points)

In the table below, list all of the grade configurations used in your district or BOCES (e.g., K-5, 6-8, 9-12). Then for each grade configuration, select a local measure from the menu.

Note: Districts and BOCES may select one or more types of growth or achievement measures for each grade configuration. If you are using more than one type of local measure for the evaluation of principals in a given grade configuration, list that grade configuration multiple times. If more space is needed, duplicate this portion of the form and upload additional pages (below) as an attachment.

The options in the drop-down menus below are abbreviated from the following list: <!--

(a) student achievement levels on State assessments in ELA and/or Math in Grades 4-8 (e.g., percentage of students in the school whose performance levels on State assessments are proficient or advanced)

(b) student growth or achievement on State assessments in ELA and/or Math in Grades 4-8 for students in each specific performance level (e.g., Level 1, Level 2)

(c) student growth or achievement on State assessments in ELA and/or Math in Grades 4-8 for students with disabilities and English Language Learners in Grades 4-8

(d) student performance on any or all of the district-wide locally selected measures approved for use in teacher evaluations

(e) four, five and/or six-year high school graduation and/or dropout rates for principals employed in a school with high school grades

(f) percentage of students who earn a Regents diploma with advanced designation and/or honors for principals employed in a school with high school grades

(g) percentage of a cohort of students that achieve specified scores on Regents examinations and/or Department approved alternative examinations (including, but not limited to, Advanced Placement examinations, International Baccalaureate examinations, SAT II, etc.), for principals employed in a school with high school grades (e.g., the percentage of students in the 2009 cohort that scored at least a 3 on an Advanced Placement examination since entry into the ninth grade)

(h) students' progress toward graduation in the school using strong predictive indicators, including but not limited to 9th and/or 10th

grade credit accumulation and/or the percentage of students that pass 9th and/or 10th grade subjects most commonly associated with graduation and/or students' progress in passing the number of required Regents examinations for graduation, for principals employed in a school with high school grades

(i) student learning objectives (only allowable for principals in programs/buildings without a Value-Added measure for the State Growth subcomponent). Used with one of the following assessments: State, State-approved 3rd party, or a District, regional, or BOCES-developed assessment that is rigorous and comparable across classrooms

Districts or BOCES that intend to use a district, regional, or BOCES-developed assessment must include the name, grade, and subject of the assessment. For example, a regionally-developed 7th grade Social Studies assessment would be written as follows: [INSERT SPECIFIC NAME OF REGION]-developed 7th grade Social Studies assessment.

Grade Configuration	Locally-Selected Measure from List of Approved Measures	Assessment

Describe the district-adopted expectations for the level of growth or achievement needed for a principal to earn each of the four HEDI rating categories and the process for assigning points within rating categories that ensures it is possible for a principal to earn any of the points in a scoring range, consistent with regulations and assurances.

Note: when completing the HEDI boxes below, it is not acceptable to just repeat the text descriptions from the regulations and/or assurances listed to the left of each box.

Use this box, if needed, to describe the process for assigning HEDI categories. If needed, you may upload a table or graphic below.	N/A
Highly Effective (18 - 20 points) Results are well above District- or BOCES-adopted expectations for growth or achievement for grade/subject.	N/A
Effective (9- 17 points) Results meet District- or BOCES-adopted expectations for growth or achievement for grade/subject.	N/A
Developing (3 - 8 points) Results are below District- or BOCES-adopted expectations for growth or achievement for grade/subject.	N/A
Ineffective (0 - 2 points) Results are well below District- or BOCES-adopted expectations for growth or achievement for grade/subject.	N/A

If you need additional space, upload a copy of "Form 8.2: Locally Selected Measures for All Other Principals" as an attachment for review. Click here for a downloadable copy of Form 8.2. (MS Word)

(No response)

If you are using tables or other graphics to explain your process for assigning HEDI categories, please clearly label them, combine them into a single file, and upload that file here.

(No response)

8.3) Locally Developed Controls

Describe any adjustments, controls, or other special considerations that will be used in setting targets for local measures, the rationale for including such factors, and the processes that will be used to mitigate potentially problematic incentives associated with the controls or adjustments.

(No response)

8.4) Principals with More Than One Locally Selected Measure

Describe the district's process for combining multiple locally selected measures where applicable for principals, each scored from 0-15 or 0-20 points as applicable, into a single subcomponent HEDI category and score.

(No response)

8.5) Assurances

Please check all of the boxes below:

8.5) Assurances Assure that the application of locally developed controls will be rigorous, fair, and transparent	Check
8.5) Assurances Assure that use of locally developed controls will not have a disparate impact on underrepresented students, in accordance with any applicable civil rights laws.	Check
8.5) Assurances Assure that enrolled students are included in accordance with policies for student assignment to schools and may not be excluded.	Check
8.5) Assurances Assure that procedures for ensuring data accuracy and integrity are being utilized.	Check
8.5) Assurances Assure that the process for assigning points for locally selected measures will use the narrative HEDI descriptions described in the regulations to effectively differentiate principals' performance in ways that improve student learning and instruction.	Check
8.5) Assurances Assure that it is possible for a principal to earn each point, including 0, for the locally selected measures subcomponent.	Check
8.5) Assurances Assure that locally-selected measures are rigorous and comparable across all principals in the same or similar programs or grade configurations across the district.	Check
8.5) Assurances If more than one type of locally-selected measure is used for different groups of principals in the same or similar grade configuration or program, certify that the measures are comparable based on the Standards of Educational and Psychological Testing.	Check
8.5) Assurances Assure that all locally-selected measures for a principal are different than any measures used for the State assessment or other comparable measures subcomponent.	Check

9. Other Measures of Effectiveness (Principals)

Created Monday, August 06, 2012
Updated Thursday, January 03, 2013

Page 1

9.1) Principal Practice Rubric

Select the choice of principal practice rubric from the menu of State-approved rubrics to assess performance based on ISLLC 2008 Standards. If your district has been granted a variance by NYSED through the variance process, select "district variance" from the menu.

The "Second Rubric" space is optional. A district may use multiple rubrics, as long as the same rubric(s) is used for all principals in the same or similar programs or grade configurations across the district.

Multidimensional Principal Performance Rubric

(No response)

9.2) Points Within Other Measures

State the number of points that will be assigned to each of the following measures, making sure that the points total 60. If you are not assigning any points to the "ambitious and measurable goals" measure, enter 0.

Some districts may prefer to assign points differently for different groups of principals. This APPR form only provides one space for assigning points within other measures for principals. If your district/BOCES prefers to assign points differently for different groups of principals, enter the points assignment for one group of principals below. For the other group(s) of principals, fill out copies of this form and upload as an attachment for review.

Is the following points assignment for all principals?

Yes

If you checked "no" above, fill in the group of principals covered:

(No response)

State the number of points that will be assigned to each of the following measures, making sure that the points total 60. If you are not assigning any points to the "ambitious and measurable goals" measure, enter 0.

Broad assessment of principal leadership and management actions based on the practice rubric by the supervisor, a trained administrator or a trained independent evaluator. This must incorporate multiple school visits by supervisor, trained administrator, or trained independent evaluator, at least one of which must be from a supervisor, and at least one of which must be unannounced. [At least 31 points]	60
---	----

Any remaining points shall be assigned based on results of one or more ambitious and measurable goals set collaboratively with principals and their superintendents or district superintendents.	0
--	---

If the above points assignment is not for "all principals," fill out an additional copy of "Form 9.2: Points Within Other Measures" for each group of principals, combine them into a single file, and upload as an attachment for review. Click here for a downloadable copy of Form 9.2. (MS Word)

(No response)

9.3) Assurances -- Goals

Please check the boxes below (if applicable):

9.3) Assurances -- Goals Assure that if any points are assigned to goals, at least one goal will address the principal's contribution to improving teacher effectiveness based on one or more of the following: improved retention of high performing teachers; correlation of student growth scores to teachers granted vs. denied tenure; or improvements in proficiency rating of the principal on specific teacher effectiveness standards in the principal practice rubric.	Checked
9.3) Assurances -- Goals Assure that any other goals, if applicable, shall address quantifiable and verifiable improvements in academic results or the school's learning environment (e.g. student or teacher attendance).	Checked

9.4) Sources of Evidence (if applicable)

If you indicated above that one or more points will be assigned to the "ambitious and measurable goals" measure, identify at least two of the following sources of evidence that will be utilized as part of assessing every principal's goal(s):

9.4) Sources of Evidence (if applicable) Structured feedback from teachers using a State-approved tool	(No response)
9.4) Sources of Evidence (if applicable) Structured feedback from students using a State-approved tool	(No response)
9.4) Sources of Evidence (if applicable) Structured feedback from families using a State-approved tool	(No response)
9.4) Sources of Evidence (if applicable) School visits by other trained evaluators	(No response)
9.4) Sources of Evidence (if applicable) Review of school documents, records, and/or State accountability processes (all count as one source)	(No response)

9.5) Survey Tool(s) (if applicable)

If you indicated above that 1 or more points will be assigned to feedback using a State-approved survey tool, please check the box below:

(No response)

Note: When the State-approved survey list is posted, this form will be updated with dropdown menus of approved survey tools.

Principal Evaluation Tripod School Perception Survey for Teachers	(No response)
K12 Insight Student Survey (Grades 3-5) for Principal Evaluation in New York	(No response)
K12 Insight Student Survey (Grades 6-12) for Principal Evaluation in New York	(No response)
K12 Insight Parent Survey for Principal Evaluation in New York	(No response)
K12 Insight Teacher/Staff Survey for Principal Evaluation in New York	(No response)
District variance	(No response)

9.6) Assurances

Please check all of the boxes below:

9.6) Assurances Assure that all ISLLC 2008 Leadership Standards are assessed at least one time per year.	Checked
9.6) Assurances Assure that the process for assigning points for the "other measures" subcomponent will use the narrative HEDI descriptions described in the regulations to effectively differentiate principals' performance in ways that improve student learning and instruction	Checked
9.6) Assurances Assure that it is possible for a principal to earn each point, including 0, for the "other measures" subcomponent.	Checked
9.6) Assurances Assure that the same rubric(s) is used for all principals in the same or similar programs or grade configurations across the district or BOCES.	Checked

9.7) Process for Assigning Points and Determining HEDI Ratings

Describe the process for assigning points and determining HEDI ratings using the principal practice rubric and/or any additional instruments used in the district. Include, if applicable, the process for combining results of multiple "other measures" into a single result for this subcomponent.

The Superintendent will meet with the principal on a weekly basis in the principal's school. The Superintendent's office is located in the secondary school building and therefore the Superintendent has opportunities to observe the principal on a daily basis. The Superintendent will make unannounced visits to the elementary school on at least a monthly basis. These visits will be completed by May 30. The purpose of these visits will be to observe the performance of the principals as outlined in the multidimensional practice rubric.

The Superintendent will meet bi-weekly with the principals in a small group setting to discuss issues and initiatives related to curriculum and instruction. Observations from faculty meetings, grade/department meetings and other pertinent community meetings will be taken into consideration when completing the rubric.

Additional information for the superintendent's consideration in utilizing the rubric will be:

The superintendent and principal will conduct a review of state assessment results, identify areas of weakness, determine actions to be taken, and identify resources to be made available to the principal and building. By June 1 the superintendent and principal will meet to review the initiatives and the associated outcomes.

The Superintendent will use information from data analysis, observation and in depth discussions about student academic performance to complete the Multi-dimensional rubric and to assign points that will align with the HEDI scale.

The multi-dimensional rubric will be used to determine the "other measures of effectiveness" score for the principals. Each sub-component will be rated Highly Effective (4), Effective (3), Developing (2), or Ineffective (1). After each of the 22 sub-components have been rated, they will be added together to create a total rubric score out of a maximum of 88 points. If a principal is rated Ineffective for each sub-component of the rubric they will receive a score of 0 for the 60 points other measures portion of their composite score. The attached conversion chart will be used to determine the number of points that each principal will earn in this area.

If you are using tables or other graphics to explain your process for assigning points and determining HEDI ratings, please clearly label them, combine them into a single file, and upload that file here.

[assets/survey-uploads/5143/159225-pMADJ4gk6R/Conversion Chart for Principal rubric_3.docx](#)

Describe the level of performance required for each of the HEDI rating categories, consistent with the narrative descriptions in the regulations for the "other measures" subcomponent. Also describe how the points available within each HEDI category will be assigned.

Highly Effective: Overall performance and results exceed standards.

The work of the principal results in extraordinary teacher performance as is evidenced in student academic growth beyond expectations during the school year. Principals who

	earn 53-60 points will fall into the highly effective range for other measures of effectiveness.
Effective: Overall performance and results meet standards.	The work of the principal results in acceptable, measurable and appropriate teacher performance as is evidenced in student academic growth during the school year. Principals an overall scoring range of 38-52 as outlined in the attached conversion chart will be deemed to be effective.
Developing: Overall performance and results need improvement in order to meet standards.	The work of the principal results in teacher performance that does not meet the established standard as is evidenced by student academic growth during the school year. Principals who have an overall scoring range of 17-37 points as outlined in the attached conversion chart will be deemed to be developing.
Ineffective: Overall performance and results do not meet standards.	The work of the principal does not result in acceptable teacher performance as is evidenced in student growth throughout the school year. Principals who have an overall rating of 0-16 points as outlined in the attached conversion chart will be deemed to be ineffective.

Please provide the locally-negotiated 60 point scoring bands.

Highly Effective	53-60
Effective	38-52
Developing	17-37
Ineffective	0-16

9.8) School Visits

Enter the minimum number of school visits that will be done by each of the following evaluators, making sure that the number of visits "by supervisor" is at least 1 and the total number of visits is at least 2, for both probationary and tenured principals. If your APPR plan does not include visits by a trained administrator or independent evaluator, enter 0 in those boxes.

Probationary Principals

By supervisor	10
By trained administrator	0
By trained independent evaluator	0
Enter Total	10

Tenured Principals

By supervisor	10
By trained administrator	0
By trained independent evaluator	0
Enter Total	10

10. Composite Scoring (Principals)

Created Monday, August 06, 2012

Updated Tuesday, November 27, 2012

Page 1

Standards for Rating Categories

Growth or Comparable Measures

Locally-selected Measures of growth or achievement

Other Measures of Effectiveness (Teacher and Leader standards)

Highly

Effective

Results are well above state average for similar students (or District goals if no state test).

Results are well above District- or BOCES- adopted expectations for growth or achievement for grade/subject.

Overall performance and results exceed ISLLC leadership standards.

Effective

Results meet state average for similar students (or District goals if no state test).

Results meet District- or BOCES-adopted expectations for growth or achievement for grade/subject.

Overall performance and results meet ISLLC leadership standards.

Developing

Results are below state average for similar students (or District goals if no state test).

Results are below District- or BOCES-adopted expectations for growth or achievement for grade/subject.

Overall performance and results need improvement in order to meet ISLLC leadership standards.

Ineffective

Results are well below state average for similar students (or District goals if no state test).

Results are well below District- or BOCES-adopted expectations for growth or achievement for grade/subject.

Overall performance and results do not meet ISLLC leadership standards.

For the 2013-2014 school year and beyond, the Commissioner shall review the specific scoring ranges for each of the rating categories annually before the start of each school year and shall recommend any changes to the Board of Regents for consideration.

10.1) The 2012-13 scoring ranges for principals for whom there is no approved Value-Added measure of student growth will be:

2012-13 where there is no Value-Added measure

Growth or Comparable Measures

**Locally-selected Measures of
growth or achievement**

Other Measures of Effectiveness

(60 points)

Overall

Composite Score

Highly Effective

18-20

18-20

Ranges determined locally--see below

91-100

Effective

9-17

9-17

75-90

Developing

3-8

3-8

65-74

Ineffective

0-2

0-2

Insert district's or BOCES' negotiated HEDI scoring ranges for the Other Measures of Effectiveness Subcomponent (same as question 9.7), from 0 to 60 points

Highly Effective	53-60
Effective	38-52
Developing	17-37
Ineffective	0-16

10.2) The 2012-13 scoring ranges for principals for whom there is an approved Value-Added measure for student growth will be:

2012-13 where Value-Added growth measure applies

Growth or Comparable Measures

Locally-selected Measures of growth or achievement

Other Measures of Effectiveness

(60 points)

Overall

Composite Score

Highly Effective

22-25

14-15

Ranges determined locally--see above

91-100

Effective

10-21

8-13

75-90

Developing

3-9

3-7

65-74

Ineffective

0-2

0-2

0-64

11. Additional Requirements - Principals

Created Wednesday, August 01, 2012
Updated Thursday, November 29, 2012

Page 1

11.1) Assurances -- Improvement Plans

Please check the boxes below.

11.1) Assurances -- Improvement Plans Assure that principals who receive a Developing or Ineffective rating will receive a Principal Improvement Plan (PIP) within 10 school days from the opening of classes in the school year following the performance year	Checked
11.1) Assurances -- Improvement Plans Assure that PIPs shall include: 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 principal's improvement in those areas	Checked

11.2) Attachment: Principal Improvement Plan Forms

As a required attachment to this APPR plan, upload the PIP forms that are used in your school district or BOCES. For a list of supported file types, go to the Resources folder (above) and click Technical Tips.

[assets/survey-uploads/5276/157714-Df0w3Xx5v6/Principal Improvement Plan and Guidance Document.docx](#)

11.3) Appeals Process

Pursuant to Education Law section 3012-c, a principal may only challenge the following in an appeal:

(1) the substance of the annual professional performance review

(2) the school district's or BOCES' adherence to the standards and methodologies required for such reviews, pursuant to Education Law section 3012-c

(3) the adherence to the regulations of the Commissioner and compliance with any applicable locally negotiated procedures, as well as the school district's or BOCES' issuance and/or implementation of the terms of the teacher or principal improvement plan, as required under Education Law section 3012-c

Describe the procedure for ensuring that appeals of annual performance evaluations will be handled in a timely and expeditious way:

Appeals of Annual Professional Performance Review

• Principals who are covered under Education Law 3012-c (chapter 103 of the laws of 2010) may appeal evaluations that result in an overall rating of Ineffective or Developing. Principals must notify the Superintendent in writing within ten (10) days of the receipt of the document on which the rating is finalized, but in no case later than September 1 of the year following the school year to which the rating applies. (see appendix I for Appeal form)

• Appeals procedures are limited to the following subjects:

1. The substance of the annual professional performance review
2. The District's adherence to the standards and methodologies required for such review
3. Compliance with any locally negotiated procedures applicable to annual professional performance reviews or improvement plans
4. The District's issuance and/or implementation of the terms of the principal improvement plan

• The Superintendent's designee will render a decision based upon the information presented within ten (10) days of the submission of the appeal. Only the information presented at the time of the appeal will be considered, when rendering a decision. Both the principal submitting the appeal and the evaluator will be notified in writing of the Superintendent designee's decision. The decision of the Superintendent's designee will be final

• If the decision of the Superintendent's designee favors on the side of the principal, the Superintendent will work with the Principal to revise the annual professional performance review. The revised evaluation will be reflective of the information considered during the appeal. The principal will receive a copy of the revised annual professional performance review within ten days of the final decision.

Written Appeal of Annual Professional Performance Review

Principal Name: _____

Date of APPR meeting with Evaluator: _____

Date Appeal is submitted to Superintendent: _____ Superintendent Initials: _____

(Initials do not constitute a written response from administration; they simply show evidence of their receipt)

Did you receive a rating of ineffective or developing on your APPR? _____

Please specify the basis of this appeal by checking one of the following:

- Substance of the APPR
- District's adherence to the standards and methodologies required by such review
- District's compliance with its procedures for conducting the APPR

Please use the space provided below to explain in detail the specific basis for the appeal. Only the information provided at the time of submission of the appeal will be considered when rendering a decision. (Please include a copy of your APPR)

11.4) Training and Certification of Lead Evaluators and Evaluators

Describe the process by which evaluators will be trained and the process for how the district will certify and re-certify lead evaluators. Describe the process for ensuring inter-rater reliability. Describe the duration and nature of such training.

All lead evaluators will participate in training offered through GVEP BOCES and its joint management team. The lead evaluator will create a portfolio which includes dates and topics of trainings that he/she participated in regarding the evaluation of principals. The principal lead evaluator will participate in a minimum of two full days of training and a variety of focus group discussions with other lead evaluators. The focus of these trainings will be on the ISLLC standards and the multi-dimensional rubric that will be used for principal evaluation. He/she will continue to participate in professional development opportunities offered by GVEP-BOCES, neighboring BOCES, and NYSCOSS.

The Superintendent of Schools will be the only lead evaluator for principals in the district. Since there are only two principals to be evaluated under this plan inter-rater reliability within the district will not be an issue.

The Principal's lead evaluator will be certified annually by the Alexander Central School District's Board of Education.

Each of the 6 domains on the rubric will be reviewed on an ongoing basis at weekly meetings with the principals.

11.5) Assurances -- Evaluators

Please check the boxes below:

-
- Checked
-

(1) the New York State Teaching Standards, and their related elements and performance indicators and the Leadership Standards and their related functions, as applicable

(2) evidence-based observation techniques that are grounded in research

(3) application and use of the student growth percentile model and the value-added growth model as defined in section 30-2.2 of this Subpart

(4) application and use of the State-approved teacher or principal rubric(s) selected by the district or BOCES for use in evaluations, including training on the effective application of such rubrics to observe a teacher or principal's practice

(5) application and use of any assessment tools that the school district or BOCES utilizes to evaluate its classroom teachers or building principals, including but not limited to, structured portfolio reviews; student, parent, teacher and/or community surveys; professional growth goals and school improvement goals, etc.

(6) application and use of any State-approved locally selected measures of student achievement used by the school district or BOCES to evaluate its teachers or principals

(7) use of the Statewide Instructional Reporting System

(8) the scoring methodology utilized by the Department and/or the district or BOCES to evaluate a teacher or principal under this Subpart, including how scores are generated for each subcomponent and the composite effectiveness score and application and use of the scoring ranges prescribed by the Commissioner for the four designated rating categories used for the teacher's or principal's overall rating and their subcomponent ratings

(9) specific considerations in evaluating teachers and principals of English language learners and students with disabilities

-
- Checked
-

11.6) Assurances -- Principals

Please check all of the boxes below:

11.6) Assurances -- Principals Assure the entire APPR plan will be completed for each principal as soon as practicable, but in no case later than September 1 of the school year next following the school year for which the building principal's performance is being measured.	Checked
11.6) Assurances -- Principals Assure that the district will provide the principal's score and rating on the locally selected measures subcomponent, if available, and on the other measures of principal effectiveness subcomponent for a principal's annual professional performance review, in writing, no later than the last school day of the school year for which the principal is being measured.	Checked
11.6) Assurances -- Principals Assure that the APPR will be put on the district website by September 10 or within 10 days after approval, whichever is later.	Checked
11.6) Assurances -- Principals Assure that the evaluation system will be used as a significant factor for employment decisions.	Checked
11.6) Assurances -- Principals Assure that principals will receive timely and constructive feedback as part of the evaluation process.	Checked
11.6) Assurances -- Principals Assure the district has appeal procedures that are consistent with the regulations and that they provide for the timely and expeditious resolution of an appeal.	Checked

11.7) Assurances -- Data

Please check all of the boxes below:

11.7) Assurances -- Data Assure that the NYSED will receive accurate teacher and student data, including enrollment and attendance data and any other student, teacher, school, course, and teacher/student linkage data necessary to comply with this Subpart, in a format and timeline prescribed by the Commissioner.	Checked
11.7) Assurances -- Data Certify that the district provides an opportunity for every classroom teacher to verify the subjects and/or student rosters assigned to them.	Checked
11.7) Assurances -- Data Assure scores for all principals will be reported to NYSED for each subcomponent, as well as the composite rating, as per NYSED requirements.	Checked

12. Joint Certification of APPR Plan

Created Thursday, August 02, 2012

Updated Thursday, January 10, 2013

Page 1

12.1) Upload the Joint Certification of the APPR Plan

Please obtain the required signatures, create a PDF file, and upload your joint certification of the APPR Plan using this form: APPR District Certification Form

[assets/survey-uploads/5581/158204-3Uqgn5g9Iu/district certification form 1-10-13.pdf](assets/survey-uploads/5581/158204-3Uqgn5g9Iu/district%20certification%20form%201-10-13.pdf)

File types supported for uploads

PDF (preferred)

Microsoft Office (.doc, .ppt, .xls)

Microsoft Office 2007: Supported but not recommended (.docx, .pptx, .xlsx)

Open Office (.odt, .ott)

Images (.jpg, .gif)

Other Formats (.html, .xhtml, .txt, .rtf, .latex)

Please note that .docx, .pptx, and .xlsx formats are not entirely supported.

Please save your file types as .doc, .ppt or .xls respectively before uploading.

ALEXANDER CENTRAL SCHOOL DISTRICT

Chart for Assigning HEDI Ratings for Student Learning Objectives

District-adopted expectations for the level of performance required for each HEDI rating category and the process for assigning points to teachers based on SLO results consistent with regulations and assurances in the Comparable Growth Measures subcomponent.

The District is using a general process for assigning HEDI categories for all grades/subjects in this subcomponent.

HEDI Criteria within State-Provided Growth Measures

1. A generic HEDI criteria and scoring framework will be used for Comparable Growth SLOs as shown in the chart below.
2. The SLO targets will set goals consistent with the above generic HEDI criteria
3. The SLOs will be set based upon the NYS learning standards and in a manner to target a least one year of academic growth.

<i>Highly Effective</i>	<i>Effective</i>	<i>Developing</i>	<i>Ineffective</i>
The work of the teacher results in extraordinary student academic growth beyond expectations during the school year.	The work of the teacher results in acceptable, measurable, and appropriate student academic growth.	The work of the teacher results in student academic growth that does not meet the established standard and/or is not achieved with all populations taught by the teacher.	The work of the teacher does not result in acceptable student academic growth.
This is evidenced when 90% or more of students meet or exceed the Student Learning Objective.	This is evidenced when 80% - 89% of students meet the Student Learning Objective.	This is evidenced when only 50% -79% of students meet the Student Learning Objective.	This is evidenced when less than 50% of students meet the Student Learning Objective.

<i>Highly Effective</i>		<i>Effective</i>									<i>Developing</i>					<i>Ineffective</i>				
20	19	18	17	16	15	14	13	12	11	10	9	8	7	6	5	4	3	2	1	0
>96	93-95	90-92	88-89	87	86	85	84	83	82	81	80	75	70	65	60	55	50	33	17	0
												-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-
												79	74	69	64	59	54	49	32	16

Locally Selected Measures of Student achievement:

Twenty (20) points (15 points if value added model is used) will be based on locally selected measures of student achievement. Teachers will work collaboratively with their building principal to develop a specific achievement goal that is determined to be rigorous and comparable across classrooms.

Teachers will establish goals by November 1, 2012. Data from regionally developed or district developed assessments will be used to set achievement goals. Data derived from summative assessments will be scored in a manner which ensures that teachers do not score assessments in which they have a vested interest. HEDI scores will be determined based on the percentage of goal attainment for each teacher.

HEDI Ratings for Local Measures of Student Achievement for Teachers in Grades for which there is an approved Value Added Measure

<i>Highly Effective</i>		<i>Effective</i>						<i>Developing</i>					<i>Ineffective</i>		
15	14	13	12	11	10	9	8	7	6	5	4	3	2	1	0
94-100	85-93	81-84	78-80	75-77	72-74	68-71	65-67	63-64	61-62	59-60	57-58	55-56	37-54	19-36	0-18

HEDI Ratings for Local Measures of Student Achievement for Teachers in Grades for which there is not an approved Value Added Measure

<i>Highly Effective</i>			<i>Effective</i>									<i>Developing</i>					<i>Ineffective</i>			
20	19	18	17	16	15	14	13	12	11	10	9	8	7	6	5	4	3	2	1	0
96-100	91-95	85-90	82-84	79-81	77-78	75-76	73-74	71-72	69-70	67-68	65-66	64	62-63	60-61	58-59	56-57	55	37-54	19-36	0-18

Locally Selected Measures of Student achievement:

Twenty (20) points (15 points if value added model is used) will be based on locally selected measures of student achievement. Teachers will work collaboratively with their building principal to develop a specific achievement goal that is determined to be rigorous and comparable across classrooms.

Teachers will establish goals by November 1, 2012. Data from regionally developed or district developed assessments will be used to set achievement goals. Data derived from summative assessments will be scored in a manner which ensures that teachers do not score assessments in which they have a vested interest. HEDI scores will be determined based on the percentage of goal attainment for each teacher.

HEDI Ratings for Local Measures of Student Achievement for Teachers in Grades for which there is an approved Value Added Measure

<i>Highly Effective</i>		<i>Effective</i>						<i>Developing</i>					<i>Ineffective</i>		
15	14	13	12	11	10	9	8	7	6	5	4	3	2	1	0
94-100	85-93	81-84	78-80	75-77	72-74	68-71	65-67	63-64	61-62	59-60	57-58	55-56	37-54	19-36	0-18

HEDI Ratings for Local Measures of Student Achievement for Teachers in Grades for which there is not an approved Value Added Measure

<i>Highly Effective</i>			<i>Effective</i>									<i>Developing</i>					<i>Ineffective</i>			
20	19	18	17	16	15	14	13	12	11	10	9	8	7	6	5	4	3	2	1	0
96-100	91-95	85-90	82-84	79-81	77-78	75-76	73-74	71-72	69-70	67-68	65-66	64	62-63	60-61	58-59	56-57	55	37-54	19-36	0-18

Conversion Chart for Other Measures of Effectiveness

Total Average Rubric Score	Category	Conversion score for composite
Ineffective 0-49		
1		0
1.1		12
1.2		25
1.3		37
1.4		49
Developing 50-56		
1.5		50
1.6		50.7
1.7		51.4
1.8		52.1
1.9		52.8
2		53.5
2.1		54.2
2.2		54.9
2.3		55.6
2.4		56.3
Effective 57-58		
2.5		57
2.6		57.2
2.7		57.4
2.8		57.6
2.9		57.8
3		58
3.1		58.2
3.2		58.4
3.3		58.6
3.4		58.8
Highly Effective		

3.5		59
3.6		59.3
3.7		59.5
3.8		59.8
3.9		60
4		60.25 (round to 60)

Appendix G

TEACHER IMPROVEMENT PLAN

A Teacher Improvement Plan (TIP) will be developed for teachers who have earned a total composite score on their annual professional performance review in the developing or ineffective range. The total composite score includes points from the state assessment results (20 points), local assessment results (20 points) and teacher practice rubric (60 points).

Teacher Name: _____ **Date TIP was developed:** _____

Plan developed in cooperation with (indicate who was present at the meeting): _____

Clearly explain areas in need of improvement: _____

Goal(s): _____

Objectives:

Strategies and Actions Teacher will take: _____

Strategies and Actions District will take: _____

Progress Monitoring (please explain how progress toward goal attainment will be monitored, include timelines: _____

*The District will be responsible for expenses associated with professional development activities that are directly related to the TIP. All PD activities and their associated expenses must be approved by the building principal **prior** to the teacher engaging in the activity.*

My signature below indicates that I have participated in the development of this plan and that I am in agreement with its contents.

Teacher: _____ Date: _____

Principal: _____ Date: _____

Other: _____ Date: _____

Appendix H

Teacher Improvement Plan Guidance

This document is intended to provide all interested parties the guidance necessary to develop and implement an effective Teacher Improvement Plan. The teacher improvement plan is an instrument to promote professional growth and is not disciplinary in nature.

1. A teacher improvement plan will be developed with teachers who receive a rating of ineffective or developing on their annual profession performance review.
2. The Tip must be developed after the teacher receives his/her rating but not more than ten days after the start of the school year.
3. The TIP will be developed in consultation with the teacher and building administrator.
4. Teachers have the right to Union representation during the development of the TIP.
5. The TIP will clearly define (in writing) the area(s) in which the teacher needs to improve.
6. The TIP will clearly define (in writing) the performance goals, expectations, timelines and benchmarks and standards a teacher must meet.
7. The TIP will clearly specify (in writing) the appropriate strategies and actions the district will make available to the teacher (e.g., peer coaching, portfolios, observations of other teachers, professional development etc.)
8. The TIP will clearly specify (in writing) how improvement/progress will be measured and monitored.
9. The TIP will clearly specify (in writing) a time table for periodic reviews of improvement/progress.
10. The district shall not pursue disciplinary action against a teacher on issues directly related to the TIP until the TIP has been implemented and its effectiveness in improving the teacher's performance has been evaluated.
11. There will be no further action by the district on issues related to the TIP, once the teacher has met or exceeded the TIP's performance expectations.

PRINCIPAL IMPROVEMENT PLAN

A Principal Improvement Plan (PIP) will be developed for principals who have earned a total composite score on their annual professional performance review in the developing or ineffective range. The total composite score includes points from the state assessment results (20 points), local assessment results (20 points) and principal practice rubric (60 points).

Principal Name: _____ **Date PIP was developed:** _____

Plan developed in cooperation with (indicate who was present at the meeting): _____

Clearly explain areas in need of improvement: _____

Goal(s): _____

Objectives:

Strategies and Actions Principal will take: _____

Strategies and Actions District will take: _____

Progress Monitoring (please explain how progress toward goal attainment will be monitored, include timelines: _____

*The District will be responsible for expenses associated with professional development activities that are directly related to the PIP. All PD activities and their associated expenses must be approved by the Superintendent **prior** to the principal engaging in the activity.*

My signature below indicates that I have participated in the development of this plan and that I am in agreement with its contents.

Principal: _____ Date: _____

Superintendent: _____ Date: _____

Other: _____ Date: _____

Principal Improvement Plan Guidance

This document is intended to provide all interested parties the guidance necessary to develop and implement an effective Principal Improvement Plan. The principal improvement plan is an instrument to promote professional growth and is not disciplinary in nature.

1. A principal improvement plan will be developed with teachers who receive a rating of ineffective or developing on their annual profession performance review.
2. The PIP must be developed after the principal receives his/her rating but not more than ten days after the start of the school year.
3. The PIP will be developed in consultation with the principal and the Superintendent.
4. Principals will have the right to Union representation during the development of the PIP.
5. The PIP will clearly define (in writing) the area(s) in which the principal needs to improve.
6. The PIP will clearly define (in writing) the performance goals, expectations, timelines and benchmarks and standards a principal must meet.
7. The PIP will clearly specify (in writing) the appropriate strategies and actions the district will make available to the principal (e.g., peer coaching, portfolios, professional development etc.)
8. The PIP will clearly specify (in writing) how improvement/progress will be measured and monitored.
9. The PIP will clearly specify (in writing) a time table for periodic reviews of improvement/progress.
10. The district shall not pursue disciplinary action against a principal on issues directly related to the PIP until the PIP has been implemented and its effectiveness in improving the principal's performance has been evaluated.
11. There will be no further action by the district on issues related to the PIP, once the teacher has met or exceeded the PIP's performance expectations.

ALEXANDER CENTRAL SCHOOL DISTRICT

Chart for Assigning HEDI Ratings for Principals

District-adopted expectations for the level of performance required for each HEDI rating category and the process for assigning points to principals based on locally selected measures of growth or achievement.

HEDI Criteria within Locally selected measures of Growth or Achievement

1. A generic HEDI criteria and scoring framework will be used for Comparable Growth as shown in the chart below.
2. Targets will set goals consistent with the above generic HEDI criteria
3. The targets will be set based upon the ISLLC standards and in a manner to target at least one year of academic growth.

<i>Highly Effective</i>	<i>Effective</i>	<i>Developing</i>	<i>Ineffective</i>
The work of the principal results in extraordinary teacher performance as is evidenced by student academic growth beyond expectations during the school year.	The work of the principal results in teacher performance that is acceptable, measurable, and appropriate as evidenced by student academic growth.	The work of the principal results in teacher performance that does not meet the established standard as is evidenced by student academic growth.	The work of the principal does not result in acceptable teacher performance as is evidenced in student academic growth.
85% of students will meet or exceed the established target	At least 65% of students will meet the established target.	At least 55% of students will meet the established target.	Fewer than 55% of students will meet the established target.

<i>Highly Effective</i>		<i>Effective</i>						<i>Developing</i>					<i>Ineffective</i>		
15	14	13	12	11	10	9	8	7	6	5	4	3	2	1	0
94-100	85-93	81-84	78-80	75-77	72-74	68-71	65-67	63-64	61-62	59-60	57-58	55-56	37-54	19-36	0-18

APPR Plan for Principal's

The detailed conversion chart below allows conversion of an average rubric score to a specific conversion score for other measures of effectiveness.

Total Average Rubric Score	Category	Conversion score for composite
Ineffective 0-16		
0		0
1		2
2		2
3		3
4		4
5		4
6		5
7		6
8		6
9		7
10		8
11		8
12		9
13		10
14		10
15		11
16		12
17		13
18		13
19		14
20		15
21		15
22		16
Developing 17-37		
23		17
24		17
25		18
26		19
27		19
28		20
29		21
30		21
31		22
32		23
33		23
34		24
35		25
36		25
37		26

38		27
39		27
40		28
41		29
42		29
43		30
44		31
45		31
46		32
47		33
48		33
49		34
50		35
51		35
52		36
53		37
54		37
Effective 38-52		
55		38
56		38
57		39
58		40
59		41
60		41
61		42
62		43
63		43
64		44
65		45
66		45
67		46
68		47
69		47
70		48
71		49
72		49
73		49
74		51
75		51
76		52
Highly Effective 53-60		
77		53
78		53
79		54
80		55

81		55
82		56
83		57
84		57
85		58
86		59
87		59
88		60

DISTRICT CERTIFICATION FORM: Please download this form, sign and upload to APPR form

By signing this document, the school district or BOCES certifies that this document constitutes the district's or BOCES' complete Annual Professional Performance Review (APPR) Plan, that all provisions of the APPR that are subject to collective negotiations have been resolved pursuant to the provisions of Article 14 of the Civil Service Law and that such APPR Plan complies with the requirements of Education Law §3012-c and Subpart 30-2 of the Rules of the Board of Regents and has been adopted by the governing body of the school district or BOCES. By signing this document, the collective bargaining agent(s) of the school district or BOCES, where applicable, certify that this document constitutes the district's or BOCES' complete Annual Professional Performance Review (APPR) Plan, that collective negotiations have been completed on all provisions of the APPR that are subject to collective bargaining, and that such APPR Plan complies with the requirements of Education Law §3012-c and Subpart 30-2 of the Rules of the Board of Regents and has been adopted by the governing body of the school district or BOCES.

The school district or BOCES and its collective bargaining agent(s), where applicable, also certify that upon information and belief, all statements made herein are true and accurate and that any applicable collective bargaining agreements for teachers and principals are consistent with and/or have been amended and/or modified or otherwise resolved to the extent required by Article 14 of the Civil Service Law, as necessary to require that all classroom teachers and building principals will be evaluated using a comprehensive annual evaluation system that rigorously adheres to Education Law §3012-c and Subpart 30-2 of the Rules of the Board of Regents.


The school district or BOCES and its collective bargaining agent(s), where applicable, also make the following specific certifications with respect to their APPR Plan:

- Assure that the evaluation system will be used as a significant factor for employment decisions and teacher and principal development
- Assure that the entire APPR plan will be completed for each teacher or principal as soon as practicable, but in no case later than September 1 of the school year next following the school year for which the classroom teacher or building principal's performance is being measured
- Assure that the district or BOCES will provide the teacher's or principal's score and rating on the locally selected measures subcomponent, if available, and on the other measures of teacher and principal effectiveness subcomponent for a teacher's or principal's annual professional performance review, in writing, no later than the last school day of the school year for which the teacher or principal is being measured
- Assure that the APPR plan will be posted on the district's or BOCES' website by September 10 or within 10 days after it is approved by the Commissioner, whichever is later
- Assure that accurate teacher and student data will be provided to the Commissioner in a format and timeline prescribed by the Commissioner
- Assure that the district or BOCES will report the individual subcomponent scores and the total composite effectiveness score for each classroom teacher and building principal in a manner prescribed by the Commissioner
- Certify that the district provides an opportunity for every classroom teacher and building principal to verify the subjects and/or student rosters assigned to them
- Assure that teachers and principals will receive timely and constructive feedback as part of the evaluation process
- Assure that any training course for lead evaluator certification addresses each of the requirements in the regulations, including specific considerations in evaluating teachers and principals of English Language Learners and students with disabilities
- Assure that educators who receive a Developing or Ineffective rating will receive a TIP or PIP plan, in accordance with the regulations, as soon as practicable but in no case later than 10 school days from the opening of classes in the school year following the performance year
- Assure that all evaluators and lead evaluators will be properly trained and that lead evaluators will be certified and recertified as necessary in accordance with the regulations
- Assure that the district or BOCES has appeal procedures that are consistent with the regulations and that they provide for the timely and expeditious resolution of an appeal
- Assure that, for teachers, all NYS Teaching Standards are assessed at least once per year, and, for principals, all Leadership Standards are assessed at least once per year
- Assure that it is possible for a teacher or principal to obtain each point in the scoring ranges, including 0 for each subcomponent and that the APPR Plan describes the process for assigning points for each subcomponent
- Assure that locally-selected measures are rigorous and comparable across all classrooms (for teachers, the same locally-selected measure is used across a subject and/or grade level; for principals, the same locally-selected measure must be used for all principals in the same or similar program or grade configuration)

- Assure that, if more than one type of locally-selected measure is used for different groups of teachers within a grade/subject, the measures are comparable based on the Standards of Educational and Psychological Testing
- Assure that, if more than one type of locally-selected measure is used for principals in the same or similar grade configuration or program, the measures are comparable based on the Standards of Educational and Psychological Testing
- Assure that the process for assigning points for all subcomponents and the composite scores will use the narrative HEDI descriptions described in the regulations to effectively differentiate educators' performance in ways that improve student learning and instruction
- Assure that district or BOCES will develop SLOs according to the rules and/or guidance established by SED and that past academic performance and / or baseline academic data of students is taken into account when developing an SLO
- Assure that Student Growth/Value Added Measure will be used where applicable
- Assure that any material changes to this APPR Plan will be submitted to the Commissioner for approval as soon as practicable and/or in a timeframe prescribed by the Commissioner
- Assure that this APPR Plan applies to all classroom teachers and building principals as defined in the regulation and SED guidance
- Assure that the district or BOCES will provide the Department with any information necessary to conduct annual monitoring pursuant to the regulations
- If this APPR Plan is being submitted subsequent to July 1, 2012, assure that this was the result of unresolved collective bargaining negotiations

Signatures, dates

Superintendent Signature: Date: 1-10-13



Teachers Union President Signature: Date: 1/10/2013



Administrative Union President Signature: Date: 1/10/2013



Board of Education President Signature: Date: 1/10/2013

