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

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

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

January 17, 2013

Robert S. Dubik, Superintendent
Cazenovia Central School District
31 Emory Avenue
Cazenovia, NY 13035

Dear Superintendent Dubik:

Congratulations. I am pleased to inform you that your Annual Professional Performance Review Plan (APPR) meets the criteria outlined in Education Law §3012-c and Subpart 30-2 of the Commissioner's Regulations and has been approved for the 2012-2013 school year. As a reminder, we are relying on the information you provided on your APPR form, including the certifications and assurances that are part of your approved APPR. If any material changes are made to your approved APPR plan, your district/BOCES must submit such material changes to us for approval. Please see the attached notes for further information.

Please be advised that, pursuant to Education Law §3012-c, the Department will be analyzing data supplied by districts, BOCES, and/or schools and may order a corrective action plan if there are unacceptably low correlation results between the student growth subcomponent and any other measures of teacher and principal effectiveness and/or if the teacher or principal scores or ratings show little differentiation across educators and/or the lack of differentiation is not justified by equivalently consistent student achievement results.

The New York State Education Department and I look forward to continuing our work together, with the goal of ensuring that every school has world-class educators in the classroom, every teacher has a world-class principal to support his or her professional growth, and every student achieves college and career readiness.

Thank you again for your hard work.

Sincerely,

John B. King, Jr.
Commissioner

Attachment

c: Jody Manning

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

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

Annual Professional Performance Reviews: 2012-13

Created Tuesday, May 29, 2012
Updated Thursday, December 20, 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 : 250201060000

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

250201060000

1.2) School District Name: CAZENOVIA CSD

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

CAZENOVIA CSD

1.3) School Improvement Grant (SIG) Districts Only

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

(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 Tuesday, May 29, 2012
Updated Wednesday, January 16, 2013

Page 1

STATE-PROVIDED MEASURES OF STUDENT GROWTH

(25 points with an approved value-added measure)

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

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

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

2.1) Assurances

Please check the boxes below:

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

STUDENT LEARNING OBJECTIVES AS COMPARABLE GROWTH MEASURES (20 points)

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

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

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

If no State assessment or Regents exam exists:

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

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

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

State assessments, *required if one exists*

List of State-approved 3rd party assessments

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

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

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

2.2) Grades K-3 ELA

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

	ELA	Assessment
K	District, regional, or BOCES-developed assessment	Cazenovia CSD-locally developed Gr K ELA assessment
1	District, regional, or BOCES-developed assessment	Cazenovia CSD-locally developed Gr 1ELA assessment
2	Not applicable	Cazenovia CSD-locally developed Gr 2 ELA assessment

	ELA	Assessment
3	State assessment	3rd Grade State Assessment

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

Use this box, if needed, to describe the general process for assigning HEDI categories for these grades/subjects in this subcomponent. If needed, you may upload a table or graphic at 2.11, below.	Teachers in collaboration with the principal will establish individualized student growth targets based on pre-assessment data. HEDI points will be awarded based on the percentage of students meeting or exceeding the target on the indicated post-assessment.
Highly Effective (18 - 20 points) Results are well-above state average for similar students (or District goals if no state test).	85-100% of students meet target
Effective (9 - 17 points) Results meet state average for similar students (or District goals if no state test).	70-84% of students meet target
Developing (3 - 8 points) Results are below state average for similar students (or District goals if no state test).	50-69% of students meet target
Ineffective (0 - 2 points) Results are well-below state average for similar students (or District goals if no state test).	0-49% of students meet target

2.3) Grades K-3 Math

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

	Math	Assessment
K	District, regional, or BOCES-developed assessment	Cazenovia CSD-locally developed K Math assessment
1	District, regional, or BOCES-developed assessment	Cazenovia CSD-locally developed Gr 1 Math assessment
2	District, regional, or BOCES-developed assessment	Cazenvia CSD-locally developed Gr2 Math assessment

	Math	Assessment
3	State assessment	3rd Grade State Assessment

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

Use this box, if needed, to describe the general process for assigning HEDI categories for these grades/subjects in this subcomponent. If needed, you may upload a table or graphic at 2.11, below.	Teachers in collaboration with the principal will establish individualized student growth targets based on pre-assessment data. HEDI points will be awarded based on the percentage of students meeting or exceeding the target on the indicated post-assessment.
Highly Effective (18 - 20 points) Results are well-above state average for similar students (or District goals if no state test).	85-100% of students meet target
Effective (9 - 17 points) Results meet state average for similar students (or District goals if no state test).	70-84% of students meet target
Developing (3 - 8 points) Results are below state average for similar students (or District goals if no state test).	50-69% of students meet target

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

2.4) Grades 6-8 Science

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

	Science	Assessment
6	District, regional or BOCES-developed assessment	Cazenovia CSD-locally developed Grade 6 Science assessments
7	District, regional or BOCES-developed assessment	Cazenovia CSD-locally developed 7grade developed assessments

	Science	Assessment
8	State assessment	8th Grade State Science Assessment

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

Use this box, if needed, to describe the general process for assigning HEDI categories for these grades/subjects in this subcomponent. If needed, you may upload a table or graphic at 2.11, below.	Teachers in collaboration with the principal will establish individualized student growth targets based on pre-assessment data. HEDI points will be awarded based on the percentage of students meeting or exceeding the target on the indicated post-assessment.
Highly Effective (18 - 20 points) Results are well-above state average for similar students (or District goals if no state test).	85-100% of students meet target
Effective (9 - 17 points) Results meet state average for similar students (or District goals if no state test).	70-84% of students meet target
Developing (3 - 8 points) Results are below state average for similar students (or District goals if no state test).	50-69% of students meet target
Ineffective (0 - 2 points) Results are well-below state average for similar students (or District goals if no state test).	0-49% of students meet target

2.5) Grades 6-8 Social Studies

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

	Social Studies	Assessment
6	District, regional or BOCES-developed assessment	Cazenovia CSD- locally developed Gr 6 Social Studies Assessment
7	District, regional or BOCES-developed assessment	Cazenovia CSD-locally developed Gr 7 Social Studies Assessment

8	District, regional or BOCES-developed assessment	Cazenovia CSD-locally developed Gr 8 Social Studies Assessment

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

Use this box, if needed, to describe the general process for assigning HEDI categories for these grades/subjects in this subcomponent. If needed, you may upload a table or graphic at 2.11, below.	Teachers in collaboration with the principal will establish individualized student growth targets based on pre-assessment data. HEDI points will be awarded based on the percentage of students meeting or exceeding the target on the indicated post-assessment.
Highly Effective (18 - 20 points) Results are well-above District goals for similar students.	85-100% of students to meet target
Effective (9 - 17 points) Results meet District goals for similar students.	70-84% of students to meet target
Developing (3 - 8 points) Results are below District goals for similar students.	50-69% of students meet target.
Ineffective (0 - 2 points) Results are well-below District goals for similar students.	0-49% of students to meet target

2.6) High School Social Studies Regents Courses

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

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

		Assessment
Global 1	District, regional, or BOCES-developed assessment	Cazenovia CSD Developed 9th Grade Global Studies Assessment

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

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

Use this box, if needed, to describe the general process for assigning HEDI categories for these grades/subjects in this subcomponent. If needed, you may upload a table or graphic at 2.11, below.	Teachers in collaboration with the principal will establish individualized student growth targets based on pre-assessment data. HEDI points will be awarded based on the percentage of students meeting or exceeding the target on the indicated post-assessment.
Highly Effective (18 - 20 points) Results are well-above District goals for similar students.	85-100% of students to meet target

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

2.7) High School Science Regents Courses

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

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

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

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

Use this box, if needed, to describe the general process for assigning HEDI categories for these grades/subjects in this subcomponent. If needed, you may upload a table or graphic at 2.11, below.	Teachers in collaboration with the principal will establish individualized student growth targets based on pre-assessment data. HEDI points will be awarded based on the percentage of students meeting or exceeding the target on the indicated post-assessment.
Highly Effective (18 - 20 points) Results are well-above District goals for similar students.	85-100% of students to meet target
Effective (9 - 17 points) Results meet District goals for similar students.	70-84% of students to meet target
Developing (3 - 8 points) Results are below District goals for similar students.	50-69% of studentsw to meet target
Ineffective (0 - 2 points) Results are well-below District goals for similar students.	0-49% of students to meet target

2.8) High School Math Regents Courses

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

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

Math Regents Courses	Assessment

Algebra 1	Regents assessment	Regents assessment
Geometry	Regents assessment	Regents assessment
Algebra 2	Regents assessment	Regents assessment

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

Use this box, if needed, to describe the general process for assigning HEDI categories for these grades/subjects in this subcomponent. If needed, you may upload a table or graphic at 2.11, below.	Teachers in collaboration with the principal will establish individualized student growth targets based on pre-assessment data. HEDI points will be awarded based on the percentage of students meeting or exceeding the target on the indicated post-assessment.
Highly Effective (18 - 20 points) Results are well-above District goals for similar students.	85-100 of students to meet target
Effective (9 - 17 points) Results meet District goals for similar students.	70-84% of students to meet target
Developing (3 - 8 points) Results are below District goals for similar students.	50-69% of studentsw to meet target
Ineffective (0 - 2 points) Results are well-below District goals for similar students.	0-49% of students to meet target

2.9) High School English Language Arts

Using the drop-down boxes below, please first select the assessment that will be used for SLOs for the grade/subject listed. Then name the specific assessment, listing the full name of the assessment. Regents assessment must be used where available. Be sure to select the English Regents assessment in at least one grade in Task 2.9 (9, 10, and/or 11).

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

	High School English Courses	Assessment
Grade 9 ELA	District, regional or BOCES-developed assessment	Cazenovia Developed 9th grade ELA Assessment
Grade 10 ELA	District, regional or BOCES-developed assessment	Cazenovia Developed 10th Grade ELA Assessment
Grade 11 ELA	Regents assessment	NYS Comprehensive English Regents Exam

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

Use this box, if needed, to describe the general process for assigning HEDI categories for these grades/subjects in this subcomponent. If needed, you may upload a table or graphic at 2.11, below.	Teachers in collaboration with the principal will establish individualized student growth targets based on pre-assessment data. HEDI points will be awarded based on the percentage of students meeting or exceeding the target on the indicated post-assessment.
Highly Effective (18 - 20 points) Results are well-above District goals for similar students.	85-100% of students to meet target

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

2.10) All Other Courses

Fill in, as applicable, for all other teachers in additional grades/subjects that have Student Learning Objectives. If you need additional space, duplicate this form and upload (below) as an attachment to your APPR plan. You may combine into one line any groups of teachers for whom the answers in the boxes are the same including, for example, "all other teachers not named above" .

Course(s) or Subject(s)	Option	Assessment
Allother courses not named above	District, Regional or BOCES-developed	Cazenovia CSD locally developed assessments for grade and subject specific assessments

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.	Teachers in collaboration with the principal will establish individualized student growth targets based on pre-assessment data. HEDI points will be awarded based on the percentage of students meeting or exceeding the target on the indicated post-assessment.
Highly Effective (18 - 20 points) Results are well-above District goals for similar students.	85-100% of students to meet target
Effective (9 - 17 points) Results meet District goals for similar students.	70-84% of students to meet target
Developing (3 - 8 points) Results are below District goals for similar students.	50-69% of students to meet target
Ineffective (0 - 2 points) Results are well-below District goals for similar students.	0-49% of students to meet target

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

(No response)

2.11) HEDI Tables or Graphics

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

assets/survey-uploads/5364/135469-TXEtxx9bQW/appr 211 final.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.

(No response)

2.13) Teachers with more than one growth measure

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

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

2.14) Assurances

Please check all of the boxes below:

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

2.14) Assurances | Assure that it is possible for an educator to earn each point, including 0, for SLOs in the Growth subcomponent scoring range.	Checked
2.14) Assurances | Assure that processes are in place to monitor SLOs to ensure rigor and comparability across classrooms.	Checked

3. Local Measures (Teachers)

Created Tuesday, May 29, 2012
Updated Wednesday, January 16, 2013

Page 1

Locally Selected Measures of Student Achievement or Growth

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

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

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

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

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

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

Growth or achievement measure(s) from these options.

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

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

Measures based on:

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

3.1) Grades 4-8 ELA

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

	Locally-Selected Measure from List of Approved Measures	Assessment
4	5) District, regional, or BOCES–developed assessments	Cazenovia CSD developed Gr 4 ELA assessments
5	5) District, regional, or BOCES–developed assessments	Cazenovia CSD developed GR 5 ELA assessments

6	5) District, regional, or BOCES–developed assessments	Cazenovia CSD developed Gr 6 ELA assessments
7	5) District, regional, or BOCES–developed assessments	Cazenovia CSD developed Gr7 ELA assessment
8	5) District, regional, or BOCES–developed assessments	Cazenovia CSD developed Gr 8 ELA assessment

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

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

Use this box, if needed, to describe the general process for assigning HEDI categories for these grades/subjects in this subcomponent. If needed, you may upload a table or graphic at 3.3, below.	HEDI points will awarded using the formula listed below
Highly Effective (14 - 15 points) Results are well above District- or BOCES-adopted expectations for growth or achievement for grade/subject.	The following conversion scale and formula will be for locally developed assessments: Rounding rule will apply: .5 and higher will round up, .49 and below will round down Assessment Score = Scale Score 0-54=1 55-64=2 65=84=3 85-100=4 Calculation: [(#students scoring 2,3,4) + (#students scoring 3,4)]x7.5 Divided by # students tested Total Score of 14-15 is Highly Effective
Effective (8- 13 points) Results meet District- or BOCES-adopted expectations for growth or achievement for grade/subject.	The following conversion scale and formula will be for locally developed assessments: Rounding rule will apply: .5 and higher will round up, .49 and below will round down Assessment Score = Scale Score 0-54=1 55-64=2 65=84=3 85-100=4 Calculation: [(#students scoring 2,3,4) + (#students scoring 3,4)]x7.5 Divided by # students tested Total Score of 8-13 is Effective
Developing (3 - 7 points) Results are below District- or BOCES-adopted expectations for growth or achievement for grade/subject.	The following conversion scale and formula will be for locally developed assessments: Rounding rule will apply: .5 and higher will round up, .49 and below will round down

	Assessment Score = Scale Score 0-54=1 55-64=2 65=84=3 85-100=4 Calculation: [(#students scoring 2,3,4) + (#students scoring 3,4)]x7.5 Divided by # students tested Total Score of 3-7 is Developing
Ineffective (0 - 2 points) Results are well below District- or BOCES-adopted expectations for growth or achievement for grade/subject.	The following conversion scale and formula will be for locally developed assessments:Rounding rule will apply: .5 and higher will round up, .49 and below will round down Assessment Score = Scale Score 0-54=1 55-64=2 65=84=3 85-100=4 Calculation: [(#students scoring 2,3,4) + (#students scoring 3,4)]x7.5 Divided by # students tested Total Score of 0-2 is Ineffective

3.2) Grades 4-8 Math

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

	Locally-Selected Measure from List of Approved Measures	Assessment
4	5) District, regional, or BOCES–developed assessments	Cazenovia CSD - Locally developed Gr 4 Math Assessment
5	5) District, regional, or BOCES–developed assessments	Cazenovia CSD - Locally developed Gr 5 Math Assessment
6	5) District, regional, or BOCES–developed assessments	Cazenovia CSD - Locally developed Gr 6 Math Assessment
7	5) District, regional, or BOCES–developed assessments	Cazenovia CSD - Locally developed Gr 7 Math Assessment
8	5) District, regional, or BOCES–developed assessments	Cazenovia CSD - Locally developed Gr 8 Math Assessment

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

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

Use this box, if needed, to describe the general process for assigning HEDI categories for these grades/subjects in this subcomponent. If needed, you may upload a table or graphic at 3.3, below.	HEDI points will be awarded using the formula listed below
Highly Effective (14 - 15 points) Results are well above District- or BOCES-adopted expectations for growth or achievement for grade/subject.	The following conversion scale and formula will be for locally developed assessments: Rounding rule will apply: .5 and higher will round up, .49 and below will round down Assessment Score = Scale Score 0-54=1 55-64=2 65=84=3 85-100=4 Calculation: [(#students scoring 2,3,4) + (#students scoring 3,4)]x7.5 Divided by # students tested Total Score of 14-15 is Highly Effective
Effective (8- 13 points) Results meet District- or BOCES-adopted expectations for growth or achievement for grade/subject.	The following conversion scale and formula will be for locally developed assessments: Rounding rule will apply: .5 and higher will round up, .49 and below will round down Assessment Score = Scale Score 0-54=1 55-64=2 65=84=3 85-100=4 Calculation: [(#students scoring 2,3,4) + (#students scoring 3,4)]x7.5 Divided by # students tested Total Score of 8-13 is Effective
Developing (3 - 7 points) Results are below District- or BOCES-adopted expectations for growth or achievement for grade/subject.	The following conversion scale and formula will be for locally developed assessments: Rounding rule will apply: .5 and higher will round up, .49 and below will round down Assessment Score = Scale Score 0-54=1 55-64=2 65=84=3 85-100=4 Calculation: [(#students scoring 2,3,4) + (#students scoring 3,4)]x7.5 Divided by # students tested Total Score of 3-7 is Developing

Ineffective (0 - 2 points) Results are well below District- or BOCES-adopted expectations for growth or achievement for grade/subject.	The following conversion scale and formula will be for locally developed assessments: Rounding rule will apply: .5 and higher will round up, .49 and below will round down Assessment Score = Scale Score 0-54=1 55-64=2 65=84=3 85-100=4 Calculation: [(#students scoring 2,3,4) + (#students scoring 3,4)]x7.5 Divided by # students tested Total Score of 0-2 is Ineffective

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.

(No response)

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

Growth or achievement measure(s) from these options.

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

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

Measures based on:

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

3.4) Grades K-3 ELA

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

	Locally-Selected Measure from List of Approved Measures	Assessment
K	5) District, regional, or BOCES–developed assessments	Cazenovia CSD - Locally developed Gr K ELA Assessment
1	5) District, regional, or BOCES–developed assessments	Cazenovia CSD - Locally developed Gr 1 ELA Assessment
2	5) District, regional, or BOCES–developed assessments	Cazenovia CSD - Locally developed Gr 2 ELAAssessment
3	5) District, regional, or BOCES–developed assessments	Cazenovia CSD - Locally developed Gr 3 ELA Assessment

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

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

Use this box, if needed, to describe the general process for assigning HEDI categories for these grades/subjects in this subcomponent. If needed, you may upload a table or graphic at 3.13, below.	HEDI points will be awarded using the formula listed below
Highly Effective (18-20 points) Results are well above District- or BOCES-adopted expectations for growth or achievement for grade/subject.	The following conversion scale and formula will be for locally developed assessments: Rounding rule will apply: .5 and higher will round up, .49 and below will round down Assessment Score = Scale Score 0-54=1 55-64=2 65=84=3 85-100=4 Calculation: [(#students scoring 2,3,4) + (#students scoring 3,4)]x10 Divided by # students tested Total Score of 18-20 is Highly Effective
Effective (9-17 points) Results meet District- or BOCES-adopted expectations for growth or achievement for grade/subject.	The following conversion scale and formula will be for locally developed assessments: Rounding rule will apply: .5 and higher will round up, .49 and below will round down Assessment Score = Scale Score 0-54=1 55-64=2 65=84=3 85-100=4 Calculation: [(#students scoring 2,3,4) + (#students scoring 3,4)]x10 Divided by # students tested Total Score of 9-17 is Effective
Developing (3 - 8 points) Results are below District- or BOCES-adopted expectations for growth or achievement for grade/subject.	The following conversion scale and formula will be for locally developed assessments: Rounding rule will apply: .5 and higher will round up, .49 and below will round down Assessment Score = Scale Score 0-54=1 55-64=2 65=84=3 85-100=4 Calculation: [(#students scoring 2,3,4) + (#students scoring 3,4)]x10 Divided by # students tested Total Score of 3-8 is Developing
Ineffective (0 - 2 points) Results are well below District- or BOCES-adopted expectations for growth or achievement for grade/subject.	The following conversion scale and formula will be for locally developed assessments: Rounding rule will apply: .5 and higher will round up, .49 and below will round down

	Assessment Score = Scale Score 0-54=1 55-64=2 65=84=3 85-100=4 Calculation: [(#students scoring 2,3,4) + (#students scoring 3,4)]x10 Divided by # students tested Total Score of 0-2 is Ineffective

3.5) Grades K-3 Math

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

	Locally-Selected Measure from List of Approved Measures	Assessment
K	5) District, regional, or BOCES–developed assessments	Cazenovia CSD - locally developed Grade K Math Assessment
1	5) District, regional, or BOCES–developed assessments	Cazenovia CSD - locally developed Grade 1 Math Assessment
2	5) District, regional, or BOCES–developed assessments	Cazenovia CSD - locally developed Grade 2 Math Assessment
3	5) District, regional, or BOCES–developed assessments	Cazenovia CSD - locally developed Grade 3 Math Assessment

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

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

Use this box, if needed, to describe the general process for assigning HEDI categories for these grades/subjects in this subcomponent. If needed, you may upload a table or graphic at 3.13, below.	HEDI points will be awarded using the formula listed below
Highly Effective (18-20 points) Results are well above District- or BOCES-adopted expectations for growth or achievement for grade/subject.	The following conversion scale and formula will be for locally developed assessments: Rounding rule will apply: .5 and higher will round up, .49 and below will round down Assessment Score = Scale Score 0-54=1 55-64=2 65=84=3

	85-100=4 Calculation: [(#students scoring 2,3,4) + (#students scoring 3,4)]x10 Divided by # students tested Total Score of 18-20 is Highly Effective
Effective (9-17 points) Results meet District- or BOCES-adopted expectations for growth or achievement for grade/subject.	The following conversion scale and formula will be for locally developed assessments: Rounding rule will apply: .5 and higher will round up, .49 and below will round down Assessment Score = Scale Score 0-54=1 55-64=2 65=84=3 85-100=4 Calculation: [(#students scoring 2,3,4) + (#students scoring 3,4)]x10 Divided by # students tested Total Score of 9-17 is Effective
Developing (3 - 8 points) Results are below District -or BOCES-adopted expectations for growth or achievement for grade/subject.	The following conversion scale and formula will be for locally developed assessments: Rounding rule will apply: .5 and higher will round up, .49 and below will round down Assessment Score = Scale Score 0-54=1 55-64=2 65=84=3 85-100=4 Calculation: [(#students scoring 2,3,4) + (#students scoring 3,4)]x10 Divided by # students tested Total Score of 3-8 is Developing
Ineffective (0 - 2 points) Results are well below District- or BOCES-adopted expectations for growth or achievement for grade/subject.	The following conversion scale and formula will be for locally developed assessments: Rounding rule will apply: .5 and higher will round up, .49 and below will round down Assessment Score = Scale Score 0-54=1 55-64=2 65=84=3 85-100=4 Calculation: [(#students scoring 2,3,4) + (#students scoring 3,4)]x10 Divided by # students tested Total Score of 0-2 is Ineffective

3.6) Grades 6-8 Science

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

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

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

Use this box, if needed, to describe the general process for assigning HEDI categories for these grades/subjects in this subcomponent. If needed, you may upload a table or graphic at 3.13, below.	HEDI points will be awarded using the formula listed below
Highly Effective (18 - 20 points) Results are well above District- or BOCES-adopted expectations for growth or achievement for grade/subject.	The following conversion scale and formula will be for locally developed assessments: Rounding rule will apply: .5 and higher will round up, .49 and below will round down Assessment Score = Scale Score 0-54=1 55-64=2 65=84=3 85-100=4 Calculation: [(#students scoring 2,3,4) + (#students scoring 3,4)]x10 Divided by # students tested Total Score of 18-20 is Highly Effective
Effective (9 - 17 points) Results meet District- or BOCES-adopted expectations for growth or achievement for grade/subject.	The following conversion scale and formula will be for locally developed assessments: Rounding rule will apply: .5 and higher will round up, .49 and below will round down Assessment Score = Scale Score 0-54=1 55-64=2 65=84=3 85-100=4 Calculation: [(#students scoring 2,3,4) + (#students scoring 3,4)]x10 Divided by # students tested Total Score of 9-17 is Effective

Developing (3 - 8 points) Results are below District- or BOCES-adopted expectations for growth or achievement for grade/subject.	The following conversion scale and formula will be for locally developed assessments: Rounding rule will apply: .5 and higher will round up, .49 and below will round down Assessment Score = Scale Score 0-54=1 55-64=2 65=84=3 85-100=4 Calculation: [(#students scoring 2,3,4) + (#students scoring 3,4)]x10 Divided by # students tested Total Score of 3-8 is Developing
Ineffective (0 - 2 points) Results are well below District- or BOCES-adopted expectations for growth or achievement for grade/subject.	The following conversion scale and formula will be for locally developed assessments: Rounding rule will apply: .5 and higher will round up, .49 and below will round down Assessment Score = Scale Score 0-54=1 55-64=2 65=84=3 85-100=4 Calculation: [(#students scoring 2,3,4) + (#students scoring 3,4)]x10 Divided by # students tested Total Score of 0-2 is Ineffective

3.7) Grades 6-8 Social Studies

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

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

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

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

Use this box, if needed, to describe the general process for assigning HEDI categories for these grades/subjects in this subcomponent. If needed, you may upload a table or graphic at 3.13, below.	HEDI points will be awarded using the formula listed below
Highly Effective (18 - 20 points) Results are well above District- or BOCES-adopted expectations for growth or achievement for grade/subject.	The following conversion scale and formula will be for locally developed assessments: Rounding rule will apply: .5 and higher will round up, .49 and below will round down Assessment Score = Scale Score 0-54=1 55-64=2 65=84=3 85-100=4 Calculation: [(#students scoring 2,3,4) + (#students scoring 3,4)]x10 Divided by # students tested Total Score of 18-20 is Highly Effective
Effective (9 - 17 points) Results meet District- or BOCES-adopted expectations for growth or achievement for grade/subject.	The following conversion scale and formula will be for locally developed assessments: Rounding rule will apply: .5 and higher will round up, .49 and below will round down Assessment Score = Scale Score 0-54=1 55-64=2 65=84=3 85-100=4 Calculation: [(#students scoring 2,3,4) + (#students scoring 3,4)]x10 Divided by # students tested Total Score of 9-17 is Effective
Developing (3 - 8 points) Results are below District- or BOCES-adopted expectations for growth or achievement for grade/subject.	The following conversion scale and formula will be for locally developed assessments: Rounding rule will apply: .5 and higher will round up, .49 and below will round down Assessment Score = Scale Score 0-54=1 55-64=2 65=84=3 85-100=4 Calculation: [(#students scoring 2,3,4) + (#students scoring 3,4)]x10 Divided by # students tested Total Score of 3-8 is Developing

Ineffective (0 - 2 points) Results are well below District- or BOCES-adopted expectations for growth or achievement for grade/subject.	The following conversion scale and formula will be for locally developed assessments: Rounding rule will apply: .5 and higher will round up, .49 and below will round down Assessment Score = Scale Score 0-54=1 55-64=2 65=84=3 85-100=4 Calculation: [(#students scoring 2,3,4) + (#students scoring 3,4)]x10 Divided by # students tested Total Score of 0-2 is Ineffective

3.8) High School Social Studies

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

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

	Locally-Selected Measure from List of Approved Measures	Assessment
Global 1	5) District, regional, or BOCES–developed assessments	Cazenovia CSD-Locally developed Global 1 Assessment
Global 2	5) District, regional, or BOCES–developed assessments	Cazenovia CSD-Locally developed Global 2 Assessment
American History	5) District, regional, or BOCES–developed assessments	Cazenovia CSD-Locally developed American History Assessment

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

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

Use this box, if needed, to describe the general process for assigning HEDI categories for these grades/subjects in this subcomponent. If needed, you may upload a table or graphic at 3.13, below.	HEDI points will be awarded using the formula listed below
Highly Effective (18 - 20 points) Results are well above District- or BOCES-adopted expectations for growth or achievement for grade/subject.	The following conversion scale and formula will be for locally developed assessments: Rounding rule will apply: .5 and higher will round up, .49 and below will round down

	Assessment Score = Scale Score 0-54=1 55-64=2 65=84=3 85-100=4 Calculation: [(#students scoring 2,3,4) + (#students scoring 3,4)]x10 Divided by # students tested Total Score of 18-20 is Highly Effective
Effective (9 - 17 points) Results meet District- or BOCES-adopted expectations for growth or achievement for grade/subject.	The following conversion scale and formula will be for locally developed assessments: Rounding rule will apply: .5 and higher will round up, .49 and below will round down Assessment Score = Scale Score 0-54=1 55-64=2 65=84=3 85-100=4 Calculation: [(#students scoring 2,3,4) + (#students scoring 3,4)]x10 Divided by # students tested Total Score of 9-17 is Effective
Developing (3 - 8 points) Results are below District- or BOCES-adopted expectations for growth or achievement for grade/subject.	The following conversion scale and formula will be for locally developed assessments: Rounding rule will apply: .5 and higher will round up, .49 and below will round down Assessment Score = Scale Score 0-54=1 55-64=2 65=84=3 85-100=4 Calculation: [(#students scoring 2,3,4) + (#students scoring 3,4)]x10 Divided by # students tested Total Score of 3-8 is Developing
Ineffective (0 - 2 points) Results are well below District- or BOCES-adopted expectations for growth or achievement for grade/subject.	The following conversion scale and formula will be for locally developed assessments: Rounding rule will apply: .5 and higher will round up, .49 and below will round down Assessment Score = Scale Score 0-54=1 55-64=2 65=84=3 85-100=4 Calculation:

	[(#students scoring 2,3,4) + (#students scoring 3,4)]x10 Divided by # students tested Total Score of 0-2 is Ineffective

3.9) High School Science

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

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

	Locally-Selected Measure from List of Approved Measures	Assessment
Living Environment	5) District, regional, or BOCES–developed assessments	Cazenovia CSD-Locally developed Living Envrionment Assessment
Earth Science	5) District, regional, or BOCES–developed assessments	Cazenovia CSD-Locally developed Earth Science Assessment
Chemistry	5) District, regional, or BOCES–developed assessments	Cazenovia CSD-Locally developed Chemistry Assessment
Physics	5) District, regional, or BOCES–developed assessments	Cazenovia CSD-Locally developed Physics Assessment

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

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

Use this box, if needed, to describe the general process for assigning HEDI categories for these grades/subjects in this subcomponent. If needed, you may upload a table or graphic at 3.13, below.	HEDI points will be awarded using the formula listed below
Highly Effective (18-20 points) Results are well above District- or BOCES-adopted expectations for growth or achievement for grade/subject.	The following conversion scale and formula will be for locally developed assessments: Rounding rule will apply: .5 and higher will round up, .49 and below will round down Assessment Score = Scale Score 0-54=1 55-64=2 65=84=3 85-100=4 Calculation: [(#students scoring 2,3,4) + (#students scoring 3,4)]x10 Divided by # students tested Total Score of 18-20 is Highly Effective

Developing (3 - 8 points) Results are below District- or BOCES-adopted expectations for growth or achievement for grade/subject.	The following conversion scale and formula will be for locally developed assessments: Rounding rule will apply: .5 and higher will round up, .49 and below will round down Assessment Score = Scale Score 0-54=1 55-64=2 65=84=3 85-100=4 Calculation: [(#students scoring 2,3,4) + (#students scoring 3,4)]x10 Divided by # students tested Total Score of 9-17 is Effective
Effective (9 - 17points) Results meet District- or BOCES-adopted expectations for growth or achievement for grade/subject.	The following conversion scale and formula will be for locally developed assessments: Rounding rule will apply: .5 and higher will round up, .49 and below will round down Assessment Score = Scale Score 0-54=1 55-64=2 65=84=3 85-100=4 Calculation: [(#students scoring 2,3,4) + (#students scoring 3,4)]x10 Divided by # students tested Total Score of 3-8 is Developing
Ineffective (0 - 2 points) Results are well below District- or BOCES-adopted expectations for growth or achievement for grade/subject.	The following conversion scale and formula will be for locally developed assessments: Rounding rule will apply: .5 and higher will round up, .49 and below will round down Assessment Score = Scale Score 0-54=1 55-64=2 65=84=3 85-100=4 Calculation: [(#students scoring 2,3,4) + (#students scoring 3,4)]x10 Divided by # students tested Total Score of 0-2 is Ineffective

3.10) High School Math

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

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

	Locally-Selected Measure from List of Approved Measures	Assessment
Algebra 1	5) District, regional, or BOCES–developed assessments	Cazenovia CSD-Locally developed Algebra 1 Assessment
Geometry	5) District, regional, or BOCES–developed assessments	Cazenovia CSD-Locally developed Geometry Assessment
Algebra 2	5) District, regional, or BOCES–developed assessments	Cazenovia CSD-Locally developed Algebra 2 Assessment

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

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

Use this box, if needed, to describe the general process for assigning HEDI categories for these grades/subjects in this subcomponent. If needed, you may upload a table or graphic at 3.13, below.	HEDI points will be awarded using the formula listed below
Highly Effective (18 - 20 points) Results are well above District- or BOCES-adopted expectations for growth or achievement for grade/subject.	The following conversion scale and formula will be for locally developed assessments:Rounding rule will apply: .5 and higher will round up, .49 and below will round down Assessment Score = Scale Score 0-54=1 55-64=2 65=84=3 85-100=4 Calculation: [(#students scoring 2,3,4) + (#students scoring 3,4)]x10 Divided by # students tested Total Score of 18-20 is Highly Effective
Effective (9 - 17 points) Results meet District- or BOCES-adopted expectations for growth or achievement for grade/subject.	The following conversion scale and formula will be for locally developed assessments:Rounding rule will apply: .5 and higher will round up, .49 and below will round down Assessment Score = Scale Score 0-54=1 55-64=2 65=84=3 85-100=4 Calculation: [(#students scoring 2,3,4) + (#students scoring 3,4)]x10

	Divided by # students tested Total Score of 9-17 is Effective
Developing (3 - 8 points) Results are below District- or BOCES-adopted expectations for growth or achievement for grade/subject.	The following conversion scale and formula will be for locally developed assessments:Rounding rule will apply: .5 and higher will round up, .49 and below will round down Assessment Score = Scale Score 0-54=1 55-64=2 65=84=3 85-100=4 Calculation: [(#students scoring 2,3,4) + (#students scoring 3,4)]x10 Divided by # students tested Total Score of 3-8 is Developing
Ineffective (0 - 2 points) Results are well below District- or BOCES-adopted expectations for growth or achievement for grade/subject.	The following conversion scale and formula will be for locally developed assessments:Rounding rule will apply: .5 and higher will round up, .49 and below will round down Assessment Score = Scale Score 0-54=1 55-64=2 65=84=3 85-100=4 Calculation: [(#students scoring 2,3,4) + (#students scoring 3,4)]x10 Divided by # students tested Total Score of 0-2 is Ineffective

3.11) High School English Language Arts

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

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

	Locally-Selected Measure from List of Approved Measures	Assessment
Grade 9 ELA	5) District, regional, or BOCES–developed assessments	Cazenovia CSD-Locally developed ELA 9 Assessment
Grade 10 ELA	5) District, regional, or BOCES–developed assessments	Cazenovia CSD-Locally developed ELA 10 Assessment
Grade 11 ELA	5) District, regional, or BOCES–developed assessments	Cazenovia CSD-Locally developed ELA 11 Assessment

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

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

Use this box, if needed, to describe the general process for assigning HEDI categories for these grades/subjects in this subcomponent. If needed, you may upload a table or graphic at 3.13, below.	HEDI points will be awarded using the formula listed below
Highly Effective (18 - 20 points) Results are well above District- or BOCES-adopted expectations for growth or achievement for grade/subject.	The following conversion scale and formula will be for locally developed assessments: Rounding rule will apply: .5 and higher will round up, .49 and below will round down Assessment Score = Scale Score 0-54=1 55-64=2 65=84=3 85-100=4 Calculation: [(#students scoring 2,3,4) + (#students scoring 3,4)]x10 Divided by # students tested Total Score of 18-20 is Highly Effective
Effective (9 - 17 points) Results meet District- or BOCES-adopted expectations for growth or achievement for grade/subject.	The following conversion scale and formula will be for locally developed assessments: Rounding rule will apply: .5 and higher will round up, .49 and below will round down Assessment Score = Scale Score 0-54=1 55-64=2 65=84=3 85-100=4 Calculation: [(#students scoring 2,3,4) + (#students scoring 3,4)]x10 Divided by # students tested Total Score of 9-17 is Effective
Developing (3 - 8 points) Results are below District- or BOCES-adopted expectations for growth or achievement for grade/subject.	The following conversion scale and formula will be for locally developed assessments: Rounding rule will apply: .5 and higher will round up, .49 and below will round down Assessment Score = Scale Score 0-54=1 55-64=2 65=84=3 85-100=4 Calculation: [(#students scoring 2,3,4) + (#students scoring 3,4)]x10 Divided by # students tested Total Score of 3-8 is Developing
Ineffective (0 - 2 points) Results are well below District- or BOCES-adopted expectations for growth or achievement for grade/subject.	The following conversion scale and formula will be for locally developed assessments: Rounding rule will apply: .5 and higher will round up, .49 and below will round down Assessment Score = Scale Score 0-54=1

	55-64=2 65=84=3 85-100=4 Calculation: [(#students scoring 2,3,4) + (#students scoring 3,4)]x10 Divided by # students tested Total Score of 0-2 is Ineffective

3.12) All Other Courses

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

	Course(s) or Subject(s)	Locally-Selected Measure from List of Approved Measures	Assessment
	All other courses	5) District/regional/BOCES–developed	Cazenovia CSD-locally developed assessments for each specific course

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

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

Use this box, if needed, to describe the general process for assigning HEDI categories for these grades/subjects in this subcomponent. If needed, you may upload a table or graphic at 3.13, below.	HEDI points will be awarded using the formula listed below
Highly Effective (18 - 20 points) Results are well above District- or BOCES -adopted expectations for growth or achievement for grade/subject.	The following conversion scale and formula will be for locally developed assessments: Rounding rule will apply: .5 and higher will round up, .49 and below will round down Assessment Score = Scale Score 0-54=1 55-64=2 65=84=3 85-100=4 Calculation: [(#students scoring 2,3,4) + (#students scoring 3,4)]x10 Divided by # students tested

	Total Score of 18-20 is Highly Effective
Effective (9 - 17 points) Results meet District- or BOCES-adopted expectations for growth or achievement for grade/subject.	The following conversion scale and formula will be for locally developed assessments: Rounding rule will apply: .5 and higher will round up, .49 and below will round down Assessment Score = Scale Score 0-54=1 55-64=2 65=84=3 85-100=4 Calculation: [(#students scoring 2,3,4) + (#students scoring 3,4)]x10 Divided by # students tested Total Score of 9-17 is Effective
Developing (3 - 8 points) Results are below District- or BOCES-adopted expectations for growth or achievement for grade/subject.	The following conversion scale and formula will be for locally developed assessments: Rounding rule will apply: .5 and higher will round up, .49 and below will round down Assessment Score = Scale Score 0-54=1 55-64=2 65=84=3 85-100=4 Calculation: [(#students scoring 2,3,4) + (#students scoring 3,4)]x10 Divided by # students tested Total Score of 3-8 is Developing
Ineffective (0 - 2 points) Results are well below District- or BOCES-adopted expectations for growth or achievement for grade/subject.	The following conversion scale and formula will be for locally developed assessments: Rounding rule will apply: .5 and higher will round up, .49 and below will round down Assessment Score = Scale Score 0-54=1 55-64=2 65=84=3 85-100=4 Calculation: [(#students scoring 2,3,4) + (#students scoring 3,4)]x10 Divided by # students tested Total Score of 0-2 is Ineffective

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.

(No response)

3.14) Locally Developed Controls

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

(No response)

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.

Teachers with more than one locally selectd measure will be awarded points on the combined scores of the number of students in each group 0-20/0-15 weighed proportionally.

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 Tuesday, May 29, 2012
Updated Wednesday, January 16, 2013

Page 1

4.1) Teacher Practice Rubric

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

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

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

NYSUT Teacher Practice Rubric

(No response)

4.2) Points Within Other Measures

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

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

Is the following points assignment applicable to all teachers?

Yes

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

(No response)

Multiple (at least two) classroom observations by principal or other trained administrator, at least one of which must be unannounced [at least 31 points]	60
One or more observation(s) by trained independent evaluators	0
Observations by trained in-school peer teachers	0
Feedback from students using State-approved survey tool	0
Feedback from parents/caregivers using State-approved survey tool	0
Structured reviews of lesson plans, student portfolios and other teacher artifacts	(No response)

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

(No response)

4.3) Survey Tools (if applicable)

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

(No response)

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

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

4.4) Assurances

Please check all of the boxes below:

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

4.5) Process for Assigning Points and Determining HEDI Ratings

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

Once each Standard receives a score from 0-4, the score received is divided by the total number of points available to provide a percent scored in Standards I-IV, which is then applied to the 20 possible points. This process is repeated for the second set of observations. Those scores are then added together. The resulting score out of 40 provides an overall observation score out of 40 points. (eg. If there are 22 standards, the maximum possible points is 88. The total points scored over all standards will be divided by the maximum number of points possible. Therefore, 88 points scored out of 88 is 100%. That percent is applied to 20 points resulting in a score of 20. This process is repeated for the second set of observations resulting in two 20 point scores making up 40 of the 60 points.)

The remaining 20 points will be used to assess professional responsibilities under the remaining Standards as follows:

Standard 5 - 10 points
Standard 6 - 5 points
Standard 7 - 5 points

Evaluation of these standards will be based on artifacts provided by the administrator and the teacher to be collected in a portfolio. The list of artifacts is included as Appendix D. The portfolio will be reviewed with the teacher during the month of May or June. HEDI points will be awarded in Standards 5,6,7, from I-IV for in each Standard:

4.0 - Highly Effective
3.0 - Effective
2.0 - Developing
1.0 - Ineffective

Once each standard is scored the average of the standard scores will be taken for each domain and converted (from 1-4 to 0 - 10) using the attached chart. Scores from Standards 6 and 7 will be averaged together (I-IV) and then converted (0-10) to form the second 10 of 20 points.
A total will be calculated from adding each section together; formal observation, mini observation and artifacts. It is understood the final composite score must be a whole number and rounding will apply accordingly. Rounding on the conversion chart will apply with greater than or equal to .5 rounding up to the next whole number.

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

assets/survey-uploads/5091/135526-eka9yMJ855/APPR 10 point conversion chart.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.	Overall performance and results are exceptional and exceed NYS teaching standards of professional practice. A total score of 59-60 is Highly Effective.
Effective: Overall performance and results meet NYS Teaching Standards.	Overall performance is acceptable and meets the NYS teaching standards of professional practice. A total score of 57-58 is Effective.
Developing: Overall performance and results need improvement in order to meet NYS Teaching Standards.	Overall performance needs improvement in order to meet NYS teaching standards. A total score of 50-56 is Developing.
Ineffective: Overall performance and results do not meet NYS Teaching Standards.	Overall performance is not acceptable and does not meet NYS teaching standards of professional practice. A total score of 0-49 is Ineffective.

Provide the ranges for the 60-point scoring bands.

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

4.6) Observations of Probationary Teachers

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

By building principals or other trained administrators

4.6) Observations of Probationary Teachers | Formal/Long	2
4.6) Observations of Probationary Teachers | Informal/Short	6
4.6) Observations of Probationary Teachers | Enter Total	8

By trained in-school peer teachers or other trained reviewers

Formal/Long	0
Informal/Short	0

Independent evaluators

Formal/Long	0
Informal/Short	0

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

- In Person

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

- In Person

4.7) Observations of Tenured Teachers

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

By building principals or other trained administrators

4.7) Observations of Tenured Teachers | Formal/Long	1
4.7) Observations of Tenured Teachers | Informal/Short	3
4.7) Observations of Tenured Teachers | Total	4

By trained in-school peer teachers or other trained reviewers

Formal/Long	0

Informal/Short	0

Independent evaluators

Formal/Long	0
Informal/Short	0

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

- In Person

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

- In Person

5. Composite Scoring (Teachers)

Created Tuesday, May 29, 2012
Updated Wednesday, January 16, 2013

Page 1

Standards for Rating Categories

Growth or Comparable Measures

Locally-selected Measures of

growth or achievement

Other Measures of Effectiveness

(Teacher and Leader standards)

Highly

Effective

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

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

Overall performance and results exceed NYS Teaching Standards.

Effective

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

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

Overall performance and results meet NYS Teaching Standards.

Developing

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

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

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

Ineffective

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

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

Overall performance and results do not meet NYS Teaching Standards.

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

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

2012-13 where there is no Value-Added measure

Growth or Comparable Measures

Locally-selected Measures of

growth or achievement

Other Measures of Effectiveness

(60 points)

Overall

Composite Score

Highly Effective

18-20

18-20

Ranges determined locally--see below

91-100

Effective

9-17

9-17

75-90

Developing

3-8

3-8

65-74

Ineffective

0-2

0-2

0-64

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

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

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

2012-13 where Value-Added growth measure applies

Growth or Comparable Measures

Locally-selected Measures of

growth or achievement

Other Measures of Effectiveness

(60 points)

Overall

Composite Score

Highly Effective

22-25

14-15

Ranges determined locally--see above

91-100

Effective

10-21

8-13

75-90

Developing

3-9

3-7

65-74

Ineffective

0-2

0-2

0-64

6. Additional Requirements - Teachers

Created Tuesday, May 29, 2012
Updated Wednesday, January 16, 2013

Page 1

6.1) Assurances -- Improvement Plans

Please check the boxes below:

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

6.2) Attachment: Teacher Improvement Plan Forms

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

assets/survey-uploads/5265/135548-Df0w3Xx5v6/Appendix E.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:

1. The appeals of annual professional performance review are limits to those that rate a tenured teacher as ineffective or developing only. Non-tenured teachers may only appeal an annual performance review of ineffective.
2. The appeal procedures allow the scope of the appeals, under Education law 3012-c to the following subjects:
1. The district's adherence to the standards and methodologies required for such reviws, pusuant to Education Law 3012-c
2. The adherence to the commissioner's regulations, as applicable to such reviews;

3. Compliance with any local negotiated procedures applicable to annual performance reviews or improvement plans; and
4. The district's issuance and/or implementation of the terms of the teacher improvement plan under Education Law 3012-c

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

All appeals must be submitted in writing to the Lead Evaluator no later than ten (10) school days from the date when the teacher receives his/her summative professional performance review and composite score. All information and evidence the teacher wants to have considered must be included in the written appeal. A copy of the performance review must also be submitted with the appeal. The failure to file an appeal within these timeframes shall be deemed a waiver of the right to appeal and the appeal shall be deemed abandoned.

If a teacher is challenging the issuance of a teacher improvement plan, the appeal must be filed within ten (10) school days of issuance of such plan. All information and evidence the teacher wants to have considered must be included in the written appeal. A copy of the improvement plan must also be submitted with the appeal. The failure to file an appeal within these timeframes shall be deemed a waiver of the right to appeal and the appeal shall be deemed abandoned.

Upon written receipt of the written appeal from the teacher, the Lead Evaluator shall have ten (10) school days from the date of the receipt to reply. If the Lead Evaluator does not concur with the appeal and make any necessary and appropriate changes to the summative evaluation, the appeal will be forwarded to the Superintendent of Schools at the end of the 10 day period.

A recommendation concerning the appeal will be rendered by a two person review panel. The Superintendent of Schools and the Association President will each appoint one person to this panel within the time allotted to the appeals panel (20 days from the submission of the appeal). The members of the panel will not work in the same program as the teacher making the appeal.

In making their recommendation, the panel shall consider the written record, comprised of the teacher's appeal papers and any documentary evidence accompanying the appeal, as well as the lead evaluator's response and any additional documentary evidence submitted with the response.

The panel will issue a written recommendation on the merits of the appeal no later than twenty (20) school days from the date when the teacher filed his/her appeal to the Superintendent of Schools, who will, within ten (10) school days of the panel's recommendation, issue a written, final decision about the appeal. The written decision will be provided to the teacher and to the Lead Evaluator.

This decision will be final and an appeal shall be deemed completed upon the issuance of that decision. The decision of the Superintendent of Schools shall not be subject to any further appeal.

No disiplinary action predicated upon the at issue evaluation or improvement plan will be taken by the District aganist a tenured teacher until the appeal process has been concluded.
All steps and the resolution of the appeal will be timely and expeditous in accordance with education law 3012c.

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 Superintendent will ensure that all lead evaluators have been trained and certified in accordance with regulations. The district will utilize Onondaga Cortland Madison BOCES network team evaluator training, lead evaluator training and certification in accordance with SED procedures and processes (18 hours minimum). Lead evaluator training concentrates on:
1. The NYS Teaching Standards, and their related elements and performance indicators as applicable;
2. Evidence based observation techniques that are grounded in research;
3. Application and the use of the student growth percentile model and the value-added growth model;
4. Application and the use of the teacher rubric, including training on the effective application of such rubrics to observe a teacher's practice;
5. Application and the use of any assessment tools that the school district or BOCES utilizes to evaluate its classroom teachers, including but not limited to, structured portfolio reviews; professional growth goals etc.;
6. Application and use of any locally selected measures of student achievement used by the district to evaluate its teachers;
7. Use of Statewide Instructional Reporting System;
8. The scoring methodology 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 overall rating and their subcomponent ratings; and

The Superintendent will ensure that the lead evaluators participate in annual training and are re-certified on an annual basis. The BOCES Network Team will be utilized to provide the training and recertification. Any individual who fails to achieve required training or certification or recertification, as applicable, shall not conduct or complete evaluations.
Inter-rater reliability will be maintained through the re-certification process via the BOCES network team

6.5) Assurances -- Evaluators

Please check the boxes below:

- Checked

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

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

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

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

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

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

(7) use of the Statewide Instructional Reporting System

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

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

- Checked

6.6) Assurances -- Teachers

Please check all of the boxes below:

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

6.7) Assurances -- Data

Please check all of the boxes below:

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

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

Created Tuesday, May 29, 2012
Updated Tuesday, January 08, 2013

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-4
5-7
8-12
(No response)
(No response)
(No response)
(No response)

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

Please check the boxes below:

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

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

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

State assessments, *required if one exists*

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

List of State-approved 3rd party assessments

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

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

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

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.	(No response)
Highly Effective (18 - 20 points) Results are well above state average for similar students (or District goals if no state test).	NA
Effective (9 - 17 points) Results meet state average for similar students (or District goals if no state test).	NA
Developing (3 - 8 points) Results are below state average for similar students (or District goals if no state test).	NA
Ineffective (0 - 2 points) Results are well below state average for similar students (or District goals if no state test).	NA

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

(No response)

7.4) Special Considerations for Comparable Growth Measures

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

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

(No response)

7.5) Principals with More Than One Growth Measure

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

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

7.6) Assurances -- Comparable Growth Measures

Please check all of the boxes below:

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

8. Local Measures (Principals)

Created Tuesday, May 29, 2012
Updated Tuesday, January 08, 2013

Page 1

Locally-Selected Measures of Student Achievement or Growth

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

Grade Configuration	Locally-Selected Measure from List of Approved Measures	Assessment
K-4	(d) measures used by district for teacher evaluation	Cazenovia CSD developed grade level assessments (3-4) in ELA, Math, Science, and Social Studies
5-7	(d) measures used by district for teacher evaluation	Cazenovia CSD developed grade level assessments (5-7) in ELA, Math, Science, and Social Studies
8-12	(d) measures used by district for teacher evaluation	Cazenovia CSD developed grade level assessments 8-12) in ELA, Math, Science, and Social Studies

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.	Scores from all assessments will be averaged together and used as the assessment score as below
Highly Effective (14 - 15 points) Results are well above District- or BOCES-adopted expectations for growth or achievement for grade/subject.	The following conversion scale and formula will be used for locall developed assesments: Assessment Score=Scale Score 0-54=1 55-64=2 65-84=3 85-100=4 Calculation: [(#students scoring 2,3,4) + (#students scoring 3,4)] x 7.5 Divided by #students tested Total Score of 14-15 is highly Effective
Effective (8- 13 points) Results meet District- or BOCES-adopted expectations for growth or achievement	The following conversion scale and formula will be used for locall developed assesments:

for grade/subject.	Assessment Score=Scale Score 0-54=1 55-64=2 65-84=3 85-100=4 Calculation: [(#students scoring 2,3,4) + (#students scoring 3,4)] x 7.5 Divided by #students tested Total Score of 8-13 is Effective
Developing (3 - 7 points) Results are below District- or BOCES-adopted expectations for growth or achievement for grade/subject.	The following conversion scale and formula will be used for locall developed assesments: Assessment Score=Scale Score 0-54=1 55-64=2 65-84=3 85-100=4 Calculation: [(#students scoring 2,3,4) + (#students scoring 3,4)] x 7.5 Divided by #students tested Total Score of 3-7is Developing
Ineffective (0 - 2 points) Results are well below District- or BOCES-adopted expectations for growth or achievement for grade/subject.	The following conversion scale and formula will be used for locall developed assesments: Assessment Score=Scale Score 0-54=1 55-64=2 65-84=3 85-100=4 Calculation: [(#students scoring 2,3,4) + (#students scoring 3,4)] x 7.5 Divided by #students tested Total Score of 0-2 is Inffective

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.

(No response)

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
	NA		NA

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

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

(No response)

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

(No response)

8.3) Locally Developed Controls

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

(No response)

8.4) Principals with More Than One Locally Selected Measure

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

(No response)

8.5) Assurances

Please check all of the boxes below:

8.5) Assurances | Assure that the application of locally developed controls will be rigorous, fair, and transparent	Check
8.5) Assurances | Assure that use of locally developed controls will not have a disparate impact on underrepresented students, in accordance with any applicable civil rights laws.	Check

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

9. Other Measures of Effectiveness (Principals)

Created Tuesday, May 29, 2012
Updated Wednesday, January 16, 2013

Page 1

9.1) Principal Practice Rubric

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

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

Marshall's Principal Evaluation Rubric

(No response)

9.2) Points Within Other Measures

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

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

Is the following points assignment for all principals?

Yes

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

(No response)

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

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

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

(No response)

9.3) Assurances -- Goals

Please check the boxes below (if applicable):

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

9.4) Sources of Evidence (if applicable)

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

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

9.5) Survey Tool(s) (if applicable)

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

(No response)

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

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

Principal Evaluation Tripod School Perception Survey (Combined Parent Survey)	(No response)
Principal Evaluation Tripod School Perception Survey (Combined Student Surveys)	(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 remaining 60% (or 60 out of the total 100 point composite score) of the composite effectiveness score is based on other measures of principal effectiveness consistent with standards prescribed by the Commissioner in regulation. Marshall's Principal Evaluation rubric will be used to evaluate principals. The rubric is included in the appendix. Each of the 6 domains of the rubric will be worth 10 of the 60 points (for a total of 60 points). The following formula will be used to calculate the number of points for the Principal Effectiveness composite score. (No one may receive higher than 10 points in any domain).

3.5 (# items rated highly effective) + 2.5 (# items rated effective) + 1 (# items rated developing) dividedby 3.5 (items scored in the domain) = x.x is then multiplied by 10 to equal the domain score.
Each of the domain scores will be added together to provider an overall rubric score 0-60. It is understood the final composite score will be a whole number, rounding will apply accordingly.
E.g
Domain 2 (5 sub component); all HE
3.5 (5) + 2.5 (0) + /3.5(5) = 1.1 x 10 =10
Domain 2 (5 sub component); 3 HE,2E
3.5 (3) + 2.5(2) +1(0) 3.5(5) = 8857. 8857x10=8.857

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.

(No response)

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

Highly Effective: Overall performance and results exceed standards.	Overall performance and results are exceptional and reflective of truly outstanding leadership. A score is calculated for each domain. The sum of the domain scores are tallied and a total score of 53-60 is Highly Effective.

Effective: Overall performance and results meet standards.	Overall performance and results are exceptional and reflective of solid professional leadership. A score is calculated for each domain. The sum of the domain scores are tallied and a total score of 42-52 is Effective.
Developing: Overall performance and results need improvement in order to meet standards.	Overall performance needs improvement in order to meet district standards of professional practice. A score is calculated for each domain. The sum of the domain scores are tallied and a total score of 25-41 is Developing.
Ineffective: Overall performance and results do not meet standards.	Overall performance and results are unacceptable and do not meet district standards of professional practive. The score is calculated for each domain. The sum of the domain scores are tallied and a total score of 0-24 is Ineffective.

Please provide the locally-negotiated 60 point scoring bands.

Highly Effective	53-60
Effective	42-52
Developing	25-41
Ineffective	0-24

9.8) School Visits

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

Probationary Principals

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

Tenured Principals

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

10. Composite Scoring (Principals)

Created Tuesday, May 29, 2012
Updated Wednesday, January 02, 2013

Page 1

Standards for Rating Categories

Growth or Comparable Measures

Locally-selected Measures of

growth or achievement

Other Measures of Effectiveness

(Teacher and Leader standards)

Highly

Effective

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

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

Overall performance and results exceed ISLLC leadership standards.

Effective

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

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

Overall performance and results meet ISLLC leadership standards.

Developing

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

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

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

Ineffective

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

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

Overall performance and results do not meet ISLLC leadership standards.

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

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

2012-13 where there is no Value-Added measure

Growth or Comparable Measures

Locally-selected Measures of

growth or achievement

Other Measures of Effectiveness

(60 points)

Overall

Composite Score

Highly Effective

18-20

18-20

Ranges determined locally--see below

91-100

Effective

9-17

9-17

75-90

Developing

3-8

3-8

65-74

Ineffective

0-2

0-2

0-64

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

Highly Effective	53-60
Effective	42-52
Developing	25-41
Ineffective	0-24

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

2012-13 where Value-Added growth measure applies

Growth or Comparable Measures

Locally-selected Measures of

growth or achievement

Other Measures of Effectiveness

(60 points)

Overall

Composite Score

Highly Effective

22-25

14-15

Ranges determined locally--see above

91-100

Effective

10-21

8-13

75-90

Developing

3-9

3-7

65-74

Ineffective

0-2

0-2

0-64

11. Additional Requirements - Principals

Created Tuesday, May 29, 2012
Updated Wednesday, January 16, 2013

Page 1

11.1) Assurances -- Improvement Plans

Please check the boxes below.

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

11.2) Attachment: Principal Improvement Plan Forms

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

assets/survey-uploads/5276/135554-Df0w3Xx5v6/Principal Improvement Plan Document_1.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:

A principal who receives a composite score rating of "ineffective" or "developing" may appeal his/her performance review. ratings of "effective" and "highly effective" cannot appeal.

A principal may appeal the school district's adherence to standards and methologies required, adherence to applicable regulations of the Commissioner of Education, and compliance with the procedures for the conduct of performance reviews set forth in the annual professional performance review plan, and/or the substance of the annual performance review.

Only tenured principals may file an appeal. Non-tenures principals may add a response to the annual evaluation which will be kept in his/her personnel file.

A principal may not file multiple appeals regarding the same performance review. All grounds for appealing a particular performance review must be raised within the same appeal. Any grounds not raised at the time the appeal is filed shall be deemed waived.

Appeals concerning a principal's performance must be filed no later than ten (10) school days of the date when the principal receives their evaluation. A principal wishing to initiate an appeal must submit, in writing, to the Superintendent a detaqiled description of the specific point(s) of disagreement over his/her performance review, along with any and all additional documents or written materials that they beleive are revevant to the appeal. All material and documentation must be submitted at the time the appeal is filed. Under this appeal process the principal bears the burden of proving by substantial evidence the merits of their appeal.

Within fifteen (15) school days of the receipt of the appeal, the school district staff members who issued the performance review must submit a detailed written response to the appeal. The response must contain all additional documents.

The decision will be rendered by three(3) person panel. The panel will consist of an outside district administrator that has been trained as a lead evaluator and one (1) representative of the CASA administrative group, and a person to be named from the Superintendent of Schools. The panel shall issue a written decision on the merits of the appeal no later than thirty (30) school days from the date when the principal filed their appeal.

The decision of the panel is final and the appeal shall be deemed completed upon the issuance of that decision.

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 will ensure that all lead evaluators have been trained and certified in accordance with regulation. The district will utilize Onondaga Cortland Madison BOCES Network Team evaluator training, lead evaluator training and certicication in accordance with SED procedures and processes (18 hours minimum). Lead evaluator training will concentrate on:

1) The New York Teaching Standards and their related elements and performance indicators as applicable;
2) Evidence-based observaion techniques that are grounded in research;
3) Application and use of the student growth percentile model and the value-added growth model;
4) Application and the use of the principal rubric, including training on the effective application of such rubrics to observe a principal's practice;
5) Application and use of any assessment tools that the school district or BOCES utilized to evaluate its building principal, including but not limited to, structured portfolio rreviews; professional growth goals etc..
6) Application and the use of any locally selected measures of achievement used by the district to evaluate its principals.
7) Use of Statewide Instructional Reporting System;
8) The scoring methodology inclusing how scores are generated for each subcomponent and the composite effectiveness score and the application and use of scoring ranges prescribed by the Commissioner for the four designated rating categories used for the principal's overall rating and their subcomponent ratings and;

The Superintendent will ensure that lead evaluators participate in annual training and are re-certified on an annual basis. The BOCES Network Team will be utilized to provide training and re-certification. Any individual who fail to achieve the required training or certification or re-certification, as applicable, shall not conduct or complete evaluations.

The District Superintendent is the sole lead evaluator for all principals; therefore, inter-rater reliability is not a concern as there is only one evaluator.

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	Checked

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.	
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 Tuesday, May 29, 2012
Updated Wednesday, January 16, 2013

Page 1

12.1)Upload the Joint Certification of the APPR Plan

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

assets/survey-uploads/5581/135555-3Uqgn5g9Iu/APPR final signatures2.pdf

File types supported for uploads

PDF (preferred)

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

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

Open Office (.odt, .ott)

Images (.jpg, .gif)

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

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

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

HEDI Criteria & Points Assignments

Highly Effective			Effective									Developing						Ineffective		
20	19	18	17	16	15	14	13	12	11	10	9	8	7	6	5	4	3	2	1	0
97-100%	91-96%	85-90%	83 - 84%	81-82%	79-80%	77-78%	76%	75%	73-74%	71-72%	70%	66-69%	63-65%	60-62%	57-59%	54-56%	50-53%	47-49%	43-46%	≤42%

2.11

Teachers in collaboration with the principal will establish individualized student growth targets based on pre-assessment data. HEDI points will be awarded based on the percentage of students meeting or exceeding the target on the indicated post-assessment.

Appendix E
Cazenovia Teacher Improvement Plan

Teacher:_____ Grade/Subject: _____

Evaluator: _____ Date: _____

Association Representative (if requested): _____

1. List the areas in need of improvement. If there are several, indicate the priority order for addressing them.

2. Performance Goals: Provide specific, measurable objectives the teacher must meet to show improvement.

3. Timeline: Indicate duration of TIP and schedule of periodic reviews of progress.

4. Assessment of improvement: Indicate what measures will be used to assess improvement.

5. Differentiated activities to support improvement:

    a. Professional learning activities to support improvement.

    b. Support and assistance to be provided by district.

    c. Other

6. Artifacts to demonstrate improvement

Scheduled Meeting Dates:

Evaluator Comments: Meeting Date: _____

Teacher Comments:

Evaluator Comments: Meeting Date: _____

Teacher Comments:

Recommendation for Results of TIP

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

Next Steps:

Evaluator's Signature: _____ Date: _____

Teacher Signature: _____ Date: _____

Teacher's signature does not constitute agreement but merely signifies s/he has examined and discussed the materials with his/her evaluator. Teachers shall have the right to insert written explanation or response to written feedback, which may be considered during the Appeals process.

Cazenovia CSD

HEDI - 10 Point Conversion Chart Based Upon 1-4 Rubric Rating

For Standards 5 and Standards 6/7 combined

	Highly Effective						Effective									
10 point Score	10.00	9.80	9.60	9.40	9.20	9.00	8.55	8.10	7.65	7.20	6.75	6.30	5.85	5.40	4.85	4.50
Rubric Rating	4.00	3.90	3.80	3.70	3.60	3.50	3.40	3.30	3.20	3.10	3.00	2.90	2.80	2.70	2.60	2.50

	Developing										Ineffective				
10 point Score	4.20	3.90	3.60	3.30	3.00	2.70	2.40	2.10	1.80	1.50	1.25	1.00	0.75	0.50	0.00
Rubric Rating	2.40	2.30	2.20	2.10	2.00	1.90	1.80	1.70	1.60	1.50	1.40	1.30	1.20	1.10	1.00

Cazenovia Central School District

Principal Improvement Plan

DATE:

CASA BARGAINING UNIT MEMBER/POSITION:

EVALUATOR:

PROFESSIONAL IMPROVEMENT PLAN SUPPORT TEAM:

_____	_____
Administrator(s)	Designated Association Member

REASON FOR PROFESSIONAL IMPROVEMENT PLAN:

PROFESSIONAL IMPROVEMENT PLAN:

List strategies to be used with an outline of expected outcomes, strategies, and resources as well as a time line for the strategies to be implemented.

EXPECTED OUTCOMES:

STRATEGIES:

RESOURCES:

TIMELINE:

SIGNATURES:

Superintendent (or designee)	**Date**	**Bargaining Unit Member**	**Date**
Assistant Superintendent for Instruction	**Date**	**Designated CAA Member**	**Date**

Cc: Personnel (Original), Principal, Superintendent, and Assistant Superintendent for Instruction

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 the 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: 1/16/13

Robert S Carl

Teachers Union President Signature: Date: 01.16.13

Catherine Taylor Susan M Tresco

Administrative Union President Signature: Date: 1/16/13

G. Michael Byrnes

Board of Education President Signature: Date: 1/16/13