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 4, 2013

Dr. Pamela Kissel, Superintendent
Churchville-Chili Central School District
139 Fairbanks Road
Churchville, NY 14428

Dear Superintendent Kissel:

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: Jo Anne Antonacci

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 Monday, June 04, 2012
Updated Monday, December 17, 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 :

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

261501060000

1.2) School District Name:

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

CHURCHVILLE-CHILI CSD

1.3) School Improvement Grant (SIG) Districts Only

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

Not applicable

1.4) Award Classification

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

(No response)

1.5) Assurances

Please check all of the boxes below:

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

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

Re-submission to address deficiencies

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

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

Annual (2012-13)

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

Created Monday, June 04, 2012
Updated Wednesday, December 26, 2012

Page 1

STATE-PROVIDED MEASURES OF STUDENT GROWTH

(25 points with an approved value-added measure)

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

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

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

2.1) Assurances

Please check the boxes below:

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

STUDENT LEARNING OBJECTIVES AS COMPARABLE GROWTH MEASURES (20 points)

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

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

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

If no State assessment or Regents exam exists:

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

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

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

State assessments, *required if one exists*

List of State-approved 3rd party assessments

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

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

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

2.2) Grades K-3 ELA

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

	ELA	Assessment
K	District, regional, or BOCES-developed assessment	Monroe 2 BOCES Regionally developed Grade Kindergarten ELA assessment
1	District, regional, or BOCES-developed assessment	Monroe 2 BOCES Regionally developed Grade 1 ELA assessment
2	District, regional, or BOCES-developed assessment	Monroe 2 BOCES Regionally developed Grade 2 ELA assessment

	ELA	Assessment
3	State assessment	3rd Grade State Assessment

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

Use this box, if needed, to describe the general process for assigning HEDI categories for these grades/subjects in this subcomponent. If needed, you may upload a table or graphic at 2.11, below.	Points are assigned based on percentage of teacher's students achieving individual growth targets. Students will take a Monroe 2 BOCES regionally developed pre-assessment. Results from the pre-assessment and other pertinent student data will be analyzed by both the teacher and lead evaluator (administrator) to set SLO targets. Students will take a post (summary) assessment developed regionally with Monroe 2 BOCES or State Assessment/Regents (where one exists) at the end of the course. These results will be used to determine students' academic growth. See attached document at 2.11
Highly Effective (18 - 20 points) Results are well-above state average for similar students (or District goals if no state test).	Highly Effective – 94% of students or more will meet or exceed their target goal on the summative assessment
Effective (9 - 17 points) Results meet state average for similar students (or District goals if no state test).	Effective –80-93% of students or more will meet or exceed their target goal on the summative assessment
Developing (3 - 8 points) Results are below state average for similar students (or District goals if no state test).	Developing – 65-79% of students or more will meet or exceed their target goal on the summative assessment
Ineffective (0 - 2 points) Results are well-below state average for similar students (or District goals if no state test).	Ineffective – 0-64% of students or more will meet or exceed their target goal on the summative assessment

2.3) Grades K-3 Math

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

	Math	Assessment
K	District, regional, or BOCES-developed assessment	Monroe 2 BOCES Regionally developed Grade Kindergarten Math assessment
1	District, regional, or BOCES-developed assessment	Monroe 2 BOCES Regionally developed Grade 1 Math assessment
2	District, regional, or BOCES-developed assessment	Monroe 2 BOCES Regionally developed Grade 2 Math assessment

	Math	Assessment
3	State assessment	3rd Grade State Assessment

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

Use this box, if needed, to describe the general process for assigning HEDI categories for these grades/subjects in this subcomponent. If needed, you may upload a table or graphic at 2.11, below.	Points are assigned based on percentage of teacher's students achieving individual growth targets. Students will take a Monroe 2 BOCES regionally developed pre-assessment. Results from the pre-assessment and other pertinent student data will be analyzed by both the teacher and lead evaluator (administrator) to set SLO targets. Students will take a post (summary) assessment developed regionally with Monroe 2 BOCES or State Assessment/Regents (where one exists) at the end of the

	course. These results will be used to determine students' academic growth. See attached document at 2.11
Highly Effective (18 - 20 points) Results are well-above state average for similar students (or District goals if no state test).	Highly Effective – 94% of students or more will meet or exceed their target goal on the summative assessment
Effective (9 - 17 points) Results meet state average for similar students (or District goals if no state test).	Effective –80-93% of students or more will meet or exceed their target goal on the summative assessment
Developing (3 - 8 points) Results are below state average for similar students (or District goals if no state test).	Developing – 65-79% of students or more will meet or exceed their target goal on the summative assessment
Ineffective (0 - 2 points) Results are well-below state average for similar students (or District goals if no state test).	Ineffective – 0-64% of students or more will meet or exceed their target goal on the summative assessment

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	Monroe 2 BOCES Regionally developed Grade 6 Science assessment
7	District, regional or BOCES-developed assessment	Monroe 2 BOCES Regionally 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.	Points are assigned based on percentage of teacher's students achieving individual growth targets. Students will take a Monroe 2 BOCES regionally developed pre-assessment. Results from the pre-assessment and other pertinent student data will be analyzed by both the teacher and lead evaluator (administrator) to set SLO targets. Students will take a post (summary) assessment developed regionally with Monroe 2 BOCES or State Assessment/Regents (where one exists) at the end of the course. These results will be used to determine students' academic growth. See attached document at 2.11
Highly Effective (18 - 20 points) Results are well-above state average for similar students (or District goals if no state test).	Highly Effective – 94% of students or more will meet or exceed their target goal on the summative assessment
Effective (9 - 17 points) Results meet state average for similar students (or District goals if no state test).	Effective –80-93% of students or more will meet or exceed their target goal on the summative assessment
Developing (3 - 8 points) Results are below state average for similar students (or District goals if no state test).	Developing – 65-79% of students or more will meet or exceed their target goal on the summative assessment

Ineffective (0 - 2 points) Results are well-below state average for similar students (or District goals if no state test).	Ineffective – 0-64% of students or more will meet or exceed their target goal on the summative assessment

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	Monroe 2 BOCES Regionally developed Grade 6 Social Studies assessment
7	District, regional or BOCES-developed assessment	Monroe 2 BOCES Regionally developed Grade 7 Social Studies assessment
8	District, regional or BOCES-developed assessment	Monroe 2 BOCES Regionally developed Grade 8 Socal 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.	Points are assigned based on percentage of teacher's students achieving individual growth targets. Students will take a Monroe 2 BOCES regionally developed pre-assessment. Results from the pre-assessment and other pertinent student data will be analyzed by both the teacher and lead evaluator (administrator) to set SLO targets. Students will take a post (summary) assessment developed regionally with Monroe 2 BOCES or State Assessment/Regents (where one exists) at the end of the course. These results will be used to determine students' academic growth. See attached document at 2.11
Highly Effective (18 - 20 points) Results are well-above District goals for similar students.	Highly Effective – 94% of students or more will meet or exceed their target goal on the summative assessment
Effective (9 - 17 points) Results meet District goals for similar students.	Effective –80-93% of students or more will meet or exceed their target goal on the summative assessment
Developing (3 - 8 points) Results are below District goals for similar students.	Developing – 65-79% of students or more will meet or exceed their target goal on the summative assessment
Ineffective (0 - 2 points) Results are well-below District goals for similar students.	Ineffective – 0-64% of students or more will meet or exceed their target goal on the summative assessment

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	Monroe 2 BOCES Regionally developed Global 1 assessment

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

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

Use this box, if needed, to describe the general process for assigning HEDI categories for these grades/subjects in this subcomponent. If needed, you may upload a table or graphic at 2.11, below.	Points are assigned based on percentage of teacher's students achieving individual growth targets. Students will take a Monroe 2 BOCES regionally developed pre-assessment. Results from the pre-assessment and other pertinent student data will be analyzed by both the teacher and lead evaluator (administrator) to set SLO targets. Students will take a post (summary) assessment developed regionally with Monroe 2 BOCES or State Assessment/Regents (where one exists) at the end of the course. These results will be used to determine students' academic growth. See attached document at 2.11
Highly Effective (18 - 20 points) Results are well-above District goals for similar students.	Highly Effective – 94% of students or more will meet or exceed their target goal on the summative assessment
Effective (9 - 17 points) Results meet District goals for similar students.	Effective –80-93% of students or more will meet or exceed their target goal on the summative assessment
Developing (3 - 8 points) Results are below District goals for similar students.	Developing – 65-79% of students or more will meet or exceed their target goal on the summative assessment
Ineffective (0 - 2 points) Results are well-below District goals for similar students.	Ineffective – 0-64% of students or more will meet or exceed their target goal on the summative assessment

2.7) High School Science Regents Courses

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

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

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

For High School Science Regents Courses: describe the district-adopted expectations for the level of performance required for each HEDI rating category and the process for assigning points to teachers based on SLO results consistent with regulations and assurances

in the Comparable Growth Measures subcomponent. Include any district-determined expectations for student performance.

Use this box, if needed, to describe the general process for assigning HEDI categories for these grades/subjects in this subcomponent. If needed, you may upload a table or graphic at 2.11, below.	Points are assigned based on percentage of teacher's students achieving individual growth targets. Students will take a Monroe 2 BOCES regionally developed pre-assessment. Results from the pre-assessment and other pertinent student data will be analyzed by both the teacher and lead evaluator (administrator) to set SLO targets. Students will take a post (summary) assessment developed regionally with Monroe 2 BOCES or State Assessment/Regents (where one exists) at the end of the course. These results will be used to determine students' academic growth. See attached document at 2.11
Highly Effective (18 - 20 points) Results are well-above District goals for similar students.	Highly Effective – 94% of students or more will meet or exceed their target goal on the summative assessment
Effective (9 - 17 points) Results meet District goals for similar students.	Effective –80-93% of students or more will meet or exceed their target goal on the summative assessment
Developing (3 - 8 points) Results are below District goals for similar students.	Developing – 65-79% of students or more will meet or exceed their target goal on the summative assessment
Ineffective (0 - 2 points) Results are well-below District goals for similar students.	Ineffective – 0-64% of students or more will meet or exceed their target goal on the summative assessment

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.	Points are assigned based on percentage of teacher's students achieving individual growth targets. Students will take a Monroe 2 BOCES regionally developed pre-assessment. Results from the pre-assessment and other pertinent student data will be analyzed by both the teacher and lead evaluator (administrator) to set SLO targets. Students will take a post (summary) assessment developed regionally with Monroe 2 BOCES or State Assessment/Regents (where one exists) at the end of the course. These results will be used to determine students' academic growth. See attached document at 2.11
Highly Effective (18 - 20 points) Results are well-above District goals for similar students.	Highly Effective – 94% of students or more will meet or exceed their target goal on the summative assessment

Effective (9 - 17 points) Results meet District goals for similar students.	Effective –80-93% of students or more will meet or exceed their target goal on the summative assessment
Developing (3 - 8 points) Results are below District goals for similar students.	Developing – 65-79% of students or more will meet or exceed their target goal on the summative assessment
Ineffective (0 - 2 points) Results are well-below District goals for similar students.	Ineffective – 0-64% of students or more will meet or exceed their target goal on the summative assessment

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	Monroe 2 BOCES Regionally developed Grade 9 ELA assessment
Grade 10 ELA	District, regional or BOCES-developed assessment	Monroe 2 BOCES Regionally developed Grade 10 assessment
Grade 11 ELA	Regents assessment	NYS ELA Regents Assessment 11

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

Use this box, if needed, to describe the general process for assigning HEDI categories for these grades/subjects in this subcomponent. If needed, you may upload a table or graphic at 2.11, below.	Points are assigned based on percentage of teacher's students achieving individual growth targets. Students will take a Monroe 2 BOCES regionally developed pre-assessment. Results from the pre-assessment and other pertinent student data will be analyzed by both the teacher and lead evaluator (administrator) to set SLO targets. Students will take a post (summary) assessment developed regionally with Monroe 2 BOCES or State Assessment/Regents (where one exists) at the end of the course. These results will be used to determine students' academic growth. See attached document at 2.11
Highly Effective (18 - 20 points) Results are well-above District goals for similar students.	Highly Effective – 94% of students or more will meet or exceed their target goal on the summative assessment
Effective (9 - 17 points) Results meet District goals for similar students.	Effective –80-93% of students or more will meet or exceed their target goal on the summative assessment
Developing (3 - 8 points) Results are below District goals for similar students.	Developing – 65-79% of students or more will meet or exceed their target goal on the summative assessment
Ineffective (0 - 2 points) Results are well-below District goals for similar students.	Ineffective – 0-64% of students or more will meet or exceed their target goal on the summative assessment

2.10) All Other Courses

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

Course(s) or Subject(s)	Option	Assessment
K-8 Art	District, Regional or BOCES-developed	Monroe 2 BOCES -regionally developed - grades K-8 Art assessment
K-8 Music	District, Regional or BOCES-developed	Monroe 2 BOCES -regionally developed - grades K-8 Music assessment
K-12 Physical Education	District, Regional or BOCES-developed	Monroe 2 BOCES -regionally developed -grades K-12 Physical Education assessment
9-12 Dance	District, Regional or BOCES-developed	CCCSD District developed - grades 9-12 Dance assessment
K-4 Library	School/BOCES-wide/group/team results based on State	NYS ELA grades 3, 4 Assessment
Grade 6 Library	School/BOCES-wide/group/team results based on State	NYS ELA grade 6 Assessment
7-8 Gateway To Technology	District, Regional or BOCES-developed	Monroe 2 BOCES -regionally developed - Electronics, Robotics, Science of Technology and Design and Modeling assessment
7-8 Family and Consumer Science	District, Regional or BOCES-developed	Monroe 2 BOCES -regionally developed - Career Explorations, Nutrition, and Home Environment assessment
K-2 Literacy Intervention Teachers	District, Regional or BOCES-developed	Monroe 2 BOCES -regionally developed - grades K, 1, 2 ELA assessment
K-2 ESL Teachers	District, Regional or BOCES-developed	Monroe 2 BOCES -regionally developed - grades K, 1, 2 ELA assessment
K-2 Intervention Teachers	District, Regional or BOCES-developed	Monroe 2 BOCES -regionally developed - grades K, 1, 2 ELA assessment
3-8 Intervention Teachers	School/BOCES-wide/group/team results based on State	NYS Math Assessment - grades 5, 6, 7, 8 ELA and Math assessment
3-4 ESL Teachers	State Assessment	NYS ELA grades 3, 4 Assessment; NYSESLAT
Health 6, 9-12	District, Regional or BOCES-developed	Monroe 2 BOCES Regionally developed 9-12 Health assessment
French 7, 8	District, Regional or BOCES-developed	Monroe 2 BOCES Regionally developed grades 7, 8 French assessment
Spanish 7, 8	District, Regional or BOCES-developed	Monroe 2 BOCES Regionally developed grades 7, 8 Spanish assessment
Participation in Government	District, Regional or BOCES-developed	Monroe 2 BOCES Regionally developed -Participation in Government assessment
Wildlife Ecology	District, Regional or BOCES-developed	Monroe 2 BOCES Regionally developed -Wildlife Ecology assessment
5-12 ESL	School/BOCES-wide/group/team results based on State	NYS grade 5 ELA Assessment; grade 11 NYS ELA assessment
English 12	District, Regional or BOCES-developed	Monroe 2 BOCES Regionally developed - grade 12 English assessment

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

Use this box, if needed, to describe the general process for assigning HEDI categories for these grades/subjects in this subcomponent. If needed, you may upload a table or graphic at 2.11, below.	Points are assigned based on percentage of teacher's students achieving individual growth targets. Students will take a Monroe 2 BOCES regionally developed pre-assessment. Results from the pre-assessment and other pertinent student data will be analyzed by both the teacher and lead evaluator (administrator) to set SLO targets. Students will take a post (summary) assessment developed regionally with Monroe 2 BOCES or State Assessment/Regents (where one exists) at the end of the course. These results will be used to determine students' academic growth. See attached document at 2.11
Highly Effective (18 - 20 points) Results are well-above District goals for similar students.	Highly Effective – 94% of students or more will meet or exceed their target goal on the summative assessment
Effective (9 - 17 points) Results meet District goals for similar students.	Effective –80-93% of students or more will meet or exceed their target goal on the summative assessment
Developing (3 - 8 points) Results are below District goals for similar students.	Developing – 65-79% of students or more will meet or exceed their target goal on the summative assessment
Ineffective (0 - 2 points) Results are well-below District goals for similar students.	Ineffective – 0-64% of students or more will meet or exceed their target goal on the summative assessment

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)

assets/survey-uploads/5364/138508-avH4IQNZMh/CCCSD Review Room Form_2_10_All_Other_Courses1_2.docx

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/5364/138508-TXEtxx9bQW/CCCSD Review Room HEDI Rating-20.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 Controls

2.13) Teachers with more than one growth measure

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

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

2.14) Assurances

Please check all of the boxes below:

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

3. Local Measures (Teachers)

Created Monday, June 04, 2012
Updated Wednesday, December 26, 2012

Page 1

Locally Selected Measures of Student Achievement or Growth

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

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

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

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

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

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

Growth or achievement measure(s) from these options.

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

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

Measures based on:

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

3.1) Grades 4-8 ELA

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

	Locally-Selected Measure from List of Approved Measures	Assessment
4	6(ii) School wide measure computed locally	NYS Grade 4 ELA and Math Assessment
5	6(ii) School wide measure computed locally	NYS Grade 6, 7, 8 ELA and Math Assessment
6	6(ii) School wide measure computed locally	NYS Grade 6, 7, 8 ELA and Math Assessment

7	6(ii) School wide measure computed locally	NYS Grade 6, 7, 8 ELA and Math Assessment
8	6(ii) School wide measure computed locally	NYS Grade 6,7, 8 ELA and Math 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.	For teachers of grade 4, the average percentage of students that achieve level 3 4 on Grades 4 ELA and Math; For teachers of grades 5, 6, 7, 8, the average percentage of students that achieve level 3 4 on grades 6, 7 8 ELA and Math NYS assessments. Each calculated using the attached 0-100 conversion chart. The Grade 4 ELA and Math, as well as grades 6, 7, 8 ELA and Math, will be averaged using equal weight. See attached document at 3.3 below
Highly Effective (14 - 15 points) Results are well above District- or BOCES-adopted expectations for growth or achievement for grade/subject.	60-100% Average of Levels 3 4 on ELA Math grades 4 -for grade 4 teachers; Average of Levels 3 4 on ELA Math grades 6, 7 8 for grade 5, 6, 7, 8 teachers (all equal weight)
Effective (8- 13 points) Results meet District- or BOCES-adopted expectations for growth or achievement for grade/subject.	50-59% Average of Levels 3 4 on ELA Math grades 4 -for grade 4 teachers; Average of Levels 3 4 on ELA Math grades 6, 7 8 for grade 5, 6, 7, 8 teachers (all equal weight)
Developing (3 - 7 points) Results are below District- or BOCES-adopted expectations for growth or achievement for grade/subject.	40-49% Average of Levels 3 4 on ELA Math grades 4 -for grade 4 teachers; Average of Levels 3 4 on ELA Math grades 6, 7 8 for grade 5, 6, 7, 8 teachers (all equal weight))
Ineffective (0 - 2 points) Results are well below District- or BOCES-adopted expectations for growth or achievement for grade/subject.	0-39% Average of Levels 3 4 on ELA Math grades 4 -for grade 4 teachers; Average of Levels 3 4 on ELA Math grades 6, 7 8 for grade 5, 6, 7, 8 teachers (all equal weight)

3.2) Grades 4-8 Math

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

	Locally-Selected Measure from List of Approved Measures	Assessment
4	6(ii) School wide measure computed locally	NYS Grade 4 ELA and Math Assessment
5	6(ii) School wide measure computed locally	NYS Grade 6, 7 8 ELA and Math Assessment
6	6(ii) School wide measure computed locally	NYS Grade 6, 7 8 ELA and Math Assessment
7	6(ii) School wide measure computed locally	NYS Grade 6, 7 8 ELA and Math Assessment

8	6(ii) School wide measure computed locally	NYS Grade 6, 7, 8 ELA and 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.	For teachers of grade 4, the average percentage of students that achieve level 3 4 on Grades 4 ELA and Math; For teachers of grades 5, 6, 7, 8, the average percentage of students that achieve level 3 4 on grades 6, 7 8 ELA and Math NYS assessments. Each calculated using the attached 0-100 conversion chart. The Grade 4 ELA and Math, as well as grades 6, 7, 8 ELA and Math, will be averaged using equal weight. See attached document at 3.3 below
Highly Effective (14 - 15 points) Results are well above District- or BOCES-adopted expectations for growth or achievement for grade/subject.	60-100% Average of Levels 3 4 on ELA Math grades 4 -for grade 4 teachers; Average of Levels 3 4 on ELA Math grades 6, 7 8 for grade 5, 6, 7, 8 teachers (all equal weight)
Effective (8- 13 points) Results meet District- or BOCES-adopted expectations for growth or achievement for grade/subject.	50-59% Average of Levels 3 4 on ELA Math grades 4 -for grade 4 teachers; Average of Levels 3 4 on ELA Math grades 6, 7 8 for grade 5, 6, 7, 8 teachers (all equal weight)
Developing (3 - 7 points) Results are below District- or BOCES-adopted expectations for growth or achievement for grade/subject.	40-49% Average of Levels 3 4 on ELA Math grades 4 -for grade 4 teachers; Average of Levels 3 4 on ELA Math grades 6, 7 8 for grade 5, 6, 7, 8 teachers (all equal weight)
Ineffective (0 - 2 points) Results are well below District- or BOCES-adopted expectations for growth or achievement for grade/subject.	0-39% Average of Levels 3 4 on ELA Math grades 4 -for grade 4 teachers; Average of Levels 3 4 on ELA Math grades 6, 7 8 for grade 5, 6, 7, 8 teachers (all equal weight)

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/5139/138514-rhJdBgDruP/CCCSD Review Room HEDI Rating-Value Added 15.docx

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

Growth or achievement measure(s) from these options.

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

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

Measures based on:

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

3.4) Grades K-3 ELA

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

	Locally-Selected Measure from List of Approved Measures	Assessment
K	6(ii) School-wide measure computed locally	NYS Grade 4 ELA and Math Assessment
1	6(ii) School-wide measure computed locally	NYS Grade 4 ELA and Math Assessment
2	6(ii) School-wide measure computed locally	NYS Grade 4 ELA and Math Assessment
3	6(ii) School-wide measure computed locally	NYS Grade 4 ELA and Math 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.	For teachers of grades K-3, the average percentage of students that achieve level 3 4 on Grades 4 ELA and Math; Each calculated using the attached 0-100 conversion chart. The Grade 4 ELA and Math will be averaged using equal weight. See attached document at 3.3 below
Highly Effective (18-20 points) Results are well above District- or BOCES-adopted expectations for growth or achievement for grade/subject.	71-100% Average percentage of students that achieve levels 3 4 on grade 4 ELA Math grades 4 -for grades K-3 teachers; (all equal weight)
Effective (9-17 points) Results meet District- or BOCES-adopted expectations for growth or achievement for grade/subject.	57-70% Average percentage of students that achieve levels 3 4 on grade 4 ELA Math grades 4 -for grades K-3 teachers; (all equal weight)
Developing (3 - 8 points) Results are below District- or BOCES-adopted expectations for growth or achievement for grade/subject.	40-56% Average percentage of students that achieve levels 3 4 on grade 4 ELA Math grades 4 -for grades K-3 teachers; (all equal weight)
Ineffective (0 - 2 points) Results are well below District- or BOCES-adopted expectations for growth or achievement for grade/subject.	0-39% Average percentage of students that achieve levels 3 4 on grade 4 ELA Math grades 4 -for grades K-3 teachers; (all equal weight)

3.5) Grades K-3 Math

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

	Locally-Selected Measure from List of Approved Measures	Assessment
K	6(ii) School-wide measure computed locally	NYS Grade 4 ELA and Math Assessment
1	6(ii) School-wide measure computed locally	NYS Grade 4 ELA and Math Assessment
2	6(ii) School-wide measure computed locally	NYS Grade 4 ELA and Math Assessment
3	6(ii) School-wide measure computed locally	NYS Grade 4 ELA and 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.	For teachers of grades K-3, the average percentage of students that achieve level 3 4 on Grades 4 ELA and Math; Each calculated using the attached 0-100 conversion chart. The Grade 4 ELA and Math will be averaged using equal weight. See attached document at 3.3 below
Highly Effective (18-20 points) Results are well above District- or BOCES-adopted expectations for growth or achievement for grade/subject.	71-100% Average percentage of students that achieve levels 3 4 on grade 4 ELA Math grades 4 -for grades K-3 teachers; (all equal weight)
Effective (9-17 points) Results meet District- or BOCES-adopted expectations for growth or achievement for grade/subject.	57-70% Average percentage of students that achieve levels 3 4 on grade 4 ELA Math grades 4 -for grades K-3 teachers; (all equal weight)
Developing (3 - 8 points) Results are below District -or BOCES-adopted expectations for growth or achievement for grade/subject.	40-56% Average percentage of students that achieve levels 3 4 on grade 4 ELA Math grades 4 -for grades K-3 teachers; (all equal weight)
Ineffective (0 - 2 points) Results are well below District- or BOCES-adopted expectations for growth or achievement for grade/subject.	0-39% Average percentage of students that achieve levels 3 4 on grade 4 ELA Math grades 4 -for grades K-3 teachers; (all equal weight)

3.6) Grades 6-8 Science

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

	Locally-Selected Measure from List of Approved Measures	Assessment
6	6(ii) School wide measure computed locally	NYS Grades 6, 7, 8 ELA and Math Assessment
7	6(ii) School wide measure computed locally	NYS Grades 6, 7, 8 ELA and Math Assessment
8	6(ii) School wide measure computed locally	NYS Grades 6, 7, 8 ELA and Math 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.	For science teachers of grades 6, 7, 8, the average percentage of students that achieve level 3 4 on grades 6, 7 8 ELA and Math NYS assessments. Each calculated using the attached 0-100 conversion chart. The grades 6, 7, 8 ELA and Math will be averaged using equal weight. See attached document at 3.3 below
Highly Effective (18 - 20 points) Results are well above District- or BOCES-adopted expectations for growth or achievement for grade/subject.	71-100% Average percentage of students that achieve levels 3 4 on grades 6, 7 8 ELA Math for grades 6-8 science teachers; (all equal weight)

Effective (9 - 17 points) Results meet District- or BOCES-adopted expectations for growth or achievement for grade/subject.	57-70% Average percentage of students that achieve levels 3 4 on grades 6, 7 8 ELA Math for grades 6-8 science teachers; (all equal weight)
Developing (3 - 8 points) Results are below District- or BOCES-adopted expectations for growth or achievement for grade/subject.	40-56% Average percentage of students that achieve levels 3 4 on grades 6, 7 8 ELA Math for grades 6-8 science teachers; (all equal weight)
Ineffective (0 - 2 points) Results are well below District- or BOCES-adopted expectations for growth or achievement for grade/subject.	0-39% Average percentage of students that achieve levels 3 4 on grades 6, 7 8 ELA Math for grades 6-8 science teachers; (all equal weight)

3.7) Grades 6-8 Social Studies

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

	Locally-Selected Measure from List of Approved Measures	Assessment
6	6(ii) School wide measure computed locally	NYS Grades 6, 7, 8 ELA and Math Assessment
7	6(ii) School wide measure computed locally	NYS Grades 6, 7, 8 ELA and Math Assessment
8	6(ii) School wide measure computed locally	NYS Grades 6, 7, 8 ELA and Math 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.	For social studies teachers of grades 6, 7, 8, the average percentage of students that achieve level 3 4 on grades 6, 7 8 ELA and Math NYS assessments. Each calculated using the attached 0-100 conversion chart. The grades 6, 7, 8 ELA and Math will be averaged using equal weight. See attached document at 3.3 below
Highly Effective (18 - 20 points) Results are well above District- or BOCES-adopted expectations for growth or achievement for grade/subject.	71-100% Average percentage of students that achieve levels 3 4 on grades 6, 7 8 ELA Math for grades 6-8 social studies teachers; (all equal weight)
Effective (9 - 17 points) Results meet District- or BOCES-adopted expectations for growth or achievement for grade/subject.	57-70% Average percentage of students that achieve levels 3 4 on grades 6, 7 8 ELA Math for grades 6-8 social studies teachers; (all equal weight)
Developing (3 - 8 points) Results are below District- or BOCES-adopted expectations for growth or achievement for grade/subject.	40-56% Average percentage of students that achieve levels 3 4 on grades 6, 7 8 ELA Math for grades 6-8 social studies teachers; (all equal weight)
Ineffective (0 - 2 points) Results are well below District- or BOCES-adopted expectations for growth or achievement for grade/subject.	0-39% Average percentage of students that achieve levels 3 4 on grades 6, 7 8 ELA Math for grades 6-8 social studies teachers; (all equal weight)

3.8) High School Social Studies

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

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

	Locally-Selected Measure from List of Approved Measures	Assessment
Global 1	6(ii) School wide measure computed locally	The average of the (5) Regents exams: Algebra, Living Environment, Global, ELA 11, US History Gov't
Global 2	6(ii) School wide measure computed locally	The average of the (5) Regents exams: Algebra, Living Environment, Global, ELA 11, US History Gov't
American History	6(ii) School wide measure computed locally	The average of the (5) Regents exams: Algebra, Living Environment, Global, ELA 11, US History Gov't

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.	The average of five Regents exams necessary for graduation will be calculated using the attached 0-100 conversion chart. The five Regents used will be Algebra 1, Global History, US History, English 11, and Living Environment. These are the gate keeper Regents exams to graduation. Proficiency constitutes a 65. See attached document at 3.13 below
Highly Effective (18 - 20 points) Results are well above District- or BOCES-adopted expectations for growth or achievement for grade/subject.	An 85-100 average of all five 2013 Regents exams listed above will be considered highly effective (see attached chart).
Effective (9 - 17 points) Results meet District- or BOCES-adopted expectations for growth or achievement for grade/subject.	An 65-84 average of all five 2013 Regents exams listed above will be considered highly effective (see attached chart).
Developing (3 - 8 points) Results are below District- or BOCES-adopted expectations for growth or achievement for grade/subject.	An 55-64 average of all five 2013 Regents exams listed above will be considered highly effective (see attached chart).
Ineffective (0 - 2 points) Results are well below District- or BOCES-adopted expectations for growth or achievement for grade/subject.	An 0-54 average of all five 2013 Regents exams listed above will be considered highly effective (see attached chart).

3.9) High School Science

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

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

	Locally-Selected Measure from List of Approved Measures	Assessment
Living Environment	6(ii) School wide measure computed locally	The average of the (5) Regents exams: Algebra, Living Environment, Global, ELA 11, US History Gov't
Earth Science	6(ii) School wide measure computed locally	The average of the (5) Regents exams: Algebra, Living Environment, Global, ELA 11, US History Gov't
Chemistry	6(ii) School wide measure computed locally	The average of the (5) Regents exams: Algebra, Living Environment, Global, ELA 11, US History Gov't
Physics	6(ii) School wide measure computed locally	The average of the (5) Regents exams: Algebra, Living Environment, Global, ELA 11, US History Gov't

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.	The average of five Regents exams necessary for graduation will be calculated using the attached 0-100 conversion chart. The five Regents used will be Algebra 1, Global History, US History, English 11, and Living Environment. These are the gate keeper Regents exams to graduation. Proficiency constitutes a 65. See attached document at 3.13 below
Highly Effective (18-20 points) Results are well above District- or BOCES-adopted expectations for growth or achievement for grade/subject.	An 85-100 average of all five 2013 Regents exams listed above will be considered highly effective (see attached chart).
Developing (3 - 8 points) Results are below District- or BOCES-adopted expectations for growth or achievement for grade/subject.	An 65-84 average of all five 2013 Regents exams listed above will be considered effective (see attached chart).
Effective (9 - 17points) Results meet District- or BOCES-adopted expectations for growth or achievement for grade/subject.	An 55-64 average of all five 2013 Regents exams listed above will be considered developing (see attached chart).
Ineffective (0 - 2 points) Results are well below District- or BOCES-adopted expectations for growth or achievement for grade/subject.	An 0-54 average of all five 2013 Regents exams listed above will be considered ineffective (see attached chart).

3.10) High School Math

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

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

	Locally-Selected Measure from List of Approved Measures	Assessment

Algebra 1	6(ii) School wide measure computed locally	The average of the (5) Regents exams: Algebra, Living Environment, Global, ELA 11, US History Gov't
Geometry	6(ii) School wide measure computed locally	The average of the (5) Regents exams: Algebra, Living Environment, Global, ELA 11, US History Gov't
Algebra 2	6(ii) School wide measure computed locally	The average of the (5) Regents exams: Algebra, Living Environment, Global, ELA 11, US History Gov't

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.	The average of five Regents exams necessary for graduation will be calculated using the attached 0-100 conversion chart. The five Regents used will be Algebra 1, Global History, US History, English 11, and Living Environment. These are the gate keeper Regents exams to graduation. Proficiency constitutes a 65. See attached document at 3.13 below
Highly Effective (18 - 20 points) Results are well above District- or BOCES-adopted expectations for growth or achievement for grade/subject.	An 85-100 average of all five 2013 Regents exams listed above will be considered highly effective (see attached chart).
Effective (9 - 17 points) Results meet District- or BOCES-adopted expectations for growth or achievement for grade/subject.	An 65-84 average of all five 2013 Regents exams listed above will be considered effective (see attached chart).
Developing (3 - 8 points) Results are below District- or BOCES-adopted expectations for growth or achievement for grade/subject.	An 55-64 average of all five 2013 Regents exams listed above will be considered developing (see attached chart).
Ineffective (0 - 2 points) Results are well below District- or BOCES-adopted expectations for growth or achievement for grade/subject.	An 0-54 average of all five 2013 Regents exams listed above will be considered ineffective (see attached chart).

3.11) High School English Language Arts

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

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

	Locally-Selected Measure from List of Approved Measures	Assessment
Grade 9 ELA	6(ii) School wide measure computed locally	The average of the (5) Regents exams: Algebra, Living Environment, Global, ELA 11, US History Gov't
Grade 10 ELA	6(ii) School wide measure computed locally	The average of the (5) Regents exams: Algebra, Living Environment, Global, ELA 11, US History Gov't

Grade 11 ELA	6(ii) School wide measure computed locally	The average of the (5) Regents exams: Algebra, Living Environment, Global, ELA 11, US History Gov't

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

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

Use this box, if needed, to describe the general process for assigning HEDI categories for these grades/subjects in this subcomponent. If needed, you may upload a table or graphic at 3.13, below.	The average of five Regents exams necessary for graduation will be calculated using the attached 0-100 conversion chart. The five Regents used will be Algebra 1, Global History, US History, English 11, and Living Environment. These are the gate keeper Regents exams to graduation. Proficiency constitutes a 65. See attached document at 3.13 below
Highly Effective (18 - 20 points) Results are well above District- or BOCES-adopted expectations for growth or achievement for grade/subject.	An 85-100 average of all five 2013 Regents exams listed above will be considered highly effective (see attached chart).
Effective (9 - 17 points) Results meet District- or BOCES-adopted expectations for growth or achievement for grade/subject.	An 65-84 average of all five 2013 Regents exams listed above will be considered effective (see attached chart).
Developing (3 - 8 points) Results are below District- or BOCES-adopted expectations for growth or achievement for grade/subject.	An 55-64 average of all five 2013 Regents exams listed above will be considered developing (see attached chart).
Ineffective (0 - 2 points) Results are well below District- or BOCES-adopted expectations for growth or achievement for grade/subject.	An 0-54 average of all five 2013 Regents exams listed above will be considered ineffective (see attached chart).

3.12) All Other Courses

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

	Course(s) or Subject(s)	Locally-Selected Measure from List of Approved Measures	Assessment
	All 9-12 Courses	6(ii) School wide measure computed locally	The average of the (5) Regents exams: Algebra, Living Environment, Global, ELA 11, US History Gov't. Proficiency constitutes a 65.
	All K-4 Courses	6(ii) School wide measure computed locally	NYS Grade 4 ELA and Math Assessment
	All 5-8 Courses	6(ii) School wide measure computed locally	NYS Grades 6, 7, 8 ELA and Math Assessment

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

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

Use this box, if needed, to describe the general process for assigning HEDI categories for these grades/subjects in this subcomponent. If needed, you may upload a table or graphic at 3.13, below.	see attached document at 3.13 below
Highly Effective (18 - 20 points) Results are well above District- or BOCES -adopted expectations for growth or achievement for grade/subject.	see attached document at 3.13 below
Effective (9 - 17 points) Results meet District- or BOCES-adopted expectations for growth or achievement for grade/subject.	see attached document at 3.13 below
Developing (3 - 8 points) Results are below District- or BOCES-adopted expectations for growth or achievement for grade/subject.	see attached document at 3.13 below
Ineffective (0 - 2 points) Results are well below District- or BOCES-adopted expectations for growth or achievement for grade/subject.	see attached document at 3.13 below

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/5139/138514-y92vNseFa4/CCCSD Review Room HEDI Rating 20 points updated.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 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.

K-4 Teachers will receive a single component HEDI category and score based upon the average percentage of students that achieved level 3 4 on Grades 4 ELA and Math NYS assessments calculated using the attached 0-100 conversion chart. The Grade 4 ELA and Math achievement will be averaged using equal weight.

5-8 Teachers will receive a single component HEDI category and score based upon the average percentage of students that achieved level 3 4 on Grades 6, 7, 8 ELA and Math NYS assessments calculated using the attached 0-100 conversion chart. Grades 6, 7, 8 ELA and Math achievement will be averaged using equal weight.

9-12 Teachers will receive a single component HEDI category and score based upon student results on average performance of students 2013 NYS Regents: Algebra, Living Environment, Global, English 11 and US History and Government. Proficiency constitutes a 65.

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 13, 2012
Updated Friday, January 04, 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.)

The Teaching and Learning Framework

NYSUT Teacher Practice Rubric (2012 Edition)

4.2) Points Within Other Measures

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

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

Is the following points assignment applicable to all teachers?

Yes

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

(No response)

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

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

(No response)

4.3) Survey Tools (if applicable)

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

(No response)

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

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

4.4) Assurances

Please check all of the boxes below:

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

4.5) Process for Assigning Points and Determining HEDI Ratings

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

See attached document outlining the Evaluation Process and HEDI ratings

NOTE: NYSUT addresses NYS Teaching Standards 1, 2, 5, 6
Pearson Teaching and Learning rubric will be used to cover standards 3, 4, 7, 8
All Standards are equally weighted (see attachment)

UNIT MEMBER EVALUATION

As per Education Law 3012c all unit members will be evaluated annually. The observation and evaluation of all unit members is the responsibility of the administration. Emphasis shall be placed on the improvement of instruction.
Annual Professional Performance Review Plan:
All unit members, unless expressly excluded below, will be evaluated annually in accordance with the District's Annual Professional Performance Review Plan and in accordance with Education Law 3012c. Unit member should receive a composite score (comprised of 20 points based upon a student learning objective, 20 points will be based on a locally selected measure of student achievement and 60 points will be determined by the completed Pearson rubric) and an overall HEDI rating score by September 1. The September 1 deadline may be extended under extenuating circumstances or by administrative/CCEA agreement.
For 2012-13 unit members with titles of OT's, PT's, school psychologists, grades 7-12 librarians, instructional coaches, TLC teachers, speech pathologists, counselors and any other unit members that are not teachers of record, will be excluded from the APPR evaluation and will evaluated in the same manner they have in the past. The district and CCEA agree to meet during the 2012-13 school year to work on a new separate evaluation to be used for these specific positions beginning 2013-14. In September of each year, District and Association will meet to discuss those titles that will be excluded from APPR evaluation for that school year.
The scope and specifics of the District's Annual Professional Performance Review Plan will be reviewed annually by the administration and the CCEA.
The SLO goal setting meeting will be completed by October 30 and the mid-year conference will be completed between January 1 and February 28. Unit member and lead evaluator will attend both meetings. Prior to the mid-year conference, at least one formal observation and one mini observation will be completed. The teacher may supply a portfolio of evidence to substantiate the successful completion of performance indicators.

Annual Summative Evaluation of Unit Members:
An annual summative evaluation will be made of all unit members each year. Such annual summative evaluation will be based in part upon at least one announced formal observation, a minimum of one unannounced mini observation of at least 30 minutes and a minimum of two unannounced walkthrough observations of approximately 10 minutes each. Observations must be conducted openly and with full knowledge of the unit members. Observations will not take place the day before or after a vacation period lasting at least one week.
For new unit members (defined as a unit member in his/her first year of probation or a unit member serving in the capacity of a long term substitute for a period of one-half a year or more) and non-tenured unit members in their second or third year of probation and previously tenured unit members who have transferred to a new tenure area, there shall be at least one additional announced formal observation. Said additional observation must be completed by May 1. Observations must be conducted openly and with full knowledge of the unit members. New unit members shall attend the new teacher summer training and monthly seminars.
Copies of the Walkthrough, Mini and Formal Observation forms are included in Appendix. If the district wishes to make changes to any of these forms, they will first consult with the CCEA president, vice president and negations' chair. Any changes made will be mutually agreed upon.
Observation of Unit Members:
Within ten school days after a unit member is formally observed, a conference will be held. The ten school day limit may be extended under unusual or emergency circumstances. A written formal observation report will be provided to unit member within 30 school days of the formal observation conference. A space shall be provided where the unit member shall sign the written observation report to indicate that the unit member has been given a hard copy of the written observation report. After a mini observation, a conference can be requested by either party.
Teacher Improvement Plans:
As per Education Law 3012c, any unit member rated developing or ineffective will be place on a Teacher Improvement Plan as per Appendix. Where the District deems it warranted outside of the 3012c process, a Teacher Improvement Plan shall also be developed. Unit members in need of improvement are to be identified in writing by the Building Principal to the unit member, the Assistant Superintendent for Human Resources and the President of the Association.
Annual Rubric Evaluation Conferences:
A conference regarding a unit member's annual rubric evaluation will be held no later than June 14 of the respective school year, at which time the unit member will be provided with a copy (electronic or hard copy) of their annual rubric evaluation. The unit member shall sign the annual rubric evaluation in the space provided to indicate that he/she has been given a hard copy of the annual rubric evaluation.
In the event that the unit member's annual rubric evaluation contains a recommendation to dismiss or to deny tenure, the unit member shall be notified in advance and shall be provided with a copy (electronic or hard copy) of the rubric evaluation at least 24 hours prior to the rubric evaluation conference. Such unit member may, at his/her option, be accompanied by a representative of the Association to serve as an observer during the annual rubric evaluation conference.
The June 14 deadline may be extended if extenuating circumstances prevent the annual rubric evaluation conference of any unit member from being completed by June 14. Furthermore, in the event that a unit member fails to attend an annual rubric evaluation conference scheduled on or before June 14, or in the event that a unit member must reschedule a conference to a date subsequent to June 14, the deadline for the annual rubric evaluation conference will be deemed waived and the conference may take place after June 14.

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/5091/142210-eka9yMJ855/CCCSD Review Room Other Measures of EffectivenessUpdatedJan2013.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.	Teachers who score 3.5-4.0 as outlined above will have an ocerall scoring range of 59-60 based on the conversion chart (see attached document)
Effective: Overall performance and results meet NYS Teaching Standards.	Teachers who score 2.5-3.4 as outlined above will have an overall scoring range of 57-58 based on the conversion chart (see attached document)
Developing: Overall performance and results need improvement in order to meet NYS Teaching Standards.	Teachers who score 1.5-2.4 as outlined above will have an overall scoring range of 50-56 based on the conversion chart (see attached document)
Ineffective: Overall performance and results do not meet NYS Teaching Standards.	Teachers who score 1.0-1.4 as outlined above will have an overall scoring range of 0-49 based on the conversion chart (see attached document)

Provide the ranges for the 60-point scoring bands.

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

4.6) Observations of Probationary Teachers

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

By building principals or other trained administrators

4.6) Observations of Probationary Teachers | Formal/Long	2
4.6) Observations of Probationary Teachers | Informal/Short	3
4.6) Observations of Probationary Teachers | Enter Total	5

By trained in-school peer teachers or other trained reviewers

Formal/Long	0
Informal/Short	0

Independent evaluators

Formal/Long	0
Informal/Short	0

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

- In Person

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

- In Person

4.7) Observations of Tenured Teachers

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

By building principals or other trained administrators

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

By trained in-school peer teachers or other trained reviewers

Formal/Long	0
Informal/Short	0

Independent evaluators

Formal/Long	0
Informal/Short	0

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

- In Person

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

- In Person

5. Composite Scoring (Teachers)

Created Wednesday, June 13, 2012
Updated Tuesday, November 13, 2012

Page 1

Standards for Rating Categories

Growth or Comparable Measures

Locally-selected Measures of

growth or achievement

Other Measures of Effectiveness

(Teacher and Leader standards)

Highly

Effective

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

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

Overall performance and results exceed NYS Teaching Standards.

Effective

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

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

Overall performance and results meet NYS Teaching Standards.

Developing

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

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

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

Ineffective

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

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

Overall performance and results do not meet NYS Teaching Standards.

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

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

2012-13 where there is no Value-Added measure

Growth or Comparable Measures

Locally-selected Measures of

growth or achievement

Other Measures of Effectiveness

(60 points)

Overall

Composite Score

Highly Effective

18-20

18-20

Ranges determined locally--see below

91-100

Effective

9-17

9-17

75-90

Developing

3-8

3-8

65-74

Ineffective

0-2

0-2

0-64

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

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

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

2012-13 where Value-Added growth measure applies

Growth or Comparable Measures

Locally-selected Measures of

growth or achievement

Other Measures of Effectiveness

(60 points)

Overall

Composite Score

Highly Effective

22-25

14-15

Ranges determined locally--see above

91-100

Effective

10-21

8-13

75-90

Developing

3-9

3-7

65-74

Ineffective

0-2

0-2

0-64

6. Additional Requirements - Teachers

Created Wednesday, June 13, 2012
Updated Monday, December 17, 2012

Page 1

6.1) Assurances -- Improvement Plans

Please check the boxes below:

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

6.2) Attachment: Teacher Improvement Plan Forms

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

assets/survey-uploads/5265/142212-Df0w3Xx5v6/APPENDIX F APPR TIP Review Room.docx

6.3) Appeals Process

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

(1) the substance of the annual professional performance review

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

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

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

APPEAL
An appeal of a TIP is limited to the district's issuance and/or implementation of the terms of the TIP under Education Law § 3012-c noting an appeal of the overall APPR is for a rating of "ineffective" or "developing" only. A teacher may appeal the implementation of the TIP in accordance with the appeals procedure. The appeal of a TIP will not affect the District's right to dismiss a probationary teacher, deny tenure, or serve to otherwise lengthen the probationary period. In accordance with NYS Education Law 3012c.

APPR APPEALS PROCEDURE

APPEALS OF INEFFECTIVE and DEVELOPING RATINGS ONLY
Appeals of an annual professional performance review shall be limited only to those where the teacher has received an overall rating of "ineffective" or "developing" based on his/her single composite effectiveness score.
WHAT MAY BE CHALLENGED IN AN APPEAL
Appeals are limited to adherence to commissioner's regulations, compliance to negotiated procedures, and adherence to education law. Additionally, areas designated by the teacher, with their supporting documentation attached at the time, in the observation process that are contrary to the evaluator's ratings, may serve as the basis for an appeal subject to the criteria as described above.
PROHIBITION AGAINST MORE THAN ONE APPEAL
A teacher may not file multiple appeals regarding the same performance review or teacher improvement plan. All grounds for appeal must be raised with specificity within one appeal. Any grounds not raised at the time the appeal is filed shall be deemed waived.
BURDEN OF PROOF
In an appeal, the teacher has the burden of demonstrating by clear and convincing evidence that his/her overall rating of "ineffective" or "developing" was affected by substantial error or defect.
TIME FRAME FOR FILING APPEAL
Appeals must be submitted in writing to the Superintendent no later than 20 school days after receipt by the teacher of his/her official annual professional performance review, if the appeal is challenging the plan; or no later than 20 school days after issuance of the teacher improvement plan, if the appeal is challenging the improvement plan.
When filing an appeal, the teacher must submit a detailed 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 and any additional documents or materials relevant to the appeal. The performance review and/or improvement plan being challenged must be submitted with the appeal.
TIME FRAME FOR DISTRICT RESPONSE
Within 20 school days of receipt of an appeal, the CCCSD Lead Evaluator(s) who issued the performance review must submit a detailed written response to the appeal to the Superintendent. The response must include any and all additional documents, written materials, or other evidentiary materials specific to the point(s) of disagreement that support the District response and are relevant to the resolution of the appeal. Any information not submitted at the time the response is filed will not be considered in determining the appeal. The teacher initiating the appeal shall receive a copy (electronic or hard copy) of the response filed by the District, and any and all additional information submitted with the response. The committee has ten [10] school days, from receipt of the above information, to make a decision.
Notwithstanding the above time frames, an appeal does not serve to lengthen a teacher's probationary period. The District reserves its right to terminate a probationary teacher and/or to make a tenure determination pending an appeal in accordance with NYS Education Law 3012c.
DECISION-MAKING
Appeals shall be submitted to the Superintendent. Upon receipt of such appeal, the Superintendent, or designee, shall notify the President of the Association. A committee of two [2] teachers, who have received a composite rating of Effective or Highly Effective, selected by the President of the Association, and two [2] administrators, neither of whom evaluated the appellant, selected by the Superintendent, or designee, shall be convened to hear the appeal. If a principal is selected to the committee, he/she must also have received a composite rating of Effective or Highly Effective. The committee has ten [10] school days, from receipt of the above information, to make a decision.
DECISION
A majority opinion is required to sustain the appeal. A written decision, sustaining or denying the appeal, shall be sent to the appellant, evaluator of the appellant, and Superintendent, setting forth the reasons and factual basis for each determination on each of the specific issues raised by the appeal. If the appeal is sustain, the rating may be modified or set aside (new evaluation in whole or in part). In the case of a 2-2 split, while the appeal is denied, the rationale for both views will be stated in writing. The appeal will go to the Superintendent. The Superintendent will schedule a meeting within 10 school days with both the teacher and lead evaluator at which time the Superintendent will discuss the written documents submitted with both parties and request any additional evidence either party may have to further justify their case. Within 10 school days of the meeting, the Superintendent shall render a written decision sustaining or denying the appeal.

EXCLUSIVITY OF APPEAL PROCEDURE
This appeal procedure shall constitute the exclusive means for initiating, reviewing, and resolving any challenges and appeals related to a teacher's APPR and/or TIP.

6.4) Training and Certification of Lead Evaluators and Evaluators

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

TRAINING/CERTIFICATION
Members of the District Network Team completed the RTTT Network Team Summer Institute provided by the State Education Department in Albany. These members have been certified as a turnkey trainer to implement the goals of the Regents Reform Agenda including Common Core Standards, school-based inquiry, and the new performance evaluations for teachers.
All administrators in the district responsible for observing and evaluating teachers will continue to participate in training sessions provided by the Network Team Equivalent trainers as well as other training sessions designed to sharpen observation skills, review criteria to be evaluated and methods of evaluation in accordance with the nine assurance areas outlined in the State Education Department's requirements.
The District will ensure the training and certification of its lead evaluators in accordance with the requirements prescribed in the commissioner's regulations. All lead evaluators will submit certification to the Superintendent who, in turn, will recommend BOE approval. The District will further ensure that lead evaluators maintain inter-rater reliability over time and that they are recertified on an annual basis.

Note: Churchville-Chili administrative team participates in monthly review and discussion focusing upon observation evidence collection and alignment to rubric indicators. The team training (in addition to BOCES 2 training sessions) consists of reviewing lesson observation videos, collecting evidence and determining alignment. These discussions include formal observations, mini-observations, and walkthroughs. The observation evidence is collected in a web-based tool and is tracked to ensure accuracy and timeliness of feedback.

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 Wednesday, June 13, 2012
Updated Wednesday, December 26, 2012

Page 1

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

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

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

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

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

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

Please check the boxes below:

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

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

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

State assessments, *required if one exists*

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

List of State-approved 3rd party assessments

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

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

School or Program Type	SLO with Assessment Option	Name of the Assessment
K-4	State assessment	NYS Grades 3 and 4 ELA and Math assessments

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.	K-4 Principals - 1) Will receive a score from SED based upon Grade 4 Student performance on NYS ELA and Math 4; 2) Will receive a score based upon the grade 3 students SLO growth meeting established growth targets on NYS grade 3 ELA and Math assessment. Principals will create individual student growth targets with the Asst. Superintendent for grade 3 based upon pre-assessment data. HEDI points will be assigned based on the percent of students achieving individual growth targets. NOTE: grade 4 enrollment is less than 30% of students in each K-4 school. NOTE: The State score and SLO score will be combined proportionately.
Highly Effective (18 - 20 points) Results are well above state average for similar students (or District goals if no state test).	94-100% of the students meeting established growth targets
Effective (9 - 17 points) Results meet state average for similar students (or District goals if no state test).	80-93% of the students meeting established growth targets
Developing (3 - 8 points) Results are below state average for similar students (or District goals if no state test).	65-79% of the students meeting established growth targets
Ineffective (0 - 2 points) Results are well below state average for similar students (or District goals if no state test).	0-64% of the students meeting established 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/5365/142213-lha0DogRNw/CCCSD Review Room HEDI Rating 20 points.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 Controls

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 Wednesday, June 13, 2012
Updated Wednesday, December 26, 2012

Page 1

Locally-Selected Measures of Student Achievement or Growth

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

	Grade Configuration	Locally-Selected Measure from List of Approved Measures	Assessment
	5-8	(a) achievement on State assessments	NYS Grades 6, 7, 8 ELA and Math assessments
	9-12	(d) measures used by district for teacher evaluation	NYS Regents: Algebra, Living Environment, Global, ELA 11, US History and Government

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.	5-8: The average achievement of students achieving level 3 4 on Grades 6, 7 8 ELA and Math NYS assessments calculated using the attached 0-100 conversion chart. The Grades 6, 7, 8 ELA and Math will be averaged using equal weight. 9-12: The average of five Regents exams necessary for graduation will be calculated using the attached 0-100 conversion chart. The five Regents used will be Algebra 1, Global History, US History, English 11, and Living Environment. These are the gate keeper Regents exams to graduation. Proficiency constitutes a 65.
Highly Effective (14 - 15 points) Results are well above District- or BOCES-adopted expectations for growth or achievement for grade/subject.	5-8: 60-100% Average achievement of students achieving Levels 3 4 on ELA Math grades 6, 7 8 9-12: An 85-100 average of all five 2013 Regents exams listed above will be considered highly effective
Effective (8- 13 points) Results meet District- or BOCES-adopted expectations for growth or achievement for grade/subject.	5-8: 50-59% Average of students achieving Levels 3 4 on ELA Math grades 6, 7 8 9-12: An 65-84 average of all five 2013 Regents exams

	listed above will be considered effective
Developing (3 - 7 points) Results are below District- or BOCES-adopted expectations for growth or achievement for grade/subject.	5-8: 40-49% Average of students achieving Levels 3 4 on ELA Math grades 6,7 8 9-12: An 55-64 average of all five 2013 Regents exams listed above will be considered developing
Ineffective (0 - 2 points) Results are well below District- or BOCES-adopted expectations for growth or achievement for grade/subject.	5-8: 0-39% Average of students achieving Levels 3 4 on ELA Math grades 6, 7 8 9-12: An 0-54 average of all five 2013 Regents exams listed above will be considered ineffective

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/5366/142214-qBFVOWF7fC/CCCSD Review Room HEDI Rating-Value Added 15 MS HS Pr.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
K-4	(a) achievement on State assessments	NYS Grade 4 ELA and Math

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.	K-4: The average level of students achieving level 3 4 on Grade 4 ELA and Math NYS assessments calculated using the attached 0-100 conversion chart. The Grades 4 ELA and Math will be averaged using equal weight. NOTE: grade 4 enrollment is less than 30% of the total population in each elementary school
Highly Effective (18 - 20 points) Results are well above District- or BOCES-adopted expectations for growth or achievement for grade/subject.	71-100% Average of students achieving Levels 3 4 on grade 4 ELA Math will be considered highly effective
Effective (9- 17 points) Results meet District- or BOCES-adopted expectations for growth or achievement for grade/subject.	57-70% Average of students achieving Levels 3 4 on grade 4 ELA Math will be considered effective
Developing (3 - 8 points) Results are below District- or BOCES-adopted expectations for growth or achievement	40-56% Average of students achieving Levels 3 4 on grade 4 ELA Math will be considered developing

for grade/subject.	
Ineffective (0 - 2 points) Results are well below District- or BOCES-adopted expectations for growth or achievement for grade/subject.	0-39% Average of students achieving Levels 3 4 on grade 4 ELA Math will be considered ineffective

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/5366/142214-T8MlGWUVm1/CCCSD Review Room HEDI Rating 20 points updated.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.

No Controls

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 Wednesday, June 13, 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.	Checked
9.3) Assurances -- Goals | Assure that any other goals, if applicable, shall address quantifiable and verifiable improvements in academic results or the school's learning environment (e.g. student or teacher attendance).	Checked

9.4) Sources of Evidence (if applicable)

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

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

9.5) Survey Tool(s) (if applicable)

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

(No response)

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

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.

Principals will be assessed on a collection of evidence using the LCI Multidimensional Rubric. For the 2012-13 school year, the scoring range will be
1) Vision for Learning 4 indicators
2) The Culture of Teaching and Learning 10 indicators
3) The Management of Learning 5 indicators
4) Relationships with the broader community 3 indicators
5) Integrity, fairness… 6 indicators
6) Political, social… 3 indicators
7) OTHER: goal setting and attainment 14 indicators

45 total indicators

PROCESS
Step 1 Identify number of Performance Indicators per Domain (effective/highly effective)
Step 2 Determine % range to rank 4, 3, 2, 1 using formula:
80% -100% of Performance Indicators per Domain = (4)
60%-79% of Performance Indicators per Domain = (3)
40%-59% of Performance Indicators per Domain = (2)
0%-39% of Performance Indicators per Domain = (1)
Step 3 Convert percentages into a rubric number (1, 2, 3, 4)
Step 4 Take total rubric score and divide by the # of Domain (7); then use
the 60 point conversion chart to determine HEDI

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/5143/142216-pMADJ4gk6R/CCCSD Review Room Principal Rubric Conversion Chartupdated.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.	Principals who score 3.5-4.0 as outlined above will have an overall scoring range of 59-60 based on the conversion chart (see attached document)
Effective: Overall performance and results meet standards.	Principals who score 2.5-3.4 as outlined above will have an overall scoring range of 57-58 based on the conversion chart (see attached document)
Developing: Overall performance and results need improvement in order to meet standards.	Principals who score 1.5-2.4 as outlined above will have an overall scoring range of 50-56 based on the conversion chart (see attached document)
Ineffective: Overall performance and results do not meet standards.	Principals who score 1.0-1.4 as outlined above will have an overall scoring range of 0-49 based on the conversion chart (see attached document)

Please provide the locally-negotiated 60 point scoring bands.

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

9.8) School Visits

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

Probationary Principals

By supervisor	4
By trained administrator	0
By trained independent evaluator	0
Enter Total	4

Tenured Principals

By supervisor	4
By trained administrator	0
By trained independent evaluator	0
Enter Total	4

10. Composite Scoring (Principals)

Created Wednesday, June 13, 2012
Updated Tuesday, November 13, 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

0-64

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

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

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

2012-13 where Value-Added growth measure applies

Growth or Comparable Measures

Locally-selected Measures of

growth or achievement

Other Measures of Effectiveness

(60 points)

Overall

Composite Score

Highly Effective

22-25

14-15

Ranges determined locally--see above

91-100

Effective

10-21

8-13

75-90

Developing

3-9

3-7

65-74

Ineffective

0-2

0-2

0-64

11. Additional Requirements - Principals

Created Wednesday, June 13, 2012
Updated Monday, December 17, 2012

Page 1

11.1) Assurances -- Improvement Plans

Please check the boxes below.

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

11.2) Attachment: Principal Improvement Plan Forms

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

assets/survey-uploads/5276/142218-Df0w3Xx5v6/PIP form Principal Standards.docx

11.3) Appeals Process

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

(1) the substance of the annual professional performance review

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

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

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

APPEALS OF INEFFECTIVE and DEVELOPING RATINGS ONLY
Appeals of an annual professional performance review shall be limited only to those where the principal has received an overall rating of "ineffective" or "developing" based on his/her single composite effectiveness score.
WHAT MAY BE CHALLENGED IN AN APPEAL
In an appeal, the principal may only challenge:
1) The substance of the annual professional performance review;

2) The Churchville-Chili Central School District's adherence to the standards and methodologies required for such reviews, pursuant to Education Law §3012-c;
3) The adherence to the regulations of the New York Commissioner of Education, as applicable to such reviews;
4) Compliance with any applicable locally negotiated procedures applicable to the Churchville-Chili Central School District's annual professional performance review plan;
1) The Churchville-Chili Central School District's' issuance and/or implementation of the terms of the principal improvement plan under Education Law §3012-c.
PROHIBITION AGAINST MORE THAN ONE APPEAL
A principal may not file multiple appeals regarding the same performance review or principal improvement plan. All grounds for appeal must be raised with specificity within one appeal. Any grounds not raised at the time the appeal is filed shall be deemed waived.
BURDEN OF PROOF
In an appeal, the principal has the burden of demonstrating by clear and convincing evidence that his/her overall rating of "ineffective" or "developing" was affected by substantial error or defect.
TIME FRAME FOR FILING APPEAL
Appeals must be submitted in writing to the Superintendent no later than 15 calendar days after receipt by the principal of his/her official annual professional performance review, if the appeal is challenging the plan; or no later than 15 calendar days after issuance of the principal improvement plan, if the appeal is challenging the improvement plan. The failure to file an appeal within these timeframes shall be deemed a waiver of the right to appeal and the appeal shall be deemed abandoned.
When filing an appeal, the principal must submit a detailed 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 and any additional documents or materials relevant to the appeal. The performance review and/or improvement plan being challenged must be submitted with the appeal. Any information not submitted at the time the appeal is filed will not be considered.
TIME FRAME FOR DISTRICT RESPONSE
Upon receiving such appeal, the Superintendent, or designee, shall notify the president of the Certified Administrator Group.
Within 15 calendar days of receipt of an appeal, the CCCSD Lead Evaluator(s) who issued the performance review must submit a detailed written response to the appeal to the Superintendent. The response must include any and all additional documents, written materials, or other evidentiary materials specific to the point(s) of disagreement that support the District response and are relevant to the resolution of the appeal. Any information not submitted at the time the response is filed will not be considered in determining the appeal. The principal initiating the appeal shall receive a copy of the response filed by the District, and any and all additional information submitted with the response.
Notwithstanding the above time frames, an appeal does not serve to lengthen a principal's probationary period. The District reserves its right to terminate a probationary principal and/or to make a tenure determination pending an appeal in accordance with NYS Education Law 3012c.
DECISION-MAKER ON APPEAL
A committee of four (4) representatives, two (2) principals/directors selected by the President of the CAG decision and two (2) administrators selected by the Superintendent, or designee, shall be convened to hear the appeal. A majority opinion is required to sustain the appeal. If the committee is deadlocked, the decision on the appeal shall be rendered by the Superintendent, or the Superintendent's designee, except that an appeal may not be decided by the same individual who was responsible for making the final rating decision. In such case, the Superintendent must appoint a designee to decide the appeal.
Alternatively, the appellant may appeal solely to the Superintendent, or designee, for a decision.

DECISION
A written decision on the merits of the appeal shall be rendered no later than 45 calendar days from the date upon which the principal filed his/her appeal. The appeal shall be based solely on the written record, comprised of the principal's appeal papers and any documentary evidence which accompanied the appeal, as well as the committee response (if selected) to the appeal and additional documentary evidence submitted with such papers. Such decision shall be final and binding on the parties, and shall not be subject to any further appeal through any other process including grievance or arbitration procedures contained with the CCEA collective bargaining agreement, adjudication before an administrative body or individual (including but not limited to the Commissioner of Education) or court action.
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 an appeal is sustained in whole or in part, the decision maker may set aside a rating and direct that a new evaluation (or portion thereof) be conducted, or award such other relief as he/she deems appropriate under the circumstances. A copy of the decision shall be provided to the principal and the evaluator.

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.

TRAINING/CERTIFICATION
Members of the District Network Team completed the RTTT Network Team Summer Institute provided by the State Education Department in Albany. These members have been certified as a turnkey trainer to implement the goals of the Regents Reform Agenda including Common Core Standards, school-based inquiry, and the new performance evaluations for principals.
The Superintendent and Assistant Superintendent for Instruction in the district are responsible for observing and evaluating principals. They will continue to participate in training sessions provided by the Network Team Equivalent trainers as well as other training sessions designed to sharpen observation skills, review criteria to be evaluated and methods of evaluation in accordance with the State Education Department's requirements.
The District will ensure the training and certification of its lead evaluators (for principals) in accordance with the requirements prescribed in the commissioner's regulations. The District will further ensure that lead evaluators maintain inter-rater reliability over time and that they are recertified on an annual basis. The BOE will certify them upon receipt of confirmation of meeting certification requirements.

Note: Churchville-Chili Superintendent and Assistant Superintendent participate in monthly review and discussion focusing upon observation evidence collection and alignment to rubric indicators. The team training (in addition to BOCES 2 training) consists of reviewing goal setting, collecting evidence and determining alignment to rubric indicators. These discussions include principals during school visitations in which both the Superintendent and Assistant Superintendent participate.

11.5) Assurances -- Evaluators

Please check the boxes below:

- Checked

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

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

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

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

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

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

(7) use of the Statewide Instructional Reporting System

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

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

- Checked

11.6) Assurances -- Principals

Please check all of the boxes below:

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

11.7) Assurances -- Data

Please check all of the boxes below:

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

12. Joint Certification of APPR Plan

Created Wednesday, June 13, 2012
Updated Friday, January 04, 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/5581/142219-3Uqgn5g9Iu/CCCSD Review Room APPR signatures 010313_1.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.

Form 2.10) All Other Courses

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

	Course(s) or Subject(s)	Option	Assessment
	AP World	○ State Assessment ○ State-approved 3rd party assessment ● District, Regional or BOCES-developed ○ School/BOCES-wide/group/team results based on State	Monroe 2 BOCES developed Regional AP World
	AP US History	○ State Assessment ○ State-approved 3rd party assessment ● District, Regional or BOCES-developed ○ School/BOCES-wide/group/team results based on State	Monroe 2 BOCES developed Regional AP US History
	AP Government	○ State Assessment ○ State-approved 3rd party assessment ● District, Regional or BOCES-developed ○ School/BOCES-wide/group/team results based on State	Monroe 2 BOCES developed Regional AP Government
	AP Psychology	○ State Assessment ○ State-approved 3rd party assessment ● District, Regional or BOCES-developed ○ School/BOCES-wide/group/team results based on State	Monroe 2 BOCES developed Regional AP Psychology

Course(s) or Subject(s)	Option	Assessment
Economics	○ State Assessment ○ State-approved 3rd party assessment ● District, Regional or BOCES-developed ○ School/BOCES-wide/group/team results based on State	Monroe 2 BOCES developed Regional Economics
Psychology	○ State Assessment ○ State-approved 3rd party assessment ● District, Regional or BOCES-developed ○ School/BOCES-wide/group/team results based on State	Monroe 2 BOCES developed Regional Psychology
Studio in Art	○ State Assessment ○ State-approved 3rd party assessment ● District, Regional or BOCES-developed ○ School/BOCES-wide/group/team results based on State	Monroe 2 BOCES developed Regional Studio in Art
Painting	○ State Assessment ○ State-approved 3rd party assessment ● District, Regional or BOCES-developed ○ School/BOCES-wide/group/team results based on State	Monroe 2 BOCES developed Painting

Course(s) or Subject(s)	Option	Assessment
Drawing and Illustration	○ State Assessment ○ State-approved 3rd party assessment ● District, Regional or BOCES-developed ○ School/BOCES-wide/group/team results based on State	Monroe 2 BOCES developed Regional Drawing and Illustration
Ceramics	○ State Assessment ○ State-approved 3rd party assessment ● District, Regional or BOCES-developed ○ School/BOCES-wide/group/team results based on State	Monroe 2 BOCES developed Regional Ceramics
Design and Drawing Production	○ State Assessment ○ State-approved 3rd party assessment ● District, Regional or BOCES-developed ○ School/BOCES-wide/group/team results based on State	Monroe 2 BOCES developed Regional Design and Drawing Production Assessment
CIM	○ State Assessment ○ State-approved 3rd party assessment ● District, Regional or BOCES-developed ○ School/BOCES-wide/group/team results based on State	Monroe 2 BOCES developed Regional CIM

Course(s) or Subject(s)	Option	Assessment
Computer Applications	○ State Assessment ○ State-approved 3rd party assessment ● District, Regional or BOCES-developed ○ School/BOCES-wide/group/team results based on State	Monroe 2 BOCES developed Regional Computer Applications
Accounting	○ State Assessment ○ State-approved 3rd party assessment ● District, Regional or BOCES-developed ○ School/BOCES-wide/group/team results based on State	CCCSD developed Accounting
Wind Ensemble	○ State Assessment ○ State-approved 3rd party assessment ● District, Regional or BOCES-developed ○ School/BOCES-wide/group/team results based on State	Monroe 2 BOCES developed Regional Wind Ensemble Assessment

Course(s) or Subject(s)	Option	Assessment
Band	○ State Assessment ○ State-approved 3rd party assessment ● District, Regional or BOCES-developed ○ School/BOCES-wide/group/team results based on State	Monroe 2 BOCES developed Regional Band 9-12
Chorus	○ State Assessment ○ State-approved 3rd party assessment ● District, Regional or BOCES-developed ○ School/BOCES-wide/group/team results based on State	Monroe 2 BOCES developed Regional Chorus Assessment
Money Management	○ State Assessment ○ State-approved 3rd party assessment ● District, Regional or BOCES-developed ○ School/BOCES-wide/group/team results based on State	Monroe 2 BOCES developed Regional Money Management
Career Management	○ State Assessment ○ State-approved 3rd party assessment ● District, Regional or BOCES-developed ○ School/BOCES-wide/group/team results based on State	Monroe 2 BOCES developed Regional Career Management

Course(s) or Subject(s)	Option	Assessment
Math and Finance	○ State Assessment ○ State-approved 3rd party assessment ● District, Regional or BOCES-developed ○ School/BOCES-wide/group/team results based on State	Monroe 2 BOCES developed Regional Math and Finance
Integrated Algebra	○ State Assessment ○ State-approved 3rd party assessment ● District, Regional or BOCES-developed ○ School/BOCES-wide/group/team results based on State	Monroe 2 BOCES developed Regional Integrated Algebra
Applied Geometry	○ State Assessment ○ State-approved 3rd party assessment ● District, Regional or BOCES-developed ○ School/BOCES-wide/group/team results based on State	Monroe 2 BOCES developed Regional Applied Geometry
Pre Calculus BC	○ State Assessment ○ State-approved 3rd party assessment ● District, Regional or BOCES-developed ○ School/BOCES-wide/group/team results based on State	Monroe 2 BOCES developed Regional Pre Calculus BC

Course(s) or Subject(s)	Option	Assessment
Pre Calculus AB	○ State Assessment ○ State-approved 3rd party assessment ● District, Regional or BOCES-developed ○ School/BOCES-wide/group/team results based on State	Monroe 2 BOCES developed Regional Pre Calculus AB
AP Calculus BC	○ State Assessment ○ State-approved 3rd party assessment ● District, Regional or BOCES-developed ○ School/BOCES-wide/group/team results based on State	CCCSD developed AP Calculus BC
American Sign Language	○ State Assessment ○ State-approved 3rd party assessment ● District, Regional or BOCES-developed ○ School/BOCES-wide/group/team results based on State	Monroe 2 BOCES developed Regional American Sign Language
AP Language	○ State Assessment ○ State-approved 3rd party assessment ● District, Regional or BOCES-developed ○ School/BOCES-wide/group/team results based on State	Monroe 2 BOCES developed Regional AP Language

AP Literature	○ State Assessment ○ State-approved 3rd party assessment ● District, Regional or BOCES-developed ○ School/BOCES-wide/group/team results based on State	Monroe 2 BOCES developed Regional AP Literature
Spanish II, III, IV, V	○ State Assessment ○ State-approved 3rd party assessment ● District, Regional or BOCES-developed ○ School/BOCES-wide/group/team results based on State	Monroe 2 BOCES developed Regional Spanish II, III, IV, V
French II, III, IV	○ State Assessment ○ State-approved 3rd party assessment ● District, Regional or BOCES-developed ○ School/BOCES-wide/group/team results based on State	Monroe 2 BOCES developed Regional French II, III, IV

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

Use this box, if needed, to describe the general process for assigning HEDI categories for these grades/subjects in this subcomponent. If needed, you may upload a table or graphic at 2.11.	Points are assigned based on percentage of teacher's students achieving individual growth targets. Students will take a Monroe 2 BOCES regionally developed pre-assessment. Results from the pre-assessment and other pertinent student data will be analyzed by both the teacher and lead evaluator (administrator) to set SLO targets. Students will take a post (summary) assessment developed regionally with Monroe 2 BOCES or State Assessment/Regents (where one exists) at the end of the course. These results will be used to determine students' academic growth.
Highly Effective (18 - 20 points) Results are well-above District goals for similar students.	See 2.11
Effective (9 - 17 points) Results meet District goals for similar students.	See 2.11
Developing (3 - 8 points) Results are below District goals for similar students.	See 2.11
Ineffective (0 - 2 points) Results are well-below District goals for similar students.	See 2.11

HEDI Rating Churchville-Chili Central School District

0-20 HEDI Rating: No Value Added Growth Measure

Highly Effective – 94% of students or more will meet or exceed their target goal on the summative assessment

Effective –80-93% of students or more will meet or exceed their target goal on the summative assessment

Developing – 65-79% of students or more will meet or exceed their target goal on the summative assessment

Ineffective – 0-64% of students or more will meet or exceed their target goal on the summative assessment

HIGHLY EFFECTIVE			EFFECTIVE									DEVELOPING						INEFFECTIVE		
20	19	18	17	16	15	14	13	12	11	10	9	8	7	6	5	4	3	2	1	0
100-99	98-97	96-94	93	92	91	90	89-88	87-86	85-84	83	82-80	79	78	76-77	73-75	69-72	65-68	61-64	56-60	55-0

HEDI Rating Churchville-Chili Central School District

0-15 HEDI Rating: Value Added

Highly Effective – 60-100% of students achieve targeted growth

Effective –50-59% of students achieve targeted growth

Developing – 40-49% of students achieve targeted growth

Ineffective – 0-39% of students achieve targeted growth

HIGHLY EFFECTIVE		EFFECTIVE						DEVELOPING					INEFFECTIVE		
15	14	13	12	11	10	9	8	7	6	5	4	3	2	1	0
88-100	60-87	58-59	56-57	54-55	52-53	51	50	48-49	44-47	42-43	41	40	30-39	11-29	0-10

HEDI Rating Churchville-Chili Central School District

0-20 HEDI Rating: No Value Added Growth Measure

K-4: The average percent of students that achieve level 3 & 4 on Grade 4 NYS ELA and Math assessment

5-8: The average percent of students that achieve level 3 & 4 on Grade 6, 7, 8 NYS ELA and Math assessment

HIGHLY EFFECTIVE			EFFECTIVE									DEVELOPING						INEFFECTIVE		
20	19	18	17	16	15	14	13	12	11	10	9	8	7	6	5	4	3	2	1	0
90-100	80-89	71-79	69-70	66-68	63-65	62	61	60	59	58	57	55-56	52-54	49-51	46-48	43-45	40-42	30-39	11-29	0-10

9-12: The average of five Regents exams necessary for graduation will be calculated using this conversion chart. The five Regents used will be Algebra 1, Global History, US History, English 11, and Living Environment.

HIGHLY EFFECTIVE			EFFECTIVE									DEVELOPING						INEFFECTIVE		
20	19	18	17	16	15	14	13	12	11	10	9	8	7	6	5	4	3	2	1	0
97-100	89-96	85-88	83-84	81-82	79-80	76-78	74-75	71-73	69-70	67-68	65-66	64	62-63	60-61	58-59	56-57	55	41-54	15-40	0-14

CHURCHVILLE-CHILI CENTRAL SCHOOL DISTRICT

CONVERSION CHART FOR OTHER MEASURES OF EFFECTIVENESS

1.0		0.0
1.1		12.3
1.2		24.5
1.3		36.8
1.4		49.0
DEVELOPING 50 – 56		
1.5		50.0
1.6		50.7
1.7		51.3
1.8		52.0
1.9		52.7
2.0		53.3
2.1		54.0
2.2		54.7
2.3		55.3
2.4		56.0
EFFECTIVE 57 – 58		
2.5		57.0
2.6		57.2
2.7		57.4
2.8		57.6
2.9		57.8
3.0		58.0
3.1		58.2
3.2		58.4
3.3		58.6
3.4		58.8
HIGHLY EFFECTIVE 59 – 60		
3.5		59.0
3.6		59.2
3.7		59.4
3.8		59.6
3.9		59.8
4.0		60.0

NOTE: Teacher Composite Scores will be converted to whole numbers. Rounding rules apply in all cases.

Other Measures of Effectiveness (60%)

Teachers will be assessed on a collection of evidence using the Pearson/NYSUT Rubric(s). The Pearson Rubric will be used in its entirety and will be supplemented with Standards 1, 2, 5, 6, and 7 (including all elements therein) of the NYSUT Rubric as required by NYSED.

Pearson Rubric and NYSUT

NYSUT 2012		Pearson
NYSUT Standard 1 Knowledge of Students and Student Learning		1) Plan and Organize the Lesson for Learning
NYSUT Standard 2 Knowledge of Content and Instructional Planning		2) Promote Student Interest and Engagement
NYSUT Standard 5 Assessment for Student Learning		3) Demonstrate High Expectations for Student Learning
NYSUT Standard 6 Professional Responsibilities and Collaboration		4) Respond to Diverse Student Characteristics and Needs
NYSUT Standard 7 Professional Growth		5) Make Ideas Clear, Connected, and Accessible to Students
		6) Ask Questions and Lead Discussions to Promote Learning
		7) Maintain a Positive Emotional Climate
		8) Manage the Classroom to Maximize Productivity
		9) Manage the Classrooms to Promote Learning
		10) Assess Student Performance and Progress

For the 2012-13 school year, the scoring will be:

75% -100% of Pearson Performance Indicators/NYSUT Elements per Domain rated effective or highly effective = (4) points

55%-74% of Pearson Performance Indicators/NYSUT Elements per Domain rated effective or highly effective = (3) points

35%-54% of Pearson Performance Indicators/ NYSUT Elements per Domain rated effective or highly effective = (2) points

0%-34% of Pearson Performance Indicators/ NYSUT Elements per Domain rated effective or highly effective = (1) point

PROCESS

*Lead Evaluator will be checking indicators (and scoring) based upon evidence collected during the observations (formal, mini-, and walkthrough) process. This will be done prior to calculating percentages for point assignment.

Step 1 Identified # of Performance Indicators/elements per Domain

Step 2 Assess whether each performance indicator of the Pearson Rubric is observed; assess and rate each element of the NYSUT Standards 1, 2, 5, 6, 7 as Highly Effective, Effective, Developing, or Ineffective

Step 3 Determine number of Performance Indicators (Pearson Rubric) obtained; Determine number of Elements rated as Highly Effective or Effective in each Domain (NYSUT Standards 1, 2, 5, 6, 7)

Step 4 Assign point value (1-4) to each Domain based upon the percentage as outlined above

Step 5 Convert percentages into a rubric number (average scores) = (1, 2, 3, 4)

Step 6 Use the 60 point conversion chart to determine total points out of 60

Sample

NYSUT Standard 1 – Knowledge of Students and Student Learning (6 elements)

Element 1 Teacher demonstrates knowledge of child and adolescent development, including students' cognitive, language, social, emotional and physical development levels.

Rating (from Ineffective to Highly Effective) = Effective

*same process will be used for the other 5 elements in Standard 1 of the NYSUT Rubric. If (4) of the (6) elements were rated as Highly Effective or Effective, a teacher would receive a Domain Score of (3); which is 66% of elements scored as HE or E

APPENDIX F

CHURCHVILLE-CHILI CENTRAL SCHOOL

APPR: Teacher Improvement Plan (October 23, 2012)

STATUS: DATE FINAL EVALUATION CONDUCTED:_____

____ Probationary

____ Tenure *TIMEFRAME FOR TIP:_____

____ Other (LTS, etc.) *Note: A minimum until midyear conference; may be modified by mutual agreement

Teacher:_____ Position:_____

Administrator:_____ Position:_____

Meeting Participants:_____

Teacher Improvement Plan for APPR rating: ___ Developing ___ Ineffective

- Plan and Organize the Lesson for Learning
- Promote Student Interest and Engagement
- Demonstrate High Expectations for Student Learning
- Respond to Diverse Student Characteristics and Needs
- Make ideas Clear, Connected and Accessible to Students
- Ask Questions and Lead Discussions to Promote Student Learning
- Maintain a Positive Emotional Climate
- Manage the Classroom to Maximize Productivity
- Manage the Classroom to Promote Learning
- Assess Student Performance and Progress
- Professional Responsibilities and Collaboration
- Professional Growth

List goals to address the APPR areas identified for improvement; list differentiated activities to support teacher's improvement in the areas listed above; describe the manner in which the improvement will be assessed and provide a timeline for achieving improvement.

TIMEFRAMES	RECOMMENDED SUPPORTS/RESOURCES	SUCCESS MEASURES

HEDI Rating Churchville-Chili Central School District

0-20 HEDI Rating: No Value Added Growth Measure

Highly Effective – 94% of students or more will meet or exceed their target goal on the summative assessment

Effective –80-93% of students or more will meet or exceed their target goal on the summative assessment

Developing – 65-79% of students or more will meet or exceed their target goal on the summative assessment

Ineffective – 0-64% of students or more will meet or exceed their target goal on the summative assessment

HIGHLY EFFECTIVE			EFFECTIVE									DEVELOPING						INEFFECTIVE		
20	19	18	17	16	15	14	13	12	11	10	9	8	7	6	5	4	3	2	1	0
100-99	98-97	96-94	93	92	91	90	89-88	87-86	85-84	83	82-80	79	78	76-77	73-75	69-72	65-68	61-64	56-60	55-0

HEDI Rating Churchville-Chili Central School District

0-15 HEDI Rating: Value Added

For 5-8 principal: The average percentage of students that achieve level 3 & 4 on grades 6, 7 & 8 ELA and Math NYS assessments. Each calculated using the attached 0-100 conversion chart. The Grade 4 ELA and Math, as well as grades 6, 7, & 8 ELA and Math, will be averaged using equal weight.

HIGHLY EFFECTIVE		EFFECTIVE						DEVELOPING					INEFFECTIVE		
15	14	13	12	11	10	9	8	7	6	5	4	3	2	1	0
88-100	60-87	58-59	56-57	54-55	52-53	51	50	48-49	44-47	42-43	41	40	30-39	11-29	0-10

For 9-12 principal: The average of five Regents exams necessary for graduation will be calculated: Algebra 1, Global History, US History, English 11, and Living Environment

HIGHLY EFFECTIVE		EFFECTIVE						DEVELOPING					INEFFECTIVE		
15	14	13	12	11	10	9	8	7	6	5	4	3	2	1	0
92-100	85-91	83-84	79-82	75-78	71-74	67-70	65-66	63-64	61-62	59-60	57-58	55-56	41-54	14-40	0-13

HEDI Rating Churchville-Chili Central School District

0-20 HEDI Rating: No Value Added Growth Measure

K-4: The average percent of students that achieve level 3 & 4 on Grade 4 NYS ELA and Math assessment

5-8: The average percent of students that achieve level 3 & 4 on Grade 6, 7, 8 NYS ELA and Math assessment

HIGHLY EFFECTIVE			EFFECTIVE									DEVELOPING						INEFFECTIVE		
20	19	18	17	16	15	14	13	12	11	10	9	8	7	6	5	4	3	2	1	0
90-100	80-89	71-79	69-70	66-68	63-65	62	61	60	59	58	57	55-56	52-54	49-51	46-48	43-45	40-42	30-39	11-29	0-10

9-12: The average of five Regents exams necessary for graduation will be calculated using this conversion chart. The five Regents used will be Algebra 1, Global History, US History, English 11, and Living Environment.

HIGHLY EFFECTIVE			EFFECTIVE									DEVELOPING						INEFFECTIVE		
20	19	18	17	16	15	14	13	12	11	10	9	8	7	6	5	4	3	2	1	0
97-100	89-96	85-88	83-84	81-82	79-80	76-78	74-75	71-73	69-70	67-68	65-66	64	62-63	60-61	58-59	56-57	55	41-54	15-40	0-14

CHURCHVILLE-CHILI CENTRAL SCHOOL DISTRICT

CONVERSION CHART FOR OTHER MEASURES OF EFFECTIVENESS

1.0		0.0
1.1		12.3
1.2		24.5
1.3		36.8
1.4		49.0
DEVELOPING 50 – 56		
1.5		50.0
1.6		50.7
1.7		51.3
1.8		52.0
1.9		52.7
2.0		53.3
2.1		54.0
2.2		54.7
2.3		55.3
2.4		56.0
EFFECTIVE 57 – 58		
2.5		57.0
2.6		57.2
2.7		57.4
2.8		57.6
2.9		57.8
3.0		58.0
3.1		58.2
3.2		58.4
3.3		58.6
3.4		58.8
HIGHLY EFFECTIVE 59 – 60		
3.5		59.0
3.6		59.2
3.7		59.4
3.8		59.6
3.9		59.8
4.0		60.0

NOTE: Principal Composite Scores will be converted to whole numbers. Rounding rules apply in all cases. See p. 2 for Process

Other Measures of Effectiveness (60%)

Principals will be assessed on a collection of evidence using the LCI Multidimensional Rubric.

PROCESS

Step 1 Identify # of Performance Indicators achieving effective/highly effective

Step 2 Determine % range to rank 4, 3, 2, 1 using formula:

80% -100% of Performance Indicators per Domain = (4)

60%-79% of Performance Indicators per Domain = (3)

40%-59% of Performance Indicators per Domain = (2)

0%-39% of Performance Indicators per Domain = (1)

Step 3 Convert percentages into a rubric number (1, 2, 3, 4)

Step 4 Take total rubric score and divide by the # of Domain (7); then use the 60 point conversion chart

	LCI Multidimensional	
1)	Vision for Learning	4 indicators
2)	The Culture of Teaching and Learning	10 indicators
3)	The Management of Learning	5 indicators
4)	Relationships with the broader community…	3 indicators
5)	Integrity, fairness…	6 indicators
6)	Political, social…	3 indicators
7)	OTHER: goal setting and attainment	14 indicators
	Sample Total	45 total indicators

Churchville-Chili Central School District
Principal Improvement Plan (PIP)

STATUS: DATE FINAL EVALUATION CONDUCTED:_____

____ Probationary

____ Tenure *TIMEFRAME FOR TIP:_____

____ Other (LTS, etc.) *Note: Determined by administrator

Principal: _____ Position:_____

Lead Evaluator:_____ Position:_____

Meeting Participants:_____

Signatures of Agreement: _____ _____

__ APPR rating of Developing or Ineffective

__ Other: not meeting Principal standards

Identify the areas for Principal Improvement Plans:

- Vision for Learning
- The Culture of Teaching and Learning
- The Management of Learning
- Relationships with the broader community
- Integrity, fairness…
- Political, social
- Other: goal setting and attainment

List goals to address the Standards identified for improvement; list differentiated activities to support principal's improvement in the areas listed above; describe the manner in which the improvement will be assessed and provide a timeline for achieving improvement.

Timelines	Improvement Goal/Outcome	Action Steps/Activities	Accessible Resources	Formative Evaluation Dates	Evidence for Goal Achievement

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

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

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

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

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

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

Signatures, dates

Superintendent Signature: Date: 1/3/13

Pamela W. Kessel

Teachers Union President Signature: Date: 1/3/13

Douglas D. Becker

Administrative Union President Signature: Date: 1/3/13

David A. Johnson

Board of Education President Signature: Date: 1/3/13

Katherine Allen