



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

July 18, 2013

Revised

Richard Yochem, Superintendent
Avoca Central School District
17-29 Oliver St.
PO Box G
Avoca, NY 14809

Dear Superintendent Yochem:


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: Horst Graefe

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 Wednesday, May 09, 2012

Updated Wednesday, May 15, 2013

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 : 570201040000

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

570201040000

1.2) School District Name: AVOCA CSD

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

AVOCA CSD

1.3) School Improvement Grant (SIG) Districts Only

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

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):

(No response)

1.5) Assurances

Please check all of the boxes below:

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

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

Submission of material changes to an approved APPR plan

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 Wednesday, May 09, 2012

Updated Friday, June 21, 2013

Page 1

STATE-PROVIDED MEASURES OF STUDENT GROWTH

(25 points with an approved value-added measure)

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

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

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

2.1) Assurances

Please check the boxes below:

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

STUDENT LEARNING OBJECTIVES AS COMPARABLE GROWTH MEASURES (20 points)

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

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

State assessments (or Regents or Regent equivalents), *required if one exists*
If no State assessment or Regents exam exists:

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

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

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

State assessments, *required if one exists*

List of State-approved 3rd party assessments

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

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

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

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

2.2) Grades K-3 ELA

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

	ELA	Assessment
K	State-approved 3rd party assessment	STAR Reading Enterprise
1	State-approved 3rd party assessment	STAR Reading Enterprise
2	State-approved 3rd party assessment	STAR Reading Enterprise

	ELA	Assessment
3	State assessment	3rd Grade State Assessment

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

Use this box, if needed, to describe the general process for assigning HEDI categories for these grades/subjects in this subcomponent. If needed, you may upload a table or graphic at 2.11, below.

Teachers and their respective building principal will collaboratively develop an SLO based on their student rosters. Once baseline information has been collected, teachers will meet as a grade-level data team to review the reports and predicted growth data the system provides and will set

	appropriate and rigorous targets for students using a differentiated approach. SLO targets will be set for each individual student. (See Sample Table 2.11)
Highly Effective (18 - 20 points) Results are well-above state average for similar students (or District goals if no state test).	Teachers will be assigned a Highly Effective rating when a significantly greater than expected percentage of the class achieves the target goal set.
Effective (9 - 17 points) Results meet state average for similar students (or District goals if no state test).	Teachers will be assigned an Effective rating when the expected, slightly lower or slightly higher percentage of the class achieves the target goal set.
Developing (3 - 8 points) Results are below state average for similar students (or District goals if no state test).	Teachers will be assigned a Developing rating when a moderately lower percentage of students achieves the target goal set.
Ineffective (0 - 2 points) Results are well-below state average for similar students (or District goals if no state test).	Teachers will be assigned an Ineffective rating when a significantly lower percentage of students achieves the target goal set.

2.3) Grades K-3 Math

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

	Math	Assessment
K	State-approved 3rd party assessment	STAR Math Enterprise
1	State-approved 3rd party assessment	STAR Math Enterprise
2	State-approved 3rd party assessment	STAR Math Enterprise

	Math	Assessment
3	State assessment	3rd Grade State Assessment

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

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 respective building principal will collaboratively develop an SLO based on their student rosters. Once baseline information has been collected, teachers will meet as a grade-level data team to review the reports and predicted growth data the system provides and will set appropriate and rigorous targets for students using a differentiated approach. SLO targets will be set for each individual student. (See Sample Table 2.11)
Highly Effective (18 - 20 points) Results are well-above state average for similar students (or District goals if no state test).	Teachers will be assigned a Highly Effective rating when a significantly greater than expected percentage of the class achieves the target goal set.
Effective (9 - 17 points) Results meet state average for similar students (or District goals if no state test).	Teachers will be assigned an Effective rating when the expected, slightly lower or slightly higher percentage of the class achieves the target goal set.
Developing (3 - 8 points) Results are below state average for similar students (or District goals if no state test).	Teachers will be assigned a Developing rating when a moderately lower percentage of students achieves the target goal

set.

Ineffective (0 - 2 points) Results are well-below state average for similar students (or District goals if no state test).

Teachers will be assigned an Ineffective rating when a significantly lower percentage of students achieves the target goal set.

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	Avoca Central School District Locally Developed 6th Grade Science Assessment
7	District, regional or BOCES-developed assessment	GST BOCES Regionally Developed 7th Grade Science Assessment
	Science	Assessment
8	State assessment	8th Grade State Science Assessment

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

Use this box, if needed, to describe the general process for assigning HEDI categories for these grades/subjects in this subcomponent. If needed, you may upload a table or graphic at 2.11, below.	Teachers will write an SLO for the entire grade level/course enrollment. Once baseline information has been collected, teachers will meet as a content department to review the data and collaboratively set appropriate and rigorous targets for students using a differentiated approach. SLO targets will be set for each individual student. (See Table 2.11)
Highly Effective (18 - 20 points) Results are well-above state average for similar students (or District goals if no state test).	Teachers will be assigned a Highly Effective rating when a significantly greater than expected percentage of the class achieves the target goal set.
Effective (9 - 17 points) Results meet state average for similar students (or District goals if no state test).	Teachers will be assigned an Effective rating when the expected, slightly lower or slightly higher percentage of the class achieves the target goal set.
Developing (3 - 8 points) Results are below state average for similar students (or District goals if no state test).	Teachers will be assigned a Developing rating when a moderately lower percentage of students achieves the target goal set.
Ineffective (0 - 2 points) Results are well-below state average for similar students (or District goals if no state test).	Teachers will be assigned an Ineffective rating when a significantly lower percentage of students achieves the target goal set.

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	Avoca Central School District Locally Developed 6th Grade Social Studies Assessment
7	District, regional or BOCES-developed assessment	Avoca Central School District Locally Developed 7th Grade Social Studies Assessment
8	District, regional or BOCES-developed assessment	Avoca Central School District Locally Developed 8th Grade Social Studies Assessment

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

Use this box, if needed, to describe the general process for assigning HEDI categories for these grades/subjects in this subcomponent. If needed, you may upload a table or graphic at 2.11, below.	Teachers will write an SLO for the entire grade level/course enrollment. Once baseline information has been collected, teachers will meet as a content department to review the data and collaboratively set appropriate and rigorous targets for students using a differentiated approach. SLO targets will be set for each individual student.(See Sample 2.11)
Highly Effective (18 - 20 points) Results are well-above District goals for similar students.	Teachers will be assigned a Highly Effective rating when a significantly greater than expected percentage of the class achieves the target goal set.
Effective (9 - 17 points) Results meet District goals for similar students.	Teachers will be assigned an Effective rating when the expected, slightly lower or slightly higher percentage of the class achieves the target goal set.
Developing (3 - 8 points) Results are below District goals for similar students.	Teachers will be assigned a Developing rating when a moderately lower percentage of students achieves the target goal set.
Ineffective (0 - 2 points) Results are well-below District goals for similar students.	Teachers will be assigned an Ineffective rating when a significantly lower percentage of students achieves the target goal set.

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	GST BOCES Regionally Developed Global 1 Assessment

	Social Studies Regents Courses	Assessment
Global 2	Regents assessment	Regents assessment
American History	Regents assessment	Regents assessment

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

Use this box, if needed, to describe the general process for assigning HEDI categories for these grades/subjects in this subcomponent. If needed, you may upload a table or graphic at 2.11, below.	Teachers will write an SLO for the entire grade level/course enrollment. Once baseline information has been collected, teachers will meet as a content department to review the data and collaboratively set appropriate and rigorous targets for students using a differentiated approach. SLO targets will be set for each individual student. (See Table 2.11)
Highly Effective (18 - 20 points) Results are well-above District goals for similar students.	Teachers will be assigned a Highly Effective rating when a significantly greater than expected percentage of the class achieves the target goal set.
Effective (9 - 17 points) Results meet District goals for similar students.	Teachers will be assigned an Effective rating when the expected, slightly lower or slightly higher percentage of the class achieves the target goal set.
Developing (3 - 8 points) Results are below District goals for similar students.	Teachers will be assigned a Developing rating when a moderately lower percentage of students achieves the target goal set.
Ineffective (0 - 2 points) Results are well-below District goals for similar students.	Teachers will be assigned an Ineffective rating when a significantly lower percentage of students achieves the target goal set.

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 will write an SLO for the entire grade level/course enrollment. Once baseline information has been collected, teachers will meet as a content department to review the data and collaboratively set appropriate and rigorous targets for students using a differentiated approach. SLO targets will be set for each individual student. (See Table 2.11)
Highly Effective (18 - 20 points) Results are well-above District goals for similar students.	Teachers will be assigned a Highly Effective rating when a significantly greater than expected percentage of the class achieves the target goal set.

Effective (9 - 17 points) Results meet District goals for similar students.	Teachers will be assigned an Effective rating when the expected, slightly lower or slightly higher percentage of the class achieves the target goal set.
Developing (3 - 8 points) Results are below District goals for similar students.	Teachers will be assigned a Developing rating when a moderately lower percentage of students achieves the target goal set.
Ineffective (0 - 2 points) Results are well-below District goals for similar students.	Teachers will be assigned an Ineffective rating when a significantly lower percentage of students achieves the target goal set.

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 will write an SLO for the entire grade level/course enrollment. Once baseline information has been collected, teachers will meet as a content department to review the data and collaboratively set appropriate and rigorous targets for students using a differentiated approach. SLO targets will be set for each individual student.(See Table 2.11)
Highly Effective (18 - 20 points) Results are well-above District goals for similar students.	Teachers will be assigned a Highly Effective rating when a significantly greater than expected percentage of the class achieves the target goal set.
Effective (9 - 17 points) Results meet District goals for similar students.	Teachers will be assigned an Effective rating when the expected, slightly lower or slightly higher percentage of the class achieves the target goal set.
Developing (3 - 8 points) Results are below District goals for similar students.	Teachers will be assigned a Developing rating when a moderately lower percentage of students achieves the target goal set.
Ineffective (0 - 2 points) Results are well-below District goals for similar students.	Teachers will be assigned an Ineffective rating when a significantly lower percentage of students achieves the target goal set.

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	GST BOCES Regionally Developed 9th Grade ELA Assessment
Grade 10 ELA	District, regional or BOCES-developed assessment	GST BOCES Regionally Developed 10th Grade ELA Assessment
Grade 11 ELA	Regents assessment	Comprehensive English Regents

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

Use this box, if needed, to describe the general process for assigning HEDI categories for these grades/subjects in this subcomponent. If needed, you may upload a table or graphic at 2.11, below.	Teachers will write an SLO for the entire grade level/course enrollment. Once baseline information has been collected, teachers will meet as a content department to review the data and collaboratively set appropriate and rigorous targets for students using a differentiated approach. SLO targets will be set for each individual student.
Highly Effective (18 - 20 points) Results are well-above District goals for similar students.	Teachers will be assigned a Highly Effective rating when a significantly greater than expected percentage of the class achieves the target goal set.
Effective (9 - 17 points) Results meet District goals for similar students.	Teachers will be assigned an Effective rating when the expected, slightly lower or slightly higher percentage of the class achieves the target goal set.
Developing (3 - 8 points) Results are below District goals for similar students.	Teachers will be assigned a Developing rating when a moderately lower percentage of students achieves the target goal set.
Ineffective (0 - 2 points) Results are well-below District goals for similar students.	Teachers will be assigned an Ineffective rating when a significantly lower percentage of students achieves the target goal set.

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
Art (K-12)	District, Regional or BOCES-developed	GST BOCES Regionally Developed Elementary (K-4) Art Assessment; GST BOCES Regionally Developed Middle Level (Grades 5-8) Art Assessment; GST BOCES Regionally Developed High School (9-12) Art Assessment
Instrumental Music (4-12)	District, Regional or BOCES-developed	GST BOCES Regionally Developed Year 1 Instrumental Music Assessment; GST BOCES Regionally Developed Year 2 Instrumental Music Assessment
Physical Education (K-12)	District, Regional or BOCES-developed	Avoca Central School District Locally Developed Elementary Level (K-5) Physical Education Assessment; Avoca Central

		School District Locally Developed Middle Level (6-8) Physical Education Assessment; Avoca Central School District Locally Developed High School Level (9-12) Physical Education Assessment
Foreign Language (Spanish Courses 1-4)	District, Regional or BOCES-developed	Avoca Central School District Locally Developed Spanish 8 Assessment, GST BOCES Regionally Developed Spanish I Assessment, GST BOCES Regionally Developed Spanish III Assessment
Life Skills	District, Regional or BOCES-developed	Avoca Central School District Locally Developed 12th Grade Life Skills Assessment
Technology and Computer Skills	District, Regional or BOCES-developed	Avoca Central School District Locally Developed Elementary (K-5) Technology Assessment, Avoca Central School District Locally Developed Middle Level (6-8) Technology Assessment, Avoca Central School District Locally Developed High School Level (9-12) Assessment
Home and Careers	District, Regional or BOCES-developed	Avoca Central School District Locally Developed Home and Careers Skills 7th Grade Assessment
Library Media (4-6)	District, Regional or BOCES-developed	GST BOCES Regionally Developed Middle Level (4-6) Library/Media Skills Assessment
Mathematics 11	District, Regional or BOCES-developed	Avoca Central School District Locally Developed Consumer Mathematics 11th Grade Assessment
Band	District, Regional or BOCES-developed	GST BOCES Regionally Developed Year 1 Winds and Percussion Assessment; GST BOCES Regionally Developed Year 2 Winds and Percussions Assessment; GST BOCES Regionally Developed Intermediate (Year 3 and beyond) Winds and Percussions Assessment; GST BOCES Regionally Developed Year 1 Strings Assessment; GST BOCES Regionally Developed Year 2 Strings Assessment
Chorus	District, Regional or BOCES-developed	Avoca Central School District Locally Developed Elementary (K-5) Chorus Assessment; Avoca Central School District Locally Developed Middle Level (6-8) Chorus Assessment; Avoca Central School District Locally Developed High School Level (9-12) Locally Developed Chorus Assessment
Health	District, Regional or BOCES-developed	Avoca Central School District Locally Developed Middle Level 6th Grade Health Assessment; Avoca Central School District Locally Developed High School Level (10-12) Health Assessment
Special Education / Resource Room	State-approved 3rd party assessment	STAR Reading Enterprise
Speech	District, Regional or BOCES-developed	Avoca Central School District Locally Developed Elementary Level (K-5) Speech Skills Assessments
Reading (K-4)	State-approved 3rd party assessment	STAR Reading Enterprise

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

Use this box, if needed, to describe the general process for assigning HEDI categories for these grades/subjects in this	Teachers will write an SLO for the entire grade level/course enrollment. Once baseline information has been collected,
--	--

subcomponent. If needed, you may upload a table or graphic at 2.11, below.	teachers will meet as a content department to review the data and collaboratively set appropriate and rigorous targets for students using a differentiated approach. SLO targets will be set for each individual student.
Highly Effective (18 - 20 points) Results are well-above District goals for similar students.	Teachers will be assigned a Highly Effective rating when a significantly greater than expected percentage of the class achieves the target goal set.
Effective (9 - 17 points) Results meet District goals for similar students.	Teachers will be assigned an Effective rating when the expected, slightly lower or slightly higher percentage of the class achieves the target goal set..
Developing (3 - 8 points) Results are below District goals for similar students.	Teachers will be assigned a Developing rating when a moderately lower percentage of students achieves the target goal set.
Ineffective (0 - 2 points) Results are well-below District goals for similar students.	Teachers will be assigned an Ineffective rating when a significantly lower percentage of students achieves the target goal set.

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

(No response)

2.11) HEDI Tables or Graphics

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

assets/survey-uploads/5364/127348-TXEttx9bQW/SLO Differentiated Approach.doc

2.12) Locally Developed Controls

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

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

No Controls

2.13) Teachers with more than one growth measure

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

If educators have more than one SLO for comparable growth (or a State-provided growth measure and an SLO for comparable

growth), the measures will each earn a score from 0-20 points which Districts must weight proportionately based on the number of students in each SLO.

2.14) Assurances

Please check all of the boxes below:

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

3. Local Measures (Teachers)

Created Wednesday, May 09, 2012

Updated Wednesday, July 17, 2013

Page 1

Locally Selected Measures of Student Achievement or Growth

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

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

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

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

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

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

Growth or achievement measure(s) from these options.

One or more of the following types of local measures of student growth or achievement may be used for the evaluation of teachers. The options in the drop-down menus below are abbreviated from the following list:

Measures based on:

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

3.1) Grades 4-8 ELA

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

	Locally-Selected Measure from List of Approved Measures	Assessment
4	6(ii) School wide measure computed locally	Team Achievement Targets using Combined 4th Grade NY State ELA Assessment and 4th Grade NY State Math Assessment
5	6(ii) School wide measure computed locally	Team Achievement Targets using Combined 8th Grade NY State ELA Assessment and 8th Grade NY State Math Assessment
6	6(ii) School wide measure computed locally	Team Achievement Targets using Combined 8th Grade NY State ELA Assessment and 8th Grade NY State Math Assessment
7	6(ii) School wide measure computed locally	Team Achievement Targets using Combined 8th Grade NY State ELA Assessment and 8th Grade NY State Math Assessment
8	6(ii) School wide measure computed locally	Team Achievement Targets using Combined 8th Grade NY State ELA Assessment and 8th Grade NY State Math Assessment

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

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

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.

K-4

The team achievement goal for K-4 teachers will be meeting the NYS average percent for 3's on both the ELA/Math 4th grade Assessment. Points will be assigned based on the difference between the school average and the state average for percent proficient on the NYS ELA and Math 4th grade assessments.

Additional points will be awarded to teachers whose students reach the mastery level determined locally by averaging the 4's for the prior three years on those assessments which will be the target goal for Mastery. After calculating the percent of students meeting the target and the difference between that percentage and the prior three years average, the attached chart will be used to assign points.

The percent values listed on the chart are the minimum values needed to obtain the corresponding HEDI value. The final HEDI score will be rounded to the nearest whole number (> or equal to 5 rounds up, < 5 rounds down).

5-8

The team achievement goal for 5-8 teachers will be meeting the NYS average percent for 3's on both the ELA/Math 8th grade Assessment. Points will be assigned based on the difference between the school average and the state average for percent proficient on the NYS ELA and Math 8th grade assessments.

Additional points will be awarded to teachers whose students reach the mastery level determined locally by averaging the 4's for the prior three years on those assessments which will be the target goal for Mastery. After calculating the percent of students meeting the target and the difference between that percentage and the prior three years average, the attached chart will be used to assign points.

The percent values listed on the chart are the minimum values needed to obtain the corresponding HEDI value. The final HEDI score will be rounded to the nearest whole number (> or equal to 5 rounds up, < 5 rounds down).

9-12

The team achievement goal for 9-12 teachers will be a combined average grade of 65 using the NYS ELA regents and the NYS Integrated Algebra regents. These averages will be compared to the averages for the previous 3 years on these regents. Points will be assigned based on the difference between the school average and the prior three years average for percent achieving 65 or better on the NYS ELA Regents and the NYS Integrated Algebra Regents.

Additional points will be awarded to teachers whose students reach the mastery level of 85 by comparing these averages to average of the prior three years on these regents' exams. After calculating the percent of students meeting the target and the difference between that percentage and the prior three years average, the attached chart will be used to assign points

The percent values listed on the chart are the minimum values needed to obtain the corresponding HEDI value. The final HEDI score will be rounded to the nearest whole number (> or equal to 5 rounds up, < 5 rounds down).

. In the event that value added is not approved we will use the chart in 3.13

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

Student Performance Targets will be determined by Data-Driven Inquiry Teams based on State Assessment Data. Teams whose student performance significantly exceeds the determined target will be considered highly effective. See attached table in 3.3.

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

Student Performance Targets will be determined by Data-Driven Inquiry Teams based on State Assessment Data. Teams whose student performance meets, is slightly above or slightly below the determined target will be considered effective. See attached table in 3.3.

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

Student Performance Targets will be determined by Data-Driven Inquiry Teams based on State Assessment Data. Teams whose student performance is moderately below the determined target will be considered developing. See attached table in 3.3.

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

Student Performance Targets will be determined by Data-Driven Inquiry Teams based on State Assessment Data. Teams whose student performance falls significantly below the determined target will be considered ineffective. See attached table in 3.3.

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	Team Achievement Targets using Combined 4th Grade NY State ELA Assessment and 4th Grade NY State Math Assessment
5	6(ii) School wide measure computed locally	Team Achievement Targets using Combined 8th Grade NY State ELA Assessment and 8th Grade NY State Math Assessment
6	6(ii) School wide measure computed locally	Team Achievement Targets using Combined 8th Grade NY State ELA Assessment and 8th Grade NY State Math Assessment
7	6(ii) School wide measure computed locally	Team Achievement Targets using Combined 8th Grade NY State ELA Assessment and 8th Grade NY State Math Assessment
8	6(ii) School wide measure computed locally	Team Achievement Targets using Combined 8th Grade NY State ELA Assessment and 8th Grade NY State Math Assessment

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

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

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

K-4

The team achievement goal for K-4 teachers will be meeting the NYS average percent for 3's on both the ELA/Math 4th grade Assessment. Points will be assigned based on the difference between the school average and the state average for percent proficient on the NYS ELA and Math 4th grade assessments.

Additional points will be awarded to teachers whose students reach the mastery level determined locally by averaging the 4's for the prior three years on those assessments which will be the target goal for Mastery. After calculating the percent of students meeting the target and the difference between that percentage and the prior three years average, the attached chart will be used to assign points.

The percent values listed on the chart are the minimum values needed to obtain the corresponding HEDI value. The final HEDI score will be rounded to the nearest whole number (> or equal to 5 rounds up, < 5 rounds down).

5-8

The team achievement goal for 5-8 teachers will be meeting the NYS average percent for 3's on both the ELA/Math 8th grade Assessment. Points will be assigned based on the difference between the school average and the state average for percent proficient on the NYS ELA and Math 8th grade assessments.

Additional points will be awarded to teachers whose students reach the mastery level determined locally by averaging the 4's for the prior three years on those assessments which will be the target goal for Mastery. After calculating the percent of students meeting the target and the difference between that percentage and the prior three years average, the attached chart will be used to assign points.

The percent values listed on the chart are the minimum values needed to obtain the corresponding HEDI value. The final HEDI score will be rounded to the nearest whole number (> or equal to 5 rounds up, < 5 rounds down).

9-12

The team achievement goal for 9-12 teachers will be a combined average grade of 65 using the NYS ELA regents and the NYS Integrated Algebra regents. These averages will be compared to the averages for the previous 3 years on these regents. Points will be assigned based on the difference between the school average and the prior three years average for percent achieving 65 or better on the NYS ELA Regents and the NYS Integrated Algebra Regents.

Additional points will be awarded to teachers whose students reach the mastery level of 85 by comparing these averages to average of the prior three years on these regents' exams. After calculating the percent of students meeting the target and the

difference between that percentage and the prior three years average, the attached chart will be used to assign points

The percent values listed on the chart are the minimum values needed to obtain the corresponding HEDI value. The final HEDI score will be rounded to the nearest whole number (> or equal to 5 rounds up, < 5 rounds down).

.In the event that value added is not approved we will use the chart in 3.13

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

Student Performance Targets will be determined by Data-Driven Inquiry Teams based on State Assessment Data. Teams whose student performance significantly exceeds the determined target will be considered highly effective. See attached table in 3.3.

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

Student Performance Targets will be determined by Data-Driven Inquiry Teams based on State Assessment Data. Teams whose student performance meets, or is slightly above or slightly below the determined target will be considered effective. See attached table in 3.3.

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

Student Performance Targets will be determined by Data-Driven Inquiry Teams based on State Assessment Data. Teams whose student performance is moderately below the determined target will be considered developing. See attached table in 3.3.

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

Student Performance Targets will be determined by Data-Driven Inquiry Teams based on State Assessment Data. Teams whose student performance falls significantly below the determined target will be considered ineffective. See attached table in 3.3.

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/5139/127366-rhJdBgDruP/team slo charts.pdf](#)

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

Growth or achievement measure(s) from these options.

One or more of the following types of local measures of student growth or achievement may be used for the evaluation of teachers. The options in the drop-down menus below are abbreviated from the following list:

Measures based on:

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

3.4) Grades K-3 ELA

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

	Locally-Selected Measure from List of Approved Measures	Assessment
K	6(ii) School-wide measure computed locally	Team Achievement Targets using Combined 4th Grade NY State ELA Assessment and 4th Grade NY State Math Assessment
1	6(ii) School-wide measure computed locally	Team Achievement Targets using Combined 4th Grade NY State ELA Assessment and 4th Grade NY State Math Assessment
2	6(ii) School-wide measure computed locally	Team Achievement Targets using Combined 4th Grade NY State ELA Assessment and 4th Grade NY State Math Assessment
3	6(ii) School-wide measure computed locally	Team Achievement Targets using Combined 4th Grade NY State ELA Assessment and 4th Grade NY State Math Assessment

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

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

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.

K-4

The team achievement goal for K-4 teachers will be meeting the NYS average percent for 3's on both the ELA/Math 4th grade Assessment. Points will be assigned based on the difference between the school average and the state average for percent proficient on the NYS ELA and Math 4th grade assessments.

Additional points will be awarded to teachers whose students reach the mastery level determined locally by averaging the 4's for the prior three years on those assessments which will be the target goal for Mastery. After calculating the percent of students meeting the target and the difference between that percentage and the prior three years average, the attached chart will be used to assign points.

The percent values listed on the chart are the minimum values needed to obtain the corresponding HEDI value. The final HEDI score will be rounded to the nearest whole number (> or equal to 5 rounds up, < 5 rounds down).

5-8

The team achievement goal for 5-8 teachers will be meeting the NYS average percent for 3's on both the ELA/Math 8th grade Assessment. Points will be assigned based on the difference between the school average and the state average for percent proficient on the NYS ELA and Math 8th grade assessments.

Additional points will be awarded to teachers whose students reach the mastery level determined locally by averaging the 4's for the prior three years on those assessments which will be the target goal for Mastery. After calculating the percent of students meeting the target and the difference between that percentage and the prior three years average, the attached chart will be used to assign points.

The percent values listed on the chart are the minimum values needed to obtain the corresponding HEDI value. The final HEDI score will be rounded to the nearest whole number (> or equal to 5 rounds up, < 5 rounds down).

9-12

The team achievement goal for 9-12 teachers will be a combined average grade of 65 using the NYS ELA regents and the NYS Integrated Algebra regents. These averages will be compared to the averages for the previous 3 years on these regents. Points will be assigned based on the difference between the school average and the prior three years average for percent achieving 65 or better on the NYS ELA Regents and the NYS Integrated Algebra Regents.

Additional points will be awarded to teachers whose students reach the mastery level of 85 by comparing these averages to average of the prior three years on these regents' exams. After calculating the percent of students meeting the target and the

difference between that percentage and the prior three years average, the attached chart will be used to assign points

The percent values listed on the chart are the minimum values needed to obtain the corresponding HEDI value. The final HEDI score will be rounded to the nearest whole number (> or equal to 5 rounds up, < 5 rounds down).

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

Student Performance Targets will be determined by Data-Driven Inquiry Teams based on State Assessment Data. Teams whose student performance significantly exceeds the determined target will be considered highly effective. See attached table in 3.3.

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

Student Performance Targets will be determined by Data-Driven Inquiry Teams based on State Assessment Data. Teams whose student performance meets, is slightly above or slightly below the determined target will be considered effective. See attached table in 3.3.

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

Student Performance Targets will be determined by Data-Driven Inquiry Teams based on State Assessment Data. Teams whose student performance is moderately below the determined target will be considered developing. See attached table in 3.3.

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

Student Performance Targets will be determined by Data-Driven Inquiry Teams based on State Assessment Data. Teams whose student performance falls significantly below the determined target will be considered ineffective. See attached table in 3.3.

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	Team Achievement Targets using Combined 4th Grade NY State ELA Assessment and 4th Grade NY State Math Assessment
1	6(ii) School-wide measure computed locally	Team Achievement Targets using Combined 4th Grade NY State ELA Assessment and 4th Grade NY State Math Assessment
2	6(ii) School-wide measure computed locally	Team Achievement Targets using Combined 4th Grade NY State ELA Assessment and 4th Grade NY State Math Assessment
3	6(ii) School-wide measure computed locally	Team Achievement Targets using Combined 4th Grade NY State ELA Assessment and 4th Grade NY State Math Assessment

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

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

Use this box, if needed, to describe the general process for assigning HEDI categories for these grades/subjects in this

K-4
The team achievement goal for K-4 teachers will be meeting the

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

NYS average percent for 3's on both the ELA/Math 4th grade Assessment. Points will be assigned based on the difference between the school average and the state average for percent proficient on the NYS ELA and Math 4th grade assessments.

Additional points will be awarded to teachers whose students reach the mastery level determined locally by averaging the 4's for the prior three years on those assessments which will be the target goal for Mastery. After calculating the percent of students meeting the target and the difference between that percentage and the prior three years average, the attached chart will be used to assign points.

The percent values listed on the chart are the minimum values needed to obtain the corresponding HEDI value. The final HEDI score will be rounded to the nearest whole number (> or equal to 5 rounds up, < 5 rounds down).

5-8

The team achievement goal for 5-8 teachers will be meeting the NYS average percent for 3's on both the ELA/Math 8th grade Assessment. Points will be assigned based on the difference between the school average and the state average for percent proficient on the NYS ELA and Math 8th grade assessments.

Additional points will be awarded to teachers whose students reach the mastery level determined locally by averaging the 4's for the prior three years on those assessments which will be the target goal for Mastery. After calculating the percent of students meeting the target and the difference between that percentage and the prior three years average, the attached chart will be used to assign points.

The percent values listed on the chart are the minimum values needed to obtain the corresponding HEDI value. The final HEDI score will be rounded to the nearest whole number (> or equal to 5 rounds up, < 5 rounds down).

9-12

The team achievement goal for 9-12 teachers will be a combined average grade of 65 using the NYS ELA regents and the NYS Integrated Algebra regents. These averages will be compared to the averages for the previous 3 years on these regents. Points will be assigned based on the difference between the school average and the prior three years average for percent achieving 65 or better on the NYS ELA Regents and the NYS Integrated Algebra Regents.

Additional points will be awarded to teachers whose students reach the mastery level of 85 by comparing these averages to average of the prior three years on these regents' exams. After calculating the percent of students meeting the target and the difference between that percentage and the prior three years average, the attached chart will be used to assign points

The percent values listed on the chart are the minimum values needed to obtain the corresponding HEDI value. The final HEDI score will be rounded to the nearest whole number (> or equal to 5 rounds up, < 5 rounds down).

Highly Effective (18-20 points) Results are well above District- or BOCES-adopted expectations for growth or achievement for grade/subject.	Student Performance Targets will be determined by Data-Driven Inquiry Teams based on State Assessment Data. Teams whose student performance significantly exceeds the determined target will be considered highly effective. See attached table in 3.3.
Effective (9-17 points) Results meet District- or BOCES-adopted expectations for growth or achievement for grade/subject.	Student Performance Targets will be determined by Data-Driven Inquiry Teams based on State Assessment Data. Teams whose student performance meets, is slightly above or slightly below the determined target will be considered effective. See attached table in 3.3.
Developing (3 - 8 points) Results are below District -or BOCES-adopted expectations for growth or achievement for grade/subject.	Student Performance Targets will be determined by Data-Driven Inquiry Teams based on State Assessment Data. Teams whose student performance is moderately below the determined target will be considered developing. See attached table in 3.3.
Ineffective (0 - 2 points) Results are well below District- or BOCES-adopted expectations for growth or achievement for grade/subject.	Student Performance Targets will be determined by Data-Driven Inquiry Teams based on State Assessment Data. Teams whose student performance falls significantly below the determined target will be considered ineffective. See attached table in 3.3.

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	Team Achievement Targets using Combined 8th Grade NY State ELA Assessment and 8th Grade NY State Math Assessment
7	6(ii) School wide measure computed locally	Team Achievement Targets using Combined 8th Grade NY State ELA Assessment and 8th Grade NY State Math Assessment
8	6(ii) School wide measure computed locally	Team Achievement Targets using Combined 8th Grade NY State ELA Assessment and 8th Grade NY State Math Assessment

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

Use this box, if needed, to describe the general process for assigning HEDI categories for these grades/subjects in this subcomponent. If needed, you may upload a table or graphic at 3.13, below.	<p>Grades 6-8 Science Teachers will be included in K-4. The team achievement goal for K-4 teachers will be meeting the NYS average percent for 3's on both the ELA/Math 4th grade Assessment. Points will be assigned based on the difference between the school average and the state average for percent proficient on the NYS ELA and Math 4th grade assessments.</p> <p>Additional points will be awarded to teachers whose students reach the mastery level determined locally by averaging the 4's for the prior three years on those assessments which will be the target goal for Mastery. After calculating the percent of students meeting the target and the difference between that percentage and the prior three years average, the attached chart will be used to assign points.</p> <p>The percent values listed on the chart are the minimum values needed to obtain the corresponding HEDI value. The final HEDI score will be rounded to the nearest whole number (> or equal to</p>
---	--

5 rounds up, < 5 rounds down).

5-8

The team achievement goal for 5-8 teachers will be meeting the NYS average percent for 3's on both the ELA/Math 8th grade Assessment. Points will be assigned based on the difference between the school average and the state average for percent proficient on the NYS ELA and Math 8th grade assessments.

Additional points will be awarded to teachers whose students reach the mastery level determined locally by averaging the 4's for the prior three years on those assessments which will be the target goal for Mastery. After calculating the percent of students meeting the target and the difference between that percentage and the prior three years average, the attached chart will be used to assign points.

The percent values listed on the chart are the minimum values needed to obtain the corresponding HEDI value. The final HEDI score will be rounded to the nearest whole number (> or equal to 5 rounds up, < 5 rounds down).

9-12

The team achievement goal for 9-12 teachers will be a combined average grade of 65 using the NYS ELA regents and the NYS Integrated Algebra regents. These averages will be compared to the averages for the previous 3 years on these regents. Points will be assigned based on the difference between the school average and the prior three years average for percent achieving 65 or better on the NYS ELA Regents and the NYS Integrated Algebra Regents.

Additional points will be awarded to teachers whose students reach the mastery level of 85 by comparing these averages to average of the prior three years on these regents' exams. After calculating the percent of students meeting the target and the difference between that percentage and the prior three years average, the attached chart will be used to assign points

The percent values listed on the chart are the minimum values needed to obtain the corresponding HEDI value. The final HEDI score will be rounded to the nearest whole number (> or equal to 5 rounds up, < 5 rounds down).

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

Student Performance Targets will be determined by Data-Driven Inquiry Teams based on State Assessment Data. Teams whose student performance significantly exceeds the determined target will be considered highly effective. See attached table in 3.3.

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

Student Performance Targets will be determined by Data-Driven Inquiry Teams based on State Assessment Data. Teams whose student performance meets, is slightly above or slightly below the determined target will be considered effective. See attached table in 3.3.

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

Student Performance Targets will be determined by Data-Driven Inquiry Teams based on State Assessment Data. Teams whose student performance is moderately below the determined target will be considered developing. See attached table in 3.3.

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

Student Performance Targets will be determined by Data-Driven Inquiry Teams based on State Assessment Data. Teams whose student performance falls significantly below the determined target will be considered ineffective. See attached table in 3.3.

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	Team Achievement Targets using Combined 8th Grade NY State ELA Assessment and 8th Grade NY State Math Assessment
7	6(ii) School wide measure computed locally	Team Achievement Targets using Combined 8th Grade NY State ELA Assessment and 8th Grade NY State Math Assessment
8	6(ii) School wide measure computed locally	Team Achievement Targets using Combined 8th Grade NY State ELA Assessment and 8th Grade NY State Math Assessment

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

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

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

Grades 6-8 Social Studies Teachers will be included in K-4. The team achievement goal for K-4 teachers will be meeting the NYS average percent for 3's on both the ELA/Math 4th grade Assessment. Points will be assigned based on the difference between the school average and the state average for percent proficient on the NYS ELA and Math 4th grade assessments.

Additional points will be awarded to teachers whose students reach the mastery level determined locally by averaging the 4's for the prior three years on those assessments which will be the target goal for Mastery. After calculating the percent of students meeting the target and the difference between that percentage and the prior three years average, the attached chart will be used to assign points.

The percent values listed on the chart are the minimum values needed to obtain the corresponding HEDI value. The final HEDI score will be rounded to the nearest whole number (> or equal to 5 rounds up, < 5 rounds down).

5-8

The team achievement goal for 5-8 teachers will be meeting the NYS average percent for 3's on both the ELA/Math 8th grade Assessment. Points will be assigned based on the difference between the school average and the state average for percent proficient on the NYS ELA and Math 8th grade assessments.

Additional points will be awarded to teachers whose students reach the mastery level determined locally by averaging the 4's for the prior three years on those assessments which will be the target goal for Mastery. After calculating the percent of students meeting the target and the difference between that percentage and the prior three years average, the attached chart will be used to assign points.

The percent values listed on the chart are the minimum values needed to obtain the corresponding HEDI value. The final HEDI score will be rounded to the nearest whole number (> or equal to 5 rounds up, < 5 rounds down).

9-12

The team achievement goal for 9-12 teachers will be a combined average grade of 65 using the NYS ELA regents and the NYS Integrated Algebra regents. These averages will be compared to the averages for the previous 3 years on these regents. Points will be assigned based on the difference between the school average and the prior three years average for percent achieving 65 or better on the NYS ELA Regents and the NYS Integrated Algebra Regents.

Additional points will be awarded to teachers whose students reach the mastery level of 85 by comparing these averages to average of the prior three years on these regents' exams. After calculating the percent of students meeting the target and the difference between that percentage and the prior three years average, the attached chart will be used to assign points

The percent values listed on the chart are the minimum values needed to obtain the corresponding HEDI value. The final HEDI score will be rounded to the nearest whole number (> or equal to 5 rounds up, < 5 rounds down).

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

Student Performance Targets will be determined by Data-Driven Inquiry Teams based on State Assessment Data. Teams whose student performance significantly exceeds the determined target will be considered highly effective. See attached table in 3.3.

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

Student Performance Targets will be determined by Data-Driven Inquiry Teams based on State Assessment Data. Teams whose student performance meets, is slightly above or slightly below the determined target will be considered effective. See attached table in 3.3.

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

Student Performance Targets will be determined by Data-Driven Inquiry Teams based on State Assessment Data. Teams whose student performance is moderately below the determined target will be considered developing. See attached table in 3.3.

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

Student Performance Targets will be determined by Data-Driven Inquiry Teams based on State Assessment Data. Teams whose student performance falls significantly below the determined target will be considered ineffective. See attached table in 3.3.

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	Team Achievement Target goal using the Comprehensive English Regents Exam and Integrated Algebra Regents Exam
Global 2	6(ii) School wide measure computed locally	Team Achievement Target goal using the Comprehensive English Regents Exam and Integrated Algebra Regents Exam
American History	6(ii) School wide measure computed locally	Team Achievement Target goal using the Comprehensive English Regents Exam and Integrated Algebra Regents Exam

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

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

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>All High School Teachers will be included in a Team Achievement Target Goal. The team achievement goal for 9-12 teachers will be a combined average grade of 65 using the NYS ELA regents and the NYS Integrated Algebra regents. These averages will be compared to the averages for the previous 3 years on these regents. Points will be assigned based on the difference between the school average and the prior three years average for percent achieving 65 or better on the NYS ELA Regents and the NYS Integrated Algebra Regents.</p> <p>Additional points will be awarded to teachers whose students reach the mastery level of 85 by comparing these averages to average of the prior three years on these regents' exams. After calculating the percent of students meeting the target and the difference between that percentage and the prior three years average, the attached chart will be used to assign points</p> <p>The percent values listed on the chart are the minimum values needed to obtain the corresponding HEDI value. The final HEDI score will be rounded to the nearest whole number (> or equal to 5 rounds up, < 5 rounds down).</p>
Highly Effective (18 - 20 points) Results are well above District- or BOCES-adopted expectations for growth or achievement for grade/subject.	Student Performance Targets will be determined by Data-Driven Inquiry Teams based on Regents Data. Teams whose student performance significantly exceeds the determined target will be considered highly effective. See attached table in 3.3.
Effective (9 - 17 points) Results meet District- or BOCES-adopted expectations for growth or achievement for grade/subject.	Student Performance Targets will be determined by Data-Driven Inquiry Teams based on Regents Data. Teams whose student performance meets, is slightly above or slightly below the determined target will be considered effective. See attached table in 3.3.

Developing (3 - 8 points) Results are below District- or BOCES-adopted expectations for growth or achievement for grade/subject.	Student Performance Targets will be determined by Data-Driven Inquiry Teams based on Regents Data. Teams whose student performance is moderately below the determined target will be considered Developing. See attached table in 3.3.
Ineffective (0 - 2 points) Results are well below District- or BOCES-adopted expectations for growth or achievement for grade/subject.	Student Performance Targets will be determined by Data-Driven Inquiry Teams based on Regents Data. Teams whose student performance significantly falls below the determined target will be considered Ineffective. See attached table in 3.3.

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	Team Achievement Target goal using the Comprehensive English Regents Exam and Integrated Algebra Regents Exam
Earth Science	6(ii) School wide measure computed locally	Team Achievement Target goal using the Comprehensive English Regents Exam and Integrated Algebra Regents Exam
Chemistry	6(ii) School wide measure computed locally	Team Achievement Target goal using the Comprehensive English Regents Exam and Integrated Algebra Regents Exam
Physics	6(ii) School wide measure computed locally	Team Achievement Target goal using the Comprehensive English Regents Exam and Integrated Algebra Regents Exam

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

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

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>All High School Teachers will be included in a Team Achievement Target. The team achievement goal for 9-12 teachers will be a combined average grade of 65 using the NYS ELA regents and the NYS Integrated Algebra regents. These averages will be compared to the averages for the previous 3 years on these regents. Points will be assigned based on the difference between the school average and the prior three years average for percent achieving 65 or better on the NYS ELA Regents and the NYS Integrated Algebra Regents.</p> <p>Additional points will be awarded to teachers whose students reach the mastery level of 85 by comparing these averages to average of the prior three years on these regents' exams. After calculating the percent of students meeting the target and the difference between that percentage and the prior three years average, the attached chart will be used to assign points</p>
---	--

The percent values listed on the chart are the minimum values needed to obtain the corresponding HEDI value. The final HEDI score will be rounded to the nearest whole number (> or equal to 5 rounds up, < 5 rounds down).

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

Student Performance Targets will be determined by Data-Driven Inquiry Teams based on Regents Data. Teams whose student performance significantly exceeds the determined target will be considered highly effective. See attached table in 3.3.

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

Student Performance Targets will be determined by Data-Driven Inquiry Teams based on Regents Data. Teams whose student performance falls moderately below the determined target will be considered developing. See attached table in 3.3.

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

Student Performance Targets will be determined by Data-Driven Inquiry Teams based on Regents Data. Teams whose student performance meets, is slightly above or slightly below the determined target will be considered Effective. See attached table in 3.3.

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

Student Performance Targets will be determined by Data-Driven Inquiry Teams based on Regents Data. Teams whose student performance significantly falls below the determined target will be considered Ineffective. See attached table in 3.3.

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	Team Achievement Target goal using the Comprehensive English Regents Exam and Integrated Algebra Regents Exam
Geometry	6(ii) School wide measure computed locally	Team Achievement Target goal using the Comprehensive English Regents Exam and Integrated Algebra Regents Exam
Algebra 2	6(ii) School wide measure computed locally	Team Achievement Target goal using the Comprehensive English Regents Exam and Integrated Algebra Regents Exam

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

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

Use this box, if needed, to describe the general process for assigning HEDI categories for these grades/subjects in this

All High School Teachers will be included in a Team Achievement Target Goal. The team achievement goal for 9-12

subcomponent. If needed, you may upload a table or graphic at 3.13, below.	<p>teachers will be a combined average grade of 65 using the NYS ELA regents and the NYS Integrated Algebra regents. These averages will be compared to the averages for the previous 3 years on these regents. Points will be assigned based on the difference between the school average and the prior three years average for percent achieving 65 or better on the NYS ELA Regents and the NYS Integrated Algebra Regents.</p> <p>Additional points will be awarded to teachers whose students reach the mastery level of 85 by comparing these averages to average of the prior three years on these regents' exams. After calculating the percent of students meeting the target and the difference between that percentage and the prior three years average, the attached chart will be used to assign points</p> <p>The percent values listed on the chart are the minimum values needed to obtain the corresponding HEDI value. The final HEDI score will be rounded to the nearest whole number (> or equal to 5 rounds up, < 5 rounds down).</p>
Highly Effective (18 - 20 points) Results are well above District- or BOCES-adopted expectations for growth or achievement for grade/subject.	Student Performance Targets will be determined by Data-Driven Inquiry Teams based on Regents Data. Teams whose student performance significantly exceeds the determined target will be considered highly effective. See attached table in 3.3.
Effective (9 - 17 points) Results meet District- or BOCES-adopted expectations for growth or achievement for grade/subject.	Student Performance Targets will be determined by Data-Driven Inquiry Teams based on Regents Data. Teams whose student performance meets, is slightly above or slightly below the determined target will be considered effective. See attached table in 3.3.
Developing (3 - 8 points) Results are below District- or BOCES-adopted expectations for growth or achievement for grade/subject.	Student Performance Targets will be determined by Data-Driven Inquiry Teams based on Regents Data. Teams whose student performance is moderately below the determined target will be considered Developing. See attached table in 3.3.
Ineffective (0 - 2 points) Results are well below District- or BOCES-adopted expectations for growth or achievement for grade/subject.	Student Performance Targets will be determined by Data-Driven Inquiry Teams based on Regents Data. Teams whose student performance significantly falls below the determined target will be considered Ineffective. See attached table in 3.3.

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	Team Achievement Target goal using the Comprehensive English Regents Exam and Integrated Algebra Regents Exam
Grade 10 ELA	6(ii) School wide measure computed locally	Team Achievement Target goal using the Comprehensive English Regents Exam and Integrated Algebra Regents Exam
Grade 11 ELA	6(ii) School wide measure computed locally	Team Achievement Target goal using the Comprehensive English Regents Exam and Integrated Algebra Regents Exam

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

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

<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 be included in a Team Achievement Target Goal. The team achievement goal for 9-12 teachers will be a combined average grade of 65 using the NYS ELA regents and the NYS Integrated Algebra regents. These averages will be compared to the averages for the previous 3 years on these regents. Points will be assigned based on the difference between the school average and the prior three years average for percent achieving 65 or better on the NYS ELA Regents and the NYS Integrated Algebra Regents.</p> <p>Additional points will be awarded to teachers whose students reach the mastery level of 85 by comparing these averages to average of the prior three years on these regents' exams. After calculating the percent of students meeting the target and the difference between that percentage and the prior three years average, the attached chart will be used to assign points</p> <p>The percent values listed on the chart are the minimum values needed to obtain the corresponding HEDI value. The final HEDI score will be rounded to the nearest whole number (> or equal to 5 rounds up, < 5 rounds down).</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>Student Performance Targets will be determined by Data-Driven Inquiry Teams based on Regents Data. Teams whose student performance significantly exceeds the determined target will be considered highly effective. See attached table in 3.3.</p>
<p>Effective (9 - 17 points) Results meet District- or BOCES-adopted expectations for growth or achievement for grade/subject.</p>	<p>Student Performance Targets will be determined by Data-Driven Inquiry Teams based on Regents Data. Teams whose student performance meets, is slightly above or slightly below the determined target will be considered effective. See attached table in 3.3.</p>
<p>Developing (3 - 8 points) Results are below District- or BOCES-adopted expectations for growth or achievement for grade/subject.</p>	<p>Student Performance Targets will be determined by Data-Driven Inquiry Teams based on Regents Data. Teams whose student performance is moderately below the determined target will be considered Developing. See attached table in 3.3.</p>
<p>Ineffective (0 - 2 points) Results are well below District- or BOCES-adopted expectations for growth or achievement for grade/subject.</p>	<p>Student Performance Targets will be determined by Data-Driven Inquiry Teams based on Regents Data. Teams whose student performance significantly falls below the determined target will be considered Ineffective. See attached table in 3.3.</p>

3.12) All Other Courses

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

Course(s) or Subject(s)	Locally-Selected Measure from List of Approved Measures	Assessment
-------------------------	---	------------

meeting the target and the difference between that percentage and the prior three years average, the attached chart will be used to assign points.

The percent values listed on the chart are the minimum values needed to obtain the corresponding HEDI value. The final HEDI score will be rounded to the nearest whole number (> or equal to 5 rounds up, < 5 rounds down).

9-12

The team achievement goal for 9-12 teachers will be a combined average grade of 65 using the NYS ELA regents and the NYS Integrated Algebra regents. These averages will be compared to the averages for the previous 3 years on these regents. Points will be assigned based on the difference between the school average and the prior three years average for percent achieving 65 or better on the NYS ELA Regents and the NYS Integrated Algebra Regents.

Additional points will be awarded to teachers whose students reach the mastery level of 85 by comparing these averages to average of the prior three years on these regents' exams. After calculating the percent of students meeting the target and the difference between that percentage and the prior three years average, the attached chart will be used to assign points

The percent values listed on the chart are the minimum values needed to obtain the corresponding HEDI value. The final HEDI score will be rounded to the nearest whole number (> or equal to 5 rounds up, < 5 rounds down).

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

Student Performance Targets will be determined by Data-Driven Inquiry Teams based on Regents Data. Teams whose student performance significantly exceeds the determined target will be considered highly effective. See attached table in 3.3.

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

Student Performance Targets will be determined by Data-Driven Inquiry Teams based on Regents Data. Teams whose student performance meets, is slightly above or slightly below the determined target will be considered effective. See attached table in 3.3.

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

Student Performance Targets will be determined by Data-Driven Inquiry Teams based on Regents Data. Teams whose student performance is moderately below the determined target will be considered Developing. See attached table in 3.3.

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

Student Performance Targets will be determined by Data-Driven Inquiry Teams based on Regents Data. Teams whose student performance significantly falls below the determined target will be considered Ineffective. See attached table in 3.3.

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/5139/127366-y92vNseFa4/team slo charts.pdf

3.14) Locally Developed Controls

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

No Controls

3.15) Teachers with More Than One Locally Selected Measure

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

All teachers will have their local score composed of two measures. Targets will be set for each of two assessments, combined points weighted proportionally based on enrollment. Each assessment will have targets set for proficiency (defined as Level 3 on the 3-8 NYS Assessments, or 65 and above on the NYS Regents Examinations) and a target set for mastery (defined as Level 4 on the 3-8 NYS Assessments, or 85 and above on the NYS Regents Examinations)- the majority of the points will be assigned based on performance toward a goal of proficiency, and a smaller portion based on performance toward a goal of mastery. (see table uploaded in 3.3)

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 Wednesday, May 09, 2012

Updated Tuesday, June 04, 2013

Page 1

4.1) Teacher Practice Rubric

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

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

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

Marzano's Causal Teacher Evaluation Model

(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?

No

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

Tenured teachers

Multiple (at least two) classroom observations by principal or other trained administrator, at least one of which must be unannounced [at least 31 points]	42
One or more observation(s) by trained independent evaluators	0
Observations by trained in-school peer teachers	0
Feedback from students using State-approved survey tool	0
Feedback from parents/caregivers using State-approved survey tool	0
Structured reviews of lesson plans, student portfolios and other teacher artifacts	18

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)

assets/survey-uploads/5091/127389-2UoxI2HPmn/Form4_2_PointsWithinOtherMeasures.doc

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.

Tenured teachers will be assessed using the complete rubric, but points will be assigned to 14 of the 41 elements in Domain I. These elements will be assessed through formal and information observation processes, including pre- and post- observation conferences that will be included in the formal observation process. Tenured teachers will additionally be assigned points in 18 of the 19 elements in Domains 2,3, and 4. These 18 elements will be assessed through the use of artifacts as evidence of a given rating for each element. (See attached conversion table)

Non-Tenured Teachers will be assigned a point value for each of the 60 elements. According to the attached reference chart 1 point will be assessed to all teachers for the 1 element regarding ELL, as our district has no ELL students.

If teachers were ineffective in all domains and each element of each domain a teacher would receive a score of (0) zero.

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

assets/survey-uploads/5091/127389-eka9yMJ855/Marzano Rubric Conversion Chart.docx

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

Highly Effective: Overall performance and results exceed NYS Teaching Standards.	Teachers whose rubric score falls within this range have demonstrated overall performance and results exceed standards. See teacher rubric conversion document (attached) for an explanation of how points are assigned.
Effective: Overall performance and results meet NYS Teaching Standards.	Teachers whose rubric score falls within this range have demonstrated overall performance and results meet standards. See teacher rubric conversion document (attached) for an explanation of how points are assigned.
Developing: Overall performance and results need improvement in order to meet NYS Teaching Standards.	Teachers whose rubric score falls within this range have demonstrated overall performance and results need improvement in order to meet standards. See teacher rubric conversion document (attached) for an explanation of how points are assigned.
Ineffective: Overall performance and results do not meet NYS Teaching Standards.	Teachers whose rubric score falls within this range have demonstrated overall performance and results do not meet standards. See teacher rubric conversion document (attached) for an explanation of how points are assigned.

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	3
4.6) Observations of Probationary Teachers Enter Total	5

By trained in-school peer teachers or other trained reviewers

Formal/Long	0
Informal/Short	0

Independent evaluators

Formal/Long	0
Informal/Short	0

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

-
- In Person
-

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

-
- In Person
-

4.7) Observations of Tenured Teachers

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

By building principals or other trained administrators

4.7) Observations of Tenured Teachers Formal/Long	1
4.7) Observations of Tenured Teachers Informal/Short	2
4.7) Observations of Tenured Teachers 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 tenured teachers be done in person, by video, or both?

-
- In Person
-

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

- In Person
-

5. Composite Scoring (Teachers)

Created Thursday, July 12, 2012

Updated Wednesday, May 15, 2013

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 Thursday, July 12, 2012

Updated Wednesday, October 10, 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/5265/151125-Df0w3Xx5v6/Teacher Improvement Plan.doc](assets/survey-uploads/5265/151125-Df0w3Xx5v6/Teacher%20Improvement%20Plan.doc)

6.3) Appeals Process

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

(1) the substance of the annual professional performance review

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

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

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

APPEALS PROCESS

The purpose of the internal appeals process is to foster and nurture growth of the professional staff in order to maintain a highly qualified and effective work force. The following appeal process is designed to further this goal. The burden of proof will be on the appellant to establish by the preponderance of the evidence that the rating given by the lead evaluator was not justified.

• All tenured and probationary employees who meet the appeal process criteria may use this appeal process.

- Said appeal process will be available to employees to appeal either a procedural error in the evaluation process or appeal a substantive portion of the evaluation. All aspects of an evaluation must be presented when initiating an appeal. A teacher cannot file multiple appeals on the same review, thus all issues must be raised at the time the appeal is filed or are deemed waived.
- Only employees who receive a "Developing" or "Ineffective" rating in one or more of the evaluative criteria for (a) a formal observation, (b) an informal observation, or (c) an annual professional performance review (composite score) may process an appeal. The evaluative criteria categories that may be appealed are the 60 elements associated with the Marzano's Causal Teacher Evaluation Model or a procedural error.

1. GOVERNING BODY TO ADJUDICATE THE APPEAL: The governing body will be defined as the "Evaluation Appeals Committee" (EAC). The EAC make up will be:

- a. One tenured administrator. The tenured administrator appointed to the EAC will not be the administrator who authored the evaluation and will be chosen by the Superintendent or his/her designee.*
- b. Two tenured teachers. The tenured teachers appointed to the EAC will be chosen by the President of the Association or his/her designee.*

2. APPEALS DECISION MAKING

- a. The EAC will have the right to ask questions of the appellant, the lead evaluator, and any other relevant participants. They have the right to collect any and all information necessary to make an informed decision.*
- b. The EAC will reach their findings (see Section 4 below) through unanimous vote.*
- c. If a unanimous vote is not reached, the EAC will write up the opposing viewpoints and submit the opposing viewpoints to the lead evaluator, the appellant, the Association President, and the Superintendent.*
- d. At this point, a Superintendent's Evaluation Appeals Committee (SEAC) made up of two (2) Superintendent appointees and one (1) union appointee will review the evaluation and position papers and by majority vote determine which of the opposing viewpoints will be the final outcome.*

3. TIMELINE

- a. The employee must attempt to resolve the appeal informally within five (5) business days of receipt of the evaluation through an informal conference with the lead evaluator.*
- b. The employee must forward the evaluation appeal within five (5) business days of an unsuccessful informal conference in writing to the Superintendent of Schools and the Association President.*
- c. The Superintendent and Association President will charge the EAC to hold a Conference within five (5) business days of receipt of the appeal.*
- d. The EAC will issue its findings to the Superintendent, Association President, the employee and the lead evaluator within five (5) business days of the Conference.*
- e. If the SEAC is utilized, they will be given five (5) business days to meet and render their final decision by majority vote.*

4. COMMITTEE FINDINGS

- a. The EAC/SEAC is empowered to overturn a section of the evaluation and assign a new rating to that section. Said ability to overturn a section of the evaluation does not negate the fact that the evaluation was timely completed.*
- b. The EAC/SEAC is empowered to overturn the entire evaluation if the evaluation was procedurally flawed and assign a new rating where appropriate.*
- c. The EAC/SEAC is empowered to overturn a section or the entire evaluation and require a course of action so as to enhance the professional growth of the employee.*
- d. The EAC/SEAC is empowered to affirm the evaluation and require a course of action so as to enhance the professional growth of the employee.*
- e. The EAC/SEAC is empowered to affirm the evaluation.*

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.

EVALUATOR TRAINING:

- 1. The District will certify lead evaluators as qualified to conduct teacher evaluations under 3012-c and Commissioner's Regulation 30-2. [30-2.9(a)]*
- 2. The District will provide training to evaluators and lead evaluators through the GST BOCES RTTT Evaluator Training program with multiple training dates to be held throughout the 2011-12 and 2012-13 school years. GST BOCES will provide 3 hours minimum of training per each of the required components, including but not limited to:*

- a. NYS Teaching and Leadership Standards
- b. Evidence-Based Observation Techniques
- c. Application and use of Student Growth and Value-Added Models
- d. Application and Use of State-Approved Rubrics
- e. Application and Use of State-Approved Locally Developed Measures of Student Achievement
- f. Use of the Statewide Instructional Reporting System
- g. The Scoring Methodology Used by the Department and/or Your District
- h. Specific Considerations in Evaluating Teachers and Principals of ELL and SWD
- i. Work Toward Inter-Rater Reliability

3. Classroom observations required by this APPR plan may be commenced September 5, 2012, provided of course, that the administrator performing such classroom evaluations are properly credentialed school administrators for such purpose. [30-2.9(a)]

INTER-RATER RELIABILITY

Lead evaluators will maintain inter-rater reliability over time. Evaluators and lead evaluators will be trained through the GST BOCES RTTT Evaluator Training Program in maintaining inter-rater reliability. As part of such training, Lead Evaluators will participate in activities to promote inter-rater reliability at least three times per school year, and as many times as needed to develop at least three benchmarks of reasonable reliability as verified by the District Superintendent, within said school year. See 30-2.9(b)(5)

RECERTIFICATION

Lead evaluators and evaluators who received initial certification will be recertified with at least two half day trainings to review the process for effectively conducting observations through the collection of evidence, bias-awareness exercises and calibration of ratings..

6.5) Assurances -- Evaluators

Please check the boxes below:

-
- Checked
-

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

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

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

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

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

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

(7) use of the Statewide Instructional Reporting System

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

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

• Checked

6.6) Assurances -- Teachers

Please check all of the boxes below:

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

6.7) Assurances -- Data

Please check all of the boxes below:

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

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

Created Tuesday, July 17, 2012

Updated Monday, August 27, 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-6
7-12
(No response)

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

Please check the boxes below:

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

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

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

State assessments, *required if one exists*

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

List of State-approved 3rd party assessments

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

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

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

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

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

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

(No response)

7.4) Special Considerations for Comparable Growth Measures

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

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

N/A

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/rtrt/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 Wednesday, August 08, 2012

Updated Wednesday, July 17, 2013

Page 1

Locally-Selected Measures of Student Achievement or Growth

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

- (a) student achievement levels on State assessments in ELA and/or Math in Grades 4-8 (e.g., percentage of students in the school whose performance levels on State assessments are proficient or advanced)
- (b) student growth or achievement on State assessments in ELA and/or Math in Grades 4-8 for students in each specific performance level (e.g., Level 1, Level 2)
- (c) student growth or achievement on State assessments in ELA and/or Math in Grades 4-8 for students with disabilities and English Language Learners in Grades 4-8
- (d) student performance on any or all of the district-wide locally selected measures approved for use in teacher evaluations
- (e) four, five and/or six-year high school graduation and/or dropout rates for principals employed in a school with high school grades

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

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

(h) students' progress toward graduation in the school using strong predictive indicators, including but not limited to 9th and/or 10th grade credit accumulation and/or the percentage of students that pass 9th and/or 10th grade subjects most commonly associated with graduation and/or students' progress in passing the number of required Regents examinations for graduation, for principals employed in a school with high school grades

Grade Configuration	Locally-Selected Measure from List of Approved Measures	Assessment
K-6	(d) measures used by district for teacher evaluation	Team Achievement Target Goals based on combined 4th Grade NY State ELA Assessment and the 4th Grade NY State Math assessment, combined with a Team Achievement Goal based on the 8th Grade NY State ELA Assessment and 8th Grade Math Assessment
7-12	(d) measures used by district for teacher evaluation	Team Achievement Target Goals based on combined 8th Grade NY State ELA Assessment and 8th Grade NY State Math Assessment; combined with a Team Achievement Target goal based on the Comprehensive English Regents Exam and Integrated Algebra Regents Exam

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>Principals will participate in the same team achievement target goals as the teachers for whom they are each responsible, assuming the same HEDI ratings as the teachers. Any combination of goals, will have point values prorated proportionally based on the number of individual teachers the principal is responsible for.</p> <p>The team achievement goal for K-6 principal will be meeting the NYS average percent for 3's on both the ELA/Math 4th grade Assessment. Points will be assigned based on the difference between the school average and the state average for percent proficient on the NYS ELA and Math 4th grade assessments.</p> <p>Additional points will be awarded to principals whose students reach the mastery level determined locally by averaging the 4's for the prior three years on those assessments which will be the</p>
--	--

target goal for Mastery. After calculating the percent of students meeting the target and the difference between that percentage and the prior three years average, the attached chart will be used to assign points.

The percent values listed on the chart are the minimum values needed to obtain the corresponding HEDI value. The final HEDI score will be rounded to the nearest whole number (> or equal to 5 rounds up, < 5 rounds down).

The team achievement goal for 7-12 principal will be a combined average grade of 65 using the NYS ELA regents and the NYS Integrated Algebra regents. These averages will be compared to the averages for the previous 3 years on these regents. Points will be assigned based on the difference between the school average and the prior three years average for percent achieving 65 or better on the NYS ELA Regents and the NYS Integrated Algebra Regents.

Additional points will be awarded to principals whose students reach the mastery level of 85 by comparing these averages to average of the prior three years on these regents' exams. After calculating the percent of students meeting the target and the difference between that percentage and the prior three years average, the attached chart will be used to assign points

The percent values listed on the chart are the minimum values needed to obtain the corresponding HEDI value. The final HEDI score will be rounded to the nearest whole number (> or equal to 5 rounds up, < 5 rounds down).

In the event that Value added is not approved we will use the chart in 3.13

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

Student Performance Targets will be determined by Data-Driven Inquiry Teams based on State Assessment Data. Teams whose student performance is well above the determined target will be considered Highly Effective. See attached table in 8.1.

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

Student Performance Targets will be determined by Data-Driven Inquiry Teams based on State Assessment Data. Teams whose student performance meets, is slightly above or slightly below the determined target will be considered Effective. See attached table in 8.1.

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

Student Performance Targets will be determined by Data-Driven Inquiry Teams based on State Assessment Data. Teams whose student performance falls moderately below the determined target will be considered Developing. See attached table in 8.1.

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

Student Performance Targets will be determined by Data-Driven Inquiry Teams based on State Assessment Data. Teams whose student performance falls significantly below the determined target will be considered Ineffective. See attached table in 8.1.

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/5366/160591-qBFVOWF7fC/team slo charts.pdf

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

(h) students' progress toward graduation in the school using strong predictive indicators, including but not limited to 9th and/or 10th grade credit accumulation and/or the percentage of students that pass 9th and/or 10th grade subjects most commonly associated with graduation and/or students' progress in passing the number of required Regents examinations for graduation, for principals employed in a school with high school grades

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

(No response)

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

(No response)

8.3) Locally Developed Controls

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

(No response)

8.4) Principals with More Than One Locally Selected Measure

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

(No response)

8.5) Assurances

Please check all of the boxes below:

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

9. Other Measures of Effectiveness (Principals)

Created Wednesday, August 08, 2012

Updated Wednesday, June 26, 2013

Page 1

9.1) Principal Practice Rubric

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

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

Multidimensional Principal Performance Rubric

(No response)

9.2) Points Within Other Measures

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

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

Is the following points assignment for all principals?

Yes

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

(No response)

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

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

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

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

(No response)

9.3) Assurances -- Goals

Please check the boxes below (if applicable):

9.3) Assurances -- Goals Assure that if any points are assigned to goals, at least one goal will address the principal's contribution to improving teacher effectiveness based on one or more of the following: improved retention of high performing teachers; correlation of student growth scores to teachers granted vs. denied tenure; or improvements in proficiency rating of the principal on specific teacher effectiveness standards in the principal practice rubric.	(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)
Principal Evaluation Tripod School Perception Survey (Combined Parent Survey)	(No response)
Principal Evaluation Tripod School Perception Survey (Combined Student Surveys)	(No response)

NYC School Survey-2012 Parent Survey	(No response)
NYC School Survey-2012 Student Survey	(No response)
NYC School Survey-2012 Teacher Survey	(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.

Using the Multidimensional Principal Performance Rubric, each ISSLC standard will be evaluated on a scale of 0-4. Each sub-category under standards 1 through 6 shall be assigned a rating from 0-4. An average composite score will be generated, based on the eighteen subcomponents of the Multidimensional Principal Performance Rubric.

See attachment for point conversion chart.

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/5143/160592-pMADJ4gk6R/3036156-Principals other 60 to HEDI_2.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.	Principals whose overall composite score rating falls between 3.3 and 4.0 will be considered Highly Effective. Such composite score rating is well above District expectations for performance, based on the ISSLC standards for school leadership, as evidenced using the MPPR rubric.
Effective: Overall performance and results meet standards.	Principals whose overall composite score rating falls between 2.5 and 3.2 will be considered Effective. Such composite score rating is at District expectations for performance, based on the ISSLC standards for school leadership, as evidenced using the MPPR rubric.
Developing: Overall performance and results need improvement in order to meet standards.	Principals whose overall composite score rating falls between 1.7 and 2.4 will be considered Developing. Such composite score rating is below District expectations for performance, based on the ISSLC

Ineffective: Overall performance and results do not meet standards.

standards for school leadership, as evidenced using the MPPR rubric.

Principals whose overall composite score rating falls between 0 and 1.6 will be considered Ineffective. Such composite score rating is well below District expectations for performance, based on the ISSLC standards for school leadership, as evidenced using the MPPR rubric.

Please provide the locally-negotiated 60 point scoring bands.

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

9.8) School Visits

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

Probationary Principals

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

Tenured Principals

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

10. Composite Scoring (Principals)

Created Wednesday, August 08, 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

0-64

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	57-58
Developing	50-56
Ineffective	0-49

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

2012-13 where Value-Added growth measure applies

Growth or Comparable Measures

Locally-selected Measures of growth or achievement

Other Measures of Effectiveness (60 points)

Overall Composite Score

Highly Effective

22-25

14-15

Ranges determined locally--see above

91-100

Effective

10-21

8-13

75-90

Developing

3-9

3-7

65-74

Ineffective

0-2

0-2

0-64

11. Additional Requirements - Principals

Created Wednesday, August 08, 2012
Updated Wednesday, October 10, 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/5276/160595-Df0w3Xx5v6/Principal Improvement Plan 11.2.doc](#)

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 PROCESS

The purpose of the internal appeals process is to foster and nurture growth of the professional staff in order to maintain a highly qualified and effective work force. The following appeal process is designed to further this goal. The burden of proof will be on the appellant to establish by the preponderance of the evidence that the rating given by the lead evaluator was not justified.

- All tenured and probationary principals who meet the appeal process criteria may use this appeal process.
- Said appeal process will be available to employees to appeal either a procedural error in the evaluation process or appeal a substantive portion of the evaluation. All aspects of an evaluation must be presented when initiating an appeal. A principal cannot file

multiple appeals on the same review, thus all issues must be raised at the time the appeal is filed or are deemed waived.

• Only principals who receive a "Developing" or "Ineffective" rating in one or more of the evaluative criteria for (a) an observation, or (b) an annual professional performance review (composite score) may process an appeal. The evaluative criteria categories that may be appealed are the elements associated with the Multidimensional Principal Performance Rubric (MPPR) or a procedural error.

1. *GOVERNING BODY TO ADJUDICATE THE APPEAL:* The governing body will be defined as the "Principal Evaluation Appeals Committee" (PEAC). The PEAC make up will be:

- a. One tenured administrator. The tenured administrator appointed to the PEAC will not be the administrator who authored the evaluation and will be chosen by the Superintendent or his/her designee. Said appointee will be a practicing administrator, with knowledge and understanding of the MPPR.
- b. Two tenured principals appointed to the PEAC will be chosen by the Principal (also the appellant) or his/her designee. Said appointees will be practicing administrators, with knowledge and understanding of the MPPR.

2. *APPEALS DECISION MAKING*

- a. The PEAC will have the right to ask questions of the appellant, the lead evaluator, and any other relevant participants. They have the right to collect any and all information necessary to make an informed decision.
- b. The PEAC will reach their findings (see Section 4 below) through unanimous vote.
- c. If a unanimous vote is not reached, the EAC will write up the opposing viewpoints and submit the opposing viewpoints to the lead evaluator, the appellant, and the Superintendent.
- d. At this point, a District Evaluation Appeals Committee (DEAC) made up of two (2) Superintendent appointees and one (1) principal appointee will review the evaluation and position papers and by majority vote determine which of the opposing viewpoints will be the final outcome.

3. *TIMELINE*

- a. The employee must attempt to resolve the appeal informally within five (5) business days of receipt of the evaluation through an informal conference with the lead evaluator.
- b. The employee must forward the evaluation appeal within five (5) business days of an unsuccessful informal conference in writing to the Superintendent of Schools, requesting a review by the PEAC to be completed.
- c. The Superintendent will charge the PEAC to hold a Conference within five (5) business days of receipt of the appeal.
- d. The PEAC will issue its findings to the Superintendent, the principal and the lead evaluator within five (5) business days of the Conference.
- e. If the DEAC is utilized, they will be given five (5) business days to meet and render their final decision by majority vote.

4. *COMMITTEE FINDINGS*

- a. The PEAC/DEAC is empowered to overturn a section of the evaluation and assign a new rating to that section. Said ability to overturn a section of the evaluation does not negate the fact that the evaluation was timely completed.
- b. The PEAC/DEAC is empowered to overturn the entire evaluation if the evaluation was procedurally flawed and assign a new rating where appropriate.
- c. The PEAC/DEAC is empowered to overturn a section or the entire evaluation and require a course of action so as to enhance the professional growth of the principal.
- d. The PEAC/DEAC is empowered to affirm the evaluation and require a course of action so as to enhance the professional growth of the employee.
- e. The PEAC/DEAC is empowered to affirm the evaluation.

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.

EVALUATOR TRAINING:

1. The District will certify lead evaluators as qualified to conduct teacher evaluations under 3012-c and Commissioner's Regulation 30-2. [30-2.9(a)]

2. The District will provide training to evaluators and lead evaluators through the GST BOCES RTTT Evaluator Training program with multiple training dates to be held throughout the 2011-12 and 2012-13 school years. GST BOCES will provide 3 hours minimum of training per each of the required components, including but not limited to:

- a. NYS Teaching and Leadership Standards

- b. Evidence-Based Observation Techniques
- c. Application and use of Student Growth and Value-Added Models
- d. Application and Use of State-Approved Rubrics
- e. Application and Use of State-Approved Locally Developed Measures of Student Achievement
- f. Use of the Statewide Instructional Reporting System
- g. The Scoring Methodology Used by the Department and/or Your District
- h. Specific Considerations in Evaluating Teachers and Principals of ELL and SWD
- i. Work Toward Inter-Rater Reliability

3. Classroom observations required by this APPR plan may be commenced September 5, 2012, provided of course, that the administrator performing such classroom evaluations are properly credentialed school administrators for such purpose. [30-2.9(a)]

INTER-RATER RELIABILITY

Lead evaluators will maintain inter-rater reliability over time. Evaluators and lead evaluators will be trained through the GST BOCES RTTT Evaluator Training Program in maintaining inter-rater reliability. As part of such training, Lead Evaluators will participate in activities to promote inter-rater reliability at least three times per school year, and as many times as needed to develop at least three benchmarks of reasonable reliability as verified by the District Superintendent, within said school year. See 30-2.9(b)(5)

RECERTIFICATION

Lead evaluators and evaluators who recieved initial certification will be recertified with at least two half day trainings to review the process for effectively conducting observations through the collection of evidence, bias-awareness exercises and calibration of ratings..

11.5) Assurances -- Evaluators

Please check the boxes below:

-
- Checked
-

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

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

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

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

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

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

to evaluate its teachers or principals

(7) use of the Statewide Instructional Reporting System

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

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

• Checked

11.6) Assurances -- Principals

Please check all of the boxes below:

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

11.7) Assurances -- Data

Please check all of the boxes below:

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

12. Joint Certification of APPR Plan

Created Wednesday, August 08, 2012

Updated Thursday, July 18, 2013

Page 1

12.1) Upload the Joint Certification of the APPR Plan

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

[assets/survey-uploads/5581/160599-3Uqgn5g9Iu/signed 7-18-13.pdf](#)

File types supported for uploads

PDF (preferred)

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

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

Open Office (.odt, .ott)

Images (.jpg, .gif)

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

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

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

Form 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.

Fill in the group of teachers covered (e.g., "probationary teachers"): Probationary teachers

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	
Observations by trained in-school peer teachers	
Feedback from students using State-approved survey tool	
Feedback from parents/caregivers using State-approved survey tool	
Structured reviews of lesson plans, student portfolios and other teacher artifacts	

Marzano Rubric Conversion Formula

Tenured Teachers would be assessed in 14 of the 41 elements in Domain 1. These 14 elements would be assessed primarily through formal and informal classroom observation. Each of the 14 assessed elements would be scored according to the following conversion chart:

Not Using	Beginning	Developing	Applying	Innovating
0	.05	1.8	2.9	3

14 Assessed Elements * 3 Points Each = 42 Possible Points in Domain 1

Tenured Teachers would also be assessed in 18 of the 19 elements in Domains 2, 3, & 4. These 18 elements would be assessed primarily through "TED". Each of the 18 assessed elements would be scored according to the following conversion chart.

Not Using	Beginning	Developing	Applying	Innovating
0	.05	.65	.9	1

18 Assessed Elements * 1 Point Each = 18 Possible Points in Domains 2, 3, & 4.

Non-tenured teachers would be assessed on 41 of the 41 elements in Domain 1 and 18 of the 19 in Domains 2, 3, & 4 through formal and informal classroom observation as well as "TED". Each element would have a maximum value of 1.0

Not Using	Beginning	Developing	Applying	Innovating
0	.05	.65	.9	1

59 Assessed Elements * 1 Point Each = 59 Possible Points in Domains 1, 2, 3, & 4.

Scoring Ranges for the State Assessment, Local Measures and the Other 60% of Teacher Effectiveness follow:

	State Assessment	Local Measure	Remaining 60%
Highly Effective	18-20	18-20	59-60
Effective	12-17	12-17	57-58
Developing	3-11	3-11	50-56
Ineffective	0-2	0-2	0-49

Teacher Improvement Plan

(To be completed jointly by teacher and administrator)

Name: _____ Grade/Subject: _____

Area of Needed Improvement	Action Steps (Provide detailed description – with measurable/attainable goals, including a description of the support and assistance provided)	Timeline for Achieving Improvement	How will Improvement be Assessed	Action Steps Completed	
				YES	NO

Member Comments:

Administrator Comments:

Member Signature _____

Date: _____

Administrator Signature _____

Date: _____

End of the Year Review: (check all that apply)

- Member has successfully met criteria outlined in the TIP plan
- Member has not successfully met criteria outlined in the TIP plan
- Member has received a composite score of effective or better
- Member has not received a composite score of effective or better

Member Signature _____

Date: _____

Administrator Signature _____

Date: _____

TEACHER'S SCORE	<p style="text-align: center;">VALUE</p> <p style="text-align: center;">Target of Proficiency - Defined as: Level 3 (3-8 NYS Assessments); 65 and above (NYS Regents Examinations)</p>
0	15% or More Below Target
1	14% Below Target
2	13.5% Below Target
3	13% Below Target
4	12.5% Below Target
5	12% Below Target
6	11.5% Below Target
7	10% Below Target
8	9.5% Below Target
9	Meets Target
10	1% Above Target
11	2% Above Target
12	3% Above Target
13	4% Above Target
14	5% Above Target
15	6% Above Target
16	7% Above Target
17	8% Above Target
18	8.5% Above Target
19	9% Above Target
20	10% or More Above Target

TEACHER'S SCORE	<p style="text-align: center;">VALUE</p> <p style="text-align: center;">Target of Proficiency - Defined as: Level 3 (3-8 NYS Assessments); 65 and above (NYS Regents Examinations)</p>
0	15% or More Below Target
1	14% Below Target
2	13.5% Below Target
3	13% Below Target
4	12.5% Below Target
5	12% Below Target
6	11.5% Below Target
7	10% Below Target
8	Meets Target
9	1% Above Target
10	2% Above Target
11	3% Above Target
12	4% Above Target
13	5% Above Target
14	6% Above Target
15	7% or More Above Target

TEACHER'S SCORE	<p style="text-align: center;">VALUE</p> <p style="text-align: center;">Target of Proficiency - Defined as: Level 3 (3-8 NYS Assessments); 65 and above (NYS Regents Examinations)</p>
0	15% or More Below Target
1	14% Below Target
2	13.5% Below Target
3	13% Below Target
4	12.5% Below Target
5	12% Below Target
6	11.5% Below Target
7	10% Below Target
8	9.5% Below Target
9	Meets Target
10	1% Above Target
11	2% Above Target
12	3% Above Target
13	4% Above Target
14	5% Above Target
15	6% Above Target
16	7% Above Target
17	8% Above Target
18	8.5% Above Target
19	9% Above Target
20	10% or More Above Target

TEACHER'S SCORE	<p style="text-align: center;">VALUE</p> <p style="text-align: center;">Target of Proficiency - Defined as: Level 3 (3-8 NYS Assessments); 65 and above (NYS Regents Examinations)</p>
0	15% or More Below Target
1	14% Below Target
2	13.5% Below Target
3	13% Below Target
4	12.5% Below Target
5	12% Below Target
6	11.5% Below Target
7	10% Below Target
8	Meets Target
9	1% Above Target
10	2% Above Target
11	3% Above Target
12	4% Above Target
13	5% Above Target
14	6% Above Target
15	7% or More Above Target

TEACHER'S SCORE	<p style="text-align: center;">VALUE</p> <p style="text-align: center;">Target of Proficiency - Defined as: Level 3 (3-8 NYS Assessments); 65 and above (NYS Regents Examinations)</p>
0	15% or More Below Target
1	14% Below Target
2	13.5% Below Target
3	13% Below Target
4	12.5% Below Target
5	12% Below Target
6	11.5% Below Target
7	10% Below Target
8	9.5% Below Target
9	Meets Target
10	1% Above Target
11	2% Above Target
12	3% Above Target
13	4% Above Target
14	5% Above Target
15	6% Above Target
16	7% Above Target
17	8% Above Target
18	8.5% Above Target
19	9% Above Target
20	10% or More Above Target

TEACHER'S SCORE	<p style="text-align: center;">VALUE</p> <p style="text-align: center;">Target of Proficiency - Defined as: Level 3 (3-8 NYS Assessments); 65 and above (NYS Regents Examinations)</p>
0	15% or More Below Target
1	14% Below Target
2	13.5% Below Target
3	13% Below Target
4	12.5% Below Target
5	12% Below Target
6	11.5% Below Target
7	10% Below Target
8	Meets Target
9	1% Above Target
10	2% Above Target
11	3% Above Target
12	4% Above Target
13	5% Above Target
14	6% Above Target
15	7% or More Above Target

Assigning Principal "other 60"

Using the Multidimensional Principal Performance Rubric, each ISSLC standard will be evaluated on a scale of 0-4. Each sub-category under standards 1 through 6 shall be assigned a rating from 0-4. Each rating will be assigned points as follows: Ineffective = 0, Developing = 2, Effective = 3, Highly effective = 4. An average composite score will be generated, based on the eighteen sub-components of the Multidimensional Principal Performance Rubric.

Conversion Chart (60 pts)

Ineffective : Score 0.1 – 1.6

Score	0	0.1	0.2	0.3	0.4	0.5	0.6	0.7	0.8	0.9	1.0	1.1	1.2	1.3	1.4	1.5	1.6
Total points	0	2	5	8	11	14	17	20	23	26	29	32	35	38	41	42	49

Developing: Score 1.7 - 2.4

Score	1.7	1.8	1.9	2.0	2.1	2.2	2.3	2.4
Total Points	50	51	52	53	54	55	56	56

Effective 2.5 – 3.2

Score	2.5	2.6	2.7	2.8	2.9	3.0	3.1	3.2
Total Points	57	57	57	57	58	58	58	58

Highly Effective 3.3 – 4.0

Score	3.3	3.4	3.5	3.6	3.7	3.8	3.9	4.0
Total Points	59	59	59	59	60	60	60	60

Principal Improvement Plan (PIP)

Multi-Dimensional Rubric Domains

- Shared Vision & Learning
- School Culture and Instructional Program
- Safe, Efficient, Effective Learning Environment
- Community
- Political, Social, Economic, Legal, Cultural
- Integrity, Fairness, Ethics

STATUS

I.N.: Improvement Noted (write specifics)

D.N.: Deficiency Noted, Continued Improvement Required (write specifics)

Areas of Concern or Deficiencies (Multidimensional Rubric Domains)	Action Plan	How Monitored	Date of Review	Indicators of Success	Status

Signatures:

Building Principal*/Date

Superintendent/Date

*The principal's signature which appears on this form simply signifies that the principal has seen the form and is aware of the contents therein. It does not indicate approval or disapproval of the evaluation.

*All evaluation practices shall be pursuant to the contractual agreement.

Differentiated Approach for Setting Targets for Student Learning Objectives

District Expectations of Student Progress from Baseline through Target Assessments

Starting/Ending Performance	END: 1	END: 2	END: 3	END: 4
START: 1	NO	YES	YES	YES
START: 2	NO	NO	YES	YES
START: 3	NO	NO	YES	YES
START: 4	NO	NO	NO	YES

Calculate the percentage of the students who met his/her targeted progress and assign points per the chart below.



Table A. Differentiated District Expectations

Rating Points	Ineffective 0-2 Points	Developing 3-8 Points	Effective 9-17 Points	Highly Effective 18-20 Points
Percentage of students whose progress meets targeted expectations.	0-29% of students meet target 0-10% = 0 pts 11-20% = 1pt 21-29% = 2 pts	30-54% of students meet target 30-35% = 3 pts 36-40% = 4 pts 41-45% = 5 pts 46-50% = 6 pts 51-52%= 7 pts 53-54%= 8 pts	55-85% of students meet target 55-60% = 9 pts 61-65% = 10 pts 66-69% = 11 pts 70-72% = 12 pts 73-75% = 13 pts 76-78% = 14 pts 79-81% = 15 pts 82-83% = 16 pts 84-85% = 17 pts	86%+ of students meet target 86-90% = 18 pts 91-94% = 19 pts 95-100%= 20 pts

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:

Richard Johnson 7/18/13

Teachers Union President Signature: Date:

Julie Peck 7/18/13

Administrative Union President Signature: Date:

M. Foley 7/18/13

Board of Education President Signature: Date:

S. N. A. M. 7/18/13