



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

November 30, 2012

Thomas F. Perillo, Superintendent
Amsterdam City School District
11 Liberty Street
Amsterdam, NY 12010

Dear Superintendent Perillo:

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: Patrick Michel

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 Friday, June 29, 2012

Updated Thursday, November 29, 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 : 270100010000

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

27010001000

1.2) School District Name: AMSTERDAM CITY SD

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

Amsterdam City SD

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.

Not applicable

1.4) Award Classification

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

-
- School Innovation Fund Round 2 (NYSED)
-

- Systemic Supports for District and School Turnaround (NYSESED)
- Undergraduate Clinically Rich Teacher Preparation Pilot Programs RFP (NYSESED)

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 Friday, June 29, 2012

Updated Tuesday, November 27, 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 | District, regional, or BOCES-developed assessment | WSWHE BOCES-developed – NYS ELA K-assessment |
| 1 | District, regional, or BOCES-developed assessment | WSWHE BOCES-developed – NYS ELA 1-assessment |
| 2 | District, regional, or BOCES-developed assessment | WSWHE BOCES-developed – NYS ELA 2-assessment |

| | ELA | Assessment |
|---|------------------|----------------------------|
| 3 | State assessment | 3rd Grade State Assessment |

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

| | |
|---|--|
| Use this box, if needed, to describe the general process for assigning HEDI categories for these grades/subjects in this subcomponent. If needed, you may upload a table or graphic at 2.11, below. | Teachers and their building principals will collaboratively develop SLO's based on their student rosters using available background and baseline data. Appropriate and rigorous targets will be set for each SLO. After the specified assessment is administered and scored, the building principals will determine the percentage of students who met the differentiated targets (based on each SLO). After this percentage is determined, the table attached will be utilized to determine the appropriate points and HEDI category for each teacher. Because our K-3 teachers are common branch, the points assigned for the ELA and Math SLO's will be averaged to determine the amount of comparable growth measures subcomponent points and HEDI rating. |
| Highly Effective (18 - 20 points) Results are well-above state average for similar students (or District goals if no state test). | Based on the District's goals and priorities, a large majority of the students meet district target goals in the areas of language arts as evaluated by WSWHE BOCES created ELA assessments and/or the NYS ELA assessment (for grade 3). See attached table. |
| Effective (9 - 17 points) Results meet state average for similar students (or District goals if no state test). | Based on the District's goals and priorities, a majority of the students meet district target goals in the areas of language arts as evaluated by WSWHE BOCES created ELA assessments and/or the NYS ELA assessment (for grade 3). See attached table. |
| Developing (3 - 8 points) Results are below state average for similar students (or District goals if no state test). | Based on the District's goals and priorities, some of the students meet district target goals in the areas of language arts as evaluated by WSWHE BOCES created ELA assessments and/or the NYS ELA assessment (for grade 3). See attached table. |
| Ineffective (0 - 2 points) Results are well-below state average for similar students (or District goals if no state test). | Based on the District's goals and priorities, few of the students meet district target goals in the areas of language arts as evaluated by WSWHE BOCES created ELA assessments and/or the NYS ELA assessment (for grade 3). See attached table. |

2.3) Grades K-3 Math

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

| | Math | Assessment |
|---|---|---|
| K | District, regional, or BOCES-developed assessment | WSWHE BOCES-developed – NYS MATH K-assessment |
| 1 | District, regional, or BOCES-developed assessment | WSWHE BOCES-developed – NYS MATH 1 assessment |
| 2 | District, regional, or BOCES-developed assessment | WSWHE BOCES-developed – NYS MATH 2 assessment |
| | Math | Assessment |
| 3 | State assessment | 3rd Grade State Assessment |

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

| | |
|--|---|
| <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>Teachers and their building principals will collaboratively develop SLO's based on their student rosters using available background and baseline data. Appropriate and rigorous targets will be set for each SLO. After the specified assessment is administered and scored, the building principals will determine the percentage of students who met the differentiated targets (based on each SLO). After this percentage is determined, the table attached will be utilized to determine the appropriate points and HEDI category for each teacher. Because our K-3 teachers are common branch, the points assigned for the ELA and Math SLO's will be averaged to determine the amount of comparable growth measures subcomponent points and HEDI rating.</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>Based on the District's goals and priorities, a large majority of the students meet district target goals in the areas of mathematics as evaluated by WSWHE BOCES created MATH assessments and/or the NYS MATH assessment (for grade 3). See attached table.</p> |
| <p>Effective (9 - 17 points) Results meet state average for similar students (or District goals if no state test).</p> | <p>Based on the District's goals and priorities, a majority of the students meet district target goals in the areas of mathematics as evaluated by WSWHE BOCES created MATH assessments and/or the NYS MATH assessment (for grade 3). See attached table.</p> |
| <p>Developing (3 - 8 points) Results are below state average for similar students (or District goals if no state test).</p> | <p>Based on the District's goals and priorities, some of the students meet district target goals in the areas of mathematics as evaluated by WSWHE BOCES created MATH assessments and/or the NYS MATH assessment (for grade 3). See attached table.</p> |
| <p>Ineffective (0 - 2 points) Results are well-below state average for similar students (or District goals if no state test).</p> | <p>Based on the District's goals and priorities, few of the students meet district target goals in the areas of mathematics as evaluated by WSWHE BOCES created MATH assessments and/or the NYS MATH assessment (for grade 3). See attached table.</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 | Greater Amsterdam School District Developed Grade 6 Science Assessment |
| 7 | District, regional or BOCES-developed assessment | Greater Amsterdam School District Developed Grade 7 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.

| | |
|--|--|
| <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>Teachers and their building principals will collaboratively develop SLO's based on their student rosters using available background and baseline data. Appropriate and rigorous targets will be set for each SLO. After the specified assessment is administered and scored, the building principals will determine the percentage of students who met the differentiated targets (based on each SLO). After this percentage is determined, the table attached will be utilized to determine the appropriate points and HEDI category for each teacher.</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>Based on the District's goals and priorities, a large majority of the students meet district target goals in the areas of science as evaluated by District created science assessments and/or NYS 8th grade science assessments. See attached table.</p> |
| <p>Effective (9 - 17 points) Results meet state average for similar students (or District goals if no state test).</p> | <p>Based on the District's goals and priorities, a majority of the students meet district target goals in the areas of science as evaluated by District created science assessments and/or NYS 8th grade science assessments. See attached table.</p> |
| <p>Developing (3 - 8 points) Results are below state average for similar students (or District goals if no state test).</p> | <p>Based on the District's goals and priorities, some of the students meet district target goals in the areas of science as evaluated by District created science assessments and/or NYS 8th grade science assessments. See attached table.</p> |
| <p>Ineffective (0 - 2 points) Results are well-below state average for similar students (or District goals if no state test).</p> | <p>Based on the District's goals and priorities, few of the students meet district target goals in the areas of science as evaluated by District created science assessments and/or NYS 8th grade science assessments. See attached table.</p> |

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 | Greater Amsterdam School District Developed Grade 6 Social Studies Assessment |
| 7 | District, regional or BOCES-developed assessment | Greater Amsterdam School District Developed Grade 7 Social Studies Assessment |
| 8 | District, regional or BOCES-developed assessment | Greater Amsterdam School District Developed Grade 8 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. | Teachers and their building principals will collaboratively develop SLO's based on their student rosters using available background and baseline data. Appropriate and rigorous targets will be set for each SLO. After the specified assessment is administered and scored, the building principals will determine the percentage of students who met the differentiated targets (based on each SLO). After this percentage is determined, the table attached will be utilized to determine the appropriate points and HEDI category for each teacher. |
| Highly Effective (18 - 20 points) Results are well-above District goals for similar students. | Based on the District's goals and priorities, a large majority of the students meet district target goals in the areas of social studies as evaluated by District created social studies assessments. See attached table. |
| Effective (9 - 17 points) Results meet District goals for similar students. | Based on the District's goals and priorities, a majority of the students meet district target goals in the areas of social studies as evaluated by District created social studies assessments. See attached table. |
| Developing (3 - 8 points) Results are below District goals for similar students. | Based on the District's goals and priorities, some of the students meet district target goals in the areas of social studies as evaluated by District created social studies assessments. See attached table. |
| Ineffective (0 - 2 points) Results are well-below District goals for similar students. | Based on the District's goals and priorities, few of the students meet district target goals in the areas of social studies as evaluated by District created social studies assessments. See attached table. |

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 | Greater Amsterdam School District Developed Global 1 Social Studies 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. | Teachers and their building principals will collaboratively develop SLO's based on their student rosters using available background and baseline data. Appropriate and rigorous targets will be set for each SLO. After the specified assessment is administered and scored, the building principals will determine the percentage of students who met the differentiated targets (based on each SLO). After this percentage is determined, the table attached will be utilized to determine the appropriate points and HEDI category for each teacher. |
|---|---|

| | |
|---|--|
| graphic at 2.11, below. | rigorous targets will be set for each SLO. After the specified assessment is administered and scored, the building principals will determine the percentage of students who met the differentiated targets (based on each SLO). After this percentage is determined, the table attached will be utilized to determine the appropriate points and HEDI category for each teacher. |
| Highly Effective (18 - 20 points) Results are well-above District goals for similar students. | Based on the District's goals and priorities, a large majority of the students meet district target goals as described in each SLO. See attached table. |
| Effective (9 - 17 points) Results meet District goals for similar students. | Based on the District's goals and priorities, a majority of the students meet district target goals as described in each SLO. See attached table. |
| Developing (3 - 8 points) Results are below District goals for similar students. | Based on the District's goals and priorities, some of the students meet district target goals as described in each SLO. See attached table. |
| Ineffective (0 - 2 points) Results are well-below District goals for similar students. | Based on the District's goals and priorities, few of the students meet district target goals as described in each SLO. See attached table. |

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. | Teachers and their building principals will collaboratively develop SLO's based on their student rosters using available background and baseline data. Appropriate and rigorous targets will be set for each SLO. After the specified assessment is administered and scored, the building principals will determine the percentage of students who met the differentiated targets (based on each SLO). After this percentage is determined, the table attached will be utilized to determine the appropriate points and HEDI category for each teacher. |
| Highly Effective (18 - 20 points) Results are well-above District goals for similar students. | Based on the District's goals and priorities, a large majority of the students meet district target goals as described in each SLO. See attached table. |

| | |
|--|---|
| Effective (9 - 17 points) Results meet District goals for similar students. | Based on the District's goals and priorities, a majority of the students meet district target goals as described in each SLO. See attached table. |
| Developing (3 - 8 points) Results are below District goals for similar students. | Based on the District's goals and priorities, some of the students meet district target goals as described in each SLO. See attached table. |
| Ineffective (0 - 2 points) Results are well-below District goals for similar students. | Based on the District's goals and priorities, few of the students meet district target goals as described in each SLO. See attached table. |

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. | Teachers and their building principals will collaboratively develop SLO's based on their student rosters using available background and baseline data. Appropriate and rigorous targets will be set for each SLO. After the specified assessment is administered and scored, the building principals will determine the percentage of students who met the differentiated targets (based on each SLO). After this percentage is determined, the table attached will be utilized to determine the appropriate points and HEDI category for each teacher. |
| Highly Effective (18 - 20 points) Results are well-above District goals for similar students. | Based on the District's goals and priorities, a large majority of the students meet district target goals as described in each SLO. See attached table. |
| Effective (9 - 17 points) Results meet District goals for similar students. | Based on the District's goals and priorities, a majority of the students meet district target goals as described in each SLO. See attached table. |
| Developing (3 - 8 points) Results are below District goals for similar students. | Based on the District's goals and priorities, some of the students meet district target goals as described in each SLO. See attached table. |
| Ineffective (0 - 2 points) Results are well-below District goals for similar students. | Based on the District's goals and priorities, few of the students meet district target goals as described in each SLO. See attached table. |

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 | WSWHE BOCES-developed – ELA 9-assessment |
| Grade 10 ELA | District, regional or BOCES-developed assessment | WSWHE BOCES-developed – ELA 10-assessment |
| Grade 11 ELA | Regents assessment | NYS ELA Regents Assessment |

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

| | |
|---|---|
| Use this box, if needed, to describe the general process for assigning HEDI categories for these grades/subjects in this subcomponent. If needed, you may upload a table or graphic at 2.11, below. | Teachers and their building principals will collaboratively develop SLO's based on their student rosters using available background and baseline data. Appropriate and rigorous targets will be set for each SLO. After the specified assessment is administered and scored, the building principals will determine the percentage of students who met the differentiated targets (based on each SLO). After this percentage is determined, the table attached will be utilized to determine the appropriate points and HEDI category for each teacher. |
| Highly Effective (18 - 20 points) Results are well-above District goals for similar students. | Based on the District's goals and priorities, a large majority of the students meet district target goals as described in each SLO. See attached table. |
| Effective (9 - 17 points) Results meet District goals for similar students. | Based on the District's goals and priorities, a majority of the students meet district target goals as described in each SLO. See attached table. |
| Developing (3 - 8 points) Results are below District goals for similar students. | Based on the District's goals and priorities, some of the students meet district target goals as described in each SLO. See attached table. |
| Ineffective (0 - 2 points) Results are well-below District goals for similar students. | Based on the District's goals and priorities, few of the students meet district target goals as described in each SLO. See attached table. |

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 |
|-------------------------|---------------------------------------|---|
| English 12 | District, Regional or BOCES-developed | WSWHE BOCES-developed – ELA 12-assessment |
| Music K-12 | District, Regional or BOCES-developed | WSWHE BOCES-developed – Music grade level appropriate- assessment |

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.

There will be no locally developed controls utilized for SLOs in any course or subject area.

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 Monday, October 08, 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 | 6(ii) School wide measure computed locally | NYS ELA Grades 3-5 Assessments |
| 5 | 6(ii) School wide measure computed locally | NYS ELA Grades 3-5 Assessments |
| 6 | 6(ii) School wide measure computed locally | NYS ELA Grades 6-8 Assessments |
| 7 | 6(ii) School wide measure computed locally | NYS ELA Grades 6-8 Assessments |

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. | School-wide measure of student achievement: Our goal is to increase level of students scoring Level 2 or better on ELA assessments school wide by 3 percentage points compared to previous year's level of performance on each NYS ELA assessments. All elementary schools will demonstrate evidence of school wide achievement based on Grades 3-5 NYS ELA assessments. The middle school will demonstrate evidence of school wide achievement based on Grades 6-8 NYS ELA assessments. HEDI points will be awarded to teachers based on the actual percentage of students scoring Level 2 or better on the final assessment. |
| Highly Effective (14 - 15 points) Results are well above District- or BOCES-adopted expectations for growth or achievement for grade/subject. | The school-wide attainment of student achievement far exceeds the district established school-wide targets. School-wide student achievement far exceeds the targeted 3 percentage point increase in students scoring level on the NYS ELA assessments compared to previous year results. See attached tables for school specific targets. |
| Effective (8- 13 points) Results meet District- or BOCES-adopted expectations for growth or achievement for grade/subject. | The school-wide attainment is within the district established school-wide targets. School-wide student achievement is within the stated range for students scoring level 2 or higher on the NYS ELA assessments compared to previous year results. See attached tables for school specific targets. |
| Developing (3 - 7 points) Results are below District- or BOCES-adopted expectations for growth or achievement for grade/subject. | The school-wide attainment of student achievement is below the district established school-wide targets. School-wide student achievement is below the targeted 3 percentage point increase in students scoring level on the NYS ELA assessments compared to previous year results. See attached tables for school specific targets. |
| Ineffective (0 - 2 points) Results are well below District- or BOCES-adopted expectations for growth or achievement for grade/subject. | The school-wide attainment of student achievement is substantially below the district established school-wide targets. School-wide student achievement is substantially below the targeted 3 percentage point increase in students scoring level on the NYS ELA assessments compared to previous year results. See attached tables for school specific targets. |

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 | 6(ii) School wide measure computed locally | NYS ELA Grades 3-5 Assessments |
| 5 | 6(ii) School wide measure computed locally | NYS ELA Grades 3-5 Assessments |
| 6 | 6(ii) School wide measure computed locally | NYS ELA Grades 6-8 Assessments |
| 7 | 6(ii) School wide measure computed locally | NYS ELA Grades 6-8 Assessments |
| 8 | 6(ii) School wide measure computed locally | NYS ELA Grades 6-8 Assessments |

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. | School-wide measure of student achievement: Our goal is to increase level of students scoring Level 2 or better on ELA assessments school wide by 3 percentage points compared to previous year's level of performance on each NYS ELA assessments. All elementary schools will demonstrate evidence of school wide achievement based on Grades 3-5 NYS ELA assessments. The middle school will demonstrate evidence of school wide achievement based on Grades 6-8 NYS ELA assessments. HEDI points will be awarded to teachers based on the actual percentage of students scoring Level 2 or better on the final assessment. |
| Highly Effective (14 - 15 points) Results are well above District- or BOCES-adopted expectations for growth or achievement for grade/subject. | The school-wide attainment of student achievement far exceeds the district established school-wide targets. School-wide student achievement far exceeds the targeted 3 percentage point increase in students scoring level on the NYS ELA assessments compared to previous year results. See attached tables for school specific targets. |
| Effective (8- 13 points) Results meet District- or BOCES-adopted expectations for growth or achievement for grade/subject. | The school-wide attainment is within the district established school-wide targets. School-wide student achievement is within the stated range for students scoring level 2 or higher on the NYS ELA assessments compared to previous year results. See attached tables for school specific targets.. |
| Developing (3 - 7 points) Results are below District- or BOCES-adopted expectations for growth or achievement for grade/subject. | The school-wide attainment of student achievement is below the district established school-wide targets. School-wide student achievement is below the targeted 3 percentage point increase in students scoring level on the NYS ELA assessments compared to previous year results. See attached tables for school specific targets. |
| Ineffective (0 - 2 points) Results are well below District- or BOCES-adopted expectations for growth or achievement for grade/subject. | The school-wide attainment of student achievement is substantially below the district established school-wide targets. School-wide student achievement is substantially below the targeted 3 percentage point increase in students scoring level on the NYS ELA assessments compared to previous year results. See attached tables for |

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/5139/191018-rhJdBgDruP/GASD REVISED LOCAL Measures102012_1.docx

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

Growth or achievement measure(s) from these options.

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

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

Measures based on:

- 1) The change in percentage of a teacher's students who achieve a specific level of performance as determined locally, on such assessments/examinations compared to those students' level of performance on such assessments/examinations in the previous school year (e.g., a three percentage point increase in students earning the proficient level (three) or better performance level on the 7th grade math State assessment compared to those same students' performance levels on the 6th grade math State assessment, or an increase in the percentage of a teacher's students earning the advanced performance level (four) on the 4th grade ELA or math State assessments compared to those students' performance levels on the 3rd grade ELA or math State assessments)
- 2) Teacher specific growth score computed by the Department based on the percent of the teacher's students earning a State determined level of growth. The methodology to translate such growth into the State-established sub-component scoring ranges shall be determined locally
- 3) Teacher specific achievement or growth score computed in a manner determined locally based on a measure of student performance on the State assessments, Regents examinations and/or Department approved alternative examinations other than the measure described in 1) or 2), above
- 4) Student growth or achievement computed in a manner determined locally based on a State-approved 3rd party assessment
- 5) Student growth or achievement computed in a manner determined locally based on a district, regional or BOCES-developed assessment that is rigorous and comparable across classrooms

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

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

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

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

3.4) Grades K-3 ELA

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

| | Locally-Selected Measure from List of Approved Measures | Assessment |
|---|---|--------------------------------|
| K | 6(ii) School-wide measure computed locally | NYS ELA Grades 3-5 Assessments |
| 1 | 6(ii) School-wide measure computed locally | NYS ELA Grades 3-5 Assessments |
| 2 | 6(ii) School-wide measure computed locally | NYS ELA Grades 3-5 Assessments |
| 3 | 6(ii) School-wide measure computed locally | NYS ELA Grades 3-5 Assessments |

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. | School-wide measure of student achievement: Our goal is to increase level of students scoring Level 2 or better on ELA assessments school wide by 3 percentage points compared to previous year's level of performance on each NYS ELA assessments. All elementary schools will demonstrate evidence of school wide achievement based on Grades 3-5 NYS ELA assessments. HEDI points will be awarded to teachers based on the actual percentage of students scoring Level 2 or better on the final assessment. |
| Highly Effective (18-20 points) Results are well above District- or BOCES-adopted expectations for growth or achievement for grade/subject. | The school-wide attainment of student achievement far exceeds the district established school-wide targets. School-wide student achievement far exceeds the targeted 3 percentage point increase in students scoring level on the NYS ELA assessments compared to previous year results. See attached tables for school specific targets. |
| Effective (9-17 points) Results meet District- or BOCES-adopted expectations for growth or achievement | The school-wide attainment is within the district established school-wide targets. School-wide student |

| | |
|--|---|
| for grade/subject. | achievement is within the stated range for students scoring level 2 or higher on the NYS ELA assessments compared to previous year results. See attached tables for school specific targets. |
| Developing (3 - 8 points) Results are below District- or BOCES-adopted expectations for growth or achievement for grade/subject. | The school-wide attainment of student achievement is below the district established school-wide targets. School-wide student achievement is below the targeted 3 percentage point increase in students scoring level on the NYS ELA assessments compared to previous year results. See attached tables for school specific targets. |
| Ineffective (0 - 2 points) Results are well below District- or BOCES-adopted expectations for growth or achievement for grade/subject. | The school-wide attainment of student achievement is substantially below the district established school-wide targets. School-wide student achievement is substantially below the targeted 3 percentage point increase in students scoring level on the NYS ELA assessments compared to previous year results. See attached tables for school specific targets. |

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 | 6(ii) School-wide measure computed locally | NYS ELA Grades 3-5 Assessments |
| 1 | 6(ii) School-wide measure computed locally | NYS ELA Grades 3-5 Assessments |
| 2 | 6(ii) School-wide measure computed locally | NYS ELA Grades 3-5 Assessments |
| 3 | 6(ii) School-wide measure computed locally | NYS ELA Grades 3-5 Assessments |

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. | School-wide measure of student achievement: Our goal is to increase level of students scoring Level 2 or better on ELA assessments school wide by 3 percentage points compared to previous year's level of performance on each NYS ELA assessments. All elementary schools will demonstrate evidence of school wide achievement based on Grades 3-5 NYS ELA assessments. HEDI points will be awarded to teachers based on the actual percentage of students scoring Level 2 or better on the final assessment. |
| Highly Effective (18-20 points) Results are well above District- or BOCES-adopted expectations for growth or achievement for grade/subject. | The school-wide attainment of student achievement far exceeds the district established school-wide targets. School-wide student achievement far exceeds the targeted 3 percentage point increase in students scoring level on the NYS ELA assessments compared to previous |

| | |
|--|---|
| | year results. See attached tables for school specific targets. |
| Effective (9-17 points) Results meet District- or BOCES-adopted expectations for growth or achievement for grade/subject. | The school-wide attainment is within the district established school-wide targets. School-wide student achievement is within the stated range for students scoring level 2 or higher on the NYS ELA assessments compared to previous year results. See attached tables for school specific targets. |
| Developing (3 - 8 points) Results are below District -or BOCES-adopted expectations for growth or achievement for grade/subject. | The school-wide attainment of student achievement is below the district established school-wide targets. School-wide student achievement is below the targeted 3 percentage point increase in students scoring level on the NYS ELA assessments compared to previous year results. See attached tables for school specific targets. |
| Ineffective (0 - 2 points) Results are well below District- or BOCES-adopted expectations for growth or achievement for grade/subject. | The school-wide attainment of student achievement is substantially below the district established school-wide targets. School-wide student achievement is substantially below the targeted 3 percentage point increase in students scoring level on the NYS ELA assessments compared to previous year results. See attached tables for school specific targets. |

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 | 6(ii) School wide measure computed locally | NYS ELA Grades 6-8 Assessments |
| 7 | 6(ii) School wide measure computed locally | NYS ELA Grades 6-8 Assessments |
| 8 | 6(ii) School wide measure computed locally | NYS ELA Grades 6-8 Assessments |

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. | School-wide measure of student achievement: Our goal is to increase level of students scoring level 2 or better on ELA assessments school wide by 3 percentage points compared to previous year's level of performance on each NYS ELA assessments. The middle school will demonstrate evidence of school wide achievement based on Grades 6-8 NYS ELA assessments. HEDI points will be awarded to teachers based on the actual percentage of students scoring Level 2 or better on the final assessment. |
| Highly Effective (18 - 20 points) Results are well above District- or BOCES-adopted expectations for growth or achievement for grade/subject. | The school-wide attainment of student achievement far exceeds the district established school-wide targets. School-wide student achievement far exceeds the targeted 3 percentage point increase in students scoring level on the NYS ELA assessments compared to previous year results. See attached tables for school specific targets. |

| | |
|--|---|
| Effective (9 - 17 points) Results meet District- or BOCES-adopted expectations for growth or achievement for grade/subject. | The school-wide attainment is within the district established school-wide targets. School-wide student achievement is within the stated range for students scoring level 2 or higher on the NYS ELA assessments compared to previous year results. See attached tables for school specific targets. |
| Developing (3 - 8 points) Results are below District- or BOCES-adopted expectations for growth or achievement for grade/subject. | The school-wide attainment of student achievement is below the district established school-wide targets. School-wide student achievement is below the targeted 3 percentage point increase in students scoring level on the NYS ELA assessments compared to previous year results. See attached tables for school specific targets. |
| Ineffective (0 - 2 points) Results are well below District- or BOCES-adopted expectations for growth or achievement for grade/subject. | The school-wide attainment of student achievement is substantially below the district established school-wide targets. School-wide student achievement is substantially below the targeted 3 percentage point increase in students scoring level on the NYS ELA assessments compared to previous year results. See attached tables for school specific targets. |

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 | 6(ii) School wide measure computed locally | NYS ELA Grades 6-8 Assessments |
| 7 | 6(ii) School wide measure computed locally | NYS ELA Grades 6-8 Assessments |
| 8 | 6(ii) School wide measure computed locally | NYS ELA Grades 6-8 Assessments |

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. | School-wide measure of student achievement: Our goal is to increase level of pstudents scoring Level 2 or better on ELA assessments school wide by 3 percentage points compared to previous year's level of performance on each NYS ELA assessments. The middle school will demonstrate evidence of school wide achievement based on Grades 6-8 NYS ELA assessments. HEDI points will be awarded to teachers based on the actual percentage of students scoring Level 2 or better on the final assessment. |
| Highly Effective (18 - 20 points) Results are well above District- or BOCES-adopted expectations for growth or achievement for grade/subject. | The school-wide attainment of student achievement far exceeds the district established school-wide targets. School-wide student achievement far exceeds the targeted 3 percentage point increase in students scoring level on the NYS ELA assessments compared to previous |

year results. See attached tables for school specific targets.

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

The school-wide attainment is within the district established school-wide targets. School-wide student achievement is within the stated range for students scoring level 2 or higher on the NYS ELA assessments compared to previous year results. See attached tables for school specific targets.

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

The school-wide attainment of student achievement is below the district established school-wide targets. School-wide student achievement is below the targeted 3 percentage point increase in students scoring level on the NYS ELA assessments compared to previous year results. See attached tables for school specific targets.

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

The school-wide attainment of student achievement is substantially below the district established school-wide targets. School-wide student achievement is substantially below the targeted 3 percentage point increase in students scoring level on the NYS ELA assessments compared to previous year results. See attached tables for school specific targets.

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 | 6(ii) School wide measure computed locally | ELA, Algebra, Algebra 2/Trigonometry, Geometry, Global Studies, US History, Living Environments, Chemistry, Earth Science, Physics NYS Regents Exams |
| Global 2 | 6(ii) School wide measure computed locally | ELA, Algebra, Algebra 2/Trigonometry, Geometry, Global Studies, US History, Living Environments, Chemistry, Earth Science, Physics NYS Regents Exams |
| American History | 6(ii) School wide measure computed locally | ELA, Algebra, Algebra 2/Trigonometry, Geometry, Global Studies, US History, Living Environments, Chemistry, Earth Science, Physics NYS Regents Exams |

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

All high school teachers will have their 20% local measures HEDI score determined by the extent to which

| | |
|--|---|
| <p>this subcomponent. If needed, you may upload a table or graphic at 3.13, below.</p> | <p>they reach the following target: Our goal is to increase the level of proficiency by 3 percentage points of the composite score of ELA, Algebra, Algebra 2/Trigonometry, Geometry, Global Studies, US History, Living Environments, Chemistry, Earth Science and Physics NYS Regents Exams compared to previous year's level of performance on each assessment. HEDI points will be awarded to teachers based on the actual percentage of students scoring proficient for grades 9-12.</p> |
| <p>Highly Effective (18 - 20 points) Results are well above District- or BOCES-adopted expectations for growth or achievement for grade/subject.</p> | <p>The school-wide attainment of student growth and achievement far exceeds the district established school-wide targets. School-wide student achievement far exceeds the targeted composite 3 percent increase in students scoring at or above proficiency on the ELA, Algebra, Algebra 2/Trigonometry, Geometry, Global Studies, US History, Living Environments, Chemistry, Earth Science and Physics NYS Regents Exams compared to previous year's level of performance on each assessment.</p> |
| <p>Effective (9 - 17 points) Results meet District- or BOCES-adopted expectations for growth or achievement for grade/subject.</p> | <p>The school-wide attainment is within the district established school-wide targets. School-wide student achievement is within the stated range for students scoring at or above proficiency on the ELA, Algebra, Algebra 2/Trigonometry, Geometry, Global Studies, US History, Living Environments, Chemistry, Earth Science and Physics NYS Regents Exams compared to previous year's level of performance on each assessment.</p> |
| <p>Developing (3 - 8 points) Results are below District- or BOCES-adopted expectations for growth or achievement for grade/subject.</p> | <p>The school-wide attainment of student growth and achievement is below the district established school-wide targets. School-wide student achievement is below the targeted composite 3 percent increase in students scoring at or above proficiency on the ELA, Algebra, Algebra 2/Trigonometry, Geometry, Global Studies, US History, Living Environments, Chemistry, Earth Science and Physics NYS Regents Exams compared to previous year's level of performance on each assessment.</p> |
| <p>Ineffective (0 - 2 points) Results are well below District- or BOCES-adopted expectations for growth or achievement for grade/subject.</p> | <p>The school-wide attainment of student growth and achievement is substantially below the district established school-wide targets. School-wide student achievement is substantially below the targeted composite 3 percent increase in students scoring at or above proficiency on the ELA, Algebra, Algebra 2/Trigonometry, Geometry, Global Studies, US History, Living Environments, Chemistry, Earth Science and Physics NYS Regents Exams compared to previous year's level of performance on each assessment.</p> |

3.9) High School Science

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

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

| | Locally-Selected Measure from List of Approved Measures | Assessment |
|--------------------|---|--|
| Living Environment | 6(ii) School wide measure computed locally | ELA, Algebra, Algebra 2/Trigonometry, Geometry, Global Studies, US History, Living Environments, Chemistry, Earth Science, Physics NYS Regents Exams |
| Earth Science | 6(ii) School wide measure computed locally | ELA, Algebra, Algebra 2/Trigonometry, Geometry, Global Studies, US History, Living Environments, Chemistry, Earth Science, Physics NYS Regents Exams |
| Chemistry | 6(ii) School wide measure computed locally | ELA, Algebra, Algebra 2/Trigonometry, Geometry, Global Studies, US History, Living Environments, Chemistry, Earth Science, Physics NYS Regents Exams |
| Physics | 6(ii) School wide measure computed locally | ELA, Algebra, Algebra 2/Trigonometry, Geometry, Global Studies, US History, Living Environments, Chemistry, Earth Science, Physics NYS Regents Exams |

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. | All high school teachers will have their 20% local measures HEDI score determined by the extent to which they reach the following target: Our goal is to increase the level of proficiency by 3 percentage points of the composite score of ELA, Algebra, Algebra 2/Trigonometry, Geometry, Global Studies, US History, Living Environments, Chemistry, Earth Science and Physics NYS Regents Exams compared to previous year's level of performance on each assessment. HEDI points will be awarded to teachers based on the actual percentage of students scoring proficient for grades 9-12. |
| Highly Effective (18-20 points) Results are well above District- or BOCES-adopted expectations for growth or achievement for grade/subject. | The school-wide attainment of student growth and achievement far exceeds the district established school-wide targets. School-wide student achievement meets or exceeds the targeted composite 3 percent increase in students scoring at or above proficiency on the ELA, Algebra, Algebra 2/Trigonometry, Geometry, Global Studies, US History, Living Environments, Chemistry, Earth Science and Physics NYS Regents Exams compared to previous year's level of performance on each assessment. |
| Developing (3 - 8 points) Results are below District- or BOCES-adopted expectations for growth or achievement for grade/subject. | The school-wide attainment of student growth and achievement is below the district established school-wide targets. School-wide student achievement is below the targeted composite 3 percent increase in students scoring at or above proficiency on the ELA, Algebra, Algebra 2/Trigonometry, Geometry, Global Studies, US History, Living Environments, Chemistry, Earth Science and Physics NYS Regents Exams compared to previous year's level of performance on each assessment. |

| | |
|---|---|
| <p>Effective (9 - 17points) Results meet District- or BOCES-adopted expectations for growth or achievement for grade/subject.</p> | <p>The school-wide attainment is within the district established school-wide targets. School-wide student achievement is within the stated range for students scoring at or above proficiency on the ELA, Algebra, Algebra 2/Trigonometry, Geometry, Global Studies, US History, Living Environments, Chemistry, Earth Science and Physics NYS Regents Exams compared to previous year's level of performance on each assessment.</p> |
| <p>Ineffective (0 - 2 points) Results are well below District- or BOCES-adopted expectations for growth or achievement for grade/subject.</p> | <p>The school-wide attainment of student growth and achievement is substantially below the district established school-wide targets. School-wide student achievement is substantially below the targeted composite 3 percent increase in students scoring at or above proficiency on the ELA, Algebra, Algebra 2/Trigonometry, Geometry, Global Studies, US History, Living Environments, Chemistry, Earth Science and Physics NYS Regents Exams compared to previous year's level of performance on each assessment.</p> |

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 | 6(ii) School wide measure computed locally | ELA, Algebra, Algebra 2/Trigonometry, Geometry, Global Studies, US History, Living Environments, Chemistry, Earth Science, Physics NYS Regents Exams |
| Geometry | 6(ii) School wide measure computed locally | ELA, Algebra, Algebra 2/Trigonometry, Geometry, Global Studies, US History, Living Environments, Chemistry, Earth Science, Physics NYS Regents Exams |
| Algebra 2 | 6(ii) School wide measure computed locally | ELA, Algebra, Algebra 2/Trigonometry, Geometry, Global Studies, US History, Living Environments, Chemistry, Earth Science Physics NYS Regents Exams |

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.

| | |
|--|---|
| <p>Use this box, if needed, to describe the general process for assigning HEDI categories for these grades/subjects in this subcomponent. If needed, you may upload a table or graphic at 3.13, below.</p> | <p>All high school teachers will have their 20% local measures HEDI score determined by the extent to which they reach the following target: Our goal is to increase the level of proficiency by 3 percentage points of the composite score of ELA, Algebra, Algebra 2/Trigonometry, Geometry, Global Studies, US History, Living</p> |
|--|---|

Environments, Chemistry, Earth Science and Physics NYS Regents Exams compared to previous year's level of performance on each assessment. HEDI points will be awarded to teachers based on the actual percentage of students scoring proficient for grades 9-12.

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

The school-wide attainment is within the district established school-wide targets. School-wide student achievement is within the stated range for students scoring level 2 on the NYS ELA assessments compared to previous year results. See attached tables for school specific targets.

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

The school-wide attainment is within the district established school-wide targets. School-wide student achievement is within the stated range for students scoring at or above proficiency on the ELA, Algebra, Algebra 2/Trigonometry, Geometry, Global Studies, US History, Living Environments, Chemistry, Earth Science and Physics NYS Regents Exams compared to previous year's level of performance on each assessment.

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

The school-wide attainment of student growth and achievement is below the district established school-wide targets. School-wide student achievement is below the targeted composite 3 percent increase in students scoring at or above proficiency on the ELA, Algebra, Algebra 2/Trigonometry, Geometry, Global Studies, US History, Living Environments, Chemistry, Earth Science and Physics NYS Regents Exams compared to previous year's level of performance on each assessment.

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

The school-wide attainment of student growth and achievement is substantially below the district established school-wide targets. School-wide student achievement is substantially below the targeted composite 3 percent increase in students scoring at or above proficiency on the ELA, Algebra, Algebra 2/Trigonometry, Geometry, Global Studies, US History, Living Environments, Chemistry, Earth Science and Physics NYS Regents Exams compared to previous year's level of performance on each assessment.

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 | 6(ii) School wide measure computed locally | ELA, Algebra, Algebra 2/Trigonometry, Geometry, Global Studies, US History, Living Environments, Chemistry, Earth Science, Physics NYS Regents Exams |
| Grade 10 ELA | 6(ii) School wide measure computed locally | ELA, Algebra, Algebra 2/Trigonometry, Geometry, Global Studies, US History, Living Environments, Chemistry, Earth Science, Physics NYS Regents Exams |

| | | |
|-----------------|--|--|
| Grade 11 ELA | 6(ii) School wide measure computed locally | ELA, Algebra, Algebra 2/Trigonometry, Geometry, Global Studies, US History, Living Environments, Chemistry, Earth Science, Physics NYS Regents Exams |
|-----------------|--|--|

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. | All high school teachers will have their 20% local measures HEDI score determined by the extent to which they reach the following target: Our goal is to increase the level of proficiency by 3 percentage points of the composite score of ELA, Algebra, Algebra 2/Trigonometry, Geometry, Global Studies, US History, Living Environments, Chemistry, Earth Science and Physics NYS Regents Exams compared to previous year's level of performance on each assessment. HEDI points will be awarded to teachers based on the actual percentage of students scoring proficient for grades 9-12. |
| Highly Effective (18 - 20 points) Results are well above District- or BOCES-adopted expectations for growth or achievement for grade/subject. | The school-wide attainment of student growth and achievement far exceeds the district established school-wide targets. School-wide student achievement far exceeds the targeted composite 3 percent increase in students scoring at or above proficiency on the ELA, Algebra, Algebra 2/Trigonometry, Geometry, Global Studies, US History, Living Environments, Chemistry, Earth Science and Physics NYS Regents Exams compared to previous year's level of performance on each assessment. |
| Effective (9 - 17 points) Results meet District- or BOCES-adopted expectations for growth or achievement for grade/subject. | The school-wide attainment is within the district established school-wide targets. School-wide student achievement is within the stated range for students scoring at or above proficiency on the ELA, Algebra, Algebra 2/Trigonometry, Geometry, Global Studies, US History, Living Environments, Chemistry, Earth Science and Physics NYS Regents Exams compared to previous year's level of performance on each assessment. |
| Developing (3 - 8 points) Results are below District- or BOCES-adopted expectations for growth or achievement for grade/subject. | The school-wide attainment of student growth and achievement is below the district established school-wide targets. School-wide student achievement is below the targeted composite 3 percent increase in students scoring at or above proficiency on the ELA, Algebra, Algebra 2/Trigonometry, Geometry, Global Studies, US History, Living Environments, Chemistry, Earth Science and Physics NYS Regents Exams compared to previous year's level of performance on each assessment. |
| Ineffective (0 - 2 points) Results are well below District- or BOCES-adopted expectations for growth or achievement for grade/subject. | The school-wide attainment of student growth and achievement is substantially below the district established school-wide targets. School-wide student achievement is substantially below the targeted composite 3 percent increase in students scoring at or above proficiency on the |

and the middle school will utilize the NYS Grades 6-8 ELA assessments). HEDI points will be awarded to teachers based on the actual percentage of students scoring level 2 or higher on the final assessments grades K-8 and students scoring proficient for grades 9-12.

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

The school-wide attainment of student growth and achievement far exceeds the district established school-wide targets. School-wide student achievement far exceeds the targeted composite 3 percent increase in students scoring proficient on the ELA, Algebra, Algebra 2/Trigonometry, Geometry, Global Studies, US History, Living Environments, Chemistry, Earth Science, and Physics NYS Regents Exams compared to previous year's level of performance on each assessment. Our targets for the elementary schools and middle school teachers are to increase level of proficiency on ELA assessments school wide by 3 percentage points compared to previous year's level of performance on each NYS ELA assessments (elementary schools will utilize the NYS Grades 3-5 ELA assessments and the middle school will utilize the NYS Grades 6-8 ELA assessments).

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

The school-wide attainment is within the district established school-wide targets. School-wide student achievement is within the stated range for students scoring at or above proficiency on the ELA, Algebra, Algebra 2/Trigonometry, Geometry, Global Studies, US History, Living Environments, Chemistry, Earth Science and Physics NYS Regents Exams compared to previous year's level of performance on each assessment. Our targets for the elementary schools and middle school teachers are to increase level of students scoring level 2 or higher on ELA assessments school wide by 3 percentage points compared to previous year's level of performance on each NYS ELA assessments (elementary schools will utilize the NYS Grades 3-5 ELA assessments and the middle school will utilize the NYS Grades 6-8 ELA assessments).

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

The school-wide attainment of student growth and achievement is below the district established school-wide targets. School-wide student achievement is below the targeted composite 3 percent increase in students scoring proficiency on the ELA, Algebra, Algebra 2/Trigonometry, Geometry, Global Studies, US History, Living Environments, Chemistry, Earth Science and Physics NYS Regents Exams compared to previous year's level of performance on each assessment. Our targets for the elementary schools and middle school teachers are to increase level of students scoring level 2 or higher on ELA assessments school wide by 3 percentage points compared to previous year's level of performance on each NYS ELA assessments (elementary schools will utilize the NYS Grades 3-5 ELA assessments and the middle school will utilize the NYS Grades 6-8 ELA assessments).

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

The school-wide attainment of student growth and achievement is substantially below the district established school-wide targets. School-wide student achievement is substantially below the targeted composite 3 percent increase in students scoring at or above proficiency on the

ELA, Algebra, Algebra 2/Trigonometry, Geometry, Global Studies, US History, Living Environments, Chemistry, Earth Science and Physics NYS Regents Exams compared to previous year's level of performance on each assessment. Our targets for the elementary schools and middle school teachers are to increase level of students scoring Level 2 or higher on ELA assessments school wide by 3 percentage points compared to previous year's level of performance on each NYS ELA assessments (elementary schools will utilize the NYS Grades 3-5 ELA assessments and the middle school will utilize the NYS Grades 6-8 ELA assessments).

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/5139/191018-y92vNseFa4/GASD REVISED LOCAL Measures102012_2.docx

3.14) Locally Developed Controls

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

There will be no locally developed controls.

3.15) Teachers with More Than One Locally Selected Measure

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

Since school wide measures are being utilized district wide for the locally selected measure, this is not relevant.

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 Monday, October 08, 2012

Updated Wednesday, November 28, 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

(No response)

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] | 60 |
| One or more observation(s) by trained independent evaluators | (No response) |
| Observations by trained in-school peer teachers | (No response) |
| Feedback from students using State-approved survey tool | (No response) |
| Feedback from parents/caregivers using State-approved survey tool | (No response) |
| Structured reviews of lesson plans, student portfolios and other teacher artifacts | (No response) |

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.

Points will be assigned by using an average rubric score of 1-4. Teachers will be rated according to the Danielson Framework rubric, and then the rating within each subcomponent will be averaged and converted to a 60-point scale.

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.

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. | Overall performance and results are exceptional and exceed NYS Teaching Standards of professional practice. The teacher has earned a rating of 59 to 60 points for achieving an average rubric score of 3.2 to 4.0 as measured across the four domains of the Danielson Framework for Teaching rubric. |
| Effective: Overall performance and results meet NYS Teaching Standards. | Overall performance and results are acceptable and meet NYS Teaching Standards of professional practice. The teacher has earned a rating of 57 to 58 points for achieving an average rubric score of 2.5 to 3.1 as measured across the four domains of the Danielson Framework for Teaching rubric. |
| Developing: Overall performance and results need improvement in order to meet NYS Teaching Standards. | Overall performance and results need improvement in order to meet NYS Teaching Standards of professional practice. The teacher has earned a rating of 50 to 56 points for achieving an average rubric score of 1.5 to 2.4 as measured across the four domains of the Danielson Framework for Teaching rubric. |
| Ineffective: Overall performance and results do not meet NYS Teaching Standards. | Overall performance and results do not meet NYS Teaching Standards of professional practice. The teacher has earned a rating of 0 to 49 points for achieving an average rubric score of 1.0 to 1.4 as measured across the four domains of the Danielson Framework for Teaching rubric. |

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 | 2 |
| 4.6) Observations of Probationary Teachers Informal/Short | 1 |
| 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?

-
- Both
-

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

-
- Both
-

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 | 1 |
| 4.7) Observations of Tenured Teachers Informal/Short | 1 |
| 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?

-
- Both
-

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

-
- Both
-

5. Composite Scoring (Teachers)

Created Monday, October 08, 2012

Updated Wednesday, November 28, 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 Monday, October 08, 2012

Updated Wednesday, November 28, 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/5265/191495-Df0w3Xx5v6/GASD TIP FINAL.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:

Right to Appeal

1) Only tenured teachers who receive an APPR rating of "Ineffective" or "Developing" may appeal their evaluation through the procedure herein. A teacher may appeal each evaluation only once. A component may not be appealed until all parts of the evaluation have been received. All parts of the evaluation being appealed must be done at one time. Alternatively, the teacher can submit a

written rebuttal, which will be attached to the evaluation.

2) Probationary teachers may not file appeals through the procedure established herein but may file a written rebuttal which shall be attached to the evaluation.

Standard for Appeal

The parties agree that the goal of the APPR is to improve teaching practice and will not be used for any other purpose.

An appeal of an evaluation must be based upon one or more of the following grounds:

- 1) The substance of the APPR;*
- 2) The District's failure to adhere to the standards and methodologies required for the APPR that are set forth in Education Law§3012-c and applicable rules and regulations;*
- 3) The District's failure to comply with locally negotiated procedures; and*
- 4) The District's failure to issue and/or implement the terms of the Teacher Improvement Plan, where applicable, as required under Education Law§3012-c*

Level I: Conference with Reviewer

Within 5 school days of receipt of the evaluation, a teacher may appeal the evaluation by submitting Part I of the Evaluation Appeals Form to the administrator issuing the evaluation and their ATA building president. The administrator shall provide to the teacher a copy of any and all district approved forms upon which the evaluation was based. A meeting of the teacher, administrator and ATA representative will be held no later than 10 school days of the request being filed. Within 5 school days of the meeting, the administrator will uphold or modify the evaluation or re-conduct a specific component of the evaluation and notify the teacher in writing of their intent to do so. If the teacher is not satisfied with the outcome of this written decision, (s)he may appeal or rebut, in accordance with this agreement.

Level II: Review by APPR Appeals Panel

- 1. A tenured teacher may file a written appeal of the evaluation to the Office of Personnel within 10 school days of the receipt of the Level I Decision. Part II of the Evaluation Appeals Form must be completed. This form must identify the grounds for appeal, and shall explain why the appealing teacher believes the evaluation should be modified or invalidated.*
- 2. The Office of Personnel will send a copy of the appeals and necessary paperwork to the Superintendent of Schools and the ATA President within 5 days of receipt of the appeal. The Office of Personnel will coordinate the mutually agreed upon place, time and date of the meeting.*
- 3. The Superintendent and ATA President will appoint the Appeals Panel within 5 days of receipt of the appeals. The Office of Personnel will share the appeals and necessary paperwork with the newly appointed panel members within 5 days of receipt of the names of the panel members. The Appeals Panel will then convene in a timely fashion, no later than 10 days after receipt of appeals packet.*

The Appeals Panel will be made up of three tenured administrators from within the District, appointed by the Superintendent of Schools, and three tenured teachers from within the District, appointed by the ATA President. The Panel will be drawn from a pool of trained/qualified administrators and teachers. All members of the pool shall complete evaluator training prior to panel selection. The District will make every effort to provide trainings during non-instructional time (included but not limited to summer, conference or staff development days and after school). In the event that training takes place after contractual hours, teachers will be paid the contractual workshop rate. The hearing of appeals will not take place during instructional time. Members in the pool will commit to a three-year term. If a case is under review, the same panel must work until the appeal is resolved.

It shall be the duty of the Panel to answer the question, "Is there reasonable basis for the appeal and if so, what action is needed to resolve the situation?"

Determination of Appeal

The Appeals Panel shall issue its decision within 10 days of receiving the appeal. Upon the conclusion of its consideration of an appeal, each member of the Panel shall vote by confidential ballot to uphold or modify the evaluation. The Panel cannot conclude Level II of the Appeals Process until a majority decision has been reached. If the majority of the Panel determines that the evaluation should be upheld, then the rating shall stand. If the majority of the Panel determines that the evaluation should be modified, then it shall also make a determination as to how the modifications will be achieved, including, but not limited to, changing the rating or ordering a specific component of the evaluation to be re-conducted. Only a majority vote of the Appeals Panel can forward an "Ineffective" final rating to be used toward any discipline charges or any other future legal or contractual decision tied to an "Ineffective" rating.

Level III: Appeal to the Superintendent

If a teacher is rated “Ineffective” and appeals the rating and the Panel changes the rating to “Developing,” the person cannot appeal to the Superintendent. However, in all other cases, a teacher may appeal a Level II decision to the Superintendent within 5 days of teacher receipt of the Panel’s decision. The Superintendent will issue a decision within 10 days of receiving the appeal.

The determination of the appeal pursuant to the above process is final and binding. It is not subject to any further appeal pursuant to the contractual grievance procedure, or to any administrative or judicial tribunal. However, the failure of the District to abide by the above agreed upon process shall be subject to the grievance procedure set forth in the parties’ collective bargaining agreement. Nothing contained in this provision shall prohibit a teacher who is the subject of discipline pursuant to the expedited disciplinary process of Education Law Section 3020-a from raising the validity of the APPR in question.

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 and lead evaluators have been trained and certified in accordance with regulation. The district utilizes and will continue to utilize the Hamilton-Fulton-Montgomery BOCES Network Team evaluator/ lead evaluator training in accordance with SED procedures and processes.

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

- New York State Teaching Standards and ISLLC 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*
 - Use of Statewide instruction Reporting System*
 - Scoring methodology used to evaluate teachers and principals*
- Specific considerations in evaluating teachers of state-specified subgroups*

Recertification and Updated Training

The District will work to ensure that lead evaluators maintain inter-rater reliability over time, that they are re-certified on a regular basis and receive updated training on any changes in the law, regulations or applicable collective bargaining agreements. The BOCES training has included five separate full day lead evaluator sessions and a process to maintain inter-rater reliability over time in accordance with NYSED guidance and protocols recommended in training for lead evaluators.

In addition:

Danielson Framework for Teaching training for all evaluators has been received by administrators (3 days). Yearly refresher training on the Framework will be also be required (The training may be provided by district personnel or through available resources outside of the school district).

Multidimensional Professional Performance Review (MPPR) Rubric training provided by Hamilton-Fulton-Montgomery BOCES Network Team is required and scheduled for November 2012. This is supplemental training that will focus on an understanding of the MPPR as it will apply to the Annual Professional Performance Review.

Inter-rater reliability will be assessed through the training process as participants will be required to collect evidence, align the evidence to the rubric, and score sample teacher performance. Each evaluator will be required to maintain records verifying their participation in the training program. These records, along with a sampling of the evaluators work, will be used to certify and re-certify all evaluators. Inter-rater reliability training will take place during the Fall of the 2012-13 school year. Continued training on inter-rater reliability during monthly administrative meetings over the course of the 2012-2013 will occur.

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 | Checked |
|---|---------|

| | |
|---|---------|
| 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. | |
| 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, October 08, 2012

Updated Monday, October 22, 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):

| |
|---------------|
| K-5 |
| 6-8 |
| 9-12 |
| (No response) |
| (No response) |
| (No response) |
| (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. | not applicable |
| Highly Effective (18 - 20 points) Results are well above state average for similar students (or District goals if no state test). | not applicable |
| Effective (9 - 17 points) Results meet state average for similar students (or District goals if no state test). | not applicable |
| Developing (3 - 8 points) Results are below state average for similar students (or District goals if no state test). | not applicable |
| Ineffective (0 - 2 points) Results are well below state average for similar students (or District goals if no state test). | not applicable |

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.

There are no special considerations

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 Tuesday, October 09, 2012

Updated Thursday, November 29, 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-5 | (d) measures used by district for teacher evaluation | NYS Grades 3-5 ELA Assessments |
| 6-8 | (d) measures used by district for teacher evaluation | NYS Grades 6-8 ELA Assessments |
| 9-12 | (d) measures used by district for teacher evaluation | ELA, Algebra, Algebra 2/Trigonometry, Geometry, Global Studies, US History, Living Environments, Chemistry, Earth Science and Physics NYS Regents Exams |
| | | |
| | | |
| | | |
| | | |

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>School-wide measure of student achievement: Our goal is to increase level of students scoring a Level 2 or better on ELA assessments school wide by 3 percentage points compared to previous year's level of performance on each NYS ELA assessments. All elementary schools will demonstrate evidence of school wide achievement based on Grades 3-5 NYS ELA assessments. The middle school will demonstrate evidence of school wide achievement based on Grades 6-8 NYS ELA. Grades 9-12 will see an increase the level of proficiency by 3 percentage points of the composite score of ELA, Algebra, Algebra 2/Trigonometry, Geometry, Global Studies, US History, Living Environments, Chemistry, Earth Science and Physics NYS Regents Exams to 73%. HEDI points will be awarded to teachers based on the actual percentage of</p> |
|--|--|

students scoring Level 2 or better on the final assessment for grades 3-8. For grades 9-12 HEDI points will be awarded to teachers based on the actual percentage of students scoring proficiency on the Regents exams.

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

The school-wide attainment of student achievement far exceeds the district established school-wide targets. School-wide student achievement far exceeds the targeted 3 percentage point increase in students scoring level on the NYS ELA assessments or NYS Regent assessments compared to previous year results. See attached tables for school specific targets.

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

The school-wide attainment of student achievement is within the district established school-wide targets. See attached tables for school specific targets.

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

The school-wide attainment of student achievement is below the district established school-wide targets. School-wide student achievement is below the targeted 3 percentage point increase in students scoring level on the NYS ELA assessments or NYS Regents assessments compared to previous year results. See attached tables for school specific targets.

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

The school-wide attainment of student achievement is substantially below the district established school-wide targets. School-wide student achievement is substantially below the targeted 3 percentage point increase in students scoring level on the NYS ELA assessments or NYS Regents assessments compared to previous year results. See attached tables for school specific targets.

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/5366/191523-qBFVOWF7fC/GASD_REVISED_LOCAL_Measures102012_2.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. | not applicable |
| Highly Effective (18 - 20 points) Results are well above District- or BOCES-adopted expectations for growth or achievement for grade/subject. | not applicable |
| Effective (9- 17 points) Results meet District- or BOCES-adopted expectations for growth or achievement for grade/subject. | not applicable |
| Developing (3 - 8 points) Results are below District- or BOCES-adopted expectations for growth or achievement for grade/subject. | not applicable |
| Ineffective (0 - 2 points) Results are well below District- or BOCES-adopted expectations for growth or achievement for grade/subject. | not applicable |

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.

There are no locally developed controls

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.

none

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 Tuesday, October 09, 2012
Updated Thursday, November 29, 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. | (No response) |
| 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). | (No response) |

9.4) Sources of Evidence (if applicable)

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

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

9.5) Survey Tool(s) (if applicable)

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

(No response)

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

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

9.6) Assurances

Please check all of the boxes below:

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

9.7) Process for Assigning Points and Determining HEDI Ratings

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

The district shall utilize the Multidimensional Professional Performance Review (MPPR) rubric for principal evaluation as the basis for the 60 points allocated to measures of leadership and management. The superintendent's designee's assessment shall be based on at least 3 visits of 30 minutes or more to the school, while in session. Two will be as agreed to between the superintendent's designee and principal, one will be unannounced. Any indicator not observed will be scored a zero.

All visits must be completed no later than April 30. Additional sources of information for evidence in support of each domain of the rubric: may include

- School documents related to components of the rubric.*
- A joint critical analysis of the NYS School Report Card (or other similar NYS accountability report) including discussion of actions to improve student performance and district resources available to facilitate implementation of these actions.*
- No later than March 1, the principal and the Superintendent's designee shall meet to discuss the principal's progress. They will discuss domains in which evidence of success is still needed.*
- No later than May 31, the principal and the Superintendent's designee shall meet to review these initiatives and actions of the principal over the year and to review how district resources have been used.*

The District and the Association have agreed to the following Points Allocation to be used for the final summative evaluation for the 2012-13 school year among the following six Domains contained within the agreed-upon principal practice rubric:

DOMAIN 1 – SHARED VISION OF LEARNING (8 points)

DOMAIN 2 –SCHOOL CULTURE AND INSTRUCTIONAL PROGRAM (15 points)

DOMAIN 3 – SAFE, EFFICIENT, EFFECTIVE LEARNING ENVIRONMENT (12 points)

DOMAIN 4 - COMMUNITY (9 points)

DOMAIN5 – INTEGRITY, FAIRNESS, ETHICS (8 points)

DOMAIN 6 – POLITICAL, SOCIAL, ECONOMIC, LEGAL AND CULTURAL CONTEXT (8 points)

See attached document

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/5143/191533-pMADJ4gk6R/GASD FINAL MPPR TEMPLATE.doc](#)

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. | Overall principal performance substantially exceeds district standard for leadership performance based on NYS standards (ISLLC 2008). Points will be assigned in this category based on the total achieved on the GASD GASD MPPR-Multidimensional Professional Performance Review. The point distribution range for highly effective is 59 - 60. |
| Effective: Overall performance and results meet standards. | Overall principal performance meets or exceeds district standard for leadership performance based on NYS standards (ISLLC 2008). Points will be assigned in this category based on the total achieved on the GASD GASD MPPR-Multidimensional Professional Performance Review. The point distribution range for effective is 49-58. |
| Developing: Overall performance and results need improvement in order to meet standards. | Overall principal performance does not meet district standard for leadership performance based on NYS standards (ISLLC 2008). Points will be assigned in this category based on the total achieved on the GASD GASD MPPR-Multidimensional Professional Performance Review. The point distribution range for developing is 34-48. |
| Ineffective: Overall performance and results do not meet standards. | Overall principal performance is substantially below the district standard for leadership performance based on NYS standards (ISLLC 2008). Points will be assigned in this category based on the total achieved on the GASD GASD MPPR-Multidimensional Professional Performance Review. The point distribution range for ineffective is 0-33. |

Please provide the locally-negotiated 60 point scoring bands.

| | |
|------------------|-------|
| Highly Effective | 59-60 |
| Effective | 49-58 |
| Developing | 34-48 |
| Ineffective | 0-33 |

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 | 3 |
| By trained administrator | 0 |
| By trained independent evaluator | 0 |
| Enter Total | 3 |

Tenured Principals

| | |
|----------------------------------|---|
| By supervisor | 3 |
| By trained administrator | 0 |
| By trained independent evaluator | 0 |
| Enter Total | 3 |

10. Composite Scoring (Principals)

Created Tuesday, October 09, 2012

Updated Monday, October 22, 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 | 59-60 |
| Effective | 49-58 |
| Developing | 34-48 |
| Ineffective | 0-33 |

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 Tuesday, October 09, 2012

Updated Wednesday, November 28, 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/5276/191546-Df0w3Xx5v6/GASD PIP.docx](#)

11.3) Appeals Process

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

(1) the substance of the annual professional performance review

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

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

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

Appeals are limited to those identified by Education Law §3012 c, as follows:

(1) The substance of the annual professional performance review;

(2) The school district's or board of cooperative educational services' adherence to the standards and methodologies required for such reviews;

(3) The adherence to Commissioner's Regulations, as applicable to such reviews;

(4) Compliance with any applicable locally negotiated procedures applicable to annual professional performance reviews or

improvement plans; and

(5) The school district's or board of cooperative educational services' issuance and/or implementation of the terms of the principal improvement plan.

(6) Only tenured principals who receive an APPR rating of "Ineffective" or "Developing" may appeal their evaluation through the procedure herein. Alternatively, principals can submit a written rebuttal, which will be attached to the evaluation. Probationary principals may not file appeals through the procedure established herein but may file a written rebuttal which shall be attached to the evaluation.

RATINGS THAT MAY BE APPEALED:

Appeals of annual professional performance reviews may be brought for ineffective, developing or any rating tied to compensation. An appeal may only be initiated once a principal receives the overall composite score and rating.

PROHIBITION AGAINST MORE THAN ONE APPEAL

A principal may not file multiple appeals regarding the same performance review. The issuance of an improvement plan may prompt an appeal independent of the performance review. The implementation of an improvement plan may be appealed upon each alleged breach thereof. All grounds for appeal must be raised with specificity within such appeal. Any grounds not raised shall be deemed waived.

BURDEN OF PROOF

The burden shall be on the building principal to establish by the preponderance of the evidence that the rating given to the appellant was justified or that an improvement plan was appropriately issued and/or implemented.

TIME FRAME FOR FILING APPEAL

All appeals shall be filed in writing. (Utilize Office of Personnel here to assist.)

An appeal of a performance review must be filed no later than fifteen (15) business days of the date when the principal receives their final APPR. If a principal is challenging the content of a principal improvement plan, appeals must be filed with fifteen (15) business days of issuance of such plan. An appeal of the implementation of an improvement plan shall be within fifteen (15) business days of the failure of the district to implement any component of the plan.

The failure to file an appeal within these timeframes shall be deemed a waiver of the right to appeal and the appeal shall be deemed abandoned. An extension of the time in which to appeal may be granted by the superintendent upon written request. This extension must not extend the appeal to where it is no longer deemed timely and expeditious.

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. Supportive evidence about the challenges may also be submitted with the appeal. Any additional documents or materials relevant to the appeal must be provided by the district upon written request for same. The performance review and/or improvement plan being challenged must also be submitted with the appeal.

DECISION PROCESS FOR APPEAL

Within ten (10) business days of receipt of an appeal, the evaluator (Superintendent's designee) 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 evaluator's (Superintendent's designee) response. The principal initiating the appeal shall receive a copy of the response and all additional information submitted with the response, at the same time the evaluator (Superintendent's designee) files its response.

If the principal is not satisfied with the outcome of this written decision, (s)he may appeal or rebut, in accordance with this agreement. The parties agree that:

- a. Within five (5) business days of the District response above, the principal may file an appeal with the Office of Personnel.
- b. An appeals panel shall be chosen comprised of 2 Directors (that were not involved in the evaluation) and 2 Amsterdam School Administrator's Association (ASAA) representatives.
- c. The appeal shall be heard by the panel in a timely manner after the appeal is made, but in no event shall it be less than five (5) business days or more than fifteen (15) business days after the appeal is received.
- d. The hearing shall be conducted in no more than one (1) business day unless extenuating circumstances are present and the parties agree to a second day.
- e. The parties shall have the ability to be represented by either legal counsel, union representative, or appear pro se.

DECISION

The panel shall submit a written decision on the merits of the appeal no later than ten (10) business days from the close of the hearing. Such decision shall be a final administrative decision.

The decision shall set forth the reasons and factual basis for the determination on each of the specific issues raised in the appeal. A copy of the decision shall be provided to the principal and the district representative.

A principal may then appeal to the Superintendent of Schools. If the panel changes the rating to “Developing,” the principal cannot appeal to the Superintendent. However, in all other cases, a principal may appeal a panel decision to the Superintendent within 5 days of receipt of the panel’s decision. The Superintendent will issue a decision within 10 days of receiving the appeal.

A principal who files an appeal does not waive his/her right to submit a written rebuttal to the final evaluation. A principal who elects to submit a written rebuttal to his/her evaluation prior to the expiration of the fifteen (15) business days in which to file a notice of appeal does not waive her/his right to file an appeal.

EXCLUSIVITY OF SECTION 3012C APPEAL PROCEDURE

This appeal procedure shall constitute the means for initiating, reviewing and resolving challenges to a principal performance review or improvement plan. A principal may not resort to any other contractual grievance procedures for the resolution of challenges and appeals related to a professional performance review and/or improvement plan.

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 and lead evaluators have been trained and certified in accordance with regulation. The district utilizes and will continue to utilize the Hamilton-Fulton-Montgomery BOCES Network Team evaluator/ lead evaluator training in accordance with SED procedures and processes.

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

- *New York State Teaching Standards and ISLLC 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 ELLS and students with disabilities.

Recertification and Updated Training

The District will work to ensure that lead evaluators maintain inter-rater reliability over time, that they are re-certified on a regular basis and receive updated training on any changes in the law, regulations or applicable collective bargaining agreements. The BOCES training has included five separate full day lead evaluator sessions and a process to maintain inter-rater reliability over time in accordance with NYSED guidance and protocols recommended in training for lead evaluators.

In addition:

Danielson Framework for Teaching training for all evaluators has been received by administrators (3 days). Yearly refresher training on the Framework will be also be required (The training may be provided by district personnel or through available resources outside of the school district).

Multidimensional Professional Performance Review (MPPR) Rubric training provided by Hamilton-Fulton-Montgomery BOCES Network Team is required and scheduled for November 2012. This is supplemental training that will focus on an understanding of the MPPR as it will apply to the Annual Professional Performance Review.

Inter-rater reliability will be assessed through the training process as participants will be required to collect evidence, align the evidence to the rubric, and score sample teacher performance. Each evaluator will be required to maintain records verifying their participation in the training program. These records, along with a sampling of the evaluators work, will be used to certify and re-certify all evaluators. Inter-rater reliability training will take place during the Fall of the 2012-13 school year. Continued training on inter-rater reliability during monthly administrative meetings over the course of the 2012-2013 will occur.

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 | Checked |
|---|---------|

| | |
|---|---------|
| writing, no later than the last school day of the school year for which the principal is being measured. | |
| 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 Monday, October 08, 2012

Updated Friday, November 30, 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/5581/191509-3Uqgn5g9Iu/signature_sheet3.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 SCALES GASD STATE GROWTH

20 Point

| | HEDI Points | SLO Target | HEDI Scores Range |
|-------------------------|--------------------|-------------------|--------------------------|
| Ineffective | 0 | 0.00% | 0.00% to 6.91% |
| | 1 | 6.92% | 6.92% to 13.83% |
| | 2 | 13.84% | 13.84% to 20.75% |
| Developing | 3 | 20.76% | 20.76% to 27.67% |
| | 4 | 27.68% | 27.68% to 34.59% |
| | 5 | 34.60% | 34.60% to 41.51% |
| | 6 | 41.52% | 41.52% to 48.43% |
| | 7 | 48.44% | 48.44% to 55.36% |
| | 8 | 55.37% | 55.37% to 62.28% |
| Effective | 9 | 62.29% | 62.29% to 65.70% |
| | 10 | 65.71% | 65.71% to 69.13% |
| | 11 | 69.14% | 69.14% to 72.56% |
| | 12 | 72.57% | 72.57% to 75.99% |
| | 13 | 76.00% | 76.00% to 79.42% |
| | 14 | 79.43% | 79.43% to 82.85% |
| | 15 | 82.86% | 82.86% to 86.28% |
| | 16 | 86.29% | 86.29% to 89.70% |
| | 17 | 89.71% | 89.71% to 93.13% |
| Highly Effective | 18 | 93.14% | 93.14% to 96.56% |
| | 19 | 96.57% | 96.57% to 98.28% |
| | 20 | 98.29% | 98.29% to 100.00% |

GASD LOCAL Measures

The Locally Selected Measures component will measure achievement. The following locally selected assessments shall be used as evidence:

School-wide measures of student achievement:

Our goal is to increase level of students scoring a Level 2 or better on ELA assessments school wide by 3 percentage points for all 4 elementary schools and middle school compared to previous year's level of performance on each assessment.

- All elementary schools will demonstrate evidence of school wide achievement based on Grades 3-5 NYS ELA assessments. The middle school will demonstrate evidence of school wide achievement based on Grades 6-8 NYS ELA assessments. (see attached HEDI scales for each building)

Lynch Literacy Academy (GRADES 6-8)

Teachers/Principal will be awarded HEDI points based on the percentage of students scoring Basic Standard L2 or higher on the NYS ELA Assessment. The goal is a 3% improvement over the 2011-2012 NYS ELA assessments grades 6-8.

Lynch Literacy Academy 15 Point Rubric

| | HEDI Points | Proficiency Target | HEDI Scores Range | | |
|------------------|-------------|--------------------|-------------------|----|---------|
| Ineffective | 0 | 0.00% | 0.00% | to | 10.24% |
| | 1 | 10.25% | 10.25% | to | 20.49% |
| | 2 | 20.50% | 20.50% | to | 30.74% |
| Developing | 3 | 30.75% | 30.75% | to | 40.99% |
| | 4 | 41.00% | 41.00% | to | 51.24% |
| | 5 | 51.25% | 51.25% | to | 61.49% |
| | 6 | 61.50% | 61.50% | to | 71.74% |
| | 7 | 71.75% | 71.75% | to | 81.99% |
| Effective | 8 | 82.00% | 82.00% | to | 82.99% |
| | 9 | 83.00% | 83.00% | to | 83.99% |
| | 10 | 84.00% | 84.00% | to | 86.99% |
| | 11 | 87.00% | 87.00% | to | 87.99% |
| | 12 | 88.00% | 88.00% | to | 88.99% |
| | 13 | 89.00% | 89.00% | to | 89.99% |
| Highly Effective | 14 | 90.00% | 90.00% | to | 95.00% |
| | 15 | 95.01% | 95.01% | to | 100.00% |

Lynch 20 Point Rubric

| LYNCH | HEDI Points | Proficiency Target | HEDI Score Range |
|------------------|-------------|--------------------|-------------------|
| Ineffective | 0 | 0.00% | 0.00% to 9.99% |
| | 1 | 10.00% | 10.00% to 19.99% |
| | 2 | 20.00% | 20.00% to 27.99% |
| Developing | 3 | 28.00% | 28.00% to 36.99% |
| | 4 | 37.00% | 37.00% to 46.99% |
| | 5 | 47.00% | 47.00% to 55.99% |
| | 6 | 56.00% | 56.00% to 64.99% |
| | 7 | 65.00% | 65.00% to 74.99% |
| | 8 | 75.00% | 75.00% to 81.99% |
| Effective | 9 | 82.00% | 82.00% to 83.99% |
| | 10 | 84.00% | 84.00% to 84.99% |
| | 11 | 85.00% | 85.00% to 85.99% |
| | 12 | 86.00% | 86.00% to 86.99% |
| | 13 | 87.00% | 87.00% to 87.99% |
| | 14 | 88.00% | 88.00% to 88.99% |
| | 15 | 89.00% | 89.00% to 89.99% |
| | 16 | 90.00% | 90.00% to 90.99% |
| | 17 | 91.00% | 91.00% to 91.99% |
| Highly Effective | 18 | 92.00% | 92.00% to 92.99% |
| | 19 | 93.00% | 93.00% to 97.99% |
| | 20 | 98.00% | 98.00% to 100.00% |

Marie Curie Elementary School (GRADES K-5)

Teachers/Principal will be awarded HEDI points based on the percentage of students scoring Basic Standard L2 or higher on the NYS ELA Assessment. The goal is a 3% improvement over the 2011-2012 NYS ELA assessments grades 3-5.

Marie Curie Elementary School 15 Point Rubric

| | HEDI Points | Proficiency Target | HEDI Scores Range | |
|------------------|-------------|--------------------|-------------------|------------|
| Ineffective | 0 | 0.00% | 0.00% | to 9.61% |
| | 1 | 9.62% | 9.62% | to 19.24% |
| | 2 | 19.25% | 19.25% | to 28.87% |
| Developing | 3 | 28.88% | 28.88% | to 38.49% |
| | 4 | 38.50% | 38.50% | to 48.12% |
| | 5 | 48.13% | 48.13% | to 57.74% |
| | 6 | 57.75% | 57.75% | to 67.37% |
| | 7 | 67.38% | 67.38% | to 76.99% |
| Effective | 8 | 77.00% | 77.00% | to 77.99% |
| | 9 | 78.00% | 78.00% | to 78.99% |
| | 10 | 79.00% | 79.00% | to 81.99% |
| | 11 | 82.00% | 82.00% | to 82.99% |
| | 12 | 83.00% | 83.00% | to 83.99% |
| | 13 | 84.00% | 84.00% | to 91.99% |
| Highly Effective | 14 | 92.00% | 92.00% | to 96.00% |
| | 15 | 96.01% | 96.01% | to 100.00% |

Marie Curie Elementary School 20 Point Rubric

| | HEDI Points | Proficiency Target | HEDI Score Range |
|------------------|-------------|--------------------|-------------------|
| Ineffective | 0 | 0.00% | 0.00% to 9.99% |
| | 1 | 10.00% | 10.00% to 19.99% |
| | 2 | 20.00% | 20.00% to 27.99% |
| Developing | 3 | 28.00% | 28.00% to 36.99% |
| | 4 | 37.00% | 37.00% to 46.99% |
| | 5 | 47.00% | 47.00% to 55.99% |
| | 6 | 56.00% | 56.00% to 64.99% |
| | 7 | 65.00% | 65.00% to 74.99% |
| | 8 | 75.00% | 75.00% to 77.99% |
| Effective | 9 | 78.00% | 78.00% to 78.99% |
| | 10 | 79.00% | 79.00% to 79.99% |
| | 11 | 80.00% | 80.00% to 80.99% |
| | 12 | 81.00% | 81.00% to 81.99% |
| | 13 | 82.00% | 82.00% to 82.99% |
| | 14 | 83.00% | 83.00% to 83.99% |
| | 15 | 84.00% | 84.00% to 84.99% |
| | 16 | 85.00% | 85.00% to 85.99% |
| | 17 | 86.00% | 86.00% to 86.99% |
| Highly Effective | 18 | 87.00% | 87.00% to 90.99% |
| | 19 | 91.00% | 91.00% to 95.99% |
| | 20 | 96.00% | 96.00% to 100.00% |

William B. Tecler Elementary School (GRADES K-5)

Teachers/Principal will be awarded HEDI points based on the percentage of students scoring Basic Standard (L2) or higher on the NYS ELA Assessment. The goal is a 3% improvement over the 2011-2012 NYS ELA assessments grades 3-5.

William B. Tecler Elementary School 15 Point Rubric

| | HEDI Points | Proficiency Target | HEDI Scores Range | |
|------------------|-------------|--------------------|-------------------|------------|
| Ineffective | 0 | 0.00% | 0.00% | to 8.37% |
| | 1 | 8.38% | 8.38% | to 16.74% |
| | 2 | 16.75% | 16.75% | to 25.12% |
| Developing | 3 | 25.13% | 25.13% | to 33.49% |
| | 4 | 33.50% | 33.50% | to 41.87% |
| | 5 | 41.88% | 41.88% | to 50.24% |
| | 6 | 50.25% | 50.25% | to 58.62% |
| | 7 | 58.63% | 58.63% | to 66.99% |
| Effective | 8 | 67.00% | 67.00% | to 67.99% |
| | 9 | 68.00% | 68.00% | to 68.99% |
| | 10 | 69.00% | 69.00% | to 71.99% |
| | 11 | 72.00% | 72.00% | to 72.99% |
| | 12 | 73.00% | 73.00% | to 73.99% |
| | 13 | 74.00% | 74.00% | to 80.99% |
| Highly Effective | 14 | 81.00% | 81.00% | to 90.50% |
| | 15 | 90.51% | 90.51% | to 100.00% |

William B. Tecler Elementary School 20 Point Rubric

| | HEDI Points | Proficiency Percent | HEDI Scores Range |
|------------------|-------------|---------------------|-------------------|
| Ineffective | 0 | 0.00% | 0.00% to 7.55% |
| | 1 | 7.56% | 7.56% to 15.10% |
| | 2 | 15.11% | 15.11% to 22.66% |
| Developing | 3 | 22.67% | 22.67% to 30.21% |
| | 4 | 30.22% | 30.22% to 37.77% |
| | 5 | 37.78% | 37.78% to 45.32% |
| | 6 | 45.33% | 45.33% to 52.88% |
| | 7 | 52.89% | 52.89% to 60.43% |
| | 8 | 60.44% | 60.44% to 67.99% |
| Effective | 9 | 68.00% | 68.00% to 68.49% |
| | 10 | 68.50% | 68.50% to 69.49% |
| | 11 | 69.50% | 69.50% to 70.50% |
| | 12 | 70.51% | 70.51% to 71.99% |
| | 13 | 72.00% | 72.00% to 75.99% |
| | 14 | 76.00% | 76.00% to 79.99% |
| | 15 | 80.00% | 80.00% to 83.99% |
| | 16 | 84.00% | 84.00% to 87.99% |
| | 17 | 88.00% | 88.00% to 91.99% |
| Highly Effective | 18 | 92.00% | 92.00% to 95.99% |
| | 19 | 96.00% | 96.00% to 98.00% |
| | 20 | 98.01% | 98.01% to 100.00% |

Raphael J. McNulty Elementary School (GRADES K-5)

Teachers/Principal will be awarded HEDI points based on the percentage of students scoring Basic Standard L2 or higher on the NYS ELA Assessment. The goal is a 3% improvement over the 2011-2012 NYS ELA assessments grades 3-5. to 73% school wide 2011-12 ELA grades 3-5 assessments.

Raphael J. McNulty Elementary School 15 Point Rubric

| | HEDI Points | Proficiency Target | HEDI Scores Range | |
|------------------|-------------|--------------------|-------------------|------------|
| Ineffective | 0 | 0.00% | 0.00% | to 8.87% |
| | 1 | 8.88% | 8.88% | to 17.74% |
| | 2 | 17.75% | 17.75% | to 26.62% |
| Developing | 3 | 26.63% | 26.63% | to 35.49% |
| | 4 | 35.50% | 35.50% | to 44.37% |
| | 5 | 44.38% | 44.38% | to 53.24% |
| | 6 | 53.25% | 53.25% | to 62.12% |
| | 7 | 62.13% | 62.13% | to 70.99% |
| Effective | 8 | 71.00% | 71.00% | to 71.99% |
| | 9 | 72.00% | 72.00% | to 72.99% |
| | 10 | 73.00% | 73.00% | to 75.99% |
| | 11 | 76.00% | 76.00% | to 76.99% |
| | 12 | 77.00% | 77.00% | to 77.99% |
| | 13 | 78.00% | 78.00% | to 82.99% |
| Highly Effective | 14 | 83.00% | 83.00% | to 91.50% |
| | 15 | 91.51% | 91.51% | to 100.00% |

Raphael J. McNulty Elementary School 20 Point Rubric

| | HEDI Points | Proficiency Target | HEDI Scores Range |
|------------------|-------------|--------------------|-------------------|
| Ineffective | 0 | 0.00% | 0.00% to 7.99% |
| | 1 | 8.00% | 8.00% to 15.99% |
| | 2 | 16.00% | 16.00% to 23.99% |
| Developing | 3 | 24.00% | 24.00% to 31.99% |
| | 4 | 32.00% | 32.00% to 39.99% |
| | 5 | 40.00% | 40.00% to 47.99% |
| | 6 | 48.00% | 48.00% to 55.99% |
| | 7 | 56.00% | 56.00% to 63.99% |
| | 8 | 64.00% | 64.00% to 71.99% |
| Effective | 9 | 72.00% | 72.00% to 72.50% |
| | 10 | 72.51% | 72.51% to 73.50% |
| | 11 | 73.51% | 73.51% to 74.50% |
| | 12 | 74.51% | 74.51% to 75.99% |
| | 13 | 76.00% | 76.00% to 79.85% |
| | 14 | 79.86% | 79.86% to 83.20% |
| | 15 | 83.21% | 83.21% to 86.56% |
| | 16 | 86.57% | 86.57% to 89.92% |
| | 17 | 89.93% | 89.93% to 93.28% |
| Highly Effective | 18 | 93.29% | 93.29% to 96.63% |
| | 19 | 96.64% | 96.64% to 98.32% |
| | 20 | 98.33% | 98.33% to 100.00% |

William J. Barkley Elementary School (GRADES K-5)

Teachers/Principal will be awarded HEDI points based on the percentage of students scoring Basic Standard L2 or higher on the NYS ELA Assessment. The goal is a 3% improvement over the 2011-2012 NYS ELA assessments grades 3-5.

William J. Barkley Elementary School 15 Point Rubric

| | HEDI Points | Proficiency Target | HEDI Scores Range | | |
|------------------|-------------|--------------------|-------------------|----|---------|
| Ineffective | 0 | 0.00% | 0.00% | to | 10.99% |
| | 1 | 11.00% | 11.00% | to | 21.99% |
| | 2 | 22.00% | 22.00% | to | 32.99% |
| Developing | 3 | 33.00% | 33.00% | to | 43.99% |
| | 4 | 44.00% | 44.00% | to | 54.99% |
| | 5 | 55.00% | 55.00% | to | 65.99% |
| | 6 | 66.00% | 66.00% | to | 76.99% |
| | 7 | 77.00% | 77.00% | to | 87.99% |
| Effective | 8 | 88.00% | 88.00% | to | 88.99% |
| | 9 | 89.00% | 89.00% | to | 89.99% |
| | 10 | 90.00% | 90.00% | to | 92.99% |
| | 11 | 93.00% | 93.00% | to | 93.99% |
| | 12 | 94.00% | 94.00% | to | 94.99% |
| | 13 | 95.00% | 95.00% | to | 97.49% |
| Highly Effective | 14 | 97.50% | 97.50% | to | 98.75% |
| | 15 | 98.76% | 98.76% | to | 100.00% |

William J. Barkley Elementary School 20 Point Rubric

| | HEDI Points | Proficiency Target | HEDI Scores Range |
|-------------------------|--------------------|---------------------------|--------------------------|
| Ineffective | 0 | 0.00% | 0.00% to 9.88% |
| | 1 | 9.89% | 9.89% to 19.77% |
| | 2 | 19.78% | 19.78% to 29.66% |
| Developing | 3 | 29.67% | 29.67% to 39.55% |
| | 4 | 39.56% | 39.56% to 49.43% |
| | 5 | 49.44% | 49.44% to 59.32% |
| | 6 | 59.33% | 59.33% to 69.21% |
| | 7 | 69.22% | 69.22% to 79.10% |
| | 8 | 79.11% | 79.11% to 88.99% |
| Effective | 9 | 89.00% | 89.00% to 89.99% |
| | 10 | 90.00% | 90.00% to 90.99% |
| | 11 | 91.00% | 91.00% to 91.99% |
| | 12 | 92.00% | 92.00% to 92.99% |
| | 13 | 93.00% | 93.00% to 93.99% |
| | 14 | 94.00% | 94.00% to 94.99% |
| | 15 | 95.00% | 95.00% to 95.99% |
| | 16 | 96.00% | 96.00% to 96.99% |
| | 17 | 97.00% | 97.00% to 97.99% |
| Highly Effective | 18 | 98.00% | 98.00% to 98.99% |
| | 19 | 99.00% | 99.00% to 99.50% |
| | 20 | 99.51% | 99.51% to 100.00% |

Amsterdam High School (Grades 9-12 ALL COURSES)

Teachers/Principal will be awarded HEDI points based on the percentage of the composite score of ELA, Algebra, Algebra 2/Trigonometry, Geometry, Global Studies, US History, Living Environments, Chemistry, Earth Science and Physics NYS Regents Exams grades 9-12 to proficiency (65 or better).

Amsterdam High School 15 Point Rubric

| | HEDI Points | Proficiency Targets | HEDI Scores Range | | |
|------------------|-------------|---------------------|-------------------|----|---------|
| Ineffective | 0 | 0.00% | 0.00% | to | 8.49% |
| | 1 | 8.50% | 8.50% | to | 16.99% |
| | 2 | 17.00% | 17.00% | to | 25.49% |
| Developing | 3 | 25.50% | 25.50% | to | 33.99% |
| | 4 | 34.00% | 34.00% | to | 42.49% |
| | 5 | 42.50% | 42.50% | to | 50.99% |
| | 6 | 51.00% | 51.00% | to | 59.49% |
| | 7 | 59.50% | 59.50% | to | 67.99% |
| Effective | 8 | 68.00% | 68.00% | to | 68.99% |
| | 9 | 69.00% | 69.00% | to | 69.99% |
| | 10 | 70.00% | 70.00% | to | 72.99% |
| | 11 | 73.00% | 73.00% | to | 73.99% |
| | 12 | 74.00% | 74.00% | to | 74.99% |
| | 13 | 75.00% | 75.00% | to | 79.99% |
| Highly Effective | 14 | 80.00% | 80.00% | to | 90.00% |
| | 15 | 90.01% | 90.01% | to | 100.00% |

Amsterdam High School 20 Point Rubric

| | HEDI Points | Proficiency Targets | HEDI Scores Range |
|------------------|-------------|---------------------|-------------------|
| Ineffective | 0 | 0.00% | 0.00% to 7.66% |
| | 1 | 7.67% | 7.67% to 15.32% |
| | 2 | 15.33% | 15.33% to 22.99% |
| Developing | 3 | 23.00% | 23.00% to 30.66% |
| | 4 | 30.67% | 30.67% to 38.32% |
| | 5 | 38.33% | 38.33% to 45.99% |
| | 6 | 46.00% | 46.00% to 53.66% |
| | 7 | 53.67% | 53.67% to 61.32% |
| | 8 | 61.33% | 61.33% to 68.99% |
| Effective | 9 | 69.00% | 69.00% to 69.99% |
| | 10 | 70.00% | 70.00% to 70.99% |
| | 11 | 71.00% | 71.00% to 71.99% |
| | 12 | 72.00% | 72.00% to 72.99% |
| | 13 | 73.00% | 73.00% to 73.99% |
| | 14 | 74.00% | 74.00% to 74.99% |
| | 15 | 75.00% | 75.00% to 79.99% |
| | 16 | 80.00% | 80.00% to 84.99% |
| | 17 | 85.00% | 85.00% to 89.99% |
| Highly Effective | 18 | 90.00% | 90.00% to 94.99% |
| | 19 | 95.00% | 95.00% to 97.50% |
| | 20 | 97.51% | 97.51% to 100.00% |

GASD LOCAL Measures

The Locally Selected Measures component will measure achievement. The following locally selected assessments shall be used as evidence:

School-wide measures of student achievement:

Our goal is to increase level of students scoring a Level 2 or better on ELA assessments school wide by 3 percentage points for all 4 elementary schools and middle school compared to previous year's level of performance on each assessment.

- All elementary schools will demonstrate evidence of school wide achievement based on Grades 3-5 NYS ELA assessments. The middle school will demonstrate evidence of school wide achievement based on Grades 6-8 NYS ELA assessments. (see attached HEDI scales for each building)

Lynch Literacy Academy (GRADES 6-8)

Teachers/Principal will be awarded HEDI points based on the percentage of students scoring Basic Standard L2 or higher on the NYS ELA Assessment. The goal is a 3% improvement over the 2011-2012 NYS ELA assessments grades 6-8.

Lynch Literacy Academy 15 Point Rubric

| | HEDI Points | Proficiency Target | HEDI Scores Range | |
|------------------|-------------|--------------------|-------------------|------------|
| Ineffective | 0 | 0.00% | 0.00% | to 10.24% |
| | 1 | 10.25% | 10.25% | to 20.49% |
| | 2 | 20.50% | 20.50% | to 30.74% |
| Developing | 3 | 30.75% | 30.75% | to 40.99% |
| | 4 | 41.00% | 41.00% | to 51.24% |
| | 5 | 51.25% | 51.25% | to 61.49% |
| | 6 | 61.50% | 61.50% | to 71.74% |
| | 7 | 71.75% | 71.75% | to 81.99% |
| Effective | 8 | 82.00% | 82.00% | to 82.99% |
| | 9 | 83.00% | 83.00% | to 83.99% |
| | 10 | 84.00% | 84.00% | to 86.99% |
| | 11 | 87.00% | 87.00% | to 87.99% |
| | 12 | 88.00% | 88.00% | to 88.99% |
| | 13 | 89.00% | 89.00% | to 89.99% |
| Highly Effective | 14 | 90.00% | 90.00% | to 95.00% |
| | 15 | 95.01% | 95.01% | to 100.00% |

Lynch 20 Point Rubric

| LYNCH | HEDI Points | Proficiency Target | HEDI Score Range |
|------------------|-------------|--------------------|-------------------|
| Ineffective | 0 | 0.00% | 0.00% to 9.99% |
| | 1 | 10.00% | 10.00% to 19.99% |
| | 2 | 20.00% | 20.00% to 27.99% |
| Developing | 3 | 28.00% | 28.00% to 36.99% |
| | 4 | 37.00% | 37.00% to 46.99% |
| | 5 | 47.00% | 47.00% to 55.99% |
| | 6 | 56.00% | 56.00% to 64.99% |
| | 7 | 65.00% | 65.00% to 74.99% |
| | 8 | 75.00% | 75.00% to 81.99% |
| Effective | 9 | 82.00% | 82.00% to 83.99% |
| | 10 | 84.00% | 84.00% to 84.99% |
| | 11 | 85.00% | 85.00% to 85.99% |
| | 12 | 86.00% | 86.00% to 86.99% |
| | 13 | 87.00% | 87.00% to 87.99% |
| | 14 | 88.00% | 88.00% to 88.99% |
| | 15 | 89.00% | 89.00% to 89.99% |
| | 16 | 90.00% | 90.00% to 90.99% |
| | 17 | 91.00% | 91.00% to 91.99% |
| Highly Effective | 18 | 92.00% | 92.00% to 92.99% |
| | 19 | 93.00% | 93.00% to 97.99% |
| | 20 | 98.00% | 98.00% to 100.00% |

Marie Curie Elementary School (GRADES K-5)

Teachers/Principal will be awarded HEDI points based on the percentage of students scoring Basic Standard L2 or higher on the NYS ELA Assessment. The goal is a 3% improvement over the 2011-2012 NYS ELA assessments grades 3-5.

Marie Curie Elementary School 15 Point Rubric

| | HEDI Points | Proficiency Target | HEDI Scores Range | |
|------------------|-------------|--------------------|-------------------|------------|
| Ineffective | 0 | 0.00% | 0.00% | to 9.61% |
| | 1 | 9.62% | 9.62% | to 19.24% |
| | 2 | 19.25% | 19.25% | to 28.87% |
| Developing | 3 | 28.88% | 28.88% | to 38.49% |
| | 4 | 38.50% | 38.50% | to 48.12% |
| | 5 | 48.13% | 48.13% | to 57.74% |
| | 6 | 57.75% | 57.75% | to 67.37% |
| | 7 | 67.38% | 67.38% | to 76.99% |
| Effective | 8 | 77.00% | 77.00% | to 77.99% |
| | 9 | 78.00% | 78.00% | to 78.99% |
| | 10 | 79.00% | 79.00% | to 81.99% |
| | 11 | 82.00% | 82.00% | to 82.99% |
| | 12 | 83.00% | 83.00% | to 83.99% |
| | 13 | 84.00% | 84.00% | to 91.99% |
| Highly Effective | 14 | 92.00% | 92.00% | to 96.00% |
| | 15 | 96.01% | 96.01% | to 100.00% |

Marie Curie Elementary School 20 Point Rubric

| | HEDI Points | Proficiency Target | HEDI Score Range |
|------------------|-------------|--------------------|-------------------|
| Ineffective | 0 | 0.00% | 0.00% to 9.99% |
| | 1 | 10.00% | 10.00% to 19.99% |
| | 2 | 20.00% | 20.00% to 27.99% |
| Developing | 3 | 28.00% | 28.00% to 36.99% |
| | 4 | 37.00% | 37.00% to 46.99% |
| | 5 | 47.00% | 47.00% to 55.99% |
| | 6 | 56.00% | 56.00% to 64.99% |
| | 7 | 65.00% | 65.00% to 74.99% |
| | 8 | 75.00% | 75.00% to 77.99% |
| Effective | 9 | 78.00% | 78.00% to 78.99% |
| | 10 | 79.00% | 79.00% to 79.99% |
| | 11 | 80.00% | 80.00% to 80.99% |
| | 12 | 81.00% | 81.00% to 81.99% |
| | 13 | 82.00% | 82.00% to 82.99% |
| | 14 | 83.00% | 83.00% to 83.99% |
| | 15 | 84.00% | 84.00% to 84.99% |
| | 16 | 85.00% | 85.00% to 85.99% |
| | 17 | 86.00% | 86.00% to 86.99% |
| Highly Effective | 18 | 87.00% | 87.00% to 90.99% |
| | 19 | 91.00% | 91.00% to 95.99% |
| | 20 | 96.00% | 96.00% to 100.00% |

William B. Tecler Elementary School (GRADES K-5)

Teachers/Principal will be awarded HEDI points based on the percentage of students scoring Basic Standard (L2) or higher on the NYS ELA Assessment. The goal is a 3% improvement over the 2011-2012 NYS ELA assessments grades 3-5.

William B. Tecler Elementary School 15 Point Rubric

| | HEDI Points | Proficiency Target | HEDI Scores Range | |
|------------------|-------------|--------------------|-------------------|------------|
| Ineffective | 0 | 0.00% | 0.00% | to 8.37% |
| | 1 | 8.38% | 8.38% | to 16.74% |
| | 2 | 16.75% | 16.75% | to 25.12% |
| Developing | 3 | 25.13% | 25.13% | to 33.49% |
| | 4 | 33.50% | 33.50% | to 41.87% |
| | 5 | 41.88% | 41.88% | to 50.24% |
| | 6 | 50.25% | 50.25% | to 58.62% |
| | 7 | 58.63% | 58.63% | to 66.99% |
| Effective | 8 | 67.00% | 67.00% | to 67.99% |
| | 9 | 68.00% | 68.00% | to 68.99% |
| | 10 | 69.00% | 69.00% | to 71.99% |
| | 11 | 72.00% | 72.00% | to 72.99% |
| | 12 | 73.00% | 73.00% | to 73.99% |
| | 13 | 74.00% | 74.00% | to 80.99% |
| Highly Effective | 14 | 81.00% | 81.00% | to 90.50% |
| | 15 | 90.51% | 90.51% | to 100.00% |

William B. Tecler Elementary School 20 Point Rubric

| | HEDI Points | Proficiency Percent | HEDI Scores Range |
|------------------|-------------|---------------------|-------------------|
| Ineffective | 0 | 0.00% | 0.00% to 7.55% |
| | 1 | 7.56% | 7.56% to 15.10% |
| | 2 | 15.11% | 15.11% to 22.66% |
| Developing | 3 | 22.67% | 22.67% to 30.21% |
| | 4 | 30.22% | 30.22% to 37.77% |
| | 5 | 37.78% | 37.78% to 45.32% |
| | 6 | 45.33% | 45.33% to 52.88% |
| | 7 | 52.89% | 52.89% to 60.43% |
| | 8 | 60.44% | 60.44% to 67.99% |
| Effective | 9 | 68.00% | 68.00% to 68.49% |
| | 10 | 68.50% | 68.50% to 69.49% |
| | 11 | 69.50% | 69.50% to 70.50% |
| | 12 | 70.51% | 70.51% to 71.99% |
| | 13 | 72.00% | 72.00% to 75.99% |
| | 14 | 76.00% | 76.00% to 79.99% |
| | 15 | 80.00% | 80.00% to 83.99% |
| | 16 | 84.00% | 84.00% to 87.99% |
| | 17 | 88.00% | 88.00% to 91.99% |
| Highly Effective | 18 | 92.00% | 92.00% to 95.99% |
| | 19 | 96.00% | 96.00% to 98.00% |
| | 20 | 98.01% | 98.01% to 100.00% |

Raphael J. McNulty Elementary School (GRADES K-5)

Teachers/Principal will be awarded HEDI points based on the percentage of students scoring Basic Standard L2 or higher on the NYS ELA Assessment. The goal is a 3% improvement over the 2011-2012 NYS ELA assessments grades 3-5. to 73% school wide 2011-12 ELA grades 3-5 assessments.

Raphael J. McNulty Elementary School 15 Point Rubric

| | HEDI Points | Proficiency Target | HEDI Scores Range | |
|------------------|-------------|--------------------|-------------------|------------|
| Ineffective | 0 | 0.00% | 0.00% | to 8.87% |
| | 1 | 8.88% | 8.88% | to 17.74% |
| | 2 | 17.75% | 17.75% | to 26.62% |
| Developing | 3 | 26.63% | 26.63% | to 35.49% |
| | 4 | 35.50% | 35.50% | to 44.37% |
| | 5 | 44.38% | 44.38% | to 53.24% |
| | 6 | 53.25% | 53.25% | to 62.12% |
| | 7 | 62.13% | 62.13% | to 70.99% |
| Effective | 8 | 71.00% | 71.00% | to 71.99% |
| | 9 | 72.00% | 72.00% | to 72.99% |
| | 10 | 73.00% | 73.00% | to 75.99% |
| | 11 | 76.00% | 76.00% | to 76.99% |
| | 12 | 77.00% | 77.00% | to 77.99% |
| | 13 | 78.00% | 78.00% | to 82.99% |
| Highly Effective | 14 | 83.00% | 83.00% | to 91.50% |
| | 15 | 91.51% | 91.51% | to 100.00% |

Raphael J. McNulty Elementary School 20 Point Rubric

| | HEDI Points | Proficiency Target | HEDI Scores Range |
|------------------|-------------|--------------------|-------------------|
| Ineffective | 0 | 0.00% | 0.00% to 7.99% |
| | 1 | 8.00% | 8.00% to 15.99% |
| | 2 | 16.00% | 16.00% to 23.99% |
| Developing | 3 | 24.00% | 24.00% to 31.99% |
| | 4 | 32.00% | 32.00% to 39.99% |
| | 5 | 40.00% | 40.00% to 47.99% |
| | 6 | 48.00% | 48.00% to 55.99% |
| | 7 | 56.00% | 56.00% to 63.99% |
| | 8 | 64.00% | 64.00% to 71.99% |
| Effective | 9 | 72.00% | 72.00% to 72.50% |
| | 10 | 72.51% | 72.51% to 73.50% |
| | 11 | 73.51% | 73.51% to 74.50% |
| | 12 | 74.51% | 74.51% to 75.99% |
| | 13 | 76.00% | 76.00% to 79.85% |
| | 14 | 79.86% | 79.86% to 83.20% |
| | 15 | 83.21% | 83.21% to 86.56% |
| | 16 | 86.57% | 86.57% to 89.92% |
| | 17 | 89.93% | 89.93% to 93.28% |
| Highly Effective | 18 | 93.29% | 93.29% to 96.63% |
| | 19 | 96.64% | 96.64% to 98.32% |
| | 20 | 98.33% | 98.33% to 100.00% |

William J. Barkley Elementary School (GRADES K-5)

Teachers/Principal will be awarded HEDI points based on the percentage of students scoring Basic Standard L2 or higher on the NYS ELA Assessment. The goal is a 3% improvement over the 2011-2012 NYS ELA assessments grades 3-5.

William J. Barkley Elementary School 15 Point Rubric

| | HEDI Points | Proficiency Target | HEDI Scores Range | | |
|------------------|-------------|--------------------|-------------------|----|---------|
| Ineffective | 0 | 0.00% | 0.00% | to | 10.99% |
| | 1 | 11.00% | 11.00% | to | 21.99% |
| | 2 | 22.00% | 22.00% | to | 32.99% |
| Developing | 3 | 33.00% | 33.00% | to | 43.99% |
| | 4 | 44.00% | 44.00% | to | 54.99% |
| | 5 | 55.00% | 55.00% | to | 65.99% |
| | 6 | 66.00% | 66.00% | to | 76.99% |
| | 7 | 77.00% | 77.00% | to | 87.99% |
| Effective | 8 | 88.00% | 88.00% | to | 88.99% |
| | 9 | 89.00% | 89.00% | to | 89.99% |
| | 10 | 90.00% | 90.00% | to | 92.99% |
| | 11 | 93.00% | 93.00% | to | 93.99% |
| | 12 | 94.00% | 94.00% | to | 94.99% |
| | 13 | 95.00% | 95.00% | to | 97.49% |
| Highly Effective | 14 | 97.50% | 97.50% | to | 98.75% |
| | 15 | 98.76% | 98.76% | to | 100.00% |

William J. Barkley Elementary School 20 Point Rubric

| | HEDI Points | Proficiency Target | HEDI Scores Range |
|-------------------------|--------------------|---------------------------|--------------------------|
| Ineffective | 0 | 0.00% | 0.00% to 9.88% |
| | 1 | 9.89% | 9.89% to 19.77% |
| | 2 | 19.78% | 19.78% to 29.66% |
| Developing | 3 | 29.67% | 29.67% to 39.55% |
| | 4 | 39.56% | 39.56% to 49.43% |
| | 5 | 49.44% | 49.44% to 59.32% |
| | 6 | 59.33% | 59.33% to 69.21% |
| | 7 | 69.22% | 69.22% to 79.10% |
| | 8 | 79.11% | 79.11% to 88.99% |
| Effective | 9 | 89.00% | 89.00% to 89.99% |
| | 10 | 90.00% | 90.00% to 90.99% |
| | 11 | 91.00% | 91.00% to 91.99% |
| | 12 | 92.00% | 92.00% to 92.99% |
| | 13 | 93.00% | 93.00% to 93.99% |
| | 14 | 94.00% | 94.00% to 94.99% |
| | 15 | 95.00% | 95.00% to 95.99% |
| | 16 | 96.00% | 96.00% to 96.99% |
| | 17 | 97.00% | 97.00% to 97.99% |
| Highly Effective | 18 | 98.00% | 98.00% to 98.99% |
| | 19 | 99.00% | 99.00% to 99.50% |
| | 20 | 99.51% | 99.51% to 100.00% |

Amsterdam High School (Grades 9-12 ALL COURSES)

Teachers/Principal will be awarded HEDI points based on the percentage of the composite score of ELA, Algebra, Algebra 2/Trigonometry, Geometry, Global Studies, US History, Living Environments, Chemistry, Earth Science and Physics NYS Regents Exams grades 9-12 to proficiency (65 or better).

Amsterdam High School 15 Point Rubric

| | HEDI Points | Proficiency Targets | HEDI Scores Range | | |
|------------------|-------------|---------------------|-------------------|----|---------|
| Ineffective | 0 | 0.00% | 0.00% | to | 8.49% |
| | 1 | 8.50% | 8.50% | to | 16.99% |
| | 2 | 17.00% | 17.00% | to | 25.49% |
| Developing | 3 | 25.50% | 25.50% | to | 33.99% |
| | 4 | 34.00% | 34.00% | to | 42.49% |
| | 5 | 42.50% | 42.50% | to | 50.99% |
| | 6 | 51.00% | 51.00% | to | 59.49% |
| | 7 | 59.50% | 59.50% | to | 67.99% |
| Effective | 8 | 68.00% | 68.00% | to | 68.99% |
| | 9 | 69.00% | 69.00% | to | 69.99% |
| | 10 | 70.00% | 70.00% | to | 72.99% |
| | 11 | 73.00% | 73.00% | to | 73.99% |
| | 12 | 74.00% | 74.00% | to | 74.99% |
| | 13 | 75.00% | 75.00% | to | 79.99% |
| Highly Effective | 14 | 80.00% | 80.00% | to | 90.00% |
| | 15 | 90.01% | 90.01% | to | 100.00% |

Amsterdam High School 20 Point Rubric

| | HEDI Points | Proficiency Targets | HEDI Scores Range |
|------------------|-------------|---------------------|-------------------|
| Ineffective | 0 | 0.00% | 0.00% to 7.66% |
| | 1 | 7.67% | 7.67% to 15.32% |
| | 2 | 15.33% | 15.33% to 22.99% |
| Developing | 3 | 23.00% | 23.00% to 30.66% |
| | 4 | 30.67% | 30.67% to 38.32% |
| | 5 | 38.33% | 38.33% to 45.99% |
| | 6 | 46.00% | 46.00% to 53.66% |
| | 7 | 53.67% | 53.67% to 61.32% |
| | 8 | 61.33% | 61.33% to 68.99% |
| Effective | 9 | 69.00% | 69.00% to 69.99% |
| | 10 | 70.00% | 70.00% to 70.99% |
| | 11 | 71.00% | 71.00% to 71.99% |
| | 12 | 72.00% | 72.00% to 72.99% |
| | 13 | 73.00% | 73.00% to 73.99% |
| | 14 | 74.00% | 74.00% to 74.99% |
| | 15 | 75.00% | 75.00% to 79.99% |
| | 16 | 80.00% | 80.00% to 84.99% |
| | 17 | 85.00% | 85.00% to 89.99% |
| Highly Effective | 18 | 90.00% | 90.00% to 94.99% |
| | 19 | 95.00% | 95.00% to 97.50% |
| | 20 | 97.51% | 97.51% to 100.00% |

Greater Amsterdam School District

Measures of Teacher Effectiveness based on the NYS Teaching Standards – 60%

Charlotte Danielson's Framework for Teaching rubric (2007) shall be utilized for the evaluation of all classroom teachers beginning on September 1, 2012. The rubric shall be amended to reflect the following required rating categories: Ineffective (formerly Unsatisfactory), Developing (formerly Basic), Effective (formerly Proficient) and Highly Effective (formerly Distinguished). See chart below.

Teachers shall be evaluated using the Framework in the following manner:

TENURED TEACHERS:

There will be two observations annually for tenured teachers. One will be announced and one will be unannounced. For the announced observation there will be a preconference and a post conference. For the unannounced observation there will be a post conference.

NON-TENURED TEACHERS:

There will be a minimum of three observations annually for probationary teachers (2 announced and 1 unannounced observation). Announced observations shall be conducted once each semester during the probationary period, more frequently for teachers who need help. For the announced observation, there will be pre-conferences and post conferences. For the unannounced observation there will be a post conference.

All monitoring and observation of work performance of a teacher will be conducted openly and with full knowledge of the teacher.

Applicable APPR law and regulation defines the effectiveness terms for the Other Measures of Teacher Effectiveness subcomponent as follows:

| Rating | Definition |
|-------------------------|--|
| Highly Effective | Overall performance and results exceed NYS Teaching Standards |
| Effective | Overall performance and results meet NYS Teaching Standards |
| Developing | Overall performance and results need improvement in order to meet NYS Teaching Standards |
| Ineffective | Overall performance and results do not meet NYS Teaching Standards |

Teachers will be evaluated on all NYS Teaching Standards on a yearly basis.

The components to be evaluated will be decided upon collaboratively by the building administrator performing the evaluation and the teacher. In the event that a mutual agreement cannot be reached, the final decision as to which components are to be evaluated will be made by the evaluator.

Danielson Framework has been aligned to the NYS Teaching Standards and will be scored as described below:

- Each component will be rated 1-4 with:
- 1- Ineffective
 - 2- Developing
 - 3- Effective
 - 4-Highly effective

No score lower than 1 will be given.

The component scores within each domain will be averaged to establish a domain average. This will be rounded to the nearest hundredth.

All domain averages will then be averaged and rounded to the nearest tenth for a score which will be converted as follows:

| | Average points | Point Total |
|------------------|----------------|-------------|
| Highly Effective | 3.7-4.0 | 60 |
| | 3.2-3.6 | 59 |
| Effective | 2.7-3.1 | 58 |
| | 2.5-2.6 | 57 |
| Developing | 2.3-2.4 | 56 |
| | 2.2 | 55 |
| | 2.0-2.1 | 54 |
| | 1.9 | 53 |
| | 1.7-1.8 | 52 |
| | 1.6 | 51 |
| Ineffective | 1.5 | 50 |
| | 1.4 | 49 |
| | 1.3 | 37 |
| | 1.2 | 25 |
| | 1.1 | 12 |
| | 1.0 | 0 |

- A preconference meeting will be held within 5 days prior to the announced observation.
- A post observation conference will be held within 5 school days of the observation.
- Pre-conference and post-conference meetings will take place in the teacher's classroom when possible
- Teachers must be made aware of observations as they are occurring.
- No mechanical or electronic recording devices shall be used for observations, unless agreed to by the teacher in writing as described in C.3.5.
- Teachers will be given a window of 15 school days during which the unannounced observation will occur. The observation will occur no sooner than one day following notification and no later than the 15 school day window. This will sunset June 30, 2013 and be revisited for 2013-14.
- No observation will occur the day prior to a vacation or the day following a vacation.
- Teachers will be observed between Oct 1 and May 15. Any teacher whose students take a state assessment will be observed prior to its administration.



Teacher Improvement Plan

Amsterdam School District

Introduction



The NYS Commissioner's Regulations (3012-c and 100.2(o)) require that any teacher with an Annual Professional Performance Review rated as *Developing* or *Ineffective* shall receive a Teacher Improvement Plan (TIP). A TIP shall be developed by the supervising administrator, the teacher whose rating was deemed *Developing* or *Ineffective* and an Amsterdam Teacher's Association representative. At the end of the timeline set forth by the TIP, the teacher, supervising administrator and union representative shall meet to assess the teacher's performance and ability to meet the goals set forth by the TIP. Based on the outcome of this assessment, the TIP may be deemed satisfactory, modified or continued, or deemed as unsuccessfully completed by the teacher.

The process outlined in the GASD Annual Professional Performance Review will offer guidance for the number and type of observations to be completed by an administrator during the course of the school year. The final evaluation includes evidence from all teacher rubric components and encompasses much more than the formal observations.

A TIP is completed collegially among the teacher (whose rating is *Developing* or *Ineffective*), the supervising administrator and the Amsterdam Teacher's Association representative to set professional goals to support growth toward improved student outcomes. This team will be referred to as the Support Team throughout this document. It is an expectation of all parties to work towards teacher growth in an environment of self respect. Periodic follow up sessions should be conducted to assess the teacher's progress.

A TIP defines specific standards-based goals that a teacher must make progress toward attaining within a specific period of time and shall include the areas that need improvement, a timeline for achieving the improvement, the manner by which the improvement will be assessed, and, where appropriate, differentiated activities to support improvement in these areas.

The TIP must be developed locally through negotiations and implementation must begin no later than 10 school days from the opening of classes in the school year following the school year for which such teacher's performance is being measured.



Teacher Improvement Plan Amsterdam School District (Page 2 of 3)



4. Resources – The Support Team will jointly list resources, available district materials, workshops, etc. to help to improve his or her practice.

5. Timeline – The Support Team will develop a timeline for the process and a date for the follow-up evaluation. The teacher will present documentation and evidence of improvement in the designated area at this time. Additional observations/meetings will take place as needed.

If this action is unsuccessful after one or more attempts to resolve the difficulties, the administrator must document the lack of success and submit the evidence to the appropriate Director and Superintendent.

The Teacher Improvement Plan and all records of subsequent observations and meetings will become part of the teacher’s record. The teacher should maintain copies of all documentation.

Date for Review: _____

Teacher Signature: _____ Date: _____

Administrator Signature: _____ Date: _____

ATA Rep. Signature: _____ Date: _____

Signature does not imply agreement, but acknowledges review and receipt of the report. Written comments may be attached.



Teacher Improvement Plan MEETING LOG (Page 3 of 3)



Log all meetings here. It is understood additional meetings may be necessary.

| Date | Meeting Summary | Feedback/Indicators of Progress | Signatures |
|-------------|------------------------|--|-------------------|
| | | | |
| | | | |
| | | | |
| | | | |

MPPR-Multidimensional Professional Performance Review (60 Points)

| | | | | | | |
|--|--|--|-----------|----------|----------|----------|
| DOMAIN 1 – SHARED VISION OF LEARNING | | | | | | |
| An education leader promotes the success of every student by facilitating the development, articulation, implementation, and stewardship of a vision of learning that is shared and supported by all stakeholders. | | | | | | |
| 4 point rubric (EIGHT total)points | | | HE | E | D | I |
| A. Culture (attitudes, knowledge, behaviors and beliefs that characterize the school environment and are shared by its stakeholders) – vision and mission | | | | | | |
| B. Sustainability (a focus on continuance and meaning beyond the present moment, contextualizing today’s success and improvements as the legacy of the future) – school improvement | | | | | | |
| Evidence: | | | | | | |
| | | | | | | |

| | | | | | | |
|---|--|--|-----------|----------|----------|----------|
| DOMAIN 2 –SCHOOL CULTURE AND INSTRUCTIONAL PROGRAM | | | | | | |
| An education leader promotes the success of every student by advocating, nurturing, and sustaining a school culture and instructional program conducive to student learning and staff professional growth. | | | | | | |
| 3 point rubric FIFTEEN (total) points | | | HE | E | D | I |
| A. Culture (attitudes, knowledge, behaviors and beliefs that characterize the school environment and are shared by its stakeholders) – communication, collaboration, learning environment | | | | | | |
| B. Instructional Program (design and delivery of high quality curriculum that produces clear evidence of learning) – curricular program, meaning for students, approaches to supervise instruction & actions towards instructional time | | | | | | |
| C. Capacity Building (developing potential and tapping existing internal expertise to promote learning and improve practice) – instructional and leadership capacity, approaches to technologies | | | | | | |
| D. Sustainability (a focus on continuance and meaning beyond the present moment, contextualizing today’s success and improvements as the legacy of the future) – assessment, accountability and student achievement | | | | | | |
| E. Strategic Planning Process (the implementation and stewardship of goals, decisions and actions) – monitoring/inquiry/ instructional program | | | | | | |
| Evidence: | | | | | | |
| | | | | | | |

| |
|---|
| DOMAIN 3 – SAFE, EFFICIENT, EFFECTIVE LEARNING ENVIRONMENT |
|---|

| | | | | | | |
|---|--|--|-----------|----------|----------|----------|
| An education leader promotes the success of every student by ensuring management of the organization, operation, and resources for a safe, efficient, and effective learning environment. | | | | | | |
| 3 point rubric TWELVE (total) points | | | HE | E | D | I |
| A. Capacity Building (developing potential and tapping existing internal expertise to promote learning and improve practice) – use of human, fiscal and technological resources, leadership | | | | | | |
| B. Culture (attitudes, knowledge, behaviors and beliefs that characterize the school environment and are shared by its stakeholders) – school safety | | | | | | |
| C. Sustainability (a focus on continuance and meaning beyond the present moment, contextualizing today’s success and improvements as the legacy of the future) – management & operational systems | | | | | | |
| D. Instructional Program (design and delivery of high quality curriculum that produces clear evidence of learning) – time allocation | | | | | | |
| Evidence: | | | | | | |

| | | | | | | |
|---|--|--|-----------|----------|----------|----------|
| DOMAIN 4 - COMMUNITY | | | | | | |
| An education leader promotes the success of every student by collaborating with faculty and community members, responding to diverse community interests and needs, and mobilizing community resources. | | | | | | |
| 3 point rubric NINE (total) points | | | HE | E | D | I |
| A. Strategic Planning Process: (gather and analyze data to monitor effects of actions and decisions on goal attainment and enable mid-course adjustments as needed to better enable success) – Inquiry, educational environment | | | | | | |
| B. Culture (attitudes, knowledge, behaviors and beliefs that characterize the school environment and are shared by its stakeholders) – community engagement | | | | | | |
| C. Sustainability (a focus on continuance and meaning beyond the present moment, contextualizing today’s success and improvements as the legacy of the future) – family and caregiver involvement | | | | | | |
| Evidence: | | | | | | |

| | | | | | | |
|---|--|--|-----------|----------|----------|----------|
| DOMAIN 5 – INTEGRITY, FAIRNESS, ETHICS | | | | | | |
| An education leader promotes the success of every student by acting with integrity, fairness, and in an ethical manner. | | | | | | |
| 4 point rubric (EIGHT total)points | | | HE | E | D | I |

| | | | | |
|--|--|--|--|--|
| A. Sustainability (a focus on continuance and meaning beyond the present moment, contextualizing today’s success and improvements as the legacy of the future) – accountability academic & social, decision making, handling of mandates | | | | |
| B. Culture (attitudes, knowledge, behaviors and beliefs that characterize the school environment and are shared by its stakeholders) – self awareness, reflective practice, transparency and ethical behaviors, democracy, equity, diversity, individual needs of students | | | | |
| Evidence: | | | | |

| | | | | |
|---|-----------|----------|----------|----------|
| DOMAIN 6 – POLITICAL, SOCIAL, ECONOMIC, LEGAL AND CULTURAL CONTEXT | | | | |
| An education leader promotes the success of every student by understanding, responding to, and influencing the political, social, economic, legal, and cultural context. | | | | |
| 4 point rubric (EIGHT total)points | | | | |
| | HE | E | D | I |
| A. Sustainability (a focus on continuance and meaning beyond the present moment, contextualizing today’s success and improvements as the legacy of the future) – decisions affecting student learning from outside the school, emerging trends or initiatives | | | | |
| B. Culture (attitudes, knowledge, behaviors and beliefs that characterize the school environment and are shared by its stakeholders) – advocates | | | | |
| Evidence: | | | | |

| Growth Factor or SLO (25 OR 20) | Local Measure (20 OR 15) | MPPR Score (60) | Overall Composite Score | Overall Heidi Rating |
|---------------------------------|--------------------------|-----------------|-------------------------|----------------------|
| | | | | |

MPPR
 Highly Effective 59-60
 Effective 57-58
 Developing 46-56
 Ineffective 0-45

I have reviewed this document: _____

Date: _____

Evaluation conducted by _____

MPPR - Point Distribution for Each Domain

| D1 8pts | HE | E | D | I |
|------------|----|------|------|------|
| A | 4 | 3.88 | 3.72 | 1.33 |
| B | 4 | 3.88 | 3.72 | 1.33 |

| D3 12pts | HE | E | D | I |
|-------------|----|------|------|---|
| A | 3 | 2.91 | 2.79 | 1 |
| B | 3 | 2.91 | 2.79 | 1 |
| C | 3 | 2.91 | 2.79 | 1 |
| D | 3 | 2.91 | 2.79 | 1 |

| D5 8pts | HE | E | D | I |
|------------|----|------|------|------|
| A | 4 | 3.88 | 3.72 | 1.33 |
| B | 4 | 3.88 | 3.72 | 1.33 |

| D2 15pts | HE | E | D | I |
|-------------|----|------|------|---|
| A | 3 | 2.91 | 2.79 | 1 |
| B | 3 | 2.91 | 2.79 | 1 |
| C | 3 | 2.91 | 2.79 | 1 |
| D | 3 | 2.91 | 2.79 | 1 |
| E | 3 | 2.91 | 2.79 | 1 |

| D4 9pts | HE | E | D | I |
|------------|----|------|------|---|
| A | 3 | 2.91 | 2.79 | 1 |
| B | 3 | 2.91 | 2.79 | 1 |
| C | 3 | 2.91 | 2.79 | 1 |

| D6 8pts | HE | E | D | I |
|------------|----|------|------|------|
| A | 4 | 3.88 | 3.72 | 1.33 |
| B | 4 | 3.88 | 3.72 | 1.33 |

Break down of above calculations:

| | 4 point rubric | Equivalent Percent | 3 point rubric |
|------------------|----------------|--------------------|----------------|
| Highly Effective | 4 | 100% | 3 |
| Effective | 3.88 | 97% | 2.91 |
| Developing | 3.72 | 93% | 2.79 |
| Ineffective | 1.33 | 33% | 1 |

SECTION V: IMPROVEMENT PLAN

Greater Amsterdam School District Principal Improvement Plan Process

Upon rating a principal as ineffective or developing, an improvement plan designed to rectify perceived or demonstrated deficiencies must be developed and commenced no later than ten (10) school days after the start of a school year. The superintendent's designee, in conjunction with the principal, must develop an improvement plan that contains:

1. A clear delineation of the deficiencies that resulted in the ineffective or developing assessment
2. Specific improvement goal/outcome statements.
3. Specific improvement action steps/activities.
4. A reasonable timeline for achieving improvement.
5. Required and accessible resources to achieve goal.
6. A formative evaluation process documenting meetings strategically scheduled throughout the year to assess progress. These meetings shall occur at least twice during the year: once during the first semester and the second time during the second semester. A written summary of feedback on progress shall be given following each meeting.
7. The process by which improvement efforts will be assessed, including evidence demonstrating improvement.
8. A formal final written summative assessment delineating progress made with the opportunity for comments by the principal.

Principal Improvement Plan

Name of Principal _____

School Building _____

Academic Year _____

Name of Supervisor: _____

Deficiency that promulgated the “ineffective” or “developing” performance rating:

Improvement Goal/Outcome:

Action Steps/Activities:

Timeline for completion: Required and Accessible Resources, including identification of responsibility for provision:

Dates of formative evaluation on progress (lead evaluator and principal initial each date to confirm the meeting):

First Semester meeting: Date: _____

Second Semester meeting: Date: _____

Other:

Evidence to be provided for Goal Achievement:

Assessment Summary: Superintendent’s designee is to attach a narrative summary of improvement status, including verification of the provision of support and resources as outlined above. Such summary shall be signed by the superintendent’s

designee and principal with the opportunity for the principal to attach comment.

GASD LOCAL Measures

The Locally Selected Measures component will measure achievement. The following locally selected assessments shall be used as evidence:

School-wide measures of student achievement:

Our goal is to increase level of students scoring a Level 2 or better on ELA assessments school wide by 3 percentage points for all 4 elementary schools and middle school compared to previous year's level of performance on each assessment.

- All elementary schools will demonstrate evidence of school wide achievement based on Grades 3-5 NYS ELA assessments. The middle school will demonstrate evidence of school wide achievement based on Grades 6-8 NYS ELA assessments. (see attached HEDI scales for each building)

Lynch Literacy Academy (GRADES 6-8)

Teachers/Principal will be awarded HEDI points based on the percentage of students scoring Basic Standard L2 or higher on the NYS ELA Assessment. The goal is a 3% improvement over the 2011-2012 NYS ELA assessments grades 6-8.

Lynch Literacy Academy 15 Point Rubric

| | HEDI Points | Proficiency Target | HEDI Scores Range | |
|------------------|-------------|--------------------|-------------------|------------|
| Ineffective | 0 | 0.00% | 0.00% | to 10.24% |
| | 1 | 10.25% | 10.25% | to 20.49% |
| | 2 | 20.50% | 20.50% | to 30.74% |
| Developing | 3 | 30.75% | 30.75% | to 40.99% |
| | 4 | 41.00% | 41.00% | to 51.24% |
| | 5 | 51.25% | 51.25% | to 61.49% |
| | 6 | 61.50% | 61.50% | to 71.74% |
| | 7 | 71.75% | 71.75% | to 81.99% |
| Effective | 8 | 82.00% | 82.00% | to 82.99% |
| | 9 | 83.00% | 83.00% | to 83.99% |
| | 10 | 84.00% | 84.00% | to 86.99% |
| | 11 | 87.00% | 87.00% | to 87.99% |
| | 12 | 88.00% | 88.00% | to 88.99% |
| | 13 | 89.00% | 89.00% | to 89.99% |
| Highly Effective | 14 | 90.00% | 90.00% | to 95.00% |
| | 15 | 95.01% | 95.01% | to 100.00% |

Lynch 20 Point Rubric

| LYNCH | HEDI Points | Proficiency Target | HEDI Score Range |
|------------------|-------------|--------------------|-------------------|
| Ineffective | 0 | 0.00% | 0.00% to 9.99% |
| | 1 | 10.00% | 10.00% to 19.99% |
| | 2 | 20.00% | 20.00% to 27.99% |
| Developing | 3 | 28.00% | 28.00% to 36.99% |
| | 4 | 37.00% | 37.00% to 46.99% |
| | 5 | 47.00% | 47.00% to 55.99% |
| | 6 | 56.00% | 56.00% to 64.99% |
| | 7 | 65.00% | 65.00% to 74.99% |
| | 8 | 75.00% | 75.00% to 81.99% |
| Effective | 9 | 82.00% | 82.00% to 83.99% |
| | 10 | 84.00% | 84.00% to 84.99% |
| | 11 | 85.00% | 85.00% to 85.99% |
| | 12 | 86.00% | 86.00% to 86.99% |
| | 13 | 87.00% | 87.00% to 87.99% |
| | 14 | 88.00% | 88.00% to 88.99% |
| | 15 | 89.00% | 89.00% to 89.99% |
| | 16 | 90.00% | 90.00% to 90.99% |
| | 17 | 91.00% | 91.00% to 91.99% |
| Highly Effective | 18 | 92.00% | 92.00% to 92.99% |
| | 19 | 93.00% | 93.00% to 97.99% |
| | 20 | 98.00% | 98.00% to 100.00% |

Marie Curie Elementary School (GRADES K-5)

Teachers/Principal will be awarded HEDI points based on the percentage of students scoring Basic Standard L2 or higher on the NYS ELA Assessment. The goal is a 3% improvement over the 2011-2012 NYS ELA assessments grades 3-5.

Marie Curie Elementary School 15 Point Rubric

| | HEDI Points | Proficiency Target | HEDI Scores Range | |
|------------------|-------------|--------------------|-------------------|------------|
| Ineffective | 0 | 0.00% | 0.00% | to 9.61% |
| | 1 | 9.62% | 9.62% | to 19.24% |
| | 2 | 19.25% | 19.25% | to 28.87% |
| Developing | 3 | 28.88% | 28.88% | to 38.49% |
| | 4 | 38.50% | 38.50% | to 48.12% |
| | 5 | 48.13% | 48.13% | to 57.74% |
| | 6 | 57.75% | 57.75% | to 67.37% |
| | 7 | 67.38% | 67.38% | to 76.99% |
| Effective | 8 | 77.00% | 77.00% | to 77.99% |
| | 9 | 78.00% | 78.00% | to 78.99% |
| | 10 | 79.00% | 79.00% | to 81.99% |
| | 11 | 82.00% | 82.00% | to 82.99% |
| | 12 | 83.00% | 83.00% | to 83.99% |
| | 13 | 84.00% | 84.00% | to 91.99% |
| Highly Effective | 14 | 92.00% | 92.00% | to 96.00% |
| | 15 | 96.01% | 96.01% | to 100.00% |

Marie Curie Elementary School 20 Point Rubric

| | HEDI Points | Proficiency Target | HEDI Score Range |
|------------------|-------------|--------------------|-------------------|
| Ineffective | 0 | 0.00% | 0.00% to 9.99% |
| | 1 | 10.00% | 10.00% to 19.99% |
| | 2 | 20.00% | 20.00% to 27.99% |
| Developing | 3 | 28.00% | 28.00% to 36.99% |
| | 4 | 37.00% | 37.00% to 46.99% |
| | 5 | 47.00% | 47.00% to 55.99% |
| | 6 | 56.00% | 56.00% to 64.99% |
| | 7 | 65.00% | 65.00% to 74.99% |
| | 8 | 75.00% | 75.00% to 77.99% |
| Effective | 9 | 78.00% | 78.00% to 78.99% |
| | 10 | 79.00% | 79.00% to 79.99% |
| | 11 | 80.00% | 80.00% to 80.99% |
| | 12 | 81.00% | 81.00% to 81.99% |
| | 13 | 82.00% | 82.00% to 82.99% |
| | 14 | 83.00% | 83.00% to 83.99% |
| | 15 | 84.00% | 84.00% to 84.99% |
| | 16 | 85.00% | 85.00% to 85.99% |
| | 17 | 86.00% | 86.00% to 86.99% |
| Highly Effective | 18 | 87.00% | 87.00% to 90.99% |
| | 19 | 91.00% | 91.00% to 95.99% |
| | 20 | 96.00% | 96.00% to 100.00% |

William B. Tecler Elementary School (GRADES K-5)

Teachers/Principal will be awarded HEDI points based on the percentage of students scoring Basic Standard (L2) or higher on the NYS ELA Assessment. The goal is a 3% improvement over the 2011-2012 NYS ELA assessments grades 3-5.

William B. Tecler Elementary School 15 Point Rubric

| | HEDI Points | Proficiency Target | HEDI Scores Range | |
|------------------|-------------|--------------------|-------------------|------------|
| Ineffective | 0 | 0.00% | 0.00% | to 8.37% |
| | 1 | 8.38% | 8.38% | to 16.74% |
| | 2 | 16.75% | 16.75% | to 25.12% |
| Developing | 3 | 25.13% | 25.13% | to 33.49% |
| | 4 | 33.50% | 33.50% | to 41.87% |
| | 5 | 41.88% | 41.88% | to 50.24% |
| | 6 | 50.25% | 50.25% | to 58.62% |
| | 7 | 58.63% | 58.63% | to 66.99% |
| Effective | 8 | 67.00% | 67.00% | to 67.99% |
| | 9 | 68.00% | 68.00% | to 68.99% |
| | 10 | 69.00% | 69.00% | to 71.99% |
| | 11 | 72.00% | 72.00% | to 72.99% |
| | 12 | 73.00% | 73.00% | to 73.99% |
| | 13 | 74.00% | 74.00% | to 80.99% |
| Highly Effective | 14 | 81.00% | 81.00% | to 90.50% |
| | 15 | 90.51% | 90.51% | to 100.00% |

William B. Tecler Elementary School 20 Point Rubric

| | HEDI Points | Proficiency Percent | HEDI Scores Range |
|------------------|-------------|---------------------|-------------------|
| Ineffective | 0 | 0.00% | 0.00% to 7.55% |
| | 1 | 7.56% | 7.56% to 15.10% |
| | 2 | 15.11% | 15.11% to 22.66% |
| Developing | 3 | 22.67% | 22.67% to 30.21% |
| | 4 | 30.22% | 30.22% to 37.77% |
| | 5 | 37.78% | 37.78% to 45.32% |
| | 6 | 45.33% | 45.33% to 52.88% |
| | 7 | 52.89% | 52.89% to 60.43% |
| | 8 | 60.44% | 60.44% to 67.99% |
| Effective | 9 | 68.00% | 68.00% to 68.49% |
| | 10 | 68.50% | 68.50% to 69.49% |
| | 11 | 69.50% | 69.50% to 70.50% |
| | 12 | 70.51% | 70.51% to 71.99% |
| | 13 | 72.00% | 72.00% to 75.99% |
| | 14 | 76.00% | 76.00% to 79.99% |
| | 15 | 80.00% | 80.00% to 83.99% |
| | 16 | 84.00% | 84.00% to 87.99% |
| | 17 | 88.00% | 88.00% to 91.99% |
| Highly Effective | 18 | 92.00% | 92.00% to 95.99% |
| | 19 | 96.00% | 96.00% to 98.00% |
| | 20 | 98.01% | 98.01% to 100.00% |

Raphael J. McNulty Elementary School (GRADES K-5)

Teachers/Principal will be awarded HEDI points based on the percentage of students scoring Basic Standard L2 or higher on the NYS ELA Assessment. The goal is a 3% improvement over the 2011-2012 NYS ELA assessments grades 3-5. to 73% school wide 2011-12 ELA grades 3-5 assessments.

Raphael J. McNulty Elementary School 15 Point Rubric

| | HEDI Points | Proficiency Target | HEDI Scores Range | |
|------------------|-------------|--------------------|-------------------|------------|
| Ineffective | 0 | 0.00% | 0.00% | to 8.87% |
| | 1 | 8.88% | 8.88% | to 17.74% |
| | 2 | 17.75% | 17.75% | to 26.62% |
| Developing | 3 | 26.63% | 26.63% | to 35.49% |
| | 4 | 35.50% | 35.50% | to 44.37% |
| | 5 | 44.38% | 44.38% | to 53.24% |
| | 6 | 53.25% | 53.25% | to 62.12% |
| | 7 | 62.13% | 62.13% | to 70.99% |
| Effective | 8 | 71.00% | 71.00% | to 71.99% |
| | 9 | 72.00% | 72.00% | to 72.99% |
| | 10 | 73.00% | 73.00% | to 75.99% |
| | 11 | 76.00% | 76.00% | to 76.99% |
| | 12 | 77.00% | 77.00% | to 77.99% |
| | 13 | 78.00% | 78.00% | to 82.99% |
| Highly Effective | 14 | 83.00% | 83.00% | to 91.50% |
| | 15 | 91.51% | 91.51% | to 100.00% |

Raphael J. McNulty Elementary School 20 Point Rubric

| | HEDI Points | Proficiency Target | HEDI Scores Range |
|------------------|-------------|--------------------|-------------------|
| Ineffective | 0 | 0.00% | 0.00% to 7.99% |
| | 1 | 8.00% | 8.00% to 15.99% |
| | 2 | 16.00% | 16.00% to 23.99% |
| Developing | 3 | 24.00% | 24.00% to 31.99% |
| | 4 | 32.00% | 32.00% to 39.99% |
| | 5 | 40.00% | 40.00% to 47.99% |
| | 6 | 48.00% | 48.00% to 55.99% |
| | 7 | 56.00% | 56.00% to 63.99% |
| | 8 | 64.00% | 64.00% to 71.99% |
| Effective | 9 | 72.00% | 72.00% to 72.50% |
| | 10 | 72.51% | 72.51% to 73.50% |
| | 11 | 73.51% | 73.51% to 74.50% |
| | 12 | 74.51% | 74.51% to 75.99% |
| | 13 | 76.00% | 76.00% to 79.85% |
| | 14 | 79.86% | 79.86% to 83.20% |
| | 15 | 83.21% | 83.21% to 86.56% |
| | 16 | 86.57% | 86.57% to 89.92% |
| | 17 | 89.93% | 89.93% to 93.28% |
| Highly Effective | 18 | 93.29% | 93.29% to 96.63% |
| | 19 | 96.64% | 96.64% to 98.32% |
| | 20 | 98.33% | 98.33% to 100.00% |

William J. Barkley Elementary School (GRADES K-5)

Teachers/Principal will be awarded HEDI points based on the percentage of students scoring Basic Standard L2 or higher on the NYS ELA Assessment. The goal is a 3% improvement over the 2011-2012 NYS ELA assessments grades 3-5.

William J. Barkley Elementary School 15 Point Rubric

| | HEDI Points | Proficiency Target | HEDI Scores Range | | |
|------------------|-------------|--------------------|-------------------|----|---------|
| Ineffective | 0 | 0.00% | 0.00% | to | 10.99% |
| | 1 | 11.00% | 11.00% | to | 21.99% |
| | 2 | 22.00% | 22.00% | to | 32.99% |
| Developing | 3 | 33.00% | 33.00% | to | 43.99% |
| | 4 | 44.00% | 44.00% | to | 54.99% |
| | 5 | 55.00% | 55.00% | to | 65.99% |
| | 6 | 66.00% | 66.00% | to | 76.99% |
| | 7 | 77.00% | 77.00% | to | 87.99% |
| Effective | 8 | 88.00% | 88.00% | to | 88.99% |
| | 9 | 89.00% | 89.00% | to | 89.99% |
| | 10 | 90.00% | 90.00% | to | 92.99% |
| | 11 | 93.00% | 93.00% | to | 93.99% |
| | 12 | 94.00% | 94.00% | to | 94.99% |
| | 13 | 95.00% | 95.00% | to | 97.49% |
| Highly Effective | 14 | 97.50% | 97.50% | to | 98.75% |
| | 15 | 98.76% | 98.76% | to | 100.00% |

William J. Barkley Elementary School 20 Point Rubric

| | HEDI Points | Proficiency Target | HEDI Scores Range |
|-------------------------|--------------------|---------------------------|--------------------------|
| Ineffective | 0 | 0.00% | 0.00% to 9.88% |
| | 1 | 9.89% | 9.89% to 19.77% |
| | 2 | 19.78% | 19.78% to 29.66% |
| Developing | 3 | 29.67% | 29.67% to 39.55% |
| | 4 | 39.56% | 39.56% to 49.43% |
| | 5 | 49.44% | 49.44% to 59.32% |
| | 6 | 59.33% | 59.33% to 69.21% |
| | 7 | 69.22% | 69.22% to 79.10% |
| | 8 | 79.11% | 79.11% to 88.99% |
| Effective | 9 | 89.00% | 89.00% to 89.99% |
| | 10 | 90.00% | 90.00% to 90.99% |
| | 11 | 91.00% | 91.00% to 91.99% |
| | 12 | 92.00% | 92.00% to 92.99% |
| | 13 | 93.00% | 93.00% to 93.99% |
| | 14 | 94.00% | 94.00% to 94.99% |
| | 15 | 95.00% | 95.00% to 95.99% |
| | 16 | 96.00% | 96.00% to 96.99% |
| | 17 | 97.00% | 97.00% to 97.99% |
| Highly Effective | 18 | 98.00% | 98.00% to 98.99% |
| | 19 | 99.00% | 99.00% to 99.50% |
| | 20 | 99.51% | 99.51% to 100.00% |

Amsterdam High School (Grades 9-12 ALL COURSES)

Teachers/Principal will be awarded HEDI points based on the percentage of the composite score of ELA, Algebra, Algebra 2/Trigonometry, Geometry, Global Studies, US History, Living Environments, Chemistry, Earth Science and Physics NYS Regents Exams grades 9-12 to proficiency (65 or better).

Amsterdam High School 15 Point Rubric

| | HEDI Points | Proficiency Targets | HEDI Scores Range | | |
|------------------|-------------|---------------------|-------------------|----|---------|
| Ineffective | 0 | 0.00% | 0.00% | to | 8.49% |
| | 1 | 8.50% | 8.50% | to | 16.99% |
| | 2 | 17.00% | 17.00% | to | 25.49% |
| Developing | 3 | 25.50% | 25.50% | to | 33.99% |
| | 4 | 34.00% | 34.00% | to | 42.49% |
| | 5 | 42.50% | 42.50% | to | 50.99% |
| | 6 | 51.00% | 51.00% | to | 59.49% |
| | 7 | 59.50% | 59.50% | to | 67.99% |
| Effective | 8 | 68.00% | 68.00% | to | 68.99% |
| | 9 | 69.00% | 69.00% | to | 69.99% |
| | 10 | 70.00% | 70.00% | to | 72.99% |
| | 11 | 73.00% | 73.00% | to | 73.99% |
| | 12 | 74.00% | 74.00% | to | 74.99% |
| | 13 | 75.00% | 75.00% | to | 79.99% |
| Highly Effective | 14 | 80.00% | 80.00% | to | 90.00% |
| | 15 | 90.01% | 90.01% | to | 100.00% |

Amsterdam High School 20 Point Rubric

| | HEDI Points | Proficiency Targets | HEDI Scores Range |
|------------------|-------------|---------------------|-------------------|
| Ineffective | 0 | 0.00% | 0.00% to 7.66% |
| | 1 | 7.67% | 7.67% to 15.32% |
| | 2 | 15.33% | 15.33% to 22.99% |
| Developing | 3 | 23.00% | 23.00% to 30.66% |
| | 4 | 30.67% | 30.67% to 38.32% |
| | 5 | 38.33% | 38.33% to 45.99% |
| | 6 | 46.00% | 46.00% to 53.66% |
| | 7 | 53.67% | 53.67% to 61.32% |
| | 8 | 61.33% | 61.33% to 68.99% |
| Effective | 9 | 69.00% | 69.00% to 69.99% |
| | 10 | 70.00% | 70.00% to 70.99% |
| | 11 | 71.00% | 71.00% to 71.99% |
| | 12 | 72.00% | 72.00% to 72.99% |
| | 13 | 73.00% | 73.00% to 73.99% |
| | 14 | 74.00% | 74.00% to 74.99% |
| | 15 | 75.00% | 75.00% to 79.99% |
| | 16 | 80.00% | 80.00% to 84.99% |
| | 17 | 85.00% | 85.00% to 89.99% |
| Highly Effective | 18 | 90.00% | 90.00% to 94.99% |
| | 19 | 95.00% | 95.00% to 97.50% |
| | 20 | 97.51% | 97.51% to 100.00% |

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:

Thomas F. Perillo 11/30/12

Teachers Union President Signature: Date:

E. G. [Signature] 11/30/12

Administrative Union President Signature: Date: ,

David Zuber 11/30/12

Board of Education President Signature: Date:

Nellie Bush 11/30/12