



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

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

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

January 2, 2013

Don Wheeler, Superintendent
Bainbridge-Guilford Central School District
18 Juliard St.
Bainbridge, NY 13733

Dear Superintendent Wheeler:

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: William Tammaro

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

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

Annual Professional Performance Reviews: 2012-13

Created Tuesday, September 04, 2012

Updated Sunday, December 23, 2012

1

Disclaimers

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

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

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

1. SCHOOL DISTRICT INFORMATION

1.1) School District's BEDS Number : 080201040000

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

080201040000

1.2) School District Name: BAINBRIDGE-GUILFORD CSD

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

BAINBRIDGE-GUILFORD 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?

Re-submission to address deficiencies

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

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

Annual (2012-13)

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

Created Tuesday, September 04, 2012
Updated Thursday, December 27, 2012

Page 1

STATE-PROVIDED MEASURES OF STUDENT GROWTH

(25 points with an approved value-added measure)

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

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

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

2.1) Assurances

Please check the boxes below:

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

STUDENT LEARNING OBJECTIVES AS COMPARABLE GROWTH MEASURES (20 points)

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

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

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

If no State assessment or Regents exam exists:

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

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

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

State assessments, *required if one exists*

List of State-approved 3rd party assessments

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

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

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

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

2.2) Grades K-3 ELA

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

| | ELA | Assessment |
|---|---|--|
| K | District, regional, or BOCES-developed assessment | BG developed Kindergarten ELA Assessment |
| 1 | District, regional, or BOCES-developed assessment | BG developed First Grade ELA Assessment |
| 2 | District, regional, or BOCES-developed assessment | BG developed Second Grade ELA Assessment |
| | ELA | Assessment |
| 3 | State assessment | 3rd Grade State Assessment |

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

| | |
|---|---|
| Use this box, if needed, to describe the general process for assigning HEDI categories for these grades/subjects in this subcomponent. If needed, you may upload a table or graphic at 2.11, below. | Teachers, in collaboration with the building principal, will be establishing individual student growth targets using the pre-assessment baseline data received in the beginning of the school year. Based upon the overall percentage of students who meet or exceed their individual growth targets, a corresponding 0 to 20 HEDI score will be determined using the conversion chart in task 2.11 |
| Highly Effective (18 - 20 points) Results are well-above state average for similar students (or District goals if no state test). | 85-100% of students meet target |
| Effective (9 - 17 points) Results meet state average for similar students (or District goals if no state test). | 70-84% of students meet target |
| Developing (3 - 8 points) Results are below state average for similar students (or District goals if no state test). | 50-69% of students meet target |
| Ineffective (0 - 2 points) Results are well-below state average for similar students (or District goals if no state test). | 0-49% of students meet target |

2.3) Grades K-3 Math

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

| | Math | Assessment |
|---|---|---|
| K | District, regional, or BOCES-developed assessment | DCMO Regionally Developed K Math Assessment |
| 1 | District, regional, or BOCES-developed assessment | DCMO Regionally Developed Grade 1 Math Assessment |
| 2 | District, regional, or BOCES-developed assessment | DCMO Regionally Developed Grade 2 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, in collaboration with the building principal, will be establishing individual student growth targets using the pre-assessment baseline data received in the beginning of the school year. Based upon the overall percentage of students who meet or exceed their individual growth targets, a corresponding 0 to 20 HEDI score will be determined using the conversion chart in task 2.11 |
| Highly Effective (18 - 20 points) Results are well-above state average for similar students (or District goals if no state test). | 85-100% of students meet target |
| Effective (9 - 17 points) Results meet state average for similar students (or District goals if no state test). | 70-84% of students meet target |

| | |
|--|--------------------------------|
| Developing (3 - 8 points) Results are below state average for similar students (or District goals if no state test). | 50-69% of students meet target |
| Ineffective (0 - 2 points) Results are well-below state average for similar students (or District goals if no state test). | 0-49% of students meet target |

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 | DCMO Regionally Developed Science Assessment: Grade 6 |
| 7 | District, regional or BOCES-developed assessment | DCMO Regionally Developed Science Assessment: Grade 7 |
| | 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, in collaboration with the building principal, will be establishing individual student growth targets using the pre-assessment baseline data received in the beginning of the school year. Based upon the overall percentage of students who meet or exceed their individual growth targets, a corresponding 0 to 20 HEDI score will be determined using the conversion chart in task 2.11 |
| Highly Effective (18 - 20 points) Results are well-above state average for similar students (or District goals if no state test). | 85-100% of students meet target |
| Effective (9 - 17 points) Results meet state average for similar students (or District goals if no state test). | 70-84% of students meet target |
| Developing (3 - 8 points) Results are below state average for similar students (or District goals if no state test). | 50-69% of students meet target |
| Ineffective (0 - 2 points) Results are well-below state average for similar students (or District goals if no state test). | 0-49% of students meet target |

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 | DCMO Regionally Developed Social Studies Assessment: Grade 6 |
| 7 | District, regional or BOCES-developed assessment | DCMO Regionally Developed Social Studies Assessment: Grade 7 |
| 8 | District, regional or BOCES-developed assessment | DCMO Regionally Developed Social Studies Assessment: Grade 8 |

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, in collaboration with the building principal, will be establishing individual student growth targets using the pre-assessment baseline data received in the beginning of the school year. Based upon the overall percentage of students who meet or exceed their individual growth targets, a corresponding 0 to 20 HEDI score will be determined using the conversion chart in task 2.11 |
| Highly Effective (18 - 20 points) Results are well-above District goals for similar students. | 85-100% Of students meet target |
| Effective (9 - 17 points) Results meet District goals for similar students. | 70-84% of students meet target |
| Developing (3 - 8 points) Results are below District goals for similar students. | 50-69% of students meet target |
| Ineffective (0 - 2 points) Results are well-below District goals for similar students. | 0-49% of students meet target |

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 | DCMO Regionally Developed Social Studies Assessment: Grade 9 |

| | 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, in collaboration with the building principal, will be establishing individual student growth targets using the pre-assessment baseline data received in the beginning of the school year. Based upon the overall percentage of students who meet or exceed their individual growth targets, a corresponding 0 to 20 HEDI score will be determined using the conversion chart in task 2.11 |
| Highly Effective (18 - 20 points) Results are well-above District goals for similar students. | 85-100% Of students meet target |
| Effective (9 - 17 points) Results meet District goals for similar students. | 70-84% of students meet target |
| Developing (3 - 8 points) Results are below District goals for similar students. | 50-69% of students meet target |
| Ineffective (0 - 2 points) Results are well-below District goals for similar students. | 0-49% of students meet target |

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, in collaboration with the building principal, will be establishing individual student growth targets using the pre-assessment baseline data received in the beginning of the school year. Based upon the overall percentage of students who meet or exceed their individual growth targets, a corresponding 0 to 20 HEDI score will be determined using the conversion chart in task 2.11 |
| Highly Effective (18 - 20 points) Results are well-above District goals for similar students. | 85-100% of students meet target |
| Effective (9 - 17 points) Results meet District goals for similar students. | 70-84% of students meet target |
| Developing (3 - 8 points) Results are below District goals for similar students. | 50-69% of students meet target |
| Ineffective (0 - 2 points) Results are well-below District goals for similar students. | 0-49% of students meet target |

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, in collaboration with the building principal, will be establishing individual student growth targets using the pre-assessment baseline data received in the beginning of the school year. Based upon the overall percentage of students who meet or exceed their individual growth targets, a corresponding 0 to 20 HEDI score will be determined using the conversion chart in task 2.11 |
| Highly Effective (18 - 20 points) Results are well-above District goals for similar students. | 85-100% of students meet target |
| Effective (9 - 17 points) Results meet District goals for similar students. | 70-84% of students meet target |
| Developing (3 - 8 points) Results are below District goals for similar students. | 50-69% of students meet target |
| Ineffective (0 - 2 points) Results are well-below District goals for similar students. | 0-49% of students meet target |

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 | DCMO Regionally Developed ELA Assessment: Grade 9 |
| Grade 10 ELA | District, regional or BOCES-developed assessment | DCMO Regionally Developed ELA Assessment: 10 |
| Grade 11 ELA | Regents assessment | Comprehensive English Regents |

| | |
|--|--------------------------------|
| Effective (9 - 17 points) Results meet District goals for similar students. | 70-84% of students meet target |
| Developing (3 - 8 points) Results are below District goals for similar students. | 50-69% of students meet target |
| Ineffective (0 - 2 points) Results are well-below District goals for similar students. | 0-49% of students meet target |

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/5364/171573-TXEttx9bQW/SL0 20-Teachers 2-11_1.docx

2.12) Locally Developed Controls

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

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

(No response)

2.13) Teachers with more than one growth measure

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

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

2.14) Assurances

Please check all of the boxes below:

2.14) Assurances | Assure the application of locally developed controls will be rigorous, fair, and transparent and only those used for State Growth will be used for Comparable Growth Measures. Checked

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

3. Local Measures (Teachers)

Created Tuesday, September 04, 2012
Updated Thursday, December 27, 2012

Page 1

Locally Selected Measures of Student Achievement or Growth

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

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

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

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

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

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

Growth or achievement measure(s) from these options.

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

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

Measures based on:

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

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

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

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

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

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

3.1) Grades 4-8 ELA

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

| | Locally-Selected Measure from List of Approved Measures | Assessment |
|---|---|--|
| 4 | 5) District, regional, or BOCES–developed assessments | DCMO Regionally Developed ELA Assessment Grade 4 |
| 5 | 5) District, regional, or BOCES–developed assessments | DCMO Regionally Developed ELA Assessment Grade 5 |

| | | |
|---|---|--|
| 6 | 5) District, regional, or BOCES–developed assessments | DCMO Regionally Developed ELA Assessment Grade 6 |
| 7 | 5) District, regional, or BOCES–developed assessments | DCMO Regionally Developed ELA Assessment Grade 7 |
| 8 | 5) District, regional, or BOCES–developed assessments | DCMO Regionally Developed ELA Assessment Grade 8 |

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. | The principal with the teachers will work to establish goals based on the pre-assessment. The goals will be based on student achievement and will detail how the teacher can earn each point. Based upon the percentage of students that meet or exceed the proficiency target, a corresponding 0 to 15 point HEDI score will be assigned. Proficiency here is defined as a score of 60% or higher. See upload in 3.3. |
| Highly Effective (14 - 15 points) Results are well above District- or BOCES-adopted expectations for growth or achievement for grade/subject. | See upload in 3.3 |
| Effective (8- 13 points) Results meet District- or BOCES-adopted expectations for growth or achievement for grade/subject. | See upload in 3.3 |
| Developing (3 - 7 points) Results are below District- or BOCES-adopted expectations for growth or achievement for grade/subject. | See upload in 3.3 |
| Ineffective (0 - 2 points) Results are well below District- or BOCES-adopted expectations for growth or achievement for grade/subject. | See upload 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 | 5) District, regional, or BOCES–developed assessments | DCMO Regionally Developed Math Assessment Grade 4 |
| 5 | 5) District, regional, or BOCES–developed assessments | DCMO Regionally Developed Math Assessment Grade 5 |
| 6 | 5) District, regional, or BOCES–developed assessments | DCMO Regionally Developed Math Assessment Grade 6 |

| | | |
|---|---|---|
| 7 | 5) District, regional, or BOCES–developed assessments | DCMO Regionally Developed Math Assessment Grade 7 |
| 8 | 5) District, regional, or BOCES–developed assessments | DCMO Regionally Developed Math Assessment Grade 8 |

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. | The principal with the teachers will work to establish goals based on the pre-assessment. The goals will be based on student achievement and will detail how the teacher can earn each point. Based upon the percentage of students that meet or exceed the proficiency target, a corresponding 0 to 15 point HEDI score will be assigned. Proficiency here is defined as a score of 60% or higher. See upload in 3.3. |
| Highly Effective (14 - 15 points) Results are well above District- or BOCES-adopted expectations for growth or achievement for grade/subject. | See upload in 3.3 |
| Effective (8- 13 points) Results meet District- or BOCES-adopted expectations for growth or achievement for grade/subject. | See upload in 3.3 |
| Developing (3 - 7 points) Results are below District- or BOCES-adopted expectations for growth or achievement for grade/subject. | See upload in 3.3 |
| Ineffective (0 - 2 points) Results are well below District- or BOCES-adopted expectations for growth or achievement for grade/subject. | See upload 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/5139/171657-rhJdBgDruP/Local 15- Teachers 3-3.docx

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

Growth or achievement measure(s) from these options.

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

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

Measures based on:

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

3.4) Grades K-3 ELA

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

| Locally-Selected Measure from List of Approved Measures | Assessment |
|---|------------|
|---|------------|

| | | |
|---|---|--|
| K | 5) District, regional, or BOCES–developed assessments | DCMO Regionally Developed Literacy Assessment:Kindergarten |
| 1 | 5) District, regional, or BOCES–developed assessments | DCMO Regionally Developed Literacy Assessment:Grade 1 |
| 2 | 5) District, regional, or BOCES–developed assessments | DCMO Regionally Developed Literacy Assessment: Grade 2 |
| 3 | 5) District, regional, or BOCES–developed assessments | DCMO Regionally Developed Literacy Assessment: Grade 3 |

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. | The principal with the teachers will work to establish goals based on the pre-assessment. The goals will be based on student achievement and will detail how the teacher can earn each point. Based upon the percentage of students that meet or exceed the proficiency target, a corresponding 0 to 20 point HEDI score will be assigned. Proficiency here is defined as a score of 60% or higher. See upload in 3.13. |
| Highly Effective (18-20 points) Results are well above District- or BOCES-adopted expectations for growth or achievement for grade/subject. | See upload in 3.13. |
| Effective (9-17 points) Results meet District- or BOCES-adopted expectations for growth or achievement for grade/subject. | See upload in 3.13. |
| Developing (3 - 8 points) Results are below District- or BOCES-adopted expectations for growth or achievement for grade/subject. | See upload in 3.13. |
| Ineffective (0 - 2 points) Results are well below District- or BOCES-adopted expectations for growth or achievement for grade/subject. | See upload in 3.13. |

3.5) Grades K-3 Math

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

| | Locally-Selected Measure from List of Approved Measures | Assessment |
|---|---|--|
| K | 5) District, regional, or BOCES–developed assessments | DCMO Regionally Developed Math Assessment:Kindergarten |
| 1 | 5) District, regional, or BOCES–developed assessments | DCMO Regionally Developed Math Assessment: Grade 1 |

| | | |
|---|---|--|
| 2 | 5) District, regional, or BOCES–developed assessments | DCMO Regionally Developed Math Assessment: Grade 2 |
| 3 | 5) District, regional, or BOCES–developed assessments | DCMO Regionally Developed Math Assessment: Grade 3 |

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

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

| | |
|---|---|
| Use this box, if needed, to describe the general process for assigning HEDI categories for these grades/subjects in this subcomponent. If needed, you may upload a table or graphic at 3.13, below. | The principal with the teachers will work to establish goals based on the pre-assessment. The goals will be based on student achievement and will detail how the teacher can earn each point. Based upon the percentage of students that meet or exceed the proficiency target, a corresponding 0 to 20 point HEDI score will be assigned. Proficiency here is defined as a score of 60% or higher. See upload in 3.13. |
| Highly Effective (18-20 points) Results are well above District- or BOCES-adopted expectations for growth or achievement for grade/subject. | See upload in 3.13 |
| Effective (9-17 points) Results meet District- or BOCES-adopted expectations for growth or achievement for grade/subject. | See upload in 3.13 |
| Developing (3 - 8 points) Results are below District -or BOCES-adopted expectations for growth or achievement for grade/subject. | See upload in 3.13 |
| Ineffective (0 - 2 points) Results are well below District- or BOCES-adopted expectations for growth or achievement for grade/subject. | See upload in 3.13 |

3.6) Grades 6-8 Science

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

| | Locally-Selected Measure from List of Approved Measures | Assessment |
|---|---|---|
| 6 | 5) District, regional, or BOCES–developed assessments | DCMO Regionally Developed Science Assessment: Grade 6 |
| 7 | 5) District, regional, or BOCES–developed assessments | DCMO Regionally Developed Science Assessment: Grade 7 |
| 8 | 5) District, regional, or BOCES–developed assessments | DCMO Regionally Developed Science Assessment: Grade 8 |

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. | The principal with the teachers will work to establish goals based on the pre-assessment. The goals will be based on student achievement and will detail how the teacher can earn each point. Based upon the percentage of students that meet or exceed the proficiency target, a corresponding 0 to 20 point HEDI score will be assigned. Proficiency here is defined as a score of 60% or higher. See upload in 3.13. |
| Highly Effective (18 - 20 points) Results are well above District- or BOCES-adopted expectations for growth or achievement for grade/subject. | See upload in 3.13. |
| Effective (9 - 17 points) Results meet District- or BOCES-adopted expectations for growth or achievement for grade/subject. | See upload in 3.13. |
| Developing (3 - 8 points) Results are below District- or BOCES-adopted expectations for growth or achievement for grade/subject. | See upload in 3.13. |
| Ineffective (0 - 2 points) Results are well below District- or BOCES-adopted expectations for growth or achievement for grade/subject. | See upload in 3.13. |

3.7) Grades 6-8 Social Studies

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

| | Locally-Selected Measure from List of Approved Measures | Assessment |
|---|---|--|
| 6 | 5) District, regional, or BOCES–developed assessments | DCMO Regionally Developed Social Studies Assessment: Grade 6 |
| 7 | 5) District, regional, or BOCES–developed assessments | DCMO Regionally Developed Social Studies Assessment: Grade 7 |
| 8 | 5) District, regional, or BOCES–developed assessments | DCMO Regionally Developed Social Studies Assessment: Grade 8 |

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. | The principal with the teachers will work to establish goals based on the pre-assessment. The goals will be based on student achievement and will detail how the teacher can earn each point. Based upon the percentage of students |
|---|---|

that meet or exceed the proficiency target, a corresponding 0 to 20 point HEDI score will be assigned. Proficiency here is defined as a score of 60% or higher. See upload in 3.13.

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

See upload in 3.13.

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

See upload in 3.13.

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

See upload in 3.13.

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

See upload in 3.13.

3.8) High School Social Studies

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

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

| | Locally-Selected Measure from List of Approved Measures | Assessment |
|------------------|---|---|
| Global 1 | 5) District, regional, or BOCES–developed assessments | DCMO Regionally Developed Social Studies Assessment: Grade 9 |
| Global 2 | 5) District, regional, or BOCES–developed assessments | DCMO Regionally Developed Social Studies Assessment: Grade 10 |
| American History | 5) District, regional, or BOCES–developed assessments | DCMO Regionally Developed Social Studies Assessment: Grade 11 |

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.

The principal with the teachers will work to establish goals based on the pre-assessment. The goals will be based on student achievement and will detail how the teacher can earn each point. Based upon the percentage of students that meet or exceed the proficiency target, a corresponding 0 to 20 point HEDI score will be assigned. Proficiency here is defined as a score of 60% or higher. See upload in 3.13.

| | |
|---|---------------------|
| Highly Effective (18 - 20 points) Results are well above District- or BOCES-adopted expectations for growth or achievement for grade/subject. | See upload in 3.13. |
| Effective (9 - 17 points) Results meet District- or BOCES-adopted expectations for growth or achievement for grade/subject. | See upload in 3.13. |
| Developing (3 - 8 points) Results are below District- or BOCES-adopted expectations for growth or achievement for grade/subject. | See upload in 3.13. |
| Ineffective (0 - 2 points) Results are well below District- or BOCES-adopted expectations for growth or achievement for grade/subject. | See upload in 3.13. |

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 | 5) District, regional, or BOCES–developed assessments | DCMO Regionally Developed Science Assessment: Grade 10 |
| Earth Science | 5) District, regional, or BOCES–developed assessments | DCMO Regionally Developed Science Assessment: Grade 9 |
| Chemistry | 5) District, regional, or BOCES–developed assessments | DCMO Regionally Developed Science Assessment: Grade 11 |
| Physics | 5) District, regional, or BOCES–developed assessments | DCMO Regionally Developed Science Assessment: Grade 12 |

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. | The principal with the teachers will work to establish goals based on the pre-assessment. The goals will be based on student achievement and will detail how the teacher can earn each point. Based upon the percentage of students that meet or exceed the proficiency target, a corresponding 0 to 20 point HEDI score will be assigned. Proficiency here is defined as a score of 60% or higher. See upload in 3.13. |
|---|---|

| | |
|---|---------------------|
| Highly Effective (18-20 points) Results are well above District- or BOCES-adopted expectations for growth or achievement for grade/subject. | See upload in 3.13. |
| Developing (3 - 8 points) Results are below District- or BOCES-adopted expectations for growth or achievement for grade/subject. | See upload in 3.13. |
| Effective (9 - 17points) Results meet District- or BOCES-adopted expectations for growth or achievement for grade/subject. | See upload in 3.13. |
| Ineffective (0 - 2 points) Results are well below District- or BOCES-adopted expectations for growth or achievement for grade/subject. | See upload in 3.13. |

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 | 5) District, regional, or BOCES–developed assessments | BG Regionally Developed Algebra Assessment |
| Geometry | 5) District, regional, or BOCES–developed assessments | BG Regionally Developed Geometry Assessment |
| Algebra 2 | 5) District, regional, or BOCES–developed assessments | BG Regionally Developed Algebra 2 Assessment |

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

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

| | |
|---|---|
| Use this box, if needed, to describe the general process for assigning HEDI categories for these grades/subjects in this subcomponent. If needed, you may upload a table or graphic at 3.13, below. | The principal with the teachers will work to establish goals based on the pre-assessment. The goals will be based on student achievement and will detail how the teacher can earn each point. Based upon the percentage of students that meet or exceed the proficiency target, a corresponding 0 to 20 point HEDI score will be assigned. Proficiency here is defined as a score of 60% or higher. See upload in 3.13. |
| Highly Effective (18 - 20 points) Results are well above District- or BOCES-adopted expectations for growth or achievement for grade/subject. | See upload in 3.13. |

| | |
|--|---------------------|
| Effective (9 - 17 points) Results meet District- or BOCES-adopted expectations for growth or achievement for grade/subject. | See upload in 3.13. |
| Developing (3 - 8 points) Results are below District- or BOCES-adopted expectations for growth or achievement for grade/subject. | See upload in 3.13. |
| Ineffective (0 - 2 points) Results are well below District- or BOCES-adopted expectations for growth or achievement for grade/subject. | See upload in 3.13. |

3.11) High School English Language Arts

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

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

| | Locally-Selected Measure from List of Approved Measures | Assessment |
|--------------|---|--|
| Grade 9 ELA | 5) District, regional, or BOCES–developed assessments | DCMO Regionally Developed ELA Assessment: Grade 9 |
| Grade 10 ELA | 5) District, regional, or BOCES–developed assessments | DCMO Regionally Developed ELA Assessment: Grade 10 |
| Grade 11 ELA | 5) District, regional, or BOCES–developed assessments | DCMO Regionally Developed ELA Assessment: Grade 11 |

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

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

| | |
|---|---|
| Use this box, if needed, to describe the general process for assigning HEDI categories for these grades/subjects in this subcomponent. If needed, you may upload a table or graphic at 3.13, below. | The principal with the teachers will work to establish goals based on the pre-assessment. The goals will be based on student achievement and will detail how the teacher can earn each point. Based upon the percentage of students that meet or exceed the proficiency target, a corresponding 0 to 20 point HEDI score will be assigned. Proficiency here is defined as a score of 60% or higher. See upload in 3.13. |
| Highly Effective (18 - 20 points) Results are well above District- or BOCES-adopted expectations for growth or achievement for grade/subject. | See upload in 3.13. |
| Effective (9 - 17 points) Results meet District- or BOCES-adopted expectations for growth or achievement for grade/subject. | See upload in 3.13. |

Ineffective (0 - 2 points) Results are well below District- or BOCES-adopted expectations for growth or achievement for grade/subject. See upload in 3.13.

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/5139/171657-y92vNseFa4/Local 20-Teachers 3-13.docx

3.14) Locally Developed Controls

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

No controls are being used at this time.

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.

N/A

3.16) Assurances

Please check all of the boxes below:

| | |
|--|---------|
| 3.16) Assurances Assure the application of locally-developed controls will be rigorous, fair, and transparent. | Checked |
| 3.16) Assurances Assure that use of locally-developed controls will not have a disparate impact on underrepresented students in accordance with any applicable civil rights laws. | Checked |
| 3.16) Assurances Assure that enrolled students in accordance with teacher of record policies are included and may not be excluded. | Checked |
| 3.16) Assurances Assure that procedures for ensuring data accuracy and integrity are being utilized. | Checked |
| 3.16) Assurances Assure that the process for assigning points for locally selected measures will use the narrative HEDI descriptions described in the regulations to effectively differentiate educators' performance in ways that improve student learning and instruction. | Checked |
| 3.16) Assurances Assure that it is possible for an educator to earn each point, including 0, for the locally-selected measures subcomponent. | Checked |

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

4. Other Measures of Effectiveness (Teachers)

Created Monday, September 24, 2012

Updated Friday, December 28, 2012

Page 1

4.1) Teacher Practice Rubric

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

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

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

NYSUT Teacher Practice Rubric

(No response)

4.2) Points Within Other Measures

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

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

Is the following points assignment applicable to all teachers?

Yes

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

(No response)

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

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

(No response)

4.3) Survey Tools (if applicable)

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

(No response)

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

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

4.4) Assurances

Please check all of the boxes below:

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

4.5) Process for Assigning Points and Determining HEDI Ratings

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

Teachers will be assigned a raw score from 0-60 based on observations and self reflection. In order to determine this score (0 to 60) the teacher will receive a score of 1 to 4 for the first observation, the second observation and the self reflection/goal setting components. The score for the first observation, the second observation, and the professional reflection /goal setting will be averaged to determine an average composite score out of 1-4. The overall composite score consisting of the first observation, the second observation and the professional reflection/ goal setting will then convert to a HEDI score of 0-60 using the uploaded conversion chart in task 4.5.

We understand that the teachers' overall composite score will be rounded to the nearest whole number.

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/5091/181124-eka9yMJ855/APPENDIX K-Revised.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. | see chart in task 4.5 |
| Effective: Overall performance and results meet NYS Teaching Standards. | see chart in task 4.5 |
| Developing: Overall performance and results need improvement in order to meet NYS Teaching Standards. | see chart in task 4.5 |
| Ineffective: Overall performance and results do not meet NYS Teaching Standards. | see chart in task 4.5 |

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 | 0 |
| 4.6) Observations of Probationary Teachers Enter Total | 2 |

By trained in-school peer teachers or other trained reviewers

| | |
|----------------|---|
| Formal/Long | 0 |
| Informal/Short | 0 |

Independent evaluators

| | |
|----------------|---|
| Formal/Long | 0 |
| Informal/Short | 0 |

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

-
- In Person
-

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

-
- Not Applicable
-

4.7) Observations of Tenured Teachers

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

By building principals or other trained administrators

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

By trained in-school peer teachers or other trained reviewers

| | |
|----------------|---|
| Formal/Long | 0 |
| Informal/Short | 0 |

Independent evaluators

| | |
|----------------|---|
| Formal/Long | 0 |
| Informal/Short | 0 |

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

-
- In Person
-

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

-
- Not Applicable
-

5. Composite Scoring (Teachers)

Created Monday, September 24, 2012

Updated Friday, December 28, 2012

Page 1

Standards for Rating Categories

Growth or Comparable Measures

Locally-selected Measures of

growth or achievement

Other Measures of Effectiveness

(Teacher and Leader standards)

Highly

Effective

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

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

Overall performance and results exceed NYS Teaching Standards.

Effective

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

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

Overall performance and results meet NYS Teaching Standards.

Developing

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

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

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

Ineffective

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

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

Overall performance and results do not meet NYS Teaching Standards.

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

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

2012-13 where there is no Value-Added measure

Growth or Comparable Measures

Locally-selected Measures of

growth or achievement

Other Measures of Effectiveness

(60 points)

Overall

Composite Score

Highly Effective

18-20

18-20

Ranges determined locally--see below

91-100

Effective

9-17

9-17

75-90

Developing

3-8

3-8

65-74

Ineffective

0-2

0-2

0-64

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

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

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

2012-13 where Value-Added growth measure applies

Growth or Comparable Measures

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

Other Measures of Effectiveness

(60 points)

Overall

Composite Score

Highly Effective

22-25

14-15

Ranges determined locally--see above

91-100

Effective

10-21

8-13

75-90

Developing

3-9

3-7

65-74

Ineffective

0-2

0-2

0-64

6. Additional Requirements - Teachers

Created Monday, September 24, 2012
Updated Thursday, December 27, 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/5265/181188-Df0w3Xx5v6/APPENDIX L and M TIP Plans.docx

6.3) Appeals Process

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

(1) the substance of the annual professional performance review

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

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

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

All steps in the resolution of an appeal will occur in a timely and expeditious manner in compliance with Education Law 3012-C

Appeals Procedures

The purpose of the APPR appeal process is to foster and nurture growth of the professional staff in order to maintain a highly qualified and effective work force. The appeal procedures shall provide for the timely and expeditious resolution of the appeal.

Teachers who meet the appeal process criteria identified below may use this appeal process. An appeal may be filed challenging the APPR based upon one or more of the following grounds:

1. The substance of the Annual Professional Performance Review;
2. The District's adherence to the standards and methodologies required for the Annual Professional Performance Review, pursuant to Education Law §3012-c and applicable rules and regulations;
3. The District's compliance with either the applicable regulations of the Commissioner of Education, or locally negotiated procedures;
4. The District's issuance and or implementation of the terms of a TIP, where applicable, as required under Education Law §3012-c.

In accordance with Education Law §3012-c the following applies: A teacher may not file multiple appeals regarding the same performance review or TIP. All grounds for appeal must be raised within one appeal, provided that the teacher knew or could have reasonably known the ground(s) existed at the time the appeal was initiated, in which instance a further appeal may be filed but only based upon such previously unknown ground(s). An APPR which is the subject of a pending appeal shall not be sought to be offered in evidence or placed in evidence in any Education Law §3020-a proceeding, or any locally negotiated procedure, until the appeal process is concluded.

Any teacher aggrieved by an APPR rating of either "ineffective" or "developing" may challenge that APPR. Each step will occur in a timely manner within the guidelines established within each section as outlined below:

A. Level 1 Appeal -Appeal to Evaluator

1. Informal

If the teacher has concerns with their evaluation, the teacher may request an informal conference with the evaluating administrator, within five (5) school days from the date of the post-conference. The meeting shall be scheduled within ten (10) school days from the date of the request. Within this context, the appeal meeting will be heard within 15 school days from the request of the teacher to the administrator. The parties shall discuss any or all related issues. In order to advance to a Level 1 Formal Appeal, the teacher must first attend an informal conference.

2. Formal

If the teacher has concerns with their evaluation after their informal conference, the teacher may request a formal conference with the evaluating administrator. The teacher is entitled to BGTA representation at the conference.

Any appeal must be submitted to the evaluator in writing, using the Appeal Form (Appendix M), no later than ten (10) school days from the date of the informal conference. The evaluator responsible for the issue(s) being appealed must schedule a conference no later than ten (10) school days from the receipt of the appeal. Thus, the formal appeal will be heard within twenty (20) school days from the completion of the informal hearing. The conference shall be a meeting wherein the authoring administrator and the teacher shall discuss the evaluation and the area(s) of dispute. All supporting documentation shall be provided by both parties at the conference.

The evaluator shall have the option to uphold or modify any component of the evaluation.

Within ten (10) school days, of the date of the formal conference, or thirty days, from the completion of the informal hearing, the evaluator responsible for the issue(s) being appealed must submit a detailed written appeal response to the teacher and Superintendent. Along with the response, supporting documentation, must be submitted, or specifically noted pending, as well as any additional documents or materials relevant to the response.

If the teacher is not satisfied with the outcome of the Level 1 Formal Appeal, he/she may proceed to a Level 2 Appeal.

B. Level 2 Appeal– Appeal to Committee

The Level 2 Appeal shall be submitted to the Superintendent and BGTA President in writing, using the Appeal Form (Appendix M), no later than ten (10) school days from the date of the decision of the Level 1 Formal Appeal.

The Superintendent must schedule a conference no later than ten (10) school days from the receipt of the Level 1 Appeal. The teacher is entitled to BGTA representation at the conference. The conference shall be a meeting wherein the parties shall discuss the evaluation and the area(s) of dispute. Supporting documentation shall be provided by both parties at the conference.

The Committee make up shall be:

- a. Two tenured administrators, certified to conduct evaluations, appointed by the Superintendent or his/her designee. The administrator appointed shall not be the administrator who authored the evaluation.*
- b. Two tenured teachers appointed by the President of the BGTA or his/her designee.*

Within ten (10) school days of the Level 2 conference, the Appeal Committee shall reach its decision using consensus model (majority). The Committee shall submit a detailed written response to the administrative evaluator, the teacher, the BGTA President and the Superintendent at the same time they reach their decision. The response must include additional documents or written materials that are specific to the point(s) of disagreement and/or are relevant to the resolution of the appeal for each determination on each of the specific issues raised in the appeal. The Appeal Committee decision is final and binding.

If consensus is not reached, the Committee shall write up opposing viewpoints and submit the opposing viewpoints to the administrative evaluator, the teacher, the BGTA President and the Superintendent.

If the teacher is unsatisfied with the outcome of the Level 2 conference, the teacher may file a Level 3 appeal within ten (10) school days from the receipt of the written response. If the Superintendent is the evaluator, the teacher may file a Level 4 appeal within ten (10) school days from the receipt of the written response.

C. Level 3 Appeal – Appeal to Superintendent

The Level 3 Appeal, initiated by the teacher, requires written notification to the Superintendent using the Appeal Form (Appendix M). Notification must be within ten (10) school days of the receipt of the Level 2 Appeal.

The teacher is entitled to BGTA representation at the conference. The Superintendent must schedule a conference no later than ten (10) school days from the receipt of the Level 2 Appeal. The conference shall be a meeting wherein the parties shall discuss the evaluation and the area(s) of dispute. Supporting documentation shall be provided by both parties at the conference.

The Superintendent shall have the option to uphold or modify any component of the evaluation. The decision of the Superintendent is final and binding.

D. Level 4 Appeal – Appeal to Board of Education (BOE)

**Only available if the Superintendent is the evaluator*

The Level 4 Appeal, initiated by the teacher, requires written notification to the BOE using the Appeal Form (Appendix M). Notification must be within ten (10) school days of the receipt of the Level 2 Formal Appeal. The BOE must schedule a conference no later than ten (10) school days from the receipt of the appeal. The teacher is entitled to BGTA representation at the conference. The conference shall be a meeting wherein the BOE and the teacher shall discuss the evaluation and the area(s) of dispute. Supporting documentation shall be provided by both parties at the conference.

The BOE shall have the option to uphold or modify any component of the evaluation.

Within ten (10) school days of the date of the formal conference, the BOE must submit a detailed written appeal response to the teacher, the BGTA President and Superintendent. Along with the response, supporting documentation, must be submitted, or specifically noted pending, as well as any additional documents or materials relevant to the response. The BOE decision is final and binding.

Personnel File Submissions following Appeal Determination:

- 1. Should any level of the appeal overturn a section of the evaluation the section of the evaluation that was overturned should be redacted prior to submission of evaluation into the member's personnel file.*
- 2. Should any level of the appeal overturn the entire evaluation, if the evaluation was procedurally flawed, the overturned evaluation shall not be placed into the member's personnel file.*
- 3. Should any level of the appeal overturn a section or the entire evaluation and require an alternate course of action, the overturned section(s) or evaluation shall not be placed in the member's personnel file.*
- 4. Should any level of the appeal affirm the evaluation and require additional action, the evaluation shall be placed in the member's personnel file. The additional course of action results shall be stapled to the evaluation. The member shall retain the right to rebut any negative evaluation submitted to the personnel file in accordance with the bilaterally negotiated contract language.*
- 5. Should any level of the appeal affirm the evaluation, the evaluation shall be placed in the member's personnel file. The member*

shall retain the right to rebut any negative evaluation submitted to the personnel file in accordance with the bilaterally negotiated contract language.

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.

Any evaluator who participates in the evaluation of teachers or principals for the purpose of determining an APPR rating shall be fully trained and/or certified as required by Education Law §3012-c and the Regulations of the Commissioner of Education prior to conducting a teacher evaluation.

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

All evaluators shall successfully complete a training course that meets the minimum requirements prescribed in Chapter 103 and Section 30-2.9 of the regulations thereunder. Such training shall include application and use of the State-approved teacher practice rubric(s) selected by the District for use in evaluations. Training for lead evaluators will include the following required topics:

- New York State Teaching Standards and International SSLC Standards*
- Evidence-based observation*
- Application and use of Student Growth Percentile and Value Added Growth Model data*
- Application and use of the State-approved teacher or principal rubrics*
- Application and use of any and all assessment tools used to evaluate teachers and principals*
- Application and use of State-approved locally selected measures of student achievement*
- Use of Statewide instructional Reporting System*
- Scoring methodology used to evaluate teachers and principals*
- Specific considerations in evaluating teachers and principals of English Language Learners and students with disabilities*

Once an evaluator has successfully completed a training course meeting the minimum requirements prescribed in the law and regulations, he/she shall be deemed to be certified by the District as a lead evaluator. The District will participate in DCMO regionally developed re-certification training sessions for the re-certification of lead evaluators. If this recertification training is not available the District will work with other regional schools to secure recertification training from NYSUT certified trainers.

Any evaluation or APPR rating that is determined in whole or in part by an administrator or supervisor who is not certified by the Bainbridge-Guilford Central School District Board of Education to conduct such evaluations shall, upon appeal by the subject of the evaluation or APPR rating, be deemed to be invalid and shall be expunged from the teacher's record. The invalidation of an evaluation or APPR rating for this reason shall also preclude its use in the employment decisions of retention, tenure determinations, and termination.

All professional staff subject to the district's APPR will be provided with an orientation and/or training on the evaluation system that will include: a review of the content and use of the evaluation system, the NYS Teaching Standards (teachers) or ISLLC Standards (principal), the district's teacher practice rubric (teacher) or school administrator rubric (principal), forms and the procedures to be followed consistent with the approved APPR plan and associated contractual provisions. All training for current staff will be conducted prior to the implementation of the APPR process. Training will be conducted within 30 calendar days of the beginning of each subsequent school year for newly hired staff.

Teacher training will include rubric-specific training provided by NYSUT and evidence-based evaluation methods training provided by DCMO BOCES. Representatives from the Teachers Association and the District will jointly conduct additional / turnkey training for teachers. Principal training will include rubric-specific training provided by NYSUT, rubric-specific training in the Marshall rubric by their representatives, and evidence-based evaluation methods training provided by DCMO BOCES.

In summary, a White Paper published by the New York State Council of School Superintendents quotes Charlotte Danielson describing inter-rater reliability as "trained evaluators who can make accurate and consistent judgments based on evidence." In the broadest sense, three primary "gates" for effective evaluation—fairness, reliability, and validity—must be recognized, established and maintained as the cornerstones of efficacious administrator and teacher evaluation systems. To this end, the Bainbridge-Guilford Central School District will work with the DCMO BOCES Network Team to ensure all lead evaluators maintain inter-rater reliability over time and that they are re-rate reliability, lead evaluators in the Bainbridge-Guilford Central School District will be subject to targeted professional development activities designed to teach best practice data collection, analysis, and reporting methods.

Furthermore, the analysis of administrator and teacher artifacts, e.g. homework assignments, projects, quizzes, and parental letters, reports, etc..., will be cross-referenced with employee observation reports. Scheduled lead evaluator training activities will include teaching installments designed to encourage group analysis and scoring of administrator and teacher practice videos using SED approved rubrics. Finally, the District will work with neighboring schools to schedule "Instructional Rounds" as a means to collaborate, observe, reflect and share highly effective inter-rater reliability practices.

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 Friday, October 05, 2012
Updated Thursday, December 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):

| |
|---------------|
| 7-12 |
| 2-6 |
| (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 |
|------------------------|--|---|
| K-1 | District, regional, or BOCES-developed | DCMO Regionally Developed ELA and Math Assessment-K and 1 |
| | | |
| | | |
| | | |

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. | The building principal, will be establishing individual student growth targets using the pre-assessment baseline data received in the beginning of the school year. Based upon the overall percentage of students who meet or exceed their individual growth targets, Principals will receive a corresponding 0 to 20 HEDI score will be determined using the conversion chart in task 7.3 |
| Highly Effective (18 - 20 points) Results are well above state average for similar students (or District goals if no state test). | See upload in Task 7.3 |
| Effective (9 - 17 points) Results meet state average for similar students (or District goals if no state test). | See upload in Task 7.3 |
| Developing (3 - 8 points) Results are below state average for similar students (or District goals if no state test). | See upload in Task 7.3 |
| Ineffective (0 - 2 points) Results are well below state average for similar students (or District goals if no state test). | See upload in Task 7.3 |

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.

7.4) Special Considerations for Comparable Growth Measures

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

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

(No response)

7.5) Principals with More Than One Growth Measure

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

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

7.6) Assurances -- Comparable Growth Measures

Please check all of the boxes below:

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

8. Local Measures (Principals)

Created Friday, October 05, 2012
Updated Friday, December 28, 2012

Page 1

Locally-Selected Measures of Student Achievement or Growth

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

| Grade Configuration | Locally-Selected Measure from List of Approved Measures | Assessment |
|---------------------|---|---|
| 2-6 | (d) measures used by district for teacher evaluation | DCMO Regionally Developed Grade Assessments that are grade and subject specific |
| 7-12 | (d) measures used by district for teacher evaluation | DCMO Regionally Developed Grade Assessments that are grade and subject specific |
| | | |
| | | |
| | | |
| | | |

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. | The principal will work to establish individual student achievement targets. Based upon the percentage of students that meet or exceed the proficiency target, a corresponding 0 to 15 point HEDI score will be assigned to the principal. Proficiency here is defined as a score of 60% or higher. See upload in 8.1 |
| Highly Effective (14 - 15 points) Results are well above District- or BOCES-adopted expectations for growth or achievement for grade/subject. | See upload in task 8.1 |
| Effective (8- 13 points) Results meet District- or BOCES-adopted expectations for growth or achievement for grade/subject. | See upload in task 8.1 |
| Developing (3 - 7 points) Results are below District- or BOCES-adopted expectations for growth or achievement for grade/subject. | See upload in task 8.1 |
| Ineffective (0 - 2 points) Results are well below District- or BOCES-adopted expectations for growth or achievement | See upload in task 8.1 |

for grade/subject.

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/5366/189629-qBFVOWF7fC/Local 15 Principals 8-1-revisedb.docx

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

in a school with high school grades

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

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

| Grade Configuration | Locally-Selected Measure from List of Approved Measures | Assessment |
|---------------------|---|---|
| PK-1 | (d) measures used by district for teacher evaluation | DCMO Regionally Developed ELA and Math Assessments Grades K and 1 |
| | | |
| | | |
| | | |
| | | |
| | | |

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. | The principal will work to establish individual student achievement targets. Based upon the percentage of students that meet or exceed the proficiency target, a corresponding 0 to 20 point HEDI score will be assigned to the principal. Proficiency here is defined as a score of 60% or higher. See upload in 8.2 |
| Highly Effective (18 - 20 points) Results are well above District- or BOCES-adopted expectations for growth or achievement for grade/subject. | See upload in task 8.2 |
| Effective (9- 17 points) Results meet District- or BOCES-adopted expectations for growth or achievement for grade/subject. | See upload in task 8.2 |
| Developing (3 - 8 points) Results are below District- or BOCES-adopted expectations for growth or achievement for grade/subject. | See upload in task 8.2 |
| Ineffective (0 - 2 points) Results are well below District- or BOCES-adopted expectations for growth or achievement for grade/subject. | See upload in task 8.2 |

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.

assets/survey-uploads/5366/189629-T8MIGWUVm1/Local 20- Principals 8-2.docx

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 Friday, October 05, 2012
Updated Friday, December 28, 2012

Page 1

9.1) Principal Practice Rubric

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

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

Marshall's Principal Evaluation Rubric

(No response)

9.2) Points Within Other Measures

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

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

Is the following points assignment for all principals?

Yes

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

(No response)

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

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

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

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

(No response)

9.3) Assurances -- Goals

Please check the boxes below (if applicable):

| | |
|--|---------------|
| 9.3) Assurances -- Goals Assure that if any points are assigned to goals, at least one goal will address the principal's contribution to improving teacher effectiveness based on one or more of the following: improved retention of high performing teachers; correlation of student growth scores to teachers granted vs. denied tenure; or improvements in proficiency rating of the principal on specific teacher effectiveness standards in the principal practice rubric. | (No response) |
| 9.3) Assurances -- Goals Assure that any other goals, if applicable, shall address quantifiable and verifiable improvements in academic results or the school's learning environment (e.g. student or teacher attendance). | (No response) |

9.4) Sources of Evidence (if applicable)

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

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

9.5) Survey Tool(s) (if applicable)

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

(No response)

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

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

9.6) Assurances

Please check all of the boxes below:

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

9.7) Process for Assigning Points and Determining HEDI Ratings

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

Principals will be assigned a raw score from 0 to 60 based on observations and evaluations conducted using the Marshall Rubric. In order to determine this score (0 to 60), the principal will receive a score of 0 to 10 for each component observed within the 6 Domains. The score from all observed components within each domain will be averaged together to determine the principals overall rubric score. The Overall Rubric Score will then convert to a HEDI score of 0 to 60 using the uploaded conversion chart in Task 9.7. For example, a principal that scores a 45 on the rubric would translate to a score in the "developing" range. The principal would then receive 45 points toward the composite score. The final composite score will be rounded down to the nearest whole number.

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/5143/189649-pMADJ4gk6R/Principals other 60 9-7_1.docx

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

| | |
|--|---------------|
| Highly Effective: Overall performance and results exceed standards. | See Chart 9.7 |
| Effective: Overall performance and results meet standards. | See Chart 9.7 |
| Developing: Overall performance and results need improvement in order to meet standards. | See Chart 9.7 |
| Ineffective: Overall performance and results do not meet standards. | See Chart 9.7 |

Please provide the locally-negotiated 60 point scoring bands.

| | |
|------------------|-------|
| Highly Effective | 46-60 |
| Effective | 31-45 |
| Developing | 16-30 |
| Ineffective | 0-15 |

9.8) School Visits

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

Probationary Principals

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

Tenured Principals

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

10. Composite Scoring (Principals)

Created Friday, October 05, 2012

Updated Tuesday, December 18, 2012

Page 1

Standards for Rating Categories

Growth or Comparable Measures

Locally-selected Measures of growth or achievement

Other Measures of Effectiveness (Teacher and Leader standards)

Highly

Effective

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

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

Overall performance and results exceed ISLLC leadership standards.

Effective

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

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

Overall performance and results meet ISLLC leadership standards.

Developing

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

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

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

Ineffective

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

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

Overall performance and results do not meet ISLLC leadership standards.

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

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

2012-13 where there is no Value-Added measure

Growth or Comparable Measures

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

Other Measures of Effectiveness

(60 points)

Overall

Composite Score

Highly Effective

18-20

18-20

Ranges determined locally--see below

91-100

Effective

9-17

9-17

75-90

Developing

3-8

3-8

65-74

Ineffective

0-2

0-2

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

| | |
|------------------|-------|
| Highly Effective | 46-60 |
| Effective | 31-45 |
| Developing | 16-30 |
| Ineffective | 0-15 |

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 Friday, October 05, 2012
Updated Thursday, December 27, 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/5276/189727-Df0w3Xx5v6/SECTION V- Principal Improvement Plan-Revised Docs.docx](#)

11.3) Appeals Process

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

- (1) the substance of the annual professional performance review
- (2) the school district's or BOCES' adherence to the standards and methodologies required for such reviews, pursuant to Education Law section 3012-c
- (3) the adherence to the regulations of the Commissioner and compliance with any applicable locally negotiated procedures, as well as the school district's or BOCES' issuance and/or implementation of the terms of the teacher or principal improvement plan, as required under Education Law section 3012-c

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

TIME FRAME FOR FILING APPEAL

All appeals shall be filed in writing. The act of mailing the appeal shall constitute filing. All Appeals will be handled in a timely and expeditious manner. The appeals process timeline noted in this document starts on the day the principal the complete APPR review. All steps and the resolution of the appeal will be timely and expeditious in compliance with education law 3012-c.

An extension, due to extenuating circumstances to any of the time references may be granted by the superintendent upon request. Any

extensions will occur in a timely and expeditious manner

An appeal of a performance review must be filed no later than fifteen (15) business days of the date when the principal receives their final and complete annual professional performance review. If a principal is challenging the issuance of a principal improvement plan, appeals must be filed with fifteen (15) business days of issuance of such plan. An appeal of the implementation of an improvement plan shall be within fifteen (15) business days of the failure of the district to implement any component of the plan. The failure to file an appeal within these timeframes shall be deemed a waiver of the right to appeal and the appeal shall be deemed abandoned. An extension of the time in which to appeal may be granted by the Superintendent upon written request.

When filing an appeal, the principal must submit a written description of the specific areas of disagreement over his or her performance review, or the issuance and/or implementation of the terms of his or her improvement plan. Supportive evidence about the challenges may also be submitted with the appeal. Any additional documents or materials relevant to the appeal must be provided by the district upon written request for same. The performance review and/or improvement plan being challenged must also be submitted with the appeal.

TIME FRAME FOR DISTRICT RESPONSE

Within ten (10) business days of receipt of an appeal, the district must submit a detailed written response to the appeal. The response must include all additional documents or written materials relevant to the point(s) of disagreement that support the district's response. Any such information that is not submitted at the time the response is filed shall not be considered on behalf of the district in the deliberations related to the resolution of the appeal. The principal initiating the appeal shall receive a copy of the response filed by the school district, and all additional information submitted with the response, at the same time the school district files its response. Additional material supporting the challenges may be submitted by the principal up to the date of the hearing.

DECISION PROCESS FOR APPEAL

Within five (5) business days of the district's response, a panel consisting of a Superintendent's Designee, one member chosen by the administrators unit, and a mutually agreed upon third party shall be formed.

The parties agree that:

The panel shall hear appeals in a timely manner after the appeal is made, but in no event shall it be less than five (5) business days or more than fifteen (15) business days after the appeal.

The hearing shall be conducted in no more than one business day unless extenuating circumstances are present and the panel agrees to a second day.

The parties shall have the ability to be represented by either legal counsel, union representative, or appear pro se;

The parties shall exchange an anticipated witness list no less than two (2) business days before the scheduled hearing date;

The principal shall have the prerogative to determine whether the appeal shall be open to the public or not;

The district shall have the opportunity to present its case supporting the rating or improvement plan and then the principal may refute the presentation. These may include the presentation of material, witnesses and/or affidavits in lieu of testimony.

DECISION

A written decision on the merits of the appeal shall be rendered no later than ten (10) business days from the close of the hearing. The decision shall set forth the reasons and factual basis for the determination on each of the specific issues raised in the appeal. The reviewer must either, affirm, set aside or modify a district's rating or improvement plan. A copy of the decision shall be provided to the principal and the district representative.

EXCLUSIVITY OF SECTION 3012-C APPEAL PROCEDURE

This appeal procedure shall constitute the means for initiating, reviewing and resolving challenges to a building principal performance review or improvement plan.

11.4) Training and Certification of Lead Evaluators and Evaluators

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

Training and Certification of Lead Evaluators and Evaluators

Any evaluator who participates in the evaluation of teachers or principals for the purpose of determining an APPR rating shall be fully trained and/or certified as required by Education Law §3012-c and the Regulations of the Commissioner of Education prior to conducting a teacher evaluation.

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

All evaluators shall successfully complete a training course that meets the minimum requirements prescribed in Chapter 103 and Section 30-2.9 of the regulations thereunder. Such training shall include application and use of the State-approved teacher practice rubric(s) selected by the District for use in evaluations. Training for lead evaluators will include the following required topics:

„X New York State Teaching Standards and International SSLC Standards

„X Evidence-based observation

„X Application and use of Student Growth Percentile and Value Added Growth Model data

„X Application and use of the State-approved teacher or principal rubrics

„X Application and use of any and all assessment tools used to evaluate teachers and principals

„X Application and use of State-approved locally selected measures of student achievement

„X Use of Statewide instructional Reporting System

„X Scoring methodology used to evaluate teachers and principals

„X Specific considerations in evaluating teachers and principals of English Language Learners and students with disabilities

Once an evaluator has successfully completed a training course meeting the minimum requirements prescribed in the law and regulations, he/she shall be deemed to be certified by the District as a lead evaluator. The District will participate in re-certification training through collaboration with other Districts using the Marshall Rubric and through attendance at Kim Marshall approved training seminars and workshops.

Any evaluation or APPR rating that is determined in whole or in part by an administrator or supervisor who is not certified by the Bainbridge-Guilford Central School District Board of Education to conduct such evaluations shall, upon appeal by the subject of the evaluation or APPR rating, be deemed to be invalid and shall be expunged from the teacher's record. The invalidation of an evaluation or APPR rating for this reason shall also preclude its use in the employment decisions of retention, tenure determinations, and termination.

All professional staff subject to the district's APPR will be provided with an orientation and/or training on the evaluation system that will include: a review of the content and use of the evaluation system, the NYS Teaching Standards (teachers) or ISLLC Standards (principal), the district's teacher practice rubric (teacher) or school administrator rubric (principal), forms and the procedures to be followed consistent with the approved APPR plan and associated contractual provisions. All training for current staff will be conducted prior to the implementation of the APPR process. Training will be conducted within 30 calendar days of the beginning of each subsequent school year for newly hired staff.

Teacher training will include rubric-specific training provided by NYSUT and evidence-based evaluation methods training provided by DCMO BOCES. Representatives from the Teachers Association and the District will jointly conduct additional / turnkey training for teachers. Principal training will include rubric-specific training provided by NYSUT, rubric-specific training in the Marshall rubric by their representatives, and evidence-based evaluation methods training provided by DCMO BOCES.

In summary, a White Paper published by the New York State Council of School Superintendents quotes Charlotte Danielson describing inter-rater reliability as "trained evaluators who can make accurate and consistent judgments based on evidence." In the broadest sense, three primary "gates" for effective evaluation—fairness, reliability, and validity—must be recognized, established and maintained as the cornerstones of efficacious administrator and teacher evaluation systems. To this end, the Bainbridge-Guilford Central School District will work with the DCMO BOCES Network Team to ensure all lead evaluators maintain inter-rater reliability over time and that they are re-certified on an annual basis.

Specifically, to maintain an acceptable standard of inter-rater reliability, lead evaluators in the Bainbridge-Guilford Central School District will be subject to targeted professional development activities designed to teach best practice data collection, analysis, and reporting methods.

Furthermore, the analysis of administrator and teacher artifacts, e.g. homework assignments, projects, quizzes, and parental letters, reports, etc..., will be cross-referenced with employee observation reports.

Scheduled lead evaluator training activities will include teaching installments designed to encourage group analysis and scoring of administrator and teacher practice videos using SED approved rubrics.

Finally, the District will work with neighboring schools to schedule "Instructional Rounds" as a means to collaborate, observe, reflect and share highly effective inter-rater reliability practices.

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

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

11.7) Assurances -- Data

Please check all of the boxes below:

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

12. Joint Certification of APPR Plan

Created Friday, October 05, 2012

Updated Wednesday, January 02, 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/5581/189739-3Uqgn5g9Iu/APPR Cert Signatures 01-2-2013.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.

Bainbridge-Guilford Student Learning Objectives as Comparable Growth Measures: Teachers

| % of Students | HEDI Points | HEDI Rating |
|---------------|-------------|------------------|
| 100-98 | 20 | Highly Effective |
| 97-92 | 19 | |
| 91-85 | 18 | |
| 84-82 | 17 | Effective |
| 81-80 | 16 | |
| 79-77 | 15 | |
| 76-75 | 14 | |
| 74 | 13 | |
| 73 | 12 | |
| 72 | 11 | |
| 71 | 10 | |
| 70 | 9 | |
| 69-65 | 8 | Developing |
| 64-60 | 7 | |
| 59-57 | 6 | |
| 56-55 | 5 | |
| 54-52 | 4 | |
| 51-50 | 3 | |
| 49 | 2 | Ineffective |
| 48-40 | 1 | |
| 39 and below | 0 | |

Bainbridge-Guilford Local Measures of Student Achievement: Teachers

| % of Students | HEDI Points | HEDI Rating |
|----------------------|--------------------|--------------------|
| 100-93 | 15 | Highly Effective |
| 92-85 | 14 | |
| 84-82 | 13 | Effective |
| 81-80 | 12 | |
| 79-78 | 11 | |
| 77-76 | 10 | |
| 75-73 | 9 | |
| 72-70 | 8 | Developing |
| 69-65 | 7 | |
| 64-60 | 6 | |
| 59-57 | 5 | |
| 56-53 | 4 | |
| 52-50 | 3 | |
| 49 | 2 | Ineffective |
| 48-40 | 1 | |
| 39 and below | 0 | |

Bainbridge-Guilford Local Measures of Student Achievement: Teachers

| % of Students | HEDI Points | HEDI Rating |
|----------------------|--------------------|--------------------|
| 100-98 | 20 | Highly Effective |
| 97-92 | 19 | |
| 91-85 | 18 | |
| 84-82 | 17 | Effective |
| 81-80 | 16 | |
| 79-77 | 15 | |
| 76-75 | 14 | |
| 74 | 13 | |
| 73 | 12 | |
| 72 | 11 | |
| 71 | 10 | |
| 70 | 9 | |
| 69-65 | 8 | Developing |
| 64-60 | 7 | |
| 59-57 | 6 | |
| 56-55 | 5 | |
| 54-52 | 4 | |
| 51-50 | 3 | |
| 49 | 2 | Ineffective |
| 48-40 | 1 | |
| 39 and below | 0 | |

SECTION V: IMPROVEMENT PLAN

Long Beach City School District

Principal Improvement Plan Process

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

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

Principal Improvement Plan

Name of Principal _____

School Building _____

Academic Year ____

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

Improvement Goal/Outcome:

Action Steps/Activities:

Timeline for completion:

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

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

October:

March:

Other:

Evidence to be provided for Goal Achievement:

Assessment Summary: Superintendent is to attach a narrative summary of improvement progress, including verification of the provision of support and resources as outlined above no later than 10 days after the identified completion date. Such summary shall be signed by the superintendent and principal with the opportunity for the principal to attach comments.

APPENDIX K
60% Conversion Chart

Scoring Methodology for the 60% Teacher Effects

Converting points to a rating

The teacher's rating will drive how many points the teacher will receive toward the composite score. In this subcomponent, the teacher should first be rated according to the rubric, that rating would determine where the teacher falls in the HEDI categories, and then the points are applied. For example, a teacher that scores 3.0 on the rubric would translate to a score in the "effective" range. The teacher would then receive 58 points toward the composite score.

Calculating Steps

- Taking into account the SED preset scales for the other two sub-components and the composite scores, NYSUT calculated the scale (point distribution) for each rating category (Highly Effective=59-60, Effective=57-58, Developing=50-56, Ineffective=0-49) for this sub-component.
- Once these sub-component scale scores were determined, NYSUT calculated how much each rubric score category of 1-4 would be worth, based on the number of points within each category. For example, a 1 on the rubric equates to an ineffective rating, the number of possible rubric points in the 1 range would need to equate to the 49 points of the ineffective subcomponent score. There are 4 possible rubric scores in the 1 range (1.1-1.4 since 1=0) and 49 points in that range, so each rubric score is worth approximately 12 points within this category. This calculation was done for each category based on the possible number of rubric scores and the number of sub-component points within each category (rubric points in developing were worth 0.7 point, Effective were worth approximately 0.2 point and Highly Effective were worth .25 point).

Teacher Effects Conversion Scale

| Level | Overall rubric average score | 60 point distribution for composite |
|------------------|-------------------------------------|--|
| Ineffective | 1-1.4 | 0-49 |
| Developing | 1.5-2.4 | 50-56 |
| Effective | 2.5-3.4 | 57-58 |
| Highly Effective | 3.5-4 | 59-60 |

The detailed conversion chart below allows districts to convert any average rubric score to a specific conversion score for that sub-component.

Rubric Score to Sub-Component Conversion Chart

| Total Average Rubric Score | Category | Conversion score for composite |
|-----------------------------------|-----------------|---------------------------------------|
| Ineffective 0-49 | | |
| 1 | | 0 |
| 1.1 | | 12 |
| 1.2 | | 25 |
| 1.3 | | 37 |
| 1.4 | | 49 |
| Developing 50-56.3 | | |
| 1.5 | | 50 |
| 1.6 | | 50.7 |
| 1.7 | | 51.4 |
| 1.8 | | 52.1 |
| 1.9 | | 52.8 |
| 2 | | 53.5 |
| 2.1 | | 54.2 |
| 2.2 | | 54.9 |
| 2.3 | | 55.6 |
| 2.4 | | 56.3 |
| Effective 57-58.8 | | |
| 2.5 | | 57 |
| 2.6 | | 57.2 |
| 2.7 | | 57.4 |
| 2.8 | | 57.6 |
| 2.9 | | 57.8 |
| 3 | | 58 |
| 3.1 | | 58.2 |
| 3.2 | | 58.4 |
| 3.3 | | 58.6 |
| 3.4 | | 58.8** |
| Highly Effective 59-60 | | |
| 3.5 | | 59 |
| 3.6 | | 59.3 |
| 3.7 | | 59.5 |
| 3.8 | | 59.8 |
| 3.9 | | 60 |
| 4 | | 60.25 (round to 60) |

*** A composite score of 58.8 will be rounded down to 58 despite the general rounding rule of rounding to the nearest whole number.

NYSUT Rubric Example: an illustration of the process used to combine scores into a composite score.

| Assessment of Teacher Effectiveness Standard | Observation #1 and Evidence Score | Observation #2 and Evidence Score | Professional Reflection and Goal Setting |
|---|--|--|---|
| Standard 1 Knowledge of Student and Student Learning | 3 | 3 | |
| Standard 2 Knowledge of Content and Instructional Planning | 4 | | |
| Standard 3 Instructional Practice | 3 | | |
| Standard 4 Learning Environment | | 3 | |
| Standard 5 Assessment for Student Learning | 2 | 3 | |
| Standard 6 Professional Responsibilities and Collaboration | | | 3 |
| Standard 7 Professional Growth | | | 2 |
| | | | |
| Subtotal of observation and evidence column | 12 | 9 | 5 |
| Divide by the number of standards evaluated in each column | $12/4 = 3$ | $9/3 = 3$ | $5/2 = 2.5$ |
| Average the final scores | $8.5/3 = 2.83$ | | |
| Total score of Professional Practice 1-4 Rating | 2.83 | | |
| | | | |
| HEDI Rating | Effective | | |
| Sub-component score | 57.6 | | |

APPENDIX L

TIP Form

Teacher: _____

Subject/Grade Level: _____

Evaluator: _____

Effective Date of TIP: _____

| Standards Chosen for Further Development | Action(s) to be Taken | Administrator's Responsibilities | Teacher's Responsibilities | Timeline for Progress | Indicators of Success | Improvements Made and Documented |
|--|-----------------------|----------------------------------|----------------------------|-----------------------|-----------------------|----------------------------------|
| | | | | | | |

Evaluator's Signature: _____

Date: _____

Teacher's Signature: _____

Date: _____

Representative/Witness Signature: _____

Date: _____

Or Teacher's Signature Waiving Representation: _____

Date: _____

APPENDIX M

Appeal Form

- **Submit the signed and completed form to the authoring administrator or APPR Committee within the timelines outline in Section XVI of the APPR.**

Appeal Information: _____ Date of Appeal: _____

Teacher's Name: _____ Authoring Evaluator: _____

Building: _____ Date APPR or TIP was received: _____

Stage: Stage 1 Stage 2 Stage 3 Stage 4

Disclaimer: By submitting this appeal, I am requesting that the authoring administrator or APPR Committee to deny the appeal, to sustain the appeal and grant the remedy sought, or to sustain the appeal and modify the remedy. _____ Teacher Signature _____ Date

Type of Appeal:

Procedural Appeal

Please explain why the evaluation process was procedurally flawed (Include CBA Language, Relevant documents and the evaluation or TIP under appeal)

Substantive Appeal (Check the all the boxes below that are being appealed)

Content Knowledge Preparation Instructional Delivery Classroom Management

Student Development Assessment Student Growth Collaboration

Reflective and Responsive Practice TIP Plan

Rating Being Appealed: Ineffective Developing

Remedy Being Sought: Developing Effective Highly Effective TIP Removal

Explain why you believe the Appeal being sought should be granted:

Bainbridge-Guilford Student Learning Objectives as Comparable Growth Measures: Principals

| % of Students | HEDI Points | HEDI Rating |
|---------------|-------------|------------------|
| 100-98 | 20 | Highly Effective |
| 97-92 | 19 | |
| 91-84 | 18 | |
| 83-77 | 17 | Effective |
| 76-70 | 16 | |
| 69-68 | 15 | |
| 67-64 | 14 | |
| 63-60 | 13 | |
| 59-56 | 12 | |
| 55-52 | 11 | |
| 51-48 | 10 | |
| 47-44 | 9 | |
| 43-40 | 8 | Developing |
| 39-36 | 7 | |
| 35-32 | 6 | |
| 31-28 | 5 | |
| 27-24 | 4 | |
| 23-20 | 3 | |
| 19-15 | 2 | Ineffective |
| 14-9 | 1 | |
| 8-0 | 0 | |

**Bainbridge-Guilford Locally Selected Measures of Student Achievement for Principals:
Value Added**

| % of Students | HEDI Points | HEDI Rating |
|---------------|-------------|------------------|
| 100-93 | 15 | Highly Effective |
| 92-84 | 14 | |
| 83-75 | 13 | Effective |
| 74-70 | 12 | |
| 69-65 | 11 | |
| 64-57 | 10 | |
| 56-51 | 9 | |
| 50-44 | 8 | |
| 43-38 | 7 | Developing |
| 37-34 | 6 | |
| 33-30 | 5 | |
| 29-26 | 4 | |
| 25-20 | 3 | |
| 19 | 2 | Ineffective |
| 18-15 | 1 | |
| 14 and below | 0 | |

Bainbridge-Guilford Local Measures of Student Achievement: Principals

| % of Students | HEDI Points | HEDI Rating |
|----------------------|--------------------|--------------------|
| 100-98 | 20 | Highly Effective |
| 97-92 | 19 | |
| 91-84 | 18 | |
| 83-77 | 17 | Effective |
| 76-70 | 16 | |
| 69-68 | 15 | |
| 67-64 | 14 | |
| 63-60 | 13 | |
| 59-56 | 12 | |
| 55-52 | 11 | |
| 51-48 | 10 | |
| 47-44 | 9 | |
| 43-40 | 8 | Developing |
| 39-36 | 7 | |
| 35-32 | 6 | |
| 31-28 | 5 | |
| 27-24 | 4 | |
| 23-20 | 3 | |
| 19-15 | 2 | Ineffective |
| 14-9 | 1 | |
| 8-0 | 0 | |

Bainbridge-Guilford Principal Measures: Other Measures

| Rating | Domain Average Range | Composite Score |
|------------------|----------------------|-----------------|
| Highly Effective | 10-7.6 | 60-46 |
| Effective | 7.5-5.1 | 45-31 |
| Developing | 5.0-2.6 | 30-16 |
| Ineffective | 2.5-0 | 15-0 |

Kim Marshall Rubric Example

| | Highly Effective | Effective | Developing | Ineffective |
|---|------------------|-----------|------------|-------------|
| Domain/ Indicator points range | 7.6-10 | 5.1-7.5 | 2.6-5.0 | 0-2.5 |
| A. Diagnosis and planning | 8.5 | | | |
| B. Priority Management/communication | | 7.5 | | |
| C. Curriculum and Data | | 7.0 | | |
| D. Supervision, Evaluation and Professional Development | 9.75 | | | |
| E. Discipline and Parent Involvement | 8.5 | | | |
| F. Management and External Relations | | | 5.0 | |
| Total points | 26.75 (27) | 14.5 (15) | 5.0 (5) | |

Total rubric points awarded will be rounded up to nearest whole number.

$$27 + 15 + 5 = 47$$

| HEDI SCORE | | |
|--------------------------|---------------------------------|---------------------------|
| <u>Performance Level</u> | <u>Points ranges negotiated</u> | <u>Final rubric score</u> |
| Highly Effective | 46-60 | 47 |
| Effective | 31-45 | |
| Developing | 16-30 | |
| Ineffective | 0-15 | |

B-G CSD Building Principal Improvement Plan

Name of Principal _____

School Building _____ Academic Year _____

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

Improvement Goal/Outcome:

Action Steps/Activities:

Timeline for completion:

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

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

December:

March:

Other:

Evidence to be provided for Goal Achievement:

Assessment Summary: Superintendent is to attach a narrative summary of improvement progress, including verification of the provision of support and resources as outlined above no later than 10 days after the identified completion date. Such summary shall be signed by the Superintendent and principal with the opportunity for the principal to attach comments.

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:

[Handwritten Signature] 1/2/13

Teachers Union President Signature: Date:

[Handwritten Signature] 1/2/13

Administrative Union President Signature: Date:

[Handwritten Signature] 1/2/13

Board of Education President Signature: Date:

[Handwritten Signature] 1/2/13