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

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

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

July 15, 2013

Revised

Mark Dupra, Superintendent
Charlotte Valley Central School District
15611 State Highway 23
Davenport, NY 13750

Dear Superintendent Dupra:

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: Nicholas Savin

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

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

Annual Professional Performance Reviews: 2012-13

Created Thursday, May 03, 2012
Updated Monday, June 24, 2013

1

Disclaimers

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

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

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

1. SCHOOL DISTRICT INFORMATION

1.1) School District's BEDS Number : 120401040000

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

120401040000

1.2) School District Name: CHARLOTTE VALLEY CSD

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

CHARLOTTE VALLEY CSD

1.3) School Improvement Grant (SIG) Districts Only

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

Not applicable

1.4) Award Classification

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

(No response)

1.5) Assurances

Please check all of the boxes below:

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

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

Submission of material changes to an approved APPR plan

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

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

Annual (2012-13)

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

Created Thursday, May 03, 2012
Updated Friday, June 28, 2013

Page 1

STATE-PROVIDED MEASURES OF STUDENT GROWTH

(25 points with an approved value-added measure)

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

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

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

2.1) Assurances

Please check the boxes below:

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

STUDENT LEARNING OBJECTIVES AS COMPARABLE GROWTH MEASURES (20 points)

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

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

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

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

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

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

State assessments, *required if one exists*

List of State-approved 3rd party assessments

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

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

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

2.2) Grades K-3 ELA

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

	ELA	Assessment
K	School-or BOCES-wide, group or team results based on State assessments	NYS Grades 3-8 ELA, Math and Science Assessments and all Regents Exams
1	School-or BOCES-wide, group or team results based on State assessments	NYS Grades 3-8 ELA, Math and Science Assessments and all Regents Exams
2	School-or BOCES-wide, group or team results based on State assessments	NYS Grades 3-8 ELA, Math and Science Assessments and all Regents Exams

	ELA	Assessment
3	State assessment	3rd Grade State Assessment

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

Use this box, if needed, to describe the general process for assigning HEDI categories for these grades/subjects in this	For grades K-2 ELA and Math, the district has set a rigor expectation for growth of passing as being proficient on all

subcomponent. If needed, you may upload a table or graphic at 2.11, below.	state/Regents exams. Proficiency for the state assessments is defined as a score of 3 or better. Proficiency for Regents exams is defined as score of 65 or better. HEDI points will be awarded based on the percentage of students, school-wide, meeting the minimum rigor expectation for growth. (See Chart in Task 2.11) For grade 3, the teacher, in collaboration with the principal, will set class growth targets using baseline data. HEDI points will be assigned to teachers according to the percentage of students that meet or exceed the set growth targets.
Highly Effective (18 - 20 points) Results are well-above state average for similar students (or District goals if no state test).	20 Points - 95-100% of students demonstrate growth 19 Points - 90-94% of students demonstrate growth 18 Points - 85-89% of students demonstrate growth
Effective (9 - 17 points) Results meet state average for similar students (or District goals if no state test).	17 Points - 82-84% of students demonstrate growth 16 Points - 79-81% of students demonstrate growth 15 Points - 77-78% of students demonstrate growth 14 Points - 75-76% of students demonstrate growth 13 Points - 73-74% of students demonstrate growth 12 Points - 71-72% of students demonstrate growth 11 Points - 69-70% of students demonstrate growth 10 Points - 67-68% of students demonstrate growth 09 Points - 65-66% of students demonstrate growth
Developing (3 - 8 points) Results are below state average for similar students (or District goals if no state test).	08 Points - 63-64% of students demonstrate growth 07 Points - 61-62% of students demonstrate growth 06 Points - 59-60% of students demonstrate growth 05 Points - 57-58% of students demonstrate growth 04 Points - 56% of students demonstrate growth 03 Points - 55% of students demonstrate growth
Ineffective (0 - 2 points) Results are well-below state average for similar students (or District goals if no state test).	02 Points - 36-54% of students demonstrate growth 01 Points - 18-35% of students demonstrate growth 00 Points - <18% of students demonstrate growth

2.3) Grades K-3 Math

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

	Math	Assessment
K	School-or BOCES-wide, group or team results based on State assessments	NYS Grades 3-8 ELA, Math and Science Assessments and all Regents Exams
1	School-or BOCES-wide, group or team results based on State assessments	NYS Grades 3-8 ELA, Math and Science Assessments and all Regents Exams
2	School-or BOCES-wide, group or team results based on State assessments	NYS Grades 3-8 ELA, Math and Science Assessments and all Regents Exams

	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.	For grades K-2 ELA and Math, the district has set a rigor expectation for growth of passing as being proficient on all state/Regents exams. Proficiency for the state assessments is defined as a score of 3 or better. Proficiency for Regents exams is defined as score of 65 or better. HEDI points will be awarded based on the percentage of students, school-wide, meeting the minimum rigor expectation for growth. (See Chart in Task 2.11) For grade 3, the teacher, in collaboration with the principal, will set class growth targets using baseline data. HEDI points will be assigned to teachers according to the percentage of students that meet or exceed the set growth targets.
Highly Effective (18 - 20 points) Results are well-above state average for similar students (or District goals if no state test).	20 Points - 95-100% of students demonstrate growth 19 Points - 90-94% of students demonstrate growth 18 Points - 85-89% of students demonstrate growth
Effective (9 - 17 points) Results meet state average for similar students (or District goals if no state test).	17 Points - 82-84% of students demonstrate growth 16 Points - 79-81% of students demonstrate growth 15 Points - 77-78% of students demonstrate growth 14 Points - 75-76% of students demonstrate growth 13 Points - 73-74% of students demonstrate growth 12 Points - 71-72% of students demonstrate growth 11 Points - 69-70% of students demonstrate growth 10 Points - 67-68% of students demonstrate growth 09 Points - 65-66% of students demonstrate growth
Developing (3 - 8 points) Results are below state average for similar students (or District goals if no state test).	08 Points - 63-64% of students demonstrate growth 07 Points - 61-62% of students demonstrate growth 06 Points - 59-60% of students demonstrate growth 05 Points - 57-58% of students demonstrate growth 04 Points - 56% of students demonstrate growth 03 Points - 55% of students demonstrate growth
Ineffective (0 - 2 points) Results are well-below state average for similar students (or District goals if no state test).	02 Points - 36-54% of students demonstrate growth 01 Points - 18-35% of students demonstrate growth 00 Points - <18% of students demonstrate growth

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	State-approved 3rd party assessment	Stanford Achievement Test (10th edition)
7	State-approved 3rd party assessment	Stanford Achievement Test (10th edition)

	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	The teacher, in collaboration with the principal, will set class growth targets using baseline data. HEDI points will be assigned

subcomponent. If needed, you may upload a table or graphic at 2.11, below.	to teachers according to the percentage of students that meet or exceed the set growth targets.
Highly Effective (18 - 20 points) Results are well-above state average for similar students (or District goals if no state test).	20 Points - 95-100% of students demonstrate growth 19 Points - 90-94% of students demonstrate growth 18 Points - 85-89% of students demonstrate growth
Effective (9 - 17 points) Results meet state average for similar students (or District goals if no state test).	17 Points - 82-84% of students demonstrate growth 16 Points - 79-81% of students demonstrate growth 15 Points - 77-78% of students demonstrate growth 14 Points - 75-76% of students demonstrate growth 13 Points - 73-74% of students demonstrate growth 12 Points - 71-72% of students demonstrate growth 11 Points - 69-70% of students demonstrate growth 10 Points - 67-68% of students demonstrate growth 09 Points - 65-66% of students demonstrate growth
Developing (3 - 8 points) Results are below state average for similar students (or District goals if no state test).	08 Points - 63-64% of students demonstrate growth 07 Points - 61-62% of students demonstrate growth 06 Points - 59-60% of students demonstrate growth 05 Points - 57-58% of students demonstrate growth 04 Points - 56% of students demonstrate growth 03 Points - 55% of students demonstrate growth
Ineffective (0 - 2 points) Results are well-below state average for similar students (or District goals if no state test).	02 Points - 36-54% of students demonstrate growth 01 Points - 18-35% of students demonstrate growth 00 Points - <18% of students demonstrate growth

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	State-approved 3rd party assessment	Stanford Achievement Test (10th edition)
7	State-approved 3rd party assessment	Stanford Achievement Test (10th edition)
8	State-approved 3rd party assessment	Stanford Achievement Test (10th edition)

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.	The teacher, in collaboration with the principal, will set class growth targets using baseline data. HEDI points will be assigned to teachers according to the percentage of students that meet or exceed the set growth targets.
Highly Effective (18 - 20 points) Results are well-above District goals for similar students.	20 Points - 95-100% of students demonstrate growth 19 Points - 90-94% of students demonstrate growth 18 Points - 85-89% of students demonstrate growth
Effective (9 - 17 points) Results meet District goals for similar students.	17 Points - 82-84% of students demonstrate growth 16 Points - 79-81% of students demonstrate growth 15 Points - 77-78% of students demonstrate growth 14 Points - 75-76% of students demonstrate growth 13 Points - 73-74% of students demonstrate growth 12 Points - 71-72% of students demonstrate growth 11 Points - 69-70% of students demonstrate growth

	10 Points - 67-68% of students demonstrate growth 09 Points - 65-66% of students demonstrate growth
Developing (3 - 8 points) Results are below District goals for similar students.	08 Points - 63-64% of students demonstrate growth 07 Points - 61-62% of students demonstrate growth 06 Points - 59-60% of students demonstrate growth 05 Points - 57-58% of students demonstrate growth 04 Points - 56% of students demonstrate growth 03 Points - 55% of students demonstrate growth
Ineffective (0 - 2 points) Results are well-below District goals for similar students.	02 Points - 36-54% of students demonstrate growth 01 Points - 18-35% of students demonstrate growth 00 Points - <18% of students demonstrate growth

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	School-/BOCES-wide group/team results based on State assessments	NYS Grades 3-8 ELA, Math and Science Assessments and all Regents Exams

	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.	For Global 1, the district has set rigor expectation for growth of passing as being proficient on all state/Regents exams. Proficiency for the state assessments is defined as a score of 3 or better. Proficiency for Regents exams is defined as score of 65 or better. HEDI points will be awarded based on the percentage of students, school-wide, meeting the minimum rigor expectation for growth. (See Chart in Task 2.11) For Global 2 and American History, the teacher, in collaboration with the principal, will set class growth targets using baseline data. HEDI points will be assigned to teachers according to the percentage of students that meet or exceed the set growth targets.
Highly Effective (18 - 20 points) Results are well-above District goals for similar students.	20 Points - 95-100% of students demonstrate growth 19 Points - 90-94% of students demonstrate growth 18 Points - 85-89% of students demonstrate growth
Effective (9 - 17 points) Results meet District goals for similar students.	17 Points - 82-84% of students demonstrate growth 16 Points - 79-81% of students demonstrate growth 15 Points - 77-78% of students demonstrate growth 14 Points - 75-76% of students demonstrate growth

	13 Points - 73-74% of students demonstrate growth 12 Points - 71-72% of students demonstrate growth 11 Points - 69-70% of students demonstrate growth 10 Points - 67-68% of students demonstrate growth 09 Points - 65-66% of students demonstrate growth
Developing (3 - 8 points) Results are below District goals for similar students.	08 Points - 63-64% of students demonstrate growth 07 Points - 61-62% of students demonstrate growth 06 Points - 59-60% of students demonstrate growth 05 Points - 57-58% of students demonstrate growth 04 Points - 56% of students demonstrate growth 03 Points - 55% of students demonstrate growth
Ineffective (0 - 2 points) Results are well-below District goals for similar students.	02 Points - 36-54% of students demonstrate growth 01 Points - 18-35% of students demonstrate growth 00 Points - <18% of students demonstrate growth

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.	The teacher, in collaboration with the principal, will set class growth targets using baseline data. HEDI points will be assigned to teachers according to the percentage of students that meet or exceed the set growth targets.
Highly Effective (18 - 20 points) Results are well-above District goals for similar students.	20 Points - 95-100% of students demonstrate growth 19 Points - 90-94% of students demonstrate growth 18 Points - 85-89% of students demonstrate growth
Effective (9 - 17 points) Results meet District goals for similar students.	17 Points - 82-84% of students demonstrate growth 16 Points - 79-81% of students demonstrate growth 15 Points - 77-78% of students demonstrate growth 14 Points - 75-76% of students demonstrate growth 13 Points - 73-74% of students demonstrate growth 12 Points - 71-72% of students demonstrate growth 11 Points - 69-70% of students demonstrate growth 10 Points - 67-68% of students demonstrate growth 09 Points - 65-66% of students demonstrate growth
Developing (3 - 8 points) Results are below District goals for similar students.	08 Points - 63-64% of students demonstrate growth 07 Points - 61-62% of students demonstrate growth

	06 Points - 59-60% of students demonstrate growth 05 Points - 57-58% of students demonstrate growth 04 Points - 56% of students demonstrate growth 03 Points - 55% of students demonstrate growth
Ineffective (0 - 2 points) Results are well-below District goals for similar students.	02 Points - 36-54% of students demonstrate growth 01 Points - 18-35% of students demonstrate growth 00 Points - <18% of students demonstrate growth

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.	The teacher, in collaboration with the principal, will set class growth targets using baseline data. HEDI points will be assigned to teachers according to the percentage of students that meet or exceed the set growth targets.
Highly Effective (18 - 20 points) Results are well-above District goals for similar students.	20 Points - 95-100% of students demonstrate growth 19 Points - 90-94% of students demonstrate growth 18 Points - 85-89% of students demonstrate growth
Effective (9 - 17 points) Results meet District goals for similar students.	17 Points - 82-84% of students demonstrate growth 16 Points - 79-81% of students demonstrate growth 15 Points - 77-78% of students demonstrate growth 14 Points - 75-76% of students demonstrate growth 13 Points - 73-74% of students demonstrate growth 12 Points - 71-72% of students demonstrate growth 11 Points - 69-70% of students demonstrate growth 10 Points - 67-68% of students demonstrate growth 09 Points - 65-66% of students demonstrate growth
Developing (3 - 8 points) Results are below District goals for similar students.	08 Points - 63-64% of students demonstrate growth 07 Points - 61-62% of students demonstrate growth 06 Points - 59-60% of students demonstrate growth 05 Points - 57-58% of students demonstrate growth 04 Points - 56% of students demonstrate growth 03 Points - 55% of students demonstrate growth
Ineffective (0 - 2 points) Results are well-below District goals for similar students.	02 Points - 36-54% of students demonstrate growth 01 Points - 18-35% of students demonstrate growth 00 Points - <18% of students demonstrate growth

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	School-/BOCES-wide group/team results based on State assessments	NYS Grades 3-8 ELA, Math and Science Assessments and all Regents Exams
Grade 10 ELA	School-/BOCES-wide group/team results based on State assessments	NYS Grades 3-8 ELA, Math and Science Assessments and all Regents Exams
Grade 11 ELA	Regents assessment	NYS Comprehensive English Regents

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

Use this box, if needed, to describe the general process for assigning HEDI categories for these grades/subjects in this subcomponent. If needed, you may upload a table or graphic at 2.11, below.	For ELA 9 and 10, the district has set rigor expectation for growth of passing as being proficient on all state/Regents exams. Proficiency for the state assessments is defined as a score of 3 or better. Proficiency for Regents exams is defined as score of 65 or better. HEDI points will be awarded based on the percentage of students, school-wide, meeting the minimum rigor expectation for growth. (See Chart in Task 2.11) For grade 11, the teacher, in collaboration with the principal, will set class growth targets using baseline data. HEDI points will be assigned to teachers according to the percentage of students that meet or exceed the set growth targets.
Highly Effective (18 - 20 points) Results are well-above District goals for similar students.	20 Points - 95-100% of students demonstrate growth 19 Points - 90-94% of students demonstrate growth 18 Points - 85-89% of students demonstrate growth
Effective (9 - 17 points) Results meet District goals for similar students.	17 Points - 82-84% of students demonstrate growth 16 Points - 79-81% of students demonstrate growth 15 Points - 77-78% of students demonstrate growth 14 Points - 75-76% of students demonstrate growth 13 Points - 73-74% of students demonstrate growth 12 Points - 71-72% of students demonstrate growth 11 Points - 69-70% of students demonstrate growth 10 Points - 67-68% of students demonstrate growth 09 Points - 65-66% of students demonstrate growth
Developing (3 - 8 points) Results are below District goals for similar students.	08 Points - 63-64% of students demonstrate growth 07 Points - 61-62% of students demonstrate growth 06 Points - 59-60% of students demonstrate growth 05 Points - 57-58% of students demonstrate growth 04 Points - 56% of students demonstrate growth 03 Points - 55% of students demonstrate growth
Ineffective (0 - 2 points) Results are well-below District goals for similar students.	02 Points - 36-54% of students demonstrate growth 01 Points - 18-35% of students demonstrate growth 00 Points - <18% of students demonstrate growth

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
	All other teachers not named above	School/BOCES-wide/group/team results based on State	NYS Grades 3-8 ELA, Math and Science Assessments and all Regents Exams

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.	All other teachers not named above, the district has set rigor expectation for growth of passing as being proficient on all state/Regents exams. Proficiency for the state assessments is defined as a score of 3 or better. Proficiency for Regents exams is defined as score of 65 or better. HEDI points will be awarded based on the percentage of students, school-wide, meeting the minimum rigor expectation for growth. (See Chart in Task 2.11).
Highly Effective (18 - 20 points) Results are well-above District goals for similar students.	20 Points - 95-100% of students demonstrate growth 19 Points - 90-94% of students demonstrate growth 18 Points - 85-89% of students demonstrate growth
Effective (9 - 17 points) Results meet District goals for similar students.	17 Points - 82-84% of students demonstrate growth 16 Points - 79-81% of students demonstrate growth 15 Points - 77-78% of students demonstrate growth 14 Points - 75-76% of students demonstrate growth 13 Points - 73-74% of students demonstrate growth 12 Points - 71-72% of students demonstrate growth 11 Points - 69-70% of students demonstrate growth 10 Points - 67-68% of students demonstrate growth 09 Points - 65-66% of students demonstrate growth
Developing (3 - 8 points) Results are below District goals for similar students.	08 Points - 63-64% of students demonstrate growth 07 Points - 61-62% of students demonstrate growth 06 Points - 59-60% of students demonstrate growth 05 Points - 57-58% of students demonstrate growth 04 Points - 56% of students demonstrate growth 03 Points - 55% of students demonstrate growth
Ineffective (0 - 2 points) Results are well-below District goals for similar students.	02 Points - 36-54% of students demonstrate growth 01 Points - 18-35% of students demonstrate growth 00 Points - <18% of students demonstrate growth

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/5364/124375-TXEtxx9bQW/APPR HEDI 130624.xlsx

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.

Not Applicable

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 Thursday, October 18, 2012
Updated Friday, January 11, 2013

Page 1

Locally Selected Measures of Student Achievement or Growth

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

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

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

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

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

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

Growth or achievement measure(s) from these options.

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

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

Measures based on:

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

3.1) Grades 4-8 ELA

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

	Locally-Selected Measure from List of Approved Measures	Assessment
4	6(ii) School wide measure computed locally	All NYS 3-8 ELA and Math Assessments, Grades 4 and 8 Science Assessments and all NYS Regents Examinations (ELA,, Global Studies, American History, Integrated Algebra, Geometry, Integrated Algebra 2 and Trigonometry, Earthe Science, Living Environment, Chemistry and Physics).

5	6(ii) School wide measure computed locally	All NYS 3-8 ELA and Math Assessments, Grades 4 and 8 Science Assessments and all NYS Regents Examinations (ELA,, Global Studies, American History, Integrated Algebra, Geometry, Integrated Algebra 2 and Trigonometry, Earthe Science, Living Environment, Chemistry and Physics).
6	6(ii) School wide measure computed locally	All NYS 3-8 ELA and Math Assessments, Grades 4 and 8 Science Assessments and all NYS Regents Examinations (ELA,, Global Studies, American History, Integrated Algebra, Geometry, Integrated Algebra 2 and Trigonometry, Earthe Science, Living Environment, Chemistry and Physics).
7	6(ii) School wide measure computed locally	All NYS 3-8 ELA and Math Assessments, Grades 4 and 8 Science Assessments and all NYS Regents Examinations (ELA,, Global Studies, American History, Integrated Algebra, Geometry, Integrated Algebra 2 and Trigonometry, Earthe Science, Living Environment, Chemistry and Physics).
8	6(ii) School wide measure computed locally	All NYS 3-8 ELA and Math Assessments, Grades 4 and 8 Science Assessments and all NYS Regents Examinations (ELA,, Global Studies, American History, Integrated Algebra, Geometry, Integrated Algebra 2 and Trigonometry, Earthe Science, Living Environment, Chemistry and Physics).

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.	Local Achievement Scores: Mean Mastery Test Performance A) Definitions 1) Validating Tests are all NYS 3-8 tests and all the NYS Regents exams that measure the academic performance for all students whose testing is inclusive in the respective exams. 2) Mean Mastery Test Performance (MMTP) is the school-wide mean percent (%) of students scoring at either Level 4 on the NYS 3-8 tests and >=85 points on the NYS Regents examinations. 3) Adjusted Mean Mastery Test Performance (AMMTP) is MMPT that is adjusted for specific student demographic factors. AMMTP will be the final determinant to calculate HEDI placement. B) Assumptions for Calculating AMMTP AMMTP is calculated as follows: 1) An initial baseline MMTP is established using 2011-12 data to determine the school-wide mean percent (%) of

	students scoring at either Level 4 on all NYS 3-8 tests or >=85 points on all NYS Regents examinations. In the example below, the 2012 MMTP is 18.1063% and would have reflected a HEDI score of 9 on the 20 – Point Scale or 8 on the 15 – Point scale. 2) At the beginning of 2012-13 the 2011-12 MMTP is multiplied by 101% (1.01) to establish the 2013 target. In the example below, the 2013 target is 18.2874%. This establishes the bottom score of the “Effective” range of HEDI indicators for 2012-13. Similar to B)1) above, this delineates a HEDI score of 9 on the 20 – Point Scale or 8 on the 15 – Point scale. 3) The target in Step (1) will be compared with the target in Step (2) to yield the percent increase/decrease of current student mastery. This will dictate the HEDI score on the below scale. 4) At the end of 2012-13, an appropriate weighting factor, specifically the higher of either % SWDs or ELLs or % of Students at Poverty, will be added to the baseline MMTP as follows: % SWD or ELL Added Factor % Poverty 00.00 - 10.00 % 0 <= 29.99% 10.01 - 20.00 % 1 30.00 - 60.00% >20.00 % 2 >60.00% The HEDI score from Step (3) will be adjusted according to these controls to result in a final local HEDI score. Data for both percent (%) of SWDs or ELLs or poverty will be the data in effect annually on Basic Educational Data System (BEDS) submission day. For both 2011-12 and 2012-13 academic years, the adjustment formula, based on 60+% poverty indices, is 2. Thus, assuming the MMTP target of 18.2874% is achieved, the AMMTPs for the 20 and 15 point scales will be 11 and 10, respectively. C) Future Calculations of AMMTP As referenced above for the 2012-13 calculation, at the beginning of each subsequent year, a new baseline MMTP is recalculated equal to one hundred and one percent (101%) of the previous year’s baseline MMTP. This establishes a new MMTP target reflecting one percent anticipated increases in mastery performance. As delineated in B)2) above, the weighting factor will continue to be added after the fact to establish AMMTP. Using the preceding language for 2013, the 2012 18.1063% was multiplied by 101%. This generated a 2013 target percent of 18.2874%. By extension, the 2014 target is 18.4702; the 2015 target is 18.6550%; the 2016 target is 18.415% and so on.
Highly Effective (14 - 15 points) Results are well above District- or BOCES-adopted expectations for growth or	15 >10.00% MMTP 14 +08.01 to +10.00% MMTP

achievement for grade/subject.	
Effective (8- 13 points) Results meet District- or BOCES-adopted expectations for growth or achievement for grade/subject.	13 +06.01 to +08.00% MMTP 12 +04.01 to +06.00% MMTP 11 +02.01 to +04.00% MMTP 10 +01.01 to +02.00% MMTP 09 +00.01 to +01.00% MMTP 08 Calculated MMTP
Developing (3 - 7 points) Results are below District- or BOCES-adopted expectations for growth or achievement for grade/subject.	07 -00.01 to -02.00% MMTP 06 -02.01 to -03.00% MMTP 05 -03.01 to -04.00% MMTP 04 -04.01 to -05.00% MMTP 03 -05.01 to -06.00% MMTP
Ineffective (0 - 2 points) Results are well below District- or BOCES-adopted expectations for growth or achievement for grade/subject.	02 -06.01 to -07.00% MMTP 01 -07.01 to -08.00% MMTP 00 <-08.00% MMTP

3.2) Grades 4-8 Math

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

	Locally-Selected Measure from List of Approved Measures	Assessment
4	6(ii) School wide measure computed locally	All NYS 3-8 ELA and Math Assessments, Grades 4 and 8 Science Assessments and all NYS Regents Examinations (ELA,, Global Studies, American History, Integrated Algebra, Geometry, Integrated Algebra 2 and Trigonometry, Earthe Science, Living Environment, Chemistry and Physics).
5	6(ii) School wide measure computed locally	All NYS 3-8 ELA and Math Assessments, Grades 4 and 8 Science Assessments and all NYS Regents Examinations (ELA,, Global Studies, American History, Integrated Algebra, Geometry, Integrated Algebra 2 and Trigonometry, Earthe Science, Living Environment, Chemistry and Physics).
6	6(ii) School wide measure computed locally	All NYS 3-8 ELA and Math Assessments, Grades 4 and 8 Science Assessments and all NYS Regents Examinations (ELA,, Global Studies, American History, Integrated Algebra, Geometry, Integrated Algebra 2 and Trigonometry, Earthe Science, Living Environment, Chemistry and Physics).
7	6(ii) School wide measure computed locally	All NYS 3-8 ELA and Math Assessments, Grades 4 and 8 Science Assessments and all NYS Regents Examinations (ELA,, Global Studies, American History, Integrated Algebra, Geometry, Integrated Algebra 2 and Trigonometry, Earthe Science, Living Environment, Chemistry and Physics).
8	6(ii) School wide measure computed locally	All NYS 3-8 ELA and Math Assessments, Grades 4 and 8 Science Assessments and all NYS Regents Examinations (ELA,, Global Studies, American History, Integrated Algebra, Geometry, Integrated Algebra 2 and Trigonometry, Earthe Science, Living Environment, Chemistry and Physics).

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.	Local Achievement Scores: Mean Mastery Test Performance A) Definitions 1) Validating Tests are all NYS 3-8 tests and all the NYS Regents exams that measure the academic performance for all students whose testing is inclusive in the respective exams. 2) Mean Mastery Test Performance (MMTP) is the school-wide mean percent (%) of students scoring at either Level 4 on the NYS 3-8 tests and >=85 points on the NYS Regents examinations. 3) Adjusted Mean Mastery Test Performance (AMMTP) is MMPT that is adjusted for specific student demographic factors. AMMTP will be the final determinant to calculate HEDI placement. B) Assumptions for Calculating AMMTP AMMTP is calculated as follows: 1) An initial baseline MMTP is established using 2011-12 data to determine the school-wide mean percent (%) of students scoring at either Level 4 on all NYS 3-8 tests or >=85 points on all NYS Regents examinations. In the example below, the 2012 MMTP is 18.1063% and would have reflected a HEDI score of 9 on the 20 – Point Scale or 8 on the 15 – Point scale. 2) At the beginning of 2012-13 the 2011-12 MMTP is multiplied by 101% (1.01) to establish the 2013 target. In the example below, the 2013 target is 18.2874%. This establishes the bottom score of the “Effective” range of HEDI indicators for 2012-13. Similar to B)1) above, this delineates a HEDI score of 9 on the 20 – Point Scale or 8 on the 15 – Point scale. 3) The target in Step (1) will be compared with the target in Step (2) to yield the percent increase/decrease of current student mastery. This will dictate the HEDI score on the below scale. 4) At the end of 2012-13, an appropriate weighting factor, specifically the higher of either % SWDs or ELLs or % of Students at Poverty, will be added to the baseline MMTP as follows: % SWD or ELL Added Factor % Poverty 00.00 - 10.00 % 0 <= 29.99% 10.01 - 20.00 % 1 30.00 - 60.00% >20.00 % 2 >60.00%

	The HEDI score from Step (3) will be adjusted according to these controls to result in a final local HEDI score. Data for both percent (%) of SWDs or ELLs or poverty will be the data in effect annually on Basic Educational Data System (BEDS) submission day. For both 2011-12 and 2012-13 academic years, the adjustment formula, based on 60+% poverty indices, is 2. Thus, assuming the MMTP target of 18.2874% is achieved, the AMMTPs for the 20 and 15 point scales will be 11 and 10, respectively. C) Future Calculations of AMMTP As referenced above for the 2012-13 calculation, at the beginning of each subsequent year, a new baseline MMTP is recalculated equal to one hundred and one percent (101%) of the previous year's baseline MMTP. This establishes a new MMTP target reflecting one percent anticipated increases in mastery performance. As delineated in B)2) above, the weighting factor will continue to be added after the fact to establish AMMTP. Using the preceding language for 2013, the 2012 18.1063% was multiplied by 101%. This generated a 2013 target percent of 18.2874%. By extension, the 2014 target is 18.4702; the 2015 target is 18.6550%; the 2016 target is 18.415% and so on.
Highly Effective (14 - 15 points) Results are well above District- or BOCES-adopted expectations for growth or achievement for grade/subject.	15 >10.00% MMTP 14 +08.01 to +10.00% MMTP
Effective (8- 13 points) Results meet District- or BOCES-adopted expectations for growth or achievement for grade/subject.	13 +06.01 to +08.00% MMTP 12 +04.01 to +06.00% MMTP 11 +02.01 to +04.00% MMTP 10 +01.01 to +02.00% MMTP 09 +00.01 to +01.00% MMTP 08 Calculated MMTP
Developing (3 - 7 points) Results are below District- or BOCES-adopted expectations for growth or achievement for grade/subject.	07 -00.01 to -02.00% MMTP 06 -02.01 to -03.00% MMTP 05 -03.01 to -04.00% MMTP 04 -04.01 to -05.00% MMTP 03 -05.01 to -06.00% MMTP
Ineffective (0 - 2 points) Results are well below District- or BOCES-adopted expectations for growth or achievement for grade/subject.	02 -06.01 to -07.00% MMTP 01 -07.01 to -08.00% MMTP 00 <-08.00% MMTP

3.3) HEDI Tables or Graphics

For questions 3.1 and 3.2 above, if you are using tables or other graphics to explain your general process for assigning HEDI categories, please combine all such tables or graphics into a single file, labeling each so it is clear which grades/subjects it applies to, and upload that file here.

assets/survey-uploads/5139/199955-rhJdBgDruP/Local HEDI Calc Charts 130110.docx

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

Growth or achievement measure(s) from these options.

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

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

Measures based on:

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

BOCES-developed assessment that is rigorous and comparable across classrooms

3.4) Grades K-3 ELA

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

	Locally-Selected Measure from List of Approved Measures	Assessment
K	6(ii) School-wide measure computed locally	All NYS 3-8 ELA and Math Assessments, Grades 4 and 8 Science Assessments and all NYS Regents Examinations (ELA,, Global Studies, American History, Integrated Algebra, Geometry, Integrated Algebra 2 and Trigonometry, Earthe Science, Living Environment, Chemistry and Physics).
1	6(ii) School-wide measure computed locally	All NYS 3-8 ELA and Math Assessments, Grades 4 and 8 Science Assessments and all NYS Regents Examinations (ELA,, Global Studies, American History, Integrated Algebra, Geometry, Integrated Algebra 2 and Trigonometry, Earthe Science, Living Environment, Chemistry and Physics).
2	6(ii) School-wide measure computed locally	All NYS 3-8 ELA and Math Assessments, Grades 4 and 8 Science Assessments and all NYS Regents Examinations (ELA,, Global Studies, American History, Integrated Algebra, Geometry, Integrated Algebra 2 and Trigonometry, Earthe Science, Living Environment, Chemistry and Physics).
3	6(ii) School-wide measure computed locally	All NYS 3-8 ELA and Math Assessments, Grades 4 and 8 Science Assessments and all NYS Regents Examinations (ELA,, Global Studies, American History, Integrated Algebra, Geometry, Integrated Algebra 2 and Trigonometry, Earthe Science, Living Environment, Chemistry and Physics).

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.	Local Achievement Scores: Mean Mastery Test Performance A) Definitions 1) Validating Tests are all NYS 3-8 tests and all the NYS Regents exams that measure the academic performance for all students whose testing is inclusive in the respective exams. 2) Mean Mastery Test Performance (MMTP) is the school-wide mean percent (%) of students scoring at either Level 4 on the NYS 3-8 tests and >=85 points on the NYS Regents examinations.

3) Adjusted Mean Mastery Test Performance (AMMTP) is MMPT that is adjusted for specific student demographic factors. AMMTP will be the final determinant to calculate HEDI placement.

B) Assumptions for Calculating AMMTP

AMMTP is calculated as follows:

1) An initial baseline MMTP is established using 2011-12 data to determine the school-wide mean percent (%) of students scoring at either Level 4 on all NYS 3-8 tests or >=85 points on all NYS Regents examinations. In the example below, the 2012 MMTP is 18.1063% and would have reflected a HEDI score of 9 on the 20 – Point Scale or 8 on the 15 – Point scale.

2) At the beginning of 2012-13 the 2011-12 MMTP is multiplied by 101% (1.01) to establish the 2013 target. In the example below, the 2013 target is 18.2874%. This establishes the bottom score of the “Effective” range of HEDI indicators for 2012-13. Similar to B)1) above, this delineates a HEDI score of 9 on the 20 – Point Scale or 8 on the 15 – Point scale.

3) The target in Step (1) will be compared with the target in Step (2) to yield the percent increase/decrease of current student mastery. This will dictate the HEDI score on the below scale.

4) At the end of 2012-13, an appropriate weighting factor, specifically the higher of either % SWDs or ELLs or % of Students at Poverty, will be added to the baseline MMTP as follows:
% SWD or ELL Added Factor % Poverty
00.00 - 10.00 % 0 <= 29.99%
10.01 - 20.00 % 1 30.00 - 60.00%
>20.00 % 2 >60.00%

The HEDI score from Step (3) will be adjusted according to these controls to result in a final local HEDI score.

Data for both percent (%) of SWDs or ELLs or poverty will be the data in effect annually on Basic Educational Data System (BEDS) submission day.

For both 2011-12 and 2012-13 academic years, the adjustment formula, based on 60+% poverty indices, is 2. Thus, assuming the MMTP target of 18.2874% is achieved, the AMMTPs for the 20 and 15 point scales will be 11 and 10, respectively.

C) Future Calculations of AMMTP

As referenced above for the 2012-13 calculation, at the beginning of each subsequent year, a new baseline MMTP is recalculated equal to one hundred and one percent (101%) of the previous year’s baseline MMTP. This establishes a new MMTP target reflecting one

	percent anticipated increases in mastery performance. As delineated in B)2) above, the weighting factor will continue to be added after the fact to establish AMMTP. Using the preceding language for 2013, the 2012 18.1063% was multiplied by 101%. This generated a 2013 target percent of 18.2874%. By extension, the 2014 target is 18.4702; the 2015 target is 18.6550%; the 2016 target is 18.415% and so on.
Highly Effective (18-20 points) Results are well above District- or BOCES-adopted expectations for growth or achievement for grade/subject.	20 >+10.00% MMTP 19 +09.01 to +10.00% MMTP 18 +08.01 to +09.00% MMTP
Effective (9-17 points) Results meet District- or BOCES-adopted expectations for growth or achievement for grade/subject.	17 +07.01 to +08.00% MMTP 16 +06.01 to +07.00% MMTP 15 +05.01 to +06.00% MMTP 14 +04.01 to +05.00% MMTP 13 +03.01 to +04.00% MMTP 12 +02.01 to +03.00% MMTP 11 +01.01 to +02.00% MMTP 10 +00.01 to +01.00% MMTP 09 Calculated MMTP
Developing (3 - 8 points) Results are below District- or BOCES-adopted expectations for growth or achievement for grade/subject.	08 -00.01 to -01.00% MMTP 07 -01.01 to -02.00% MMTP 06 -02.01 to -03.00% MMTP 05 -03.01 to -04.00% MMTP 04 -04.01 to -05.00% MMTP 03 -05.01 to -06.00% MMTP
Ineffective (0 - 2 points) Results are well below District- or BOCES-adopted expectations for growth or achievement for grade/subject.	02 -06.01 to -07.00% MMTP 01 -07.01 to -08.00% MMTP 00 <-08.00% MMTP

3.5) Grades K-3 Math

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

	Locally-Selected Measure from List of Approved Measures	Assessment
K	6(ii) School-wide measure computed locally	All NYS 3-8 ELA and Math Assessments, Grades 4 and 8 Science Assessments and all NYS Regents Examinations (ELA,, Global Studies, American History, Integrated Algebra, Geometry, Integrated Algebra 2 and Trigonometry, Earthe Science, Living Environment, Chemistry and Physics).
1	6(ii) School-wide measure computed locally	All NYS 3-8 ELA and Math Assessments, Grades 4 and 8 Science Assessments and all NYS Regents Examinations (ELA,, Global Studies, American History, Integrated Algebra, Geometry, Integrated Algebra 2 and Trigonometry, Earthe Science, Living Environment, Chemistry and Physics).
2	6(ii) School-wide measure computed locally	All NYS 3-8 ELA and Math Assessments, Grades 4 and 8 Science Assessments and all NYS Regents Examinations (ELA,, Global Studies, American History, Integrated Algebra, Geometry, Integrated Algebra 2 and Trigonometry, Earthe Science, Living Environment, Chemistry and Physics).
3	6(ii) School-wide measure computed locally	All NYS 3-8 ELA and Math Assessments, Grades 4 and 8 Science Assessments and all NYS Regents Examinations (ELA,,

	Global Studies, American History, Integrated Algebra, Geometry, Integrated Algebra 2 and Trigonometry, Earthe Science, Living Environment, Chemistry and Physics).

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.	Local Achievement Scores: Mean Mastery Test Performance A) Definitions 1) Validating Tests are all NYS 3-8 tests and all the NYS Regents exams that measure the academic performance for all students whose testing is inclusive in the respective exams. 2) Mean Mastery Test Performance (MMTP) is the school-wide mean percent (%) of students scoring at either Level 4 on the NYS 3-8 tests and >=85 points on the NYS Regents examinations. 3) Adjusted Mean Mastery Test Performance (AMMTP) is MMPT that is adjusted for specific student demographic factors. AMMTP will be the final determinant to calculate HEDI placement. B) Assumptions for Calculating AMMTP AMMTP is calculated as follows: 1) An initial baseline MMTP is established using 2011-12 data to determine the school-wide mean percent (%) of students scoring at either Level 4 on all NYS 3-8 tests or >=85 points on all NYS Regents examinations. In the example below, the 2012 MMTP is 18.1063% and would have reflected a HEDI score of 9 on the 20 – Point Scale or 8 on the 15 – Point scale. 2) At the beginning of 2012-13 the 2011-12 MMTP is multiplied by 101% (1.01) to establish the 2013 target. In the example below, the 2013 target is 18.2874%. This establishes the bottom score of the “Effective” range of HEDI indicators for 2012-13. Similar to B)1) above, this delineates a HEDI score of 9 on the 20 – Point Scale or 8 on the 15 – Point scale. 3) The target in Step (1) will be compared with the target in Step (2) to yield the percent increase/decrease of current student mastery. This will dictate the HEDI score on the below scale.

	4) At the end of 2012-13, an appropriate weighting factor, specifically the higher of either % SWDs or ELLs or % of Students at Poverty, will be added to the baseline MMTP as follows: % SWD or ELL Added Factor % Poverty 00.00 - 10.00 % 0 <= 29.99% 10.01 - 20.00 % 1 30.00 - 60.00% >20.00 % 2 >60.00% The HEDI score from Step (3) will be adjusted according to these controls to result in a final local HEDI score. Data for both percent (%) of SWDs or ELLs or poverty will be the data in effect annually on Basic Educational Data System (BEDS) submission day. For both 2011-12 and 2012-13 academic years, the adjustment formula, based on 60+% poverty indices, is 2. Thus, assuming the MMTP target of 18.2874% is achieved, the AMMTPs for the 20 and 15 point scales will be 11 and 10, respectively. C) Future Calculations of AMMTP As referenced above for the 2012-13 calculation, at the beginning of each subsequent year, a new baseline MMTP is recalculated equal to one hundred and one percent (101%) of the previous year's baseline MMTP. This establishes a new MMTP target reflecting one percent anticipated increases in mastery performance. As delineated in B)2) above, the weighting factor will continue to be added after the fact to establish AMMTP. Using the preceding language for 2013, the 2012 18.1063% was multiplied by 101%. This generated a 2013 target percent of 18.2874%. By extension, the 2014 target is 18.4702; the 2015 target is 18.6550%; the 2016 target is 18.415% and so on.
Highly Effective (18-20 points) Results are well above District- or BOCES-adopted expectations for growth or achievement for grade/subject.	20 >+10.00% MMTP 19 +09.01 to +10.00% MMTP 18 +08.01 to +09.00% MMTP
Effective (9-17 points) Results meet District- or BOCES-adopted expectations for growth or achievement for grade/subject.	17 +07.01 to +08.00% MMTP 16 +06.01 to +07.00% MMTP 15 +05.01 to +06.00% MMTP 14 +04.01 to +05.00% MMTP 13 +03.01 to +04.00% MMTP 12 +02.01 to +03.00% MMTP 11 +01.01 to +02.00% MMTP 10 +00.01 to +01.00% MMTP 09 Calculated MMTP
Developing (3 - 8 points) Results are below District -or BOCES-adopted expectations for growth or achievement for grade/subject.	08 -00.01 to -01.00% MMTP 07 -01.01 to -02.00% MMTP 06 -02.01 to -03.00% MMTP 05 -03.01 to -04.00% MMTP 04 -04.01 to -05.00% MMTP 03 -05.01 to -06.00% MMTP

Ineffective (0 - 2 points) Results are well below District- or BOCES-adopted expectations for growth or achievement for grade/subject.	02 -06.01 to -07.00% MMTP 01 -07.01 to -08.00% MMTP 00 <-08.00% MMTP

3.6) Grades 6-8 Science

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

	Locally-Selected Measure from List of Approved Measures	Assessment
6	6(ii) School wide measure computed locally	All NYS 3-8 ELA and Math Assessments, Grades 4 and 8 Science Assessments and all NYS Regents Examinations (ELA,, Global Studies, American History, Integrated Algebra, Geometry, Integrated Algebra 2 and Trigonometry, Earthe Science, Living Environment, Chemistry and Physics).
7	6(ii) School wide measure computed locally	All NYS 3-8 ELA and Math Assessments, Grades 4 and 8 Science Assessments and all NYS Regents Examinations (ELA,, Global Studies, American History, Integrated Algebra, Geometry, Integrated Algebra 2 and Trigonometry, Earthe Science, Living Environment, Chemistry and Physics).
8	6(ii) School wide measure computed locally	All NYS 3-8 ELA and Math Assessments, Grades 4 and 8 Science Assessments and all NYS Regents Examinations (ELA,, Global Studies, American History, Integrated Algebra, Geometry, Integrated Algebra 2 and Trigonometry, Earthe Science, Living Environment, Chemistry and Physics).

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.	Local Achievement Scores: Mean Mastery Test Performance A) Definitions 1) Validating Tests are all NYS 3-8 tests and all the NYS Regents exams that measure the academic performance for all students whose testing is inclusive in the respective exams. 2) Mean Mastery Test Performance (MMTP) is the school-wide mean percent (%) of students scoring at either Level 4 on the NYS 3-8 tests and >=85 points on the NYS Regents examinations. 3) Adjusted Mean Mastery Test Performance (AMMTP) is MMPT that is adjusted for specific student demographic factors. AMMTP will be the final determinant to calculate HEDI placement. B) Assumptions for Calculating AMMTP AMMTP is calculated as follows:

1) An initial baseline MMTP is established using 2011-12 data to determine the school-wide mean percent (%) of students scoring at either Level 4 on all NYS 3-8 tests or >=85 points on all NYS Regents examinations. In the example below, the 2012 MMTP is 18.1063% and would have reflected a HEDI score of 9 on the 20 – Point Scale or 8 on the 15 – Point scale.

2) At the beginning of 2012-13 the 2011-12 MMTP is multiplied by 101% (1.01) to establish the 2013 target. In the example below, the 2013 target is 18.2874%. This establishes the bottom score of the “Effective” range of HEDI indicators for 2012-13. Similar to B)1) above, this delineates a HEDI score of 9 on the 20 – Point Scale or 8 on the 15 – Point scale.

3) The target in Step (1) will be compared with the target in Step (2) to yield the percent increase/decrease of current student mastery. This will dictate the HEDI score on the below scale.

4) At the end of 2012-13, an appropriate weighting factor, specifically the higher of either % SWDs or ELLs or % of Students at Poverty, will be added to the baseline MMTP as follows:
% SWD or ELL Added Factor % Poverty
00.00 - 10.00 % 0 <= 29.99%
10.01 - 20.00 % 1 30.00 - 60.00%
>20.00 % 2 >60.00%

The HEDI score from Step (3) will be adjusted according to these controls to result in a final local HEDI score.

Data for both percent (%) of SWDs or ELLs or poverty will be the data in effect annually on Basic Educational Data System (BEDS) submission day.

For both 2011-12 and 2012-13 academic years, the adjustment formula, based on 60+% poverty indices, is 2. Thus, assuming the MMTP target of 18.2874% is achieved, the AMMTPs for the 20 and 15 point scales will be 11 and 10, respectively.

C) Future Calculations of AMMTP

As referenced above for the 2012-13 calculation, at the beginning of each subsequent year, a new baseline MMTP is recalculated equal to one hundred and one percent (101%) of the previous year’s baseline MMTP. This establishes a new MMTP target reflecting one percent anticipated increases in mastery performance. As delineated in B)2) above, the weighting factor will continue to be added after the fact to establish AMMTP.

Using the preceding language for 2013, the 2012 18.1063% was multiplied by 101%. This generated a 2013 target percent of 18.2874%. By extension, the 2014 target is 18.4702; the 2015 target is 18.6550%; the 2016 target

	is 18.415% and so on.
Highly Effective (18 - 20 points) Results are well above District- or BOCES-adopted expectations for growth or achievement for grade/subject.	20 >+10.00% MMTP 19 +09.01 to +10.00% MMTP 18 +08.01 to +09.00% MMTP
Effective (9 - 17 points) Results meet District- or BOCES-adopted expectations for growth or achievement for grade/subject.	17 +07.01 to +08.00% MMTP 16 +06.01 to +07.00% MMTP 15 +05.01 to +06.00% MMTP 14 +04.01 to +05.00% MMTP 13 +03.01 to +04.00% MMTP 12 +02.01 to +03.00% MMTP 11 +01.01 to +02.00% MMTP 10 +00.01 to +01.00% MMTP 09 Calculated MMTP
Developing (3 - 8 points) Results are below District- or BOCES-adopted expectations for growth or achievement for grade/subject.	08 -00.01 to -01.00% MMTP 07 -01.01 to -02.00% MMTP 06 -02.01 to -03.00% MMTP 05 -03.01 to -04.00% MMTP 04 -04.01 to -05.00% MMTP 03 -05.01 to -06.00% MMTP
Ineffective (0 - 2 points) Results are well below District- or BOCES-adopted expectations for growth or achievement for grade/subject.	02 -06.01 to -07.00% MMTP 01 -07.01 to -08.00% MMTP 00 <-08.00% MMTP

3.7) Grades 6-8 Social Studies

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

	Locally-Selected Measure from List of Approved Measures	Assessment
6	6(ii) School wide measure computed locally	All NYS 3-8 ELA and Math Assessments, Grades 4 and 8 Science Assessments and all NYS Regents Examinations (ELA,, Global Studies, American History, Integrated Algebra, Geometry, Integrated Algebra 2 and Trigonometry, Earthe Science, Living Environment, Chemistry and Physics).
7	6(ii) School wide measure computed locally	All NYS 3-8 ELA and Math Assessments, Grades 4 and 8 Science Assessments and all NYS Regents Examinations (ELA,, Global Studies, American History, Integrated Algebra, Geometry, Integrated Algebra 2 and Trigonometry, Earthe Science, Living Environment, Chemistry and Physics).
8	6(ii) School wide measure computed locally	All NYS 3-8 ELA and Math Assessments, Grades 4 and 8 Science Assessments and all NYS Regents Examinations (ELA,, Global Studies, American History, Integrated Algebra, Geometry, Integrated Algebra 2 and Trigonometry, Earthe Science, Living Environment, Chemistry and Physics).

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.	Local Achievement Scores: Mean Mastery Test Performance A) Definitions 1) Validating Tests are all NYS 3-8 tests and all the NYS Regents exams that measure the academic performance for all students whose testing is inclusive in the respective exams. 2) Mean Mastery Test Performance (MMTP) is the school-wide mean percent (%) of students scoring at either Level 4 on the NYS 3-8 tests and >=85 points on the NYS Regents examinations. 3) Adjusted Mean Mastery Test Performance (AMMTP) is MMPT that is adjusted for specific student demographic factors. AMMTP will be the final determinant to calculate HEDI placement. B) Assumptions for Calculating AMMTP AMMTP is calculated as follows: 1) An initial baseline MMTP is established using 2011-12 data to determine the school-wide mean percent (%) of students scoring at either Level 4 on all NYS 3-8 tests or >=85 points on all NYS Regents examinations. In the example below, the 2012 MMTP is 18.1063% and would have reflected a HEDI score of 9 on the 20 – Point Scale or 8 on the 15 – Point scale. 2) At the beginning of 2012-13 the 2011-12 MMTP is multiplied by 101% (1.01) to establish the 2013 target. In the example below, the 2013 target is 18.2874%. This establishes the bottom score of the “Effective” range of HEDI indicators for 2012-13. Similar to B)1) above, this delineates a HEDI score of 9 on the 20 – Point Scale or 8 on the 15 – Point scale. 3) The target in Step (1) will be compared with the target in Step (2) to yield the percent increase/decrease of current student mastery. This will dictate the HEDI score on the below scale. 4) At the end of 2012-13, an appropriate weighting factor, specifically the higher of either % SWDs or ELLs or % of Students at Poverty, will be added to the baseline MMTP as follows: % SWD or ELL Added Factor % Poverty 00.00 - 10.00 % 0 <= 29.99% 10.01 - 20.00 % 1 30.00 - 60.00% >20.00 % 2 >60.00% The HEDI score from Step (3) will be adjusted according to these controls to result in a final local HEDI score. Data for both percent (%) of SWDs or ELLs or poverty will be the data in effect annually on Basic Educational Data

	System (BEDS) submission day. For both 2011-12 and 2012-13 academic years, the adjustment formula, based on 60+% poverty indices, is 2. Thus, assuming the MMTP target of 18.2874% is achieved, the AMMTPs for the 20 and 15 point scales will be 11 and 10, respectively. C) Future Calculations of AMMTP As referenced above for the 2012-13 calculation, at the beginning of each subsequent year, a new baseline MMTP is recalculated equal to one hundred and one percent (101%) of the previous year's baseline MMTP. This establishes a new MMTP target reflecting one percent anticipated increases in mastery performance. As delineated in B)2) above, the weighting factor will continue to be added after the fact to establish AMMTP. Using the preceding language for 2013, the 2012 18.1063% was multiplied by 101%. This generated a 2013 target percent of 18.2874%. By extension, the 2014 target is 18.4702; the 2015 target is 18.6550%; the 2016 target is 18.415% and so on.
Highly Effective (18 - 20 points) Results are well above District- or BOCES-adopted expectations for growth or achievement for grade/subject.	20 >+10.00% MMTP 19 +09.01 to +10.00% MMTP 18 +08.01 to +09.00% MMTP
Effective (9 - 17 points) Results meet District- or BOCES-adopted expectations for growth or achievement for grade/subject.	17 +07.01 to +08.00% MMTP 16 +06.01 to +07.00% MMTP 15 +05.01 to +06.00% MMTP 14 +04.01 to +05.00% MMTP 13 +03.01 to +04.00% MMTP 12 +02.01 to +03.00% MMTP 11 +01.01 to +02.00% MMTP 10 +00.01 to +01.00% MMTP 09 Calculated MMTP
Developing (3 - 8 points) Results are below District- or BOCES-adopted expectations for growth or achievement for grade/subject.	08 -00.01 to -01.00% MMTP 07 -01.01 to -02.00% MMTP 06 -02.01 to -03.00% MMTP 05 -03.01 to -04.00% MMTP 04 -04.01 to -05.00% MMTP 03 -05.01 to -06.00% MMTP
Ineffective (0 - 2 points) Results are well below District- or BOCES-adopted expectations for growth or achievement for grade/subject.	02 -06.01 to -07.00% MMTP 01 -07.01 to -08.00% MMTP 00 <-08.00% MMTP

3.8) High School Social Studies

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

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

	Locally-Selected Measure from List of Approved Measures	Assessment
Global 1	6(ii) School wide measure computed locally	All NYS 3-8 ELA and Math Assessments, Grades 4 and 8 Science Assessments and all NYS Regents Examinations (ELA,, Global Studies, American History, Integrated Algebra, Geometry, Integrated Algebra 2 and Trigonometry, Earthe Science, Living Environment, Chemistry and Physics).
Global 2	6(ii) School wide measure computed locally	All NYS 3-8 ELA and Math Assessments, Grades 4 and 8 Science Assessments and all NYS Regents Examinations (ELA,, Global Studies, American History, Integrated Algebra, Geometry, Integrated Algebra 2 and Trigonometry, Earthe Science, Living Environment, Chemistry and Physics).
American History	6(ii) School wide measure computed locally	All NYS 3-8 ELA and Math Assessments, Grades 4 and 8 Science Assessments and all NYS Regents Examinations (ELA,, Global Studies, American History, Integrated Algebra, Geometry, Integrated Algebra 2 and Trigonometry, Earthe Science, Living Environment, Chemistry and Physics).

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.	Local Achievement Scores: Mean Mastery Test Performance A) Definitions 1) Validating Tests are all NYS 3-8 tests and all the NYS Regents exams that measure the academic performance for all students whose testing is inclusive in the respective exams. 2) Mean Mastery Test Performance (MMTP) is the school-wide mean percent (%) of students scoring at either Level 4 on the NYS 3-8 tests and >=85 points on the NYS Regents examinations. 3) Adjusted Mean Mastery Test Performance (AMMTP) is MMPT that is adjusted for specific student demographic factors. AMMTP will be the final determinant to calculate HEDI placement. B) Assumptions for Calculating AMMTP AMMTP is calculated as follows: 1) An initial baseline MMTP is established using 2011-12 data to determine the school-wide mean percent (%) of students scoring at either Level 4 on all NYS 3-8 tests or >=85 points on all NYS Regents examinations. In the example below, the 2012 MMTP is 18.1063% and would

	have reflected a HEDI score of 9 on the 20 – Point Scale or 8 on the 15 – Point scale. 2) At the beginning of 2012-13 the 2011-12 MMTP is multiplied by 101% (1.01) to establish the 2013 target. In the example below, the 2013 target is 18.2874%. This establishes the bottom score of the “Effective” range of HEDI indicators for 2012-13. Similar to B)1) above, this delineates a HEDI score of 9 on the 20 – Point Scale or 8 on the 15 – Point scale. 3) The target in Step (1) will be compared with the target in Step (2) to yield the percent increase/decrease of current student mastery. This will dictate the HEDI score on the below scale. 4) At the end of 2012-13, an appropriate weighting factor, specifically the higher of either % SWDs or ELLs or % of Students at Poverty, will be added to the baseline MMTP as follows: % SWD or ELL Added Factor % Poverty 00.00 - 10.00 % 0 <= 29.99% 10.01 - 20.00 % 1 30.00 - 60.00% >20.00 % 2 >60.00% The HEDI score from Step (3) will be adjusted according to these controls to result in a final local HEDI score. Data for both percent (%) of SWDs or ELLs or poverty will be the data in effect annually on Basic Educational Data System (BEDS) submission day. For both 2011-12 and 2012-13 academic years, the adjustment formula, based on 60+% poverty indices, is 2. Thus, assuming the MMTP target of 18.2874% is achieved, the AMMTPs for the 20 and 15 point scales will be 11 and 10, respectively. C) Future Calculations of AMMTP As referenced above for the 2012-13 calculation, at the beginning of each subsequent year, a new baseline MMTP is recalculated equal to one hundred and one percent (101%) of the previous year’s baseline MMTP. This establishes a new MMTP target reflecting one percent anticipated increases in mastery performance. As delineated in B)2) above, the weighting factor will continue to be added after the fact to establish AMMTP. Using the preceding language for 2013, the 2012 18.1063% was multiplied by 101%. This generated a 2013 target percent of 18.2874%. By extension, the 2014 target is 18.4702; the 2015 target is 18.6550%; the 2016 target is 18.415% and so on.
Highly Effective (18 - 20 points) Results are well above District- or BOCES-adopted expectations for growth or achievement for grade/subject.	20 >+10.00% MMTP 19 +09.01 to +10.00% MMTP 18 +08.01 to +09.00% MMTP

Effective (9 - 17 points) Results meet District- or BOCES-adopted expectations for growth or achievement for grade/subject.	17 +07.01 to +08.00% MMTP 16 +06.01 to +07.00% MMTP 15 +05.01 to +06.00% MMTP 14 +04.01 to +05.00% MMTP 13 +03.01 to +04.00% MMTP 12 +02.01 to +03.00% MMTP 11 +01.01 to +02.00% MMTP 10 +00.01 to +01.00% MMTP 09 Calculated MMTP
Developing (3 - 8 points) Results are below District- or BOCES-adopted expectations for growth or achievement for grade/subject.	08 -00.01 to -01.00% MMTP 07 -01.01 to -02.00% MMTP 06 -02.01 to -03.00% MMTP 05 -03.01 to -04.00% MMTP 04 -04.01 to -05.00% MMTP 03 -05.01 to -06.00% MMTP
Ineffective (0 - 2 points) Results are well below District- or BOCES-adopted expectations for growth or achievement for grade/subject.	02 -06.01 to -07.00% MMTP 01 -07.01 to -08.00% MMTP 00 <-08.00% MMTP

3.9) High School Science

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

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

	Locally-Selected Measure from List of Approved Measures	Assessment
Living Environment	6(ii) School wide measure computed locally	All NYS 3-8 ELA and Math Assessments, Grades 4 and 8 Science Assessments and all NYS Regents Examinations (ELA,, Global Studies, American History, Integrated Algebra, Geometry, Integrated Algebra 2 and Trigonometry, Earthe Science, Living Environment, Chemistry and Physics).
Earth Science	6(ii) School wide measure computed locally	All NYS 3-8 ELA and Math Assessments, Grades 4 and 8 Science Assessments and all NYS Regents Examinations (ELA,, Global Studies, American History, Integrated Algebra, Geometry, Integrated Algebra 2 and Trigonometry, Earthe Science, Living Environment, Chemistry and Physics).
Chemistry	6(ii) School wide measure computed locally	All NYS 3-8 ELA and Math Assessments, Grades 4 and 8 Science Assessments and all NYS Regents Examinations (ELA,, Global Studies, American History, Integrated Algebra, Geometry, Integrated Algebra 2 and Trigonometry, Earthe Science, Living Environment, Chemistry and Physics).
Physics	6(ii) School wide measure computed locally	All NYS 3-8 ELA and Math Assessments, Grades 4 and 8 Science Assessments and all NYS Regents Examinations (ELA,, Global Studies, American History, Integrated Algebra, Geometry, Integrated Algebra 2 and Trigonometry, Earthe Science, Living Environment, Chemistry and Physics).

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.	Local Achievement Scores: Mean Mastery Test Performance A) Definitions 1) Validating Tests are all NYS 3-8 tests and all the NYS Regents exams that measure the academic performance for all students whose testing is inclusive in the respective exams. 2) Mean Mastery Test Performance (MMTP) is the school-wide mean percent (%) of students scoring at either Level 4 on the NYS 3-8 tests and >=85 points on the NYS Regents examinations. 3) Adjusted Mean Mastery Test Performance (AMMTP) is MMPT that is adjusted for specific student demographic factors. AMMTP will be the final determinant to calculate HEDI placement. B) Assumptions for Calculating AMMTP AMMTP is calculated as follows: 1) An initial baseline MMTP is established using 2011-12 data to determine the school-wide mean percent (%) of students scoring at either Level 4 on all NYS 3-8 tests or >=85 points on all NYS Regents examinations. In the example below, the 2012 MMTP is 18.1063% and would have reflected a HEDI score of 9 on the 20 – Point Scale or 8 on the 15 – Point scale. 2) At the beginning of 2012-13 the 2011-12 MMTP is multiplied by 101% (1.01) to establish the 2013 target. In the example below, the 2013 target is 18.2874%. This establishes the bottom score of the “Effective” range of HEDI indicators for 2012-13. Similar to B)1) above, this delineates a HEDI score of 9 on the 20 – Point Scale or 8 on the 15 – Point scale. 3) The target in Step (1) will be compared with the target in Step (2) to yield the percent increase/decrease of current student mastery. This will dictate the HEDI score on the below scale. 4) At the end of 2012-13, an appropriate weighting factor, specifically the higher of either % SWDs or ELLs or % of Students at Poverty, will be added to the baseline MMTP as follows: % SWD or ELL Added Factor % Poverty 00.00 - 10.00 % 0 <= 29.99% 10.01 - 20.00 % 1 30.00 - 60.00% >20.00 % 2 >60.00%

	The HEDI score from Step (3) will be adjusted according to these controls to result in a final local HEDI score. Data for both percent (%) of SWDs or ELLs or poverty will be the data in effect annually on Basic Educational Data System (BEDS) submission day. For both 2011-12 and 2012-13 academic years, the adjustment formula, based on 60+% poverty indices, is 2. Thus, assuming the MMTP target of 18.2874% is achieved, the AMMTPs for the 20 and 15 point scales will be 11 and 10, respectively. C) Future Calculations of AMMTP As referenced above for the 2012-13 calculation, at the beginning of each subsequent year, a new baseline MMTP is recalculated equal to one hundred and one percent (101%) of the previous year's baseline MMTP. This establishes a new MMTP target reflecting one percent anticipated increases in mastery performance. As delineated in B)2) above, the weighting factor will continue to be added after the fact to establish AMMTP. Using the preceding language for 2013, the 2012 18.1063% was multiplied by 101%. This generated a 2013 target percent of 18.2874%. By extension, the 2014 target is 18.4702; the 2015 target is 18.6550%; the 2016 target is 18.415% and so on.
Highly Effective (18-20 points) Results are well above District- or BOCES-adopted expectations for growth or achievement for grade/subject.	20 >+10.00% MMTP 19 +09.01 to +10.00% MMTP 18 +08.01 to +09.00% MMTP
Developing (3 - 8 points) Results are below District- or BOCES-adopted expectations for growth or achievement for grade/subject.	17 +07.01 to +08.00% MMTP 16 +06.01 to +07.00% MMTP 15 +05.01 to +06.00% MMTP 14 +04.01 to +05.00% MMTP 13 +03.01 to +04.00% MMTP 12 +02.01 to +03.00% MMTP 11 +01.01 to +02.00% MMTP 10 +00.01 to +01.00% MMTP 09 Calculated MMTP
Effective (9 - 17points) Results meet District- or BOCES-adopted expectations for growth or achievement for grade/subject.	08 -00.01 to -01.00% MMTP 07 -01.01 to -02.00% MMTP 06 -02.01 to -03.00% MMTP 05 -03.01 to -04.00% MMTP 04 -04.01 to -05.00% MMTP 03 -05.01 to -06.00% MMTP
Ineffective (0 - 2 points) Results are well below District- or BOCES-adopted expectations for growth or achievement for grade/subject.	02 -06.01 to -07.00% MMTP 01 -07.01 to -08.00% MMTP 00 <-08.00% MMTP

3.10) High School Math

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

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

	Locally-Selected Measure from List of Approved Measures	Assessment
Algebra 1	6(ii) School wide measure computed locally	All NYS 3-8 ELA and Math Assessments, Grades 4 and 8 Science Assessments and all NYS Regents Examinations (ELA,, Global Studies, American History, Integrated Algebra, Geometry, Integrated Algebra 2 and Trigonometry, Earthe Science, Living Environment, Chemistry and Physics).
Geometry	6(ii) School wide measure computed locally	All NYS 3-8 ELA and Math Assessments, Grades 4 and 8 Science Assessments and all NYS Regents Examinations (ELA,, Global Studies, American History, Integrated Algebra, Geometry, Integrated Algebra 2 and Trigonometry, Earthe Science, Living Environment, Chemistry and Physics).
Algebra 2	6(ii) School wide measure computed locally	All NYS 3-8 ELA and Math Assessments, Grades 4 and 8 Science Assessments and all NYS Regents Examinations (ELA,, Global Studies, American History, Integrated Algebra, Geometry, Integrated Algebra 2 and Trigonometry, Earthe Science, Living Environment, Chemistry and Physics).

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.	Local Achievement Scores: Mean Mastery Test Performance A) Definitions 1) Validating Tests are all NYS 3-8 tests and all the NYS Regents exams that measure the academic performance for all students whose testing is inclusive in the respective exams. 2) Mean Mastery Test Performance (MMTP) is the school-wide mean percent (%) of students scoring at either Level 4 on the NYS 3-8 tests and >=85 points on the NYS Regents examinations. 3) Adjusted Mean Mastery Test Performance (AMMTP) is MMPT that is adjusted for specific student demographic factors. AMMTP will be the final determinant to calculate HEDI placement. B) Assumptions for Calculating AMMTP AMMTP is calculated as follows:

1) An initial baseline MMTP is established using 2011-12 data to determine the school-wide mean percent (%) of students scoring at either Level 4 on all NYS 3-8 tests or >=85 points on all NYS Regents examinations. In the example below, the 2012 MMTP is 18.1063% and would have reflected a HEDI score of 9 on the 20 – Point Scale or 8 on the 15 – Point scale.

2) At the beginning of 2012-13 the 2011-12 MMTP is multiplied by 101% (1.01) to establish the 2013 target. In the example below, the 2013 target is 18.2874%. This establishes the bottom score of the “Effective” range of HEDI indicators for 2012-13. Similar to B)1) above, this delineates a HEDI score of 9 on the 20 – Point Scale or 8 on the 15 – Point scale.

3) The target in Step (1) will be compared with the target in Step (2) to yield the percent increase/decrease of current student mastery. This will dictate the HEDI score on the below scale.

4) At the end of 2012-13, an appropriate weighting factor, specifically the higher of either % SWDs or ELLs or % of Students at Poverty, will be added to the baseline MMTP as follows:
% SWD or ELL Added Factor % Poverty
00.00 - 10.00 % 0 <= 29.99%
10.01 - 20.00 % 1 30.00 - 60.00%
>20.00 % 2 >60.00%

The HEDI score from Step (3) will be adjusted according to these controls to result in a final local HEDI score.

Data for both percent (%) of SWDs or ELLs or poverty will be the data in effect annually on Basic Educational Data System (BEDS) submission day.

For both 2011-12 and 2012-13 academic years, the adjustment formula, based on 60+% poverty indices, is 2. Thus, assuming the MMTP target of 18.2874% is achieved, the AMMTPs for the 20 and 15 point scales will be 11 and 10, respectively.

C) Future Calculations of AMMTP

As referenced above for the 2012-13 calculation, at the beginning of each subsequent year, a new baseline MMTP is recalculated equal to one hundred and one percent (101%) of the previous year’s baseline MMTP. This establishes a new MMTP target reflecting one percent anticipated increases in mastery performance. As delineated in B)2) above, the weighting factor will continue to be added after the fact to establish AMMTP.

Using the preceding language for 2013, the 2012 18.1063% was multiplied by 101%. This generated a 2013 target percent of 18.2874%. By extension, the 2014 target is 18.4702; the 2015 target is 18.6550%; the 2016 target is 18.415% and so on.

Highly Effective (18 - 20 points) Results are well above District- or BOCES-adopted expectations for growth or achievement for grade/subject.	20 >+10.00% MMTP 19 +09.01 to +10.00% MMTP 18 +08.01 to +09.00% MMTP
Effective (9 - 17 points) Results meet District- or BOCES-adopted expectations for growth or achievement for grade/subject.	17 +07.01 to +08.00% MMTP 16 +06.01 to +07.00% MMTP 15 +05.01 to +06.00% MMTP 14 +04.01 to +05.00% MMTP 13 +03.01 to +04.00% MMTP 12 +02.01 to +03.00% MMTP 11 +01.01 to +02.00% MMTP 10 +00.01 to +01.00% MMTP 09 Calculated MMTP
Developing (3 - 8 points) Results are below District- or BOCES-adopted expectations for growth or achievement for grade/subject.	08 -00.01 to -01.00% MMTP 07 -01.01 to -02.00% MMTP 06 -02.01 to -03.00% MMTP 05 -03.01 to -04.00% MMTP 04 -04.01 to -05.00% MMTP 03 -05.01 to -06.00% MMTP
Ineffective (0 - 2 points) Results are well below District- or BOCES-adopted expectations for growth or achievement for grade/subject.	02 -06.01 to -07.00% MMTP 01 -07.01 to -08.00% MMTP 00 <-08.00% MMTP

3.11) High School English Language Arts

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

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

	Locally-Selected Measure from List of Approved Measures	Assessment
Grade 9 ELA	6(ii) School wide measure computed locally	All NYS 3-8 ELA and Math Assessments, Grades 4 and 8 Science Assessments and all NYS Regents Examinations (ELA,, Global Studies, American History, Integrated Algebra, Geometry, Integrated Algebra 2 and Trigonometry, Earthe Science, Living Environment, Chemistry and Physics).
Grade 10 ELA	6(ii) School wide measure computed locally	All NYS 3-8 ELA and Math Assessments, Grades 4 and 8 Science Assessments and all NYS Regents Examinations (ELA,, Global Studies, American History, Integrated Algebra, Geometry, Integrated Algebra 2 and Trigonometry, Earthe Science, Living Environment, Chemistry and Physics).
Grade 11 ELA	6(ii) School wide measure computed locally	All NYS 3-8 ELA and Math Assessments, Grades 4 and 8 Science Assessments and all NYS Regents Examinations (ELA,, Global Studies, American History, Integrated Algebra, Geometry, Integrated Algebra 2 and Trigonometry, Earthe Science, Living Environment, Chemistry and Physics).

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.	Local Achievement Scores: Mean Mastery Test Performance A) Definitions 1) Validating Tests are all NYS 3-8 tests and all the NYS Regents exams that measure the academic performance for all students whose testing is inclusive in the respective exams. 2) Mean Mastery Test Performance (MMTP) is the school-wide mean percent (%) of students scoring at either Level 4 on the NYS 3-8 tests and >=85 points on the NYS Regents examinations. 3) Adjusted Mean Mastery Test Performance (AMMTP) is MMPT that is adjusted for specific student demographic factors. AMMTP will be the final determinant to calculate HEDI placement. B) Assumptions for Calculating AMMTP AMMTP is calculated as follows: 1) An initial baseline MMTP is established using 2011-12 data to determine the school-wide mean percent (%) of students scoring at either Level 4 on all NYS 3-8 tests or >=85 points on all NYS Regents examinations. In the example below, the 2012 MMTP is 18.1063% and would have reflected a HEDI score of 9 on the 20 – Point Scale or 8 on the 15 – Point scale. 2) At the beginning of 2012-13 the 2011-12 MMTP is multiplied by 101% (1.01) to establish the 2013 target. In the example below, the 2013 target is 18.2874%. This establishes the bottom score of the “Effective” range of HEDI indicators for 2012-13. Similar to B)1) above, this delineates a HEDI score of 9 on the 20 – Point Scale or 8 on the 15 – Point scale. 3) The target in Step (1) will be compared with the target in Step (2) to yield the percent increase/decrease of current student mastery. This will dictate the HEDI score on the below scale. 4) At the end of 2012-13, an appropriate weighting factor, specifically the higher of either % SWDs or ELLs or % of Students at Poverty, will be added to the baseline MMTP as follows: % SWD or ELL Added Factor % Poverty 00.00 - 10.00 % 0 <= 29.99% 10.01 - 20.00 % 1 30.00 - 60.00% >20.00 % 2 >60.00% The HEDI score from Step (3) will be adjusted according

	to these controls to result in a final local HEDI score. Data for both percent (%) of SWDs or ELLs or poverty will be the data in effect annually on Basic Educational Data System (BEDS) submission day. For both 2011-12 and 2012-13 academic years, the adjustment formula, based on 60+% poverty indices, is 2. Thus, assuming the MMTP target of 18.2874% is achieved, the AMMTPs for the 20 and 15 point scales will be 11 and 10, respectively. C) Future Calculations of AMMTP As referenced above for the 2012-13 calculation, at the beginning of each subsequent year, a new baseline MMTP is recalculated equal to one hundred and one percent (101%) of the previous year's baseline MMTP. This establishes a new MMTP target reflecting one percent anticipated increases in mastery performance. As delineated in B)2) above, the weighting factor will continue to be added after the fact to establish AMMTP. Using the preceding language for 2013, the 2012 18.1063% was multiplied by 101%. This generated a 2013 target percent of 18.2874%. By extension, the 2014 target is 18.4702; the 2015 target is 18.6550%; the 2016 target is 18.415% and so on.
Highly Effective (18 - 20 points) Results are well above District- or BOCES-adopted expectations for growth or achievement for grade/subject.	20 >+10.00% MMTP 19 +09.01 to +10.00% MMTP 18 +08.01 to +09.00% MMTP
Effective (9 - 17 points) Results meet District- or BOCES-adopted expectations for growth or achievement for grade/subject.	17 +07.01 to +08.00% MMTP 16 +06.01 to +07.00% MMTP 15 +05.01 to +06.00% MMTP 14 +04.01 to +05.00% MMTP 13 +03.01 to +04.00% MMTP 12 +02.01 to +03.00% MMTP 11 +01.01 to +02.00% MMTP 10 +00.01 to +01.00% MMTP 09 Calculated MMTP
Developing (3 - 8 points) Results are below District- or BOCES-adopted expectations for growth or achievement for grade/subject.	08 -00.01 to -01.00% MMTP 07 -01.01 to -02.00% MMTP 06 -02.01 to -03.00% MMTP 05 -03.01 to -04.00% MMTP 04 -04.01 to -05.00% MMTP 03 -05.01 to -06.00% MMTP
Ineffective (0 - 2 points) Results are well below District- or BOCES-adopted expectations for growth or achievement for grade/subject.	02 -06.01 to -07.00% MMTP 01 -07.01 to -08.00% MMTP 00 <-08.00% MMTP

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 not listed above	6(ii) School wide measure computed locally	All NYS 3-8 ELA and Math Assessments, Grades 4 and 8 Science Assessments and all NYS Regents Examinations (ELA,, Global Studies, American History, Integrated Algebra, Geometry, Integrated Algebra 2 and Trigonometry, Earthe Science, Living Environment, Chemistry and Physics).

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.	Local Achievement Scores: Mean Mastery Test Performance A) Definitions 1) Validating Tests are all NYS 3-8 tests and all the NYS Regents exams that measure the academic performance for all students whose testing is inclusive in the respective exams. 2) Mean Mastery Test Performance (MMTP) is the school-wide mean percent (%) of students scoring at either Level 4 on the NYS 3-8 tests and >=85 points on the NYS Regents examinations. 3) Adjusted Mean Mastery Test Performance (AMMTP) is MMPT that is adjusted for specific student demographic factors. AMMTP will be the final determinant to calculate HEDI placement. B) Assumptions for Calculating AMMTP AMMTP is calculated as follows: 1) An initial baseline MMTP is established using 2011-12 data to determine the school-wide mean percent (%) of students scoring at either Level 4 on all NYS 3-8 tests or >=85 points on all NYS Regents examinations. In the

	example below, the 2012 MMTP is 18.1063% and would have reflected a HEDI score of 9 on the 20 – Point Scale or 8 on the 15 – Point scale. 2) At the beginning of 2012-13 the 2011-12 MMTP is multiplied by 101% (1.01) to establish the 2013 target. In the example below, the 2013 target is 18.2874%. This establishes the bottom score of the “Effective” range of HEDI indicators for 2012-13. Similar to B)1) above, this delineates a HEDI score of 9 on the 20 – Point Scale or 8 on the 15 – Point scale. 3) The target in Step (1) will be compared with the target in Step (2) to yield the percent increase/decrease of current student mastery. This will dictate the HEDI score on the below scale. 4) At the end of 2012-13, an appropriate weighting factor, specifically the higher of either % SWDs or ELLs or % of Students at Poverty, will be added to the baseline MMTP as follows: % SWD or ELL Added Factor % Poverty 00.00 - 10.00 % 0 <= 29.99% 10.01 - 20.00 % 1 30.00 - 60.00% >20.00 % 2 >60.00% The HEDI score from Step (3) will be adjusted according to these controls to result in a final local HEDI score. Data for both percent (%) of SWDs or ELLs or poverty will be the data in effect annually on Basic Educational Data System (BEDS) submission day. For both 2011-12 and 2012-13 academic years, the adjustment formula, based on 60+% poverty indices, is 2. Thus, assuming the MMTP target of 18.2874% is achieved, the AMMTPs for the 20 and 15 point scales will be 11 and 10, respectively. C) Future Calculations of AMMTP As referenced above for the 2012-13 calculation, at the beginning of each subsequent year, a new baseline MMTP is recalculated equal to one hundred and one percent (101%) of the previous year’s baseline MMTP. This establishes a new MMTP target reflecting one percent anticipated increases in mastery performance. As delineated in B)2) above, the weighting factor will continue to be added after the fact to establish AMMTP. Using the preceding language for 2013, the 2012 18.1063% was multiplied by 101%. This generated a 2013 target percent of 18.2874%. By extension, the 2014 target is 18.4702; the 2015 target is 18.6550%; the 2016 target is 18.415% and so on.
Highly Effective (18 - 20 points) Results are well above District- or BOCES -adopted expectations for growth or achievement for grade/subject.	20 >+10.00% MMTP 19 +09.01 to +10.00% MMTP 18 +08.01 to +09.00% MMTP

Effective (9 - 17 points) Results meet District- or BOCES-adopted expectations for growth or achievement for grade/subject.	17 +07.01 to +08.00% MMTP 16 +06.01 to +07.00% MMTP 15 +05.01 to +06.00% MMTP 14 +04.01 to +05.00% MMTP 13 +03.01 to +04.00% MMTP 12 +02.01 to +03.00% MMTP 11 +01.01 to +02.00% MMTP 10 +00.01 to +01.00% MMTP 09 Calculated MMTP
Developing (3 - 8 points) Results are below District- or BOCES-adopted expectations for growth or achievement for grade/subject.	08 -00.01 to -01.00% MMTP 07 -01.01 to -02.00% MMTP 06 -02.01 to -03.00% MMTP 05 -03.01 to -04.00% MMTP 04 -04.01 to -05.00% MMTP 03 -05.01 to -06.00% MMTP
Ineffective (0 - 2 points) Results are well below District- or BOCES-adopted expectations for growth or achievement for grade/subject.	02 -06.01 to -07.00% MMTP 01 -07.01 to -08.00% MMTP 00 <-08.00% MMTP

If you need additional space, upload a copy of "Form 3.12: All Other Courses" as an attachment for review. Click here for a downloadable copy of Form 3.12. (MS Word)

(No response)

3.13) HEDI Tables or Graphics

For questions 3.4 through 3.12 above, if you are using tables or other graphics to explain your general process for assigning HEDI categories, please combine all such tables or graphics into a single file, labeling each so it is clear which grades/subjects it applies to, and upload that file here.

assets/survey-uploads/5139/199955-y92vNseFa4/Local HEDI Calc Charts 130110.docx

3.14) Locally Developed Controls

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

The local HEDI formula for Charlotte Valley Central School teachers will employ a variable additive factor (0-2 HEDI Points) to adjust the weighted performance indicator as follows:

At the end of 2012, an appropriate weighting factor, specifically the higher of either % SWDs or ELLs or % of Students at Poverty, will be added to the baseline MMTP as follows:
% SWD or ELL Added Factor % Poverty
00.00 - 10.00 % 0 HEDI Points <= 29.99%
10.01 - 20.00 % 1 HEDI Point 30.00 - 60.00%
>20.00 % 2 HEDI Points >60.00%

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.

Not Applicable

3.16) Assurances

Please check all of the boxes below:

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

4. Other Measures of Effectiveness (Teachers)

Created Thursday, October 18, 2012
Updated Monday, June 24, 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]	50
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	10

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.

Charlotte Valley Central School will use the configurations on pages 30-32 of the NYSUT Teacher Evaluation and Development (TED) Workbook to calculate the sixty (60) points for the NYSUT Teacher rubric. All sixty (60) points will be assigned based on the NYSUT rubric parameters. Multiple observations will be made to gather evidence that demonstrates competence. The breakdown of the multiple observations is delineated below:

1) Observation #1 - 1.0 to 4.0 NYSUT Rubric Score = to 0 to 30 APPR points
Division of the thirty (30) points
a) Twenty-five (25) of the thirty (30) points in the observation shall be determined based on the evaluator’s direct observation of instruction.

b) Five (5) of the thirty (30) points will be determined from the evaluator's examination of assorted artifacts that are related, directly or indirectly, to the observed instruction. Effective during the 2012-13, academic year specific evidence in the form of artifacts shall minimally include, and not be limited to, the following:
• Lesson Plans, continuously available for administrative review
• Contact Logs, continuously available for administrative review
• Course outlines for the entire academic year including rubrics that delineate grading methodology

2) Observation #2 - 1.0 to 4.0 NYSUT Rubric Score = to 0 to 30 APPR points
The format for Observation #2 shall be the same as that employed in Observation #1.

3) Over the course of two (2) observations, two sets instructional observation scores, each potentially worth 25 points are developed. Potentially, they could total 50 points. Similarly, over the course of two (2) observations, two sets related artifacts scores, each potentially worth 5 points are developed. Potentially, they could total 10 points. The grand total, potentially worth 60 points, is the sum of the points gleaned from the two (2) observations and the two (2) sets of related artifacts.

The first observation in the first year of the APPR for all teachers is announced. All subsequent observations for all teachers for all subsequent years will be unannounced.

The single exception is for probationary teachers being observed for the first time; their first observation only will be announced. All subsequent observations for all subsequent years will be unannounced.

The NYSUT rubric has a total of 97 indicators imbedded within the seven (7) essential standards. The numbers of indicators, by standard, are delineated below:

Standard 1: 10 inclusive indicators
Standard 2: 18 inclusive indicators
Standard 3: 17 inclusive indicators
Standard 4: 12 inclusive indicators
Standard 5: 13 inclusive indicators
Standard 6: 18 inclusive indicators
Standard 7: 09 inclusive indicators

The 97 NYSUT indicators will be converted to a score within the scoring range of 1-4 using the attached conversion chart.

The teacher will earn 25 points each from the two (2) evaluations based on standards 1-5.

The remaining 10 points will be based on standards 6 and 7. Evidence of for these standards will be derived from artifacts presented at a series of meetings between the teacher and the evaluator that are associated with, and relate to, the observations.

The rubric listed on the chart is the minimum score necessary to achieve the corresponding HEDI point value.

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/5091/199979-eka9yMJ855/Final Revised CVTA APPR 130111 Appdx 3.doc

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

Highly Effective: Overall performance and results exceed NYS Teaching Standards.	To be considered "Highly Effective" within this subcomponent, teachers must have a score in the range of 59-60 on the HEDI ratings. The breakdown of the NYSUT rubric scores into points for this subcomponent is as follows: 4.0 = 60 3.9 = 60

	3.8 = 60 3.7 = 59 3.6 = 59 3.5 = 59
Effective: Overall performance and results meet NYS Teaching Standards.	To be considered "Effective" within this subcomponent, teachers must have a score in the range of 57-58 on the HEDI ratings. The breakdown of the NYSUT rubric scores into points for this subcomponent is as follows: 3.4 = 58 3.3 = 58 3.2 = 58 3.1 = 58 3.0 = 58 2.9 = 57 2.8 = 57 2.7 = 57 2.6 = 57 2.5 = 57
Developing: Overall performance and results need improvement in order to meet NYS Teaching Standards.	To be considered "Developing" within this subcomponent, teachers must have a score in the range of 50-56 on the HEDI ratings. The breakdown of the NYSUT rubric scores into points for this subcomponent is as follows: 2.4 = 56 2.3 = 56 2.2 = 55 2.1 = 55 2.0 = 54 1.9 = 54 1.8 = 53 1.7 = 52 1.6 = 51 1.5 = 50
Ineffective: Overall performance and results do not meet NYS Teaching Standards.	To be considered "Ineffective" within this subcomponent, teachers must have a score in the range of 0-49 on the HEDI ratings. The breakdown of the NYSUT rubric scores into points for this subcomponent is as follows: 1.400 = 49 1.392 = 48 1.383 = 47 1.375 = 46 1.367 = 45 1.358 = 44 1.350 = 43 1.341 = 42 1.333 = 41 1.325 = 40 1.317 = 39 1.300 = 37 1.292 = 36 1.283 = 35 1.275 = 34 1.267 = 33 1.258 = 32 1.250 = 31 1.242 = 30 1.233 = 29 1.225 = 28 1.217 = 27 1.208 = 26

	1.200 = 25 1.192 = 24 1.185 = 23 1.177 = 22 1.169 = 21 1.162 = 20 1.154 = 19 1.146 = 18 1.138 = 17 1.131 = 16 1.123 = 15 1.115 = 14 1.108 = 13 1.100 = 12 1.092 = 11 1.083 = 10 1.075 = 09 1.067 = 08 1.058 = 07 1.050 = 06 1.042 = 05 1.033 = 04 1.025 = 03 1.017 = 02 1.008 = 01 1.000 = 00

Provide the ranges for the 60-point scoring bands.

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

4.6) Observations of Probationary Teachers

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

By building principals or other trained administrators

4.6) Observations of Probationary Teachers | Formal/Long	2
4.6) Observations of Probationary Teachers | Informal/Short	0
4.6) Observations of Probationary Teachers | Enter Total	2

By trained in-school peer teachers or other trained reviewers

Formal/Long	0
Informal/Short	0

Independent evaluators

Formal/Long	0
Informal/Short	0

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

- In Person

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

- Not Applicable

4.7) Observations of Tenured Teachers

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

By building principals or other trained administrators

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

By trained in-school peer teachers or other trained reviewers

Formal/Long	0
Informal/Short	0

Independent evaluators

Formal/Long	0
Informal/Short	0

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

- In Person

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

- Not Applicable

5. Composite Scoring (Teachers)

Created Thursday, October 18, 2012
Updated Friday, January 04, 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 points pursuant to the NYSUT Rubric (reference downloaded items)
Effective	57-58 points pursuant to the NYSUT Rubric (reference downloaded items)
Developing	50-56 points pursuant to the NYSUT Rubric (reference downloaded items)
Ineffective	0-49 points pursuant to the NYSUT Rubric (reference downloaded items)

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

2012-13 where Value-Added growth measure applies

Growth or Comparable Measures

Locally-selected Measures of

growth or achievement

Other Measures of Effectiveness

(60 points)

Overall

Composite Score

Highly Effective

22-25

14-15

Ranges determined locally--see above

91-100

Effective

10-21

8-13

75-90

Developing

3-9

3-7

65-74

Ineffective

0-2

0-2

0-64

6. Additional Requirements - Teachers

Created Thursday, October 18, 2012
Updated Wednesday, January 09, 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/5265/200012-Df0w3Xx5v6/CVCS PIP Form - Teachers and Principals.docx

6.3) Appeals Process

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

(1) the substance of the annual professional performance review

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

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

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

Appeals procedures

The purpose of the internal APPR appeals process is to foster and nurture growth of professional staff in order to maintain a highly qualified and effective work force. All tenured and probationary employees who meet the appeal process criteria identified below may use this appeal process. A teacher may not file multiple appeals regarding the same performance review or Professional Improvement

Plan (PIP). All grounds for appeal must be raised within the one appeal.

A) Definitions

The supervising administrator shall be the administrator who prepares the APPR.

B) APPR Subject to Appeal Procedure

1) Any unit member aggrieved by an APPR rating of ineffective or developing may challenge that APPR rating through an appeal.
2) Unit members shall have the right to union representation throughout all stages of the appeal process.

B). Grounds for an Appeal

An appeal may be filed challenging the APPR based upon one or more of the following grounds:

1) The substance of the Annual Professional Performance Review;
2) Adherence to the standards and methodologies required for the Annual Professional Performance Review, pursuant to Education Law §3012-c and applicable rules and regulations;
3) Compliance with locally negotiated procedures;
4) Implementation of the terms of the Professional (Teacher) Improvement Plan, where applicable, as required under Education Law §3012-c.

C) Notification of the Appeal

In order to be timely, the notification of the APPR appeal shall be filed, in writing, within ten (10) school days after the teacher has received the APPR. Notification of the appeal shall be provided to the superintendent of schools or his designee.

D) Supervising Administrator's Written Response to Appeal

Within ten (10) school days of receipt of an appeal, the supervising administrator must submit a detailed written response. The response must include any and all additional documents or written materials that are specific to the point(s) of disagreement and/or are relevant to the resolution of the appeal. Material not submitted at the time the response is filed shall not be considered in the deliberations related to the resolution of the appeal. In the event that an APPR is provided within ten (10) school days prior to the end of the school year, the balance of the days shall be calendar days.

E) Decisions on Appeal

All appeals will be forwarded to the appropriate party(ies), discussed below, in a timely and expeditious manner in accordance with Education Law 3012-c.

1) Probationary Teachers

All appeals go to the superintendent. Burden of proof is on the teacher. The superintendent shall render a decision in a timely and expeditious manner.

2) Tenured Teachers

There shall be two stages of APPR Appeals for tenured teachers as follows:

a) Stage 1

APPR appeals for tenured teachers shall first be reviewed by the APPR Committee, less the APPR author (Superintendent or Principal). If the APPR Committee, less the APPR author (Superintendent or Principal), unanimously agrees to an appeal decision, then the decision of the APPR Committee, less the APPR author (Superintendent or Principal), shall be final. Decisions made by the APPR Committee shall be made in a timely and expeditious manner.

b) Stage 2

If the APPR Committee, less the APPR author (Superintendent or Principal), cannot unanimously agree to a decision, then the final decision will be determined by an alternate superintendent from within the ONC BOCES group of component schools.

Selection of the alternate superintendent will be arranged by the District Superintendent (concurrent BOCES Superintendent / Representative of the Commissioner) and will not include the superintendents of either Cooperstown or Oneonta as the administrative hierarchy of both organizations is significantly different from those of the remaining ONC BOCES component schools.

Once the decision of the alternate superintendent has been determined by the District Superintendent, (s)he will arrange for the appeal documentation to be disseminated to the alternate superintendent. Subsequently, the alternate superintendent will render an appeal decision in a timely and expeditious manner.

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.

Training for Lead Evaluators

1) Evaluations of CVCS staff shall only be conducted by administratively certified personnel as required by Education Law §3012-c and the Regulations of the Commissioner of Education.

2) All CVCS administrators have been, and will continue to be, trained as lead evaluators through Otsego Northern Catskills Board of Cooperative Education Services (ONC BOCES) sponsored training sessions. Training for the lead evaluators shall include at least 60 hours of instruction.

3) The training of all lead evaluators provided by ONC BOCES pursuant to §30-2.9 of the Rules of the Board of Regents shall include the following nine (9) required elements:
a) New York State Teaching Standards, and their related elements and performance indicators or ISLLC standards and their related functions;
b) Evidence-based observation techniques, grounded in research;
c) Application and use of the student growth percentile model and the value-added growth model;
d) Application and use of approved teacher or principal practice 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's or principal's practice;
e) 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, stuctured portfolio reviews; student, parent, teacher and/or community surveys; professional growth goals and school improvement goals, etc.;
f) 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;
g) Use of the State-wide Instructional Reporting System;
h) Scoring methodology utilized by the NYS Education 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 three scoring ranges prescribed by the Commissioner;
i) Specific considerations in evaluating teachers and principals of English Language Learners and Students with Disabilities.

3) All CVCS administrators have been, and will continue to be, trained by ONC BOCES-sponsored training sessions relative to inter-rater reliability. The preceding included training by TLS (Albert Duffy) who gave a workshop on inter-rater reliability and attendees were calibrated.

4) All CVCS administrative personnel will continue to participate at least annually in future ONC BOCES-sponsored training sessions involving:
1. Training related to the nine (9) points of §30-2.9 and
2. Inter-rater reliability.

5) Certification
a) The CVCS Board of Education has certified that all CVCS administrators have been trained as lead evaluators based on its review of their training documentation supplied by ONC BOCES.
b) The CVCS Board of Education will continue to recertify that all CVCS administrators have been trained as lead evaluators based on its review of their future training documentation supplied by ONC BOCES.

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	Checked

school year for which the classroom teacher's performance is being measured.	
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 Thursday, October 18, 2012
Updated Thursday, January 10, 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-12
(No response)
(No response)
(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
	K-12	State assessment	NYS 3-8 ELA and Math Assessments, NYS Grades 4 and 8 Science Assessments, All NYS Regents Exams (ELA, Global Studies, American History, Integrated Algebra, Geometry, Trigonometry, Integrated Algebra 2 and Trigonometry, Earth Science, Living Environment, Chemistry and Physics).

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

Use this box, if needed, to describe the process for assigning HEDI categories in this subcomponent. If needed, you may upload a table or graphic below.	The Charlotte Valley Central School District will use New York State 4-8 ELA and Math Assessments to measure student growth for the state growth for principals. New York State will provide the HEDI results for the grades 4-8 ELA and Math SLOs which will then be weighted proportionally with the SLO results for grade 3 (ELA and Math), 4 and 8 (Science) and 9-12 (Regents Exams). The Charlotte Valley Central School District's process for establishing growth targets will require principals and their supervisors to examine a variety of baseline data together to set rigorous, yet achievable targets. Data to be reviewed shall include pre-assessment results as well as historic academic data.
Highly Effective (18 - 20 points) Results are well above state average for similar students (or District goals if no state test).	20 Points - 95-100% of students demonstrate growth 19 Points - 90-94% of students demonstrate growth 18 Points - 85-89% of students demonstrate growth
Effective (9 - 17 points) Results meet state average for similar students (or District goals if no state test).	17 Points - 82-84% of students demonstrate growth 16 Points - 79-81% of students demonstrate growth 15 Points - 77-78% of students demonstrate growth 14 Points - 75-76% of students demonstrate growth

	13 Points - 73-74% of students demonstrate growth 12 Points - 71-72% of students demonstrate growth 11 Points - 69-70% of students demonstrate growth 10 Points - 67-68% of students demonstrate growth 09 Points - 65-66% of students demonstrate growth
Developing (3 - 8 points) Results are below state average for similar students (or District goals if no state test).	08 Points - 63-64% of students demonstrate growth 07 Points - 61-62% of students demonstrate growth 06 Points - 59-60% of students demonstrate growth 05 Points - 57-58% of students demonstrate growth 04 Points - 56% of students demonstrate growth 03 Points - 55% of students demonstrate growth
Ineffective (0 - 2 points) Results are well below state average for similar students (or District goals if no state test).	02 Points - 36-54% of students demonstrate growth 01 Points - 18-35% of students demonstrate growth 00 Points - <18% of students demonstrate growth

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.

Not Applicable

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 Thursday, October 18, 2012
Updated Friday, January 11, 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-12	(d) measures used by district for teacher evaluation	NYS 3-8 ELA and Math Assessments, NYS Grades 4 and 8 Science Assessments, All NYS Regents Exams (ELA, Global Studies, American History, Integrated Algebra, Geometry, Trigonometry, Integrated Algebra 2 and Trigonometry, Earth Science, Living Environment, Chemistry and Physics).

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.	Local Achievement Scores: Mean Mastery Test Performance A) Definitions 1) Validating Tests are all NYS 3-8 tests and all the NYS Regents exams that measure the academic performance for all students whose testing is inclusive in the respective exams. 2) Mean Mastery Test Performance (MMTP) is the school-wide mean percent (%) of students scoring at either Level 4 on the NYS 3-8 tests and >=85 points on the NYS Regents examinations. 3) Adjusted Mean Mastery Test Performance (AMMTP) is

MMPT that is adjusted for specific student demographic factors. AMMTP will be the final determinant to calculate HEDI placement.

B) Assumptions for Calculating AMMTP

AMMTP is calculated as follows:

1) An initial baseline MMTP is established using 2011-12 data to determine the school-wide mean percent (%) of students scoring at either Level 4 on all NYS 3-8 tests or >=85 points on all NYS Regents examinations. In the example below, the 2012 MMTP is 18.1063% and would have reflected a HEDI score of 9 on the 20 – Point Scale or 8 on the 15 – Point scale.

2) At the beginning of 2012-13 the 2011-12 MMTP is multiplied by 101% (1.01) to establish the 2013 target. In the example below, the 2013 target is 18.2874%. This establishes the bottom score of the “Effective” range of HEDI indicators for 2012-13. Similar to B)1) above, this delineates a HEDI score of 9 on the 20 – Point Scale or 8 on the 15 – Point scale.

3) The target in Step (1) will be compared with the target in Step (2) to yield the percent increase/decrease of current student mastery. This will dictate the HEDI score on the below scale.

4) At the end of 2012-13, an appropriate weighting factor, specifically the higher of either % SWDs or ELLs or % of Students at Poverty, will be added to the baseline MMTP as follows:
% SWD or ELL Added Factor % Poverty
00.00 - 10.00 % 0 <= 29.99%
10.01 - 20.00 % 1 30.00 - 60.00%
>20.00 % 2 >60.00%

The HEDI score from Step (3) will be adjusted according to these controls to result in a final local HEDI score.

Data for both percent (%) of SWDs or ELLs or poverty will be the data in effect annually on Basic Educational Data System (BEDS) submission day.

For both 2011-12 and 2012-13 academic years, the adjustment formula, based on 60+% poverty indices, is 2. Thus, assuming the MMTP target of 18.2874% is achieved, the AMMTPs for the 20 and 15 point scales will be 11 and 10, respectively.

C) Future Calculations of AMMTP

As referenced above for the 2012-13 calculation, at the beginning of each subsequent year, a new baseline MMTP is recalculated equal to one hundred and one percent (101%) of the previous year’s baseline MMTP. This establishes a new MMTP target reflecting one percent anticipated increases in mastery performance. As

	delineated in B)2) above, the weighting factor will continue to be added after the fact to establish AMMTP. Using the preceding language for 2013, the 2012 18.1063% was multiplied by 101%. This generated a 2013 target percent of 18.2874%. By extension, the 2014 target is 18.4702; the 2015 target is 18.6550%; the 2016 target is 18.415% and so on.
Highly Effective (14 - 15 points) Results are well above District- or BOCES-adopted expectations for growth or achievement for grade/subject.	15 >+10.00% MMTP 14 +08.01 to +10.00% MMTP
Effective (8- 13 points) Results meet District- or BOCES-adopted expectations for growth or achievement for grade/subject.	13 +06.01 to +08.00% MMTP 12 +04.01 to +06.00% MMTP 11 +02.01 to +04.00% MMTP 10 +01.01 to +02.00% MMTP 09 +00.01 to +01.00% MMTP 08 MMTP Calculation
Developing (3 - 7 points) Results are below District- or BOCES-adopted expectations for growth or achievement for grade/subject.	07 -00.01 to -02.00% MMTP 06 -02.01 to -03.00% MMTP 05 -03.01 to -04.00% MMTP 04 -04.01 to -05.00% MMTP 03 -05.01 to -06.00% MMTP
Ineffective (0 - 2 points) Results are well below District- or BOCES-adopted expectations for growth or achievement for grade/subject.	02 -06.01 to -07.00% MMTP 01 -07.01 to -08.00% MMTP 00 <-08.00% MMTP

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
	K-12	(d) measures used by district for teacher evaluation	NYS 3-8 ELA and Math Assessments, NYS Grades 4 and 8 Science Assessments, All NYS Regents Exams (ELA, Global Studies, American History, Integrated Algebra, Geometry, Trigonometry, Integrated Algebra 2 and Trigonometry, Earth Science, Living Environment, Chemistry and Physics)

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.	Local Achievement Scores: Mean Mastery Test Performance A) Definitions 1) Validating Tests are all NYS 3-8 tests and all the NYS Regents exams that measure the academic performance for all students whose testing is inclusive in the respective exams. 2) Mean Mastery Test Performance (MMTP) is the school-wide mean percent (%) of students scoring at either Level 4 on the NYS 3-8 tests and >=85 points on the NYS Regents examinations. 3) Adjusted Mean Mastery Test Performance (AMMTP) is MMPT that is adjusted for specific student demographic factors. AMMTP will be the final determinant to calculate HEDI placement. B) Assumptions for Calculating AMMTP AMMTP is calculated as follows: 1) An initial baseline MMTP is established using 2011-12 data to determine the school-wide mean percent (%) of students scoring at either Level 4 on all NYS 3-8 tests or >=85 points on all NYS Regents examinations. In the example below, the 2012 MMTP is 18.1063% and would have reflected a HEDI score of 9 on the 20 – Point Scale or 8 on the 15 – Point scale. 2) At the beginning of 2012-13 the 2011-12 MMTP is multiplied by 101% (1.01) to establish the 2013 target. In the example below, the 2013 target is 18.2874%. This establishes the bottom score of the “Effective” range of HEDI indicators for 2012-13. Similar to B)1) above, this delineates a HEDI score of 9 on the 20 – Point Scale or 8 on the 15 – Point scale. 3) The target in Step (1) will be compared with the target in Step (2) to yield the percent increase/decrease of current student mastery. This will dictate the HEDI score on the below scale. 4) At the end of 2012-13, an appropriate weighting factor, specifically the higher of either % SWDs or ELLs or % of Students at Poverty, will be added to the baseline MMTP as follows: % SWD or ELL Added Factor % Poverty 00.00 - 10.00 % 0 <= 29.99% 10.01 - 20.00 % 1 30.00 - 60.00% >20.00 % 2 >60.00%

	The HEDI score from Step (3) will be adjusted according to these controls to result in a final local HEDI score. Data for both percent (%) of SWDs or ELLs or poverty will be the data in effect annually on Basic Educational Data System (BEDS) submission day. For both 2011-12 and 2012-13 academic years, the adjustment formula, based on 60+% poverty indices, is 2. Thus, assuming the MMTP target of 18.2874% is achieved, the AMMTPs for the 20 and 15 point scales will be 11 and 10, respectively. C) Future Calculations of AMMTP As referenced above for the 2012-13 calculation, at the beginning of each subsequent year, a new baseline MMTP is recalculated equal to one hundred and one percent (101%) of the previous year's baseline MMTP. This establishes a new MMTP target reflecting one percent anticipated increases in mastery performance. As delineated in B)2) above, the weighting factor will continue to be added after the fact to establish AMMTP. Using the preceding language for 2013, the 2012 18.1063% was multiplied by 101%. This generated a 2013 target percent of 18.2874%. By extension, the 2014 target is 18.4702; the 2015 target is 18.6550%; the 2016 target is 18.415% and so on.
Highly Effective (18 - 20 points) Results are well above District- or BOCES-adopted expectations for growth or achievement for grade/subject.	20 >+10.00% MMTP 19 +09.01 to +10.00% MMTP 18 +08.01 to +09.00% MMTP
Effective (9- 17 points) Results meet District- or BOCES-adopted expectations for growth or achievement for grade/subject.	17 +07.01 to +08.00% MMTP 16 +06.01 to +07.00% MMTP 15 +05.01 to +06.00% MMTP 14 +04.01 to +05.00% MMTP 13 +03.01 to +04.00% MMTP 12 +02.01 to +03.00% MMTP 11 +01.01 to +02.00% MMTP 10 +00.01 to +01.00% MMTP 09 Calculated % MMTP
Developing (3 - 8 points) Results are below District- or BOCES-adopted expectations for growth or achievement for grade/subject.	08 -00.01 to -01.00% MMTP 07 -01.01 to -02.00% MMTP 06 -02.01 to -03.00% MMTP 05 -03.01 to -04.00% MMTP 04 -04.01 to -05.00% MMTP 03 -05.01 to -06.00% MMTP
Ineffective (0 - 2 points) Results are well below District- or BOCES-adopted expectations for growth or achievement for grade/subject.	02 -06.01 to -07.00% MMTP 01 -07.01 to -08.00% MMTP 00 <-08.00% MMTP

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.

Not Applicable

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.

Not Applicable as the Charlotte Valley Central School Principal will have only one (1) locally selected measure.

8.5) Assurances

Please check all of the boxes below:

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

9. Other Measures of Effectiveness (Principals)

Created Thursday, October 18, 2012
Updated Wednesday, January 09, 2013

Page 1

9.1) Principal Practice Rubric

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

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

Multidimensional Principal Performance Rubric

(No response)

9.2) Points Within Other Measures

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

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

Is the following points assignment for all principals?

Yes

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

Not Applicable

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 principal will be evaluated on a scale with a score from 0-60 points.

Using the Multidimensional Rubric, the 0-60 points will be assigned as follows:
Indicators will be scored from one to four and averaged to determine a Component score.
Component Scores will be averaged to determine a Standard Score.
Standard Scores will be averaged to determine a Rubric Score.
The Rubric Score listed is the minimum score necessary to achieve the corresponding HEDI Score.

Converted Score for Other
HEDI Level HEDI Point Score Range Calculated Rubric Score Measures of Effectiveness
Highly Effective 59-60 3.76-4.00 60
3.51-3.75 59
Effective 57-58 3.26-3.50 58
2.51-3.25 57
Developing 50-56 2.40-2.50 56
2.25-2.39 55
2.10-2.24 54
1.95-2.09 53
1.80-1.94 52
1.65-1.79 51
1.51-1.64 50
Ineffective 0-49 1.49-1.50 49
1.48 48
1.47 47
1.46 46
1.45 45
1.44 44
1.43 43
1.42 42
1.41 41
1.40 40
1.39 39
1.38 38

1.37 37
1.36 36
1.35 35
1.34 34
1.33 33
1.32 32
1.31 31
1.30 30
1.29 29
1.28 28
1.27 27
1.26 26
1.25 25
1.24 24
1.23 23
1.22 22
1.21 21
1.20 20
1.19 19
1.18 18
1.17 17
1.16 16
1.15 15
1.14 14
1.13 13
1.12 12
1.11 11
1.10 10
1.09 09
1.08 08
1.07 07
1.06 06
1.05 05
1.04 04
1.03 03
1.02 02
1.01 01
1.00 00

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.	The principal will be considered highly effective if he scores 59-60 points using the HEDI chart.
Effective: Overall performance and results meet standards.	The principal will be considered effective if he scores 57-58 points using the HEDI chart.
Developing: Overall performance and results need improvement in order to meet standards.	The principal will be considered developing if he scores 50 - 56 points using the HEDI chart.

Ineffective: Overall performance and results do not meet standards.	The principal will be considered ineffective if he scores 0-49 points using the HEDI chart.

Please provide the locally-negotiated 60 point scoring bands.

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

9.8) School Visits

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

Probationary Principals

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

Tenured Principals

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

10. Composite Scoring (Principals)

Created Monday, December 03, 2012
Updated Friday, January 04, 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	59-60 Points
Effective	57-58 Points
Developing	50-56 Points
Ineffective	0-49 Points

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 Thursday, October 18, 2012
Updated Friday, January 04, 2013

Page 1

11.1) Assurances -- Improvement Plans

Please check the boxes below.

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

11.2) Attachment: Principal Improvement Plan Forms

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

assets/survey-uploads/5276/200071-Df0w3Xx5v6/CVCS PIP Form - Teachers and Principals.docx

11.3) Appeals Process

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

(1) the substance of the annual professional performance review

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

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

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

Appeals Process

A) Events for Appeal:

There are only three events that can be cause for an Appeal as follows:

1) Issuance of an APPR that is rated as "Ineffective" at any time, or "developing" at the end of either his/her second or third year of employment, or,
2) Issuance of a Principal Improvement Plan.
3) Implementation of a Principal Improvement Plan.

B) Areas that may be challenged in an Appeal

1) Substance of the Annual Professional Performance Review
2) The school district's adherence to the standards and methodologies required for such reviews pursuant to Education Law 3012-c
3) The school district's adherence to the regulation of the Commissioner and compliance with any applicable locally negotiated procedure.

C) Decision-maker on the Appeal

There shall be only one avenue for appeal; it will be to the current superintendent of the Charlotte Valley Central School district. The superintendent's decision is final.

D) Rules Governing an Appeal:

1) Within ten (10) calendar days of the Principal's notification of either VI. A) 1) or VI. A) 2) above, (s)he may submit a request for an appeal in writing. The appeal must be delivered to the superintendent in person in the presence of the superintendent's secretary who will date stamp the original document.
2) Within ten (10) calendar days of the superintendent's personal receipt of the Principal's request for an appeal, the superintendent will schedule a meeting with the Principal to entertain his/her concerns. Minutes of the meeting will be taken by the superintendent's secretary.
3) Within ten (10) calendar days of the aforementioned meeting, the superintendent will render a decision on the appeal in writing.
4) If the appeal decision favors the principal, the preexisting APPR shall be removed from the file and replaced with one that reflects the decision(s) made by the superintendent during the appeals process.
5) A principal who invokes the appeals process described herein does not waive his/her right to submit a written rebuttal to the final evaluation. A principal shall always have the right to submit a written rebuttal to his/her evaluation.
6) Lastly, though a principal may invoke the appeals process, nothing within the 3012-c regulations shall be construed to affect the statutory right of the school district to grant or deny tenure or to terminate a probationary principal during pendency of an appeal for statutorily and constitutionally permissible reasons. Said reasons shall include: misconduct, insubordination, time and attendance issues, and/or conduct inappropriate for a teaching professional.

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.

Lead Evaluator:

1) The Superintendent shall put forth for approval by the Board of Education those individuals he/she has certified as a lead evaluator of principals. The Board of Education must approve the certification of an evaluator of principals prior to the individual performing any principal observations.
2) The Superintendent shall ensure that:
a) All principals are observed by an approved evaluator.
b) All principals' APPR documents are observed by an approved evaluator.
3) It is imperative for the principal's APPR that the evaluator's certification adheres to the following NYSED standards:
a) ISLLC 2008 Leadership Standards.
b) Evidence based observation techniques.
c) Application and use of the student growth and value added growth model.
d) Application and use of State approved principal rubrics to use.
e) Application and use of any assessment tools to be used in principal evaluation, (e.g. portfolios, surveys, goals).
f) Application and use of any State approved locally developed measures of student achievement.
g) Use of the Statewide Instructional Reporting System.
h) The scoring methodology used by the district.
i) Specific considerations in evaluating teachers and principals of English language.
j) Ensure inter rater reliability for the principal evaluation system.
k) The Superintendent will ensure that lead evaluators participate in annual training and are recertified on an annual basis. The

BOCES Network Team will be utilized to provide training and recertification. Any individual who fails to achieve required training and certification or re-certification, as applicable, shall not conduct or complete evaluations.
l) Any administrator who evaluates building principals shall be required to participate in at least 12 hours of training.

11.5) Assurances -- Evaluators

Please check the boxes below:

- Checked

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

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

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

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

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

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

(7) use of the Statewide Instructional Reporting System

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

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

- Checked

11.6) Assurances -- Principals

Please check all of the boxes below:

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

11.7) Assurances -- Data

Please check all of the boxes below:

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

12. Joint Certification of APPR Plan

Created Wednesday, November 28, 2012
Updated Thursday, July 11, 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/5581/253746-3Uqgn5g9Iu/APPR Cert 130711.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 Chart	Points	Range *	
Highly Effective	20 Points	>72.35	
	19 Points	71.85	72.34
	18 Points	71.35	71.84
Effective	17 Points	70.85	71.34
	16 Points	70.35	70.84
	15 Points	69.85	70.34
	14 Points	69.35	69.84
	13 Points	68.85	69.34
	12 Points	68.35	68.84
	11 Points	67.85	68.34
	10 Points	67.35	67.84
	9 Points	66.85	67.34
Developing	8 Points	66.35	66.84
	7 Points	65.85	66.34
	6 Points	65.35	65.84
	5 Points	64.85	65.34
	4 Points	64.35	64.84
	3 Points	63.85	64.34
Ineffective	2 Points	63.35	63.84
	1 Points	62.85	63.34
	0 Points	<62.85	

*** The range, or range of scores, reflects both the starting point of 66.85 and the individual HEDI point ranges that are dependent on the starting point. The starting point is the mean proficiency on all 3-8 state and Regents exams administered during the 2011-12 academic year. ** The mean establishes the base HEDI score for the effective range during the 2012-13 academic year. Increments on the HEDI scale are + or - .50 mean percentage points. For each increase of .50, a HEDI point is added. For each decrease of .50, a HEDI point is subtracted. At the postive extreme, a mean score of >72.35 is 20 points. At the negative extreme, a mean score of <62.85 is 0 points.**

**** Combined levels 3&4 on the 3-8 state tests or >65 on Regents exams**

Chart #1 – MMTP Calculation Based on 2012 Data

	YE 2012	
Level	**# @ Level**	**% @ Level 4 or >=85 on Regents**
L4	**109**	**18.1063%**
L3	**290**	**Weighting**
L2	**151**	**2.0000%**
L1	**52**	**AMMTP**
	602	**20.1063%**

Chart #2 – 20 Point HEDI Scale Based on 2012 Data

Highly Effective	20	>+10.00% MMTP
	19	+09.01 to +10.00% MMTP
	18	+08.01 to +09.00% MMTP
Effective	17	+07.01 to +08.00% MMTP
	16	+06.01 to +07.00% MMTP
	15	+05.01 to +06.00% MMTP
	14	+04.01 to +05.00% MMTP
	13	+03.01 to +04.00% MMTP
	12	+02.01 to +03.00% MMTP
	11	+01.01 to +02.00% MMTP
	10	+00.01 to +01.00% MMTP
	09	**18.1063%** MMTP
Developing	08	-00.01 to -01.00% MMTP
	07	-01.01 to -02.00% MMTP
	06	-02.01 to -03.00% MMTP
	05	-03.01 to -04.00% MMTP
	04	-04.01 to -05.00% MMTP
	03	-05.01 to -06.00% MMTP
Ineffective	02	-06.01 to -07.00% MMTP
	01	-07.01 to -08.00% MMTP
	00	<-08.00% MMTP

Chart #3 – 15 Point HEDI Scale Based on 2012 Data

Highly Effective	15	>+10.00% MMTP
	14	+08.01 to +10.00% MMTP
Effective	13	+06.01 to +08.00% MMTP
	12	+04.01 to +06.00% MMTP
	11	+02.01 to +04.00% MMTP
	10	+01.01 to +02.00% MMTP
	09	+00.01 to +01.00% MMTP
	08	**18.1063%** MMTP
Developing	07	-00.01 to -02.00% MMTP
	06	-02.01 to -03.00% MMTP
	05	-03.01 to -04.00% MMTP
	04	-04.01 to -05.00% MMTP
	03	-05.01 to -06.00% MMTP
Ineffective	02	-06.01 to -07.00% MMTP
	01	-07.01 to -08.00% MMTP
	00	<-08.00% MMTP

Chart #1 – MMTP Calculation Based on 2012 Data

	YE 2012	
Level	**# @ Level**	**% @ Level 4 or >=85 on Regents**
L4	**109**	**18.1063%**
L3	**290**	**Weighting**
L2	**151**	**2.0000%**
L1	**52**	**AMMTP**
	602	**20.1063%**

Chart #2 – 20 Point HEDI Scale Based on 2012 Data

Highly Effective	20	>+10.00% MMTP
	19	+09.01 to +10.00% MMTP
	18	+08.01 to +09.00% MMTP
Effective	17	+07.01 to +08.00% MMTP
	16	+06.01 to +07.00% MMTP
	15	+05.01 to +06.00% MMTP
	14	+04.01 to +05.00% MMTP
	13	+03.01 to +04.00% MMTP
	12	+02.01 to +03.00% MMTP
	11	+01.01 to +02.00% MMTP
	10	+00.01 to +01.00% MMTP
	09	**18.1063%** MMTP
Developing	08	-00.01 to -01.00% MMTP
	07	-01.01 to -02.00% MMTP
	06	-02.01 to -03.00% MMTP
	05	-03.01 to -04.00% MMTP
	04	-04.01 to -05.00% MMTP
	03	-05.01 to -06.00% MMTP
Ineffective	02	-06.01 to -07.00% MMTP
	01	-07.01 to -08.00% MMTP
	00	<-08.00% MMTP

Chart #3 – 15 Point HEDI Scale Based on 2012 Data

Highly Effective	15	>+10.00% MMTP
	14	+08.01 to +10.00% MMTP
Effective	13	+06.01 to +08.00% MMTP
	12	+04.01 to +06.00% MMTP
	11	+02.01 to +04.00% MMTP
	10	+01.01 to +02.00% MMTP
	09	+00.01 to +01.00% MMTP
	08	**18.1063%** MMTP
Developing	07	-00.01 to -02.00% MMTP
	06	-02.01 to -03.00% MMTP
	05	-03.01 to -04.00% MMTP
	04	-04.01 to -05.00% MMTP
	03	-05.01 to -06.00% MMTP
Ineffective	02	-06.01 to -07.00% MMTP
	01	-07.01 to -08.00% MMTP
	00	<-08.00% MMTP

Appendix 3

Procedure for Converting Score to Rating

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

Calculating Steps

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

Teacher Effects Conversion Scale

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

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

Rubric Score to Sub-Component Conversion Chart

Highly Effective	-	4.0	-	60 Points
		3.9	-	60 Points
		3.8	-	60 Points
		3.7	-	59 Points
		3.6	-	59 Points
		3.5	-	59 Points
Effective	-	3.4	-	58 Points
		3.3	-	58 Points
		3.2	-	58 Points
		3.1	-	58 Points
		3.0	-	58 Points
		2.9	-	57 Points
		2.8	-	57 Points
		2.7	-	57 Points
		2.6	-	57 Points
		2.5	-	57 Points
Developing	-	2.4	-	56 Points
		2.3	-	56 Points
		2.2	-	55 Points
		2.1	-	55 Points
		2.0	-	54 Points

	1.9	-	54 Points
	1.8	-	53 Points
	1.7	-	52 Points
	1.6	-	51 Points
	1.5	-	50 Points
Ineffective	1.400	-	49 Points
	1.392	-	48 Points
	1.383	-	47 Points
	1.375	-	46 Points
	1.367	-	45 Points
	1.358	-	44 Points
	1.350	-	43 Points
	1.341	-	42 Points
	1.333	-	41 Points
	1.325	-	40 Points
	1.317	-	39 Points
	1.300	-	37 Points
	1.292	-	36 Points
	1.283	-	35 Points
	1.275	-	34 Points
	1.267	-	33 Points
	1.258	-	32 Points
	1.250	-	31 Points
	1.242	-	30 Points
	1.233	-	29 Points
	1.225	-	28 Points
	1.217	-	27 Points
	1.208	-	26 Points
	1.200	-	25 Points
	1.192	-	24 Points
	1.185	-	23 Points
	1.177	-	22 Points
	1.169	-	21 Points
	1.162	-	20 Points
	1.154	-	19 Points
	1.146	-	18 Points
	1.138	-	17 Points
	1.131	-	16 Points
	1.123	-	15 Points
	1.115	-	14 Points
	1.108	-	13 Points
	1.100	-	12 Points
	1.092	-	11 Points
	1.083	-	10 Points
	1.075	-	09 Points
	1.067	-	08 Points
	1.058	-	07 Points
	1.050	-	06 Points
	1.042	-	05 Points
	1.033	-	04 Points
	1.025	-	03 Points
	1.017	-	02 Points
	1.008	-	01 Points
	1.000	-	00 Points

NYSUT TED Rubric Example

Standard 1: 10 inclusive indicators
Standard 2: 18 inclusive indicators
Standard 3: 17 inclusive indicators
Standard 4: 12 inclusive indicators
Standard 5: 13 inclusive indicators
Total Potential Indicators for Standards 1-5 - 70
Standard 6: 18 inclusive indicators
Standard 7: 09 inclusive indicators
Total Potential Indicators for Standards 6-7 - 27

Avg Obsv. Score:		**2.8209**
HEDI Scale:		**57 Points**

Observation #1	Standards 1-5		Observation #1	Standards 6-7		Observation #2	Standards 1-5		Observation #2	Standards 6-7	
	Score			Score			Score			Score	
Indicator #	(1-4)	Counter	Indicator #	(1-4)	Counter	Indicator #	(1-4)	Counter	Indicator #	(1-4)	Counter
1	3	1	1	2	1	1	3	1	1	2	1
2	4	1	2	3	1	2	4	1	2	3	1
3	3	1	3	2	1	3	2	1	3	2	1
4	4	1	4	3	1	4	2	1	4	3	1
5	3	1	5	2	1	5	2	1	5	2	1
6	4	1	6	3	1	6	2	1	6	3	1
7	3	1	7	2	1	7	2	1	7	2	1
8	3	1	8	3	1	8	3	1	8	3	1
9	3	1	9	2	1	9	3	1	9	2	1
10	3	1	10	3	1	10	3	1	10	4	1
11	2	1	11	2	1	11	2	1	11	4	1
12	3	1	12	3	1	12	3	1	12	4	1
13	2	1	13	2	1	13	2	1	13	2	1
14	2	1	14	3	1	14	2	1	14	3	1
15	2	1	15	2	1	15	2	1	15	2	1
16			16	3	1	16	4	1	16	3	1
17			17	2	1	17			17	2	1
18	4	1	18	3	1	18	4	1	18	3	1
19	3	1	19	2	1	19	3	1	19	2	1
20	2	1	20	3	1	20	2	1	20	3	1
21	1	1	21	2	1	21	1	1	21	2	1
22	1	1	22	3	1	22	1	1	22	3	1
23	2	1	23			23	2	1	23	4	1
24	2	1	24			24	2	1	24	4	1
25	3	1	25			25	3	1	25		
26	3	1	26			26	3	1	26		
27	3	1	27	1	1	27	3	1	27	1	1
28	4	1				28	4	1			
29	4	1				29	4	1			
30	4	1				30	4	1			
31	3	1				31	3	1			
32	4	1				32	4	1			

33	3	1				33	3	1			
34	4	1				34	4	1			
35	3	1				35	3	1			
36	4	1				36	4	1			
37						37	3	1			
38						38					
39						39					
40						40					
41						41					
42	3	1				42	3	1			
43	3	1				43	3	1			
44	4	1				44	4	1			
45	3	1				45	3	1			
46	2	1				46	2	1			
47	2	1				47	2	1			
48	3	1				48	3	1			
49	4	1				49	4	1			
50	4	1				50	4	1			
51	4	1				51	4	1			
52	3	1				52	3	1			
53	3	1				53	3	1			
54	2	1				54	2	1			
55	2	1				55	2	1			
56	2	1				56	2	1			
57	3	1				57	3	1			
58	4	1				58	4	1			
59	4	1				59	4	1			
60	4	1				60	4	1			
61						61					
62	3	1				62	3	1			
63	3	1				63	3	1			
64	3	1				64	3	1			
65	2	1				65	2	1			
66	2	1				66	2	1			
67	1	1				67	1	1			
68	1	1				68	1	1			
69						69					
70						70					
	175	60		56	23		175	62		68	25
	Mean	2.9167		Mean	2.4348		Mean	2.8226		Mean	2.72
	Weighting	0.8333		Weighting	0.1667		Weighting	0.8333		Weighting	0.1667
	Weighted	2.4306		Weighted	0.4058		Weighted	2.3522		Weighted	0.4533
			Total Rubric Obsv. 1		**2.84**				**Toal Rubric Obsv. 2**		**2.81**

1	Knowledge of Students and Student Learning	Score
1.1a	*Describes developmental characteristics of students*	
1.1b	*Creates developmentally appropriate lessons*	
1.2a	*Uses strategies to support learning and language acquisitions*	
1.2b	*Uses current research*	
1.3a	*Meets diverse learning needs of each student*	
1.3b	*Plans for student strengths, interests and*	

	experiences	
1.4a	*Communicates with parents, guardians, and/or caregivers*	
1.5a	*Incorporates the knowledge of school community and environmental factors*	
1.5b	*Incorporates multiple perspectives*	
1.6a	*Understands technological literacy*	
A	**TCVTAI of all indicators**	
B	**Divide A by number of indicators assessed**	
C	**TCVTAI standard score**	

2	**Knowledge of Content and Instructional Planning**	**Score**
2.1a	*Understands key concepts and themes in discipline*	
2.1b	*Understands key disciplinary language*	
2.1c	*Uses current developments in pedagogy and content*	
2.1d	*Understands learning standards*	
2.2a	*Incorporates diverse social and cultural perspectives*	
2.2b	*Incorporates individual and collaborative critical thinking and problem solving*	
2.2c	*Incorporates disciplinary and cross-disciplinary learning*	
2.3a	*Designs instruction to meet diverse learning needs of students*	
2.3b	*Designs learning experiences that connect to students' life experiences*	
2.3c	*Designs self-directed learning experiences*	
2.4a	Aligns learning standards	
2.4b	Articulates learning objectives/goals with learning	
2.5a	Designs instruction using current levels of student understanding	
2.5b	Designs learning experiences using prior knowledge	
2.6a	Organizes physical space	
2.6b	Incorporates technology	
2.6c	Organizes time	
2.6d	Selects materials and resources	
A	**TCVTAI of all indicators**	
B	**Divide A by number of indicators assessed**	
C	**TCVTAI standard score**	

3	**Instructional Practice**	**Score**
3.1a	*Aligns instruction to standards*	
3.1b	*Uses research-based instruction*	
3.1c	*Engages students*	
3.2a	*Provides directions and procedures*	
3.2b	*Uses questioning techniques*	
3.2c	*Responds to students*	
3.2d	*Communicates content*	
3.3a	*Establishes high expectations*	
3.3b	*Articulates measures of success*	
3.3c	*Implements challenging learning experiences*	
3.4a	Differentiates instruction	
3.4b	Implements strategies for mastery of learning outcomes	
3.5a	Provides opportunities for collaboration	
3.5b	Provides synthesis, critical thinking, and problem-solving	
3.6a	Uses formative assessment	
3.6b	Provides feedback during and after instruction	
3.6c	Adjusts pacing	
A	**TCVTAI of all indicators**	
B	**Divide A by number of indicators assessed**	
C	**TCVTAI standard score**	

4	**Learning Environment**	**Score**

4.1a	*Interacts with students*	
4.1b	*Supports student diversity*	
4.1c	*Reinforces positive interactions among students*	
4.2a	*Establishes high expectations for achievement*	
4.2b	*Promotes student curiosity*	
4.2c	*Promotes student pride in work and accomplishments*	
4.3a	*Establishes expectations for student behavior*	
4.3b	*Establishes routines, procedures and transitions*	
4.3c	*Establishes instructional groups*	
4.4a	*Organizes the physical environment*	
4.4b	*Manages volunteers and/or paraprofessionals*	
4.4c	*Establishes classroom safety*	
A	**TCVTAI of all indicators**	
B	**Divide A by number of indicators assessed**	
C	**TCVTAI standard score**	

5	**Assessment for Student Learning**	**Score**
5.1a	*Uses assessments to establish learning goals and inform instruction*	
5.1b	*Measures and records student achievement*	
5.1c	*Aligns assessments to learning goals*	
5.1d	*Implements accommodations and modifications*	
5.2a	*Analyzes assessment data*	
5.2b	*Uses assessment data to set goals and provide feedback to students*	
5.2c	*Engages students in self-assessment*	
5.3a	*Accesses and interprets assessments*	
5.4a	*Understands assessment measures and grading procedures*	
5.4b	*Establishes an assessment system*	
5.5a	Communicates purposes and criteria	
5.5b	Provides preparation and practice	
5.5c	Provides assessment skills and strategies	
A	**TCVTAI of all indicators**	
B	**Divide A by number of indicators assessed**	
C	***TCVTAI standard score***	
6	***Professional Responsibilities and Collaboration***	***Score***
6.1a	*Demonstrates ethical, professional behavior*	
6.1b	*Advocates for students*	
6.1c	*Demonstrates ethical use of information and information technology*	
6.1d	*Completes training to comply with state and local requirements and jurisdiction*	
6.2a	*Supports the school as an organization with a vision and mission*	
6.2b	*Participates on an instructional team*	
6.2c	*Collaborates with the larger community*	
6.3a	*Engages families*	
6.3b	*Communicates student performance*	
6.4a	*Maintains records*	
6.4b	*Manages time and attendance*	
6.4c	*Maintains classroom and school resources and materials*	
6.4d	*Participates in school district events*	
6.5a	*Communicates policies*	
6.5b	*Maintains confidentiality*	
6.5c	*Reports concerns*	
6.5d	*Adheres to policies and contractual obligations*	
6.5e	*Accesses resources*	
A	***TCVTAI of all indicators***	
B	***Divide A by number of indicators assessed***	
C	***TCVTAI standard score***	
7	***Professional Growth***	***Score***
7.1a	*Reflects on evidence of student learning*	
7.1b	*Reflects on biases*	
7.1c	*Plans professional growth*	
7.2a	*Sets goals*	
7.2b	*Engages in professional growth*	

7.3a	*Gives and receives constructive feedback*	
7.3b	*Collaborates*	
7.4a	*Accesses professional memberships and resources*	
7.4b	*Expands knowledge base*	
A	**TCVTAI of all indicators**	
B	**Divide A by number of indicators assessed**	
C	**TCVTAI standard score**	

Charlotte Valley Central School
Professional Improvement Plan (PIP) Form
For Teachers and Principals

TEACHER / PRINCIPAL: _____

SUBJECT / BUILDING / AREA: _____

SUPERVISOR: _____

Rubric: _____ **Preconference:** ____/____/____
Rubric Score: _____ **Observation/Walk Through:** ____/____/____
State Assessment Score: _____ **Coaching/Mentoring:** ____/____/____
Local Assessment Score: _____ **Professional Development:** ____/____/____

Standards Chosen for Further Development:	Action(s) to be Taken:	Supervisor's Responsibilities:	Teacher or Administrator's Responsibilities:	Timeline for Achieving Improvement:	The Manner in which Improvement will be Assessed:	Progress Determination:

Mentor Requested or Assigned: ___Yes ___No

SUPERVISING ADMINISTRATOR: _____ _____/_____/_____

TEACHER / PRINCIPAL: _____ _____/_____/_____

REPRESENTATIVE / WITNESS: _____ _____/_____/_____

TEACHER / PRINCIPAL WAIVER OF REPRESENTATION: _____ _____/_____/_____

Charlotte Valley Central School
Professional Improvement Plan (PIP) Form
For Teachers and Principals

TEACHER / PRINCIPAL: _____

SUBJECT / BUILDING / AREA: _____

SUPERVISOR: _____

Rubric: _____ **Preconference:** ____/____/____
Rubric Score: _____ **Observation/Walk Through:** ____/____/____
State Assessment Score: _____ **Coaching/Mentoring:** ____/____/____
Local Assessment Score: _____ **Professional Development:** ____/____/____

Standards Chosen for Further Development:	Action(s) to be Taken:	Supervisor's Responsibilities:	Teacher or Administrator's Responsibilities:	Timeline for Achieving Improvement:	The Manner in which Improvement will be Assessed:	Progress Determination:

Mentor Requested or Assigned: ___Yes ___No

SUPERVISING ADMINISTRATOR: _____ _____/_____/_____

TEACHER / PRINCIPAL: _____ _____/_____/_____

REPRESENTATIVE / WITNESS: _____ _____/_____/_____

TEACHER / PRINCIPAL WAIVER OF REPRESENTATION: _____ _____/_____/_____

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:

7/11/2013

Teachers Union President Signature: Date:

Marylou Clark 7/11/2013

Administrative Union President Signature: Date:

7/11/2013

Board of Education President Signature: Date:

7/11/2013