



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

December 7, 2012

Robert Wagoner, Superintendent
Alexandria Central School District
34 Bolton Avenue
Alexandria Bay, NY 13607

Dear Superintendent Wagoner:

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: Jack Boak

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 Tuesday, May 08, 2012

Updated Monday, November 26, 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 :

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

220202040000

1.2) School District Name:

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

ALEXANDRIA 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 Tuesday, May 08, 2012

Updated Monday, November 26, 2012

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	State-approved 3rd party assessment	STAR Early Literacy Enterprise
1	State-approved 3rd party assessment	STAR Early Literacy Enterprise
2	State-approved 3rd party assessment	STAR Reading Enterprise

	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	Students will be given a pre-test at the beginning of the year to establish a baseline. Using that baseline data,
---	---

<p>this subcomponent. If needed, you may upload a table or graphic at 2.11, below.</p>	<p>teachers in collaboration with the principal, will set individual growth targets for students. HEDI points will be allocated to a teacher based on the percentage of students meeting or exceeding their individual growth targets.</p>
<p>Highly Effective (18 - 20 points) Results are well-above state average for similar students (or District goals if no state test).</p>	<p>Student performance results are outstanding and 85-100% of students met or exceeded their individual growth target. 20 = 95-100% 19 = 90-94% 18 = 85-89%</p>
<p>Effective (9 - 17 points) Results meet state average for similar students (or District goals if no state test).</p>	<p>Student performance results are on par with district expectations and 70-84% of students met or exceeded their individual growth target. 17 = 83-84% 16 = 81-82% 15 = 79-80% 14 = 77-78% 13 = 75-76% 12 = 73-74% 11 = 72% 10 = 71% 9 = 70%</p>
<p>Developing (3 - 8 points) Results are below state average for similar students (or District goals if no state test).</p>	<p>Student performance results are below district expectations and 50-69% of students met or exceeded their individual growth target. 8 = 65-69% 7 = 62-64% 6 = 59-61% 5 = 56-58% 4 = 53-55% 3 = 50-52%</p>
<p>Ineffective (0 - 2 points) Results are well-below state average for similar students (or District goals if no state test).</p>	<p>Student performance results are far below district expectations and 0-49% of students met or exceeded their individual growth target. 2 = 25-49% 1 = 1-24% 0 = 0%</p>

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	State-approved 3rd party assessment	STAR MATH Enterprise
1	State-approved 3rd party assessment	STAR MATH Enterprise
2	State-approved 3rd party assessment	STAR MATH Enterprise

	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.

<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 2.11, below.</p>	<p>Students will be given a pre-test at the beginning of the year to establish a baseline. Using that baseline data, teachers in collaboration with the principal, will set individual growth targets for students. HEDI points will be allocated to a teacher based on the percentage of students meeting or exceeding their individual growth targets.</p>
<p>Highly Effective (18 - 20 points) Results are well-above state average for similar students (or District goals if no state test).</p>	<p>Student performance results are outstanding and 85-100% of students met or exceeded their individual growth target. 20 = 95-100% 19 = 90-94% 18 = 85-89%</p>
<p>Effective (9 - 17 points) Results meet state average for similar students (or District goals if no state test).</p>	<p>Student performance results are on par with district expectations and 70-84% of students met or exceeded their individual growth target. 17 = 83-84% 16 = 81-82% 15 = 79-80% 14 = 77-78% 13 = 75-76% 12 = 73-74% 11 = 72% 10 = 71% 9 = 70%</p>
<p>Developing (3 - 8 points) Results are below state average for similar students (or District goals if no state test).</p>	<p>Student performance results are below district expectations and 50-69% of students met or exceeded their individual growth target. 8 = 65-69% 7 = 62-64% 6 = 59-61% 5 = 56-58% 4 = 53-55% 3 = 50-52%</p>
<p>Ineffective (0 - 2 points) Results are well-below state average for similar students (or District goals if no state test).</p>	<p>Student performance results are far below district expectations and 0-49% of students met or exceeded their individual growth target. 2 = 25-49% 1 = 1-24% 0 = 0%</p>

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	Alexandria Central School District-developed 6th Grade Science Assessment
7	District, regional or BOCES-developed assessment	Alexandria Central School District-developed 7th Grade 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.	Students will be given a pre-test at the beginning of the year to establish a baseline. Using that baseline data, teachers in collaboration with the principal, will set individual growth targets for students. HEDI points will be allocated to a teacher based on the percentage of students meeting or exceeding their individual growth targets.
Highly Effective (18 - 20 points) Results are well-above state average for similar students (or District goals if no state test).	Student performance results are outstanding and 85-100% of students met or exceeded their individual growth target. 20 = 95-100% 19 = 90-94% 18 = 85-89%
Effective (9 - 17 points) Results meet state average for similar students (or District goals if no state test).	Student performance results are on par with district expectations and 70-84% of students met or exceeded their individual growth target. 17 = 83-84% 16 = 81-82% 15 = 79-80% 14 = 77-78% 13 = 75-76% 12 = 73-74% 11 = 72% 10 = 71% 9 = 70%
Developing (3 - 8 points) Results are below state average for similar students (or District goals if no state test).	Student performance results are below district expectations and 50-69% of students met or exceeded their individual growth target. 8 = 65-69% 7 = 62-64% 6 = 59-61% 5 = 56-58% 4 = 53-55% 3 = 50-52%
Ineffective (0 - 2 points) Results are well-below state average for similar students (or District goals if no state test).	Student performance results are far below district expectations and 0-49% of students met or exceeded their individual growth target. 2 = 25-49% 1 = 1-24% 0 = 0%

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	Alexandria Central School District-developed 6th Grade Social Studies Assessment
7	District, regional or BOCES-developed assessment	Alexandria Central School District-developed 7th Grade Social Studies Assessment
8	District, regional or BOCES-developed assessment	Alexandria Central School District-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.	Students will be given a pre-test at the beginning of the year to establish a baseline. Using that baseline data, teachers in collaboration with the principal, will set individual growth targets for students. HEDI points will be allocated to a teacher based on the percentage of students meeting or exceeding their individual growth targets.
Highly Effective (18 - 20 points) Results are well-above District goals for similar students.	Student performance results are outstanding and 85-100% of students met or exceeded their individual growth target. 20 = 95-100% 19 = 90-94% 18 = 85-89%
Effective (9 - 17 points) Results meet District goals for similar students.	Student performance results are on par with district expectations and 70-84% of students met or exceeded their individual growth target. 17 = 83-84% 16 = 81-82% 15 = 79-80% 14 = 77-78% 13 = 75-76% 12 = 73-74% 11 = 72% 10 = 71% 9 = 70%
Developing (3 - 8 points) Results are below District goals for similar students.	Student performance results are below district expectations and 50-69% of students met or exceeded their individual growth target. 8 = 65-69% 7 = 62-64% 6 = 59-61% 5 = 56-58% 4 = 53-55% 3 = 50-52%
Ineffective (0 - 2 points) Results are well-below District goals for similar students.	Student performance results are far below district expectations and 0-49% of students met or exceeded their individual growth target. 2 = 25-49% 1 = 1-24% 0 = 0%

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	Alexandria Central School District-developed Global 1 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.	Students will be given a pre-test at the beginning of the year to establish a baseline. Using that baseline data, teachers in collaboration with the principal, will set individual growth targets for students. HEDI points will be allocated to a teacher based on the percentage of students meeting or exceeding their individual growth targets.
Highly Effective (18 - 20 points) Results are well-above District goals for similar students.	Student performance results are outstanding and 85-100% of students met or exceeded their individual growth target. 20 = 95-100% 19 = 90-94% 18 = 85-89%
Effective (9 - 17 points) Results meet District goals for similar students.	Student performance results are on par with district expectations and 70-84% of students met or exceeded their individual growth target. 17 = 83-84% 16 = 81-82% 15 = 79-80% 14 = 77-78% 13 = 75-76% 12 = 73-74% 11 = 72% 10 = 71% 9 = 70%
Developing (3 - 8 points) Results are below District goals for similar students.	Student performance results are below district expectations and 50-69% of students met or exceeded their individual growth target. 8 = 65-69% 7 = 62-64% 6 = 59-61% 5 = 56-58% 4 = 53-55% 3 = 50-52%

Ineffective (0 - 2 points) Results are well-below District goals for similar students.

Student performance results are far below district expectations and 0-49% of students met or exceeded their individual growth target.
 2 = 25-49%
 1 = 1-24%
 0 = 0%

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.

Students will be given a pre-test at the beginning of the year to establish a baseline. Using that baseline data, teachers in collaboration with the principal, will set individual growth targets for students. HEDI points will be allocated to a teacher based on the percentage of students meeting or exceeding their individual growth targets.

Highly Effective (18 - 20 points) Results are well-above District goals for similar students.

Student performance results are outstanding and 85-100% of students met or exceeded their individual growth target.
 20 = 95-100%
 19 = 90-94%
 18 = 85-89%

Effective (9 - 17 points) Results meet District goals for similar students.

Student performance results are on par with district expectations and 70-84% of students met or exceeded their individual growth target.
 17 = 83-84%
 16 = 81-82%
 15 = 79-80%
 14 = 77-78%
 13 = 75-76%
 12 = 73-74%
 11 = 72%
 10 = 71%
 9 = 70%

Developing (3 - 8 points) Results are below District goals for similar students.

Student performance results are below district expectations and 50-69% of students met or exceeded

their individual growth target.

8 = 65-69%

7 = 62-64%

6 = 59-61%

5 = 56-58%

4 = 53-55%

3 = 50-52%

Ineffective (0 - 2 points) Results are well-below District goals for similar students.

Student performance results are far below district expectations and 0-49% of students met or exceeded their individual growth target.

2 = 25-49%

1 = 1-24%

0 = 0%

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.

Students will be given a pre-test at the beginning of the year to establish a baseline. Using that baseline data, teachers in collaboration with the principal, will set individual growth targets for students. HEDI points will be allocated to a teacher based on the percentage of students meeting or exceeding their individual growth targets.

Highly Effective (18 - 20 points) Results are well-above District goals for similar students.

Student performance results are outstanding and 85-100% of students met or exceeded their individual growth target.

20 = 95-100%

19 = 90-94%

18 = 85-89%

Effective (9 - 17 points) Results meet District goals for similar students.

Student performance results are on par with district expectations and 70-84% of students met or exceeded their individual growth target.

17 = 83-84%

16 = 81-82%

15 = 79-80%

14 = 77-78%

13 = 75-76%

12 = 73-74%

11 = 72%
 10 = 71%
 9 = 70%

Developing (3 - 8 points) Results are below District goals for similar students.

Student performance results are below district expectations and 50-69% of students met or exceeded their individual growth target.

8 = 65-69%
 7 = 62-64%
 6 = 59-61%
 5 = 56-58%
 4 = 53-55%
 3 = 50-52%

Ineffective (0 - 2 points) Results are well-below District goals for similar students.

Student performance results are far below district expectations and 0-49% of students met or exceeded their individual growth target.

2 = 25-49%
 1 = 1-24%
 0 = 0%

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	Alexandria Central School District-developed Grade 9 ELA Assessment
Grade 10 ELA	District, regional or BOCES-developed assessment	Alexandria Central School District-developed Grade 10 ELA Assessment
Grade 11 ELA	Regents assessment	New York State Comprehensive English Regents

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.

Students will be given a pre-test at the beginning of the year to establish a baseline. Using that baseline data, teachers in collaboration with the principal, will set individual growth targets for students. HEDI points will be allocated to a teacher based on the percentage of students meeting or exceeding their individual growth targets.

Highly Effective (18 - 20 points) Results are well-above District goals for similar students.

Student performance results are outstanding and 85-100% of students met or exceeded their individual growth target.

20 = 95-100%
 19 = 90-94%
 18 = 85-89%

Effective (9 - 17 points) Results meet District goals for similar students.	Student performance results are on par with district expectations and 70-84% of students met or exceeded their individual growth target. 17 = 83-84% 16 = 81-82% 15 = 79-80% 14 = 77-78% 13 = 75-76% 12 = 73-74% 11 = 72% 10 = 71% 9 = 70%
Developing (3 - 8 points) Results are below District goals for similar students.	Student performance results are below district expectations and 50-69% of students met or exceeded their individual growth target. 8 = 65-69% 7 = 62-64% 6 = 59-61% 5 = 56-58% 4 = 53-55% 3 = 50-52%
Ineffective (0 - 2 points) Results are well-below District goals for similar students.	Student performance results are far below district expectations and 0-49% of students met or exceeded their individual growth target. 2 = 25-49% 1 = 1-24% 0 = 0%

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
Occupational Math	District, Regional or BOCES-developed	Alexandria Central School District-developed Occupational Math Assessment
Government 12	District, Regional or BOCES-developed	Alexandria Central School District-developed Government 12 Assessment
Economics 12	District, Regional or BOCES-developed	Alexandria Central School District-developed Economic 12 Assessment
Math 12	District, Regional or BOCES-developed	Alexandria Central School District-developed Math 12 Assessment
Home Ec 7	District, Regional or BOCES-developed	Alexandria Central School District-developed Home Ec 7 Assessment
Intro to French	District, Regional or BOCES-developed	Alexandria Central School District-developed Intro to French Assessment
French I	District, Regional or BOCES-developed	Alexandria Central School District-developed French I Assessment
French II	District, Regional or BOCES-developed	Alexandria Central School District-developed French II Assessment
Art 8	District, Regional or BOCES-developed	Alexandria Central School District-developed Grade 6-8 Art Assessment

Studio Art	District, Regional or BOCES-developed	Alexandria Central School District-developed Commencement Art Assessment
Studio Printmaking	District, Regional or BOCES-developed	Alexandria Central School District-developed Commencement Art Assessment
Computer Tech	District, Regional or BOCES-developed	Alexandria Central School District-developed Computer Tech Assessment
SR High Health	District, Regional or BOCES-developed	Alexandria Central School District-developed Commencement Health Assessment
Elementary Chorus	District, Regional or BOCES-developed	Alexandria Central School District-developed Elem Choral Music Assessment
Select Chorus	District, Regional or BOCES-developed	Alexandria Central School District-developed Commencement Choral Music Assessment
Tech 7	District, Regional or BOCES-developed	Alexandria Central School District-developed Tech 7 Assessment
Grade 5 Band	District, Regional or BOCES-developed	Alexandria Central School District-developed Beginning Instrumental Music Assessment
Grade 6 Band	District, Regional or BOCES-developed	Alexandria Central School District-developed Beginning Instrumental Music Assessment
Concert Band	District, Regional or BOCES-developed	Alexandria Central School District-developed Concert Band Assessment
All Courses Not Listed Above	District, Regional or BOCES-developed	Alexandria Central School District-developed subject- and grade-specific Assessment

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.	Students will be given a pre-test at the beginning of the year to establish a baseline. Using that baseline data, teachers in collaboration with the principal, will set individual growth targets for students. HEDI points will be allocated to a teacher based on the percentage of students meeting or exceeding their individual growth targets.
Highly Effective (18 - 20 points) Results are well-above District goals for similar students.	Student performance results are outstanding and 85-100% of students met or exceeded their individual growth target. 20 = 95-100% 19 = 90-94% 18 = 85-89%
Effective (9 - 17 points) Results meet District goals for similar students.	Student performance results are on par with district expectations and 70-84% of students met or exceeded their individual growth target. 17 = 83-84% 16 = 81-82% 15 = 79-80% 14 = 77-78% 13 = 75-76% 12 = 73-74% 11 = 72% 10 = 71% 9 = 70%

Developing (3 - 8 points) Results are below District goals for similar students.	Student performance results are below district expectations and 50-69% of students met or exceeded their individual growth target. 8 = 65-69% 7 = 62-64% 6 = 59-61% 5 = 56-58% 4 = 53-55% 3 = 50-52%
Ineffective (0 - 2 points) Results are well-below District goals for similar students.	Student performance results are far below district expectations and 0-49% of students met or exceeded their individual growth target. 2 = 25-49% 1 = 1-24% 0 = 0%

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/5364/126531-TXEttx9bQW/HEDI Conversion Chart for SLO.pdf

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.

Adjustments for teachers that have Students with Disabilities, English language learners or students in poverty in their class will be made if the students in those categories reach the threshold. Elementary classroom teachers in grades K-6 who teach in a co-teaching model with students with disabilities assigned to their class will receive an additional two (2) points on the HEDI scale. Secondary teachers who teach grade 7-12 who have 20% or more students with disabilities enrolled in their class will receive an additional two (2) points on the HEDI scale. Teachers who teach grades K-12 with 20% or more of their class enrollment consisting of English language learners or students in poverty will receive an additional two (2) points on the HEDI scale. The maximum number of points for any teacher is two (2) points, even if the teacher qualifies for more than one of the adjustment factors. The adjustments for teachers who teach students with disabilities, English language learners and/or students in poverty according to the thresholds will be made because the academic history of students in these categories show that they perform lower than their peers who do not fall into these categories.

Class assignments will take into account all students, including students with disabilities, English language learners and students in poverty and class assignments will not be made as an incentive associated with the adjustment factors. All enrolled students, in accordance with teacher of record policies, will be included and no students will be excluded when calculating teacher HEDI ratings.

The application of locally developed controls will be rigorous, fair, and transparent and the procedures for ensuring data accuracy and integrity are being used.

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 Friday, May 11, 2012

Updated Thursday, November 29, 2012

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	4) State-approved 3rd party assessments	STAR Reading Enterprise
5	4) State-approved 3rd party assessments	STAR Reading Enterprise
6	4) State-approved 3rd party assessments	STAR Reading Enterprise
7	4) State-approved 3rd party assessments	STAR Reading Enterprise
8	4) State-approved 3rd party assessments	STAR Reading Enterprise

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.

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.	HEDI points will be allocated to a teacher based on the student mean growth percentile (known as SGP on STAR Enterprise SGP to HEDI (Value Added) conversion chart) on the appropriate grade level assessment.
Highly Effective (14 - 15 points) Results are well above District- or BOCES-adopted expectations for growth or achievement for grade/subject.	Student performance results are outstanding and students scored an average of 61-99 points meeting district adopted expectations for Highly Effective achievement. 15 = 81-99 points 14 = 61-80 points
Effective (8- 13 points) Results meet District- or BOCES-adopted expectations for growth or achievement for grade/subject.	Student performance results are on par with district expectations and students scored an average of 41-60 points meeting expectations for Effective achievement. 13 = 57-60 points 12 = 53-56 points 11 = 49-52 points 10 = 46-48 points 9 = 43-45 points 8 = 41-42 points
Developing (3 - 7 points) Results are below District- or BOCES-adopted expectations for growth or achievement for grade/subject.	Student performance results are below district expectations and students scored an average of 21-40 points meeting expectations for Developing achievement. 7 = 35-40 points 6 = 30-34 points 5 = 27-29 points 4 = 24-26 points 3 = 21-23 points
Ineffective (0 - 2 points) Results are well below District- or BOCES-adopted expectations for growth or achievement for grade/subject.	Student performance results are far below district expectations and students scored an average of 1-20 points meeting expectations for Ineffective achievement. 2 = 11-20 points 1 = 2-10 points 0 = 1 point

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	4) State-approved 3rd party assessments	STAR MATH Enterprise
5	4) State-approved 3rd party assessments	STAR MATH Enterprise
6	4) State-approved 3rd party assessments	STAR MATH Enterprise
7	4) State-approved 3rd party assessments	STAR MATH Enterprise
8	4) State-approved 3rd party assessments	STAR MATH Enterprise

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.	HEDI points will be allocated to a teacher based on the student mean growth percentile (known as SGP on STAR Enterprise SGP to HEDI (Value Added) conversion chart) on the appropriate grade level assessment.
Highly Effective (14 - 15 points) Results are well above District- or BOCES-adopted expectations for growth or achievement for grade/subject.	Student performance results are outstanding and students scored an average of 61-99 points meeting district adopted expectations for Highly Effective achievement. 15 = 81-99 points 14 = 61-80 points
Effective (8- 13 points) Results meet District- or BOCES-adopted expectations for growth or achievement for grade/subject.	Student performance results are on par with district expectations and students scored an average of 41-60 points meeting expectations for Effective achievement. 13 = 57-60 points 12 = 53-56 points 11 = 49-52 points 10 = 46-48 points 9 = 43-45 points 8 = 41-42 points
Developing (3 - 7 points) Results are below District- or BOCES-adopted expectations for growth or achievement for grade/subject.	Student performance results are below district expectations and students scored an average of 21-40 points meeting expectations for Developing achievement. 7 = 35-40 points 6 = 30-34 points 5 = 27-29 points 4 = 24-26 points 3 = 21-23 points
Ineffective (0 - 2 points) Results are well below District- or BOCES-adopted expectations for growth or achievement for grade/subject.	Student performance results are far below district expectations and students scored an average of 1-20 points meeting expectations for Ineffective achievement. 2 = 11-20 points 1 = 2-10 points 0 = 1 point

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/5139/128507-rhJdBgDruP/STAR Enterprise SGP to HEDI \(Value Added\).pdf](assets/survey-uploads/5139/128507-rhJdBgDruP/STAR Enterprise SGP to HEDI (Value Added).pdf)

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	4) State-approved 3rd party assessments	STAR Early Literacy Enterprise
1	4) State-approved 3rd party assessments	STAR Early Literacy Enterprise
2	4) State-approved 3rd party assessments	STAR Reading Enterprise
3	4) State-approved 3rd party assessments	STAR Reading Enterprise

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.

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.	HEDI points will be allocated to a teacher based on the student mean growth percentile (known as SGP on STAR Enterprise SGP to HEDI (Non-Value Added) conversion chart) on the appropriate grade level assessment.
Highly Effective (18-20 points) Results are well above District- or BOCES-adopted expectations for growth or achievement for grade/subject.	Student performance results are outstanding and students scored an average of 61-99 points meeting district adopted expectations for Highly Effective achievement. 20 = 86-99 points 19 = 74-85 points 18 = 61-73 points
Effective (9-17 points) Results meet District- or BOCES-adopted expectations for growth or achievement for grade/subject.	Student performance results are on par with district expectations and students scored an average of 41-60 points meeting expectations for Effective achievement. 17 = 58-60 points 16 = 56-57 points 15 = 54-55 points 14 = 52-53 points 13 = 50-51 points 12 = 48-49 points 11 = 46-47 points 10 = 44-45 points 9 = 41-43 points
Developing (3 - 8 points) Results are below District- or BOCES-adopted expectations for growth or achievement for grade/subject.	Student performance results are below district expectations and students scored an average of 21-40 points meeting expectations for Developing achievement. 8 = 37-40 points 7 = 33-36 points 6 = 30-32 points 5 = 25-29 points 4 = 23-24 points 3 = 21-22 points
Ineffective (0 - 2 points) Results are well below District- or BOCES-adopted expectations for growth or achievement for grade/subject.	Student performance results are far below district expectations and students scored an average of 1-20 points meeting expectations for Ineffective achievement. 2 = 11-20 points 1 = 2-10 points

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	4) State-approved 3rd party assessments	STAR MATH Enterprise
1	4) State-approved 3rd party assessments	STAR MATH Enterprise
2	4) State-approved 3rd party assessments	STAR MATH Enterprise
3	4) State-approved 3rd party assessments	STAR MATH Enterprise

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.

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.	HEDI points will be allocated to a teacher based on the student mean growth percentile (known as SGP on STAR Enterprise SGP to HEDI (Non-Value Added) conversion chart) on the appropriate grade level assessment.
Highly Effective (18-20 points) Results are well above District- or BOCES-adopted expectations for growth or achievement for grade/subject.	Student performance results are outstanding and students scored an average of 61-99 points meeting district adopted expectations for Highly Effective achievement. 20 = 86-99 points 19 = 74-85 points 18 = 61-73 points
Effective (9-17 points) Results meet District- or BOCES-adopted expectations for growth or achievement for grade/subject.	Student performance results are on par with district expectations and students scored an average of 41-60 points meeting expectations for Effective achievement. 17 = 58-60 points 16 = 56-57 points 15 = 54-55 points 14 = 52-53 points 13 = 50-51 points 12 = 48-49 points 11 = 46-47 points 10 = 44-45 points 9 = 41-43 points
Developing (3 - 8 points) Results are below District -or BOCES-adopted expectations for growth or achievement for grade/subject.	Student performance results are below district expectations and students scored an average of 21-40 points meeting expectations for Developing achievement. 8 = 37-40 points 7 = 33-36 points 6 = 30-32 points 5 = 25-29 points 4 = 23-24 points 3 = 21-22 points

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

Student performance results are far below district expectations and students scored an average of 1-20 points meeting expectations for Ineffective achievement.
 2 = 11-20 points
 1 = 2-10 points
 0 = 1 point

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	Alexandria Central School District-developed 6th Grade Science Assessment
7	5) District, regional, or BOCES–developed assessments	Alexandria Central School District-developed 7th Grade Science Assessment
8	5) District, regional, or BOCES–developed assessments	Alexandria Central School District-developed 8th Grade 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.	District created achievement targets for HEDI points will be allocated to a teacher based on the average student scores on the appropriate grade level assessment, using HEDI Conversion Chart for LSM.
Highly Effective (18 - 20 points) Results are well above District- or BOCES-adopted expectations for growth or achievement for grade/subject.	20 = 95-100% 19 = 90-94% 18 = 85-89%
Effective (9 - 17 points) Results meet District- or BOCES-adopted expectations for growth or achievement for grade/subject.	17 = 83-84% 16 = 81-82% 15 = 79-80% 14 = 77-78% 13 = 75-76% 12 = 73-74% 11 = 72% 10 = 71% 9 = 70%
Developing (3 - 8 points) Results are below District- or BOCES-adopted expectations for growth or achievement for grade/subject.	8 = 65-69% 7 = 62-64% 6 = 59-61% 5 = 56-58% 4 = 53-55% 3 = 50-52%
Ineffective (0 - 2 points) Results are well below District- or BOCES-adopted expectations for growth or achievement for grade/subject.	2 = 25-49% 1 = 1-24% 0 = 0%

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	Alexandria Central School District-developed 6th Grade Social Studies Assessment
7	5) District, regional, or BOCES–developed assessments	Alexandria Central School District-developed 7th Grade Social Studies Assessment
8	5) District, regional, or BOCES–developed assessments	Alexandria Central School District-developed 8th Grade 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.	District created achievement targets for HEDI points will be allocated to a teacher based on the average student scores on the appropriate grade level assessment, using HEDI Conversion Chart for LSM.
Highly Effective (18 - 20 points) Results are well above District- or BOCES-adopted expectations for growth or achievement for grade/subject.	20 = 95-100% 19 = 90-94% 18 = 85-89%
Effective (9 - 17 points) Results meet District- or BOCES-adopted expectations for growth or achievement for grade/subject.	17 = 83-84% 16 = 81-82% 15 = 79-80% 14 = 77-78% 13 = 75-76% 12 = 73-74% 11 = 72% 10 = 71% 9 = 70%
Developing (3 - 8 points) Results are below District- or BOCES-adopted expectations for growth or achievement for grade/subject.	8 = 65-69% 7 = 62-64% 6 = 59-61% 5 = 56-58% 4 = 53-55% 3 = 50-52%
Ineffective (0 - 2 points) Results are well below District- or BOCES-adopted expectations for growth or achievement for grade/subject.	2 = 25-49% 1 = 1-24% 0 = 0%

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	Alexandria Central School District-developed Global 1 Assessment
Global 2	3) Teacher specific achievement or growth score computed locally	New York State Global 2 Regents Assessment
American History	3) Teacher specific achievement or growth score computed locally	New York State American History Regents Assessment

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.

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.	District created achievement targets for HEDI points will be allocated to a teacher based on the average student scores on the appropriate grade level assessment, using HEDI Conversion Chart for LSM.
Highly Effective (18 - 20 points) Results are well above District- or BOCES-adopted expectations for growth or achievement for grade/subject.	20 = 95-100% 19 = 90-94% 18 = 85-89% ----- New York State subject-specific Regents: Student performance results are outstanding and 85-100% of students met district created expectations for Highly Effective achievement. 20 = 95-100 points 19 = 90-94 points 18 = 85-89 points
Effective (9 - 17 points) Results meet District- or BOCES-adopted expectations for growth or achievement for grade/subject.	17 = 83-84% 16 = 81-82% 15 = 79-80% 14 = 77-78% 13 = 75-76% 12 = 73-74% 11 = 72% 10 = 71% 9 = 70% ----- New York State subject-specific Regents: Student performance results are on par with district created expectations and 70-84% of students met district expectations for Effective achievement. 17 = 83-84 points 16 = 81-82 points 15 = 79-80 points

14 = 77-78 points
 13 = 75-76 points
 12 = 73-74 points
 11 = 72 points
 10 = 71 points
 9 = 70 points

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

8 = 65-69%
 7 = 62-64%
 6 = 59-61%
 5 = 56-58%
 4 = 53-55%
 3 = 50-52%

New York State subject-specific Regents: Student performance results are below district created expectations and 50-69% of students met district expectations for Developing achievement.

8 = 65-69 points
 7 = 62-64 points
 6 = 59-61 points
 5 = 56-58 points
 4 = 53-55 points
 3 = 50-52 points

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

2 = 25-49%
 1 = 1-24%
 0 = 0%

New York State subject-specific Regents: Student performance results are far below district created expectations and 0-49% of students met district expectations for Ineffective achievement.

2 = 25-49 points
 1 = 1-24 points
 0 = 0 points

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	New York State Living Environment Regents Assessment
Earth Science	3) Teacher specific achievement or growth score computed locally	New York State Earth Science Regents Assessment
Chemistry	3) Teacher specific achievement or growth score computed locally	New York State Chemistry Regents Assessment

Physics	3) Teacher specific achievement or growth score computed locally	New York State Physics Regents Assessment
---------	--	---

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.

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.	District created achievement targets for HEDI points will be allocated to a teacher based on the average student scores on the appropriate grade level assessment, using HEDI Conversion Chart for LSM.
Highly Effective (18-20 points) Results are well above District- or BOCES-adopted expectations for growth or achievement for grade/subject.	20 = 95-100 points 19 = 90-94 points 18 = 85-89 points
Developing (3 - 8 points) Results are below District- or BOCES-adopted expectations for growth or achievement for grade/subject.	8 = 65-69 points 7 = 62-64 points 6 = 59-61 points 5 = 56-58 points 4 = 53-55 points 3 = 50-52 points
Effective (9 - 17points) Results meet District- or BOCES-adopted expectations for growth or achievement for grade/subject.	17 = 83-84 points 16 = 81-82 points 15 = 79-80 points 14 = 77-78 points 13 = 75-76 points 12 = 73-74 points 11 = 72 points 10 = 71 points 9 = 70 points
Ineffective (0 - 2 points) Results are well below District- or BOCES-adopted expectations for growth or achievement for grade/subject.	2 = 25-49 points 1 = 1-24 points 0 = 0 points

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	New York State Algebra 1 Regents Assessment
Geometry	3) Teacher specific achievement or growth score computed locally	New York State Geometry Regents Assessment

Algebra 2	3) Teacher specific achievement or growth score computed locally	New York State Algebra 2 Regents Assessment
-----------	--	---

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.	District created achievement targets for HEDI points will be allocated to a teacher based on the average student scores on the appropriate grade level assessment, using HEDI Conversion Chart for LSM.
Highly Effective (18 - 20 points) Results are well above District- or BOCES-adopted expectations for growth or achievement for grade/subject.	20 = 95-100 points 19 = 90-94 points 18 = 85-89 points
Effective (9 - 17 points) Results meet District- or BOCES-adopted expectations for growth or achievement for grade/subject.	17 = 83-84 points 16 = 81-82 points 15 = 79-80 points 14 = 77-78 points 13 = 75-76 points 12 = 73-74 points 11 = 72 points 10 = 71 points 9 = 70 points
Developing (3 - 8 points) Results are below District- or BOCES-adopted expectations for growth or achievement for grade/subject.	8 = 65-69 points 7 = 62-64 points 6 = 59-61 points 5 = 56-58 points 4 = 53-55 points 3 = 50-52 points
Ineffective (0 - 2 points) Results are well below District- or BOCES-adopted expectations for growth or achievement for grade/subject.	2 = 25-49 points 1 = 1-24 points 0 = 0 points

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	Alexandria Central School District-developed Grade 9 ELA Assessment
Grade 10 ELA	5) District, regional, or BOCES–developed assessments	Alexandria Central School District-developed Grade 10 ELA Assessment

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 this subcomponent. If needed, you may upload a table or graphic at 3.13, below.	District created achievement targets for HEDI points will be allocated to a teacher based on the average student scores on the appropriate grade level assessment, using HEDI Conversion Chart for LSM.
Highly Effective (18 - 20 points) Results are well above District- or BOCES-adopted expectations for growth or achievement for grade/subject.	<p>20 = 95-100% 19 = 90-94% 18 = 85-89%</p> <p>-----</p> <p>New York State subject-specific Regents: Student performance results are outstanding and 85-100% of students met district created expectations for Highly Effective achievement. 20 = 95-100 points 19 = 90-94 points 18 = 85-89 points</p>
Effective (9 - 17 points) Results meet District- or BOCES-adopted expectations for growth or achievement for grade/subject.	<p>17 = 83-84% 16 = 81-82% 15 = 79-80% 14 = 77-78% 13 = 75-76% 12 = 73-74% 11 = 72% 10 = 71% 9 = 70%</p> <p>-----</p> <p>New York State subject-specific Regents: Student performance results are on par with district created expectations and 70-84% of students met district expectations for Effective achievement. 17 = 83-84 points 16 = 81-82 points 15 = 79-80 points 14 = 77-78 points 13 = 75-76 points 12 = 73-74 points 11 = 72 points 10 = 71 points 9 = 70 points</p>
Developing (3 - 8 points) Results are below District- or BOCES-adopted expectations for growth or achievement for grade/subject.	<p>8 = 65-69% 7 = 62-64% 6 = 59-61%</p>

5 = 56-58%
 4 = 53-55%
 3 = 50-52%

New York State subject-specific Regents: Student performance results are below district created expectations and 50-69% of students met district expectations for Developing achievement.

8 = 65-69 points
 7 = 62-64 points
 6 = 59-61 points
 5 = 56-58 points
 4 = 53-55 points
 3 = 50-52 points

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

2 = 25-49%
 1 = 1-24%
 0 = 0%

New York State subject-specific Regents: Student performance results are far below district created expectations and 0-49% of students met district expectations for Ineffective achievement.

2 = 25-49 points
 1 = 1-24 points
 0 = 0 points

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
Occupational Math	5) District/regional/BOCES—developed	Alexandria Central School District-developed Occupational Math Assessment
Government 12	5) District/regional/BOCES—developed	Alexandria Central School District-developed Government 12 Assessment
Economics 12	5) District/regional/BOCES—developed	Alexandria Central School District-developed Economic 12 Assessment
Math 12	5) District/regional/BOCES—developed	Alexandria Central School District-developed Math 12 Assessment
Home Ec 7	5) District/regional/BOCES—developed	Alexandria Central School District-developed Home Ec 7 Assessment
Intro to French	5) District/regional/BOCES—developed	Alexandria Central School District-developed Intro to French Assessment

French I	5) District/regional/BOCES—develop ed	Alexandria Central School District-developed French I Assessment
French II	5) District/regional/BOCES—develop ed	Alexandria Central School District-developed French II Assessment
Art 8	5) District/regional/BOCES—develop ed	Alexandria Central School District-developed Grade 6-8 Art Assessment
Studio Art	5) District/regional/BOCES—develop ed	Alexandria Central School District-developed Commencement Art Assessment
Studio Printmaking	5) District/regional/BOCES—develop ed	Alexandria Central School District-developed Commencement Art Assessment
Computer Tech	5) District/regional/BOCES—develop ed	Alexandria Central School District-developed Computer Tech Assessment
SR High Health	5) District/regional/BOCES—develop ed	Alexandria Central School District-developed Commencement Health Assessment
Elementary Chorus	5) District/regional/BOCES—develop ed	Alexandria Central School District-developed Elem Choral Music Assessment
Select Chorus	5) District/regional/BOCES—develop ed	Alexandria Central School District-developed Commencement Choral Music Assessment
Tech 7	5) District/regional/BOCES—develop ed	Alexandria Central School District-developed Tech 7 Assessment
Grade 5 Band	5) District/regional/BOCES—develop ed	Alexandria Central School District-developed Beginning Instrumental Music Assessment
Grade 6 Band	5) District/regional/BOCES—develop ed	Alexandria Central School District-developed Beginning Instrumental Music Assessment
Concert Band	5) District/regional/BOCES—develop ed	Alexandria Central School District-developed Concert Band Assessment
All Courses Not Listed Above	5) District/regional/BOCES—develop ed	Alexandria Central School District-developed subject- and grade-specific 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.	District created achievement targets for HEDI points will be allocated to a teacher based on the average student scores on the appropriate grade level assessment, using HEDI Conversion Chart for LSM.
Highly Effective (18 - 20 points) Results are well above District- or BOCES -adopted expectations for growth or achievement for grade/subject.	20 = 95-100% 19 = 90-94% 18 = 85-89%
Effective (9 - 17 points) Results meet District- or BOCES-adopted expectations for growth or achievement for grade/subject.	17 = 83-84% 16 = 81-82% 15 = 79-80% 14 = 77-78% 13 = 75-76% 12 = 73-74% 11 = 72% 10 = 71% 9 = 70%
Developing (3 - 8 points) Results are below District- or BOCES-adopted expectations for growth or achievement for grade/subject.	8 = 65-69% 7 = 62-64% 6 = 59-61% 5 = 56-58% 4 = 53-55% 3 = 50-52%
Ineffective (0 - 2 points) Results are well below District- or BOCES-adopted expectations for growth or achievement for grade/subject.	2 = 25-49% 1 = 1-24% 0 = 0%

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/5139/128507-y92vNseFa4/HEDI Conversion Charts for LSM_1.pdf](#)

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.

Adjustments for teachers that have Students with Disabilities, English language learners or students in poverty in their class will be made if the students in those categories reach the threshold. Elementary classroom teachers in grades K-6 who teach in a co-teaching model with students with disabilities assigned to their class will receive an additional two (2) points on the HEDI scale. Secondary teachers who teach grade 7-12 who have 20% or more students with disabilities enrolled in their class will receive an additional two (2) points on the HEDI scale. Teachers who teach grades K-12 with 20% of more of their class enrollment consisting of English language learners or students in poverty will receive an additional two (2) points on the HEDI scale. The maximum number of points for any teacher is two (2) points, even if the teacher qualifies for more than one of the adjustment factors. The adjustments for teachers who teach students with disabilities, English language learners and/or students in poverty according to the thresholds will be made because the academic history of students in these categories show that they perform lower than their peers who do not fall into these

categories.

Class assignments will take into account all students, including students with disabilities, English language learners and students in poverty and class assignments will not be made as an incentive associated with the adjustment factors. All enrolled students, in accordance with teacher of record policies, will be included and no students will be excluded when calculating teacher HEDI ratings. The application of locally developed controls will be rigorous, fair, and transparent and the procedures for ensuring data accuracy and integrity are being used.

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.

For a teacher with multiple measures to determine the HEDI score each measure will be weighted proportionally based on the number of students within each measure to arrive at one HEDI score for that teacher.

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 Friday, May 11, 2012

Updated Thursday, December 06, 2012

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	0
Observations by trained in-school peer teachers	0
Feedback from students using State-approved survey tool	0
Feedback from parents/caregivers using State-approved survey tool	0
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.

Multiple Measures of Effectiveness Point Allocation

Tenured Teacher Evaluation

- *Announced Observation** = 35 points (58% of MME)
- *Unannounced Observation** = 5 points (8% of MME)
- *Evidence Folder* = 5 points (8% of MME)
- *Summative Evaluation*** = 15 points (25% of MME)

Non-Tenured Teacher Evaluation

- *Announced Observation 1** = 15 points (25% of MME)
- *Announced Observation 2** = 15 points (25% of MME)
- *Unannounced Observation** = 10 points (16% of MME)
- *Evidence Folder* = 5 points (8% of MME)
- *Summative Evaluation*** = 15 points (25% of MME)

** (Assessed using Danielson's Appendix A: The Framework for Teaching (Revised Edition 2011), Domains 1-3)*

*** (Assessed using Danielson's Appendix A: The Framework for Teaching (Revised Edition 2011), Domain 4)*

Observations Defined

- *An announced observation is an evaluation, utilizing Danielson's Appendix A: The Framework for Teaching (Revised Edition 2011), of a pre-determined instructional block, which will include a pre-observation conference and a post-observation conference.*
- *An unannounced observation is an evaluation, utilizing Danielson's Appendix A: The Framework for Teaching (Revised Edition 2011), of an instructional block, which will include a post-observation conference.*

Danielson Rating with Numerical Values correlated to NYS HEDI Ratings

- *Unsatisfactory = 0-1 (Ineffective: performance is well below average)*
 - *Basic = 2 (Developing: performance is below average)*
 - *Proficient = 3 (Effective: performance is average)*
 - *Distinguished = 4 (Highly Effective: performance is above average)*
- *In order to calculate a score for the Announced and/or Unannounced Observation(s), the administrator evaluator will average the raw tally of points earned for measured domains indicated on the Danielson Rubric, Domains 1-3. When calculating the average score for each domain measured, the administrator evaluator will tally the raw points earned (0-4 points possible) in all subcomponents measured and divide the sum by the number of subcomponents measured in order to determine a domain average score out of 4. (i.e., If a teacher scores a raw tally of 18 points in Domain 1, the subcomponent average will be determined by dividing 18 by 6, which is the number of subcomponents, in order to determine an average value of 3.) The average values for domains measured will be recorded on the Multiple Measures of Effectiveness Workbook (live excel file). Within the MME Workbook the domain average scores are multiplied by assigned weighted percentages in order to calculate a score, out of 60 points, that will be used to determine the teacher's Composite Effectiveness Score and subsequent New York State HEDI Rating. Weighted scores are applied to a MME conversion chart.*
- *Tenured teachers will have one Announced Observation and one Unannounced Observation completed by May 1.*
 - *Non-tenured teachers will have a minimum of two Announced Observations and one Unannounced Observation. At least one observation will be completed by December 15. The total number of observations will be at the administration's discretion.*

Announced Classroom Observation Procedures

- 1. Teachers will be notified at the commencement of the school year, by the administration, of the timeframes available for scheduling Announced Classroom Observations. The Announced Classroom Observation Form will be made available.*
- 2. Announced Classroom Observations will be scheduled in conjunction with the administrator and the teacher at reasonably-spaced intervals.*
- 3. Pre-observation conferences will be scheduled prior to each Announced Classroom Observation. The pre-observation conference will allow the administrator and teacher to discuss the ensuing lesson. The teacher will submit the Pre-Observation Conference form no later than two school days prior to the pre-observation conference.*
- 4. A post-observation conference will be scheduled by the administrator within five school days of the Announced Classroom Observation. The purpose of the post-observation is to discuss the details of the observed lesson. The teacher will be given the completed evaluation rubric at the post-observation conference. The teacher will have the opportunity to include a written response within two school days of the post-observation conference.*
- 5. The administrator and the teacher will sign the evaluation form as evidence of having reviewed it and having had the observation and conference. The teacher's signature on the evaluation report does not in any way signify agreement with the evaluation, and the administrator's signature does not signify agreement with the teacher's rebuttal, if any.*
- 6. The signed evaluation report, including any comments, will then be placed into the teacher's personnel folder.*

7. The teacher will be given a copy of the evaluation report for his/her own personal use.

8. A tenured teacher may request a second announced observation. This request must be made in writing no later than March 15th to the lead evaluator. At the conclusion of the observation cycle, the highest observation score will be used, with the lowest score dropped.

Unannounced Observation Procedures

1. The administrator will complete the Classroom Observation Form during the observation. The Classroom Observation Form will be made available.

2. A post-observation conference will be scheduled by the administrator within five school days of the Unannounced Classroom Observation. The purpose of the post-observation is to discuss the details of the observed lesson.

3. The teacher will be given the completed evaluation rubric no later than two days following the post-observation conference. The teacher will have the opportunity to include a written response within two school days of receiving the completed evaluation rubric.

4. The administrator and the teacher will sign the evaluation form as evidence of having reviewed it and having had the observation and conference. The teacher's signature on the evaluation report does not in any way signify agreement with the evaluation, and the administrator's signature does not signify agreement with the teacher's rebuttal, if any.

5. The signed evaluation report, including any comments, will then be placed into the teacher's personnel folder.

6. The teacher will be given a copy of the evaluation report for his/her own personal use.

Summative Evaluation

- An evaluation, utilizing Danielson's Framework for Teaching (2011) rubric focusing on Professional Responsibilities (Domain 4), will take place in May or June of each school year.

- In order to calculate a score for the Summative Evaluation score, the administrator evaluator will average the raw tally of points earned for Domain 4 indicated on the Summative Evaluation Form (Appendix D). When calculating the average score for Domain 4, the administrator evaluator will tally the raw points earned (0-4 points possible) in all subcomponents measured and divide the sum by the number of subcomponents measured in order to determine a domain average score out of 4. (i.e., if a teacher scores a raw tally of 18 points in Domain 4, the subcomponent average will be determined by dividing 18 by, which is the number of subcomponents, in order to determine an average value of 3.) The average values for domains measured will be recorded on the Multiple Measures of Effectiveness Workbook. Within the MME Workbook the domain average scores are multiplied by assigned weighted percentages in order to calculate a score, out of 60 points, that will be used to determine the teacher's Composite Effectiveness Score and subsequent New York State HEDI Rating. Weighted scores are applied to a MME conversion chart.

Summative Evaluation Procedures

1. The teacher will submit a self-evaluation to the building administrator utilizing the Summative Evaluation Form by May 1.

2. The administrator will schedule a meeting during the months of May or June to complete the summative evaluation.

3. When available, the teacher will receive his/her Teacher Composite Effectiveness Score. The teacher and administrator will initial and date to signify review of the Teacher Composite Effectiveness Score.

4. The administrator and the teacher will sign the Summative Evaluation Form as evidence of having reviewed it and having had the conference. The teacher's signature on the Summative Evaluation Form does not, in any way, signify agreement with the evaluation, and the administrator's signature does not signify agreement with the teacher's rebuttal, if any. If a rebuttal is submitted by the teacher or the administrator, it must be submitted within two days of the summative evaluation conference and will be affixed to the Summative Evaluation Form.

5. The signed Summative Evaluation Form, including any comments and/or rebuttal, will then be placed into the teacher's personnel folder.

6. The teacher will be given a copy of the Summative Evaluation Form for his/her own personal use.

The Evidence Folder

- The Evidence Folder's contents will include teacher-created assessments (which may include midterm examinations, final

examinations, projects, and unit tests), assessment data, data reflections, lesson plans (on Announced Observation lesson[s]), summative self-evaluation, and other applicable artifacts to provide evidence in support of the summative evaluation.

- In order to calculate the raw score out of 4 possible points, the evaluator will review the applicable artifacts submitted by the teacher and assign a maximum of one point for each category listed in the Evidence Folder Checklist. The raw score will be recorded on the MME Workbook.

Evidence Folder Procedures

- Teachers will maintain an evidence folder, which must be maintained and finalized in time for the Summative Evaluation meeting. The Evidence Folder coversheet will be made available.
- The evaluator will assign 0-4 raw points; one point is to be awarded for the compilation of artifacts for each category that is listed on the Evidence Folder Checklist. Zero points will be given when no evidence is provided. After a raw score of 0-4 is tabulated, the determined value will be weighted as a percent of the 60 points for MME (8% of 60 points is equal to 5 points), and applied to the MME Workbook to determine a value out of 60 points that will be used to calculate the CES.

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/5091/128582-eka9yMJ855/Multiple Measures Workbook_2.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.	The overall performance and results exceed NYS Teaching Standards. The teacher scored 59-60 points or higher on the Other Measures of Effectiveness.
Effective: Overall performance and results meet NYS Teaching Standards.	The overall performance and results meet NYS Teaching Standards. The teacher scored 57-58 points or higher on the Other Measures of Effectiveness.
Developing: Overall performance and results need improvement in order to meet NYS Teaching Standards.	The overall performance and results need improvement in order to meet NYS Teaching Standards. The teacher scored 50-56 points or higher on the Other Measures of Effectiveness.
Ineffective: Overall performance and results do not meet NYS Teaching Standards.	The overall performance and results do not meet NYS Teaching Standards. The teacher scored 0-49 points or higher on the Other Measures of Effectiveness.

Provide the ranges for the 60-point scoring bands.

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

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	3
4.6) Observations of Probationary Teachers Informal/Short	0
4.6) Observations of Probationary Teachers Enter Total	3

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?

-
- Not Applicable
-

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	2
4.7) Observations of Tenured Teachers Informal/Short	0
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?

-
- Not Applicable
-

5. Composite Scoring (Teachers)

Created Friday, May 11, 2012

Updated Wednesday, October 24, 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 Friday, May 11, 2012

Updated Monday, November 26, 2012

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/5265/128577-Df0w3Xx5v6/ACS Teacher Improvement Plan Form.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:

Teachers may appeal a Composite Effectiveness Score (CES) of "developing" or "ineffective" and the issuance and implementation of a Teacher Improvement Plan for such ratings.

What may be challenged in an appeal? The scope of appeals under Education law 3012-c shall be limited to the following subjects:

1. The School District's adherence to the standards and methodologies required for such reviews, pursuant to Education Law 3012-c;
2. The adherence to the Commissioner's regulations, as applicable to such review;
3. Compliance with any applicable locally negotiated procedures applicable to Annual Professional Performance Reviews for Teacher Improvement Plans; and
4. The School District's issuance and/or implementation of the terms of the Teacher Improvement Plan under Education Law 3012-c.

Prohibition against more than one appeal: A teacher may not file multiple appeals regarding the same APPR/CES or Teacher Improvement Plan. All grounds for appeal must be raised with specificity within one appeal. Any grounds not raised at the time the appeal is filed shall be deemed null and void.

Burden of proof: In an appeal, the teacher or administration has the burden of demonstrating a clear and legal right to the relief requested and the burden of establishing the facts upon which petitioner seeks relief.

Timeframe for filing an appeal: All appeals of the composite effectiveness score must be submitted in writing two (2) school days from the date when the teacher receives such a rating. The failure to file an appeal within this timeframe shall be deemed a waiver of the right to appeal, and the appeal shall be deemed abandoned.

Result of appeal may include:

- A new evaluation of the measure referenced in the appeal, in accordance with herein described procedure.
- Sustaining or upholding the original rating.

1. Appeal to Administrator:

A. Teacher e-mails his/her administrator in response to the contested rating, two (2) school days from when the rating was received in order to schedule a meeting. The teacher will submit in this e-mail:

- a detailed written description of the specific area(s) of disagreement over his/her performance review
- the performance review documents being challenged
- any additional documents or materials relevant to the appeal

B. Within two (2) school days from the receipt of the appeal, the administrator will contact the teacher to schedule a meeting to discuss the rating as outlined above. The meeting must occur within five (5) school days.

C. Following the meeting, the teacher may submit additional documents to the administrator two (2) school days from the date of the meeting.

D. The administrator notifies the teacher of the decision in writing no sooner than two (2) school days, but no more than four (4) school days from the date of the meeting.

2. Appeal to Review Team:

A. If the appeal is not resolved, five (5) school days from the administrator's decision, the teacher may submit the documentation described in "Appeals Procedure" 1.A.-1.D. to the Superintendent. Five (5) school days from the submission of documents, the Superintendent will then convene a review team consisting of a Superintendent designee (excluding the evaluating administrator) and two ACFA-designated teachers (excluding the evaluated teacher). The role of the review team will be to evaluate facts and evidence submitted by the teacher. All discussion will remain confidential. The review team will notify the teacher, the administrator and the Superintendent of the review team's decision in writing within two school days from having been convened using the Review Team Form.

B. Appeal to Superintendent: If the appeal is not resolved, within three school days from the receipt of the response from the review team in Step Two (2A), the teacher may re-submit the documentation presented in Step Two (2A) to the Superintendent. The Superintendent will then convene a hearing to be adjudicated by a neutral district level administrator from the Jefferson-Lewis BOCES within five (5) school days. The neutral district level administrator will render a final decision and will notify the teacher and administrator in writing within three (3) school days from having convened the hearing.

C. The teacher may submit a rebuttal to the neutral district level administrator's decision within five (5) school days to the Alexandria Central Superintendent. The rebuttal will be placed with the Annual Professional Performance Review evaluation in the teacher's personnel file.

The decision(s) shall set forth the reasons and factual basis for each determination on each of the specific issues raised in the teacher's appeal.

Exclusivity of section 3012-c appeal procedure: The 3012-c appeal procedure shall constitute the exclusive means for initiating, reviewing and resolving any and all challenges and appeals related to a teacher Annual Professional Performance Review and/or Teacher Improvement Plan. A teacher may not resort to any other contractual grievance procedures for the resolution of challenges and appeals related to an Annual Professional Performance Review and/or Teacher Improvement Plan.

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.

The District will ensure that all Evaluators/Lead Evaluators are properly trained and certified to complete an individual's performance review. This includes all certified administrators who typically conduct evaluations of teachers and the Superintendent who evaluates principals and other administrators. Evaluator training will be conducted by appropriately qualified individuals or entities. Evaluator training will be based upon the recommended SED model certification process.

The Superintendent will certify lead evaluators upon receipt of proper documentation that the individual has fully completed training. The district will maintain records of certification of evaluators.

Evaluator training will occur regionally in cooperation with Jefferson-Lewis BOCES. Evaluators will attend this BOCES training throughout the year at a duration as offered by Jefferson-Lewis BOCES. Certified evaluators will be monitored and re-certified on a periodic basis to be determined by the district in collaboration with Alexandria Central Faculty Association (ACFA).

The District will establish a process to maintain inter-rater reliability over time in accordance with NYSED guidance and protocols recommended in training for certified evaluators. The District anticipates that these protocols will include measures such as: data analysis, periodic comparisons of assessments/paired observation, and/or annual calibration sessions. In the case of evaluators who are conditionally or not-yet-certified the district will provide ongoing support and training.

This training will include the following Requirements for Certified Evaluators/Certified Lead Evaluators:

- *New York State Teaching Standards*
- *Evidence-based observations*
- *Application and use of Student Growth Percentile and/or Value Added Growth Model data*
- *Application and use of the State-approved teacher or principal rubrics*
- *Application and use of any assessment tools used to evaluate teachers and principals*
- *Application and use of State-approved locally selected measures of student achievement*
- *Use of Statewide instruction Reporting System*
- *Scoring methodology used to evaluate teachers and principals/Specific considerations in evaluating teachers and principals of ELLS, students with disabilities, and needs of an economically disadvantaged population that was identified as the seventh most economically disadvantaged based upon the total population of students living in households below the poverty line.*

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 Monday, May 14, 2012

Updated Wednesday, October 17, 2012

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):

PK-6
7-12
(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.	(No response)
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.

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; Alexandria Central School reserves the right to utilize any and all of these measures to account for the needs of an economically disadvantaged population that was identified as the seventh most economically disadvantaged based upon the total population of students living in households below the poverty line.

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 Monday, May 14, 2012

Updated Wednesday, December 05, 2012

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-6	(d) measures used by district for teacher evaluation	Percentage of students showing increase from year to year on 4-6 ELA and Math State assessments
7-12	(d) measures used by district for teacher evaluation	Percentage of students showing increase from year to year on 7-8 ELA and Math State Assessments; and percent of students grades 9-12 taking Regents exams (Integrated Algebra, Comprehensive English, Global Studies, United States History and Government, and Living Environment) who score 70 points or better.

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.

<p>Use this box, if needed, to describe the process for assigning HEDI categories. If needed, you may upload a table or graphic below.</p>	<p>K-6: A baseline will be established using the previous years grades 3-5 New York State assessment in ELA and Math data. Current year assessment results in grades 4-6 ELA and Math will be compared to the baseline data to determine measured growth. HEDI points will be allocated to a principal based on the percentage of students showing growth.</p> <p>7-12: Growth via State Assessment - A baseline will be established using the previous years grades 6-7 New York State assessment in ELA and Math data. Current year assessment results in grades 7-8 ELA and Math will be compared to the baseline data to determine measured growth. HEDI points will be allocated to a principal based</p>
--	--

on the percentage of students showing growth.

Achievement via Regents Examination - Percent of students achieving 70 points or better on current year assessment results in Integrated Algebra, Comprehensive English, Global Studies, United States History and Government, and Living Environment.

7-12 Growth and Achievement scores will be weighted proportionally

Highly Effective (14 - 15 points) Results are well above District- or BOCES-adopted expectations for growth or achievement for grade/subject.

Student performance results are outstanding with 85-100% of students meeting school wide adopted expectations for Highly Effective achievement.
15 = 93-100%
14 = 85-92%

Effective (8- 13 points) Results meet District- or BOCES-adopted expectations for growth or achievement for grade/subject.

Student performance results are on par with school wide expectations with 70-84% of students meeting expectations for Effective achievement.
13 = 83-84%
12 = 81-82%
11 = 78-80%
10 = 75-77%
9 = 72-74%
8 = 70-71%

Developing (3 - 7 points) Results are below District- or BOCES-adopted expectations for growth or achievement for grade/subject.

Student performance results are below school wide expectations with 50-69% of students meeting expectations for Developing achievement.
7 = 65-69%
6 = 60-64%
5 = 56-59%
4 = 53-55%
3 = 50-52%

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

Student performance results are far below district expectations with 0-49% of students meeting expectations for Ineffective achievement.
2 = 25-49%
1 = 1-24%
0 = 0%

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/5366/129234-qBFVOWF7fC/Alexandria Central School District Principal LSM Rubric.docx

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.	There are only 2 principals and both will have HEDI scores from the State on the first 25, so this is not applicable.
Highly Effective (18 - 20 points) Results are well above District- or BOCES-adopted expectations for growth or achievement for grade/subject.	(No response)
Effective (9- 17 points) Results meet District- or BOCES-adopted expectations for growth or achievement for grade/subject.	(No response)
Developing (3 - 8 points) Results are below District- or BOCES-adopted expectations for growth or achievement for grade/subject.	(No response)
Ineffective (0 - 2 points) Results are well below District- or BOCES-adopted expectations for growth or achievement for grade/subject.	(No response)

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.

Adjustments for principals who have Students with Disabilities, English language learners or students in poverty in their schools will be made if the students in those categories reach the following thresholds. Principals with 20% or more of their school enrollment consisting of students with disabilities or 20% or more English language learners or 20% or more students in poverty will receive an additional two (2) points on the HEDI scale. The maximum number of points for any principal is two (2) points, even if the principal has more than one of the adjustment factors. The adjustments for principals who have students with disabilities, English language learners and/or students in poverty according to the thresholds will be made because the academic history of students in these categories show that they perform lower than their peers who do not fall into these categories.

All enrolled students, in accordance with teacher of record policies, will be included and no students will be excluded when calculating principal HEDI ratings. The application of locally developed controls will be rigorous, fair, and transparent and the procedures for ensuring data accuracy and integrity are being used.

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.

Where more than one locally selected measure is required the locally selected measures will be averaged for the administrator(s) weighted proportionally and placed in the appropriate HEDI scoring bands described in parts 8.1 8.2.

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, May 14, 2012

Updated Thursday, December 06, 2012

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.

Multidimensional Principal Performance Rubric (60 points possible)

Domain 1 - Shared Vision of Learning (0-10 points possible)

Domain 2 - School Culture and Instructional Program (0-10 points possible)

Domain 3 - Safe, Efficient, Effective Learning Environment (0-10 points possible)

Domain 4 - Community (0-10 points possible)

Domain 5 - Integrity, Fairness, Ethics (0-10 points possible)

Domain 6 - Political, Social, Economic, Legal and Cultural Context (0-10 points possible)

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/5143/129237-pMADJ4gk6R/Other Measures of Effectiveness - Principal Performance Rubric.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.	Highly Effective shall receive a total point value for all six domain/subdomains 55-60 points
Effective: Overall performance and results meet standards.	Effective shall receive a total point value for all six domain/subdomains- 35-54 points
Developing: Overall performance and results need improvement in order to meet standards.	Developing shall receive a total point value for all six domain/subdomains - 11-34 points
Ineffective: Overall performance and results do not meet standards.	Ineffective shall receive a total point value for all six domain/subdomains - 0-10 points

Please provide the locally-negotiated 60 point scoring bands.

Highly Effective	55-60
Effective	35-54
Developing	11-34
Ineffective	0-10

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	2
By trained administrator	0
By trained independent evaluator	0
Enter Total	2

Tenured Principals

By supervisor	2
By trained administrator	0
By trained independent evaluator	0
Enter Total	2

10. Composite Scoring (Principals)

Created Monday, May 14, 2012

Updated Thursday, December 06, 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	55-60
Effective	35-54
Developing	11-34
Ineffective	0-10

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 Monday, May 14, 2012

Updated Monday, November 26, 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/5276/129242-Df0w3Xx5v6/ACS Principal Improvement Plan Form.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:

TIME FRAME FOR FILING THE APPEAL

All appeals must be filed in writing no later than 20 calendar days after the date on which the principal receives his/her final and complete annual professional performance review. The act of mailing the appeal shall constitute filing.

If a principal is challenging the issuance of a principal improvement plan, appeals must be filed within 15 business days of issuance of

such plan.

The failure to file an appeal within these time frames shall be deemed a waiver of the right to appeal and the appeal shall be deemed abandoned. Receipt shall mean personal receipt of a final and full APPR document.

When filing an appeal, the principal must submit a written description of the specific areas of disagreement over his or her performance review or the issuance and/or implementation of the terms of his or her improvement plan. Any additional documents or materials relevant to the appeal must be provided by the school district upon request for same. The performance review and/or improvement plan being challenged must also be submitted with the appeal. Any information not submitted at the time the appeal is filed shall not be considered.

TIME FRAME FOR SCHOOL DISTRICT RESPONSE

Within 20 calendar days of receipt of an appeal, the school district must submit a detailed written response to the appeal. The response must include all additional documents or written materials relevant to the point(s) of disagreement that support the school district's response. Any such information that is not submitted at the time the response is filed shall not be considered on behalf of the school district in the deliberations related to the resolution of the appeal. The principal initiating the appeal shall receive a copy of the response filed by the school district and all additional information submitted with the response at the same time the school district files its response.

In no event shall the appeals process take more than 40 calendar days.

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.

The District will ensure that all Evaluators/Lead Evaluators are properly trained and certified to complete an individual's performance review. This includes all certified administrators who typically conduct evaluations of teachers and the Superintendent who evaluates principals and other administrators. Evaluator training will be conducted by appropriately qualified individuals or entities. Evaluator training will be based upon the recommended SED model certification process.

The Superintendent will certify lead evaluators upon receipt of proper documentation that the individual has fully completed training. The district will maintain records of certification of evaluators.

Evaluator training will occur regionally in cooperation with Jefferson-Lewis BOCES. Evaluators will attend this BOCES training throughout the year at a duration as offered by Jefferson-Lewis BOCES. Certified evaluators will be monitored and re-certified on a periodic basis to be determined by the district in collaboration with Alexandria Central Administrators.

The District will establish a process to maintain inter-rater reliability over time in accordance with NYSED guidance and protocols recommended in training for certified evaluators. The District anticipates that these protocols will include measures such as: data analysis, periodic comparisons of assessments/paired observation, and/or annual calibration sessions. In the case of evaluators who are conditionally or not-yet-certified the district will provide ongoing support and training.

This training will include the following Requirements for Certified Evaluators/Certified Lead Evaluators:

- *New York State Teaching Standards*
- *Evidence-based observations*
- *Application and use of Student Growth Percentile and/or Value Added Growth Model data*
- *Application and use of the State-approved teacher or principal rubrics*
- *Application and use of any assessment tools used to evaluate teachers and principals*
- *Application and use of State-approved locally selected measures of student achievement*
- *Use of Statewide instruction Reporting System*
- *Scoring methodology used to evaluate teachers and principals/Specific considerations in evaluating teachers and principals of ELLS, students with disabilities, and needs of an economically disadvantaged population that was identified as the seventh most economically disadvantaged based upon the total population of students living in households below the poverty line.*

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 Friday, May 11, 2012

Updated Thursday, December 06, 2012

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/5581/128566-3Uqgn5g9Iu/JointcertAPPR120612.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.

HEDI Conversion Chart for SLO

HEDI	Target Goal	
20	95-100	
19	90-94	Highly Effective
18	85-89	
17	83-84	
16	81-82	
15	79-80	
14	77-78	
13	75-76	Effective
12	73-74	
11	72	
10	71	
9	70	
8	65-69	
7	62-64	
6	59-61	Developing
5	56-58	
4	53-55	
3	50-52	
2	25-49	Ineffective
1	1-24	
0	0	

STAR Enterprise SGP to HEDI (Value Added)

* Based on scoring bands suggested by Renaissance Learning Inc.

HEDI	Target Goal	
15	81-99	Highly Effective
14	61-80	
13	57-60	Effective
12	53-56	
11	49-52	
10	46-48	
9	43-45	
8	41-42	Developing
7	35-40	
6	30-34	
5	27-29	
4	24-26	Ineffective
3	21-23	
2	11-20	
1	2-10	
0	1	

STAR Enterprise SGP to HEDI (Non-Value Added)

* Based on scoring bands suggested by Renaissance Learning Inc.

HEDI	STAR	
20	86-99	
19	74-85	Highly Effective
18	61-73	
17	58-60	
16	56-57	
15	54-55	
14	52-53	
13	50-51	Effective
12	48-49	
11	46-47	
10	44-45	
9	41-43	
8	37-40	
7	33-36	
6	30-32	Developing
5	25-29	
4	23-24	
3	21-22	
2	11-20	
1	2-10	Ineffective
0	1	

HEDI Conversion Chart for LSM

HEDI	Target Goal	
20	95-100	Highly Effective
19	90-94	
18	85-89	
17	83-84	Effective
16	81-82	
15	79-80	
14	77-78	
13	75-76	
12	73-74	
11	72	Developing
10	71	
9	70	
8	65-69	
7	62-64	
6	59-61	Ineffective
5	56-58	
4	53-55	
3	50-52	
2	25-49	
1	1-24	
0	0	

Multiple Measures Workbook (60 Points)

Tenured Teacher Rubric

Teacher: _____

Grade/Subject: _____

HEDI Rating	Multiple Measures Subtotal	60 point distribution for Composite Effectiveness Score
Ineffective	1-1.4	0-49
Developing	1.5-2.4	50-56.3
Effective	2.5-3.4	57-58.8
Highly Effective	3.5-4	59-60

Rubric Score to Sub-Component (Weighted Formula)

I) Announced Observation

(Domain 1 Average _____ + Domain 2 Average _____ + Domain 3 Average _____)/3 = Raw Score _____

Raw Score _____ X .58 = _____

II) Unannounced Observation

(Domain 2 Average _____ + Domain 3 Average _____)/2 = Raw Score _____

Raw Score _____ X .08 = _____

III) Summative Evaluation

Domain 4 Average _____ = Raw Score _____

Raw Score _____ X .25 = _____

IV) Evidence Folder

Raw Score _____ X .08 = _____

Multiple Measures Subtotal

MM Subtotal = _____

Teacher's Signature _____ Date _____

Administrator's Signature _____ Date _____

MM Conversion Chart

Subtotal	Conversion
1	0
1.1	12
1.2	25
1.3	37
1.4	49
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
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
3.5	59
3.6	59.3
3.7	59.5
3.8	59.8
3.9	60
4	60

Standard rules of rounding apply

Multiple Measures Workbook (60 Points)

Non-Tenured Teacher Rubric

Teacher: _____

Grade/Subject: _____

HEDI Rating	Multiple Measures Subtotal	60 point distribution for Composite Effectiveness Score
Ineffective	1-1.4	0-49
Developing	1.5-2.4	50-56.3
Effective	2.5-3.4	57-58.8
Highly Effective	3.5-4	59-60

Rubric Score to Sub-Component (Weighted Formula)

I) 1st Announced Observation

(Domain 1 Average _____ + Domain 2 Average _____ + Domain 3 Average _____)/3 = Raw Score _____

Raw Score _____ X .25 = _____

II) 2nd Announced Observation

(Domain 1 Average _____ + Domain 2 Average _____ + Domain 3 Average _____)/3 = Raw Score _____

Raw Score _____ X .25 = _____

III) Unannounced Observation

(Domain 2 Average _____ + Domain 3 Average _____)/2 = Raw Score _____

Raw Score _____ X .16 = _____

IV) Summative Evaluation

Domain 4 Average _____ = Raw Score _____

Raw Score _____ X .25 = _____

V) Evidence Folder

Raw Score _____ X .08 = _____

Multiple Measures Subtotal

MM Subtotal = _____

Teacher's Signature _____

Date _____

Administrator's Signature _____ Date _____

MM Conversion Chart

Subtotal	Conversion
1	0
1.1	12
1.2	25
1.3	37
1.4	49
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
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
3.5	59
3.6	59.3
3.7	59.5
3.8	59.8
3.9	60
4	60

Standard rules of rounding apply

Alexandria Central School District Principal

Locally Selected Measures of Student Achievement or Growth

Percentage of students showing increase from year to year on 4-6 ELA and Math State assessments or percentage of students showing increase from year to year on 7-8 ELA and Math State Assessments; and percent of students grades 9-12 taking Regents exams (Integrated Algebra, Comprehensive English, Global Studies, United States History and Government, and Living Environment) who score 70 points or better.

Value Added Model

Highly Effective		Effective						Developing					Ineffective		
15	14	13	12	11	10	9	8	7	6	5	4	3	2	1	0
93-100	85-92	83-84	81-82	78-80	75-77	72-74	70-71	65-69	60-64	56-59	53-55	50-52	25-49	1-24	0

Other Measures of Effectiveness Multidimensional Principal Performance Rubric

Circle the point total in each domain that most effectively reflects the performance of the principal. Add the total number of points to yield one total score for Other Measures of Effective. The lowest possible score is 0 and the highest is 60.

Domain 1- Shared Vision of Learning (10)

Ineffective in creating a shared vision	Need to improve in creating a shared vision of learning	A strong performance in creating a shared vision of learning	An exemplary performance in creating a shared vision of learning
0	1	2	3
4	5	6	7
8	9	10	

Domain 2- School Culture and Instruction Program (10)

Ineffective in creating a positive school culture and instructional program	Need to improve in creating a positive school culture and instructional program	A strong performance in creating a positive school culture and instructional program	An exemplary performance in creating a positive school culture and instructional program
0	1	2	3
4	5	6	7
8	9	10	

Domain 3- Safe, Efficient, Effective Learning Environment (10)

Ineffective in creating a safe, efficient and effective learning environment	Need to improve in creating a safe, efficient and effective learning environment	A strong performance in creating a safe, efficient and effective learning environment	An exemplary performance in creating a safe, efficient and effective learning environment
0	1	2	3
4	5	6	7
8	9	10	

Domain 4- Community (10)

Ineffective in creating a sense of school community	Need to improve the sense of school community	A strong sense of school community	An exemplary sense of school Community
0	1	2	3
4	5	6	7
8	9	10	

Domain 5- Integrity, Fairness, Ethics (10)

Ineffective in reflecting integrity, fairness and ethics	Need to improve integrity, fairness and ethics	A strong sense of integrity, fairness and ethics	An exemplary sense of integrity, fairness and ethics							
0	1	2	3	4	5	6	7	8	9	10

Domain 6- Political, Social, Economic, Legal and Cultural Context (10)

Ineffective In reflecting and creating a political, social, economic, legal and cultural context	Need to improve In reflecting and creating a political, social, economic, legal and cultural context	A strong performance in reflecting and creating a political, social, economic, legal and cultural context	An exemplary performance In reflecting and creating a political, social, economic, legal and cultural context							
0	1	2	3	4	5	6	7	8	9	10

TOTAL NUMBER OF POINTS: _____

0-60 POSSIBLE

RATINGS:

55-60 Highly Effective

35-54 Effective

11-34 Developing

0-10 Ineffective

Principal's Signature _____ Date _____

Evaluator's Signature _____ Date _____

Alexandria Central School District

Teacher Improvement Plan

Teacher:

Administrator:

Date:

Area for Improvement	Measurable Goals for Improvement	Observable Strategies for Improvement & Supports	Who is Responsible?	Timeline	Date Goal Satisfied (Administrator must initial)

Anticipated Duration (not more than one school year):

Teacher's Signature _____ Date _____

Administrator's Signature _____ Date _____

Alexandria Central School District

Principal Improvement Plan

Principal:

Evaluator:

Date:

SPECIFIC AREAS FOR IMPROVEMENT	EXPECTED OUTCOMES OF THE PIP	RESOURCES	RESPONSIBILITIES	EVIDENCE OF ACHIEVEMENT	TIMELINE

Anticipated Duration (not more than one school year):

Principal's Signature _____ Date _____

Evaluator's Signature _____ Date _____

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:

Robert B. Wagoner, Jr. 12-6-12

Teachers Union President Signature: Date:

Robert D. Baseman, Jr. 12-6-12

Administrative Union President Signature: Date:

Samuel J. [Signature] 12-6-12

Board of Education President Signature: Date:

Stephen J. [Signature] 12/6/12