



THE STATE EDUCATION DEPARTMENT / THE UNIVERSITY OF THE STATE OF NEW YORK / ALBANY, NY 12234

COMMISSIONER OF EDUCATION
PRESIDENT OF THE UNIVERSITY OF THE STATE OF NEW YORK

September 18, 2012

David Quattrone, Superintendent
Bronxville UFSD
177 Pondfield Road
Bronxville, NY 10708

Dear Superintendent Quattrone:

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 certification 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.

Pursuant to Education Law §3012-c and Subpart 30-2, the Department will continue to work with districts to help ensure compliance with the statute and the regulations. We will be analyzing data supplied by districts, BOCES, and/or schools and may ask for 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. Please be advised that, if any provisions of your APPR plan violate the statute or the regulations, the Department reserves the right to require your district to correct and/or resolve such violations.

The Department looks 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

c: James Langlois

NOTE: 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.

Annual Professional Performance Reviews: 2012-13

Created Thursday, May 03, 2012

Updated Thursday, September 06, 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 : 660303030000

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

660303030000

1.2) School District Name: BRONXVILLE UFSD

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

BRONXVILLE UFSD

1.3) School Improvement Grant (SIG) Districts Only

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

(No response)

1.4) Award Classification

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

(No response)

1.5) Assurances

Please check all of the boxes below:

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

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

Re-submission to address deficiencies

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

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

Annual (2012-13)

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

Created Monday, June 11, 2012

Updated Thursday, September 06, 2012

Page 1

STATE-PROVIDED MEASURES OF STUDENT GROWTH

(25 points with an approved value-added measure)

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

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

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

2.1) Assurances

Please check the boxes below:

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

STUDENT LEARNING OBJECTIVES AS COMPARABLE GROWTH MEASURES (20 points)

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

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

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

If no State assessment or Regents exam exists:

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

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

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

State assessments, *required if one exists*

List of State-approved 3rd party assessments

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

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

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

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

2.2) Grades K-3 ELA

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

	ELA	Assessment
K	State-approved 3rd party assessment	NWEA MAP - Primary Grades
1	State-approved 3rd party assessment	NWEA MAP - Primary Grades
2	State-approved 3rd party assessment	NWEA MAP - Primary Grades

	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	For grades K-2, to assign teachers to HEDI categories, we will assume a normal distribution of teacher effects centered on 13.
--	--

subcomponent. If needed, you may upload a table or graphic at 2.11, below.	See attached description. For Grade 3 we will use the growth to mastery model and district standards. See attachment at 2.11 for how points are assigned within each HEDI category. For grade 3 we will use district standards based on the growth to mastery model.
Highly Effective (18 - 20 points) Results are well-above state average for similar students (or District goals if no state test).	Grades K-2: Teacher effects are greater than or equal to .9 standard deviations above average (13) Grade 3: At least 80% of students covered meet or exceed the district standard for progress based on Growth to Mastery Model.
Effective (9 - 17 points) Results meet state average for similar students (or District goals if no state test).	Grades K-2: Teacher effects are less than .9 standard deviations above average and greater than or equal to -.9 standard deviations below average. Grade 3: At least 55% of students covered meet or exceed the district standard for progress based on Growth to Mastery Model.
Developing (3 - 8 points) Results are below state average for similar students (or District goals if no state test).	Grades K-2: Teacher effects are less than -.9 standard deviations below average and greater than or equal to -2.1 standard deviations below average. Grade 3: Between 30% and 54% of students meet or exceed the district standard for progress based on Growth to Mastery Model.
Ineffective (0 - 2 points) Results are well-below state average for similar students (or District goals if no state test).	Grades K-2: Teacher effects are less than -2.1 standard deviations below average. Grade 3: Fewer than 30% of students meet or exceed the district standard for progress based on Growth to Mastery Model.

2.3) Grades K-3 Math

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

	Math	Assessment
K	State-approved 3rd party assessment	NWEA MAP for Primary Grades
1	State-approved 3rd party assessment	NWEA MAP for Primary Grades
2	State-approved 3rd party assessment	NWEA MAP for Primary Grades

	Math	Assessment
3	State assessment	3rd Grade State Assessment

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

Use this box, if needed, to describe the general process for assigning HEDI categories for these grades/subjects in this	For grades K-2, to assign teachers to HEDI categories, we will assume a normal distribution of teacher effects centered on 13.
--	--

subcomponent. If needed, you may upload a table or graphic at 2.11, below.	See attached description. For Grade 3 we will use the growth to mastery model and district standards. See attachment at 2.11 for how points are assigned within each HEDI category.
Highly Effective (18 - 20 points) Results are well-above state average for similar students (or District goals if no state test).	Grades K-2: Teacher effects are greater than or equal to .9 standard deviations above average (13) Grade 3: At least 80% of students covered meet or exceed the district standard for progress based on Growth to Mastery Model.
Effective (9 - 17 points) Results meet state average for similar students (or District goals if no state test).	Grades K-2: Teacher effects are less than .9 standard deviations above average and greater than or equal to -.9 standard deviations below average. Grade 3: At least 55% of students covered meet or exceed the district standard for progress based on Growth to Mastery Model.
Developing (3 - 8 points) Results are below state average for similar students (or District goals if no state test).	Grades K-2: Teacher effects are less than -.9 standard deviations below average and greater than or equal to -2.1 standard deviations below average. Grade 3: Between 30% and 54% of students meet or exceed the district standard for progress based on Growth to Mastery Model.
Ineffective (0 - 2 points) Results are well-below state average for similar students (or District goals if no state test).	Grades K-2: Teacher effects are less than -2.1 standard deviations below average. Grade 3: Fewer than 30% of students meet or exceed the district standard for progress based on Growth to Mastery Model.

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	District-developed grade 6 science assessment using course-wide SLOs.
7	District, regional or BOCES-developed assessment	District-developed grade 7 science assessment using course-wide SLOs.
	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.	See attachment at 2.11 for how points are assigned within each HEDI category.
---	---

Highly Effective (18 - 20 points) Results are well-above state average for similar students (or District goals if no state test).	At least 80% of students covered meet or exceed the district standard for progress based on Growth to Mastery Model.
Effective (9 - 17 points) Results meet state average for similar students (or District goals if no state test).	At least 55% of students covered meet or exceed the district standard for progress based on Growth to Mastery Model.
Developing (3 - 8 points) Results are below state average for similar students (or District goals if no state test).	Between 30% and 54% of students meet or exceed the district standard for progress based on Growth to Mastery Model.
Ineffective (0 - 2 points) Results are well-below state average for similar students (or District goals if no state test).	Fewer than 30% of students meet or exceed the district standard for progress based on Growth to Mastery Model.

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	District-developed grade 6 social studies assessment using course-wide SLOs.
7	District, regional or BOCES-developed assessment	District-developed grade 7 social studies assessment using course-wide SLOs.
8	District, regional or BOCES-developed assessment	District-developed grade 8 social studies assessment using course-wide SLOs.

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.	See attachment at 2.11 for how points are assigned within each HEDI category.
Highly Effective (18 - 20 points) Results are well-above District goals for similar students.	At least 80% of students covered meet or exceed the district standard for progress based on Growth to Mastery Model.
Effective (9 - 17 points) Results meet District goals for similar students.	At least 55% of students covered meet or exceed the district standard for progress based on Growth to Mastery Model.
Developing (3 - 8 points) Results are below District goals for similar students.	Between 30% and 54% of students meet or exceed the district standard for progress based on Growth to Mastery Model.
Ineffective (0 - 2 points) Results are well-below District goals for similar students.	Fewer than 30% of students meet or exceed the district standard for progress based on Growth to Mastery Model.

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	District-developed assessment for Grade 9 World History using course-wide SLOs.
----------	---	---

	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.	See attachment at 2.11 for how points are assigned within each HEDI category.
Highly Effective (18 - 20 points) Results are well-above District goals for similar students.	At least 80% of students covered meet or exceed the district standard for progress based on Growth to Mastery Model.
Effective (9 - 17 points) Results meet District goals for similar students.	At least 55% of students covered meet or exceed the district standard for progress based on Growth to Mastery Model.
Developing (3 - 8 points) Results are below District goals for similar students.	Between 30% and 54% of students meet or exceed the district standard for progress based on Growth to Mastery Model.
Ineffective (0 - 2 points) Results are well-below District goals for similar students.	Fewer than 30% of students meet or exceed the district standard for progress based on Growth to Mastery Model.

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.	See attachment at 2.11 for how points are assigned within each HEDI category.
---	---

Highly Effective (18 - 20 points) Results are well-above District goals for similar students.	At least 80% of students covered meet or exceed the district standard for progress based on Growth to Mastery Model.
Effective (9 - 17 points) Results meet District goals for similar students.	At least 55% of students covered meet or exceed the district standard for progress based on Growth to Mastery Model.
Developing (3 - 8 points) Results are below District goals for similar students.	Between 30% and 54% of students meet or exceed the district standard for progress based on Growth to Mastery Model.
Ineffective (0 - 2 points) Results are well-below District goals for similar students.	Fewer than 30% of students meet or exceed the district standard for progress based on Growth to Mastery Model.

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	Not applicable	Not applicable
Algebra 2	Not applicable	Not applicable

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.	See attachment at 2.11 for how points are assigned within each HEDI category.
Highly Effective (18 - 20 points) Results are well-above District goals for similar students.	At least 80% of students covered meet or exceed the district standard for progress based on Growth to Mastery Model.
Effective (9 - 17 points) Results meet District goals for similar students.	At least 55% of students covered meet or exceed the district standard for progress based on Growth to Mastery Model.
Developing (3 - 8 points) Results are below District goals for similar students.	Between 30% and 54% of students meet or exceed the district standard for progress based on Growth to Mastery Model.
Ineffective (0 - 2 points) Results are well-below District goals for similar students.	Fewer than 30% of students meet or exceed the district standard for progress based on Growth to Mastery Model.

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
-----------------------------	------------

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

Use this box, if needed, to describe the general process for assigning HEDI categories for these grades/subjects in this subcomponent. If needed, you may upload a table or graphic at 2.11, below.	See attachment at 2.11 for how points are assigned within each HEDI category.
Highly Effective (18 - 20 points) Results are well-above District goals for similar students.	At least 80% of students covered meet or exceed the district standard for progress based on Growth to Mastery Model.
Effective (9 - 17 points) Results meet District goals for similar students.	At least 55% of students covered meet or exceed the district standard for progress based on Growth to Mastery Model.
Developing (3 - 8 points) Results are below District goals for similar students.	Between 30% and 54% of students meet or exceed the district standard for progress based on Growth to Mastery Model.
Ineffective (0 - 2 points) Results are well-below District goals for similar students.	Fewer than 30% of students meet or exceed the district standard for progress based on Growth to Mastery Model.

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/5364/141645-TXEttx9bQW/COMBINED STATE MEASURES OF COMPARABLE GROWTH REV.pdf

2.12) Locally Developed Controls

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

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

The District has adopted a common standard for HEDI categories that apply to state assessments, local assessments, or third-party assessments.

Assessments will be carefully reviewed by principals and the superintendent to assure comparability, rigor, and ratings that are free of conflict of interest.

2.13) Teachers with more than one growth measure

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

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

2.14) Assurances

Please check all of the boxes below:

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

3. Local Measures (Teachers)

Created Monday, June 11, 2012

Updated Tuesday, September 11, 2012

Page 1

Locally Selected Measures of Student Achievement or Growth

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

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

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

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

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

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

Growth or achievement measure(s) from these options.

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

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

Measures based on:

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

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

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

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

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

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

3.1) Grades 4-8 ELA

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

	Locally-Selected Measure from List of Approved Measures	Assessment
4	6(ii) School wide measure computed locally	The school wide measure aggregates the scores for grades 3-5, using the NYSED ELA, math, and science tests.
5	6(ii) School wide measure computed locally	The school wide measure aggregates the scores for grades 3-5, using the NYSED ELA, math, and science tests.

6	6(ii) School wide measure computed locally	The school wide measure aggregates the scores for grades 6-8, using the NYSED ELA, math, and science tests.
7	6(ii) School wide measure computed locally	The school wide measure aggregates the scores for grades 6-8, using the NYSED ELA, math, and science tests.
8	6(ii) School wide measure computed locally	The school wide measure aggregates the scores for grades 6-8, using the NYSED ELA, math, and science tests.

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

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

Use this box, if needed, to describe the general process for assigning HEDI categories for these grades/subjects in this subcomponent. If needed, you may upload a table or graphic at 3.3, below.	At the Elementary School, all teachers, including grades K-2, art, library, music, physical education, and science at grades other than four, the local HEDI rating will reflect the aggregate percentage of all Elementary students scoring 3 or 4 on state assessments in ELA, math, and science. The system for allocating points within each HEDI category is described in the attachment to 3.3.
Highly Effective (14 - 15 points) Results are well above District- or BOCES-adopted expectations for growth or achievement for grade/subject.	The school-wide results for all students are well above District expectations for achievement of learning standards as measured by 90% (or more) of students performing at levels 3 or 4 on state assessments (based on 2011 cut-off scores).
Effective (8- 13 points) Results meet District- or BOCES-adopted expectations for growth or achievement for grade/subject.	The school-wide results for all students meet District expectations for achievement of learning standards as measured by at least 75% of students performing at levels 3 or 4 on state assessments (based on 2011 cut-off scores).
Developing (3 - 7 points) Results are below District- or BOCES-adopted expectations for growth or achievement for grade/subject.	The school-wide results for all students are below District expectations for achievement of learning standards as measured by between 65% and 74% of students performing at levels 3 or 4 on state assessments (based on 2011 cut-off scores).
Ineffective (0 - 2 points) Results are well below District- or BOCES-adopted expectations for growth or achievement for grade/subject.	The school-wide results for all students are well below District expectations for achievement of learning standards as measured by fewer than 65% of students performing at levels 3 or 4 on state assessments (based on 2011 cut-off scores)

3.2) Grades 4-8 Math

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

	Locally-Selected Measure from List of Approved Measures	Assessment
4	6(ii) School wide measure computed locally	The school wide measure aggregates the scores for grades 3-5, using the NYSED ELA, math, and science tests.
5	6(ii) School wide measure computed locally	The school wide measure aggregates the scores for grades 3-5, using the NYSED ELA, math, and science tests.

6	6(ii) School wide measure computed locally	The school wide measure aggregates the scores for grades 6-8, using the NYSED ELA, math, and science tests.
7	6(ii) School wide measure computed locally	The school wide measure aggregates the scores for grades 6-8, using the NYSED ELA, math, and science tests.
8	6(ii) School wide measure computed locally	The school wide measure aggregates the scores for grades 6-8, using the NYSED ELA, math, and science tests.

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

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

Use this box, if needed, to describe the general process for assigning HEDI categories for these grades/subjects in this subcomponent. If needed, you may upload a table or graphic at 3.3, below.	The system for allocating points within each HEDI category is described in the attachment to 3.3.
Highly Effective (14 - 15 points) Results are well above District- or BOCES-adopted expectations for growth or achievement for grade/subject.	The school-wide results for all students are well above District expectations for achievement of learning standards as measured by 90% (or more) of students performing at levels 3 or 4 on state assessments (based on 2011 cut-off scores).
Effective (8- 13 points) Results meet District- or BOCES-adopted expectations for growth or achievement for grade/subject.	The school-wide results for all students meet District expectations for achievement of learning standards as measured by at least 75% of students performing at levels 3 or 4 on state assessments (based on 2011 cut-off scores).
Developing (3 - 7 points) Results are below District- or BOCES-adopted expectations for growth or achievement for grade/subject.	The school-wide results for all students are below District expectations for achievement of learning standards as measured by between 65% and 74% of students performing at levels 3 or 4 on state assessments (based on 2011 cut-off scores).
Ineffective (0 - 2 points) Results are well below District- or BOCES-adopted expectations for growth or achievement for grade/subject.	The school-wide results for all students are well below District expectations for achievement of learning standards as measured by fewer than 65% of students performing at levels 3 or 4 on state assessments (based on 2011 cut-off scores).

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/5139/141301-rhJdBgDruP/LOCAL MEASURES OF GROWTH AND ACHIEVEMENT revised.pdf](#)

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

Growth or achievement measure(s) from these options.

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

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

Measures based on:

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

3.4) Grades K-3 ELA

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

	Locally-Selected Measure from List of Approved Measures	Assessment
K	6(ii) School-wide measure computed locally	The school wide measure aggregates the scores for grades 3-5, using the NYSED ELA, math, and science tests.
1	6(ii) School-wide measure computed locally	The school wide measure aggregates the scores for grades 3-5, using the NYSED ELA, math, and science tests.
2	6(ii) School-wide measure computed locally	The school wide measure aggregates the scores for grades 3-5, using the NYSED ELA, math, and science tests.
3	6(ii) School-wide measure computed locally	The school wide measure aggregates the scores for grades 3-5, using the NYSED ELA, math, and science tests.

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.	At the Elementary School, all teachers, including grades K-2, art, library, music, physical education, and science at grades other than four, the local HEDI rating will reflect the aggregate percentage of all Elementary students scoring 3 or 4 on state assessments in ELA, math, and science. The system for earning points within each category is described in the attachment for 3.13.
Highly Effective (18-20 points) Results are well above District- or BOCES-adopted expectations for growth or achievement for grade/subject.	The school-wide results for all students are well above District expectations for achievement of learning standards as measured by 90% (or more) of students performing at levels 3 or 4 on state assessments (based on 2011 cut-off scores).
Effective (9-17 points) Results meet District- or BOCES-adopted expectations for growth or achievement for grade/subject.	The school-wide results for all students meet District expectations for achievement of learning standards as measured by at least 75% of students performing at levels 3 or 4 on state assessments (based on 2011 cut-off scores).
Developing (3 - 8 points) Results are below District- or BOCES-adopted expectations for growth or achievement for grade/subject.	The school-wide results for all students are below District expectations for achievement of learning standards as measured by between 65% and 74% of students performing at levels 3 or 4 on state assessments (based on 2011 cut-off scores).
Ineffective (0 - 2 points) Results are well below District- or BOCES-adopted expectations for growth or achievement for grade/subject.	The school-wide results for all students are well below District expectations for achievement of learning standards as measured by fewer than 65% of students performing at levels 3 or 4 on state assessments (based on 2011 cut-off scores).

3.5) Grades K-3 Math

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

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

K	6(ii) School-wide measure computed locally	The school wide measure aggregates the scores for grades 3-5, using the NYSED ELA, math, and science tests.
1	6(ii) School-wide measure computed locally	The school wide measure aggregates the scores for grades 3-5, using the NYSED ELA, math, and science tests.
2	6(ii) School-wide measure computed locally	The school wide measure aggregates the scores for grades 3-5, using the NYSED ELA, math, and science tests.
3	6(ii) School-wide measure computed locally	The school wide measure aggregates the scores for grades 3-5, using the NYSED ELA, math, and science tests.

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.	At the Elementary School, all teachers, including grades K-2, art, library, music, physical education, and science at grades other than four, the local HEDI rating will reflect the aggregate percentage of all Elementary students scoring 3 or 4 on state assessments in ELA, math, and science. The system for earning points within each HEDI category can be found in the attachment to item 3.13.
Highly Effective (18-20 points) Results are well above District- or BOCES-adopted expectations for growth or achievement for grade/subject.	The school-wide results for all students are well above District expectations for achievement of learning standards as measured by 90% (or more) of students performing at levels 3 or 4 on state assessments (based on 2011 cut-off scores).
Effective (9-17 points) Results meet District- or BOCES-adopted expectations for growth or achievement for grade/subject.	The school-wide results for all students meet District expectations for achievement of learning standards as measured by at least 75% of students performing at levels 3 or 4 on state assessments (based on 2011 cut-off scores).
Developing (3 - 8 points) Results are below District -or BOCES-adopted expectations for growth or achievement for grade/subject.	The school-wide results for all students are below District expectations for achievement of learning standards as measured by between 65% and 74% of students performing at levels 3 or 4 on state assessments (based on 2011 cut-off scores).
Ineffective (0 - 2 points) Results are well below District- or BOCES-adopted expectations for growth or achievement for grade/subject.	The school-wide results for all students are well below District expectations for achievement of learning standards as measured by fewer than 65% of students performing at levels 3 or 4 on state assessments (based on 2011 cut-off scores).

3.6) Grades 6-8 Science

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

	Locally-Selected Measure from List of Approved Measures	Assessment
6	6(ii) School wide measure computed locally	The school wide measure aggregates the scores for grades 6-8, using the NYSED ELA, math, and science tests.

7	6(ii) School wide measure computed locally	The school wide measure aggregates the scores for grades 6-8, using the NYSED ELA, math, and science tests.
8	6(ii) School wide measure computed locally	The school wide measure aggregates the scores for grades 6-8, using the NYSED ELA, math, and science tests.

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.	At the Middle School, all teachers, including art, foreign language, music, physical education, drama, computers, technology, health, and home and careers, the local HEDI rating will be reflect the aggregate percentage of all Middle School students scoring 3 or 4 on state assessments on state assessments in ELA, math, and science. The system for earning points within each category is described in the attachment for 3.13.
Highly Effective (18 - 20 points) Results are well above District- or BOCES-adopted expectations for growth or achievement for grade/subject.	The school-wide results for all students are well above District expectations for achievement of learning standards as measured by 90% (or more) of students performing at levels 3 or 4 on state assessments (based on 2011 cut-off scores).
Effective (9 - 17 points) Results meet District- or BOCES-adopted expectations for growth or achievement for grade/subject.	The school-wide results for all students meet District expectations for achievement of learning standards as measured by at least 75% of students performing at levels 3 or 4 on state assessments (based on 2011 cut-off scores).
Developing (3 - 8 points) Results are below District- or BOCES-adopted expectations for growth or achievement for grade/subject.	The school-wide results for all students are below District expectations for achievement of learning standards as measured by between 65% and 74% of students performing at levels 3 or 4 on state assessments (based on 2011 cut-off scores).
Ineffective (0 - 2 points) Results are well below District- or BOCES-adopted expectations for growth or achievement for grade/subject.	The school-wide results for all students are well below District expectations for achievement of learning standards as measured by fewer than 65% of students performing at levels 3 or 4 on state assessments (based on 2011 cut-off scores).

3.7) Grades 6-8 Social Studies

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

	Locally-Selected Measure from List of Approved Measures	Assessment
6	6(ii) School wide measure computed locally	The school wide measure aggregates the scores for grades 6-8, using the NYSED ELA, math, and science tests.
7	6(ii) School wide measure computed locally	The school wide measure aggregates the scores for grades 6-8, using the NYSED ELA, math, and science tests.
8	6(ii) School wide measure computed locally	The school wide measure aggregates the scores for grades 6-8, using the NYSED ELA, math, and science tests.

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.	At the Middle School, all teachers, including art, foreign language, music, physical education, drama, computers, technology, health, and home and careers, the local HEDI rating will reflect the aggregate percentage of all Middle School students scoring 3 or 4 on state assessments on state assessments in ELA, math, and science. The system for earning points within each category is described in the attachment for 3.13.
Highly Effective (18 - 20 points) Results are well above District- or BOCES-adopted expectations for growth or achievement for grade/subject.	The school-wide results for all students are well above District expectations for achievement of learning standards as measured by 90% (or more) of students performing at levels 3 or 4 on state assessments (based on 2011 cut-off scores).
Effective (9 - 17 points) Results meet District- or BOCES-adopted expectations for growth or achievement for grade/subject.	The school-wide results for all students meet District expectations for achievement of learning standards as measured by at least 75% of students performing at levels 3 or 4 on state assessments (based on 2011 cut-off scores).
Developing (3 - 8 points) Results are below District- or BOCES-adopted expectations for growth or achievement for grade/subject.	The school-wide results for all students are below District expectations for achievement of learning standards as measured by between 65% and 74% of students performing at levels 3 or 4 on state assessments (based on 2011 cut-off scores).
Ineffective (0 - 2 points) Results are well below District- or BOCES-adopted expectations for growth or achievement for grade/subject.	The school-wide results for all students are well below District expectations for achievement of learning standards as measured by fewer than 65% of students performing at levels 3 or 4 on state assessments (based on 2011 cut-off scores).

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	The district-developed schoolwide measure for Global 1 consists of the aggregate percentage of Regents scores above 65 and the percentage of students enrolled in AP scores with a score of 3 or better on at least one AP exam.
Global 2	6(ii) School wide measure computed locally	The district-developed schoolwide measure for Global 2 consists of the aggregate percentage of Regents scores above 65 and the percentage of students enrolled in AP scores with a score of 3 or better on at least one AP exam.
American History	6(ii) School wide measure computed locally	The district-developed schoolwide measure for American History consists of the aggregate percentage of Regents scores above 65 and the percentage of students enrolled in AP scores with a score of 3 or better on at least one AP exam.

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

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

<p>Use this box, if needed, to describe the general process for assigning HEDI categories for these grades/subjects in this subcomponent. If needed, you may upload a table or graphic at 3.13, below.</p>	<p>At the High School, the local HEDI rating for all teachers will reflect the aggregate percentage of all students scoring 65 or better on Regents exams for Global History, US History, English, mathematics, and science and the percentage of students taking Advanced Placement courses who score 3 or better on at least one AP exam. AP exams include art history, studio art, English Language, English Literature, micro/Macro Economics, US History, World History, Calculus AB, Calculus BC, Statistics, Biology, chemistry, Environmental Science, Physics B, Physics C, French Language, Latin, and Spanish Language. The system for earning points within each category is described in the attachment for 3.13.</p>
<p>Highly Effective (18 - 20 points) Results are well above District- or BOCES-adopted expectations for growth or achievement for grade/subject.</p>	<p>The school-wide results for all students are well above District expectations for achievement of learning standards as measured by 90% or more of of Regents exams at the passing level (based on 2011 cut-off scores) and 90% or more of Advanced Placement students scoring 3 or better on at least one AP exam.</p>
<p>Effective (9 - 17 points) Results meet District- or BOCES-adopted expectations for growth or achievement for grade/subject.</p>	<p>The school-wide results for all students meet District expectations for achievement of learning standards as measured by the at least 75% of Regents exams scoring at the passing level (based on 2011 cut-off scores) and the at least 75% percentage of Advanced Placement students scoring 3 or better on at least one AP exam.</p>
<p>Developing (3 - 8 points) Results are below District- or BOCES-adopted expectations for growth or achievement for grade/subject.</p>	<p>The school-wide results for all students are below District expectations for achievement of learning standards as measured by between 65% and 74% of Regents exams score at the passing level (based on 2011 cut-off scores) and between 65% and 74% of Advanced Placement students scoring 3 or better on at least one AP exam.</p>
<p>Ineffective (0 - 2 points) Results are well below District- or BOCES-adopted expectations for growth or achievement for grade/subject.</p>	<p>The school-wide results for all students are well below District expectations for achievement of learning standards as measured by the aggregate percentage of Regents exams at the passing level (based on 2011 cut-off scores) and the aggregate percentage of Advanced Placement students scoring 3 or better on at least one AP exam.</p>

3.9) High School Science

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

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

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

Living Environment	6(ii) School wide measure computed locally	The district-developed schoolwide measure for Living Environment consists of the aggregate percentage of Regents scores above 65 and the percentage of students enrolled in AP scores with a score of 3 or better on at least one AP exam.
Earth Science	6(ii) School wide measure computed locally	The district-developed schoolwide measure for Earth Science consists of the aggregate percentage of Regents scores above 65 and the percentage of students enrolled in AP scores with a score of 3 or better on at least one AP exam.ent
Chemistry	6(ii) School wide measure computed locally	The district-developed schoolwide measure for Chemistry consists of the aggregate percentage of Regents scores above 65 and the percentage of students enrolled in AP scores with a score of 3 or better on at least one AP exam.ent
Physics	6(ii) School wide measure computed locally	The district-developed schoolwide measure for Physics consists of the aggregate percentage of Regents scores above 65 and the percentage of students enrolled in AP scores with a score of 3 or better on at least one AP exam.

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

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

Use this box, if needed, to describe the general process for assigning HEDI categories for these grades/subjects in this subcomponent. If needed, you may upload a table or graphic at 3.13, below.	At the High School, the local HEDI rating for all teachers will reflect the aggregate percentage of all students scoring 65 or better on Regents exams for Global History, US History, English, mathematics, and science and the percentage of students taking Advanced Placement courses who score 3 or better on at least one AP exam. AP exams include art history, studio art, English Language, English Literature, micro/Macro Economics, US History, World History, Calculus AB, Calculus BC, Statistics, Biology, chemistry, Environmental Science, Physics B, Physics C, French Language, Latin, and Spanish Language. The system for earning points within each category is described in the attachment for 3.13.
Highly Effective (18-20 points) Results are well above District- or BOCES-adopted expectations for growth or achievement for grade/subject.	The school-wide results for all students are well above District expectations for achievement of learning standards as measured by 90% or more of of Regents exams at the passing level (based on 2011 cut-off scores) and 90% or more of Advanced Placement students scoring 3 or better on at least one AP exam.
Developing (3 - 8 points) Results are below District- or BOCES-adopted expectations for growth or achievement for grade/subject.	The school-wide results for all students meet District expectations for achievement of learning standards as measured by the at least 75% of Regents exams scoring at the passing level (based on 2011 cut-off scores) and the at least 75% percentage of Advanced Placement students scoring 3 or better on at least one AP exam.
Effective (9 - 17points) Results meet District- or BOCES-adopted expectations for growth or achievement for grade/subject.	The school-wide results for all students are below District expectations for achievement of learning standards as measured by between 65% and 74% of students performing at levels 3 or 4 on state assessments (based on 2011 cut-off scores).
Ineffective (0 - 2 points) Results are well below District- or BOCES-adopted expectations for growth or achievement for	The school-wide results for all students are below District expectations for achievement of learning standards as measured

grade/subject.

by between 65% and 74% of students performing at levels 3 or 4 on state assessments (based on 2011 cut-off scores).

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	The district-developed schoolwide measure for Algebra 1 consists of the aggregate percentage of Regents scores above 65 and the percentage of students enrolled in AP scores with a score of 3 or better on at least one AP exam.
Geometry	6(ii) School wide measure computed locally	The district-developed schoolwide measure for Geometry consists of the aggregate percentage of Regents scores above 65 and the percentage of students enrolled in AP scores with a score of 3 or better on at least one AP exam.
Algebra 2	6(ii) School wide measure computed locally	The district-developed schoolwide measure for Algebra 2 consists of the aggregate percentage of Regents scores above 65 and the percentage of students enrolled in AP scores with a score of 3 or better on at least one AP exam.

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

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

Use this box, if needed, to describe the general process for assigning HEDI categories for these grades/subjects in this subcomponent. If needed, you may upload a table or graphic at 3.13, below.	At the High School, the local HEDI rating for all teachers will reflect the aggregate percentage of all students scoring 65 or better on Regents exams for Global History, US History, English, mathematics, and science and the percentage of students taking Advanced Placement courses who score 3 or better on at least one AP exam. AP exams include art history, studio art, English Language, English Literature, micro/Macro Economics, US History, World History, Calculus AB, Calculus BC, Statistics, Biology, chemistry, Environmental Science, Physics B, Physics C, French Language, Latin, and Spanish Language. The system for earning points within each category is described in the attachment for 3.13.
Highly Effective (18 - 20 points) Results are well above District- or BOCES-adopted expectations for growth or achievement for grade/subject.	The school-wide results for all students are well above District expectations for achievement of learning standards as measured by 90% or more of of Regents exams at the passing level (based on 2011 cut-off scores) and 90% or more of Advanced Placement students scoring 3 or better on at least one AP exam.

Effective (9 - 17 points) Results meet District- or BOCES-adopted expectations for growth or achievement for grade/subject.	The school-wide results for all students meet District expectations for achievement of learning standards as measured by the at least 75% of Regents exams scoring at the passing level (based on 2011 cut-off scores) and the at least 75% percentage of Advanced Placement students scoring 3 or better on at least one AP exam.
Developing (3 - 8 points) Results are below District- or BOCES-adopted expectations for growth or achievement for grade/subject.	The school-wide results for all students are below District expectations for achievement of learning standards as measured by between 65% and 74% of students performing at levels 3 or 4 on state assessments (based on 2011 cut-off scores).
Ineffective (0 - 2 points) Results are well below District- or BOCES-adopted expectations for growth or achievement for grade/subject.	The school-wide results for all students are below District expectations for achievement of learning standards as measured by between 65% and 74% of students performing at levels 3 or 4 on state assessments (based on 2011 cut-off scores).

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	The district-developed schoolwide measure for Grade 9 ELA consists of the aggregate percentage of Regents scores above 65 and the percentage of students enrolled in AP scores with a score of 3 or better on at least one AP exam.
Grade 10 ELA	6(ii) School wide measure computed locally	The district-developed schoolwide measure for Grade 10 ELA consists of the aggregate percentage of Regents scores above 65 and the percentage of students enrolled in AP scores with a score of 3 or better on at least one AP exam.
Grade 11 ELA	6(ii) School wide measure computed locally	The district-developed schoolwide measure for Grade 11 ELA consists of the aggregate percentage of Regents scores above 65 and the percentage of students enrolled in AP scores with a score of 3 or better on at least one AP exam.nt

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.	At the High School, the local HEDI rating for all teachers will reflect the aggregate percentage of all students scoring 65 or better on Regents exams for Global History, US History, English, mathematics, and science and the percentage of students taking Advanced Placement courses who score 3 or better on at least one AP exam. AP exams include art history,
---	--

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

<p>Use this box, if needed, to describe the general process for assigning HEDI categories for these grades/subjects in this subcomponent. If needed, you may upload a table or graphic at 3.13, below.</p>	<p>At the High School, the local HEDI rating for all teachers will reflect the aggregate percentage of all students scoring 65 or better on Regents exams for Global History, US History, English, mathematics, and science and the percentage of students taking Advanced Placement courses who score 3 or better on at least one AP exam. AP exams include art history, studio art, English Language, English Literature, micro/Macro Economics, US History, World History, Calculus AB, Calculus BC, Statistics, Biology, chemistry, Environmental Science, Physics B, Physics C, French Language, Latin, and Spanish Language. The system for earning points within each category is described in the attachment for 3.13.</p>
<p>Highly Effective (18 - 20 points) Results are well above District- or BOCES -adopted expectations for growth or achievement for grade/subject.</p>	<p>The school-wide results for all students are well above District expectations for achievement of learning standards as measured by 90% or more of of Regents exams at the passing level (based on 2011 cut-off scores) and 90% or more of Advanced Placement students scoring 3 or better on at least one AP exam.</p>
<p>Effective (9 - 17 points) Results meet District- or BOCES-adopted expectations for growth or achievement for grade/subject.</p>	<p>The school-wide results for all students meet District expectations for achievement of learning standards as measured by the at least 75% of Regents exams scoring at the passing level (based on 2011 cut-off scores) and the at least 75% percentage of Advanced Placement students scoring 3 or better on at least one AP exam.</p>
<p>Developing (3 - 8 points) Results are below District- or BOCES-adopted expectations for growth or achievement for grade/subject.</p>	<p>The school-wide results for all students are below District expectations for achievement of learning standards as measured by between 65% and 74% of students performing at levels 3 or 4 on state assessments (based on 2011 cut-off scores).</p>
<p>Ineffective (0 - 2 points) Results are well below District- or BOCES-adopted expectations for growth or achievement for grade/subject.</p>	<p>The school-wide results for all students are below District expectations for achievement of learning standards as measured by between 65% and 74% of students performing at levels 3 or 4 on state assessments (based on 2011 cut-off scores).</p>

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/5139/141301-y92vNseFa4/LOCAL MEASURES OF GROWTH AND ACHIEVEMENT revised.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 measures selected are state assessments for grades K-8 and a combination of Regents and AP scores for grades 9-12. There are many courses that do not use Regents exams, and most of our juniors take the AP English Language exam as a Regents equivalent. We believe an aggregate percentage of AP results and Regents exams covers more students and more areas of the curriculum.

The results reflect aggregate percentages provided by the state or, in the case of AP, by the College Board. The targets reflect the goal and expectation that all students should be college-ready.

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.

We are using a district wide measure that encompass all state assessments for grades K-8, and all Regents exams that we administer, and all AP exams for grades 9-12. All teachers at grades K-6, 6-8, and 9-12 will receive an overall collective score based on the achievement profile for the students in their school and the HEDI standard that was negotiated.

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 Thursday, May 03, 2012

Updated Thursday, September 06, 2012

Page 1

4.1) Teacher Practice Rubric

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

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

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

Danielson's Framework for Teaching (2011 Revised Edition)

(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]	36
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	24

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.

Direct classroom observation encompasses two domains of the Danielson 2011 rubric, Classroom Environment and instruction. Each domain includes five components. All components are weighted equally for a total of 36 points allocated to direct observation. The other two domains focus on Planning and Preparation and Professional Responsibilities; they include twelve components, each weighted equally for a total of 24 points. (One completed rubric is used to summarize both observations.) Pre-conference forms, reflection forms, lesson plans, and/or other artifacts (such as structured review of student work, parent newsletters, or performance assessments) are incorporated into the evaluation of teacher performance in these two domains not directly observable in the classroom. The assessment of these artifacts occurs during the pre/post conferences that accompany direct classroom observations.

The evaluator rates each teach on each of the twenty-two components on a 1-4 HEDI scale (4=HE, 3=E, 2=D, and 1=I). The ratings

are weighted as indicated above, totaled, and averaged. The scoring bands for the rubric scores are established at the midpoints of the 1-4 scale, e.g., an I rating ranges from 1 -1.4, D ranges from 1.5 - 2.4, E ranges from 2.5 to 3.4, and HE ranges from 3.5 - 4.0.

Finally, a conversion chart translates the average rubric score into a 0-60 scale that includes 0 and the full range of points. The ranges are indicated below.

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/5091/124213-eka9yMJ855/Danielson Spreadsheet APPR.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 weighted average score of 3.5 - 4.0 demonstrates highly successful implementation of the 22 components of the Danielson Framework (2011 edition). There is evidence that the classroom operates as a community of learners with students who assume considerable responsibility for their own learning and for the functioning of the classroom.
Effective: Overall performance and results meet NYS Teaching Standards.	A weighted average score of 2.5 - 3.4 displays successful implementation of the different components of the Danielson Framework (2011 edition).
Developing: Overall performance and results need improvement in order to meet NYS Teaching Standards.	A weighted average score of 1.5 - 2.4 demonstrates an understanding of the concepts underlying the Danielson Framework (2011 edition) There is evidence of attempts to implement its components and elements, but the implementation is sporadic, intermittent, or otherwise not entirely successful.
Ineffective: Overall performance and results do not meet NYS Teaching Standards.	A weighted average score of 1.0 - 1.4 indicates a lack of understanding of the rudimentary skills inherent in the components of the Danielson Framework (2011 edition).

Provide the ranges for the 60-point scoring bands.

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

4.6) Observations of Probationary Teachers

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

By building principals or other trained administrators

4.6) Observations of Probationary Teachers Formal/Long	3
--	---

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

By trained in-school peer teachers or other trained reviewers

Formal/Long	0
Informal/Short	0

Independent evaluators

Formal/Long	0
Informal/Short	0

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

-
- In Person
-

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

-
- Not Applicable
-

4.7) Observations of Tenured Teachers

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

By building principals or other trained administrators

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

By trained in-school peer teachers or other trained reviewers

Formal/Long	0
Informal/Short	0

Independent evaluators

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

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

-
- In Person
-

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

-
- Not Applicable
-

5. Composite Scoring (Teachers)

Created Thursday, May 03, 2012

Updated Thursday, September 06, 2012

Page 1

Standards for Rating Categories

Growth or Comparable Measures

Locally-selected Measures of

growth or achievement

Other Measures of Effectiveness

(Teacher and Leader standards)

Highly

Effective

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

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

Overall performance and results exceed NYS Teaching Standards.

Effective

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

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

Overall performance and results meet NYS Teaching Standards.

Developing

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

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

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

Ineffective

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

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

Overall performance and results do not meet NYS Teaching Standards.

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

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

2012-13 where there is no Value-Added measure

Growth or Comparable Measures

Locally-selected Measures of

growth or achievement

Other Measures of Effectiveness

(60 points)

Overall

Composite Score

Highly Effective

18-20

18-20

Ranges determined locally--see below

91-100

Effective

9-17

9-17

75-90

Developing

3-8

3-8

65-74

Ineffective

0-2

0-2

0-64

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

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

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

2012-13 where Value-Added growth measure applies

Growth or Comparable Measures

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

Other Measures of Effectiveness

(60 points)

Overall

Composite Score

Highly Effective

22-25

14-15

Ranges determined locally--see above

91-100

Effective

10-21

8-13

75-90

Developing

3-9

3-7

65-74

Ineffective

0-2

0-2

0-64

6. Additional Requirements - Teachers

Created Thursday, May 03, 2012

Updated Thursday, September 06, 2012

Page 1

6.1) Assurances -- Improvement Plans

Please check the boxes below:

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

6.2) Attachment: Teacher Improvement Plan Forms

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

assets/survey-uploads/5265/124233-Df0w3Xx5v6/TIP2_1.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:

Tenured teachers with "ineffective" or "developing" ratings and probationary teachers with "ineffective" ratings may request a review their annual evaluation within five school days of receipt. The evaluator must render a decision within five school days of receiving the request. The teacher has an additional five school days to appeal to the Superintendent of Schools. The Superintendent must make a final and binding decision within the five business days. Thus the total elapsed time for the appeals process cannot exceed twenty school days after the annual evaluation is received.

6.4) Training and Certification of Lead Evaluators and Evaluators

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

The Bronxville School District has used the Danielson Framework for Teaching for teacher evaluation since 2006. All district evaluators participated in a three-day training session conducted by a qualified Danielson trainer. In 2007 an independent consultant completed an implementation study of the evaluation system and conducted ongoing training and support for all evaluators. This training consisted of group review of videotaped teaching episodes designed to strengthen inter-rater reliability. This annual training (about ten hours per year) continued for the 2007, 2008, and 2009 school years. In 2010-11 District leaders continued this work on its own, with an in-depth focus on several specific components of the Framework.

In the fall of 2011, in anticipation of APPR requirements, the Board of Education endorsed the Danielson 2011 edition as its evaluation criteria, and the District contracted with Teachscape Inc to provide ongoing support and ensure evaluator proficiency and inter-rater reliability. The Teachscape programs provides approximately 21 hours of training plus assessments that ensure that local evaluations are consistent with expert scores. All evaluators will complete this program by September 2012, and the Superintendent will certify those who have demonstrated proficiency.

Ongoing training and review will occur throughout each school year with additional sessions scheduled as needed during the summer months. Initial training is approximately 21 hours in duration. Follow up training is 6 hours annually.

The Superintendent will certify or re-certify lead evaluators annually, based on successful participation in training activities, demonstrated inter-rater reliability, and efficiency in completing the observation process.

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 Saturday, June 09, 2012

Updated Wednesday, June 20, 2012

Page 1

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

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

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

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

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

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
(No response)	(No response)	(No response)
(No response)	(No response)	(No response)
(No response)	(No response)	(No response)
(No response)	(No response)	(No response)
(No response)	(No response)	(No response)

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.	It is anticipated that the state will provide a student growth measure for every principal because 30% of students at each school are covered by state assessments.
Highly Effective (18 - 20 points) Results are well above state average for similar students (or District goals if no state test).	Student results on state assessments are well above the state average for similar students.
Effective (9 - 17 points) Results meet state average for similar students (or District goals if no state test).	Student results on state assessments meet the state average for similar students.
Developing (3 - 8 points) Results are below state average for similar students (or District goals if no state test).	Student results on state assessments are below the state average for similar students.
Ineffective (0 - 2 points) Results are well below state average for similar students (or District goals if no state test).	Student results on state assessments are well below the state average for similar students.

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: http://usny.nysed.gov/rttt/teachers-leaders/slo/home.html .	Checked
7.6) Assurances -- Comparable Growth Measures Assure that the process for assigning points for SLOs for the Growth Subcomponent will use the narrative HEDI descriptions described in the regulations to effectively differentiate educator performance in ways that improve student learning and instruction.	Checked
7.6) Assurances -- Comparable Growth Measures Assure that it is possible for a principal to earn each point, including 0, for SLOs in the Growth subcomponent scoring range.	Checked
7.6) Assurances -- Comparable Growth Measures Assure that processes are in place to monitor SLOs to ensure rigor and comparability across classrooms.	Checked

8. Local Measures (Principals)

Created Monday, June 11, 2012

Updated Friday, September 14, 2012

Page 1

Locally-Selected Measures of Student Achievement or Growth

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

Grade Configuration	Locally-Selected Measure from List of Approved Measures	Assessment
K-5	(a) achievement on State assessments	NYSED ELA, Math, and Science
6-8	(a) achievement on State assessments	NYSED ELA, Math, and Science
9-12	(g) % achieving specific level on Regents or alternatives	Regents and AP

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.	(No response)
Highly Effective (14 - 15 points) Results are well above District- or BOCES-adopted expectations for growth or achievement for grade/subject.	<p>90% OR MORE MEET STANDARD</p> <p>K-5, 6-8: The school-wide results for all students are well above District expectations for achievement of learning standards as measured by the aggregate percentage of students performing at levels 3 or 4 on state assessments (based on 2011 cut-off scores).</p> <p>9-12: The school-wide results for all students are well above District expectations for achievement of learning standards as measured by the aggregate percentage of Regents exam results at the passing level (based on 2011 cut-off scores) and the aggregate percentage of Advanced Placement students scoring 3 or better on at least one AP exam.</p>

<p>Effective (8- 13 points) Results meet District- or BOCES-adopted expectations for growth or achievement for grade/subject.</p>	<p>BETWEEN 75-89% MEET STANDARD K-5, 6-8: The school-wide results for all students meet District expectations for achievement of learning standards as measured by the aggregate percentage of students performing at levels 3 or 4 on state assessments (based on 2011 cut-off scores). 9-12: The school-wide results for all students meet District expectations for achievement of learning standards as measured by the aggregate percentage of Regents exam results at the passing level (based on 2011 cut-off scores) and the aggregate percentage of Advanced Placement students scoring 3 or better on at least one AP exam.</p>
<p>Developing (3 - 7 points) Results are below District- or BOCES-adopted expectations for growth or achievement for grade/subject.</p>	<p>BETWEEN 65 - 74% MEET STANDARD K-5, 6-8: The school-wide results for all students are below District expectations for achievement of learning standards as measured by the aggregate percentage of students performing at levels 3 or 4 on state assessments (based on 2011 cut-off scores). 9-12: The school-wide results for all students are below District expectations for achievement of learning standards as measured by the aggregate percentage of Regents exam results at the passing level (based on 2011 cut-off scores) and the aggregate percentage of Advanced Placement students scoring 3 or better on at least one AP exam.</p>
<p>Ineffective (0 - 2 points) Results are well below District- or BOCES-adopted expectations for growth or achievement for grade/subject.</p>	<p>FEWER THAN 65% MEET STANDARD K-5, 6-8: The school-wide results for all students are well below District expectations for achievement of learning standards as measured by the aggregate percentage of students performing at levels 3 or 4 on state assessments (based on 2011 cut-off scores). 9-12: The school-wide results for all students are well below District expectations for achievement of learning standards as measured by the aggregate percentage of Regents exam results at the passing level (based on 2011 cut-off scores) and the aggregate percentage of Advanced Placement students scoring 3 or better on at least one AP exam.</p>

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/5366/141234-qBFVOWF7fC/Locally Selected Measures for Principals \(15\) rev.pdf](assets/survey-uploads/5366/141234-qBFVOWF7fC/Locally Selected Measures for Principals (15) rev.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
K-5	(a) achievement on State assessments	NYSED ELA, Math, and Science
6-8	(a) achievement on State assessments	NYSED ELA, Math, and Science
9-12	(g) % achieving specific level on Regents or alternatives	NY Regents and AP

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

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

<p>Use this box, if needed, to describe the process for assigning HEDI categories. If needed, you may upload a table or graphic below.</p>	<p>The local measures of student achievement are based on aggregate levels of mastery on state assessments (K-8) and Regents and Advanced Placement (High School). The standard is based on the percentage of students who achieve at levels 3 or 4 using the state cut-off scores established in 2011.</p>
<p>Highly Effective (18 - 20 points) Results are well above District- or BOCES-adopted expectations for growth or achievement for grade/subject.</p>	<p>90% OR MORE MEET STANDARD K-5, 6-8: The school-wide results for all students are well above District expectations for achievement of learning standards as measured by the aggregate percentage of students performing at levels 3 or 4 on state assessments (based on 2011 cut-off scores). 9-12: The school-wide results for all students are well above District expectations for achievement of learning standards as measured by the aggregate percentage of Regents exam results at the passing level (based on 2011 cut-off scores) and the aggregate percentage of Advanced Placement students scoring 3 or better on at least one AP exam.</p>
<p>Effective (9- 17 points) Results meet District- or BOCES-adopted expectations for growth or achievement for grade/subject.</p>	<p>BETWEEN 75-89% MEET STANDARD K-5, 6-8: The school-wide results for all students meet District expectations for achievement of learning standards as measured by the aggregate percentage of students performing at levels 3 or 4 on state assessments (based on 2011 cut-off scores). 9-12: The school-wide results for all students meet District expectations for achievement of learning standards as measured by the aggregate percentage of Regents exam results at the passing level (based on 2011 cut-off scores) and the aggregate percentage of Advanced Placement students scoring 3 or better on at least one AP exam.</p>
<p>Developing (3 - 8 points) Results are below District- or BOCES-adopted expectations for growth or achievement for grade/subject.</p>	<p>BETWEEN 65 - 74% MEET STANDARD K-5, 6-8: The school-wide results for all students are below District expectations for achievement of learning standards as measured by the aggregate percentage of students performing at levels 3 or 4 on state assessments (based on 2011 cut-off scores). 9-12: The school-wide results for all students are below District expectations for achievement of learning standards as measured by the aggregate percentage of Regents exam results at the passing level (based on 2011 cut-off scores) and the aggregate percentage of Advanced Placement students scoring 3 or better on at least one AP exam.</p>
<p>Ineffective (0 - 2 points) Results are well below District- or BOCES-adopted expectations for growth or achievement for grade/subject.</p>	<p>FEWER THAN 65% MEET STANDARD K-5, 6-8: The school-wide results for all students are well below District expectations for achievement of learning standards as measured by the aggregate percentage of students performing at levels 3 or 4 on state assessments (based on 2011 cut-off</p>

scores).
 9-12: The school-wide results for all students are well below District expectations for achievement of learning standards as measured by the aggregate percentage of Regents exam results at the passing level (based on 2011 cut-off scores) and the aggregate percentage of Advanced Placement students scoring 3 or better on at least one AP exam.

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

(No response)

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

assets/survey-uploads/5366/141234-T8MIGWUVm1/Local Measures for Principals (20).pdf

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.

The Local Achievement Measures for Principals are largely based on state assessments, and all appropriate steps will be taken to ensure security of test materials, integrity of test administration, and prevention of any conflict of interest in scoring. We will use the numbers provided by the state.

In the case of AP exams (for the HS principal), the exams are externally graded, and we will use the numbers provided by the College Board. All required test security measures and administration protocols will be followed.

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.

There is one aggregate measure for K-5/6-8 principals based on state assessments.

The High School uses Regents and AP scores. The standard must be met by the aggregate of both groups.

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 Thursday, May 03, 2012

Updated Friday, September 14, 2012

Page 1

9.1) Principal Practice Rubric

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

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

Multidimensional Principal Performance Rubric

(No response)

9.2) Points Within Other Measures

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

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

Is the following points assignment for all principals?

Yes

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

(No response)

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

Broad assessment of principal leadership and management actions based on the practice rubric by the supervisor, a trained administrator or a trained independent evaluator. This must incorporate multiple school visits by supervisor, trained administrator, or trained independent evaluator, at least one of which must be from a supervisor, and at least one of which must be unannounced. [At least 31 points]	60
Any remaining points shall be assigned based on results of one or more ambitious and measurable goals set collaboratively with principals and their superintendents or district superintendents.	0

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

(No response)

9.3) Assurances -- Goals

Please check the boxes below (if applicable):

9.3) Assurances -- Goals Assure that if any points are assigned to goals, at least one goal will address the principal's contribution to improving teacher effectiveness based on one or more of the following: improved retention of high performing teachers; correlation of student growth scores to teachers granted vs. denied tenure; or improvements in proficiency rating of the principal on specific teacher effectiveness standards in the principal practice rubric.	Checked
9.3) Assurances -- Goals Assure that any other goals, if applicable, shall address quantifiable and verifiable improvements in academic results or the school's learning environment (e.g. student or teacher attendance).	Checked

9.4) Sources of Evidence (if applicable)

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

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

9.5) Survey Tool(s) (if applicable)

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

(No response)

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

(No response)

(No response)

(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 has selected an approved rubric for evaluating principals, the Multidimensional Principal Performance Rubric (MPPR). The MPPR rubric is derived from the ISLLC standards adopted by the state. It covers 6 domains plus assessment of goal setting and attainment, for a total 22 components. Each component is rated on a four-point scale. The entire 60 points are based on the rubric. A conversion chart, attached below, is used to translate average rubric scores to the allocation of points and the HEDI scoring bands.

The evaluation process consists of three conferences between the principal and the supervisor - a goal setting conference, a midyear progress check, and a final evaluation conference. The MPPR framework guides the setting of goals and any additional sources of evidence needed to demonstrate effectiveness.

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/5143/124433-pMADJ4gk6R/Other Measaures for Principals \(60\).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.	Performance at this level requires a average rating of 3.5 or higher on the 22 components included in the MPPR rubric, including the setting, attainment, and evaluation of goals. Each component is rated separately. The average score for all components is translated to corresponding points on a scale of 0 - 60. A minimum score of 59 is required for a highly effective rating.
Effective: Overall performance and results meet standards.	Performance at this level requires a average rating between 2.5 and 3.4 on the 22 components included in the MPPR rubric, including the setting, attainment, and evaluation of goals. Each component is rated separately. The average score for all components is translated to corresponding points on a scale of 0 - 60. A score between 57.0 to 58.9 denotes an effective rating.
Developing: Overall performance and results need improvement in order to meet standards.	Performance at this level reflects a average rating between 1.5 and 2.4 on the 22 components included in the MPPR rubric, including the setting, attainment, and evaluation of goals. Each component is rated separately. The average score for all components is translated to corresponding points on a scale of 0 - 60. A score between 50.0 and 56.9 denotes a developing rating.

Ineffective: Overall performance and results do not meet standards.

Performance at this level reflects a rating between 1.0 and 1.4 on the 22 components included in the MPPR rubric, including the setting, attainment, and evaluation of goals. The average score is translated to corresponding points on a scale of 0 - 60. A score below 50 is considered ineffective.

Please provide the locally-negotiated 60 point scoring bands.

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

9.8) School Visits

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

Probationary Principals

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

Tenured Principals

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

10. Composite Scoring (Principals)

Created Wednesday, June 20, 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	50-56
Ineffective	0-49

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

2012-13 where Value-Added growth measure applies

Growth or Comparable Measures

Locally-selected Measures of growth or achievement

Other Measures of Effectiveness

(60 points)

Overall

Composite Score

Highly Effective

22-25

14-15

Ranges determined locally--see above

91-100

Effective

10-21

8-13

75-90

Developing

3-9

3-7

65-74

Ineffective

0-2

0-2

0-64

11. Additional Requirements - Principals

Created Wednesday, June 20, 2012
Updated Friday, September 14, 2012

Page 1

11.1) Assurances -- Improvement Plans

Please check the boxes below.

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

11.2) Attachment: Principal Improvement Plan Forms

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

<assets/survey-uploads/5276/144206-Df0w3Xx5v6/11-2 PIP rev.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:

APPEALS PROCESS FOR PRINCIPALS

- 1. Within five (5) school days of the receipt of a principal's annual evaluation, the principal may request, in writing, review by the original evaluator.*
- 2. The appeal writing shall articulate in detail the basis of the appeal to the original evaluator. As set forth in Section 3012-c of the Education Law, the evaluated principal may only challenge:*

- the substance of the annual professional performance review;
- the school district's adherence to the standards and methodologies required for such reviews pursuant to Section 3012-c of the Education Law;
- the school district's adherence to the regulations of the commissioner and compliance with any applicable locally negotiated procedures; and
- the school district's issuance and/or implementation of the terms of the principal's improvement plan.

3. The parties herewith acknowledge that unit members shall not be permitted to appeal for any other reason, including, but not limited to, alleged claims of bias, retaliation and/or inequitable application of the evaluation process and/or procedures.

4. Performance ratings of "ineffective" and "developing" are the only ratings subject to appeal for tenured principals. Principals who receive a rating of "highly effective," or "effective" shall not be permitted to appeal their rating.

5. Probationary principals may appeal a rating of "ineffective."

6. The filing of an appeal pursuant to this appeals procedure shall have no bearing and shall in no way limit and/or impair the Board of Education's unfettered right to terminate probationary principals in accordance with applicable law. The timelines for the termination of a probationary principal set forth in Education Law Section 3031 shall in all instances supersede the timelines set forth in this appeals procedure such that pending appeals shall be deemed withdrawn to the extent a response is due, at any stage, subsequent to the probationary principal's termination date and no additional salary shall be paid to the probationary principal as a result of filing an appeal under this procedure.

7. Within five (5) school days of receipt of the appeal, the original evaluator shall render a determination, in writing, respecting the appeal.

8. Within five (5) school days of the principal's receipt of the original evaluator's determination, the principal may request, in writing, an external review. Failure to articulate a particular basis for the appeal in the appeal writing to the Superintendent of Schools shall be deemed a waiver of that claim. In all other respects said appeal shall be consistent with the requirements set forth in sub-paragraphs two (2) through five (5) above.

9. Within five (5) business days of receipt of the appeal, the Superintendent of Schools and the head of the administrators' bargaining unit shall jointly select an external reviewer for the appeal. The reviewer shall render a final and binding determination, in writing, respecting the appeal.

10. The final determination shall not be grievable, arbitrable, nor reviewable in any other forum.

11. Evaluations may only be appealed once.

11.4) Training and Certification of Lead Evaluators and Evaluators

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

The Superintendent of Schools is the lead evaluator for all district principals, with input from other central office administrators. The district will certify the lead evaluator upon successful completion of required training that encompasses the nine elements specified: NY teaching standards, evidence-based observation, application and use of growth percentile and value-added models, application and use of the approved Multidimensional Principal Performance Rubric, the teacher practice rubrics, local assessment measures, use of SIRS and data reporting procedures, the scoring methodology and rating system, and specific considerations for special populations of students.

Training will be provided through several means and resources, including third party providers of approved assessments (NWEA MAP) and teacher practice rubrics (Teachscape). The bulk of the training on the approved Multidimensional Principal Performance Rubric will be provided by Learner-Centered Initiatives, the designers of that rubric. This training is conducted under the auspices of SW BOCES. The duration of initial training has been 20 hours prior to the 2012-13 school year.

Lead evaluators will be recertified periodically in order to ensure inter-rater reliability and up-to-date knowledge of criteria and procedures. Principals will also participate in half-day training to gain familiarity with the rubric, goal setting, and required evidence. The duration of follow up training is approximately a half-day annually.

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, June 13, 2012

Updated Friday, September 14, 2012

Page 1

12.1) Upload the Joint Certification of the APPR Plan

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

[assets/survey-uploads/5581/142249-3Uqgn5g9Iu/APPR certification.PDF](assets/survey-uploads/5581/142249-3Uqgn5g9Iu/APPR%20certification.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.

Danielson's Framework for Teaching (2011 Revised Edition) Conversion Flow Chart										
	Step 1	Step 2	Step 3	Step 4	Step 5	Step 6	Step 7	Step 8	Step 9	
	Determine Relative Value of Each Domain (hypo--to be negotiated)	Determine Relative Value of Each SubDomain as part of the Domain (hypo--to be negotiated)	Evaluator Gives Every Teacher a Rating of 1-4 in Each Subdomain (4=HE, 3=E, 2=D, 1=I) HYPO	Weigh Subdomain Scores	Total Domain Score	Weigh Total Domain Score and Compute Total	Negotiate HEDI Bands	Negotiate Conversion Chart		
	20%						H=59-60	Average Rubric Score	Conversion Score	
Domain 1: Planning and Preparation										
A. Knowledge of Content and Pedagogy		17%		0			E=57-58	1	0	
B. Knowledge of Students		17%		0			D=50-56	1.1	12	
C. Setting Instructional Outcomes		17%		0			I=0-49	1.2	25	
D. Knowledge of Resources		17%		0				1.3	37	
E. Designing Coherent Instruction		17%		0				1.4	49	
F. Designing Student Assessments		17%		0				1.5	50	
		100%			0	0		1.6	50.7	
Domain 2: Classroom Environment	30%									
A. Respect and Rapport		20%		0				1.7	51.4	
B. Culture for Learning		20%		0				1.8	52.1	
C. Managing Classroom Procedures		20%		0				1.9	52.8	
D. Managing Student Behavior		20%		0				2	53.5	
E. Organizing Physical Spaces		20%		0				2.1	54.2	
		100%			0	0		2.2	54.9	
								2.3	55.6	
Domain 3: Instruction	30%									
A. Communicating with Students		20%		0				2.4	56.3	
B. Questioning/Prompts and Discussion		20%		0				2.5	57	
C. Engaging Students in Learning		20%		0				2.6	57.2	
D. Using Assessment in Instruction		20%		0				2.7	57.4	
E. Using Flexibility and Responsiveness		20%		0				2.8	57.6	
		100%		0	0	0		2.9	57.8	
								3	58	
Domain 4: Teaching	20%									
A. Reflecting on Teaching		17%		0				3.1	58.2	
B. Maintaining Accurate Records		17%		0				3.2	58.4	
C. Communicating with Families		17%		0				3.3	58.6	
D. Participating in a Professional Community		17%		0				3.4	58.8	
E. Growing and Developing Professionally		17%		0				3.5	59	
F. Showing Professionalism		17%		0				3.6	59.3	
		100%						3.7	59.5	
					0	0		3.8	59.8	
Domain: Other*							0	3.9	60	
Total	100%				Evaluation Score	0		4	60.25 (round t	

Other Measures of Effectiveness for Principals (60 points)

The District has selected an approved rubric for evaluating principals, the Multidimensional Principal Performance Rubric (MPPR). The MPPR rubric is derived from the ISLLC standards adopted by the state. It covers 6 domains plus assessment of goal setting and attainment, for a total 22 components. Each component is rated on a four-point scale. The average score is used to determine the HEDI rating and assignment of points. The entire 60 points are based on the rubric.

Level	Description	Overall rubric average score	60 point distribution for composite index
Highly Effective	Average score on the MPPR rubric is well above district expectations for principal performance.	3.5-4.0	59-60
Effective	Average score on the MPPR rubric meets District expectations for principal performance.	2.5-3.4	57-58
Developing	Average score on the MPPR rubric is below district expectations for principal performance.	1.5-2.4	50-56
Ineffective	Average score on the MPPR rubric is well below District expectations for principal performance.	1.0-1.4	0-49

Multidimensional Principal Performance Rubric						
		Step 1	Step 2	Step 3	Step 4	Step 5
		Evaluator rates Principal on 1 - 4 Scale	Determine average score	HEDI Bands	Conversion Chart	
Domain1: Shared Vision of Learning				H=59-60	Average Rubric Score	Conversion Score
	A. Culture			E=57-58	1.0	0
	B. Sustainability			D=50-56	1.1	12
Domain 2: School Culture and Instructional Program				I=0-49	1.2	25
	A. Culture				1.3	37
	B. Instructional Program				1.4	49
	C. Capacity Building				1.5	50
	D. Sustainability				1.6	50.7
	E. Strategic Planning Process				1.7	51.4
Domain 3: Safe Efficient Effective Learning Environment					1.8	52.1
	A. Capacity Building				1.9	52.8
	B. Culture				2.0	53.5
	C. Sustainability				2.1	54.2
	D. Instructional Program				2.2	54.9
Domain 4: Community					2.3	55.6
	A. Strategic Planning Process: Inquiry				2.4	56.3
	B. Culture				2.5	57
	C. Sustainability				2.6	57.2
Domain 5: Integrity, Fairness, Ethics					2.8	57.6
	A. Sustainability				2.9	57.8
	B. Culture				3.0	58
Domain 6 Political, Social, Economic, Legal, and Cultural Context					3.1	58.2
	A. Sustainability				3.2	58.4
	B. Culture				3.3	58.6
Other: Goal Setting and Attainment					3.4	58.8
	A. Uncovering Goals				3.5	59
	B. Strategic Planning				3.6	59.2
	C. Taking Action				3.7	59.4
	D. Evaluating Attainment				3.8	59.6
	Total Score	0			3.9	59.8
	Number of Ratings	0			4.0	60
	Average Rating		#DIV/0!			

LOCAL MEASURES OF GROWTH AND ACHIEVEMENT (20%)

The table below shows the district standards for local measures of achievement using state assessment, Regents, and Advanced Placement results:

	Scoring Bands	% Meeting Standard	Description
H	18-20	90+	The school-wide results for all students are well above District expectations for achievement of learning standards as measured by the aggregate percentage of students performing at levels 3 or 4 on state assessments (based on 2011 cut-off scores), passing Regents exams (based on 2011 cut-off scores),, or scoring 3 or better on at least one AP exam.
E	9-17	75-89	The school-wide results for all students meet District expectations for achievement of learning standards as measured by the aggregate percentage of students performing at levels 3 or 4 on state assessments (based on 2011 cut-off scores),, passing Regents exams (based on 2011 cut-off scores), or scoring 3 or better on at least one AP exam.
D	3-8	65-74	The school-wide results for all students are below District expectations for achievement of learning standards as measured by the aggregate percentage of students performing at levels 3 or 4 on state assessments (based on 2011 cut-off scores), passing Regents exams (based on 2011 cut-off scores),, or scoring 3 or better on at least one AP exam.
I	0-2	< 65	The school-wide results for all students are well below District expectations for achievement of learning standards as measured by the aggregate percentage of students performing at levels 3 or 4 on state assessments (based on 2011 cut-off scores),, passing Regents exams (based on 2011 cut-off scores), or scoring 3 or better on at least one AP exam.

At the Elementary School, all teachers, including grades K-2, art, library, music, physical education, and science at grades other than four, the local HEDI rating will reflect the aggregate percentage of all Elementary students scoring 3 or 4 on state assessments in ELA, math, and science.

At the Middle School, all teachers, including art, foreign language, music, physical education, drama, computers, technology, health, and home and careers, the local HEDI rating will be reflect the aggregate percentage of all Middle School students scoring 3 or 4 on state assessments in ELA, math, and science.

At the High School, the local HEDI rating for all teachers will reflect the aggregate percentage of all students scoring 65 or better on Regents exams for Global History, US History, English, mathematics, and science and the percentage of students taking Advanced Placement courses who score 3 or better

on at least one AP exam. AP exams include art history, studio art, English Language, English Literature, micro/Macro Economics, US History, World History, Calculus AB, Calculus BC, Statistics, Biology, chemistry, Environmental Science, Physics B, Physics C, French Language, Latin, and Spanish Language.

As other comparable and rigorous assessments of growth and achievement are developed in subject areas without state tests, those assessments may be phased into the local measures.

Excluded from this part of the APPR regulations are guidance counselors, psychologists, OT/PT teachers, speech teachers, HS librarian, resource room/skills teachers, teacher assistants and teacher aides.

The table below shows how points may be earned within each HEDI category.

Scoring Band	Points	% Meeting Standard ¹
H	20	95
	19	93
	18	90
E	17	89
	16	88
	15	87
	14	85
	13	83
	12	81
	11	79
	10	77
	9	75
	D	8
7		73
6		71
5		69
4		67
3		65
I	2	36-64
	1	18-35
	0	0-17

¹ Standard = Levels 3 or 4 on state assessments, 65 or better on Regents exams, or students scoring 3 or better on at least one AP exam.

LOCAL MEASURES OF GROWTH AND ACHIEVEMENT (20%)

The table below shows the district standards for local measures of achievement using state assessment, Regents, and Advanced Placement results:

	Scoring Bands	% Meeting Standard	Description
H	18-20	90+	The school-wide results for all students are well above District expectations for achievement of learning standards as measured by the aggregate percentage of students performing at levels 3 or 4 on state assessments (based on 2011 cut-off scores), passing Regents exams (based on 2011 cut-off scores),, or scoring 3 or better on at least one AP exam.
E	9-17	75-89	The school-wide results for all students meet District expectations for achievement of learning standards as measured by the aggregate percentage of students performing at levels 3 or 4 on state assessments (based on 2011 cut-off scores),, passing Regents exams (based on 2011 cut-off scores), or scoring 3 or better on at least one AP exam.
D	3-8	65-74	The school-wide results for all students are below District expectations for achievement of learning standards as measured by the aggregate percentage of students performing at levels 3 or 4 on state assessments (based on 2011 cut-off scores), passing Regents exams (based on 2011 cut-off scores),, or scoring 3 or better on at least one AP exam.
I	0-2	< 65	The school-wide results for all students are well below District expectations for achievement of learning standards as measured by the aggregate percentage of students performing at levels 3 or 4 on state assessments (based on 2011 cut-off scores),, passing Regents exams (based on 2011 cut-off scores), or scoring 3 or better on at least one AP exam.

At the Elementary School, all teachers, including grades K-2, art, library, music, physical education, and science at grades other than four, the local HEDI rating will reflect the aggregate percentage of all Elementary students scoring 3 or 4 on state assessments in ELA, math, and science.

At the Middle School, all teachers, including art, foreign language, music, physical education, drama, computers, technology, health, and home and careers, the local HEDI rating will be reflect the aggregate percentage of all Middle School students scoring 3 or 4 on state assessments in ELA, math, and science.

At the High School, the local HEDI rating for all teachers will reflect the aggregate percentage of all students scoring 65 or better on Regents exams for Global History, US History, English, mathematics, and science and the percentage of students taking Advanced Placement courses who score 3 or better

on at least one AP exam. AP exams include art history, studio art, English Language, English Literature, micro/Macro Economics, US History, World History, Calculus AB, Calculus BC, Statistics, Biology, chemistry, Environmental Science, Physics B, Physics C, French Language, Latin, and Spanish Language.

As other comparable and rigorous assessments of growth and achievement are developed in subject areas without state tests, those assessments may be phased into the local measures.

Excluded from this part of the APPR regulations are guidance counselors, psychologists, OT/PT teachers, speech teachers, HS librarian, resource room/skills teachers, teacher assistants and teacher aides.

The table below shows how points may be earned within each HEDI category.

Scoring Band	Points	% Meeting Standard ¹
H	20	95
	19	93
	18	90
E	17	89
	16	88
	15	87
	14	85
	13	83
	12	81
	11	79
	10	77
	9	75
	D	8
7		73
6		71
5		69
4		67
3		65
I	2	36-64
	1	18-35
	0	0-17

¹ Standard = Levels 3 or 4 on state assessments, 65 or better on Regents exams, or students scoring 3 or better on at least one AP exam.

ITEM 2.11 BRONXVILLE STATE MEASURES OF COMPARABLE GROWTH (20%) – SUMMARY

ELEMENTARY SCHOOL

Teachers	Measure
Grades K-2	Develop SLOs based on benchmarks developed by NWEA MAP for Primary Grades (ELA and Math)
Grade 3	Develop SLOs for ELA and Math based on state assessments with 2012 GMADE and GRADE results as a baseline measure.
Grade 4 Science	Develop SLO based on state assessment using NWEA MAP Science as a baseline.
Grades 4 and 5	State will provide a growth measure for ELA and mathematics
All others	Develop course-wide SLOs based on generic expectations for SLO target achievement (fall-spring progress), including collective assessment of art work, musical performances, and fitness.

MIDDLE SCHOOL

Teachers	Measure
Grades 6-8 ELA, math	State will provide a growth measure
Grade 8 science	Develop SLOs based on state assessment using 2012 Grade 7 ELA and Math results as a baseline measure.
Grades 6-8 social studies	Develop course-wide SLOs based on generic expectations for SLO target achievement. Use previous year's final/grade as a baseline.
Grades 6-7 science	Develop course-wide SLOs based on generic expectations for SLO target achievement. Use previous year's final/grade as a baseline.
All others	Develop course-wide SLOs based on generic expectations for SLO target achievement (fall-spring progress), including collective assessments of art work, musical performances, and fitness. Also encompasses home and careers, health, computers, and technology.

HIGH SCHOOL

Teachers	Measure
Regents courses: Global History, US History, English, mathematics, and science	Develop SLOs based on Regents or equivalent performance, using GROWTH TO MASTERY approach.
Grade 9 English, mathematics, and science	Develop SLOs using NWEA MAP for Reading, language use, mathematics, and science.
Advanced Placement Courses	Develop SLOs based on AP Performance using previous year's final and grade as a baseline measure.
Other Teachers of English,	Develop course-based SLOs using previous year's final and grade as a

foreign language, social studies, mathematics, and science	baseline measure.
All others	Develop course-wide SLOs based on generic expectations for SLO target achievement (fall-spring progress),

DISTRICT STANDARDS FOR STUDENT GROWTH: Does student progress meet district expectations for growth?

Beginning Performance Level	End Performance Level			
	1	2	3	4
1	No	Yes	Yes	Yes
2	No	No	Yes	Yes
3	No	No	Yes	Yes
4	No	No	No	Yes

	Scoring Bands	% of students who meet or exceed specific levels of acceptable growth	Description
H	18-20	80+	Results are well above the district standard for progress.
E	9-17	55-79	Results meet the district standard for progress.
D	3-8	30-54	Results are below the district standard for progress.
I	0-2	< 29	Results are well below the district standard for progress.

The following table shows how teachers earn a specific number of points within each HEDI category.

Rating	Points	% at 3 or 4
H	20	90
	19	85
	18	80
<hr/>		
E	17	77
	16	74
	15	71
	14	68
	13	65
	12	62
	11	59
	10	56
	9	55
<hr/>		
D	8	51
	7	47
	6	43
	5	39
	4	35
	3	30
<hr/>		
I	2	20
	1	10
	0	<10
<hr/>		

The NWEA MAP and MAP for Primary Grades will be used to measure student growth in areas not covered by state assessments. The process for defining HEDI categories using NWEA MAP and MAP for Primary Grades follows.

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.)

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

Comparable Growth Measures (SLO) for All Teachers – ELA

(DISTRICT NAME) will be using conditional growth index (CGI) based on the NWEA MAP assessment to calculate teacher-level effectiveness ratings for the comparable growth measures in ELA in grades K-2 (*same information can be used in grades 9 & 10 as applicable*). The conditional growth index captures the contributions educators make to student learning on the NWEA MAP assessments, by comparing actual student growth to the student growth norms. These norms reflect the amount of growth that might be expected from these students based on their grade, subject, and starting RIT score. CGI scores are expressed in standard deviation units, or z-scores, with scores above zero indicating students exceeded the growth norms, whereas scores below zero indicate growth less than the growth norm. CGI scores of zero are indicative of students meeting their growth norms.

To construct an evaluative rating, CGI scores for all students linked to a particular teacher will be averaged, with this average CGI score converted to the four-category HEDI range. The objective is to facilitate valid and fair comparisons of productivity with respect to student outcomes, given that teachers often serve very different student populations. Major modeling and score translation decisions were decided by a Technical Advisory Panel made up of volunteer districts from across the state.

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.

(Prompt 1) 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.

To assign teachers to HEDI categories, we will assume a normal distribution of teacher effects centered on 13. From this point, we will use the following cut points to assign teachers to categories:

Highly Effective: Greater than or equal to .9 standard deviations above average (13)

Effective: Less than .9 standard deviations above average and greater than or equal to -.9 standard deviations below average

Developing: Less than -.9 standard deviations below average and greater than or equal to -2.1 standard deviations below average

Ineffective: Less than -2.1 standard deviations below average

(Prompt 2) Highly Effective (18-20 points) Results are well above District- or BOCES-adopted expectations for growth or achievement for grade/subject

Within the category of Highly Effective, those teachers who fall at greater than or equal to .9 standard deviations above average, we further divide the distribution to determine specific points. The specific point breakdown, with upper and lower bounds denoted in standard deviation units, is as follows:

APPR Point	\geq	$<$
18	0.9	1.1
19	1.1	1.3
20	1.3	

(Prompt 3) Effective (9- 17 points) Results meet District- or BOCES-adopted expectations for growth or achievement for grade/subject.

Within the category of Effective, those teachers who fall at less than .9 standard deviations above average and greater than or equal to -.9 standard deviations below average, we further divide the distribution to determine specific points. The specific point breakdown, with upper and lower bounds denoted in standard deviation units, is as follows:

APPR Point	≥	<
9	-0.9	-0.7
10	-0.7	-0.5
11	-0.5	-0.3
12	-0.3	-0.1
13	-0.1	0.1
14	0.1	0.3
15	0.3	0.5
16	0.5	0.7
17	0.7	0.9

(Prompt 4) Developing (3 - 8 points) Results are below District- or BOCES-adopted expectations for growth or achievement for grade/subject

Within the category of Developing, those teachers who fall at less than -.9 standard deviations below average and greater than or equal to -2.1 standard deviations below average, we further divide the distribution to determine specific points. The specific point breakdown, with upper and lower bounds denoted in standard deviation units, is as follows:

APPR Point	≥	<
3	-2.1	-1.9
4	-1.9	-1.7
5	-1.7	-1.5
6	-1.5	-1.3
7	-1.3	-1.1
8	-1.1	-0.9

(Prompt 5) Ineffective (0 - 2 points) Results are well below District- or BOCES-adopted expectations for growth or achievement for grade/subject

Within the category of Ineffective, those teachers who fall at less than -2.1 standard deviations below average, we further divide the distribution to determine specific points. The specific point breakdown, with upper and lower bounds denoted in standard deviation units, is as follows:

APPR Point	\geq	$<$
0		-2.5
1	-2.5	-2.3
2	-2.3	-2.1

Comparable Growth Measures (SLO) for All Teachers - Math

(DISTRICT NAME) will be using conditional growth index (CGI) based on the NWEA MAP assessment to calculate teacher-level effectiveness ratings for the comparable growth measures in math in grades K-2. *(same information can be used in grades 9 & 10 as desired)*. The conditional growth index captures the contributions educators make to student learning on the NWEA MAP assessments, by comparing actual student growth to the student growth norms. These norms reflect the amount of growth that might be expected from these students based on their grade, subject, and starting RIT score.. CGI scores are expressed in standard deviation units, or z-scores, with scores above zero indicating students exceeded the growth norms, whereas scores below zero indicate growth less than the growth norm. CGI scores of zero are indicative of students meeting their growth norms.

To construct an evaluative rating, CGI scores for all students linked to a particular teacher will be averaged, with this average CGI score converted to the four-category HEDI range. The objective is to facilitate valid and fair comparisons of productivity with respect to student outcomes, given that teachers often serve very different student populations. Major modeling and score translation decisions were decided by a Technical Advisory Panel made up of volunteer districts from across the state.

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.

(Prompt 1) 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.

To assign teachers to HEDI categories, we will assume a normal distribution of teacher effects centered on 13. From this point, we will use the following cut points to assign teachers to categories:

Highly Effective: Greater than or equal to .9 standard deviations above average (13)

Effective: Less than .9 standard deviations above average and greater than or equal to -.9 standard deviations below average

Developing: Less than -.9 standard deviations below average and greater than or equal to -2.1 standard deviations below average

Ineffective: Less than -2.1 standard deviations below average

(Prompt 2) Highly Effective (18-20 points) Results are well above District- or BOCES-adopted expectations for growth or achievement for grade/subject

Within the category of Highly Effective, those teachers who fall at greater than or equal to .9 standard deviations above average, we further divide the distribution to determine specific points. The specific point breakdown, with upper and lower bounds denoted in standard deviation units, is as follows:

APPR Point	\geq	$<$
18	0.9	1.1
19	1.1	1.3
20	1.3	

(Prompt 3) Effective (9- 17 points) Results meet District- or BOCES-adopted expectations for growth or achievement for grade/subject.

Within the category of Effective, those teachers who fall at less than .9 standard deviations above average and greater than or equal to -.9 standard deviations below average, we further divide the distribution to determine specific points. The specific point breakdown, with upper and lower bounds denoted in standard deviation units, is as follows:

APPR Point	\geq	$<$
9	-0.9	-0.7
10	-0.7	-0.5
11	-0.5	-0.3
12	-0.3	-0.1
13	-0.1	0.1
14	0.1	0.3
15	0.3	0.5
16	0.5	0.7
17	0.7	0.9

(Prompt 4) Developing (3 - 8 points) Results are below District- or BOCES-adopted expectations for growth or achievement for grade/subject

Within the category of Developing, those teachers who fall at less than -.9 standard deviations below average and greater than or equal to -2.1 standard deviations below average, we further divide the distribution to determine specific points. The specific point breakdown, with upper and lower bounds denoted in standard deviation units, is as follows:

APPR Point	\geq	$<$
3	-2.1	-1.9
4	-1.9	-1.7
5	-1.7	-1.5
6	-1.5	-1.3
7	-1.3	-1.1
8	-1.1	-0.9

(Prompt 5) Ineffective (0 - 2 points) Results are well below District- or BOCES-adopted expectations for growth or achievement for grade/subject

Within the category of Ineffective, those teachers who fall at less than -2.1 standard deviations below average, we further divide the distribution to determine specific points. The specific point breakdown, with upper and lower bounds denoted in standard deviation units, is as follows:

APPR Point	≥	<
0		-2.5
1	-2.5	-2.3
2	-2.3	-2.1

3.14) Locally Developed Controls

(Prompt 6) 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 conditional growth index measures the normative gain made by a typical student with pre- and post-test information (i.e. test scores from the fall and spring). This index score provides information about how a student’s growth compared to the amount of growth that might be expected for that student based on his/her starting RIT score, grade, and the subject being tested.

To ensure that the average classroom CGI score is as accurate as possible, student outliers—both positive and negative—will be removed from the estimate of a teacher’s effectiveness. Specifically, CGI scores of +/- 3 will be removed from all calculations of teacher effectiveness, as these outlying scores can have a significant impact on the average CGI score in a teacher’s classrooms, which may result in a teacher being assigned to an incorrect HEDI category.

3.15) Teachers with More Than One Comparable Growth Measure

(Prompt 7) 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.

To combine multiple locally selected measures, we will take a population-weighted average of the measures. We will independently calculate CGI measures for each subject area, then assign each teacher a HEDI point value.

Locally Selected Measures of Student Achievement for All Other Principals (15 Points)

The local measures of student achievement are based on aggregate levels of mastery on state assessments (K-8) and Regents and Advanced Placement (High School). The standard is based on the percentage of students who achieve at levels 3 or 4 using the state cut-off scores established in 2011.

	Scoring Bands	% Meeting Standard	Standard
H	14-15	91-100	K-5, 6-8: The school-wide results for all students are well above District expectations for achievement of learning standards as measured by the aggregate percentage of students performing at levels 3 or 4 on state assessments (based on 2011 cut-off scores). 9-12: The school-wide results for all students are well above District expectations for achievement of learning standards as measured by the aggregate percentage of Regents exam results at the passing level (based on 2011 cut-off scores) and the aggregate percentage of Advanced Placement students scoring 3 or better on at least one AP exam.
E	8-13	75-90	K-5, 6-8: The school-wide results for all students meet District expectations for achievement of learning standards as measured by the aggregate percentage of students performing at levels 3 or 4 on state assessments (based on 2011 cut-off scores). 9-12: The school-wide results for all students meet District expectations for achievement of learning standards as measured by the aggregate percentage of Regents exam results at the passing level (based on 2011 cut-off scores) and the aggregate percentage of Advanced Placement students scoring 3 or better on at least one AP exam.
D	3-7	65-74	K-5, 6-8: The school-wide results for all students are below District expectations for achievement of learning standards as measured by the aggregate percentage of students performing at levels 3 or 4 on state assessments (based on 2011 cut-off scores). 9-12: The school-wide results for all students are below District expectations for achievement of learning standards as measured by the aggregate percentage of Regents exam results at the passing level (based on 2011 cut-off scores) and the aggregate percentage of Advanced Placement students scoring 3 or better on at least one AP exam.
I	0-2	0-64	K-5, 6-8: The school-wide results for all students are well below District expectations for achievement of learning standards as measured by the aggregate percentage of students performing at levels 3 or 4 on state assessments (based on 2011 cut-off scores). 9-12: The school-wide results for all students are well below District expectations for achievement of learning standards as measured by the aggregate percentage of Regents exam results at the passing level (based on 2011 cut-off scores) and the aggregate percentage of Advanced Placement students scoring 3 or better on at least one AP exam.

Based on the standards explained above, the system for earning points within each scoring category is as follows:

Category	Score	% Meeting Standard
H	15	95
	14	90
	13	85
E	12	83
	11	81
	10	79
	9	77
	8	75
D	7	73
	6	71
	5	69
	4	67
	3	65
I	2	41-64
	1	21-40
	0	0-20

Locally Selected Measures of Student Achievement for All Other Principals (20 Points)

The local measures of student achievement are based on aggregate levels of mastery on state assessments (K-8) and Regents and Advanced Placement (High School). The standard is based on the percentage of students who achieve at levels 3 or 4 using the state cut-off scores established in 2011.

	Scoring Bands	% Meeting Standard	Standard
H	18-20	90+	K-5, 6-8: The school-wide results for all students are well above District expectations for achievement of learning standards as measured by the aggregate percentage of students performing at levels 3 or 4 on state assessments (based on 2011 cut-off scores). 9-12: The school-wide results for all students are well above District expectations for achievement of learning standards as measured by the aggregate percentage of Regents exam results at the passing level (based on 2011 cut-off scores) and the aggregate percentage of Advanced Placement students scoring 3 or better on at least one AP exam.
E	9-17	75-89	K-5, 6-8: The school-wide results for all students meet District expectations for achievement of learning standards as measured by the aggregate percentage of students performing at levels 3 or 4 on state assessments (based on 2011 cut-off scores). 9-12: The school-wide results for all students meet District expectations for achievement of learning standards as measured by the aggregate percentage of Regents exam results at the passing level (based on 2011 cut-off scores) and the aggregate percentage of Advanced Placement students scoring 3 or better on at least one AP exam.
D	3-8	65-74	K-5, 6-8: The school-wide results for all students are below District expectations for achievement of learning standards as measured by the aggregate percentage of students performing at levels 3 or 4 on state assessments (based on 2011 cut-off scores). 9-12: The school-wide results for all students are below District expectations for achievement of learning standards as measured by the aggregate percentage of Regents exam results at the passing level (based on 2011 cut-off scores) and the aggregate percentage of Advanced Placement students scoring 3 or better on at least one AP exam.
I	0-2	< 65	K-5, 6-8: The school-wide results for all students are well below District expectations for achievement of learning standards as measured by the aggregate percentage of students performing at levels 3 or 4 on state assessments (based on 2011 cut-off scores). 9-12: The school-wide results for all students are well below District expectations for achievement of learning standards as measured by the aggregate percentage of Regents exam results at the passing level (based on 2011 cut-off scores) and the aggregate percentage of Advanced Placement students scoring 3 or better on at least one AP exam.

	Scoring Bands	% at Levels 3 and 4	Description
H	18-20	90+	The school-wide results for all students in the school scoring 3 or 4 on state assessments are well above District expectations for achievement of learning standards.
E	9-17	80-89	The school-wide results for all students in the school scoring 3 or 4 on state assessments meet District expectations for achievement of learning standards.
D	3-8	65-79	The school-wide results for all students in the school scoring 3 or 4 on state assessments are below District expectations for achievement of learning standards.
I	0-2	< 65	The school-wide results for all students in the school scoring 3 or 4 on state assessments are well below District expectations for achievement of learning standards.

Scoring Band	Points	% at Levels 3 and 4
H	20	95
	19	93
	18	90
E	17	89
	16	88
	15	87
	14	85
	13	83
	12	81
	11	79
	10	77
D	9	75
	8	74
	7	73
	6	71
	5	69
	4	67
I	3	65
	2	36-64
	1	18-35
	0	0-17



Item 6.2 Bronxville School Teacher Improvement Plan

This plan is designed to develop teachers with overall ratings of Ineffective or Developing to improve and achieve an Effective rating. This plan must be developed no later than ten school days after the first day of classes each school year. The plan should be mutually developed. At the planning conference the evaluator and teacher (and a BTA representative if the teacher chooses) should complete all items except “date completed”. The actual dates of completion are added at each conference so that at the end of the year there is complete documentation that the improvement plan was carried out. Observation reports and other artifacts should be appended to the plan. The summary evaluation is completed at the final conference.

Teacher:

Evaluator:

1. PLANNING CONFERENCE (Held within ten school days after the first day of classes)

Date:
Present:

2. IDENTIFY AREAS NEEDING IMPROVEMENT. Identify each NY teaching standard, area of student achievement, or component of the Danielson 2011 Framework needing improvement (i.e. a rating less than effective). Check all that apply.

NY Teaching Standards	Categories of Evaluation	Classroom Observations	Other Measures
<input type="checkbox"/> Knowledge of Students and Student Learning	<input type="checkbox"/> Student Growth Measures	<input type="checkbox"/> 2a: Creating an Environment of Respect and Rapport	<input type="checkbox"/> 1a: Demonstrating Knowledge of Content and Pedagogy
<input type="checkbox"/> Knowledge of Content and Instructional Planning	<input type="checkbox"/> Local Measures of Student Achievement	<input type="checkbox"/> 2b: Establishing a Culture for Learning	<input type="checkbox"/> 1b: Demonstrating Knowledge of Students
<input type="checkbox"/> Instructional Practice	<input type="checkbox"/> Other Measures of Teaching Performance	<input type="checkbox"/> 2c: Managing Classroom Procedures	<input type="checkbox"/> 1c: Setting Instructional Outcomes
<input type="checkbox"/> Learning Environment		<input type="checkbox"/> 2d: Managing Student Behavior	<input type="checkbox"/> 1d: Demonstrating Knowledge of Resources
<input type="checkbox"/> Assessment for Student Learning		<input type="checkbox"/> 2e: Organizing Physical Space	<input type="checkbox"/> 1e: Designing Coherent Instruction
<input type="checkbox"/> Professional Responsibilities and Collaboration		<input type="checkbox"/> 3a: Communicating Clearly and Accurately	<input type="checkbox"/> 1f: Designing Student Assessments
<input type="checkbox"/> Professional Growth		<input type="checkbox"/> 3b: Using Questioning and Discussion Techniques	<input type="checkbox"/> 4a: Reflecting on Teaching
		<input type="checkbox"/> 3c: Engaging Students in Learning	<input type="checkbox"/> 4b: Maintaining Accurate Records
		<input type="checkbox"/> 3d: Using Assessment in Instruction	<input type="checkbox"/> 4c: Communicating with Families
		<input type="checkbox"/> 3e: Demonstrating Flexibility and Responsiveness	<input type="checkbox"/> 4d: Participating in a Professional Community
			<input type="checkbox"/> 4e: Growing and Developing Professionally

2. IMPROVEMENT GOALS:

(e.g., achieve effective rating in a particular component or raising levels of student achievement or growth)

3. ACCEPTABLE EVIDENCE OF ACCOMPLISHMENT:

(e.g., improved observation ratings, improved learning results, meeting rubric criteria for student work)

4. CLASSROOM OBSERVATIONS: (At least two are required, one unannounced. An Improvement Plan may call for additional observations and/or second evaluators. Add more lines as necessary.)

	Evaluator	Target Date of Completion	Date Completed
Observation # 1			
Observation # 2			
Observation # 3			
Observation # 4			

5. IMPROVEMENT ACTIVITIES AND APPROXIMATE DATES OF COMPLETION (What the teacher must do):

(e.g., professional learning experiences, peer visits, courses, additional classroom observations, preparation of relevant artifacts. Add more lines as necessary.)

Activity	Target Date of Completion	Date Completed

5. SUPPORT AND ASSISTANCE AND APPROXIMATE DATES OF COMPLETION (What the district must provide):

(e.g., mentors, peer coaching, consultant support, external resources. Add more lines as necessary.)

Resources for support and assistance	Target Date of Completion	Date Completed

6. MONITORING AND PERIODIC CONFERENCES (INCLUDING APPROXIMATE DATES)

Conference	Target Date of Completion	Date Completed
Planning Conference		
Interim Conference		
Midyear Conference		
Interim Conference		
Summary Conference		

7. IMPROVEMENT SUMMARY (At the Final Conference, the Evaluator indicates to what extent the Teacher has reached the improvement goals and provides a summary rating based on effectiveness rankings.)

Teacher's Signature:

Date:

Evaluator's Signature:

Date:



Item 11.2 Bronxville School Principal Improvement Plan

This plan is designed to develop principals with overall ratings of Ineffective or Developing to improve and achieve an Effective rating. This plan must be developed no later than ten school days after the first day of classes each school year. The plan should be mutually developed.

The plan shall identify the specific areas needing improvement, standards-based goals as imbedded in the approved rubric (MPPR), relevant timeline, the manner of assessing improvement, and associated activities and support. Activities may include mentoring, peer coaching, course work, in-service activities, visits to other schools, or work with external consultants approved by the supervisor. The planned activities shall focus on the areas of deficiency identified in the MPPR and on the evidence needed to demonstrate improvement.

A minimum of three conferences shall occur throughout the school year. Either party can request additional conferences at any mutually convenient time. The conferences shall focus on the identified areas needing improvement and the related activities and evidence.

A bargaining unit representative, if requested by the principal, may participate in all conferences. The summary evaluation – an updated assessment using the rubric - is completed within five school days of the final conference.

Principal:

Evaluator:

1. PLANNING CONFERENCE (Held within ten school days after the first day of classes)

Date:
Present:

2. IDENTIFY AREAS NEEDING IMPROVEMENT. Complete the attached checklist indicating each ISLLC standard, area of student achievement, or component of the MPPR needing improvement (i.e. a rating less than effective). Check all that apply.

3. IMPROVEMENT GOALS: (e.g., achieve effective rating in a particular component or raising levels of student achievement or growth)

4. ACCEPTABLE EVIDENCE OF ACCOMPLISHMENT: (e.g., improved observation ratings, improved learning results, meeting rubric criteria for student work)

5. IMPROVEMENT ACTIVITIES AND APPROXIMATE DATES OF COMPLETION (What the teacher must do): (e.g., professional learning experiences, peer visits, courses, additional classroom observations, preparation of relevant artifacts. Add more lines as necessary.)

Activity	Target Date of Completion	Date Completed

6. SUPPORT AND ASSISTANCE AND APPROXIMATE DATES OF COMPLETION (What the district must provide):
 (e.g., mentors, peer coaching, consultant support, external resources. Add more lines as necessary.)

Resources for support and assistance	Target Date of Completion	Date Completed

7. MONITORING AND PERIODIC CONFERENCES (INCLUDING APPROXIMATE DATES)

Conference	Target Date of Completion	Date Completed
Planning Conference		
Interim Conference		
Interim Conference		
Summary Conference		

8. IMPROVEMENT SUMMARY (At the Final Conference, the Evaluator indicates to what extent the Teacher has reached the improvement goals and provides a summary rating based on effectiveness rankings.)

Teacher's Signature:

Date:

Evaluator's Signature:

Date:

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

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

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

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

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

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

Signatures, dates

Superintendent Signature: Date: 9/12/2012

David J. Matthews

Teachers Union President Signature: Date: 9/12/2012

Paul [Signature]

Administrative Union President Signature: Date: 9/13/12

Rachel Kelly, PhD

Board of Education President Signature: Date: 9/13/2012

David M. [Signature]