



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

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

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

January 10, 2013

Andrea Galenski, Interim Superintendent
Cheektowaga-Sloan Union Free School District
166 Halstead Avenue
Sloan, NY 14212

Dear Superintendent Galenski:

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: Donald Ogilvie

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

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

Annual Professional Performance Reviews: 2012-13

Created Tuesday, June 05, 2012

Updated Friday, December 07, 2012

1

Disclaimers

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

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

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

1. SCHOOL DISTRICT INFORMATION

1.1) School District's BEDS Number : 140709030000

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

140709030000

1.2) School District Name: CHEEKTOWAGA-SLOAN UFSD

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

CHEEKTOWAGA-SLOAN UFSD

1.3) School Improvement Grant (SIG) Districts Only

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

(No response)

1.4) Award Classification

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

(No response)

1.5) Assurances

Please check all of the boxes below:

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

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

Re-submission to address deficiencies

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

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

Annual (2012-13)

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

Created Monday, June 04, 2012

Updated Monday, January 07, 2013

Page 1

STATE-PROVIDED MEASURES OF STUDENT GROWTH

(25 points with an approved value-added measure)

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

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

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

2.1) Assurances

Please check the boxes below:

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

STUDENT LEARNING OBJECTIVES AS COMPARABLE GROWTH MEASURES (20 points)

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

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

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

If no State assessment or Regents exam exists:

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

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

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

State assessments, *required if one exists*

List of State-approved 3rd party assessments

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

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

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

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

2.2) Grades K-3 ELA

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

	ELA	Assessment
K	State-approved 3rd party assessment	STAR Reading Enterprise
1	State-approved 3rd party assessment	STAR Reading Enterprise
2	State-approved 3rd party assessment	STAR Reading Enterprise

	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	Each grade level administered a pre-assessment and targets were set using the pre-assessment score and
---	--

this subcomponent. If needed, you may upload a table or graphic at 2.11, below.	three other data points. Then, teachers set growth targets with principal approval. Students will be given a post-assessment in May/June and a percentage will be calculated based on how many students met their target. This percentage will be converted to a number out of 20 based on Appendix I.
Highly Effective (18 - 20 points) Results are well-above state average for similar students (or District goals if no state test).	76-100% of students will meet growth targets.
Effective (9 - 17 points) Results meet state average for similar students (or District goals if no state test).	51-75% of students will meet growth targets.
Developing (3 - 8 points) Results are below state average for similar students (or District goals if no state test).	26-50% of students will meet growth targets.
Ineffective (0 - 2 points) Results are well-below state average for similar students (or District goals if no state test).	0-25% of all students will meet growth targets.

2.3) Grades K-3 Math

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

	Math	Assessment
K	State-approved 3rd party assessment	STAR Math Enterprise
1	State-approved 3rd party assessment	STAR Math Enterprise
2	State-approved 3rd party assessment	STAR Math Enterprise

	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.	Each grade level administered a pre-assessment and targets were set using the pre-assessment score and three other data points. Then, teachers set growth targets with principal approval. Students will be given a post-assessment in May/June and a percentage will be calculated based on how many students met their target. This percentage will be converted to a number out of 20 based on Appendix I.
Highly Effective (18 - 20 points) Results are well-above state average for similar students (or District goals if no state test).	76-100% of students will meet growth targets.
Effective (9 - 17 points) Results meet state average for similar students (or District goals if no state test).	51-75% of students will meet growth targets.
Developing (3 - 8 points) Results are below state average for similar students (or District goals if no state test).	26-50% of students will meet growth targets.

Ineffective (0 - 2 points) Results are well-below state average for similar students (or District goals if no state test).	0-25% of students will meet growth targets.
--	---

2.4) Grades 6-8 Science

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

	Science	Assessment
6	District, regional or BOCES-developed assessment	Cheektowaga-Sloan UFSD Developed Grade 6 Science Assessment
7	District, regional or BOCES-developed assessment	Cheektowaga-Sloan UFSD Developed Grade 7 Science Assessment

	Science	Assessment
8	State assessment	8th Grade State Science Assessment

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

Use this box, if needed, to describe the general process for assigning HEDI categories for these grades/subjects in this subcomponent. If needed, you may upload a table or graphic at 2.11, below.	Each grade level administered a pre-assessment and targets were set using the pre-assessment score and three other data points. Then, teachers set growth targets with principal approval. Students will be given a post-assessment in May/June and a percentage will be calculated based on how many students met their target. This percentage will be converted to a number out of 20 based on Appendix I.
Highly Effective (18 - 20 points) Results are well-above state average for similar students (or District goals if no state test).	76-100% of students will meet growth targets.
Effective (9 - 17 points) Results meet state average for similar students (or District goals if no state test).	51-75% of students will meet growth targets.
Developing (3 - 8 points) Results are below state average for similar students (or District goals if no state test).	26-50% of students will meet growth targets.
Ineffective (0 - 2 points) Results are well-below state average for similar students (or District goals if no state test).	0-25% of students will meet growth targets.

2.5) Grades 6-8 Social Studies

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

	Social Studies	Assessment
6	District, regional or BOCES-developed assessment	Cheektowaga-Sloan UFSD Developed Grade 6 Social Studies Assessment

7	District, regional or BOCES-developed assessment	Cheektowaga-Sloan UFSD Developed Grade 7 Social Studies Assessment
8	District, regional or BOCES-developed assessment	Cheektowaga-Sloan UFSD Developed Grade 8 Social Studies Assessment

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

Use this box, if needed, to describe the general process for assigning HEDI categories for these grades/subjects in this subcomponent. If needed, you may upload a table or graphic at 2.11, below.	Each grade level administered a pre-assessment and targets were set using the pre-assessment score and three other data points. Then, teachers set growth targets with principal approval. Students will be given a post-assessment in May/June and a percentage will be calculated based on how many students met their target. This percentage will be converted to a number out of 20 based on Appendix I.
Highly Effective (18 - 20 points) Results are well-above District goals for similar students.	76-100% of students will meet growth targets.
Effective (9 - 17 points) Results meet District goals for similar students.	51-75% of students will meet growth targets.
Developing (3 - 8 points) Results are below District goals for similar students.	26-50% of students will meet growth targets.
Ineffective (0 - 2 points) Results are well-below District goals for similar students.	0-25% of students will meet growth targets.

2.6) High School Social Studies Regents Courses

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

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

		Assessment
Global 1	District, regional, or BOCES-developed assessment	Cheektowaga-Sloan UFSD Developed Global 1 Assessment

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

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

Use this box, if needed, to describe the general process for assigning HEDI categories for these grades/subjects in	Each grade level administered a pre-assessment and targets were set using the pre-assessment score and
---	--

<p>this subcomponent. If needed, you may upload a table or graphic at 2.11, below.</p>	<p>three other data points. Then, teachers set growth targets with principal approval. Students will be given a post-assessment in May/June and a percentage will be calculated based on how many students met their target. This percentage will be converted to a number out of 20 based on Appendix I.</p>
<p>Highly Effective (18 - 20 points) Results are well-above District goals for similar students.</p>	<p>76-100% of students will meet growth targets.</p>
<p>Effective (9 - 17 points) Results meet District goals for similar students.</p>	<p>51-75% of students will meet growth targets.</p>
<p>Developing (3 - 8 points) Results are below District goals for similar students.</p>	<p>26-50% of students will meet growth targets.</p>
<p>Ineffective (0 - 2 points) Results are well-below District goals for similar students.</p>	<p>0-25% of students will meet growth targets.</p>

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.

<p>Use this box, if needed, to describe the general process for assigning HEDI categories for these grades/subjects in this subcomponent. If needed, you may upload a table or graphic at 2.11, below.</p>	<p>Each grade level administered a pre-assessment and targets were set using the pre-assessment score and three other data points. Then, teachers set growth targets with principal approval. Students will be given a post-assessment in May/June and a percentage will be calculated based on how many students met their target. This percentage will be converted to a number out of 20 based on Appendix I.</p>
<p>Highly Effective (18 - 20 points) Results are well-above District goals for similar students.</p>	<p>76-100% of students will meet growth targets.</p>
<p>Effective (9 - 17 points) Results meet District goals for similar students.</p>	<p>51-75% of students will meet growth targets.</p>
<p>Developing (3 - 8 points) Results are below District goals for similar students.</p>	<p>26-50% of students will meet growth targets.</p>
<p>Ineffective (0 - 2 points) Results are well-below District goals for similar students.</p>	<p>0-25% of students will meet growth targets.</p>

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.	Each grade level administered a pre-assessment and targets were set using the pre-assessment score and three other data points. Then, teachers set growth targets with principal approval. Students will be given a post-assessment in May/June and a percentage will be calculated based on how many students met their target. This percentage will be converted to a number out of 20 based on Appendix I.
Highly Effective (18 - 20 points) Results are well-above District goals for similar students.	76-100% of students will meet growth targets.
Effective (9 - 17 points) Results meet District goals for similar students.	51-75% of students will meet growth targets.
Developing (3 - 8 points) Results are below District goals for similar students.	26-50% of students will meet growth targets.
Ineffective (0 - 2 points) Results are well-below District goals for similar students.	0-25% of students will meet growth targets.

2.9) High School English Language Arts

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

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

	High School English Courses	Assessment
Grade 9 ELA	District, regional or BOCES-developed assessment	Cheektowaga-Sloan UFSD Developed Grade 9 ELA Assessment
Grade 10 ELA	District, regional or BOCES-developed assessment	Cheektowaga-Sloan UFSD Developed Grade 10 ELA Assessment
Grade 11 ELA	Regents assessment	New York State Comprehensive English Regents Assessment

Highly Effective (18 - 20 points) Results are well-above District goals for similar students.	76-100% of students will meet growth targets.
Effective (9 - 17 points) Results meet District goals for similar students.	51-75% of students will meet growth targets.
Developing (3 - 8 points) Results are below District goals for similar students.	26-50% of students will meet growth targets.
Ineffective (0 - 2 points) Results are well-below District goals for similar students.	0-25% of students will meet growth targets.

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/5364/138452-TXEttx9bQW/Task 2.11 Growth Teachers CSUFSD Determined HEDI for SLO with revised asterisk July 2012.docx

2.12) Locally Developed Controls

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

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

No additional locally developed controls have been applied.

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 Friday, June 01, 2012

Updated Friday, January 04, 2013

Page 1

Locally Selected Measures of Student Achievement or Growth

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

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

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

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

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

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

Growth or achievement measure(s) from these options.

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

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

Measures based on:

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

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

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

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

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

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

3.1) Grades 4-8 ELA

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

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

6	5) District, regional, or BOCES–developed assessments	Cheektowaga-Sloan UFSD Developed Grade 6 ELA Assessment
7	5) District, regional, or BOCES–developed assessments	Cheektowaga-Sloan UFSD Developed Grade 7 ELA Assessment
8	5) District, regional, or BOCES–developed assessments	Cheektowaga-Sloan UFSD Developed Grade 8 ELA Assessment

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

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

Use this box, if needed, to describe the general process for assigning HEDI categories for these grades/subjects in this subcomponent. If needed, you may upload a table or graphic at 3.3, below.	Teachers will establish an academic target that will be reviewed and approved by administration. Points will be awarded based upon the percentage of students achieving the target. HEDI points will be awarded accordingly.
Highly Effective (14 - 15 points) Results are well above District- or BOCES-adopted expectations for growth or achievement for grade/subject.	76-100% of students meet achievement target.
Effective (8- 13 points) Results meet District- or BOCES-adopted expectations for growth or achievement for grade/subject.	51-75% of students meet achievement target.
Developing (3 - 7 points) Results are below District- or BOCES-adopted expectations for growth or achievement for grade/subject.	26-50% of students meet achievement target.
Ineffective (0 - 2 points) Results are well below District- or BOCES-adopted expectations for growth or achievement for grade/subject.	0-25% of students meet achievement target.

3.2) Grades 4-8 Math

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

	Locally-Selected Measure from List of Approved Measures	Assessment
4	5) District, regional, or BOCES–developed assessments	Cheektowaga-Sloan UFSD Developed Grade 4 Math Assessment
5	5) District, regional, or BOCES–developed assessments	Cheektowaga-Sloan UFSD Developed Grade 5 Math Assessment
6	5) District, regional, or BOCES–developed assessments	Cheektowaga-Sloan UFSD Developed Grade 6 Math Assessment
7	5) District, regional, or BOCES–developed assessments	Cheektowaga-Sloan UFSD Developed Grade 7 Math Assessment
8	5) District, regional, or BOCES–developed assessments	Cheektowaga-Sloan UFSD Developed Grade 8 Math Assessment

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

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

Use this box, if needed, to describe the general process for assigning HEDI categories for these grades/subjects in this subcomponent. If needed, you may upload a table or graphic at 3.3, below.	Teachers will establish an academic target that will be reviewed and approved by administration. Points will be awarded based upon the percentage of students achieving the target. HEDI points will be awarded accordingly.
Highly Effective (14 - 15 points) Results are well above District- or BOCES-adopted expectations for growth or achievement for grade/subject.	76-100% of students meet achievement target.
Effective (8- 13 points) Results meet District- or BOCES-adopted expectations for growth or achievement for grade/subject.	51-75% of students meet achievement target.
Developing (3 - 7 points) Results are below District- or BOCES-adopted expectations for growth or achievement for grade/subject.	26-50% of students meet achievement target.
Ineffective (0 - 2 points) Results are well below District- or BOCES-adopted expectations for growth or achievement for grade/subject.	0-25% of students meet achievement target.

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/5139/137668-rhJdBgDruP/Task 3.3 Conversion chart for Teacher APPR 15 Point.doc

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

Growth or achievement measure(s) from these options.

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

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

Measures based on:

- 1) The change in percentage of a teacher’s students who achieve a specific level of performance as determined locally, on such

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

3.4) Grades K-3 ELA

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

	Locally-Selected Measure from List of Approved Measures	Assessment
K	5) District, regional, or BOCES-developed assessments	Cheektowaga-Sloan UFSD Developed Grade K ELA Assessment
1	5) District, regional, or BOCES-developed assessments	Cheektowaga-Sloan UFSD Developed Grade 1 ELA Assessment
2	5) District, regional, or BOCES-developed assessments	Cheektowaga-Sloan UFSD Developed Grade 2 ELA Assessment
3	5) District, regional, or BOCES-developed assessments	Cheektowaga-Sloan UFSD Developed Grade 3 ELA Assessment

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

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

Use this box, if needed, to describe the general process for assigning HEDI categories for these grades/subjects in this subcomponent. If needed, you may upload a table or graphic at 3.13, below.	Teachers will establish an academic target that will be reviewed and approved by administration. Points will be awarded based upon the percentage of students achieving the target. HEDI points will be awarded accordingly.
Highly Effective (18-20 points) Results are well above District- or BOCES-adopted expectations for growth or achievement for grade/subject.	76-100% of students meet achievement target.
Effective (9-17 points) Results meet District- or BOCES-adopted expectations for growth or achievement for grade/subject.	51-75% of students meet achievement target.
Developing (3 - 8 points) Results are below District- or BOCES-adopted expectations for growth or achievement for grade/subject.	26-50% of students meet achievement target.
Ineffective (0 - 2 points) Results are well below District- or BOCES-adopted expectations for growth or achievement for grade/subject.	0-25% of students meet achievement target.

3.5) Grades K-3 Math

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

	Locally-Selected Measure from List of Approved Measures	Assessment
K	5) District, regional, or BOCES–developed assessments	Cheektowaga-Sloan UFSD Developed Grade K Math Assessment
1	5) District, regional, or BOCES–developed assessments	Cheektowaga-Sloan UFSD Developed Grade 1 Math Assessment
2	5) District, regional, or BOCES–developed assessments	Cheektowaga-Sloan UFSD Developed Grade 2 Math Assessment
3	5) District, regional, or BOCES–developed assessments	Cheektowaga-Sloan UFSD Developed Grade 3 Math Assessment

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

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

Use this box, if needed, to describe the general process for assigning HEDI categories for these grades/subjects in this subcomponent. If needed, you may upload a table or graphic at 3.13, below.	Teachers will establish an academic target that will be reviewed and approved by administration. Points will be awarded based upon the percentage of students achieving the target. HEDI points will be awarded accordingly.
Highly Effective (18-20 points) Results are well above District- or BOCES-adopted expectations for growth or achievement for grade/subject.	76-100% of students meet achievement target.
Effective (9-17 points) Results meet District- or BOCES-adopted expectations for growth or achievement for grade/subject.	51-75% of students meet achievement target.
Developing (3 - 8 points) Results are below District -or BOCES-adopted expectations for growth or achievement for grade/subject.	26-50% of students meet achievement target.
Ineffective (0 - 2 points) Results are well below District- or BOCES-adopted expectations for growth or achievement for grade/subject.	0-25% of students meet achievement target.

3.6) Grades 6-8 Science

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

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

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

Use this box, if needed, to describe the general process for assigning HEDI categories for these grades/subjects in this subcomponent. If needed, you may upload a table or graphic at 3.13, below.	Teachers will establish an academic target that will be reviewed and approved by administration. Points will be awarded based upon the percentage of students achieving the target. HEDI points will be awarded accordingly.
Highly Effective (18 - 20 points) Results are well above District- or BOCES-adopted expectations for growth or achievement for grade/subject.	76-100% of students meet achievement target.
Effective (9 - 17 points) Results meet District- or BOCES-adopted expectations for growth or achievement for grade/subject.	51-75% of students meet achievement target.
Developing (3 - 8 points) Results are below District- or BOCES-adopted expectations for growth or achievement for grade/subject.	26-50% of students meet achievement target.

Ineffective (0 - 2 points) Results are well below District- or BOCES-adopted expectations for growth or achievement for grade/subject.	0-25% of students meet achievement target.
--	--

3.7) Grades 6-8 Social Studies

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

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

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

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

Use this box, if needed, to describe the general process for assigning HEDI categories for these grades/subjects in this subcomponent. If needed, you may upload a table or graphic at 3.13, below.	Teachers will establish an academic target that will be reviewed and approved by administration. Points will be awarded based upon the percentage of students achieving the target. HEDI points will be awarded accordingly.
Highly Effective (18 - 20 points) Results are well above District- or BOCES-adopted expectations for growth or achievement for grade/subject.	76-100% of students meet achievement target.
Effective (9 - 17 points) Results meet District- or BOCES-adopted expectations for growth or achievement for grade/subject.	51-75% of students meet achievement target.
Developing (3 - 8 points) Results are below District- or BOCES-adopted expectations for growth or achievement for grade/subject.	26-50% of students meet achievement target.
Ineffective (0 - 2 points) Results are well below District- or BOCES-adopted expectations for growth or achievement for grade/subject.	0-25% of students meet achievement target.

3.8) High School Social Studies

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

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

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

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

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

Use this box, if needed, to describe the general process for assigning HEDI categories for these grades/subjects in this subcomponent. If needed, you may upload a table or graphic at 3.13, below.	Teachers will establish an academic target that will be reviewed and approved by administration. Points will be awarded based upon the percentage of students achieving the target. HEDI points will be awarded accordingly.
Highly Effective (18 - 20 points) Results are well above District- or BOCES-adopted expectations for growth or achievement for grade/subject.	76-100% of students meet achievement target.
Effective (9 - 17 points) Results meet District- or BOCES-adopted expectations for growth or achievement for grade/subject.	51-75% of students meet achievement target.
Developing (3 - 8 points) Results are below District- or BOCES-adopted expectations for growth or achievement for grade/subject.	26-50% of students meet achievement target.
Ineffective (0 - 2 points) Results are well below District- or BOCES-adopted expectations for growth or achievement for grade/subject.	0-25% of students meet achievement target.

3.9) High School Science

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

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

	Locally-Selected Measure from List of Approved Measures	Assessment
Living Environment	5) District, regional, or BOCES–developed assessments	Cheektowaga-Sloan UFSD Developed Living Environment Assessment
Earth Science	5) District, regional, or BOCES–developed assessments	Cheektowaga-Sloan UFSD Developed Earth Science Assessment

Chemistry	5) District, regional, or BOCES–developed assessments	Cheektowaga-Sloan UFSD Developed Chemistry Assessment
Physics	5) District, regional, or BOCES–developed assessments	Cheektowaga-Sloan UFSD Developed Physics Assessment

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

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

Use this box, if needed, to describe the general process for assigning HEDI categories for these grades/subjects in this subcomponent. If needed, you may upload a table or graphic at 3.13, below.	Teachers will establish an academic target that will be reviewed and approved by administration. Points will be awarded based upon the percentage of students achieving the target. HEDI points will be awarded accordingly.
Highly Effective (18-20 points) Results are well above District- or BOCES-adopted expectations for growth or achievement for grade/subject.	76-100% of students meet achievement target.
Developing (3 - 8 points) Results are below District- or BOCES-adopted expectations for growth or achievement for grade/subject.	51-75% of students meet achievement target.
Effective (9 - 17points) Results meet District- or BOCES-adopted expectations for growth or achievement for grade/subject.	26-50% of students meet achievement target.
Ineffective (0 - 2 points) Results are well below District- or BOCES-adopted expectations for growth or achievement for grade/subject.	0-25% of students meet achievement target.

3.10) High School Math

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

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

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

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

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

Use this box, if needed, to describe the general process for assigning HEDI categories for these grades/subjects in this subcomponent. If needed, you may upload a table or graphic at 3.13, below.	Teachers will establish an academic target that will be reviewed and approved by administration. Points will be awarded based upon the percentage of students achieving the target. HEDI points will be awarded accordingly.
Highly Effective (18 - 20 points) Results are well above District- or BOCES-adopted expectations for growth or achievement for grade/subject.	76-100% of students meet achievement target.
Effective (9 - 17 points) Results meet District- or BOCES-adopted expectations for growth or achievement for grade/subject.	51-75% of students meet achievement target.
Developing (3 - 8 points) Results are below District- or BOCES-adopted expectations for growth or achievement for grade/subject.	26-50% of students meet achievement target.
Ineffective (0 - 2 points) Results are well below District- or BOCES-adopted expectations for growth or achievement for grade/subject.	0-25% of students meet achievement target.

3.11) High School English Language Arts

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

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

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

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

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

Highly Effective (18 - 20 points) Results are well above District- or BOCES -adopted expectations for growth or achievement for grade/subject.	76-100% of students meet achievement target.
Effective (9 - 17 points) Results meet District- or BOCES-adopted expectations for growth or achievement for grade/subject.	51-75% of students meet achievement target.
Developing (3 - 8 points) Results are below District- or BOCES-adopted expectations for growth or achievement for grade/subject.	26-50% of students meet achievement target.
Ineffective (0 - 2 points) Results are well below District- or BOCES-adopted expectations for growth or achievement for grade/subject.	0-25% of students meet achievement target.

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/5139/137668-y92vNseFa4/Task 3.13 Local Achievement Teachers CSUFSD Determined HEDI for SLO with revised asterisk July 2012.docx

3.14) Locally Developed Controls

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

No other locally developed controls.

3.15) Teachers with More Than One Locally Selected Measure

Describe the district's process for combining multiple locally selected measures, each scored from 0-15 or 0-20 points as applicable, into a single subcomponent HEDI category and score. Examples may include: 4th grade teacher with locally-selected measures for both ELA and Math; High School teacher with more than 1 SLO.

Teachers with more than one locally selected measure will have a combined score from subject areas classes totally 51% or more of students taught. Courses will be weighted according to the actual number of students enrolled.

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 Wednesday, June 06, 2012

Updated Wednesday, January 09, 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.)

Danielson's Framework for Teaching (2011 Revised Edition)

(No response)

4.2) Points Within Other Measures

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

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

Is the following points assignment applicable to all teachers?

Yes

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

(No response)

Multiple (at least two) classroom observations by principal or other trained administrator, at least one of which must be unannounced [at least 31 points]	60
One or more observation(s) by trained independent evaluators	0
Observations by trained in-school peer teachers	0
Feedback from students using State-approved survey tool	0
Feedback from parents/caregivers using State-approved survey tool	0
Structured reviews of lesson plans, student portfolios and other teacher artifacts	0

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.

The 60 points will be determined by the following:

- Calculating how many points out of 20 were earned from the formal classroom observation which is based on the Charlotte Danielson's Framework for Teaching 2011 (Domains 2,3), and how many points out of 20 were earned from Domains 1 and 4. o Each Subcomponent of the Domains will be scored 0-3. Point totals will be added together to get a raw score for each domain. Each raw score will then be converted to a 0-10 HEDI score using the attached chart. Those scores will then be added together to get a 0-40 HEDI score.

- Of the remaining 20 points, 10 will be calculated via an informal classroom walkthrough. Points for the walk through will be earned

based on the number of indicators observed as present. See Attached Chart.

- The final 10 points will be awarded based on a teacher's completion of a pre and post observation lesson document. Each will be worth 5 points upon completion and 0 points if not done.

o The total number of points earned out of 20 will be added to the 0-40 HEDI score to calculate a final 0-60 HEDI score.

- Any resulting decimals will be rounded to whole numbers when calculating the final composite score.

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/5091/139352-eka9yMJ855/APPR 4.5 charts-attachments with Jan 9 2013 Changes.docx

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

Highly Effective: Overall performance and results exceed NYS Teaching Standards.	46-60 points earned as stated above - 10% from unannounced classroom observation. 40% based on Charlotte Danielson's Domain 1 (Planning and Preparation; Domain 2 (Classroom Environment); Domain 3 (Instruction); and Domain 4 (Professional Responsibilities). 10% earned through pre and post observation documents and meetings.
Effective: Overall performance and results meet NYS Teaching Standards.	31-45 points earned as stated above - 10% from unannounced classroom observation. 40% based on Charlotte Danielson's Domain 1 (Planning and Preparation; Domain 2 (Classroom Environment); Domain 3 (Instruction); and Domain 4 (Professional Responsibilities). 10% earned through pre and post observation documents and meetings.
Developing: Overall performance and results need improvement in order to meet NYS Teaching Standards.	16-30 points earned as stated above - 10% from unannounced classroom observation. 40% based on Charlotte Danielson's Domain 1 (Planning and Preparation; Domain 2 (Classroom Environment); Domain 3 (Instruction); and Domain 4 (Professional Responsibilities). 10% earned through pre and post observation documents and meetings.
Ineffective: Overall performance and results do not meet NYS Teaching Standards.	0-15 points earned as stated above - 10% from unannounced classroom observation. 40% based on Charlotte Danielson's Domain 1 (Planning and Preparation; Domain 2 (Classroom Environment); Domain 3 (Instruction); and Domain 4 (Professional Responsibilities). 10% earned through pre and post observation documents and meetings.

Provide the ranges for the 60-point scoring bands.

Highly Effective	46-60
------------------	-------

Effective	31-45
Developing	16-30
Ineffective	0-15

4.6) Observations of Probationary Teachers

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

By building principals or other trained administrators

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

By trained in-school peer teachers or other trained reviewers

Formal/Long	0
Informal/Short	0

Independent evaluators

Formal/Long	0
Informal/Short	0

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

-
- In Person
-

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

-
- In Person
-

4.7) Observations of Tenured Teachers

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

By building principals or other trained administrators

4.7) Observations of Tenured Teachers Formal/Long	1
---	---

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

By trained in-school peer teachers or other trained reviewers

Formal/Long	0
Informal/Short	0

Independent evaluators

Formal/Long	0
Informal/Short	0

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

-
- In Person
-

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

-
- In Person
-

5. Composite Scoring (Teachers)

Created Friday, June 15, 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	46-60
Effective	31-45
Developing	16-30
Ineffective	0-15

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 Wednesday, June 06, 2012

Updated Friday, January 04, 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/5265/139559-Df0w3Xx5v6/Task 6.2 CHEEKTOWAGA-SLOAN TIP Form with logo June 2012.doc

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:

*The Appeals Process
Cheektowaga-Sloan UFSD*

This Agreement is made by and between the Cheektowaga-Sloan Union Free School District ("District") and the Teachers' Association of Cheektowaga-Sloan ("Association"), collectively referred to herein as the "Parties". In order to implement the

requirements of N.Y. Education Law § 3012-c, and notwithstanding any other current bargaining obligation or agreement, the District and the Association hereby agree as follows with regard to classroom teachers who are covered by Section 3012-c.

1. Where and to the extent applicable, the Annual Professional Performance Review of classroom teachers shall be a significant factor for employment decisions and teacher development as determined by the District, and will be subject to any procedures which may in the future be negotiated by the District and the Association.

2. Prior to the annual rating becoming final, a teacher receiving an ineffective rating shall meet with the applicable Administrator (or designee if the Administrator is not available) to review all findings relating to the evaluation, including but not limited to any potential procedural or substantive disputes regarding it. This does not limit the existing rights of teachers rated developing, effective or highly effective to request to informally discuss their final rating with the applicable administrator.

3. Appeals of Annual Professional Performance Reviews shall be limited to only those which rate a classroom teacher as ineffective. A unit member holding the position of classroom teacher may challenge only the substance of the Annual Professional Performance Review, the District's adherence to the standards and methodologies required for such Annual Professional Performance Review, the District's compliance with its procedures for conducting the Annual Professional Performance Review, or its issuance and/or implementation of the terms of the Teacher Improvement Plan consistent with N.Y. Education Law § 3012-c.

Such challenge must be submitted in writing to the Administrator performing the Annual Professional Performance Review or Teacher Improvement Plan. There may be only one appeal submitted in relation to any particular Annual Professional Performance Review or Teacher Improvement Plan. The writing must explain in detail the specific basis for the challenge, and should provide any relevant supporting documentation. The appeal must be submitted within six business days of the issuance of the Annual Professional Performance Review or Teacher Improvement Plan or it is deemed waived. The teacher has the burden of demonstrating a clear right to the relief requested and the burden of establishing the facts upon which such relief is sought.

Within six business days of receipt of the challenge, the Administrator conducting the Annual Professional Performance Review or Teacher Improvement Plan shall meet with the teacher and his/her union representative to discuss the appeal. Any grounds not raised in the appeal by this point shall be deemed waived for this procedure. Within six business days of such meeting, the Administrator shall submit a written determination on the appeal. Consistent with N.Y. Education Law § 3012-c, the District may not use the Annual Professional Performance Review or Teacher Improvement Plan until such determination is rendered.

If the teacher received an "ineffective" rating and disagrees with the determination, the teacher may submit a copy of the challenge, the determination, and a written statement explaining in detail the basis for disagreement with the determination, with any relevant supporting documentation, to the Superintendent of Schools within six business days of the date of the determination. Within six business days of receipt of the challenge, the Superintendent shall meet with the teacher and his/her union representative to discuss the appeal. Within six business days of such meeting, the Superintendent shall submit a written determination on the appeal. In the absence of a timely determination, the District may not use the Annual Professional Performance Review or Teacher Improvement Plan until such determination is rendered.

A unit member shall be entitled to representation by the T.A.C. during the course of any appeal authorized by this paragraph. The District shall maintain a record of all documents and materials submitted by either party during such an appeal, which shall thereafter be available for inspection by the unit member and/or the T.A.C. The teacher may present any mitigating circumstances that he/she believes relevant during the course of an appeal (including, but not limited to, Class Size, Students and Classes Assigned, Student Attendance, Teacher Leave Time/Personal Life, New Initiatives/Requirements and Physical Environment, administrative relationships), which shall be considered by the District along with all other information submitted during the appeal. The presentation or consideration of any such information presented by a teacher shall not prejudice the position that either the teacher, Association or District may take in a Section 3020-a hearing.

A challenge or determination under this section shall be exempt from the grievance and arbitration provisions in the collective negotiations agreement between the Parties, and an Annual Professional Performance Review or Teacher Improvement Plan may not be challenged in any other forum.

4. Nothing in this Memorandum of Agreement shall in any way restrict or affect the District's non-reviewable authority to terminate the appointment of or deny tenure to a probationary teacher, and any such termination or denial shall not in any way be subject to challenge through the grievance and arbitration provisions of the collective negotiations agreement between the Parties consistent with N.Y. Education Law § 3012-c.

5. Unit members receiving a mandated TIP will have the right to T.A.C. representation during the development of said TIP.

6. Nothing in this Memorandum of Agreement shall be construed to limit the defenses which the employee may place before a Section 3020-a hearing officer in challenging the allegation of a pattern of ineffective teaching or performance.

7. The Parties agree that they will further conduct negotiations concerning the APPR Regulations adopted by the Board of Regents, and to the extent necessary to comply with said Regulations and N.Y. Education Law § 3012-c.

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.

CERTIFICATION PLAN FOR EVALUATORS OF TEACHERS

NYSED REQUIREMENTS OUTLINED IN 30-2.9(b) with LEARNING OBJECTIVES and DISTRICT PLAN

1. *The NYS Teaching Standards, and their related elements and performance indicators and the Leadership Standards and their related functions, as applicable;*

- Describe the structure of the standards (Standards □ Elements □ PI/Standards □ Functions)

- Understand the rating system and scoring based on APPR requirements (20/20/60 model)

- o Administrators attended July 2011 NYS Teaching Standards session at Erie 1 BOCES

- o Administrators participated in the Moodle course through Erie 1 BOCES

- o Review NYS Teaching Standards at Opening Day Session September 2011

- o Discussion at Leadership Team Meeting September 2011

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

- Describe the evidence collection cycle

- Explain how bias can negatively impact scorer reliability

- Identify professional growth opportunities to establish inter-rater reliability

- o Administrators attended NYSED Turnkey Training August 2011 or September 15, 2011 [5 hours]

- o Administrators attended NYSED Turnkey Training Fall/Spring 2011-12 [12 hours]

- o Administrators participated in Erie 1 BOCES Moodle Course: Observing Teacher Effectiveness

- o Administrators participated in video practice – raters will review teaching videos to practice collecting evidence without opinion/bias

3. *Application and use of the student growth percentile model and the value-added growth model;*

- Differentiate between the student growth and value-added growth models

- o Administrators attended NYSED Turnkey Training Fall/Spring 2011-12 [12 hours]

- o Moodle Course: RttT Administrator Webinars

- o Administrators and Teachers participated in discussions and negotiations focused on local assessments and student growth/value added models

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;*

- Create a crosswalk or alignment between the NYS Teaching Standards and the district rubric

- Differentiate between the four rating categories (highly effective, effective, developing, ineffective)

- Brainstorming evidence or artifacts that align to the standards

- o Teachers brainstormed and collect evidence of district/school-level expectation for effective/highly effective

- o Administrators and Teachers developed timelines and expectations for the evaluation cycle

- o Administrators attended NYS Teaching Standards Workshop July 2011 [12 hours]

- o Administrators attended NYSED Turnkey Training Fall/Spring 2011-12 [12 hours]

- o Administrators participated in Moodle Course: NYS Teaching ISLLC Standards

5. *Application and use of any assessment tools that the school district or BOCES utilizes to evaluate its classroom teachers or building principals;*

- Research-based multiple measures (tools) for evaluating teacher effectiveness

- o Administrators attended NYS Teaching Standards Workshop July 2011 [12 hours]

- o Administrators attended NYSED Turnkey Training Fall/Spring 2011-12 [12 hours]

- o Administrators and teachers reviewed of options for multiple measures tools (portfolio, reflection forms, professional growth goals) and alignment to the rubric/standards

6. *Application and use of any State-approved locally selected measures of student achievement;*

- Evaluate the quality and appropriateness of locally selected measures (3rd party vs. locally developed)

- o Administrators attended NYSED Turnkey Training Fall/Spring 2011-12 [12 hours]

- o Administrators and teachers participated in local negotiations and administrative discussions focused on the local assessment and calculation of the composite score

7. *Use of the Statewide Instructional Reporting System;*

- TBD by the State

- o Administrators will implement the reporting systems required by NYSED

8. *The scoring methodology utilized by the Department and/or the district or BOCES to evaluate a teacher;*

- Identify models for calculating student growth or student achievement data

- Develop scoring ranges based on methodologies for calculating teacher effectiveness using student data

- Utilize conversion scales to assign points according to the rating scale

- o Administrators attended NYSED Turnkey Training Fall/Spring 2011-12 [12 hours]

- o Administrators participated in discussions and local negotiations focused on calculation models for determining a teacher's composite score and placement on the rating scale

- o Administrators participated in Erie 1 BOCES Moodle Course: RttT Administrator Webinars

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

- Discussions about considerations for ELL/Special Ed. Students

- o Administrators attended NYSED Turnkey Training Fall/Spring 2011-12 [12 hours]

**Ongoing training will occur to enable administrators to remain current on APPR topics.*

**Upon completion of initial and updated training the names of lead evaluators shall be submitted to the Cheektowaga-Sloan Union Free School District Board of Education for certification/recertification.*

6.5) Assurances -- Evaluators

Please check the boxes below:

-
- Checked
-

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

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

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

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

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

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

(7) use of the Statewide Instructional Reporting System

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

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

- Checked

6.6) Assurances -- Teachers

Please check all of the boxes below:

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

6.7) Assurances -- Data

Please check all of the boxes below:

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

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

Created Friday, June 15, 2012

Updated Wednesday, January 09, 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):

3-5
6-8
9-12
(No response)
(No response)
(No response)
(No response)

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

Please check the boxes below:

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

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

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

State assessments, *required if one exists*

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

List of State-approved 3rd party assessments

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

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

School or Program Type	SLO with Assessment Option	Name of the Assessment
K-2	State-approved 3rd party assessment	STAR Reading Enterprise and STAR Math Enterprise

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.	Principal will set growth targets with Superintendent approval. Students will be given a post-assessment in May/June and a percentage will be calculated based on how many students met their target goals.
Highly Effective (18 - 20 points) Results are well above state average for similar students (or District goals if no state test).	Results are above average for similar students. 75-100% of students will meet growth targets.
Effective (9 - 17 points) Results meet state average for similar students (or District goals if no state test).	Results are average for similar students. 55-74% of students will meet growth targets.
Developing (3 - 8 points) Results are below state average for similar students (or District goals if no state test).	Results are below average for similar students. 38-54% of students will meet growth targets.
Ineffective (0 - 2 points) Results are well below state average for similar students (or District goals if no state test).	Results are well below average for similar students. 0-37% of students will meet growth targets.

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

[assets/survey-uploads/5365/143207-lha0DogRNw/Task 7.3 Principal ChartChangesAPPR.docx](#)

7.4) Special Considerations for Comparable Growth Measures

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

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

(No response)

7.5) Principals with More Than One Growth Measure

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

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

7.6) Assurances -- Comparable Growth Measures

Please check all of the boxes below:

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

8. Local Measures (Principals)

Created Friday, June 15, 2012

Updated Monday, January 07, 2013

Page 1

Locally-Selected Measures of Student Achievement or Growth

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

Grade Configuration	Locally-Selected Measure from List of Approved Measures	Assessment
3-5	(d) measures used by district for teacher evaluation	All CSUFSD District Developed Grade 3-5 Subject Specific Assessments;and Grades 3-5 NYS ELA and Math Assessments
6-8	(d) measures used by district for teacher evaluation	All CSUFSD District Developed Grade 6-8 Subject Specific Assessments;and Grades 6-8 NYS ELA, Math, and Grade 8 Science Assessments
9-12	(d) measures used by district for teacher evaluation	All CSUFSD District Developed Grade 9-12 Subject Specific Assessments;and Grades 9-12 NYS Regents Assessments

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.	Principals will establish an academic target that will be reviewed and approved by administration. Points will be awarded based upon the percentage of students achieving the target. HEDI points will be awarded accordingly.
Highly Effective (14 - 15 points) Results are well above District- or BOCES-adopted expectations for growth or achievement for grade/subject.	Results are above average for similar students. 76-100% of students will meet growth targets.
Effective (8- 13 points) Results meet District- or BOCES-adopted expectations for growth or achievement for grade/subject.	Results are average for similar students. 51-75% of students will meet growth targets.

Developing (3 - 7 points) Results are below District- or BOCES-adopted expectations for growth or achievement for grade/subject.

Results are below average for similar students. 26-50% of students will meet growth targets.

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

Results are well below average for similar students. 0-25% of students will meet growth targets.

If you need additional space, upload a copy of "Form 8.1: Locally Selected Measures for Principals with an Approved Value-Added Measure" as an attachment for review. Click here for a downloadable copy of Form 8.1. (MS Word)

(No response)

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

assets/survey-uploads/5366/143211-qBFVOWF7fC/Task 8.1 Principal Chart Changes 15 Point Chart.docx

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

least a 3 on an Advanced Placement examination since entry into the ninth grade)

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

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

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

Grade Configuration	Locally-Selected Measure from List of Approved Measures	Assessment
Pre K-2	(d) measures used by district for teacher evaluation	All CSUFSD District Developed Grade Pre K-2 Subject Specific Assessments;and Grades K-2 STAR Reading and STAR Math Enterprise Assessments

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.	Principals will establish an academic target that will be reviewed and approved by administration. Points will be awarded based upon the percentage of students achieving the target. HEDI points will be awarded accordingly.
Highly Effective (18 - 20 points) Results are well above District- or BOCES-adopted expectations for growth or achievement for grade/subject.	Results are above average for similar students. 75-100% of students will meet growth targets.
Effective (9- 17 points) Results meet District- or BOCES-adopted expectations for growth or achievement for grade/subject.	Results are average for similar students. 55-74% of students will meet growth targets.
Developing (3 - 8 points) Results are below District- or BOCES-adopted expectations for growth or achievement for grade/subject.	Results are below average for similar students. 38-54% of students will meet growth targets.
Ineffective (0 - 2 points) Results are well below District- or BOCES-adopted expectations for growth or achievement for grade/subject.	Results are well below average for similar students. 0-37% of students will meet growth targets.

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

(No response)

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

assets/survey-uploads/5366/143211-T8MIGWUVm1/Task 8.2 Principal Chart Changes 20 Point Chart.docx

8.3) Locally Developed Controls

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

None

8.4) Principals with More Than One Locally Selected Measure

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

(No response)

8.5) Assurances

Please check all of the boxes below:

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

9. Other Measures of Effectiveness (Principals)

Created Thursday, October 11, 2012

Updated Friday, January 04, 2013

Page 1

9.1) Principal Practice Rubric

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

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

Multidimensional Principal Performance Rubric

(No response)

9.2) Points Within Other Measures

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

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

Is the following points assignment for all principals?

Yes

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

(No response)

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

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

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

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

(No response)

9.3) Assurances -- Goals

Please check the boxes below (if applicable):

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

9.4) Sources of Evidence (if applicable)

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

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

9.5) Survey Tool(s) (if applicable)

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

(No response)

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

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

9.6) Assurances

Please check all of the boxes below:

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

9.7) Process for Assigning Points and Determining HEDI Ratings

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

The 60 points will be determined by the following:

- Calculating how many points out of 72 were earned from the three formal visitations, and review of any and all appropriate documentation and/or principal self-reflections which are based on the Multidimensional Principal Performance Rubric.
- Calculating how many points out of 16 were earned after the lead evaluator reviews the completed goal setting form, the principal's performance per the stated goals and the post-conference.
- All elements observed and evidence collected will be scored on a scale of 1-4 and totaled.
- The total of the above will then be plotted on the MPPR/NYS APPR Conversion Chart in order to arrive at a score out of 60 points.

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

[assets/survey-uploads/5143/194152-pMADJ4gk6R/Task 9.7 Principal Chart Changes 0-60 Point Chart.docx](#)

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

Highly Effective: Overall performance and results exceed standards.	The overall performance meets and exceeds the standards. The scoring range is 50-60.
Effective: Overall performance and results meet standards.	The overall performance meets the standards. The scoring range is 35-49
Developing: Overall performance and results need improvement in order to meet standards.	The overall performance needs improvement in order to meet the standards. The scoring range is 20-34
Ineffective: Overall performance and results do not meet standards.	The overall performance as well as results do not meet the standards. The scoring range is 0-19.

Please provide the locally-negotiated 60 point scoring bands.

Highly Effective	50-60
------------------	-------

Effective	35-49
Developing	20-34
Ineffective	0-19

9.8) School Visits

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

Probationary Principals

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

Tenured Principals

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

10. Composite Scoring (Principals)

Created Friday, June 15, 2012

Updated Monday, December 17, 2012

Page 1

Standards for Rating Categories

Growth or Comparable Measures

Locally-selected Measures of growth or achievement

Other Measures of Effectiveness (Teacher and Leader standards)

Highly

Effective

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

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

Overall performance and results exceed ISLLC leadership standards.

Effective

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

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

Overall performance and results meet ISLLC leadership standards.

Developing

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

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

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

Ineffective

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

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

Overall performance and results do not meet ISLLC leadership standards.

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

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

2012-13 where there is no Value-Added measure

Growth or Comparable Measures

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

Other Measures of Effectiveness

(60 points)

Overall

Composite Score

Highly Effective

18-20

18-20

Ranges determined locally--see below

91-100

Effective

9-17

9-17

75-90

Developing

3-8

3-8

65-74

Ineffective

0-2

0-2

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

Highly Effective	50-60
Effective	35-49
Developing	20-34
Ineffective	0-19

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

2012-13 where Value-Added growth measure applies

Growth or Comparable Measures

Locally-selected Measures of growth or achievement

Other Measures of Effectiveness

(60 points)

Overall

Composite Score

Highly Effective

22-25

14-15

Ranges determined locally--see above

91-100

Effective

10-21

8-13

75-90

Developing

3-9

3-7

65-74

Ineffective

0-2

0-2

0-64

11. Additional Requirements - Principals

Created Friday, June 15, 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/5276/143220-Df0w3Xx5v6/Task 11.2 Principal Improvement Plan Form CSUFSD.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:

V. Appeal Process

1. A principal who receives an Ineffective rating on his/her APPR shall be entitled to appeal this rating. This appeal must be done in written form and submitted to the Lead Evaluator who has been trained in accordance with the requirements of the statute and regulation. An evaluation shall not be placed in a principal's personnel file until either the expiration of the fifteen (15) business day period during which an appeal could be filed by the principal or the conclusion of the appeal process described herein, whichever is later.

2. The principal must submit a written description of the specific areas of disagreement over his/her performance review, or the issuance and/or implementation of the terms of his/her improvement plan. The district upon written request must provide any additional written documents or materials relevant to the appeal for the same. The performance review and/or improvement plan being challenged must also be submitted with the appeal. Any information not submitted at the time the appeal is filed shall not be considered. These concerns are limited to those matters that may be appealed as prescribed in Section 3012 c of the Education Law:

- Substance of the annual professional performance review
- The school district's adherence to standards and methodologies required for such reviews
- Adherence to Commissioner's Regulations, as applicable to such reviews
- Compliance with any applicable locally negotiated procedures applicable to annual professional performance reviews or improvement plans
- Issuance and/or compliance with terms of the principal improvement plan

3. A principal may not file more than one appeal on the same evaluation.

4. The burden shall be on the district to establish by the preponderance of the evidence that the rating given to the appellant was justified or that an improvement plan was appropriately issued and/or implemented.

5. An appeal must be filed in writing within fifteen (15) calendar days of the presentation of the document (yearly evaluation and/or improvement plan) to the principal or the right to appeal shall be deemed as waived in all regards. The act of mailing shall constitute filing.

6. An Appeal Panel will consist of:

1 District Office Administrator

1 Building Level Principal of the Appellant's choice

1 Administrator mutually agreed upon by the appellant/CSUFSDAA and the Lead Evaluator from outside of the district

7. The Lead Evaluator or his/her designee will respond to the appeal with a written response acknowledging the appeal and directing further administrative action. This correspondence will be made within fifteen (15) business days of the receipt of the appeal. The response will include all additional documents or written materials relevant to the point(s) of disagreement that support the district's response. Any such information that is not submitted at the time the response is filed shall not be considered on behalf of the district in the deliberations related to the resolution of the appeal.

8. The Appeal Panel and appellant will meet within ten (10) business days of the written response to review the appeal and either modify the principal evaluation rating or deny the appeal. The appeal hearing shall be conducted in no more than one business day unless extenuating circumstances are present and all parties agree to a second day. The principal shall have the prerogative to determine whether the appeal shall be open to the public or not. The cost of said proceedings will not exceed \$350.00.

9. The principal shall have the opportunity to present his/her case which may include the representation of witnesses and/or affidavits in lieu of testimony, then the school district may refute the presentation, if the school district does present a case the principal will have the right to present a rebuttal case.

10. A written decision on the merits of the appeal shall be rendered no later than ten (10) business days from the close of the hearing. The appeal shall be based on a written record, comprised of the principal's appeal papers and any documentary evidence accompanying the appeal, as well as the school district's response to the appeal and additional documentary evidence submitted with such papers. The decision shall set forth the reasons and factual basis for each determination on each of the specific issues raised in the principal's appeal. If the appeal is sustained, the reviewer may set aside or modify a rating. A copy of the decision shall be provided to the principal, the Lead Evaluator and all members of the Appeal Panel.

11. In the event a principal receives a second evaluation rating of Ineffective the following year, the appeal panel will be comprised in the same way utilizing all timelines as delineated in section V.6 of this document. At any point in the appeals process, the principal may enlist the support of the local or SAANYs association support.

11.4) Training and Certification of Lead Evaluators and Evaluators

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

CERTIFICATION PLAN FOR EVALUATORS OF PRINCIPALS

NYSED REQUIREMENTS OUTLINED IN 30-2.9(b) with LEARNING OBJECTIVES and DISTRICT PLAN

1. The ISLLC Leadership Standards and their related functions, as applicable;

- Describe the structure of the standards
- Understand the rating system and scoring based on APPR requirements (20/20/60 OR 25/15/60 model)
- o Administrators attended August 2011 ISLLC Standards session at Erie 1 BOCES

- o Administrators participated in the Moodle course through Erie 1 BOCES
 - o Discussion at Leadership Team Meetings
 - o (Optional) Administrators attended SAANYS and/or NYSCOSS training on APPR
2. Evidence-based observation techniques that are grounded in research;
- Describe the evidence collection cycle
 - Explain how bias can negatively impact scorer reliability
 - Identify professional growth opportunities to establish inter-rater reliability
- o Administrators attended NYSED Turnkey Training August 2011 or September 15, 2011 [5 hours]
 - o Administrators attended NYSED Turnkey Training Fall/Spring 2011-12 [12 hours]
 - o Administrators attended webinar session on MPPR (August 2011)
3. Application and use of the student growth percentile model and the value-added growth model;
- Differentiate between the student growth and value-added growth models
- o Administrators attended NYSED Turnkey Training Fall/Spring 2011-12 [12 hours]
 - o Moodle Course: RttT Administrator Webinars
 - o Administrators participated in discussions and negotiations focused on local assessments and student growth/value added models
4. Application and use of the State-approved principal rubric(s) selected by the district or BOCES' for use in evaluations, including training on the effective application;
- Create a crosswalk or alignment between the ISLLC Standards and the district rubric
 - Differentiate between the four rating categories (highly effective, effective, developing, ineffective)
 - Brainstorming evidence or artifacts that align to the standards
- o Administrators identified evidence of district expectation for effective/highly effective
 - o Administrators developed timelines and expectations for the evaluation cycle
 - o Administrators attended Un-Wrapping the ISLLC Standards August 2011 [5 hours]
 - o Administrators attended NYSED Turnkey Training Fall/Spring 2011-12 [12 hours]
 - o Administrators participated in Moodle Course: NYS Teaching ISLLC Standards
5. Application and use of any assessment tools that the school district or BOCES utilizes to evaluate its building principals;
- Research-based multiple measures (tools) for evaluating principal effectiveness
- o Administrators attended Un-Wrapping the ISLLC Standards August 2011 [5 hours]
 - o Administrators attended NYSED Turnkey Training Fall/Spring 2011-12 [12 hours]
 - o Administrators reviewed options for multiple measures tools (portfolio, reflection forms, professional growth goals) and alignment to the rubric/standards
6. Application and use of any State-approved locally selected measures of student achievement;
- Evaluate the quality and appropriateness of locally selected measures (3rd party vs. locally developed)
- o Administrators attended NYSED Turnkey Training Fall/Spring 2011-12 [12 hours]
 - o Administrators participated in local negotiations and administrative discussions focused on the local assessment and calculation of the composite score
7. Use of the Statewide Instructional Reporting System;
- TBD by the State
 - o Administrators will implement the reporting systems required by NYSED
8. The scoring methodology utilized by the Department and/or the district or BOCES to evaluate a principal;
- Identify models for calculating student growth or student achievement data
 - Develop scoring ranges based on methodologies for calculating principal effectiveness using student data
 - Utilize conversion scales to assign points according to the rating scale
- o Administrators attended NYSED Turnkey Training Fall/Spring 2011-12 [12 hours]
 - o Administrators participated in discussions and local negotiations focused on calculation models for determining a principal's composite score and placement on the rating scale
 - o Administrators participated in Erie 1 BOCES Moodle Course: RttT Administrator Webinars
9. Specific consideration in evaluating teachers and principals of English language learners and students with disabilities.
- Discussions about considerations for ELL/Special Ed. Students
 - o Administrators attended NYSED Turnkey Training Fall/Spring 2011-12 [12 hours]
- *Ongoing training will occur to enable administrators to remain current on APPR topics.
- *Upon completion of initial and updated training the names of lead evaluators shall be submitted to the Cheektowaga-Sloan Union Free School District Board of Education for certification/recertification.

11.5) Assurances -- Evaluators

Please check the boxes below:

• Checked

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

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

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

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

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

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

(7) use of the Statewide Instructional Reporting System

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

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

• Checked

11.6) Assurances -- Principals

Please check all of the boxes below:

11.6) Assurances -- Principals Assure the entire APPR plan will be completed for each principal as soon as practicable, but in no case later than September 1 of the school year next following	Checked
---	---------

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

11.7) Assurances -- Data

Please check all of the boxes below:

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

12. Joint Certification of APPR Plan

Created Wednesday, June 06, 2012

Updated Thursday, January 10, 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/5581/139557-3Uqgn5g9Iu/Task 12 Signatures Jan 10 2013.pdf>

File types supported for uploads

PDF (preferred)

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

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

Open Office (.odt, .ott)

Images (.jpg, .gif)

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

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

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

Task 2.11 Growth-Teachers

CSUFSD Determined H.E.D.I. Scoring Scale for the SLO Process

In the 2012-13 academic year, each classroom teacher and building principals' annual professional performance review (APPR) will result in a single composite effectiveness score. For the state 20%, based on student growth (SLO) as well as the local 20% based on achievement (SLO) the district has adopted the following H.E.D.I. Scoring Scale to determine the 20 points assigned for meeting targets*:

		17	72-75%				
		16	68-71%				
		15	64-67%				
		14	61-63%	8	46-50%		
		13	59-60%	7	41-45%		
		12	57-58%	6	36-40%		
20	94-100%	11	55-56%	5	32-35%	2	19-25%
19	85-93%	10	53-54%	4	29-31%	1	9-18%
18	76-84%	9	51-52%	3	26-28%	0	0-8%
Highly Effective		Effective		Developing		Ineffective	
76-100%		51-75%		26-50%		0-25%	

*It is understood that the long term goal is for all students to reach and/or exceed proficiency standards. Student targets should be progressive steps towards that goal.

CSUFSD Teacher Evaluation Summary Sheet (Other Measures)

Teacher:

Principal:

Grade/Subject Area:

School Year:

Item	Scoring	Explanation			Points
<p align="center">Classroom Observations using Entire Danielson Rubric & Walkthrough</p>	<p align="center">100%</p>	<p><u>Annual Formal Observation Cycle:</u></p>	<p align="center">Raw Score</p>	<p align="center">Scaled score</p>	<p align="center">/60</p>
		-Pre Observation Form	/5	/5	
		-Domain #1: Planning and Preparation	/18	/10	
		-Domain #2: The Classroom Environment	/15	/10	
		-Domain #3: Instruction	/15	/10	
		-Domain #4: Professional responsibilities	/18	/10	
		-Post Observation Form	/5	/5	
		-Formative (informal) Observation Walkthrough Checklist	/10	/10	

Evaluator's Comments

The notes below will lend themselves to professional discussion between the evaluator and teacher about the New York State Teaching Standards and the four Domains of Professional Practice according to the Charlotte Danielson Model of Teacher Evaluation.

Domain 1: Planning and Preparation

Domain 2: The Classroom Environment

Domain 3: Instruction

Domain 4: Professional and Leadership Responsibilities

Teacher Signature: _____

Date: _____

Evaluator Signature: _____

Date: _____

CSUFSD Classroom Walk Through

Teacher:

Class:

Domain 2: The Classroom Environment

Date:

Time:

Domain 3: Instruction

Indicator Being Observed	Rubric Component	Rubric Indicators	(2) All Present (HE)	(1.5) Mai. Present (E)	(1) Some Present (D)	(0) None Present (I)
1. The learning objective is clearly posted or evident.	3a	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> -Clarity of lesson purpose -Clear directions and procedures specific to the lesson activity -Absence of content errors and clear expectations of concepts -Students understand the content -Correct and imaginative use of language 				
2. Students are actively engaged.	3c	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> -Activities aligned with the goals of the lesson -Student enthusiasm, interest, thinking, problem-solving, etc -Learning tasks that require high-level student thinking and are aligned with lesson objectives -Students highly motivated to work on all tasks and are persistent even when the tasks are challenging -Students actively “working,” rather than watching while their teacher “works.” -Suitable pacing of the lesson: neither dragging nor rushed, with time for closure and student reflection 				
3. Instruction and assessment of learning are integrated. Effective use of question and discussion techniques	3d 3b	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> -Teacher paying close attention to evidence of student understanding -Teacher circulating to monitor student learning and to offer feedback -Teacher adjusting instruction in response to evidence of student understanding (or lack of it) - Questions of high cognitive challenge, formulated by both students and teacher - Effective use of student responses and ideas - Discussion with the teacher stepping out of the central, mediating role 				
4. Effective classroom management is evident.	2d	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> -Clear standards of conduct, possibly posted, and possibly referred to during a lesson -Absence of acrimony between teacher and students concerning behavior -Teacher awareness of student conduct -Preventive action when needed by the teacher -Fairness -Absence of misbehavior -Reinforcement of positive behavior 				
5. Follow Up Reflection Discussion between Observer and Teacher Date: _____	4a	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> -Accurate reflections on a lesson -Citations of adjustments to practice, drawing on a repertoire of strategies 				
Total Points						/10

Discussion Notes:

(Teacher Signature and Date)

(Observer Signature and Date)

Point and Conversion Information for the Danielson Rubric

The following two tables are to be used when completing the CSUFSD Teacher Evaluation Summary Sheet:

Point Conversion Charts for Danielson Domains

APPR CHEEKTOWAGA-SLOAN UFSD

Domains 2 & 3

Raw Score	Scaled Score
1	1
2	2
3	3
4	4
5	5
6	6
7	6.5
8	7
9	7.5
10	8
11	8.5
12	9
13	9.5
14	10
15	10

Domains 1 & 4

Raw Score	Scaled Score
1	1
2	1.5
3	2
4	2.5
5	3
6	3.5
7	4
8	5
9	5.5
10	6
11	7
12	7.5
13	8
14	8.5
15	9
16	9.5
17	10
18	10

Rubric Point Value: I=0, D=1, E=2, H=3

HEDI Scoring Bands	Rating
0-15	Ineffective
16-30	Developing
31-45	Effective
46-60	Highly Effective



CHEEKTOWAGA-SLOAN SCHOOL DISTRICT
TEACHER IMPROVEMENT PLAN (TIP) (Task 6.2)

NAME OF TEACHER

NAME OF SCHOOL

ADMINISTRATOR'S NAME

SCHOOL YEAR

CHARLOTTE DANIELSON'S 2011 FRAMEWORK FOR TEACHING DOMAINS TO ADDRESS:

Domain 1: 	Domain 2: 	Domain 3: 	Domain 4:
---	---	---	---

TIP Start Date: 	Anticipated Date of TIP Completion:
-----------------------------	---

TIP Review Anticipated Meeting Dates

1. _____ 2. _____ 3. _____ 4. _____

Identified domain Category	Actions to be Taken	Principal's responsibilities	Teacher's responsibilities	Timeline for completion	Success Indicators <i>Evidence and artifacts</i>	Improvements made and documented

INITIAL PLANNING SESSION

_____/_____
TEACHER SIGNATURE DATE

_____/_____
ADMINISTRATOR SIGNATURE DATE

_____/_____
ASSOCIATION REPRESENTATIVE DATE

ACCEPTANCE OF TIP PLAN

_____/_____
TEACHER SIGNATURE DATE

_____/_____
ADMINISTRATOR SIGNATURE DATE

_____/_____
ASSOCIATION REPRESENTATIVE DATE

_____/_____
SUPERINTENDENT SIGNATURE DATE

REVIEW SESSION 1

_____/_____
TEACHER SIGNATURE DATE

_____/_____
ADMINISTRATOR SIGNATURE DATE

_____/_____
ASSOCIATION REPRESENTATIVE DATE

_____/_____
SUPERINTENDENT SIGNATURE DATE

REVIEW SESSION 2

_____/_____
TEACHER SIGNATURE DATE

_____/_____
ADMINISTRATOR SIGNATURE DATE

_____/_____
ASSOCIATION REPRESENTATIVE DATE

_____/_____
SUPERINTENDENT SIGNATURE DATE

REVIEW SESSION 3

_____/_____
TEACHER SIGNATURE DATE

_____/_____
ADMINISTRATOR SIGNATURE DATE

_____/_____
ASSOCIATION REPRESENTATIVE DATE

_____/_____
SUPERINTENDENT SIGNATURE DATE

REVIEW SESSION 4

_____/_____
TEACHER SIGNATURE DATE

_____/_____
ADMINISTRATOR SIGNATURE DATE

_____/_____
ASSOCIATION REPRESENTATIVE DATE

_____/_____
SUPERINTENDENT SIGNATURE DATE

ADEQUATE IMPROVEMENT:

SHOWN _____

NOT SHOWN _____

_____/_____
TEACHER SIGNATURE DATE

_____/_____
ADMINISTRATOR SIGNATURE DATE

_____/_____
ASSOCIATION REPRESENTATIVE DATE

_____/_____
ADMINISTRATOR SIGNATURE DATE

_____/_____
SUPERINTENDENT SIGNATURE DATE

Cheektowaga-Sloan School District 15 Point conversion

HEDI Scale for Comparable Measures

Attachment for Questions 3.3 (Reference questions 3.1 and 3.2)

HEDI Scoring	Highly Effective		Effective						Developing					Ineffective		
	15	14	13	12	11	10	9	8	7	6	5	4	3	2	1	0
	89- 100%	76- 88%	72- 75%	68- 71%	64- 67%	60- 63%	55- 59%	51- 54%	46- 50%	41- 45%	36- 40%	31- 35%	26- 30%	17- 25%	9- 16%	0- 8%

Task 3.13 Local Achievement Measures-Teachers

CSUFSD Determined H.E.D.I. Scoring Scale for the SLO Process

In the 2012-13 academic year, each classroom teacher and building principals' annual professional performance review (APPR) will result in a single composite effectiveness score. For the state 20%, based on student growth (SLO) as well as the local 20% based on achievement (SLO) the district has adopted the following H.E.D.I. Scoring Scale to determine the 20 points assigned for meeting targets*:

		17	72-75%				
		16	68-71%				
		15	64-67%				
		14	61-63%	8	46-50%		
		13	59-60%	7	41-45%		
		12	57-58%	6	36-40%		
20	94-100%	11	55-56%	5	32-35%	2	19-25%
19	85-93%	10	53-54%	4	29-31%	1	9-18%
18	76-84%	9	51-52%	3	26-28%	0	0-8%
Highly Effective		Effective		Developing		Ineffective	
76-100%		51-75%		26-50%		0-25%	

*It is understood that the long term goal is for all students to reach and/or exceed proficiency standards. Student targets should be progressive steps towards that goal.

(Task 7.3)(from pp.8,9,10)

Conversion Chart: for those who do not receive a value added measure the state measure.

(To be used for the “State 20% conversion.)

% of Target met on SLO(s) (If there is more than one SLO, the percentages will be averaged and the average will be located in the following ranges:	# of points earned for Principal’s State measure	
80-100	20	Highly Effective
77-79	19	
75-76	18	
73-74	17	Effective
70-72	16	
68-69	15	
65-67	14	
63-64	13	
60-62	12	
58-59	11	
56-57	10	
55	9	
53-54	8	
50-52	7	
48-49	6	
45-47	5	
40-44	4	
38-39	3	
30-37	2	Ineffective
20-29	1	
0-19	0	

Conversion Chart: for those who do not receive a value added measure the state measure.

(To be used for the “Local 20 point conversion)

% of Effective/Highly Effective Teachers based upon success of SLOs.	# of points earned for Principal L.A.T.	
80-100	20	Highly Effective
77-79	19	
75-76	18	
73-74	17	Effective
70-72	16	
68-69	15	
65-67	14	
63-64	13	
60-62	12	
58-59	11	
56-57	10	
55	9	
53-54	8	
50-52	7	
48-49	6	
45-47	5	
40-44		
38-39	3	
30-37	2	Ineffective
20-29	1	
0-19	0	

L.A.T. Conversion Chart: for those who receive a value added measure for the state measure

(To be used for the “Local 15 point conversion)

% of Effective/Highly Effective Teachers based upon success of SLOs.	# of points earned for Principal L.A.T.	
89-100%	15	Highly Effective
76-88%	14	
72-75%	13	Effective
68-71%	12	
64-67%	11	
60-63%	10	
55-59%	9	
51-54%	8	
46-50%	7	
41-45%	6	
36-40%	5	
31-35%	4	
26-30%	3	
17-25%	2	Ineffective
9-16%	1	
0-8%	0	

(from page 21)

Cheektowaga Sloan UFSD
MPPR/NYS APPR Conversion Chart
Raw Score: MPPR ____/72 + Goal Setting Form ____/16

<i>MPPR +Goal Setting Raw Score</i>	<i>HEDI Score (out of 60)</i>	<i>HEDI Rounded Score</i>		<i>MPPR +Goal Setting Raw Score</i>	<i>HEDI Score (out of 60)</i>	<i>HEDI Rounded Score</i>
88	60	60		44	30	30
87	59.3	60		43	29.3	30
86	58.6	59		42	28.6	29
85	58	58		41	28	28
84	57.2	58		40	27.3	28
83	57	57		39	26.6	27
82	55.9	56		38	25.9	26
81	55.2	56		37	25.2	26
80	54.5	55		36	24.5	25
79	53.9	54		35	23.9	24
78	53.1	54		34	23.2	24
77	52.5	53		33	22.5	23
76	51.8	52		32	21.8	22
75	51.1	52		31	21.1	22
74	50.1	51		30	20.5	21
73	49.8	50		29	19.8	20
72	49	49		28	19.1	20
71	48.4	49		27	18.4	19
70	47.7	48		26	17.7	18
69	47	47		25	17	17
68	46.4	47		24	16.4	17
67	45.7	46		23	15.7	16
66	45	45		22	15	15
65	44.3	45		21	14.3	15
64	43.6	44		20	13.6	14
63	43	43		19	13	13
62	42.3	43		18	12.3	13
61	42	42		17	11.6	12
60	40.9	41		16	10.9	11
59	40.2	41		15	10.2	11
58	39.5	40		14	9.5	10
57	38.9	39		13	8.9	9
56	38.2	39		12	8.2	9
55	37.5	38		11	7.5	8
54	36.8	37		10	6.8	7
53	36.1	37		9	6.1	7
52	35.5	36		8	5.5	6
51	34.8	35		7	4.8	5
50	34.1	35		6	4.1	5
49	33.4	34		5	3.4	4
48	32.7	33		4	2.7	3
47	32	32		3	2	2
46	31.2	32		2	1.4	2
45	30.7	31		1	.7	1
				0	0	0

Converted Score: ____/60

(from page 23)

**Overall Rating for other measures: Highly Effective Effective Developing
Ineffective**

(circle one)

Performance Level	Points ranges negotiated (subject to negotiated revision should NYSED ranges change)
Highly Effective	50-60
Effective	35-49
Developing	20-34
Ineffective	0-19

Points Awarded 0-60: _____

(Task 8.1) L.A.T. Conversion Chart: for those who receive a value added measure for the state measure

(To be used for the ‘Local 15 point conversion)

% of Effective/Highly Effective Teachers based upon success of SLOs.	# of points earned for Principal L.A.T.	
89-100%	15	Highly Effective
76-88%	14	
72-75%	13	Effective
68-71%	12	
64-67%	11	
60-63%	10	
55-59%	9	
51-54%	8	
46-50%	7	
41-45%	6	
36-40%	5	
31-35%	4	
26-30%	3	
17-25%	2	Ineffective
9-16%	1	
0-8%	0	

(Task 8.2) Conversion Chart: for those who do not receive a value added measure the state measure.

(To be used for the ‘Local 20 point conversion)

% of Effective/Highly Effective Teachers based upon success of SLOs.	# of points earned for Principal L.A.T.	
80-100	20	Highly Effective
77-79	19	
75-76	18	
73-74	17	Effective
70-72	16	
68-69	15	
65-67	14	
63-64	13	
60-62	12	
58-59	11	
56-57	10	
55	9	
53-54	8	
50-52	7	
48-49	6	
45-47	5	
40-44		
38-39	3	
30-37	2	Ineffective
20-29	1	
0-19	0	

(Task 11.2) Principal Improvement Plan

NAME _____

SCHOOL BUILDING _____

ACADEMIC YEAR _____

Deficiency that promulgated the “Developing or Ineffective” performance rating:

Documentation that highlights areas of deficiency-

Improvement

Goal/Outcome: _____

Action Steps/Activities:

Timeline for

completion: _____

Required and Accessible Resources (including responsibility for provision): _____

Date(s) for formative evaluation on progress (lead evaluator and principal initial each date to confirm the meeting):

December _____

March _____

Other if needed _____

Evidence of Goal Achievement:

Principal Signature: _____

Date: _____

Lead Evaluator Signature: _____

Date: _____

(Task 9.7) (from page 21)

**Cheektowaga Sloan UFSD
MPPR/NYS APPR Conversion Chart**

Raw Score: MPPR ____/72 + Goal Setting Form ____/16

<i>MPPR +Goal Setting Raw Score</i>	<i>HEDI Score (out of 60)</i>	<i>HEDI Rounded Score</i>		<i>MPPR +Goal Setting Raw Score</i>	<i>HEDI Score (out of 60)</i>	<i>HEDI Rounded Score</i>
88	60	60		44	30	30
87	59.3	60		43	29.3	30
86	58.6	59		42	28.6	29
85	58	58		41	28	28
84	57.2	58		40	27.3	28
83	57	57		39	26.6	27
82	55.9	56		38	25.9	26
81	55.2	56		37	25.2	26
80	54.5	55		36	24.5	25
79	53.9	54		35	23.9	24
78	53.1	54		34	23.2	24
77	52.5	53		33	22.5	23
76	51.8	52		32	21.8	22
75	51.1	52		31	21.1	22
74	50.1	51		30	20.5	21
73	49.8	50		29	19.8	20
72	49	49		28	19.1	20
71	48.4	49		27	18.4	19
70	47.7	48		26	17.7	18
69	47	47		25	17	17
68	46.4	47		24	16.4	17
67	45.7	46		23	15.7	16
66	45	45		22	15	15
65	44.3	45		21	14.3	15
64	43.6	44		20	13.6	14
63	43	43		19	13	13
62	42.3	43		18	12.3	13
61	42	42		17	11.6	12
60	40.9	41		16	10.9	11
59	40.2	41		15	10.2	11
58	39.5	40		14	9.5	10
57	38.9	39		13	8.9	9
56	38.2	39		12	8.2	9
55	37.5	38		11	7.5	8
54	36.8	37		10	6.8	7
53	36.1	37		9	6.1	7
52	35.5	36		8	5.5	6
51	34.8	35		7	4.8	5
50	34.1	35		6	4.1	5
49	33.4	34		5	3.4	4
48	32.7	33		4	2.7	3
47	32	32		3	2	2
46	31.2	32		2	1.4	2
45	30.7	31		1	.7	1
				0	0	0

Converted Score: ____/60

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

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

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

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

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

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

Signatures, dates

Superintendent Signature: Date:

Andrew L. Salenoki 1/10/13

Teachers Union President Signature: Date:

Stefanie Smout 1/10/2013

Administrative Union President Signature: Date:

Kevin Lepore 1-10-2013

Board of Education President Signature: Date: 1. 10 - 13

Mary H. S. [Signature]