



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

January 9, 2013

Scott Amo, Superintendent  
Beekmantown Central School District  
37 Eagle Way  
West Chazy, NY 12992

Dear Superintendent Amo:

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: Craig L. King

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 Thursday, May 10, 2012

Updated Friday, December 21, 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 : 090301060000

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

*090301060000*

#### 1.2) School District Name: BEEKMANTOWN CSD

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

*Beekmantown 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 Thursday, May 10, 2012

Updated Monday, January 07, 2013

---

### Page 1

#### STATE-PROVIDED MEASURES OF STUDENT GROWTH

(25 points with an approved value-added measure)

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

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

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

#### 2.1) Assurances

Please check the boxes below:

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

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

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

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

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

If no State assessment or Regents exam exists:

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

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

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

State assessments, *required if one exists*

List of State-approved 3rd party assessments

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

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

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

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

## 2.2) Grades K-3 ELA

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

	ELA	Assessment
K	School-or BOCES-wide, group or team results based on State assessments	NYS Grades 4-5 ELA and Math State Assessment
1	School-or BOCES-wide, group or team results based on State assessments	NYS Grades 4-5 ELA and Math State Assessment
2	School-or BOCES-wide, group or team results based on State assessments	NYS Grades 4-5 ELA and Math State 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.	For Grades K-2: Teachers will be assigned the NY State provided building wide growth score.  For Grade 3: Students will be given a pre-test at the beginning of the year to establish a baseline. Using the data individual growth targets will be assigned to each teacher's students by the principal. HEDI points will be allocated by the principal based on the percentage of students meeting or exceeding growth targets.
Highly Effective (18 - 20 points) Results are well-above state average for similar students (or District goals if no state test).	20 points- 95-100% of students meet or exceed target 19 points – 90-94% of students meet or exceed target 18 points – 85-89% of students meet or exceed target
Effective (9 - 17 points) Results meet state average for similar students (or District goals if no state test).	17 points – 83-84% of students meet or exceed target 16 points – 82% of the students meet or exceed target 15 points – 81% of students meet or exceed target 14 points – 80% of students meet or exceed target 13 points – 79% of students meet or exceed target 12 points – 78% of students meet or exceed target 11 points – 77% of students meet or exceed target 10 points – 76% of students meet or exceed target 9 points – 75% of students meet or exceed target
Developing (3 - 8 points) Results are below state average for similar students (or District goals if no state test).	8 points – 73-74% of students meet or exceed target 7 points – 70 -72% of students meet or exceed target 6 points – 67-69% of students meet or exceed target 5 points – 64-66% of students meet or exceed target 4 points – 62 -63% of students meet or exceed target 3 points – 60-61% of students meet or exceed target
Ineffective (0 - 2 points) Results are well-below state average for similar students (or District goals if no state test).	2 points – 55- 59% of students meet or exceed target 1 point – 50 -54% of students meet or exceed target 0 point – 0-49% of students meet or exceed 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	School-or BOCES-wide, group or team results based on State assessments	NYS Grades 4-5 ELA and Math State Assessment
1	School-or BOCES-wide, group or team results based on State assessments	NYS Grades 4-5 ELA and Math State Assessment
2	School-or BOCES-wide, group or team results based on State assessments	NYS Grades 4-5 ELA and Math State 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.	For Grades K-2: Teachers will be assigned the NY State provided building wide growth score.  For Grade 3: Students will be given a pre-test at the beginning of the year to establish a baseline. Using the data individual growth targets will be assigned to each teacher's students by the principal. HEDI points will be allocated by the principal based on the percentage of students meeting or exceeding growth targets
Highly Effective (18 - 20 points) Results are well-above state average for similar students (or District goals if no state test).	20 points- 95-100% of students meet or exceed target 19 points – 90-94% of students meet or exceed target 18 points – 85-89% of students meet or exceed target
Effective (9 - 17 points) Results meet state average for similar students (or District goals if no state test).	17 points – 83-84% of students meet or exceed target 16 points – 82% of the students meet or exceed target 15 points – 81% of students meet or exceed target 14 points – 80% of students meet or exceed target 13 points – 79% of students meet or exceed target 12 points – 78% of students meet or exceed target 11 points – 77% of students meet or exceed target 10 points – 76% of students meet or exceed target 9 points – 75% of students meet or exceed target
Developing (3 - 8 points) Results are below state average for similar students (or District goals if no state test).	8 points – 73-74% of students meet or exceed target 7 points – 70 -72% of students meet or exceed target 6 points – 67-69% of students meet or exceed target 5 points – 64-66% of students meet or exceed target 4 points – 62 -63% of students meet or exceed target 3 points – 60-61% of students meet or exceed target
Ineffective (0 - 2 points) Results are well-below state average for similar students (or District goals if no state test).	2 points – 55- 59% of students meet or exceed target 1 point – 50 -54% of students meet or exceed target 0 point – 0-49% of students meet or exceed 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	Beekmantown District developed 6th grade science assessment
7	District, regional or BOCES-developed assessment	Beekmantown developed grade 7 Life Science assessment
	Science	Assessment
8	State assessment	8th Grade State Science Assessment

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

Use this box, if needed, to describe the general process for assigning HEDI categories for these grades/subjects in this subcomponent. If needed, you may upload a table or graphic at 2.11, below.	Students will be given a pre-test at the beginning of the year to establish a baseline. Using the data individual growth targets will be assigned to a each teacher's students by the principal. HEDI points will be allocated by a teacher based on the percentage of students schoolwide meeting or exceeding growth targets.
Highly Effective (18 - 20 points) Results are well-above state average for similar students (or District goals if no state test).	20 points - 96-100% 19 points - 90-95% 18 points - 82-89%
Effective (9 - 17 points) Results meet state average for similar students (or District goals if no state test).	17 points - 80-81% 16 points - 77-79% 15 points - 74-76% 14 points - 71-73% 13 points - 70% 12 points - 66-69% 11 points - 62-65% 10 points - 58-61% 9 points - 55-57%
Developing (3 - 8 points) Results are below state average for similar students (or District goals if no state test).	8 points - 51-54% 7 points - 47-50% 6 points - 42-46% 5 points - 38-41% 4 points - 35-37% 3 points - 31-34%
Ineffective (0 - 2 points) Results are well-below state average for similar students (or District goals if no state test).	2 points - 28-30% 1 point - 25-27% 0 point - less than 25%

### 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	Beekmantown District developed Grade 6 social studies assessment
7	District, regional or BOCES-developed assessment	Beekmantown District developed Grade 7 social studies assessment
8	District, regional or BOCES-developed assessment	Beekmantown District developed Grade 8 social studies assessment

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

Use this box, if needed, to describe the general process for assigning HEDI categories for these grades/subjects in this subcomponent. If needed, you may upload a table or graphic at 2.11, below.	Students will be given a pre-test at the beginning of the year to establish a baseline. Using the data individual growth targets will be assigned to a each teacher's students by the principal. HEDI points will be allocated by a teacher based on the percentage of students schoolwide meeting or exceeding growth targets.
---	---

Highly Effective (18 - 20 points) Results are well-above District goals for similar students.	20 points - 96-100% 19 points - 90-95% 18 points - 82-89%
Effective (9 - 17 points) Results meet District goals for similar students.	17 points - 80-81% 16 points - 77-79% 15 points - 74-76% 14 points - 71-73% 13 points - 70% 12 points - 66-69% 11 points - 62-65% 10 points - 58-61% 9 points - 55-57%
Developing (3 - 8 points) Results are below District goals for similar students.	8 points - 51-54% 7 points - 47-50% 6 points - 42-46% 5 points - 38-41% 4 points - 35-37% 3 points - 31-34%
Ineffective (0 - 2 points) Results are well-below District goals for similar students.	2 points - 28-30% 1 point - 25-27% 0 point - less than 25%

## 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	Beekmantown District developed Global 1 Assessment

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

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

Use this box, if needed, to describe the general process for assigning HEDI categories for these grades/subjects in this subcomponent. If needed, you may upload a table or graphic at 2.11, below.	Students will be given a pre-test at the beginning of the year to establish a baseline. Using the data individual growth targets will be assigned to each teacher's students by the principal. HEDI points will be allocated by a teacher based on the percentage of students schoolwide meeting or exceeding growth targets.
---	---

Highly Effective (18 - 20 points) Results are well-above District goals for similar students.	20 points - 98-100% 19 points - 96-97% 18 points - 94-95%
Effective (9 - 17 points) Results meet District goals for similar students.	17 points - 92-93% 16 points - 90-91% 15 points - 88-89% 14 points - 86-87% 13 points - 85% 12 points - 83-84% 11 points - 81-82% 10 points - 78-80% 9 points - 75-77%
Developing (3 - 8 points) Results are below District goals for similar students.	8 points - 73-74% 7 points - 71-72% 6 points - 69-70% 5 points - 67-68% 4 points - 66% 3 points - 65%
Ineffective (0 - 2 points) Results are well-below District goals for similar students.	2 points - 55-64% 1 point - 45-54% 0 points - 0-44%

## 2.7) High School Science Regents Courses

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

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

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

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

Use this box, if needed, to describe the general process for assigning HEDI categories for these grades/subjects in this subcomponent. If needed, you may upload a table or graphic at 2.11, below.	Students will be given a pre-test at the beginning of the year to establish a baseline. Using the data individual growth targets will be assigned to each teacher's students by the principal. HEDI points will be allocated by a teacher based on the percentage of students schoolwide meeting or exceeding growth targets.
Highly Effective (18 - 20 points) Results are well-above District goals for similar students.	20 points - 98-100% 19 points - 96-97% 18 points - 94-95%

Effective (9 - 17 points) Results meet District goals for similar students.	17 points - 92-93% 16 points - 90-91% 15 points - 88-89% 14 points - 86-87% 13 points - 85% 12 points - 83-84% 11 points - 81-82% 10 points - 78-80% 9 points - 75-77%
Developing (3 - 8 points) Results are below District goals for similar students.	8 points - 73-74% 7 points - 71-72% 6 points - 69-70% 5 points - 67-68% 4 points - 66% 3 points - 65%
Ineffective (0 - 2 points) Results are well-below District goals for similar students.	2 points - 55-64% 1 point - 45-54% 0 points - 0-44%

## 2.8) High School Math Regents Courses

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

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

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

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

Use this box, if needed, to describe the general process for assigning HEDI categories for these grades/subjects in this subcomponent. If needed, you may upload a table or graphic at 2.11, below.	Students will be given a pre-test at the beginning of the year to establish a baseline. Using the data individual growth targets will be assigned to each teacher's students by the principal. HEDI points will be allocated by a teacher based on the percentage of students schoolwide meeting or exceeding growth targets.
Highly Effective (18 - 20 points) Results are well-above District goals for similar students.	20 points - 98-100% 19 points - 96-97% 18 points - 94-95%
Effective (9 - 17 points) Results meet District goals for similar students.	17 points - 92-93% 16 points - 90-91% 15 points - 88-89% 14 points - 86-87% 13 points - 85% 12 points - 83-84%

	11 points - 81-82% 10 points - 78-80% 9 points - 75-77%
Developing (3 - 8 points) Results are below District goals for similar students.	8 points - 73-74% 7 points - 71-72% 6 points - 69-70% 5 points - 67-68% 4 points - 66% 3 points - 65%
Ineffective (0 - 2 points) Results are well-below District goals for similar students.	2 points - 55-64% 1 point - 45-54% 0 points - 0-44%

## 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	Beekmantown District Developed Grade 9 ELA Assessment
Grade 10 ELA	District, regional or BOCES-developed assessment	Beekmantown District Developed Grade 10 ELA Assessment
Grade 11 ELA	Regents assessment	NYS Comprehensive English Regents

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

Use this box, if needed, to describe the general process for assigning HEDI categories for these grades/subjects in this subcomponent. If needed, you may upload a table or graphic at 2.11, below.	Students will be given a pre-test at the beginning of the year to establish a baseline. Using the data individual growth targets will be assigned to each teacher's students by the principal. HEDI points will be allocated by a teacher based on the percentage of students schoolwide meeting or exceeding growth targets.
Highly Effective (18 - 20 points) Results are well-above District goals for similar students.	20 points - 98-100% 19 points - 96-97% 18 points - 94-95%
Effective (9 - 17 points) Results meet District goals for similar students.	17 points - 92-93% 16 points - 90-91% 15 points - 88-89% 14 points - 86-87% 13 points - 85% 12 points - 83-84% 11 points - 81-82% 10 points - 78-80% 9 points - 75-77%



Effective (9 - 17 points) Results meet District goals for similar students.	17 points - 92-93%
	16 points - 90-91%
	15 points - 88-89%
	14 points - 86-87%
	13 points - 85%
	12 points - 83-84%
	11 points - 81-82%
	10 points - 78-80%
	9 points - 75-77%
Developing (3 - 8 points) Results are below District goals for similar students.	8 points - 73-74%
	7 points - 71-72%
	6 points - 69-70%
	5 points - 67-68%
	4 points - 66%
Ineffective (0 - 2 points) Results are well-below District goals for similar students.	3 points - 65%
	2 points - 55-64%
	1 point - 45-54%
	0 points - 0-44%

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/5364/128164-TXEttx9bQW/APPR Learning Factors Scores.doc*

## 2.12) Locally Developed Controls

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

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

*Refer to chart 2.11*

*The scores of students in these subcategories (SWD, ELL, Poverty) are disproportionately affected by these mitigating variables. This chart serves to accommodate for these variables and support our district goal to increase student achievement.*

*Whenever possible it is district policy to assign students to teacher rosters in such ways as to create balance among all student subcategories and populations.*

## 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: <a href="http://usny.nysed.gov/rttt/teachers-leaders/slo/home.html">http://usny.nysed.gov/rttt/teachers-leaders/slo/home.html</a> ).	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 Thursday, May 10, 2012

Updated Monday, January 07, 2013

---

#### Page 1

#### Locally Selected Measures of Student Achievement or Growth

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

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

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

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

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

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

**Growth or achievement measure(s) from these options.**

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

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

Measures based on:

- 1) The change in percentage of a teacher’s students who achieve a specific level of performance as determined locally, on such assessments/examinations compared to those students’ level of performance on such assessments/examinations in the previous school year (e.g., a three percentage point increase in students earning the proficient level (three) or better performance level on the 7th grade math State assessment compared to those same students’ performance levels on the 6th grade math State assessment, or an increase in the percentage of a teacher’s students earning the advanced performance level (four) on the 4th grade ELA or math State assessments compared to those students’ performance levels on the 3rd grade ELA or math State assessments)
  
- 2) Teacher specific growth score computed by the Department based on the percent of the teacher’s students earning a State determined level of growth. The methodology to translate such growth into the State-established sub-component scoring ranges shall be determined locally
  
- 3) Teacher specific achievement or growth score computed in a manner determined locally based on a measure of student performance on the State assessments, Regents examinations and/or Department approved alternative examinations other than the measure described in subclause 1) or 2) of this clause
  
- 4) Student growth or achievement computed in a manner determined locally based on a State-approved 3rd party assessment
  
- 5) Student growth or achievement computed in a manner determined locally based on a district, regional or BOCES-developed assessment that is rigorous and comparable across classrooms
  
- 6) A school-wide measure of either student growth or achievement based on either:
  - (i) A State-provided student growth score covering all students in the school that took the State assessment in ELA or Math in Grades 4-8; or
  - (ii) A school-wide measure of student growth or achievement computed in a manner determined locally based on a State, State-approved 3rd party, or district, regional or BOCES developed assessment that is rigorous and comparable across classrooms.

### 3.1) Grades 4-8 ELA

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

	Locally-Selected Measure from List of Approved Measures	Assessment
4	4) State-approved 3rd party assessments	AIMSweb
5	4) State-approved 3rd party assessments	AIMSweb
6	4) State-approved 3rd party assessments	STAR Reading Enterprise
7	4) State-approved 3rd party assessments	STAR Reading Enterprise
8	4) State-approved 3rd party assessments	STAR Reading Enterprise

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

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

<p>Use this box, if needed, to describe the general process for assigning HEDI categories for these grades/subjects in this subcomponent. If needed, you may upload a table or graphic at 3.3, below.</p>	<p>HEDI points will be assigned to teachers in grades 4-5 by 3rd Party vendor AIMSweb utilizing mean growth scores. Please see attachment 3.3 for description of AIMSweb process.</p> <p>HEDI points will be allocated to teachers in grades 6-8 based upon the percentage of students who make one year's growth (defined as at least 10 months), or are at or above grade level at years end on STAR Reading Enterprise. Please see attachment 3.3 for Star Reading Enterprise and Star Math Enterprise Conversion Scale.</p>
<p>Highly Effective (14 - 15 points) Results are well above District- or BOCES-adopted expectations for growth or achievement for grade/subject.</p>	<p>Refer to attachment 3.3</p>
<p>Effective (8- 13 points) Results meet District- or BOCES-adopted expectations for growth or achievement for grade/subject.</p>	<p>Refer to attachment 3.3</p>
<p>Developing (3 - 7 points) Results are below District- or BOCES-adopted expectations for growth or achievement for grade/subject.</p>	<p>Refer to attachment 3.3</p>
<p>Ineffective (0 - 2 points) Results are well below District- or BOCES-adopted expectations for growth or achievement for grade/subject.</p>	<p>Refer to attachment 3.3</p>

### 3.2) Grades 4-8 Math

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

	Locally-Selected Measure from List of Approved Measures	Assessment
4	4) State-approved 3rd party assessments	AIMSweb
5	4) State-approved 3rd party assessments	AIMSweb
6	4) State-approved 3rd party assessments	STAR Math
7	4) State-approved 3rd party assessments	STAR Math
8	4) State-approved 3rd party assessments	STAR Math

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.*

assurances listed to the left of each box.

Use this box, if needed, to describe the general process for assigning HEDI categories for these grades/subjects in this subcomponent. If needed, you may upload a table or graphic at 3.3, below.	HEDI points will be assigned to teachers in grades 4-5 by 3rd Party vendor AIMSweb utilizing mean growth scores. Please see attachment 3.3 for description of AIMSweb process.
	HEDI points will be allocated to teachers in grades 6-8 based upon the percentage of students who make one year's growth (defined as at least 10 months), or are at or above grade level at years end on STAR Reading Enterprise. Please see attachment 3.3 for Star Reading Enterprise and Star Math Enterprise Conversion Scale.
Highly Effective (14 - 15 points) Results are well above District- or BOCES-adopted expectations for growth or achievement for grade/subject.	Refer to attachment 3.3
Effective (8- 13 points) Results meet District- or BOCES-adopted expectations for growth or achievement for grade/subject.	Refer to attachment 3.3
Developing (3 - 7 points) Results are below District- or BOCES-adopted expectations for growth or achievement for grade/subject.	Refer to attachment 3.3
Ineffective (0 - 2 points) Results are well below District- or BOCES-adopted expectations for growth or achievement for grade/subject.	Refer to attachment 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/5139/128168-rhJdBgDruP/APPR Chart 3.3\\_4.pdf](assets/survey-uploads/5139/128168-rhJdBgDruP/APPR Chart 3.3_4.pdf)

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

**Growth or achievement measure(s) from these options.**

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

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

Measures based on:

1) The change in percentage of a teacher's students who achieve a specific level of performance as determined locally, on such assessments/examinations compared to those students' level of performance on such assessments/examinations in the previous school year (e.g., a three percentage point increase in students earning the proficient level (three) or better performance level on the 7th grade

math State assessment compared to those same students' performance levels on the 6th grade math State assessment, or an increase in the percentage of a teacher's students earning the advanced performance level (four) on the 4th grade ELA or math State assessments compared to those students' performance levels on the 3rd grade ELA or math State assessments)

- 2) Teacher specific growth score computed by the Department based on the percent of the teacher's students earning a State determined level of growth. The methodology to translate such growth into the State-established sub-component scoring ranges shall be determined locally
  
- 3) Teacher specific achievement or growth score computed in a manner determined locally based on a measure of student performance on the State assessments, Regents examinations and/or Department approved alternative examinations other than the measure described in 1) or 2), above
  
- 4) Student growth or achievement computed in a manner determined locally based on a State-approved 3rd party assessment
  
- 5) Student growth or achievement computed in a manner determined locally based on a district, regional or BOCES-developed assessment that is rigorous and comparable across classrooms
  
- 6) A school-wide measure of either student growth or achievement based on either:
  - (i) A State-provided student growth score covering all students in the school that took the State assessment in ELA or Math in Grades 4-8; or
  - (ii) A school-wide measure of student growth or achievement computed in a manner determined locally based on a State, State-approved 3rd party, or district, regional or BOCES developed assessment that is rigorous and comparable across classrooms
  
- 7) Student Learning Objectives (only allowable for teachers in grades/subjects without a Value-Added measure for the State Growth subcomponent). Used with one of the following assessments: State, State-approved 3rd party, or a district, regional or BOCES-developed assessment that is rigorous and comparable across classrooms

### 3.4) Grades K-3 ELA

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

	Locally-Selected Measure from List of Approved Measures	Assessment
K	4) State-approved 3rd party assessments	AIMSweb
1	4) State-approved 3rd party assessments	AIMSweb
2	4) State-approved 3rd party assessments	AIMSweb
3	4) State-approved 3rd party assessments	AIMSweb

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

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

Use this box, if needed, to describe the general process for assigning HEDI categories for these grades/subjects in this subcomponent. If needed, you may upload a table or graphic at 3.13, below.	HEDI points will be assigned to teachers in grades K-3 by 3rd Party vendor AIMSweb utilizing mean growth scores. Please see attachment for description of AIMSweb process.
Highly Effective (18-20 points) Results are well above District- or BOCES-adopted expectations for growth or achievement for grade/subject.	Refer to attachment 3.13
Effective (9-17 points) Results meet District- or BOCES-adopted expectations for growth or achievement for grade/subject.	Refer to attachment 3.13
Developing (3 - 8 points) Results are below District- or BOCES-adopted expectations for growth or achievement for grade/subject.	Refer to attachment 3.13
Ineffective (0 - 2 points) Results are well below District- or BOCES-adopted expectations for growth or achievement for grade/subject.	Refer to attachment 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	4) State-approved 3rd party assessments	AIMSweb
1	4) State-approved 3rd party assessments	AIMSweb
2	4) State-approved 3rd party assessments	AIMSweb
3	4) State-approved 3rd party assessments	AIMSweb

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

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

Use this box, if needed, to describe the general process for assigning HEDI categories for these grades/subjects in this subcomponent. If needed, you may upload a table or graphic at 3.13, below.	HEDI points will be assigned to teachers in grades K-3 by 3rd Party vendor AIMSweb utilizing mean growth scores. Please see attachment for description of AIMSweb process.
Highly Effective (18-20 points) Results are well above District- or BOCES-adopted expectations for growth or achievement for grade/subject.	Refer to attachment 3.13
Effective (9-17 points) Results meet District- or BOCES-adopted expectations for growth or achievement for grade/subject.	Refer to attachment 3.13

Developing (3 - 8 points) Results are below District -or BOCES-adopted expectations for growth or achievement for grade/subject.	Refer to attachment 3.13
Ineffective (0 - 2 points) Results are well below District- or BOCES-adopted expectations for growth or achievement for grade/subject.	Refer to attachment 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	6(i) School-wide measure based on State-provided measure	Grades 6-8 ELA and Math State Assessment
7	6(i) School-wide measure based on State-provided measure	Grades 6-8 ELA and Math State Assessment
8	6(i) School-wide measure based on State-provided measure	Grades 6-8 ELA and Math State Assessment

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

Use this box, if needed, to describe the general process for assigning HEDI categories for these grades/subjects in this subcomponent. If needed, you may upload a table or graphic at 3.13, below.	Grades 6-8 Science teachers will receive the State provided building growth score comprised of the ELA and Math State Assessments for the current school year.
Highly Effective (18 - 20 points) Results are well above District- or BOCES-adopted expectations for growth or achievement for grade/subject.	20 points 19 points 18 points
Effective (9 - 17 points) Results meet District- or BOCES-adopted expectations for growth or achievement for grade/subject.	17 points 16 points 15 points 14 points 13 points 12 points 11 points 10 points 9 points
Developing (3 - 8 points) Results are below District- or BOCES-adopted expectations for growth or achievement for grade/subject.	8 points 7 points 6 points 5 points 4 points 3 points
Ineffective (0 - 2 points) Results are well below District- or BOCES-adopted expectations for growth or achievement for grade/subject.	2 points 1 point 0

### 3.7) Grades 6-8 Social Studies

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

	Locally-Selected Measure from List of Approved Measures	Assessment
6	6(i) School-wide measure based on State-provided measure	Grades 6-8 ELA and Math State Assessment
7	6(i) School-wide measure based on State-provided measure	Grades 6-8 ELA and Math State Assessment
8	6(i) School-wide measure based on State-provided measure	Grades 6-8 ELA and Math State Assessment

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

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

Use this box, if needed, to describe the general process for assigning HEDI categories for these grades/subjects in this subcomponent. If needed, you may upload a table or graphic at 3.13, below.	Grades 6-8 Social Studies teachers will receive the State provided building growth score comprised of the ELA and Math State Assessments for the current school year.
Highly Effective (18 - 20 points) Results are well above District- or BOCES-adopted expectations for growth or achievement for grade/subject.	20 points
	19 points
	18 points
Effective (9 - 17 points) Results meet District- or BOCES-adopted expectations for growth or achievement for grade/subject.	17 points
	16 points
	15 points
	14 points
	13 points
	12 points
	11 points
	10 points
Developing (3 - 8 points) Results are below District- or BOCES-adopted expectations for growth or achievement for grade/subject.	9 points
	8 points
	7 points
	6 points
	5 points
Ineffective (0 - 2 points) Results are well below District- or BOCES-adopted expectations for growth or achievement for grade/subject.	4 points
	3 points
	2 points
	1 point
	0

### 3.8) High School Social Studies

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

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

	Locally-Selected Measure from List of Approved Measures	Assessment
Global 1	6(ii) School wide measure computed locally	Regents assessments in Global, Living Environment, ELA, US history, Integrated Algebra
Global 2	6(ii) School wide measure computed locally	Regents assessments in Global, Living Environment, ELA, US history, Integrated Algebra
American History	6(ii) School wide measure computed locally	Regents assessments in Global, Living Environment, ELA, US history, Integrated Algebra

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.	HEDI points will be allocated to all high school teachers based on the percent of students scoring 65 or better (or 55 or better for SWD and ELLs) on the applicable Regents Exams. The percentage of students meeting target on each Regents will be averaged equally.
Highly Effective (18 - 20 points) Results are well above District- or BOCES-adopted expectations for growth or achievement for grade/subject.	20 points - 98-100% 19 points - 96-97% 18 points - 94-95%
Effective (9 - 17 points) Results meet District- or BOCES-adopted expectations for growth or achievement for grade/subject.	17 points - 92-93% 16 points - 90-91% 15 points - 88-89% 14 points - 86-87% 13 points - 85% 12 points - 83-84% 11 points - 81-82% 10 points - 78-80% 9 points - 75-77%
Developing (3 - 8 points) Results are below District- or BOCES-adopted expectations for growth or achievement for grade/subject.	8 points - 73-74% 7 points - 71-72% 6 points - 69-70% 5 points - 67-68% 4 points - 66% 3 points - 65%
Ineffective (0 - 2 points) Results are well below District- or BOCES-adopted expectations for growth or achievement for grade/subject.	2 points - 55-64% 1 point - 45-54% 0 points - 0-44%

### 3.9) High School Science

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

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

	Locally-Selected Measure from List of Approved Measures	Assessment
Living Environment	6(ii) School wide measure computed locally	Regents assessments in Global, Living Environment, ELA, US history, Integrated Algebra
Earth Science	6(ii) School wide measure computed locally	Regents assessments in Global, Living Environment, ELA, US history, Integrated Algebra
Chemistry	6(ii) School wide measure computed locally	Regents assessments in Global, Living Environment, ELA, US history, Integrated Algebra
Physics	6(ii) School wide measure computed locally	Regents assessments in Global, Living Environment, ELA, US history, Integrated Algebra

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.	HEDI points will be allocated to all high school teachers based on the percent of students scoring 65 or better (or 55 or better for SWD and ELLs) on the applicable Regents Exams. The percentage of students meeting target on each Regents will be averaged equally.
Highly Effective (18-20 points) Results are well above District- or BOCES-adopted expectations for growth or achievement for grade/subject.	20 points - 98-100% 19 points - 96-97% 18 points - 94-95%
Developing (3 - 8 points) Results are below District- or BOCES-adopted expectations for growth or achievement for grade/subject.	8 points - 73-74% 7 points - 71-72% 6 points - 69-70% 5 points - 67-68% 4 points - 66% 3 points - 65%
Effective (9 - 17points) Results meet District- or BOCES-adopted expectations for growth or achievement for grade/subject.	17 points - 92-93% 16 points - 90-91% 15 points - 88-89% 14 points - 86-87% 13 points - 85% 12 points - 83-84% 11 points - 81-82% 10 points - 78-80% 9 points - 75-77%
Ineffective (0 - 2 points) Results are well below District- or BOCES-adopted expectations for growth or achievement for grade/subject.	2 points - 55-64% 1 point - 45-54% 0 points - 0-44%

### 3.10) High School Math

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

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

	Locally-Selected Measure from List of Approved Measures	Assessment
Algebra 1	6(ii) School wide measure computed locally	Regents assessments in Global, Living Environment, ELA, US history, Integrated Algebra
Geometry	6(ii) School wide measure computed locally	Regents assessments in Global, Living Environment, ELA, US history, Integrated Algebra
Algebra 2	6(ii) School wide measure computed locally	Regents assessments in Global, Living Environment, ELA, US history, Integrated Algebra

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.	HEDI points will be allocated to all high school teachers based on the percent of students scoring 65 or better (or 55 or better for SWD and ELLs) on the applicable Regents Exams. The percentage of students meeting target on each Regents will be averaged equally.
Highly Effective (18 - 20 points) Results are well above District- or BOCES-adopted expectations for growth or achievement for grade/subject.	20 points - 98-100% 19 points - 96-97% 18 points - 94-95%
Effective (9 - 17 points) Results meet District- or BOCES-adopted expectations for growth or achievement for grade/subject.	17 points - 92-93% 16 points - 90-91% 15 points - 88-89% 14 points - 86-87% 13 points - 85% 12 points - 83-84% 11 points - 81-82% 10 points - 78-80% 9 points - 75-77%
Developing (3 - 8 points) Results are below District- or BOCES-adopted expectations for growth or achievement for grade/subject.	8 points - 73-74% 7 points - 71-72% 6 points - 69-70% 5 points - 67-68% 4 points - 66% 3 points - 65%
Ineffective (0 - 2 points) Results are well below District- or BOCES-adopted expectations for growth or achievement for grade/subject.	2 points - 55-64% 1 point - 45-54% 0 points - 0-44%

### 3.11) High School English Language Arts

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

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

	Locally-Selected Measure from List of Approved Measures	Assessment
Grade 9 ELA	6(ii) School wide measure computed locally	Regents assessments in Global, Living Environment, ELA, US history, Integrated Algebra
Grade 10 ELA	6(ii) School wide measure computed locally	Regents assessments in Global, Living Environment, ELA, US history, Integrated Algebra
Grade 11 ELA	6(ii) School wide measure computed locally	Regents assessments in Global, Living Environment, ELA, US history, Integrated Algebra

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.	HEDI points will be allocated to all high school teachers based on the percent of students scoring 65 or better (or 55 or better for SWD and ELLs) on the applicable Regents Exams. The percentage of students meeting target on each Regents will be averaged equally.
Highly Effective (18 - 20 points) Results are well above District- or BOCES-adopted expectations for growth or achievement for grade/subject.	20 points - 98-100% 19 points - 96-97% 18 points - 94-95%
Effective (9 - 17 points) Results meet District- or BOCES-adopted expectations for growth or achievement for grade/subject.	17 points - 92-93% 16 points - 90-91% 15 points - 88-89% 14 points - 86-87% 13 points - 85% 12 points - 83-84% 11 points - 81-82% 10 points - 78-80% 9 points - 75-77%
Developing (3 - 8 points) Results are below District- or BOCES-adopted expectations for growth or achievement for grade/subject.	8 points - 73-74% 7 points - 71-72% 6 points - 69-70% 5 points - 67-68% 4 points - 66% 3 points - 65%
Ineffective (0 - 2 points) Results are well below District- or BOCES-adopted expectations for growth or achievement for grade/subject.	2 points - 55-64% 1 point - 45-54% 0 points - 0-44%

### 3.12) All Other Courses

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



6 points - 69-70%

5 points - 67-68%

4 points - 66%

3 points - 65%

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

For Grades 9-12

2 points - 55-64%

1 point - 45-54%

0 points - 0-44%

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/5139/128168-y92vNseFa4/APPR Chart 3.13\\_1.pdf](assets/survey-uploads/5139/128168-y92vNseFa4/APPR Chart 3.13_1.pdf)

### 3.14) Locally Developed Controls

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

*The scores of students in these subcategories (SWD, ELL, Poverty) are disproportionately affected by these mitigating variables. This chart serves to accommodate for these variables and support our district goal to increase student achievement.*

*Whenever possible it is district policy to assign students to teacher rosters in such ways as to create balance among all student subcategories and populations.*

*See 3.13*

### 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.

*NA*

### 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, June 04, 2012

Updated Monday, January 07, 2013

---

### Page 1

#### 4.1) Teacher Practice Rubric

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

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

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

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

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

(No response)

### 4.3) Survey Tools (if applicable)

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

(No response)

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

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

### 4.4) Assurances

Please check all of the boxes below:

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

### 4.5) Process for Assigning Points and Determining HEDI Ratings

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

*For each observation evidence will be collected using the NYSUT rubric. Each subcomponent will be rated on a scale of 1-4 at the conclusion of the year. (H=4, E=3, D=2, I=1) Highly effective 59-60, Effective 57-58, Developing 50-56, Ineffective 0-49. All subcomponents will be averaged for a final score that will be converted to the possible 60 points (see attached).*

*Although the rubric conversion to 60 points may involve decimals, the final computed score will be a whole number and in no instance will rounding cause a teacher to fall outside his/her HEDI band.*

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/5091/138658-eka9yMJ855/APPR NYSUT Conversion\_V2.pdf*

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.	A total score of 59-60 is Highly Effective.
Effective: Overall performance and results meet NYS Teaching Standards.	A total score of 57-58 is Effective.
Developing: Overall performance and results need improvement in order to meet NYS Teaching Standards.	A total score of 50-56 is Developing.
Ineffective: Overall performance and results do not meet NYS Teaching Standards.	A total score of 0-49 Ineffective.

Provide the ranges for the 60-point scoring bands.

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

#### 4.6) Observations of Probationary Teachers

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

By building principals or other trained administrators

4.6) Observations of Probationary Teachers   Formal/Long	2
4.6) Observations of Probationary Teachers   Informal/Short	1
4.6) Observations of Probationary Teachers   Enter Total	3

By trained in-school peer teachers or other trained reviewers

Formal/Long	0
Informal/Short	0

Independent evaluators

Formal/Long	0
-------------	---

Informal/Short	0
----------------	---

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

- 
- In Person
- 

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

- 
- In Person
- 

#### 4.7) Observations of Tenured Teachers

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

By building principals or other trained administrators

4.7) Observations of Tenured Teachers   Formal/Long	1
4.7) Observations of Tenured Teachers   Informal/Short	1
4.7) Observations of Tenured Teachers   Total	2

By trained in-school peer teachers or other trained reviewers

Formal/Long	0
Informal/Short	0

Independent evaluators

Formal/Long	0
Informal/Short	0

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

- 
- In Person
- 

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

- 
- In Person
-

# 5. Composite Scoring (Teachers)

Created Wednesday, June 27, 2012

Updated Wednesday, October 10, 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, June 04, 2012

Updated Tuesday, January 01, 2013

---

## Page 1

### 6.1) Assurances -- Improvement Plans

Please check the boxes below:

6.1) Assurances -- Improvement Plans   Assure that teachers who receive a Developing or Ineffective rating will receive a Teacher Improvement Plan (TIP) within 10 school days from the opening of classes in the school year following the performance year	Checked
6.1) Assurances -- Improvement Plans   Assure that TIP plans shall include: identification of needed areas of improvement, a timeline for achieving improvement, the manner in which the improvement will be assessed, and, where appropriate, differentiated activities to support a teacher's improvement in those areas	Checked

### 6.2) Attachment: Teacher Improvement Plan Forms

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

<assets/survey-uploads/5265/138664-Df0w3Xx5v6/TIP FORMS.pdf>

### 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:

#### *I. Appeals of Annual Professional Performance Reviews*

*To the extent that a teacher wishes to issue an appeal, the following appeals procedure is established.*

*I. Appeals will be limited to the following situations:*

- a. Probationary Teachers may submit a written rebuttal that will be attached to the APPR in the member's personnel file. Probationary teachers may not appeal the APPR.
- b. Any other teacher may appeal only an ineffective or developing APPR composite rating
- c. Any teacher may appeal an improvement plan if and only if the plan was generated as a result of an ineffective or developing composite rating, in accordance with Section II, e, below

II. The scope of any appeal will be limited to the following subjects:

- a. The substance of the individual's annual professional performance review
- b. The District's adherence to the standards and methodologies required for such review, pursuant to Education Law 3012-c
- c. The adherence to the Commissioner's regulations, as applicable to such reviews
- d. Compliance with any applicable locally negotiated procedures regarding annual professional performance reviews or improvement plans, as limited in Section I, above
- e. The District's issuance and/or implementation of the terms of the Teacher Improvement Plan under Education Law 3012-c in connection with an ineffective or developing rating

III. A teacher may not file multiple appeals regarding the same performance review or Teacher Improvement Plan. All grounds for appeal must be raised with specificity within one appeal. Any grounds not raised at the time the appeal is filed shall be deemed waived.

IV. In an appeal, the teacher has the burden of demonstrating a right to a relief requested and the burden of establishing the facts upon which petitioner seeks relief.

V. The following timelines will be strictly adhered to unless extended by mutual agreement. Any extensions will be done in a timely and expeditious manner according to SED Law 3012.c. Failure of the petitioner to meet a timeline will nullify the appeal; failure of the respondent to meet a timeline will allow movement of the appeal to the next level.

#### Level 1 – Evaluator

*(Informal)* Following a qualifying event, as defined in Sections I and II above, the teacher shall be entitled to schedule a follow-up meeting within five (5) days to informally discuss with the evaluator any and all related issues.

*(Formal)* If a teacher is challenging the issuance or implementation of a TIP, any appeal must be submitted to the evaluator in writing no later than ten (10) school days from the date when the teacher receives his/her Annual Professional Performance Review (If a teacher receives his/her Annual Professional Performance Review or Improvement Plan after the last day of school in June, the ten (10) day time limit begins when staff returns in September)

When filing an appeal, the teacher must submit a detailed written description of the specific grounds for the appeal as well as the performance review and/or improvement plan being challenged. Along with the appeal, all supporting documentation must be submitted, or specifically noted if pending. Any grounds for the appeal or any supporting documentation/information not submitted or noted at the time the appeal is filed shall not be considered.

Within ten (10) school days of receipt of an appeal, the evaluator responsible for the issue(s) being appealed must submit a detailed written response to the appeal. Along with the response, all supporting documentation must be submitted, or specifically noted if pending, as well as any additional documents or materials relevant to the response. Any supporting documentation/information not submitted or noted at the time the response is issued shall not be considered in the deliberations related to the resolution of the appeal. The teacher initiating the appeal, and the Teachers' Association President, shall receive copies of the response and any and all additional information submitted with the response.

#### Level 2 – Panel

Within five (5) school days of receipt of the Level 1 determination, if the teacher is not satisfied with such determination and if the Teachers' Association deems the appeal meritorious, the Association must submit the appeal to a bipartisan panel\* comprised of two (2) teacher representatives, two (2) administration representatives, and the Superintendent. The panel will be provided the entire appeals record; however, any information identifying the appellant or the evaluator will be redacted prior to receipt by the panel. Further, the anonymity of the panel members will be protected to the extent possible throughout this procedure.

Within five (5) school days of receipt of the Association's appeal, the panel will jointly conduct a paper review and deliberation of the matter, and will issue a written decision for resolution to the Teachers' Association President and the Superintendent of Schools or designee. The decision may be to deny the appeal, to sustain the appeal and grant the remedy sought, or to sustain the appeal and modify the remedy; further, reasoning for the decision, as well as dissenting opinions, if any, will be included with the decision. This will be a final and binding decision.

\*Upon ratification of this appeals procedure by both the Teachers' Association and the District, each party will designate eight

representatives as panelists. Those individuals will be provided training regarding APPR legislation and regulations. The teacher panelists will be taken from a pool of teachers (comprised of 2 from each building). No panelist will be taken from the same building as the appealing teacher.

VI. The entire appeals record will be part of the teacher's APPR.

VII. This appeals procedure constitutes the exclusive means for initiating, reviewing, and resolving any and all appeals within the scope for Sections I and II, above. A teacher may not resort to any other contractual grievance procedure for the resolution of these appeals, except as otherwise authorized by law.

VIII. Nothing in this appeals procedure will restrict the right of the district or the obligation of the teacher to proceed in accordance with otherwise standard practice, e.g., implementation of an improvement plan or denial/granting of tenure, for reasons other than performance, while the appeal is pending.

## 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.

### J. Duration and Nature of Training Provided to Evaluators and Lead Evaluators

The "lead evaluator" is the administrator who is primarily responsible for a teacher's APPR composite rating. 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 by the law and shall include application and use of teacher practice rubrics selected for use by the parties in evaluations.

To be deemed a district certified lead evaluator, one must successfully complete a training course, meeting the minimum requirements prescribed in the law and regulations.

All evaluators will receive on-going training on the following criteria:

1. NY 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 20-2.2 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 utilize 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 schools 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.

Administrators responsible for teacher evaluation will continue training on an annual basis through participation in the annual follow-up training for evaluators/lead evaluators provided by CEWW BOCES Network Team. This training will support the continued growth in understanding of the nine elements of performance review listed above. Administrators who complete the annual follow-up training will be re-certified as lead evaluators. The Board of Education designates the superintendent to ensure that lead evaluators participate in the initial year-long training for lead evaluators and then participate in on-going training on an annual basis for purposes of continued growth in understanding of the teacher performance evaluation process. The CEWW BOCES Network Team will be utilized to provide the initial training as well as the on-going annual training. The initial training for evaluators/lead evaluators and the annual training, thereafter, for purposes of continued growth, will maintain inter-rater reliability for evaluators over time.

Nothing herein shall be construed to prohibit an evaluator who is properly certified by the state as a school administrator from

*conducting classroom observations or school visits as part of an annual Professional Performance Review under Chapter 103 prior to completion of the training required by said chapter or the regulations there under, as long as such training is successfully completed prior to completion of the Annual Professional Performance review.*

## 6.5) Assurances -- Evaluators

Please check the boxes below:

- 
- Checked
- 

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

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

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

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

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

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

(7) use of the Statewide Instructional Reporting System

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

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

- 
- Checked
-

## 6.6) Assurances -- Teachers

Please check all of the boxes below:

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

## 6.7) Assurances -- Data

Please check all of the boxes below:

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

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

Created Tuesday, June 05, 2012

Updated Friday, December 21, 2012

## Page 1

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

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

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

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

PK-5
6-8
9-12
(No response)
(No response)
(No response)
(No response)

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

Please check the boxes below:

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

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

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

State assessments, *required if one exists*

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

List of State-approved 3rd party assessments

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

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

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

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

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

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

*(No response)*

## 7.4) Special Considerations for Comparable Growth Measures

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

Note: The only allowable controls or adjustments for Comparable Growth Measures are those used in State Growth measures, which

include: prior student achievement results, students with disabilities, English language learners, students in poverty, and, in the future, any other student-, classroom-, and school-level characteristics approved by the Board of Regents.

(No response)

## 7.5) Principals with More Than One Growth Measure

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

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

## 7.6) Assurances -- Comparable Growth Measures

Please check all of the boxes below:

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

# 8. Local Measures (Principals)

Created Tuesday, June 05, 2012

Updated Monday, January 07, 2013

---

## Page 1

### Locally-Selected Measures of Student Achievement or Growth

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

Grade Configuration	Locally-Selected Measure from List of Approved Measures	Assessment
K-5	(d) measures used by district for teacher evaluation	AIMSweb
6-8	(d) measures used by district for teacher evaluation	STAR Reading Enterprise and STAR Math Enterprise
9-12	(d) measures used by district for teacher evaluation	ELA, Integrated Algebra, Global Studies, Living Environment, US History Regents Exams

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

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

Use this box, if needed, to describe the process for assigning HEDI categories. If needed, you may upload a table or graphic below.	Please see attachment 8.1
Highly Effective (14 - 15 points) Results are well above District- or BOCES-adopted expectations for growth or achievement for grade/subject.	NA
Effective (8- 13 points) Results meet District- or BOCES-adopted expectations for growth or achievement for grade/subject.	NA
Developing (3 - 7 points) Results are below District- or BOCES-adopted expectations for growth or achievement for grade/subject.	NA
Ineffective (0 - 2 points) Results are well below District- or BOCES-adopted expectations for growth or achievement for grade/subject.	NA

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/5366/139060-qBFVOWF7fC/APPR 8.1 Chart\_revised.pdf

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

Grade Configuration	Locally-Selected Measure from List of Approved Measures	Assessment
		Not Applicable

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

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

Use this box, if needed, to describe the process for assigning HEDI categories. If needed, you may upload a table or graphic below.	Not Applicable
Highly Effective (18 - 20 points) Results are well above District- or BOCES-adopted expectations for growth or achievement for grade/subject.	Not Applicable
Effective (9- 17 points) Results meet District- or BOCES-adopted expectations for growth or achievement for grade/subject.	Not Applicable
Developing (3 - 8 points) Results are below District- or BOCES-adopted expectations for growth or achievement for grade/subject.	Not Applicable
Ineffective (0 - 2 points) Results are well below District- or BOCES-adopted expectations for growth or achievement for grade/subject.	Not Applicable

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

*(No response)*

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

*(No response)*

### 8.3) Locally Developed Controls

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

## 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.

NA

## 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 Saturday, October 06, 2012

Updated Monday, January 07, 2013

## Page 1

### 9.1) Principal Practice Rubric

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

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

*Multidimensional Principal Performance Rubric*

*(No response)*

### 9.2) Points Within Other Measures

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

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

Is the following points assignment for all principals?

*Yes*

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

*(No response)*

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

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

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

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

*(No response)*

### 9.3) Assurances -- Goals

Please check the boxes below (if applicable):

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

### 9.4) Sources of Evidence (if applicable)

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

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

### 9.5) Survey Tool(s) (if applicable)

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

*(No response)*

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

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

## 9.6) Assurances

Please check all of the boxes below:

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

## 9.7) Process for Assigning Points and Determining HEDI Ratings

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

*The district shall utilize the LCI Multidimensional rubric for principal evaluation as the basis for the 60 "Other" points allocated to measures of leadership and management. Using the rubric, the superintendent will indicate the descriptor (HEDI) for each item that best matches the principal's performance. Using a holistic approach, a HEDI rating shall then be determined for each domain and overall on the rubric. H=4, E=3, D=2, I=1. The six domains will be totaled for an overall rubric score out of 24. Based on the overall rating on the rubric, points will be assigned according to the ranges on the attached chart. Please refer to attached conversion chart.*

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

*assets/survey-uploads/5143/190248-pMADJ4gk6R/Administrator HEIDI Word 9.7 Revised.pdf*

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.	A total score of 59-60 is highly effective.
Effective: Overall performance and results meet standards.	A total score of 57-58 is effective.
Developing: Overall performance and results need improvement in order to meet standards.	A total score of 55-56 is developing.
Ineffective: Overall performance and results do not meet standards.	A total score of 0-54 is ineffective.

Please provide the locally-negotiated 60 point scoring bands.

Highly Effective	59-60
Effective	57-58
Developing	55-56
Ineffective	0-54

## 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 Wednesday, October 10, 2012

Updated Friday, December 21, 2012

---

## Page 1

### **Standards for Rating Categories**

#### **Growth or Comparable Measures**

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

#### **Other Measures of Effectiveness (Teacher and Leader standards)**

#### **Highly**

##### **Effective**

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

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

Overall performance and results exceed ISLLC leadership standards.

##### **Effective**

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

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

Overall performance and results meet ISLLC leadership standards.

##### **Developing**

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

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

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

##### **Ineffective**

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

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

Overall performance and results do not meet ISLLC leadership standards.

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

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

**2012-13 where there is no Value-Added measure**

**Growth or Comparable Measures**

**Locally-selected Measures of**

**growth or achievement**

**Other Measures of Effectiveness**

**(60 points)**

**Overall**

**Composite Score**

**Highly Effective**

**18-20**

**18-20**

**Ranges determined locally--see below**

**91-100**

**Effective**

**9-17**

**9-17**

**75-90**

**Developing**

**3-8**

**3-8**

**65-74**

**Ineffective**

**0-2**

**0-2**

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

Highly Effective	59-60
Effective	57-58
Developing	55-56
Ineffective	0-54

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

**2012-13 where Value-Added growth measure applies**

**Growth or Comparable Measures**

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

**Other Measures of Effectiveness**

**(60 points)**

**Overall**

**Composite Score**

**Highly Effective**

22-25

14-15

Ranges determined locally--see above

91-100

**Effective**

10-21

8-13

75-90

**Developing**

3-9

3-7

**65-74**

**Ineffective**

**0-2**

**0-2**

**0-64**

# 11. Additional Requirements - Principals

Created Tuesday, October 09, 2012

Updated Friday, January 04, 2013

## 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/5276/191786-Df0w3Xx5v6/APPR PIP.pdf](#)

### 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:

#### *SECTION VI: APPEAL PROCESS*

*Beekmantown Central School District  
Principal APPR Appeal Process*

*To the extent that a principal wishes to issue an appeal, the following appeals procedure is established:*

1. Appeals will be limited to the following situations:

- a. A principal completing the first year of a three-year probationary appointment may appeal only an ineffective APPR composite rating;
- b. Any other principal may appeal only an ineffective or a developing APPR composite rating; or any rating tied to compensation.
- c. Any principal may appeal an improvement plan if and only if the plan was generated as the result of an ineffective or developing composite rating, in accordance with Section II, e, below.

2. The scope of any appeal will be limited to the following subjects:

- a. The substance of the individual's annual professional performance review;
- b. The District's adherence to the standards and methodologies required for such reviews, pursuant to Education Law 3012-c;
- c. The adherence to the Commissioner's regulations, as applicable to such reviews;
- d. Compliance with any applicable locally negotiated procedures regarding annual professional performance reviews or improvement plans, as limited by Section I, above; or,
- e. The District's issuance and/or implementation of the terms of the principal improvement plan under Education Law 3012-c in connection with an ineffective or developing rating.

3. A principal may not file multiple appeals regarding the same performance review or principal improvement plan. All grounds for appeal must be raised with specificity within one appeal. Any grounds not raised at the time the appeal is filed shall be deemed waived.

4. In an appeal, the burden shall be on the district Principal to establish by the preponderance of the evidence that the rating given to the appellant was unjustified or that an improvement plan was inappropriately issued and/or implemented.

5. The following timelines will be strictly adhered to unless extended by mutual agreement. Any extensions will still be done in a timely and expeditious manner according to SED Law 3012.c. Failure of the petitioner to meet a timeline will nullify the appeal; failure of the respondent to meet a timeline will allow movement of the appeal to the next level:

#### *Level 1 - Superintendent*

- a. (Informal) Following a qualifying event, as defined in Sections I and II, above, the principal shall be encouraged and shall be entitled to schedule a follow up meeting to informally discuss with the superintendent any and all related issues.
- b. (Formal) Any appeal must be submitted to the superintendent in writing no later than ten (10) school days when the district offices are open of the date when the principal receives his/her annual professional performance review. If a principal is challenging the issuance or implementation of a principal improvement plan, the appeal must be submitted in writing within ten (10) school days of issuance or of the time when the principal knew or should have known of an alleged implementation breach of such plan.
- c. When filing an appeal, the principal must submit a detailed written description of the specific grounds for the appeal as well as the performance review and/or improvement plan being challenged. Along with the appeal, all supporting documentation must be submitted, or specifically noted if pending. Any grounds for appeal or any supporting documentation/information not submitted or noted at the time the appeal is filed shall not be considered.
- d. Within ten (10) school days when the district offices are open of receipt of an appeal, the superintendent must submit a detailed written response to the appeal. Along with the response, all supporting documentation must be submitted, or specifically noted if pending, as well as any additional documents or materials relevant to the response. Any supporting documentation/ information not submitted or noted at the time the response is issued shall not be considered in the deliberations related to the resolution of the appeal. The principal initiating the appeal, and the Principals' Association President, shall receive copies of the response and any and all additional information submitted with the response.

#### *Level 2 – Panel*

- a. Within five (5) school days when school is in session of receipt of the Level 1 determination, if the teacher principal is not satisfied with such determination and if the Administrative Association deems the appeal meritorious, the Association must submit the appeal to a bipartisan panel\* comprised of two (2) administrative representatives, three (3) BOE representatives. The panel will be provided the entire appeals record; however, any information identifying the appellant or the evaluator will be redacted prior to receipt by the panel. Further, the anonymity of the panel members will be protected to the extent possible throughout this procedure.
- b. Within five (5) school days of receipt of the Association's appeal, the panel will jointly conduct a paper review and deliberation of the matter, and will issue a written decision for resolution to the Administrative Association President and the Superintendent of Schools or designee. The decision may be to deny the appeal, to sustain the appeal and grant the remedy sought, or to sustain the appeal and modify the remedy; further, reasoning for the decision, as well as dissenting opinions, if any will be included with the decision. This will be a final and binding decision.

Each party will designate five (5) representatives as panelists. Those The Administrators' Association representatives individuals will

*be provided training regarding APPR legislation and regulations to the Administrator representatives.*

*6. The entire appeals record will be part of the principal's APPR.*

*7. This appeals procedure constitutes the exclusive means for initiating, reviewing, and resolving any and all appeals within the scope of Sections I and II, above. A principal may not resort to any other contractual grievance procedure for the resolution of these appeals, except as otherwise authorized by law.*

*Nothing in this appeals procedure will restrict the right of the district or the obligation of the principal to proceed in accordance with otherwise standard practice, e.g., implementation of an improvement plan or denial/granting of tenure for reasons other than performance, while an appeal is pending.*

## 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.

### *Certification for Lead Evaluators*

*Lead Evaluators must show evidence of training within all nine Lead Evaluator training criteria in order to receive district certification as a Lead Evaluator. Administrators must be certified by their district as a Lead Evaluator prior to concluding a teacher APPR and assigning a composite score.*

*Lead evaluators will receive training by certified trainers provided from CVES and FEH BOCES. (See following)*

*Also, calibration training will be conducted annually to assure inter-rater reliability to re-certify evaluators and lead evaluators.*

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

*(CVES) Champlain Valley Educational Services  
(FEH) Franklin-Essex-Herkimer Educational Services*

#### *Aligned Professional Development Date*

*Teacher Evaluator Training - Days 1 8/16-17/11 (CVES)*

- NYS Teaching Standards - Wisdom of Practice 8/22-23/11 (FEH)*
- Connecting NYS Approved Rubrics to NYS 11/14-15/11 (CVES)*

*Teaching Standards 6/26-27/12(CVES)*

*Teacher Evaluator Training - Day 3*

- Utilizing the NYSUT or Pearson rubric to 11/29/11 (CVES)*

*connect evidence to the NYS Teaching 12/12/11 (CVES)*

*Standards 3/22/12 (FEH)*

*7/17/12 (CVES)*

*Teacher Evaluator Training - Days 4 5 2/2 - 3/12 (CVES)*

- Unpacking the NYSUT or Pearson rubric 2/13 -14/12 (CVES)*
- Overview of Teacher Evaluation and 3/23 4/4/12 (FEH)*

*Development Handbook 7/17-18/12 (CVES)*

*2. Evidence-based observation techniques that are grounded in research.*

#### *Aligned Professional Development Date*

*Teacher Evaluator Training - Day 2 8/17/11 (CVES)*

- Evidence versus Opinion - Understanding 8/23/11 (FEH)*

*your own bias 11/15/11 (CVES)*

*6/27/12 (CVES)*

*Teacher Evaluator Training - Day 3 11/29/11 (CVES)*

- Teacher Evaluation Concepts and Gathering 12/12/11 (CVES)*

*Evidence 3/22/12 (FEH)*

*1/11/12 (CVES)*

*Teacher Evaluator Training - Days 4 5 2/2 - 3/12 (CVES)*

*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.*

*Aligned Professional Development Date*

*Teacher Evaluator Training - Day 6 3/19/12 (CVES)*

*• NYS Teacher and Principal Evaluation 4/4/12 (CVES)*

*2012-13 and Beyond - Summary of 5/21/12 (FEH)*

*Revised APPR Provisions - The Purple 7/18/12 (CVES)*

*Memo*

*• SLO Overview - 20 points Growth 5/8/12 (CVES)*

*and 20 Points Local 5/11/12 (FEH)*

*SLO Development Training*

*• Review of Purple Memo*

*• Teacher Evaluation Road Map*

*• SLO Elements and Template*

*• HEDI Ratings*

*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*

*Aligned Professional Development Date*

*Teacher Evaluator Training - Day 2*

*• Connecting NYS Approved Rubrics to NYS 8/17/11 (CVES)*

*Teaching Standards 8/23/11 (FEH)*

*11/15/11 (CVES) 6/27/12*

*(CVES)*

*Teacher Evaluator Training - Day 3 11/29/11 (CVES)*

*• Continuous Improvement Map - Where 12/12/11 (CVES)*

*you are and where you want to be on the 3/22/12 (FEH)*

*NYSUT or Pearson rubric 7/17/12 (CVES)*

*Teacher Evaluator Training - Days 4 5*

*• Unpacking the Rubric 2/2 - 3/12 (CVES)*

*• Evidence-Based Observation Practice 2/13 - 14/12 (CVES)*

*3/23 4/4/12 (FEH)*

*7/17-18/12 (CVES)*

*5. Application and use of any assessment tools that the school district or BOCES utilize 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.*

*Aligned Professional Development Date*

*Teacher Evaluator Training - Day 1 8/16/11 (CVES)*

*• Data Driven Instruction - Reporting 8/22/11 (FEH)*

*Tools 11/14/11(CVES)*

*6/26/12 (CVES)*

*Teacher Evaluator Training - Day 3*

*• Documentation Review - Organizing 11/29/11 (CVES)*

*and Analyzing Teacher Evaluation Data 12/12/11 (CVES)*

*3/22/12 (FEH)*

*7/17/12 (CVES)*

*Teacher Evaluator Training - Day 4 2/2/12 (CVES)*

- *District Rules on SLOs 2/13/12 (CVES)  
3/23/12 (FEH)*

- *District Assessment Chart 7/18/12 (CVES)*

*Teacher Evaluator Training - Day 6 3/19/12 (CVES)  
4/4/12 (CVES) 5/21/12 (FEH)*

- *Student Learning Objectives - Evidence 7/18/12 (CVES)  
(pre-and post-tests) baseline, targets,  
and HEDI)*

*Individuals may reference Data Council Meetings (CVES)  
or CIO Meetings with NERIC (FEH and CVES)*

*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.*

*Aligned Professional Development Date*

*Teacher Evaluator Training - Day 6 3/19/12 (CVES)*

- *NYS Teacher and Principal Evaluation 4/4/12 (CVES) 5/21/12 (FEH)  
2012-13 and Beyond - Summary of 7/18/12 (CVES)  
Revised APPR Provisions - The Purple 5/8/12 (CVES) 5/11/12 (FEH)  
Memo*

*• SLO Overview - 20 points Growth  
and 20 Points Local SLO*

*Development Training*

- *Review of Purple Memo*
- *Teacher Evaluation Road Map*
- *SLO Elements and Template*
- *HEDI Ratings*

*9. Specific considerations in evaluating teachers and principals of English language learners and students with disabilities.*

*Aligned Professional Development Date*

*Teacher Evaluator Training - Day 8 3/21/12 CVES)*

- *Observe and Collect Evidence of an 4/5/12(CVES)  
ESL lesson 6/8/12 (FEH)*
- *Research-Based Practices for Teaching 8/8/12 (CVES)  
Students Performing Below Grade Level 8/23/12 (CVES)  
and Students with Disabilities*

*\*\* While not listed as a training component, districts will need to ensure inter-rater reliability for both their teacher and principal evaluation systems.*

- *Inter-Rater Reliability Training - NYSUT 8/13-15/12*  
*Rubric (CVES and FEH)*

## 11.5) Assurances -- Evaluators

Please check the boxes below:

- 
- Checked
- 

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

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

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

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

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

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

(7) use of the Statewide Instructional Reporting System

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

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

- 
- Checked
- 

## 11.6) Assurances -- Principals

Please check all of the boxes below:

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

## 11.7) Assurances -- Data

Please check all of the boxes below:

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

## 12. Joint Certification of APPR Plan

Created Wednesday, November 28, 2012

Updated Tuesday, January 08, 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/5581/254304-3Uqgn5g9Iu/Certification Form - District.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.

**Rationale:**

The scores of students in these subcategories (SWD, ELL, & Poverty) are disproportionately affected by these mitigating variables. This chart serves to accommodate for these variables and support our district goal to increase student achievement.

Whenever possible it is district policy to assign students to teacher rosters in such ways as to create balance among all student subcategories and populations.

**Classroom/Learning Factors**

- A point value will be added to the local score or non-state generated score for each teacher who has SWD, ELL, and/or students with poverty identifiers.
- Using verified class/district roster(s) of students, the teacher and principal will use the chart below when identifying the point value added.

<b><u>% of SWD,ELL, Poverty</u></b>	<b>Pts added to APPR local and state APPR score</b>
No SWD or ELL	0 pts
1-10%	.25
10.01-20%	.50
20.01-40%	.75
40.01-50%	1.0
50.01-60%	1.25
60.01-70%	1.50
70.01-80%	1.75
80.01-90%	1.87
90.01-100%	2.0

- To use for individual teacher scores:
  1. Find the percentage of students for the teacher’s load with SWD, ELL, or poverty identifiers.
  2. Use chart to determine points to be added to the local (20/15) and growth scores (20/25) not generated by the state
  3. Apply point value to one or both final scores
- To use for school wide scores:
  1. Find the building wide percentage of students with SWD, ELL, or poverty identifiers.
  2. Use chart to determine points to be added to the local (20/15) and growth scores (20/25) not generated by the state
  3. Apply point value to one or both final scores
- The maximum allowable increase for this chart will be no more than 2 points. This will be added at the end of the evaluation process and although this chart may involve decimals, the final computed score will be a whole number.

## AIMSweb Step By Step Process

### Mapping Students' Native Scores to Teacher and Principal Evaluation Metric

#### Universal Screening: Occurs in Fall, Winter, and Spring

*The first three steps in this procedure involve administering the AIMSweb measure and accessing the student's raw score on the assessment.*

#### Step 1 Establishing an Independent Examiner and/or Scorer

For AIMSweb Reading Curriculum-Based Measurement, Test of Early Literacy, and Test of Early Numeracy—which are administered *individually* to students—the school or LEA will provide an independent examiner. Typically a classroom teacher administers and scores these measures, but criteria for the Teacher and Principal evaluation require an educator other than the classroom teacher or principal being evaluated to administer and score the measures. The other AIMSweb measures, which are group administered, could either be given by the teacher but scored by an independent scorer in accord with NYS APPR guidelines or administered and scored by an independent examiner.

#### Step 2 Administering and Scoring the Measure

- Group administration (Spelling, Written Expression, M-CAP, and M-COMP)

For group-administered measures, the teacher or other examiner will administer the measure to an entire class at one time. Each student will write his or her responses on a printed test form or test booklet. After the completed test materials are collected, the independent examiner will score the measures using the scoring criteria provided in each measure's Administration and Scoring manual. After completing the scoring, the examiner will enter the raw scores online (see below).

- Individual administration (Reading-CBM, Test of Early Literacy, Test of Early Numeracy, and MIDE [Spanish Early Literacy])

Each of these measures is administered one-on-one to a student by an independent examiner. Either the paper-and-pencil or Browser-based Scoring method may be used.

- Paper-and-pencil

The independent examiner will present the test material (either with a printed page or through oral presentation) to the student and will record the student's correct and incorrect responses on a printed answer key as the student completes the task. After administration, the examiner will calculate the student's raw score and will enter the raw score online (see below).

- Browser-based Scoring

The independent examiner and the student will be situated so that the AIMSweb input screen is not visible to the student. The Manager of the account will have

## AIMSweb Step By Step Process

### Mapping Students' Native Scores to Teacher and Principal Evaluation Metric

already uploaded student rosters and created logins for the independent examiners. The independent examiner will login to the AIMSweb system, view the Class list, and select the "Access now" link for a particular student. This accesses the Browser Scoring option for the assessment. The student will read the test content on a printed form or hear the test stimulus spoken by the examiner (depending on the measure) and will respond orally. The examiner will record the student's responses as they are given by clicking on the input screen. After administering the measure, the independent examiner will return to the Class list online.

#### Step 3 Accessing the Scoring System

If the examiner is not using Browser-based Scoring, the examiner will enter the raw score online. The Manager of the account will have already uploaded student rosters and created logins for the independent examiners. The independent examiner will login to the AIMSweb system, view the Class list, and select the "Access now" link for a particular student to enter the raw score.

If the examiner is using Browser-based Scoring, the score will automatically be uploaded at the completion of the test administration.

#### Step 4 Calculating Rate of Improvement (ROI)

Each student's rate of improvement (ROI) and growth percentile on an AIMSweb measure would be computed in four steps.

1. **Subtracting the fall screening raw score from the spring screening raw score;**
2. **Dividing the result by 36 weeks and rounding to 2 decimal places;**
3. **Converting the result to a growth (ROI) percentile rank using AIMSweb growth norms; and**
4. **Converting the growth percentile to a point value to be used in calculating the educator evaluation score.**

*For a school that conducts AIMSweb universal screening (benchmarking) during fall, winter, and spring, the following procedure would be used to map students' native scores for growth to metrics for educator evaluation.*

If a student lacks a fall or a spring score, ROI would be computed by subtracting the fall raw score from the winter raw score or the winter raw score from the spring raw score. The result is then divided by 18 weeks.

## AIMSweb Step By Step Process

### Mapping Students' Native Scores to Teacher and Principal Evaluation Metric

Here's an example of how to do the calculation from the student's raw scores to an evaluation score for the educator, for a Grade 3 student being assessed with Reading-CBM.

1. A student's raw score on the fall benchmark might be 95 (58<sup>th</sup> percentile on National Norms) followed by a raw score of 140 on the spring benchmark (64<sup>th</sup> percentile). Subtracting the fall score from the spring score gives a result of 45.

$$140 - 95 = 45$$

2. This result is divided by 36, providing an answer of 1.25 for the student's ROI.

$$45/36 = 1.25 \text{ as student's ROI}$$

3. From the AIMSweb growth norms, each student's ROI is converted to a national percentile rank.

$$1.25 = 65^{\text{th}} \text{ percentile for student growth (per AIMSweb growth norms)}$$

That is, this student improved faster than about two-thirds of Grade 3 students whose initial (fall) score was at a similar level.

**Note: the AIMSweb data management system makes these calculations for you.**

4. The student's growth percentile is converted to a point value as shown in the "crosswalk" below.

Student Growth Percentile	Points	
	0-20 scale	0-15 scale
80-99	20	15
60-79	15	11.25
40-59	10	7.5
20-39	5	3.75
1-19	0	0

### Step 5 Finding the Educator Evaluation Score

The teacher's evaluation score would be the average point value for students in the class.

Find the average point value for students in the class by

1. Summing the individual students' point values,
2. Dividing by the number of students, and
3. Rounding to one decimal place.

This recommended mapping method applies to principals as well as to teachers. For a principal, the evaluation score would be the average point score for all the students in the school.

## AIMSweb Step By Step Process

### Mapping Students' Native Scores to Teacher and Principal Evaluation Metric

#### Step 6 Interpreting the Educator Evaluation Score

This educator score has a possible range from 0 (if all students' ROIs are in the bottom 20% of national norms) to 20 or 15 (if all students have ROIs in the top 20%). The educator score can be interpreted by referring to the associated percentile ranges in the crosswalk table above.

**For example, a teacher score of 11.8 would indicate that ROIs for this educator's students tend to be somewhat above the national average.**

*This procedure would allow for the possibility of being based on New York State data in the future, if sufficient AIMSweb screening data are collected from the state to support the construction of state-specific growth norms.*

For teacher evaluation, AIMSweb measures that are individually administered (Reading Curriculum-Based Measurement, Tests of Early Literacy, and Test of Early Numeracy) would be given by an independent examiner. The other AIMSweb measures, which are group administered, could either be given by the teacher but scored by an independent scorer in accord with NYS APPR guidelines or administered and scored by an independent examiner.

Beekmantown Middle School Grades 6, 7, and 8  
STAR Reading Enterprise and Star Math Enterprise HEDI Conversion Scale

Highly Effective		Effective						Developing					Ineffective		
15	14	13	12	11	10	9	8	7	6	5	4	3	2	1	0
100-92%	91-85%	84-80%	79-75%	74-71%	70-68%	67-64%	63-61%	60-58%	57-55%	54-52%	51-50%	49-48%	47-46%	45-42%	41-0%

The percentages above reflect the number of students who made one year's growth (defined as at least 10 months), or are at or above grade level at year's end.

Monthly Growth	Percentage
.1	10%
.2	20%
.3	30%
.4	40%
.5	50%
.6	60%
.7	70%
.8	80%
.9	90%
1 year	100%

**Rationale:**

The scores of students in these subcategories (SWD, ELL, & Poverty) are disproportionately affected by these mitigating variables. This chart serves to accommodate for these variables and support our district goal to increase student achievement.

Whenever possible it is district policy to assign students to teacher rosters in such ways as to create balance among all student subcategories and populations.

**Classroom/Learning Factors**

- A point value will be added to the local score or non-state generated score for each teacher who has SWD, ELL, and/or students with poverty identifiers.
- Using verified class/district roster(s) of students, the teacher and principal will use the chart below when identifying the point value added.

<u>% of SWD,ELL, Poverty</u>	<b>Pts added to APPR local and state APPR score</b>
No SWD or ELL	0 pts
1-10%	.25
10.01-20%	.50
20.01-40%	.75
40.01-50%	1.0
50.01-60%	1.25
60.01-70%	1.50
70.01-80%	1.75
80.01-90%	1.87
90.01-100%	2.0

- To use for individual teacher scores:
  1. Find the percentage of students for the teacher’s load with SWD, ELL, or poverty identifiers.
  2. Use chart to determine points to be added to the local (20/15) and growth scores (20/25) not generated by the state
  3. Apply point value to one or both final scores
- To use for school wide scores:
  1. Find the building wide percentage of students with SWD, ELL, or poverty identifiers.
  2. Use chart to determine points to be added to the local (20/15) and growth scores (20/25) not generated by the state
  3. Apply point value to one or both final scores
- The maximum allowable increase for this chart will be no more than 2 points. This will be added at the end of the evaluation process and although this chart may involve decimals, the final computed score will be a whole number.

	POINTS	
Student Growth Percentile	0-20 Scale	0-15 Scale
96-99	20	15
92-95	19	14
88-91	18	14
84-87	17	13
80-83	16	12
76-79	15	11
72-75	14	11
68-71	13	10
64-67	12	9
60-63	11	8
56-59	10	8
52-55	9	7
48-51	8	6
44-47	7	5
40-43	6	5
36-39	5	4
32-35	4	3
28-31	3	2
24-27	2	2
20-23	1	1
1-19	0	0

## AIMSweb Step By Step Process

### Mapping Students' Native Scores to Teacher and Principal Evaluation Metric

#### Universal Screening: Occurs in Fall, Winter, and Spring

*The first three steps in this procedure involve administering the AIMSweb measure and accessing the student's raw score on the assessment.*

#### Step 1 Establishing an Independent Examiner and/or Scorer

For AIMSweb Reading Curriculum-Based Measurement, Test of Early Literacy, and Test of Early Numeracy—which are administered *individually* to students—the school or LEA will provide an independent examiner. Typically a classroom teacher administers and scores these measures, but criteria for the Teacher and Principal evaluation require an educator other than the classroom teacher or principal being evaluated to administer and score the measures. The other AIMSweb measures, which are group administered, could either be given by the teacher but scored by an independent scorer in accord with NYS APPR guidelines or administered and scored by an independent examiner.

#### Step 2 Administering and Scoring the Measure

- Group administration (Spelling, Written Expression, M-CAP, and M-COMP)

For group-administered measures, the teacher or other examiner will administer the measure to an entire class at one time. Each student will write his or her responses on a printed test form or test booklet. After the completed test materials are collected, the independent examiner will score the measures using the scoring criteria provided in each measure's Administration and Scoring manual. After completing the scoring, the examiner will enter the raw scores online (see below).

- Individual administration (Reading-CBM, Test of Early Literacy, Test of Early Numeracy, and MIDE [Spanish Early Literacy])

Each of these measures is administered one-on-one to a student by an independent examiner. Either the paper-and-pencil or Browser-based Scoring method may be used.

- Paper-and-pencil

The independent examiner will present the test material (either with a printed page or through oral presentation) to the student and will record the student's correct and incorrect responses on a printed answer key as the student completes the task. After administration, the examiner will calculate the student's raw score and will enter the raw score online (see below).

- Browser-based Scoring

The independent examiner and the student will be situated so that the AIMSweb input screen is not visible to the student. The Manager of the account will have

## AIMSweb Step By Step Process

### Mapping Students' Native Scores to Teacher and Principal Evaluation Metric

already uploaded student rosters and created logins for the independent examiners. The independent examiner will login to the AIMSweb system, view the Class list, and select the "Access now" link for a particular student. This accesses the Browser Scoring option for the assessment. The student will read the test content on a printed form or hear the test stimulus spoken by the examiner (depending on the measure) and will respond orally. The examiner will record the student's responses as they are given by clicking on the input screen. After administering the measure, the independent examiner will return to the Class list online.

#### Step 3 Accessing the Scoring System

If the examiner is not using Browser-based Scoring, the examiner will enter the raw score online. The Manager of the account will have already uploaded student rosters and created logins for the independent examiners. The independent examiner will login to the AIMSweb system, view the Class list, and select the "Access now" link for a particular student to enter the raw score.

If the examiner is using Browser-based Scoring, the score will automatically be uploaded at the completion of the test administration.

#### Step 4 Calculating Rate of Improvement (ROI)

Each student's rate of improvement (ROI) and growth percentile on an AIMSweb measure would be computed in four steps.

1. **Subtracting the fall screening raw score from the spring screening raw score;**
2. **Dividing the result by 36 weeks and rounding to 2 decimal places;**
3. **Converting the result to a growth (ROI) percentile rank using AIMSweb growth norms; and**
4. **Converting the growth percentile to a point value to be used in calculating the educator evaluation score.**

*For a school that conducts AIMSweb universal screening (benchmarking) during fall, winter, and spring, the following procedure would be used to map students' native scores for growth to metrics for educator evaluation.*

If a student lacks a fall or a spring score, ROI would be computed by subtracting the fall raw score from the winter raw score or the winter raw score from the spring raw score. The result is then divided by 18 weeks.

## AIMSweb Step By Step Process

### Mapping Students' Native Scores to Teacher and Principal Evaluation Metric

Here's an example of how to do the calculation from the student's raw scores to an evaluation score for the educator, for a Grade 3 student being assessed with Reading-CBM.

1. A student's raw score on the fall benchmark might be 95 (58<sup>th</sup> percentile on National Norms) followed by a raw score of 140 on the spring benchmark (64<sup>th</sup> percentile).  
Subtracting the fall score from the spring score gives a result of 45.

$$140 - 95 = 45$$

2. This result is divided by 36, providing an answer of 1.25 for the student's ROI.

$$45/36 = 1.25 \text{ as student's ROI}$$

3. From the AIMSweb growth norms, each student's ROI is converted to a national percentile rank.

$$1.25 = 65^{\text{th}} \text{ percentile for student growth (per AIMSweb growth norms)}$$

That is, this student improved faster than about two-thirds of Grade 3 students whose initial (fall) score was at a similar level.

**Note: the AIMSweb data management system makes these calculations for you.**

4. The student's growth percentile is converted to a point value as shown in the "crosswalk" below.

Student Growth Percentile	Points	
	0-20 scale	0-15 scale
80-99	20	15
60-79	15	11.25
40-59	10	7.5
20-39	5	3.75
1-19	0	0

### Step 5 Finding the Educator Evaluation Score

The teacher's evaluation score would be the average point value for students in the class.

Find the average point value for students in the class by

1. Summing the individual students' point values,
2. Dividing by the number of students, and
3. Rounding to one decimal place.

This recommended mapping method applies to principals as well as to teachers. For a principal, the evaluation score would be the average point score for all the students in the school.

## AIMSweb Step By Step Process

### Mapping Students' Native Scores to Teacher and Principal Evaluation Metric

#### Step 6 Interpreting the Educator Evaluation Score

This educator score has a possible range from 0 (if all students' ROIs are in the bottom 20% of national norms) to 20 or 15 (if all students have ROIs in the top 20%). The educator score can be interpreted by referring to the associated percentile ranges in the crosswalk table above.

**For example, a teacher score of 11.8 would indicate that ROIs for this educator's students tend to be somewhat above the national average.**

*This procedure would allow for the possibility of being based on New York State data in the future, if sufficient AIMSweb screening data are collected from the state to support the construction of state-specific growth norms.*

For teacher evaluation, AIMSweb measures that are individually administered (Reading Curriculum-Based Measurement, Tests of Early Literacy, and Test of Early Numeracy) would be given by an independent examiner. The other AIMSweb measures, which are group administered, could either be given by the teacher but scored by an independent scorer in accord with NYS APPR guidelines or administered and scored by an independent examiner.

**Rationale:**

The scores of students in these subcategories (SWD, ELL, & Poverty) are disproportionately affected by these mitigating variables. This chart serves to accommodate for these variables and support our district goal to increase student achievement.

Whenever possible it is district policy to assign students to teacher rosters in such ways as to create balance among all student subcategories and populations.

**Classroom/Learning Factors**

- A point value will be added to the local score or non-state generated score for each teacher who has SWD, ELL, and/or students with poverty identifiers.
- Using verified class/district roster(s) of students, the teacher and principal will use the chart below when identifying the point value added.

<u>% of SWD,ELL, Poverty</u>	<b>Pts added to APPR local and state APPR score</b>
No SWD or ELL	0 pts
1-10%	.25
10.01-20%	.50
20.01-40%	.75
40.01-50%	1.0
50.01-60%	1.25
60.01-70%	1.50
70.01-80%	1.75
80.01-90%	1.87
90.01-100%	2.0

- To use for individual teacher scores:
  1. Find the percentage of students for the teacher’s load with SWD, ELL, or poverty identifiers.
  2. Use chart to determine points to be added to the local (20/15) and growth scores (20/25) not generated by the state
  3. Apply point value to one or both final scores
- To use for school wide scores:
  1. Find the building wide percentage of students with SWD, ELL, or poverty identifiers.
  2. Use chart to determine points to be added to the local (20/15) and growth scores (20/25) not generated by the state
  3. Apply point value to one or both final scores
- The maximum allowable increase for this chart will be no more than 2 points. This will be added at the end of the evaluation process and although this chart may involve decimals, the final computed score will be a whole number.

	POINTS	
Student Growth Percentile	0-20 Scale	0-15 Scale
96-99	20	15
92-95	19	14
88-91	18	14
84-87	17	13
80-83	16	12
76-79	15	11
72-75	14	11
68-71	13	10
64-67	12	9
60-63	11	8
56-59	10	8
52-55	9	7
48-51	8	6
44-47	7	5
40-43	6	5
36-39	5	4
32-35	4	3
28-31	3	2
24-27	2	2
20-23	1	1
1-19	0	0

**Rationale:**

The scores of students in these subcategories (SWD, ELL, & Poverty) are disproportionately affected by these mitigating variables. This chart serves to accommodate for these variables and support our district goal to increase student achievement.

Whenever possible it is district policy to assign students to teacher rosters in such ways as to create balance among all student subcategories and populations.

**Classroom/Learning Factors**

- A point value will be added to the local score or non-state generated score for each teacher who has SWD, ELL, and/or students with poverty identifiers.
- Using verified class/district roster(s) of students, the teacher and principal will use the chart below when identifying the point value added.

<u>% of SWD,ELL, Poverty</u>	<b>Pts added to APPR local and state APPR score</b>
No SWD or ELL	0 pts
1-10%	.25
10.01-20%	.50
20.01-40%	.75
40.01-50%	1.0
50.01-60%	1.25
60.01-70%	1.50
70.01-80%	1.75
80.01-90%	1.87
90.01-100%	2.0

- To use for individual teacher scores:
  1. Find the percentage of students for the teacher’s load with SWD, ELL, or poverty identifiers.
  2. Use chart to determine points to be added to the local (20/15) and growth scores (20/25) not generated by the state
  3. Apply point value to one or both final scores
- To use for school wide scores:
  1. Find the building wide percentage of students with SWD, ELL, or poverty identifiers.
  2. Use chart to determine points to be added to the local (20/15) and growth scores (20/25) not generated by the state
  3. Apply point value to one or both final scores
- The maximum allowable increase for this chart will be no more than 2 points. This will be added at the end of the evaluation process and although this chart may involve decimals, the final computed score will be a whole number.

## Rubric Score to Sub-Component Conversion Chart

Total Average Rubric Score	Category	Conversion score for composite
<b>Ineffective 0-49</b>		
1.0		0
1.1		12
1.2		25
1.3		37
1.4		49
<b>Developing 50-56</b>		
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
<b>Effective 57-58</b>		
2.5		57
2.6		57.2
2.7		57.4
2.8		57.6
2.9		57.8
3		58
3.1		58
3.2		58
3.3		58
3.4		58
<b>Highly Effective 59-60</b>		
3.5		59
3.6		59.3
3.7		59.5
3.8		59.8
3.9		60
4		60

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

**High School Principal**

Use this box, if needed, to describe the process for assigning HEDI categories. If needed, you may upload a table or graphic online.	HEDI points will be allocated to a high school principal based on the percent of students scoring 65 or better (or 55 or better for SWD and ELLs) on the applicable Regents Exams.
Highly Effective (14 - 15 points) Results are well above District- or BOCES-adopted expectations for growth or achievement for grade/subject.	85-100% of students passing will result in a highly effective score.
Effective (8- 13 points) Results meet District- or BOCES-adopted expectations for growth or achievement for grade/subject.	61-84% of students passing will result in an effective score.
Developing (3 - 7 points) Results are below District- or BOCES-adopted expectations for growth or achievement for grade/subject.	48-60% of students passing will result in a developing score.
Ineffective (0 - 2 points) Results are well below District- or BOCES-adopted expectations for growth or achievement for grade/subject.	0-47% of students passing will result in an ineffective score.

<b>Highly Effective</b>		<b>Effective</b>						<b>Developing</b>					<b>Ineffective</b>		
15	14	13	12	11	10	9	8	7	6	5	4	3	2	1	0
100-92%	91-85%	84-80%	79-75%	74-71%	70-68%	67-64%	63-61%	60-58%	57-55%	54-52%	51-50%	49-48%	47-46%	45-42%	41-0%

## Middle School Principal

Use this box, if needed, to describe the process for assigning HEDI categories. If needed, you may upload a table or graphic online.	HEDI points will be allocated to a middle school principal based upon the percentage of students who make one year's growth (defined as at least 10 months), or are at or above grade level at years end on STAR Reading Enterprise and STAR Math Enterprise. The percentage of students meeting growth at each grade level on each component (6 in total) will be averaged together.
Highly Effective (14 - 15 points) Results are well above District- or BOCES-adopted expectations for growth or achievement for grade/subject.	85-100% of students make one year's growth or are at or above grade level at year's end.
Effective (8- 13 points) Results meet District- or BOCES-adopted expectations for growth or achievement for grade/subject.	61-84% of students make one year's growth or are at or above grade level at year's end.
Developing (3 - 7 points) Results are below District- or BOCES-adopted expectations for growth or achievement for grade/subject.	48-60% of students make one year's growth or are at or above grade level at year's end.
Ineffective (0 - 2 points) Results are well below District- or BOCES-adopted expectations for growth or achievement for grade/subject.	0-47% of students make one year's growth or are at or above grade level at year's end.

Highly Effective		Effective						Developing					Ineffective		
15	14	13	12	11	10	9	8	7	6	5	4	3	2	1	0
100-92%	91-85%	84-80%	79-75%	74-71%	70-68%	67-64%	63-61%	60-58%	57-55%	54-52%	51-50%	49-48%	47-46%	45-42%	41-0%

## Elementary School Principal

Use this box, if needed, to describe the process for assigning HEDI categories. If needed, you may upload a table or graphic online.	HEDI points will be assigned to an elementary principal by 3 <sup>rd</sup> Party vendor AIMSweb utilizing mean growth scores. Please see second attachment for description of AIMSweb.
Highly Effective (14 - 15 points) Results are well above District- or BOCES-adopted expectations for growth or achievement for	HEDI points will be assigned to an elementary principal by 3 <sup>rd</sup> Party vendor AIMSweb utilizing mean growth scores. Please see second attachment for description of AIMSweb.

grade/subject.	
Effective (8- 13 points) Results meet District- or BOCES-adopted expectations for growth or achievement for grade/subject.	HEDI points will be assigned to an elementary principal by 3 <sup>rd</sup> Party vendor AIMSweb utilizing mean growth scores. Please see second attachment for description of AIMSweb.
Developing (3 - 7 points) Results are below District- or BOCES-adopted expectations for growth or achievement for grade/subject.	HEDI points will be assigned to an elementary principal by 3 <sup>rd</sup> Party vendor AIMSweb utilizing mean growth scores. Please see second attachment for description of AIMSweb.
Ineffective (0 - 2 points) Results are well below District- or BOCES-adopted expectations for growth or achievement for grade/subject.	HEDI points will be assigned to an elementary principal by 3 <sup>rd</sup> Party vendor AIMSweb utilizing mean growth scores. Please see second attachment for description of AIMSweb.

### **Adjustment for SWD, ELL, and Poverty**

#### **Rationale:**

The scores of students in these subcategories (SWD, ELL, & Poverty) are disproportionately affected by these mitigating variables. This chart serves to accommodate for these variables and support our district goal to increase student achievement.

#### **Building Learning Factors**

- A point value will be added to the local score or non-state generated score for each principal who has SWD, ELL, and/or students with poverty identifiers.
- Using verified building roster(s) of students, the principal will use the chart below when identifying the point value added.

90.01-100%	2.0
	<b>Pts added to</b>
<b>% of SWD,ELL, Poverty</b>	<b>APPR local and state APPR score</b>
No SWD or ELL	0 pts
1-10%	.25
10.01-20%	.50
20.01-40%	.75
40.01-50%	1.0
50.01-60%	1.25
60.01-70%	1.50
70.01-80%	1.75
80.01-90%	1.87

- To use for school wide scores:
  1. Find the building wide percentage of students with SWD, ELL, or poverty identifiers.
  2. Use chart to determine points to be added to the local (20/15) and growth scores (20/25) not generated by the state
  3. Apply point value to one or both final scores
  
- The maximum allowable increase for this chart will be no more than 2 points. This will be added at the end of the evaluation process and although this chart may involve decimals, the final computed score will be a whole number.

## Appendix D

### Beekmantown Teacher Improvement Plan (TIP)

The sole purpose of the TIP is the improvement of teaching practice. The goal is to provide resources and support for teachers who have been rated as “developing” or ineffective.” The evaluator and teacher will jointly determine the strategies to be undertaken to correct the deficiencies.

Teacher: \_\_\_\_\_

Grade/Subject: \_\_\_\_\_

Evaluator: \_\_\_\_\_

BTA Rep: \_\_\_\_\_

I waive my right to Association Representation

\_\_\_\_\_  
Teacher

\_\_\_\_\_  
BTA Rep

List the area(s) needed improvement. If there are several, indicate the priority order for addressing them.

Priority	Area needing improvement	Performance goal

Describe the plan for improvement with specific, measurable objectives, timelines and process the teacher must meet in order to achieve an effective rating.

Describe the professional development opportunities, materials, resources and supports the District will make available.

Assignment of a mentor teacher  yes  no

Name of Mentor: \_\_\_\_\_

The teacher, evaluator, mentor (if applicable) and an Association representative (if requested by the teacher) shall meet \_\_\_\_\_ to assess the effectiveness and appropriateness of the TIP in assisting the teacher to achieve the goals set forth in the TIP. Based on the outcome of this assessment, the TIP shall be modified accordingly.

Evaluator's Signature: \_\_\_\_\_

Date: \_\_\_\_\_

Teacher's Signature: \_\_\_\_\_

Date: \_\_\_\_\_

Meeting Dates				
---------------	--	--	--	--

Meeting Date \_\_\_\_\_

**Evaluator Comments:**

**Teacher Comments:**

-----

Meeting Date \_\_\_\_\_

**Evaluator Comments:**

**Teacher Comments:**

-----

Meeting Date \_\_\_\_\_

**Evaluator Comments:**

**Teacher Comments:**

-----

Meeting Date \_\_\_\_\_

**Evaluator Comments:**

**Teacher Comments:**

### **Recommendation for Results of TIP**

- The teacher has met the performance goals identified through the TIP.
- The teacher has not met the performance goals.

### **Next Steps:**

**Evaluator's Signature:** \_\_\_\_\_

**Date:** \_\_\_\_\_

**Teacher's Signature:** \_\_\_\_\_

**Date:** \_\_\_\_\_

Teacher's signature does not constitute agreement but merely signifies s/he has examined and discussed the material with the evaluator. Teachers shall have the right to insert written explanation or response to written feedback of the evaluator within ten (10) school days, which may be considered during the Appeals process.

**Beekmantown Central School District  
LCI Multidimensional Rubric Conversion**

<b>Holistic Rubric Performance Level</b>	<b>Holistic Domain HEDI Point Value</b>	<b>Domains Point Value Total Conversion to Overall Rating</b>
Highly Effective	4	23-24 = 60 20-22 = 59
Effective	3	17-19 = 58 15-16 = 57
Developing	2	12-14 = 56 10-11 = 55
Ineffective	1	9-8 = 54 7-6 = 53 5-4 = 52 3-2 = 51 1 = 0

***Principal Improvement Plan***

Principal's Name: \_\_\_\_\_ Position/Site: \_\_\_\_\_

Superintendent's Name: \_\_\_\_\_ School 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:

(Superintendent 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 upon the Principal's completion of the Principal Improvement Plan, including verification of the provision of support and resources as outlined above no later than 10 business days after the identified completion date. Such summary shall be signed by the superintendent or designee and principal with the opportunity for the principal to attach comments.

Superintendent's Signature / Date: \_\_\_\_\_

Principal's Signature / Date: \_\_\_\_\_

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

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

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

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

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

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

Signatures, dates

Superintendent Signature: Date:

*John A. Alamo* 1/8/13

Teachers Union President Signature: Date:

*Meggy P. Myers* 1/8/13

Administrative Union President Signature: Date:

*Guy B. Smith* 1/8/13

Board of Education President Signature: Date:

*Leonard Gray* 1/8/13