



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

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

August 31, 2012

Geoffrey M. Hicks, Superintendent
Clarence Central School District
9625 Main Street
Clarence, NY 14031

Dear Superintendent Hicks:

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

Pursuant to Education Law §3012-c and Subpart 30-2, the Department will continue to work with districts to help ensure compliance with the statute and the regulations. We will be analyzing data supplied by districts, BOCES, and/or schools and may ask for a corrective action plan if there are unacceptably low correlation results between the student growth subcomponent and any other measures of teacher and principal effectiveness and/or if the teacher or principal scores or ratings show little differentiation across educators and/or the lack of differentiation is not justified by equivalently consistent student achievement results. Please be advised that, if any provisions of your APPR plan violate the statute or the regulations, the Department reserves the right to require your district to correct and/or resolve such violations.

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

Thank you again for your hard work.

Sincerely,



John B. King, Jr.
Commissioner

c: Donald Ogilvie

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

Annual Professional Performance Reviews: 2012-13

Created Thursday, May 10, 2012

Updated Wednesday, August 29, 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 : 140801060000

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

140801060000

1.2) School District Name: CLARENCE CSD

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

CLARENCE CSD

1.3) School Improvement Grant (SIG) Districts Only

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

(No response)

1.4) Award Classification

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

-
- Governor's Management Efficiency Grant
-

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 Wednesday, July 11, 2012

Updated Wednesday, August 29, 2012

Page 1

STATE-PROVIDED MEASURES OF STUDENT GROWTH

(25 points with an approved value-added measure)

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

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

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

2.1) Assurances

Please check the boxes below:

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

STUDENT LEARNING OBJECTIVES AS COMPARABLE GROWTH MEASURES (20 points)

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

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

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

If no State assessment or Regents exam exists:

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

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

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

State assessments, *required if one exists*

List of State-approved 3rd party assessments

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

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

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

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

2.2) Grades K-3 ELA

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

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

	ELA	Assessment
3	State assessment	3rd Grade State Assessment

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

Use this box, if needed, to describe the general process for assigning HEDI categories for these grades/subjects in this	Targets for SLOs shall be determined by teachers in the same grade level/subject or course and approved by building
--	---

subcomponent. If needed, you may upload a table or graphic at 2.11, below.	principals. Targets will be established in accordance with guidance from the Commissioner and State Education Department. Regardless of how the target for individual courses/grade levels/subject areas is established, the scoring bands listed below will be utilized to determine the number of points assigned to teachers. See graphic upload.
Highly Effective (18 - 20 points) Results are well-above state average for similar students (or District goals if no state test).	Point values for the rating of “Highly Effective” range from 18-20 with a low of 81% of students who met the target and a high of greater than 90% of students who met the target.
Effective (9 - 17 points) Results meet state average for similar students (or District goals if no state test).	The HEDI scoring band was created by first establishing the highest percentage of students who need to meet the target in order for a teacher to be considered “Effective” at 80%, which would yield 17 points, and then establishing the lowest percentage of students who would need to meet the target in order for a teacher to be considered “Effective” at 61%, which would yield 9 points. Point values between 9 and 17 were then determined associated with percentages of students who met the target ranging from 61% to 80%.
Developing (3 - 8 points) Results are below state average for similar students (or District goals if no state test).	Point values for the rating of “Developing” range from 3-8 with a low of 41% of students who met the target and a high of 60% of students who met the target.
Ineffective (0 - 2 points) Results are well-below state average for similar students (or District goals if no state test).	Point values for the rating of “Ineffective” range from 0-2, corresponding with a low of ≤14% of students who met the target and a high of 40% of students who met the target.

2.3) Grades K-3 Math

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

	Math	Assessment
K	District, regional, or BOCES-developed assessment	District developed Grade K Math Assessment
1	District, regional, or BOCES-developed assessment	District developed Grade 1 Math Assessment
2	District, regional, or BOCES-developed assessment	District 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.	Targets for SLOs shall be determined by teachers in the same grade level/subject or course and approved by building principals. Targets will be established in accordance with guidance from the Commissioner and State Education Department. Regardless of how the target for individual courses/grade levels/subject areas is established, the scoring bands listed below will be utilized to determine the number of points assigned to teachers. See graphic upload.
---	--

Highly Effective (18 - 20 points) Results are well-above state average for similar students (or District goals if no state test).	Point values for the rating of “Highly Effective” range from 18-20 with a low of 81% of students who met the target and a high of greater than 90% of students who met the target.
Effective (9 - 17 points) Results meet state average for similar students (or District goals if no state test).	The HEDI scoring band was created by first establishing the highest percentage of students who need to meet the target in order for a teacher to be considered “Effective” at 80%, which would yield 17 points, and then establishing the lowest percentage of students who would need to meet the target in order for a teacher to be considered “Effective” at 61%, which would yield 9 points. Point values between 9 and 17 were then determined associated with percentages of students who met the target ranging from 61% to 80%.
Developing (3 - 8 points) Results are below state average for similar students (or District goals if no state test).	Point values for the rating of “Developing” range from 3-8 with a low of 41% of students who met the target and a high of 60% of students who met the target.
Ineffective (0 - 2 points) Results are well-below state average for similar students (or District goals if no state test).	Point values for the rating of “Ineffective” range from 0-2, corresponding with a low of ≤14% of students who met the target and a high of 40% of students who met the target.

2.4) Grades 6-8 Science

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

	Science	Assessment
6	District, regional or BOCES-developed assessment	District developed Grade 6 Science Assessment
7	District, regional or BOCES-developed assessment	District 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.	Targets for SLOs shall be determined by teachers in the same grade level/subject or course and approved by building principals. Targets will be established in accordance with guidance from the Commissioner and State Education Department. Regardless of how the target for individual courses/grade levels/subject areas is established, the scoring bands listed below will be utilized to determine the number of points assigned to teachers. See graphic upload.
Highly Effective (18 - 20 points) Results are well-above state average for similar students (or District goals if no state test).	Point values for the rating of “Highly Effective” range from 18-20 with a low of 81% of students who met the target and a high of greater than 90% of students who met the target.
Effective (9 - 17 points) Results meet state average for similar students (or District goals if no state test).	The HEDI scoring band was created by first establishing the highest percentage of students who need to meet the target in order for a teacher to be considered “Effective” at 80%, which would yield 17 points, and then establishing the lowest percentage of students who would need to meet the target in

order for a teacher to be considered “Effective” at 61%, which would yield 9 points. Point values between 9 and 17 were then determined associated with percentages of students who met the target ranging from 61% to 80%.

Developing (3 - 8 points) Results are below state average for similar students (or District goals if no state test).

Point values for the rating of “Developing” range from 3-8 with a low of 41% of students who met the target and a high of 60% of students who met the target.

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

Point values for the rating of “Ineffective” range from 0-2, corresponding with a low of ≤14% of students who met the target and a high of 40% of students who met the target.

2.5) Grades 6-8 Social Studies

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

	Social Studies	Assessment
6	District, regional or BOCES-developed assessment	District developed Grade 6 Social Studies Assessment
7	District, regional or BOCES-developed assessment	District developed Grade 7 Social Studies Assessment
8	District, regional or BOCES-developed assessment	District developed Grade 8 Social Studies Assessment

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

Use this box, if needed, to describe the general process for assigning HEDI categories for these grades/subjects in this subcomponent. If needed, you may upload a table or graphic at 2.11, below.

Targets for SLOs shall be determined by teachers in the same grade level/subject or course and approved by building principals. Targets will be established in accordance with guidance from the Commissioner and State Education Department. Regardless of how the target for individual courses/grade levels/subject areas is established, the scoring bands listed below will be utilized to determine the number of points assigned to teachers. See graphic upload.

Highly Effective (18 - 20 points) Results are well-above District goals for similar students.

Point values for the rating of “Highly Effective” range from 18-20 with a low of 81% of students who met the target and a high of greater than 90% of students who met the target.

Effective (9 - 17 points) Results meet District goals for similar students.

The HEDI scoring band was created by first establishing the highest percentage of students who need to meet the target in order for a teacher to be considered “Effective” at 80%, which would yield 17 points, and then establishing the lowest percentage of students who would need to meet the target in order for a teacher to be considered “Effective” at 61%, which would yield 9 points. Point values between 9 and 17 were then determined associated with percentages of students who met the target ranging from 61% to 80%.

Developing (3 - 8 points) Results are below District goals for similar students.

Point values for the rating of “Developing” range from 3-8 with a low of 41% of students who met the target and a high of 60% of students who met the target.

Ineffective (0 - 2 points) Results are well-below District goals for similar students.

Point values for the rating of “Ineffective” range from 0-2, corresponding with a low of ≤14% of students who met the target and a high of 40% of students who met the target.

2.6) High School Social Studies Regents Courses

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

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

		Assessment
Global 1	District, regional, or BOCES-developed assessment	District 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.	Targets for SLOs shall be determined by teachers in the same grade level/subject or course and approved by building principals. Targets will be established in accordance with guidance from the Commissioner and State Education Department. Regardless of how the target for individual courses/grade levels/subject areas is established, the scoring bands listed below will be utilized to determine the number of points assigned to teachers. See graphic upload.
Highly Effective (18 - 20 points) Results are well-above District goals for similar students.	Point values for the rating of "Highly Effective" range from 18-20 with a low of 81% of students who met the target and a high of greater than 90% of students who met the target.
Effective (9 - 17 points) Results meet District goals for similar students.	The HEDI scoring band was created by first establishing the highest percentage of students who need to meet the target in order for a teacher to be considered "Effective" at 80%, which would yield 17 points, and then establishing the lowest percentage of students who would need to meet the target in order for a teacher to be considered "Effective" at 61%, which would yield 9 points. Point values between 9 and 17 were then determined associated with percentages of students who met the target ranging from 61% to 80%.
Developing (3 - 8 points) Results are below District goals for similar students.	Point values for the rating of "Developing" range from 3-8 with a low of 41% of students who met the target and a high of 60% of students who met the target.
Ineffective (0 - 2 points) Results are well-below District goals for similar students.	Point values for the rating of "Ineffective" range from 0-2, corresponding with a low of ≤14% of students who met the target and a high of 40% of students who met the target.

2.7) High School Science Regents Courses

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

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

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

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

Use this box, if needed, to describe the general process for assigning HEDI categories for these grades/subjects in this subcomponent. If needed, you may upload a table or graphic at 2.11, below.	Targets for SLOs shall be determined by teachers in the same grade level/subject or course and approved by building principals. Targets will be established in accordance with guidance from the Commissioner and State Education Department. Regardless of how the target for individual courses/grade levels/subject areas is established, the scoring bands listed below will be utilized to determine the number of points assigned to teachers. See graphic upload.
Highly Effective (18 - 20 points) Results are well-above District goals for similar students.	Point values for the rating of "Highly Effective" range from 18-20 with a low of 81% of students who met the target and a high of greater than 90% of students who met the target.
Effective (9 - 17 points) Results meet District goals for similar students.	The HEDI scoring band was created by first establishing the highest percentage of students who need to meet the target in order for a teacher to be considered "Effective" at 80%, which would yield 17 points, and then establishing the lowest percentage of students who would need to meet the target in order for a teacher to be considered "Effective" at 61%, which would yield 9 points. Point values between 9 and 17 were then determined associated with percentages of students who met the target ranging from 61% to 80%.
Developing (3 - 8 points) Results are below District goals for similar students.	Point values for the rating of "Developing" range from 3-8 with a low of 41% of students who met the target and a high of 60% of students who met the target.
Ineffective (0 - 2 points) Results are well-below District goals for similar students.	Point values for the rating of "Ineffective" range from 0-2, corresponding with a low of $\leq 14\%$ of students who met the target and a high of 40% of students who met the target.

2.8) High School Math Regents Courses

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

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

	Math Regents Courses	Assessment
Algebra 1	Regents assessment	Regents assessment

Geometry	Regents assessment	Regents assessment
Algebra 2	Regents assessment	Regents assessment

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

Use this box, if needed, to describe the general process for assigning HEDI categories for these grades/subjects in this subcomponent. If needed, you may upload a table or graphic at 2.11, below.	Targets for SLOs shall be determined by teachers in the same grade level/subject or course and approved by building principals. Targets will be established in accordance with guidance from the Commissioner and State Education Department. Regardless of how the target for individual courses/grade levels/subject areas is established, the scoring bands listed below will be utilized to determine the number of points assigned to teachers. See graphic upload
Highly Effective (18 - 20 points) Results are well-above District goals for similar students.	Point values for the rating of "Highly Effective" range from 18-20 with a low of 81% of students who met the target and a high of greater than 90% of students who met the target.
Effective (9 - 17 points) Results meet District goals for similar students.	The HEDI scoring band was created by first establishing the highest percentage of students who need to meet the target in order for a teacher to be considered "Effective" at 80%, which would yield 17 points, and then establishing the lowest percentage of students who would need to meet the target in order for a teacher to be considered "Effective" at 61%, which would yield 9 points. Point values between 9 and 17 were then determined associated with percentages of students who met the target ranging from 61% to 80%.
Developing (3 - 8 points) Results are below District goals for similar students.	Point values for the rating of "Developing" range from 3-8 with a low of 41% of students who met the target and a high of 60% of students who met the target.
Ineffective (0 - 2 points) Results are well-below District goals for similar students.	Point values for the rating of "Ineffective" range from 0-2, corresponding with a low of $\leq 14\%$ of students who met the target and a high of 40% of students who met the target.

2.9) High School English Language Arts

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

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

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

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

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

Use this box, if needed, to describe the general process for assigning HEDI categories for these grades/subjects in this subcomponent. If needed, you may upload a table or graphic at 2.11, below.	Targets for SLOs shall be determined by teachers in the same grade level/subject or course and approved by building principals. Targets will be established in accordance with guidance from the Commissioner and State Education Department. Regardless of how the target for individual courses/grade levels/subject areas is established, the scoring bands listed below will be utilized to determine the number of points assigned to teachers. See graphic upload.
Highly Effective (18 - 20 points) Results are well-above District goals for similar students.	Point values for the rating of “Highly Effective” range from 18-20 with a low of 81% of students who met the target and a high of greater than 90% of students who met the target.
Effective (9 - 17 points) Results meet District goals for similar students.	The HEDI scoring band was created by first establishing the highest percentage of students who need to meet the target in order for a teacher to be considered “Effective” at 80%, which would yield 17 points, and then establishing the lowest percentage of students who would need to meet the target in order for a teacher to be considered “Effective” at 61%, which would yield 9 points. Point values between 9 and 17 were then determined associated with percentages of students who met the target ranging from 61% to 80%.
Developing (3 - 8 points) Results are below District goals for similar students.	Point values for the rating of “Developing” range from 3-8 with a low of 41% of students who met the target and a high of 60% of students who met the target.
Ineffective (0 - 2 points) Results are well-below District goals for similar students.	Point values for the rating of “Ineffective” range from 0-2, corresponding with a low of ≤14% of students who met the target and a high of 40% of students who met the target.

2.10) All Other Courses

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

Course(s) or Subject(s)	Option	Assessment
Elementary Art, Music, Physical Education	District, Regional or BOCES-developed	District or BOCES developed assessment by grade level for each of the special subject areas.
Home & Career Skills - Grade 6, 7, 8	District, Regional or BOCES-developed	District developed assessment for HCS in grades 6, 7, & 8
Technology Education - Grades 6,7,8	District, Regional or BOCES-developed	District developed assessment for Technology Education in grades 6, 7, & 8
Reading Support - Grades 6, 7, 8	State-approved 3rd party assessment	Scholastic Reading Inventory
Health - Grades 6, 8	District, Regional or BOCES-developed	District developed assessment for Health - Grade 6 & 8
Orchestra, Band, Chorus, General Music - Grades 6, 7, 8	District, Regional or BOCES-developed	District developed assessment for Orchestra, Band, Chorus, & General Music - Grades 6, 7, 8
ESL - All grades	State Assessment	NYSESLAT
Physical Education & Adaptive Physical Education - Grades 6, 7, 8	District, Regional or BOCES-developed	District developed assessment for Physical Education & Adaptive Physical Education Grade 6, 7, 8
Art - Grades 6, 7, 8	District, Regional or BOCES-developed	District developed assessment for Art - Grades 6, 7, 8

Computer Applications - Grade 6	District, Regional or BOCES-developed	District developed assessment for Computer Applications- Grades 6
LOTE - Spanish, French, Latin - Grades 6, 7, 8	District, Regional or BOCES-developed	District developed assessment for Spanish, French, Latin - Grades 7, 8
AP Language & Composition	State Assessment	Comprehensive ELA Regents Assessment
AP Literature & Composition	District, Regional or BOCES-developed	District developed assessment for AP Literature & Composition
SUPA Reading/Writing	District, Regional or BOCES-developed	Syracuse University Assessment for College Level Reading/Writing Course
AP Calculus AB & AP Calculus BC	District, Regional or BOCES-developed	District developed assessment for AP Calculus AB & AP Calculus BC
AP Biology, AP Chemistry, AP Physics B, AP Physics C	District, Regional or BOCES-developed	District developed assessment for AP Biology, AP Chemistry, AP Physics B, AP Physics C
AP European History & AP World History, Global 1 RS	State Assessment	Global Studies Regents Assessment, Global 1 RS
AP US History	State Assessment	US History & Government Regents Assessment
AP Government/Politics, AP Human Geography, AP Macroeconomics, AP Psychology	District, Regional or BOCES-developed	District developed assessment for AP Government/Politics, AP Human Geography, AP Macroeconomics, AP Psychology
Participation in Government, Economics, Participation in Government S, Economics S	District, Regional or BOCES-developed	District developed assessment for Participation in Government, Economics, PIG S, Economics S

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.	Targets for SLOs shall be determined by teachers in the same grade level/subject or course and approved by building principals. Targets will be established in accordance with guidance from the Commissioner and State Education Department. Regardless of how the target for individual courses/grade levels/subject areas is established, the scoring bands listed below will be utilized to determine the number of points assigned to teachers. See graphic upload.
Highly Effective (18 - 20 points) Results are well-above District goals for similar students.	Point values for the rating of “Highly Effective” range from 18-20 with a low of 81% of students who met the target and a high of greater than 90% of students who met the target.
Effective (9 - 17 points) Results meet District goals for similar students.	The HEDI scoring band was created by first establishing the highest percentage of students who need to meet the target in order for a teacher to be considered “Effective” at 80%, which would yield 17 points, and then establishing the lowest percentage of students who would need to meet the target in order for a teacher to be considered “Effective” at 61%, which would yield 9 points. Point values between 9 and 17 were then determined associated with percentages of students who met the target ranging from 61% to 80%.
Developing (3 - 8 points) Results are below District goals for similar students.	Point values for the rating of “Developing” range from 3-8 with a low of 41% of students who met the target and a high of 60% of students who met the target.

Ineffective (0 - 2 points) Results are well-below District goals for similar students.

Point values for the rating of "Ineffective" range from 0-2, corresponding with a low of ≤14% of students who met the target and a high of 40% of students who met the target.

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

assets/survey-uploads/5364/150594-avH4IQNZMh/Form_2_10_All_Other_Courses_SLO_CCSD_2.doc

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/5364/150594-TXEttx9bQW/HEDI_SLO_20_15_Point.pdf

2.12) Locally Developed Controls

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

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

For the 2012-2013 school year, locally developed controls will include student prior academic history, students with disabilities, English language learners, and students in poverty. SLO's will use growth from baselines based on past academic history to determine adjustment factors.

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 Wednesday, July 11, 2012

Updated Wednesday, August 29, 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	4th Grade State Science Assessment - used as the local measure (achievement) for grade 4.
5	4) State-approved 3rd party assessments	Scholastic Reading Inventory
6	5) District, regional, or BOCES–developed assessments	District developed Grade 6 ELA assessment

7	5) District, regional, or BOCES–developed assessments	District developed Grade 7 ELA assessment
8	5) District, regional, or BOCES–developed assessments	District Developed Grade 8 ELA assessment

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

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

Use this box, if needed, to describe the general process for assigning HEDI categories for these grades/subjects in this subcomponent. If needed, you may upload a table or graphic at 3.3, below.	The locally-selected measure may use the same assessment, State- approved 3rd party assessment, or district/BOCES-developed assessment as the SLO used for the State growth or other comparable measures subcomponent. If the same assessment it used, it will measure achievement rather than growth. Subsequent to determining the option utilized for Locally-Selected Measures of Achievement, targets or cut scores shall be determined by teachers in the same grade level/subject or course and approved by building principals. Targets or cut scores will be established in accordance with guidance from the Commissioner and State Education Department. Regardless of how the target or cut score for individual courses/grade levels/subject areas is established, the scoring band listed below will be utilized to determine the number of points assigned to teachers. See the uploaded graphic.
Highly Effective (14 - 15 points) Results are well above District- or BOCES-adopted expectations for growth or achievement for grade/subject.	Point values for the rating of “Highly Effective” range from 14-15 with a low of 81% of students who met the target and a high of greater than 90% of students who met the target.
Effective (8- 13 points) Results meet District- or BOCES-adopted expectations for growth or achievement for grade/subject.	The HEDI scoring bands were created by first establishing the highest percentage of students who need to meet the target in order for a teacher to be considered “Effective” at 80%, which would yield 13 points, and then establishing the lowest percentage of students who would need to meet the target in order for a teacher to be considered “Effective” at 61%, which would yield 8 points. Point values between 8 and 13 were then determined associated with percentages of students who met the target ranging from 61% to 80%.
Developing (3 - 7 points) Results are below District- or BOCES-adopted expectations for growth or achievement for grade/subject.	Point values for the rating of “Developing” range from 3-7 with a low of 41% of students who met the target and a high of 60% of students who met the target.
Ineffective (0 - 2 points) Results are well below District- or BOCES-adopted expectations for growth or achievement for grade/subject.	Point values for the rating of “Ineffective” range from 0-2, corresponding with a low of ≤14% of students who met the target and a high of 40% of students who met the target.

3.2) Grades 4-8 Math

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

	Locally-Selected Measure from List of Approved Measures	Assessment
4	6(ii) School wide measure computed locally	4th Grade State Science Assessment - used as the local measure (achievement) for grade 4.
5	5) District, regional, or BOCES–developed assessments	District developed Grade 5 Math assessment
6	5) District, regional, or BOCES–developed assessments	District developed Grade 6 Math assessment
7	5) District, regional, or BOCES–developed assessments	District developed Grade 7 Math assessment
8	5) District, regional, or BOCES–developed assessments	District developed Grade 8 Math assessment

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

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

Use this box, if needed, to describe the general process for assigning HEDI categories for these grades/subjects in this subcomponent. If needed, you may upload a table or graphic at 3.3, below.	The locally-selected measure may use the same assessment, State- approved 3rd party assessment, or district/BOCES-developed assessment as the SLO used for the State growth or other comparable measures subcomponent. If the same assessment it used, it will measure achievement rather than growth. Subsequent to determining the option utilized for Locally-Selected Measures of Achievement, targets or cut scores shall be determined by teachers in the same grade level/subject or course and approved by building principals. Targets or cut scores will be established in accordance with guidance from the Commissioner and State Education Department. Regardless of how the target or cut score for individual courses/grade levels/subject areas is established, the scoring band listed below will be utilized to determine the number of points assigned to teachers. See the uploaded graphic.
Highly Effective (14 - 15 points) Results are well above District- or BOCES-adopted expectations for growth or achievement for grade/subject.	Point values for the rating of “Highly Effective” range from 14-15 with a low of 81% of students who met the target and a high of greater than 90% of students who met the target.
Effective (8- 13 points) Results meet District- or BOCES-adopted expectations for growth or achievement for grade/subject.	The HEDI scoring bands were created by first establishing the highest percentage of students who need to meet the target in order for a teacher to be considered “Effective” at 80%, which would yield 13 points, and then establishing the lowest percentage of students who would need to meet the target in order for a teacher to be considered “Effective” at 61%, which would yield 8 points. Point values between 8 and 13 were then determined associated with percentages of students who met the target ranging from 61% to 80%.
Developing (3 - 7 points) Results are below District- or BOCES-adopted expectations for growth or achievement for grade/subject.	Point values for the rating of “Developing” range from 3-7 with a low of 41% of students who met the target and a high of 60% of students who met the target.
Ineffective (0 - 2 points) Results are well below District- or BOCES-adopted expectations for growth or achievement for	Point values for the rating of “Ineffective” range from 0-2, corresponding with a low of ≤14% of students who met the

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/5139/150626-rhJdBgDruP/15PointHEDI_LocallySelected_REV.pdf

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

Growth or achievement measure(s) from these options.

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

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

Measures based on:

- 1) The change in percentage of a teacher's students who achieve a specific level of performance as determined locally, on such assessments/examinations compared to those students' level of performance on such assessments/examinations in the previous school year (e.g., a three percentage point increase in students earning the proficient level (three) or better performance level on the 7th grade math State assessment compared to those same students' performance levels on the 6th grade math State assessment, or an increase in the percentage of a teacher's students earning the advanced performance level (four) on the 4th grade ELA or math State assessments compared to those students' performance levels on the 3rd grade ELA or math State assessments)
- 2) Teacher specific growth score computed by the Department based on the percent of the teacher's students earning a State determined level of growth. The methodology to translate such growth into the State-established sub-component scoring ranges shall be determined locally
- 3) Teacher specific achievement or growth score computed in a manner determined locally based on a measure of student performance on the State assessments, Regents examinations and/or Department approved alternative examinations other than the measure described in 1) or 2), above
- 4) Student growth or achievement computed in a manner determined locally based on a State-approved 3rd party assessment
- 5) Student growth or achievement computed in a manner determined locally based on a district, regional or BOCES-developed assessment that is rigorous and comparable across classrooms

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

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

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

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

3.4) Grades K-3 ELA

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

	Locally-Selected Measure from List of Approved Measures	Assessment
K	4) State-approved 3rd party assessments	STAR Early Literacy Enterprise
1	4) State-approved 3rd party assessments	STAR Early Literacy Enterprise
2	4) State-approved 3rd party assessments	STAR Early Literacy Enterprise
3	4) State-approved 3rd party assessments	STAR Reading Enterprise

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.	The locally-selected measure may use the same assessment, State- approved 3rd party assessment, or district/BOCES-developed assessment as the SLO used for the State growth or other comparable measures subcomponent. If the same assessment it used, it will measure achievement rather than growth. Subsequent to determining the option utilized for Locally-Selected Measures of Achievement, targets or cut scores shall be determined by teachers in the same grade level/subject or course and approved by building principals. Targets or cut scores will be established in accordance with guidance from the Commissioner and State Education Department. Regardless of how the target or cut score for individual courses/grade levels/subject areas is established, the scoring band listed below will be utilized to determine the number of points assigned to teachers. See the uploaded graphic.
Highly Effective (18-20 points) Results are well above District- or BOCES-adopted expectations for growth or achievement for grade/subject.	Point values for the rating of “Highly Effective” range from 14-15 with a low of 81% of students who met the target and a high of greater than 90% of students who met the target.

Effective (9-17 points) Results meet District- or BOCES-adopted expectations for growth or achievement for grade/subject.	The HEDI scoring bands were created by first establishing the highest percentage of students who need to meet the target in order for a teacher to be considered “Effective” at 80%, which would yield 13 points, and then establishing the lowest percentage of students who would need to meet the target in order for a teacher to be considered “Effective” at 61%, which would yield 8 points. Point values between 8 and 13 were then determined associated with percentages of students who met the target ranging from 61% to 80%.
Developing (3 - 8 points) Results are below District- or BOCES-adopted expectations for growth or achievement for grade/subject.	Point values for the rating of “Developing” range from 3-7 with a low of 41% of students who met the target and a high of 60% of students who met the target.
Ineffective (0 - 2 points) Results are well below District- or BOCES-adopted expectations for growth or achievement for grade/subject.	Point values for the rating of “Ineffective” range from 0-2, corresponding with a low of ≤14% of students who met the target and a high of 40% of students who met the target.

3.5) Grades K-3 Math

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

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

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

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

Use this box, if needed, to describe the general process for assigning HEDI categories for these grades/subjects in this subcomponent. If needed, you may upload a table or graphic at 3.13, below.	The locally-selected measure may use the same assessment, State- approved 3rd party assessment, or district/BOCES-developed assessment as the SLO used for the State growth or other comparable measures subcomponent. If the same assessment it used, it will measure achievement rather than growth. Subsequent to determining the option utilized for Locally-Selected Measures of Achievement, targets or cut scores shall be determined by teachers in the same grade level/subject or course and approved by building principals. Targets or cut scores will be established in accordance with guidance from the Commissioner and State Education Department. Regardless of how the target or cut score for individual courses/grade levels/subject areas is established, the scoring band listed below will be utilized to determine the number of points assigned to teachers. See the uploaded graphic.
Highly Effective (18-20 points) Results are well above District- or BOCES-adopted expectations for growth or achievement for	Point values for the rating of “Highly Effective” range from 18-20 with a low of 81% of students who met the target and a

grade/subject. Effective (9-17 points) Results meet District- or BOCES-adopted expectations for growth or achievement for grade/subject.	high of greater than 90% of students who met the target. The HEDI scoring band was created by first establishing the highest percentage of students who need to meet the target in order for a teacher to be considered “Effective” at 80%, which would yield 17 points, and then establishing the lowest percentage of students who would need to meet the target in order for a teacher to be considered “Effective” at 61%, which would yield 9 points. Point values between 9 and 17 were then determined associated with percentages of students who met the target ranging from 61% to 80%.
Developing (3 - 8 points) Results are below District -or BOCES-adopted expectations for growth or achievement for grade/subject.	Point values for the rating of “Developing” range from 3-8 with a low of 41% of students who met the target and a high of 60% of students who met the target.
Ineffective (0 - 2 points) Results are well below District- or BOCES-adopted expectations for growth or achievement for grade/subject.	Point values for the rating of “Ineffective” range from 0-2, corresponding with a low of ≤14% of students who met the target and a high of 40% of students who met the target.

3.6) Grades 6-8 Science

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

	Locally-Selected Measure from List of Approved Measures	Assessment
6	5) District, regional, or BOCES–developed assessments	District developed Grade 6 Science assessment
7	5) District, regional, or BOCES–developed assessments	District developed Grade 7 Science assessment
8	6(ii) School wide measure computed locally	NYS Grade 8 Science Assessment

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

Use this box, if needed, to describe the general process for assigning HEDI categories for these grades/subjects in this subcomponent. If needed, you may upload a table or graphic at 3.13, below.	The locally-selected measure may use the same assessment, State- approved 3rd party assessment, or district/BOCES-developed assessment as the SLO used for the State growth or other comparable measures subcomponent. If the same assessment it used, it will measure achievement rather than growth. Subsequent to determining the option utilized for Locally-Selected Measures of Achievement, targets or cut scores shall be determined by teachers in the same grade level/subject or course and approved by building principals. Targets or cut scores will be established in accordance with guidance from the Commissioner and State Education Department. Regardless of how the target or cut score for individual courses/grade levels/subject areas is established, the scoring band listed below will be utilized to determine the number of points assigned to teachers. See the uploaded graphic.
Highly Effective (18 - 20 points) Results are well above District- or BOCES-adopted expectations for growth or achievement for grade/subject.	Point values for the rating of “Highly Effective” range from 18-20 with a low of 81% of students who met the target and a high of greater than 90% of students who met the target.
Effective (9 - 17 points) Results meet District- or BOCES-adopted expectations for growth or achievement for grade/subject.	The HEDI scoring band was created by first establishing the highest percentage of students who need to meet the target in order for a teacher to be considered “Effective” at 80%, which would yield 17 points, and then establishing the lowest

percentage of students who would need to meet the target in order for a teacher to be considered “Effective” at 61%, which would yield 9 points. Point values between 9 and 17 were then determined associated with percentages of students who met the target ranging from 61% to 80%.

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

Point values for the rating of “Developing” range from 3-8 with a low of 41% of students who met the target and a high of 60% of students who met the target.

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

Point values for the rating of “Ineffective” range from 0-2, corresponding with a low of ≤14% of students who met the target and a high of 40% of students who met the target.

3.7) Grades 6-8 Social Studies

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

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

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

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

Use this box, if needed, to describe the general process for assigning HEDI categories for these grades/subjects in this subcomponent. If needed, you may upload a table or graphic at 3.13, below.

The locally-selected measure may use the same assessment, State- approved 3rd party assessment, or district/BOCES-developed assessment as the SLO used for the State growth or other comparable measures subcomponent. If the same assessment it used, it will measure achievement rather than growth. Subsequent to determining the option utilized for Locally-Selected Measures of Achievement, targets or cut scores shall be determined by teachers in the same grade level/subject or course and approved by building principals. Targets or cut scores will be established in accordance with guidance from the Commissioner and State Education Department. Regardless of how the target or cut score for individual courses/grade levels/subject areas is established, the scoring band listed below will be utilized to determine the number of points assigned to teachers. See the uploaded graphic.

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

Point values for the rating of “Highly Effective” range from 18-20 with a low of 81% of students who met the target and a high of greater than 90% of students who met the target.

Effective (9 - 17 points) Results meet District- or BOCES-adopted expectations for growth or achievement for grade/subject.	The HEDI scoring band was created by first establishing the highest percentage of students who need to meet the target in order for a teacher to be considered “Effective” at 80%, which would yield 17 points, and then establishing the lowest percentage of students who would need to meet the target in order for a teacher to be considered “Effective” at 61%, which would yield 9 points. Point values between 9 and 17 were then determined associated with percentages of students who met the target ranging from 61% to 80%.
Developing (3 - 8 points) Results are below District- or BOCES-adopted expectations for growth or achievement for grade/subject.	Point values for the rating of “Developing” range from 3-8 with a low of 41% of students who met the target and a high of 60% of students who met the target.
Ineffective (0 - 2 points) Results are well below District- or BOCES-adopted expectations for growth or achievement for grade/subject.	Point values for the rating of “Ineffective” range from 0-2, corresponding with a low of ≤14% of students who met the target and a high of 40% of students who met the target.

3.8) High School Social Studies

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

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

	Locally-Selected Measure from List of Approved Measures	Assessment
Global 1	5) District, regional, or BOCES–developed assessments	District developed Global 1 assessment
Global 2	6(ii) School wide measure computed locally	Global Studies Regents Examination
American History	6(ii) School wide measure computed locally	US History & Government Regents Examination

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 locally-selected measure may use the same assessment, State- approved 3rd party assessment, or district/BOCES-developed assessment as the SLO used for the State growth or other comparable measures subcomponent. If the same assessment it used, it will measure achievement rather than growth. Subsequent to determining the option utilized for Locally-Selected Measures of Achievement, targets or cut scores shall be determined by teachers in the same grade level/subject or course and approved by building principals. Targets or cut scores will be established in accordance with guidance from the Commissioner and State Education Department. Regardless of how the target or cut score for individual courses/grade levels/subject areas is established, the
---	---

	scoring band listed below will be utilized to determine the number of points assigned to teachers. See the uploaded graphic.
Highly Effective (18 - 20 points) Results are well above District- or BOCES-adopted expectations for growth or achievement for grade/subject.	Point values for the rating of “Highly Effective” range from 18-20 with a low of 81% of students who met the target and a high of greater than 90% of students who met the target.
Effective (9 - 17 points) Results meet District- or BOCES-adopted expectations for growth or achievement for grade/subject.	The HEDI scoring band was created by first establishing the highest percentage of students who need to meet the target in order for a teacher to be considered “Effective” at 80%, which would yield 17 points, and then establishing the lowest percentage of students who would need to meet the target in order for a teacher to be considered “Effective” at 61%, which would yield 9 points. Point values between 9 and 17 were then determined associated with percentages of students who met the target ranging from 61% to 80%.
Developing (3 - 8 points) Results are below District- or BOCES-adopted expectations for growth or achievement for grade/subject.	Point values for the rating of “Developing” range from 3-8 with a low of 41% of students who met the target and a high of 60% of students who met the target.
Ineffective (0 - 2 points) Results are well below District- or BOCES-adopted expectations for growth or achievement for grade/subject.	Point values for the rating of “Ineffective” range from 0-2, corresponding with a low of ≤14% of students who met the target and a high of 40% of students who met the target.

3.9) High School Science

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

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

	Locally-Selected Measure from List of Approved Measures	Assessment
Living Environment	6(ii) School wide measure computed locally	Living Environment Regents Examination
Earth Science	6(ii) School wide measure computed locally	Earth Science Regents Examination
Chemistry	5) District, regional, or BOCES–developed assessments	District developed Chemistry assessment.
Physics	5) District, regional, or BOCES–developed assessments	District developed Physics assessment.

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

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

Use this box, if needed, to describe the general process for assigning HEDI categories for these grades/subjects in this subcomponent. If needed, you may upload a table or graphic at 3.13, below.	The locally-selected measure may use the same assessment, State- approved 3rd party assessment, or district/BOCES-developed assessment as the SLO used for the State growth or other comparable measures subcomponent. If the same assessment it used, it will measure achievement rather than growth. Subsequent to determining the option utilized for Locally-Selected Measures of Achievement, targets or cut
---	---

scores shall be determined by teachers in the same grade level/subject or course and approved by building principals. Targets or cut scores will be established in accordance with guidance from the Commissioner and State Education Department. Regardless of how the target or cut score for individual courses/grade levels/subject areas is established, the scoring band listed below will be utilized to determine the number of points assigned to teachers. See the uploaded graphic.

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

Point values for the rating of “Highly Effective” range from 18-20 with a low of 81% of students who met the target and a high of greater than 90% of students who met the target.

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

Point values for the rating of “Developing” range from 3-8 with a low of 41% of students who met the target and a high of 60% of students who met the target.

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

The HEDI scoring band was created by first establishing the highest percentage of students who need to meet the target in order for a teacher to be considered “Effective” at 80%, which would yield 17 points, and then establishing the lowest percentage of students who would need to meet the target in order for a teacher to be considered “Effective” at 61%, which would yield 9 points. Point values between 9 and 17 were then determined associated with percentages of students who met the target ranging from 61% to 80%.

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

Point values for the rating of “Ineffective” range from 0-2, corresponding with a low of ≤14% of students who met the target and a high of 40% of students who met the target.

3.10) High School Math

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

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

	Locally-Selected Measure from List of Approved Measures	Assessment
Algebra 1	6(ii) School wide measure computed locally	Algebra 1 Regents Examination
Geometry	5) District, regional, or BOCES–developed assessments	District developed Geometry assessment
Algebra 2	5) District, regional, or BOCES–developed assessments	District developed Algebra 2 assessment

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

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

Use this box, if needed, to describe the general process for assigning HEDI categories for these grades/subjects in this subcomponent. If needed, you may upload a table or graphic at

The locally-selected measure may use the same assessment, State- approved 3rd party assessment, or district/BOCES-developed assessment as the SLO used for the

3.13, below.	State growth or other comparable measures subcomponent. If the same assessment it used, it will measure achievement rather than growth. Subsequent to determining the option utilized for Locally-Selected Measures of Achievement, targets or cut scores shall be determined by teachers in the same grade level/subject or course and approved by building principals. Targets or cut scores will be established in accordance with guidance from the Commissioner and State Education Department. Regardless of how the target or cut score for individual courses/grade levels/subject areas is established, the scoring band listed below will be utilized to determine the number of points assigned to teachers. See the uploaded graphic.
Highly Effective (18 - 20 points) Results are well above District- or BOCES-adopted expectations for growth or achievement for grade/subject.	Point values for the rating of “Highly Effective” range from 18-20 with a low of 81% of students who met the target and a high of greater than 90% of students who met the target.
Effective (9 - 17 points) Results meet District- or BOCES-adopted expectations for growth or achievement for grade/subject.	The HEDI scoring band was created by first establishing the highest percentage of students who need to meet the target in order for a teacher to be considered “Effective” at 80%, which would yield 17 points, and then establishing the lowest percentage of students who would need to meet the target in order for a teacher to be considered “Effective” at 61%, which would yield 9 points. Point values between 9 and 17 were then determined associated with percentages of students who met the target ranging from 61% to 80%.
Developing (3 - 8 points) Results are below District- or BOCES-adopted expectations for growth or achievement for grade/subject.	Point values for the rating of “Developing” range from 3-8 with a low of 41% of students who met the target and a high of 60% of students who met the target.
Ineffective (0 - 2 points) Results are well below District- or BOCES-adopted expectations for growth or achievement for grade/subject.	Point values for the rating of “Ineffective” range from 0-2, corresponding with a low of ≤14% of students who met the target and a high of 40% of students who met the target.

3.11) High School English Language Arts

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

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

	Locally-Selected Measure from List of Approved Measures	Assessment
Grade 9 ELA	5) District, regional, or BOCES–developed assessments	District developed Grade 9 ELA assessment
Grade 10 ELA	5) District, regional, or BOCES–developed assessments	District developed Grade 9 ELA assessment
Grade 11 ELA	6(ii) School wide measure computed locally	Comprehensive English Regents Examination

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 locally-selected measure may use the same assessment, State- approved 3rd party assessment, or district/BOCES-developed assessment as the SLO used for the State growth or other comparable measures subcomponent. If the same assessment it used, it will measure achievement rather than growth. Subsequent to determining the option utilized for Locally-Selected Measures of Achievement, targets or cut scores shall be determined by teachers in the same grade level/subject or course and approved by building principals. Targets or cut scores will be established in accordance with guidance from the Commissioner and State Education Department. Regardless of how the target or cut score for individual courses/grade levels/subject areas is established, the scoring band listed below will be utilized to determine the number of points assigned to teachers. See the uploaded graphic.
Highly Effective (18 - 20 points) Results are well above District- or BOCES-adopted expectations for growth or achievement for grade/subject.	Point values for the rating of “Highly Effective” range from 18-20 with a low of 81% of students who met the target and a high of greater than 90% of students who met the target.
Effective (9 - 17 points) Results meet District- or BOCES-adopted expectations for growth or achievement for grade/subject.	The HEDI scoring band was created by first establishing the highest percentage of students who need to meet the target in order for a teacher to be considered “Effective” at 80%, which would yield 17 points, and then establishing the lowest percentage of students who would need to meet the target in order for a teacher to be considered “Effective” at 61%, which would yield 9 points. Point values between 9 and 17 were then determined associated with percentages of students who met the target ranging from 61% to 80%.
Developing (3 - 8 points) Results are below District- or BOCES-adopted expectations for growth or achievement for grade/subject.	Point values for the rating of “Developing” range from 3-8 with a low of 41% of students who met the target and a high of 60% of students who met the target.
Ineffective (0 - 2 points) Results are well below District- or BOCES-adopted expectations for growth or achievement for grade/subject.	Point values for the rating of “Ineffective” range from 0-2, corresponding with a low of ≤14% of students who met the target and a high of 40% of students who met the target.

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
Elementary Art, Music, Library, Physical Education	5) District/regional/BOCES –developed	District or BOCES developed assessments by grade level for each of the special area subjects
Home & Career Skills - Grade 6, 7, 8	5) District/regional/BOCES –developed	District developed assessment for HCS 6, 7, & 8.
Technology Education - Grades 6,7,8	5) District/regional/BOCES –developed	District developed assessment for Technology Education - Grades 6, 7, and 8.
Health - Grades 6, 8, Physical Education, Adaptive Physical Education - Grades 6, 7, 8	5) District/regional/BOCES –developed	District developed assessment for Health - Grades 6, 7, 8, and Health - Grades 6, 8

Orchestra, Band, Chorus, General Music - Grades 6, 7, 8	5) District/regional/BOCES –developed	District developed assessment for Orchestra, Band, Chorus, General Music - Grades 6, 7, 8
ESL - All Grades	3) Teacher specific achievement/growth score computed locally	NYSESLAT for ESL - all grade levels
Computer Applications - Grade 6	5) District/regional/BOCES –developed	District developed assessment on Computer Application - Grade 6
Latin - Grade 7	5) District/regional/BOCES –developed	District developed assessment for Latin - Grade 7
LOTE - Spanish, French - Grade 7, 8, and Latin - Grade 8	5) District/regional/BOCES –developed	District or BOCES developed assessment for Spanish - Grade 7, 8, French - Grade 7, 8, Latin - Grade 8
AP Language & Composition, AP Literature & Composition, AP Calculus BC, AP Chemistry, AP Physics B, AP Physics C, AP European History, AP Government/Politics, AP Human Geography, AP Macroeconomics, AP Psychology, AP US History, AP World History, AP Latin Vergil, AP Spanish Language, AP Studio Drawing, AP Music Theory	4) State-approved 3rd party	AP Exams for: AP Language & Composition, AP Literature & Composition, AP Calculus AB, AP Calculus BC, AP Biology, AP Chemistry, AP Physics B, AP Physics C, AP European History, AP Government/Politics, AP Human Geography, AP Macroeconomics, AP Psychology, AP US History, AP World History, AP Latin Vergil, AP Spanish Language, AP Studio Drawing, AP Music Theory
Participation in Government, Economics, Participation in Government S, Economics S	5) District/regional/BOCES –developed	District developed assessment for Participation in Government, Economics, Participation in Government S, Economics S
SUPA Public Affairs, SUPA Sociology, SUPA Forensics	5) District/regional/BOCES –developed	District developed assessment for Syracuse University College credit courses: SUPA Public Affairs, SUPA Sociology, SUPA Forensics
Math 5, Precalculus, Precalculus H, Precalculus R	5) District/regional/BOCES –developed	District developed assessment for Math 5, Precalculus, Precalculus H, Precalculus R
Consumer Chemistry, Environmental Science	5) District/regional/BOCES –developed	District developed assessment for Consumer Chemistry, Environmental Science
Peer Group Connection, Freshman Outreach, Youth Leadership	5) District/regional/BOCES –developed	District developed assessment for Peer Group Connection, Freshman Outreach, Youth Leadership
AP Calculus AB, AP Biology	5) District/regional/BOCES –developed	District developed assessment AP Calculus AB, District developed assessment for AP Biology
Latin 4H, French 2R, French 3R, French 4H, French 4R, Latin 1R, Latin 2R, Latin 3R, Latin 4R, Spanish 4H, Spanish 4R	5) District/regional/BOCES –developed	District developed assessment for French 2R, French 3R, French 4H, French 4R, Latin 1R, Latin 2R, Latin 3R, Latin 4R, Spanish 4H, Spanish 4R
English 12, English 12S	5) District/regional/BOCES –developed	District developed assessment for English 12, English 12S
3D Computer Modeling, Adv. Studio Video, Architectural CAD, CISCO Networking 1,	5) District/regional/BOCES	District developed assessment for 3D Computer Modeling, Adv. Studio Video,

Civil Engineering, Computer Manufacturing, Digital Electronics, Engineer Design & Development, Engineering Design, Material Process, Metal Systems, Principles of Engineering, Production System Wood, Residential Structure, Robotics 1, Robotics 2, Welding 1	–developed	Architectural CAD, CISCO Networking 1, Civil Engineering, Computer Manufacturing, Digital Electronics, Engineer Design & Development, Engineering Design, Material Process, Metal Systems, Principles of Engineering, Production System Wood, Residential Structure, Robotics 1, Robotics 2, Welding 1
Advanced Photo 1, Advanced Photo 2, Drawing/Painting 1, Drawing/Paintin 2, Studio Art, Studio Crafts 1, Studio Crafts 2, Student in Photo, Studio in Video, Studio Sculpture, Theater Performance	5) District/regional/BOCES –developed	District developed assessment for Advanced Photo 1, Advanced Photo 2, Drawing/Painting 1, Drawing/Paintin 2, Studio Art, Studio Crafts 1, Studio Crafts 2, Student in Photo, Studio in Video, Studio Sculpture, Theater Performance

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.	The locally-selected measure may use the same assessment, State- approved 3rd party assessment, or district/BOCES-developed assessment as the SLO used for the State growth or other comparable measures subcomponent. If the same assessment it used, it will measure achievement rather than growth. Subsequent to determining the option utilized for Locally-Selected Measures of Achievement, targets or cut scores shall be determined by teachers in the same grade level/subject or course and approved by building principals. Targets or cut scores will be established in accordance with guidance from the Commissioner and State Education Department. Regardless of how the target or cut score for individual courses/grade levels/subject areas is established, the scoring band listed below will be utilized to determine the number of points assigned to teachers. See the uploaded graphic.
Highly Effective (18 - 20 points) Results are well above District- or BOCES -adopted expectations for growth or achievement for grade/subject.	Point values for the rating of “Highly Effective” range from 18-20 with a low of 81% of students who met the target and a high of greater than 90% of students who met the target.
Effective (9 - 17 points) Results meet District- or BOCES-adopted expectations for growth or achievement for grade/subject.	The HEDI scoring band was created by first establishing the highest percentage of students who need to meet the target in order for a teacher to be considered “Effective” at 80%, which would yield 17 points, and then establishing the lowest percentage of students who would need to meet the target in order for a teacher to be considered “Effective” at 61%, which would yield 9 points. Point values between 9 and 17 were then determined associated with percentages of students who met the target ranging from 61% to 80%.
Developing (3 - 8 points) Results are below District- or BOCES-adopted expectations for growth or achievement for grade/subject.	Point values for the rating of “Developing” range from 3-8 with a low of 41% of students who met the target and a high of 60% of students who met the target.
Ineffective (0 - 2 points) Results are well below District- or BOCES-adopted expectations for growth or achievement for	Point values for the rating of “Ineffective” range from 0-2, corresponding with a low of ≤14% of students who met the

grade/subject.

target and a high of 40% of students who met the target.

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

assets/survey-uploads/5139/150626-Rp0Ol6pk1T/Form 3_12_All Other CoursesREV_1.doc

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/5139/150626-y92vNseFa4/HEDI_LOCAL_20_15_Point.pdf

3.14) Locally Developed Controls

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

For the 2012-2013 school year, locally developed controls will include student prior academic history, students with disabilities, English language learners, and students in poverty. SLO's will use growth from baselines based on past academic history to determine adjustment factors.

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.

The District will combine multiple locally selected measures by assessing each locally selected measure separately, calculating the point value (0-15 or 0-20), then averaging the point values. The rating always rounds to the nearest whole number; >.5 rounds up and <.5 rounds down.

The District will assess the results of each SLO separately, arriving at a HEDI rating and point value between 0-20 points. Each SLO must then be weighted proportionately based on the number of students included in all SLOs. This will provide one overall growth component score between 0-20 (or 0-15) points. The rating always rounds to the nearest whole number; ≥.5 rounds up and <.5 rounds down.

(Revised as per discussion with SED - 8/22/12)

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 Friday, July 13, 2012

Updated Friday, August 31, 2012

Page 1

4.1) Teacher Practice Rubric

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

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

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

Marzano's Causal Teacher Evaluation Model

(No response)

4.2) Points Within Other Measures

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

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

Is the following points assignment applicable to all teachers?

Yes

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

(No response)

Multiple (at least two) classroom observations by principal or other trained administrator, at least one of which must be unannounced [at least 31 points]	32
One or more observation(s) by trained independent evaluators	0
Observations by trained in-school peer teachers	0
Feedback from students using State-approved survey tool	0
Feedback from parents/caregivers using State-approved survey tool	0
Structured reviews of lesson plans, student portfolios and other teacher artifacts	28

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

(No response)

4.3) Survey Tools (if applicable)

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

(No response)

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

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

4.4) Assurances

Please check all of the boxes below:

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

4.5) Process for Assigning Points and Determining HEDI Ratings

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

The observer will utilize the Marzano Causal Teacher Evaluation Model rubrics to make judgments during the observation sessions. Scores are calculated by lesson segment. Lesson segments are subdivided by essential design questions. Each design question has primary trait rubrics for the critical elements of the evaluation model that imply best practices associated with the design question.

The observer determines during the lesson the design question(s) to focus on within each lesson segment based on what is being observed. The primary trait rubric(s) for the element being observed is used to make judgments and provide feedback. Elements which are not observed are not rated during the observation.

Rubric scores for each element are calculated on a 0-4 point scale (including 1/2 point variables). The scores for each element are

averaged to determine the overall score for the design questions that were observed. The overall scores for each design question are averaged to determine an overall score for each lesson segment.

A weighting factor is applied to each segment to calculate the total observed score for that segment. In order to determine the total observed score, rubric scores associated with content segments are weighted at three times, rubric scores associated with routine segments are weighted at two times, and rubric scores associated with segments enacted on the spot are not weighted.

The observation section is associated with the 41 rubrics assigned to Domain 1 of the Marzano Causal Teacher Evaluation Model. The Domain 1 Score is responsible for 53% (32 points) of the overall teacher point value of 60 points.

The District shall use a structured review of teacher artifact evidence to evaluate a teacher's performance for the remaining 28 points. Teachers will compile evidence (artifacts) that demonstrate understanding, knowledge and skill for each of the seven New York State Teaching Standards listed below:

1. Knowledge of Students and Student Learning
2. Knowledge of Content and Instructional Planning
3. Instructional Practice
4. Learning Environment
5. Assessment for Student Learning
6. Professional Responsibilities and Collaboration
7. Professional Growth

On an annual basis, each teacher will meet with his/her lead evaluator in structured review of artifact evidence conference. The conference represents an opportunity for the teacher and administrator to engage in reflection and dialogue around the teacher's professional growth as measured by the indicators in the NYS Teaching Standards and accompanying Domain Rubrics of the Marzano Causal Teacher Evaluation Model. The lead administrator will prompt the teacher to discuss how the artifacts chosen by the teacher are representative of professional growth, understanding, and skill development in each category of the NYS Teaching Standards. It is recommended that a teacher compile seven (7) to ten (10) artifacts indicative of understanding and skill development across the seven NYS Teaching Standards (see Appendix D for detail on structured review of teacher artifact evidence – portfolio).

Material submitted as artifacts shall be retained by the principal until the scoring is complete at which time items will be returned to the teacher. Such materials will not be copied, disseminated or otherwise made public without the teacher's written agreement.

The building administrator may schedule the APPR conference for tenured teachers at any point in the second half of the school year. Probationary teachers will be scheduled for their APPR conference during the final three months of the school year. The APPR conference can only occur after the teacher's observations (both announced and unannounced) have been completed. Teachers shall be given at least two weeks notice of the date of the APPR conference or sooner, if approved by the teacher.

The teacher's understanding, knowledge and skill development for each of the NYS Teaching Standards as evidenced by selected artifacts in the teacher portfolio and dialogue between the teacher and lead administrator, will be judged using rubrics from Domain 2, 3, and 4 of the Marzano Causal Teacher Evaluation Model. A single rubric score (four-point scale) will be calculated for each Domain from the average of rubric scores utilized in judgment of portfolio artifacts and conference dialogue.

The Domain rubrics will be weighted as follows:

Domain 1 – Marzano Causal Teacher Evaluation Model: 53% (32 points – observations)

Domain 2 – Marzano Causal Teacher Evaluation Model: 20% (12 points)

Domain 3 – Marzano Causal Teacher Evaluation Model: 12% (7 points)

Domain 4 – Marzano Causal Teacher Evaluation Model: 15% (9 points)

The scoring methodology for the assignment of points to this subcomponent shall be as follows:

The following conversion scale will be used to translate the overall average rubric scores for each domain to the 60-point distribution for the composite teacher score.

Level Overall rubric average score 60 point distribution for composite

Ineffective 1-1.4 0-49

Developing 1.5-2.4 50-56

Effective 2.5-3.4 57-58

Highly Effective 3.5-4 59-60

The detailed conversion look-up table (see uploaded graphic) is used to convert the average weighted rubric score to a specific teacher score for the other measures of teacher effectiveness sub-component.

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/5091/151503-eka9yMJ855/HEDI_Other60Points_Teacher.pdf

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

Highly Effective: Overall performance and results exceed NYS Teaching Standards.	Overall weighted average rubric score of 3.5-4 59-60 point conversion.
Effective: Overall performance and results meet NYS Teaching Standards.	Overall weighted average rubric score of 2.5-3.4 57-58 point conversion.
Developing: Overall performance and results need improvement in order to meet NYS Teaching Standards.	Overall weighted average rubric score of 1.5-2.4 50-56 point conversion.
Ineffective: Overall performance and results do not meet NYS Teaching Standards.	Overall weighted average rubric score of 1-1.4 0-49 point conversion.

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	4
4.6) Observations of Probationary Teachers Informal/Short	0
4.6) Observations of Probationary Teachers Enter 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 probationary teachers be done in person, by video, or both?

-
- In Person
-

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

-
- In Person
-

4.7) Observations of Tenured Teachers

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

By building principals or other trained administrators

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

By trained in-school peer teachers or other trained reviewers

Formal/Long	0
Informal/Short	0

Independent evaluators

Formal/Long	0
Informal/Short	0

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

-
- In Person
-

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

-
- In Person
-

5. Composite Scoring (Teachers)

Created Friday, July 13, 2012

Updated Wednesday, August 22, 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 Friday, July 13, 2012

Updated Friday, August 31, 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/5265/151506-Df0w3Xx5v6/CCSD_Teacher_Tip.doc

6.3) Appeals Process

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

(1) the substance of the annual professional performance review

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

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

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

A teacher is not authorized to trigger the appeal process until he or she receives a composite score. Depending on the assessment used, a score may not be available until after the end of the school year. Teachers must receive their composite scores no later than September 1 of the school year next following the school year for which they are being evaluated. Therefore, the appeal process will be triggered on or before September 1, when the teacher receives his or her composite score.

Only a unit member who is covered by N.Y. Education Law § 3012-c (“Covered Unit Member” or “teacher”) may appeal the result of a performance review and/or an improvement plan pursuant to the following procedure:

a. A Covered Unit Member may challenge only the substance of an APPR, the District’s adherence to the statutory standards and methodologies required for such review, the District’s compliance with its own procedures and timelines for conducting the APPR and the Regulations of the Commissioner of Education and/or the issuance or implementation of a teacher improvement plan (“TIP”). Such challenge must be submitted in writing to the Administrator performing the review, together with any supporting documentation. The challenge must explain in detail the specific reason(s) why the matter identified is the subject of the challenge. A teacher may not file multiple appeals regarding the same APPR or TIP. 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. All supporting information must also be submitted at the time the appeal is filed. Any information not submitted at the time the appeal is filed shall not be considered. In an appeal, the teacher has the burden of demonstrating a clear legal right to the relief requested and the burden of establishing the facts upon which he or she seeks relief. The challenge must be submitted within fifteen calendar days of the receipt of the APPR and/or TIP which is the subject of the challenge, or other act complained of, or it is deemed waived. For purposes of this Memorandum of Agreement, calendar days shall exclude the periods of the Winter, Mid-Winter and Spring recesses. The administrator involved will schedule a meeting to discuss the challenge. A Covered Unit Member may select an Association representative to participate in the meeting. Within fifteen calendar days of the meeting, the Administrator who issued the APPR and/or TIP shall submit to the teacher a detailed written response to the Appeal. The response must include any additional documents or written materials specific to the point(s) of disagreement that support the response and are relevant to the resolution of the appeal. For a tenured teacher who received a rating of “highly effective”, or “effective” or a non-tenured teacher who received any rating, including “ineffective”, the Administrator’s determination shall be final. If that teacher disagrees with the response, the teacher may submit a written statement outlining the basis for that disagreement to be included in his or her file along with the disputed Annual Professional Performance Review.

b. If a tenured Covered Unit Member received a rating of “ineffective” or “developing” and disagrees with the Administrator’s response to the challenge, the teacher may submit the challenge, the Administrator’s response, and a written statement explaining in detail the reason(s) for disagreement with the response to the Superintendent of Schools within seven calendar days of receipt of the administrator’s response. A meeting will be scheduled to discuss the appeal within 10 calendar days of the receipt of the administrator’s response. The tenured Covered Unit Member may select an Association representative to participate in the meeting. The Superintendent shall render a final determination on the challenge within ten calendar days thereafter.

c. A challenge or determination under this appeal process shall not be the subject of a grievance, and the arbitration provisions of the Collective Negotiations Agreement shall not apply to any such challenge or determination. The teacher retains any defenses he or she may have in the event the APPR or TIP is utilized in a subsequent 3020-a proceeding. Nothing in this appeals process shall be construed to alter or diminish, or in any way restrict or affect the District’s non-reviewable authority to terminate the appointment of or deny tenure to a probationary teacher at any time including during the pendency of an appeal for statutorily and constitutionally permissible reasons other than the teacher’s performance that is subject of the appeal, and any such termination or denial shall not in any way be subject to challenge through the grievance and arbitration provisions of the collective negotiations agreement between the Parties or in any other forum. A school district or BOCES may only terminate or deny tenure to a probationary teacher or principal during the pendency of an APPR appeal where such determination does not rely upon the performance that is being appealed (the subject of the appeal). Education Law §3012-c and §302.11 of the Rules of the Board of Regents each provide that nothing therein shall be construed to alter or diminish the authority of the governing body of a school district or BOCES to grant or deny tenure to or terminate probationary teachers or principals during the pendency of an appeal for statutorily and constitutionally permissible reasons other than the teacher’s or principal’s performance that is the subject of the appeal.

6.4) Training and Certification of Lead Evaluators and Evaluators

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

The District will establish procedures to train and certify lead evaluators. The District will use a combination of the training programs listed below to establish proficiency and certify lead evaluators:

- Direct training contracted from Learning Sciences International on the Marzano Causal Teaching Rubric and Art & Science of Teaching Framework (August 20-21, 2012 & August 27, 2012).

- Direct training from Learning Sciences International on Domain 1 Rubrics and Framework for entire teaching and administrative staff (October 26, 2012).

- Direct training on the iObservation web-based utility for archiving and communicating APPR ratings from Learning Sciences International and Erie 1 BOCES (August 13, 2012).

- Summer 2012 training (June 27-28, 2012; July 16, 2012; August 27, 2012; August 29-30, 2012) from District-level administrators and Erie 1 BOCES on the Art & Science of Teaching Framework, and the Marzano Administrator Evaluation System, including the use of Clarence teaching videos compiled during the 2011-12 school year.

- Continued training on inter-rater reliability during monthly administrative meetings over the course of the 2012-2013 school year.

- Training on Marzano Framework at particular faculty meetings held during the 2012-2013 school year in all school buildings.

- Online training on the Marzano Causal Teaching Rubric and Marzano Administrator Evaluation System provided by Learning Sciences International (8 specific 30-hour online courses, two of which will be available to all staff in 2012-13).

- The following books were purchased for administrators and used in training sessions during the summer of 2012 and the 2012-13 school year:

- o *The Art & Science of Teaching*
- o *Handbook for the Art and Science of Teaching*
- o *Designing & Teaching Learning Goals & Objectives*
- o *Formative Assessment & Standards-Based Grading*
- o *The Highly Engaged Classroom*
- o *Teaching & Assessing 21st Century Skills*
- o *Becoming a Reflective Teacher*

Inter-rater reliability for all lead evaluators will be facilitated by individual and small group scoring of teacher videos provided by the District, ASCD, Learning Sciences International, and SED. Principals will practice utilizing rubrics associated with the Marzano Causal Teaching Evaluation System to judge videos of lessons. The scores will be calibrated and practice will continue until inter-rater reliability is assured. Inter-rater reliability training will take place during the summer of 2012 and during the first three months of the 2012-13 school year.

The Superintendent of Schools shall certify all lead evaluators and evaluators annually at the completion of the training sessions. Re-certification will occur on an annual basis.

6.5) Assurances -- Evaluators

Please check the boxes below:

-
- Checked
-

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

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

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

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

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

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

(7) use of the Statewide Instructional Reporting System

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

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

• Checked

6.6) Assurances -- Teachers

Please check all of the boxes below:

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

6.7) Assurances -- Data

Please check all of the boxes below:

6.7) Assurances -- Data Assure that SED will receive accurate teacher and student data, including enrollment and attendance data, and any other student, teacher, school, course, and teacher/student linkage data necessary to comply with regulations, in a format and timeline prescribed by the Commissioner.	Checked
---	---------

6.7) Assurances -- Data Certify that the district provides an opportunity for every classroom teacher to verify the subjects and/or student rosters assigned to them.	Checked
---	---------

6.7) Assurances -- Data Assure scores for all teachers will be reported to NYSED for each subcomponent, as well as the composite rating, as per NYSED requirements.	Checked
---	---------

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

Created Friday, July 13, 2012

Updated Wednesday, August 29, 2012

Page 1

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

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

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

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

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

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.	Targets for SLOs shall be approved by the Superintendent of Schools. Targets will be established in accordance with guidance from the Commissioner and State Education Department. Regardless of how the target for the SLO is established, the scoring bands listed below will be utilized to determine the number of points assigned to principals
Highly Effective (18 - 20 points) Results are well above state average for similar students (or District goals if no state test).	Point values for the rating of “Highly Effective” range from 18-20 with a low of 76% of students who met the target and a high of greater than 85% of students who met the target.
Effective (9 - 17 points) Results meet state average for similar students (or District goals if no state test).	The 20-point value HEDI scoring band was created by first establishing the highest percentage of students who need to meet the target in order for a teacher to be considered “Effective” at 75%, which would yield 17 points, and then establishing the lowest percentage of students who would need to meet the target in order for a teacher to be considered “Effective” at 61%, which would yield 9 points. Point values between 9 and 17 were then determined associated with percentages of students who met the target ranging from 61% to 75%.
Developing (3 - 8 points) Results are below state average for similar students (or District goals if no state test).	Point values for the rating of “Developing” range from 3-8 with a low of 41% of students who met the target and a high of 60% of students who met the target.
Ineffective (0 - 2 points) Results are well below state average for similar students (or District goals if no state test).	Point values for the rating of “Ineffective” range from 0-2, corresponding with a low of ≤14% of students who met the target and a high of 40% of students who met the target.

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/5365/151509-lha0DogRNw/Admin_20Point_SLO_Conversion.pdf

7.4) Special Considerations for Comparable Growth Measures

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

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

(No response)

7.5) Principals with More Than One Growth Measure

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

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

7.6) Assurances -- Comparable Growth Measures

Please check all of the boxes below:

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

8. Local Measures (Principals)

Created Friday, July 13, 2012

Updated Wednesday, August 29, 2012

Page 1

Locally-Selected Measures of Student Achievement or Growth

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

Grade Configuration	Locally-Selected Measure from List of Approved Measures	Assessment
K-5	(b) results for students in specific performance levels	STAR Early Literacy Enterprise (Grades K-2)
K-5	(b) results for students in specific performance levels	STAR Reading Enterprise (Grades 3-4)
K-5	(b) results for students in specific performance levels	Scholastic Reading Inventory (Grade 5)
6-8	(a) achievement on State assessments	Grade 8 NYS Science Assessment
6-8	(a) achievement on State assessments	NYS Regents Earth Science Assessment
9-12	(a) achievement on State assessments	NYS Global History Regents Assessment
9-12	(a) achievement on State assessments	NYS US History Regents Assessment
9-12	(a) achievement on State assessments	NYS Living Environment Regents Assessment
9-12	(a) achievement on State assessments	NYS Integrated Algebra Regents Assessment
9-12	(a) achievement on State assessments	NYS Comprehensive English Regents Assessment

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.	<p>There will be two targets established for elementary building principals in a K-5 grade configuration.</p> <p>First, in grades kindergarten through fourth grade, student achievement shall be based on a structured district-wide goal setting process to produce annual Local Achievement Targets (LAT) to be mutually agreed upon between the Elementary</p>
---	--

Principals and Superintendent. The assessment tool to be used is the STAR Early Literacy (K-2) and STAR Reading (3-4) by Renaissance Learning, which has been approved by the NYS Education Department as a local evaluative tool.

In the 2012-13 school year, the LAT shall be 75% of the students in kindergarten through fourth grade, will attain a level of proficiency by June 10, 2013. The proficiency levels for each grade are established nationally by Renaissance Learning Corporation.

Second, in grade five, student achievement will be based on the SRI reading assessment published by the Scholastic Reading Company which has been approved by the New York State Education Department as a local evaluative tool. In the 2012-13 school year, the LAT shall be 75% of the fifth grade students at a nationally determined proficiency Lexile Score at or above 800.

The target established for the middle school principal (grades 6-8 configuration) will be based on the New York State Eighth Grade Science Assessment rate of proficiency and the performance of Eighth grade students on the New York State Earth Science Regents Exam. For the eighth grade, 75% of the eighth grade students will meet the proficiency score of Level 3 or 4 on the NYS Science Assessment. For those students taking the New York State Earth Science Regents, 75% of those students will score 75% or better. The final achievement score will be determined by finding the average of the two assessment performances.

The target established for the high school principal (grades 9-12 configuration) will be based on the on student performance on the five required New York State Regents Integrated Algebra, Global Studies, United States History, Living Environment and English 11 (June administration). For the 2012-13 school year, the local assessment target will be:

75% of the students participating in these five required Regents exams will achieve a score of 80% or better. The final percentage will be calculated by averaging the five exam performance percentages.

Regardless of how the target for school grade configurations is established, the scoring band listed below will be utilized to determine the number of points assigned to principals. See the uploaded graphic.

Highly Effective (14 - 15 points) Results are well above District- or BOCES-adopted expectations for growth or achievement for grade/subject.

76-100% of students meeting the target.

Effective (8- 13 points) Results meet District- or BOCES-adopted expectations for growth or achievement for grade/subject.

61-75% of students meeting the target

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

41-60% of students meeting the target

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

0-40% of students meeting the target.

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/5366/151513-qBFVOWF7fC/Admin_15Point_ConversionScale_1.pdf

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

(h) students' progress toward graduation in the school using strong predictive indicators, including but not limited to 9th and/or 10th

grade credit accumulation and/or the percentage of students that pass 9th and/or 10th grade subjects most commonly associated with graduation and/or students' progress in passing the number of required Regents examinations for graduation, for principals employed in a school with high school grades

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

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

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

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

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

<p>Use this box, if needed, to describe the process for assigning HEDI categories. If needed, you may upload a table or graphic below.</p>	<p>There will be two targets established for elementary building principals in a K-5 grade configuration.</p> <p>First, in grades kindergarten through fourth grade, student achievement shall be based on a structured district-wide goal setting process to produce annual Local Achievement Targets (LAT) to be mutually agreed upon between the Elementary Principals and Superintendent. The assessment tool to be used is the STAR Early Literacy (K-2) and STAR Reading (3-4) by Renaissance Learning, which has been approved by the NYS Education Department as a local evaluative tool.</p> <p>In the 2012-13 school year, the LAT shall be 75% of the students in kindergarten through fourth grade, will attain a level of proficiency by June 10, 2013. The proficiency levels for each grade are established nationally by Renaissance Learning Corporation.</p> <p>Second, in grade five, student achievement will be based on the SRI reading assessment published by the Scholastic Reading Company which has been approved by the New York State Education Department as a local evaluative tool. In the 2012-13 school year, the LAT shall be 75% of the fifth grade students at a nationally determined proficiency Lexile Score at or above 800.</p>
--	---

The target established for the middle school principal (grades 6-8 configuration) will be based on the New York State Eighth Grade Science Assessment rate of proficiency and the performance of Eighth grade students on the New York State Earth Science Regents Exam. For the eighth grade, 75% of the eighth grade students will meet the proficiency score of Level 3 or 4 on the NYS Science Assessment. For those students taking the New York State Earth Science Regents, 75% of those students will score 75% or better. The final achievement score will be determined by finding the average of the two assessment performances.

The target established for the high school principal (grades 9-12 configuration) will be based on the on student performance on the five required New York State Regents Integrated Algebra, Global Studies, United States History, Living Environment and English 11 (June administration). For the 2012-13 school year, the local assessment target will be:

75% of the students participating in these five required Regents exams will achieve a score of 80% or better. The final percentage will be calculated by averaging the five exam performance percentages.

Regardless of how the target for school grade configurations is established, the scoring band listed below will be utilized to determine the number of points assigned to principals. See the uploaded graphic.

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

76-100% of students meeting the target.

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

61-75% of students meeting the target

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

41-60% of students meeting the target

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

0-40% of students meeting the target.

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/5366/151513-T8MIGWUVm1/Admin_20Point_SLO_Conversion.pdf

8.3) Locally Developed Controls

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

No adjustments, controls, or other special consideration will be used in setting targets for local measures for administrators.

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.

The percent of students meeting the target will be calculated for each locally selected measure assigned to a principal. The scores will then be averaged to determine a single subcomponent HEDI category and score.

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 Friday, July 13, 2012

Updated Thursday, August 23, 2012

Page 1

9.1) Principal Practice Rubric

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

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

Marzano's School Administrator Rubric

(No response)

9.2) Points Within Other Measures

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

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

Is the following points assignment for all principals?

Yes

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

(No response)

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

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

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

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

(No response)

9.3) Assurances -- Goals

Please check the boxes below (if applicable):

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

9.4) Sources of Evidence (if applicable)

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

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

9.5) Survey Tool(s) (if applicable)

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

(No response)

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

(No response)

(No response)

(No response)

9.6) Assurances

Please check all of the boxes below:

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

9.7) Process for Assigning Points and Determining HEDI Ratings

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

Element A:

Supervisory Visits

Principal Portfolio

APPR Conferences (School year August 1- July 31)

(Value: 60 of the total 60 points)

Description of Element:

During the month of August, the Superintendent will meet with the building principal to establish two goals for the upcoming school year, one directed toward improving teacher effectiveness, and a second goal involving quantifiable and verifiable improvements in academic results or the school's learning environment. The Superintendent will conduct a minimum of two supervisory visits each month of the school year with one monthly visit being a minimum of thirty minutes and one unannounced visit. Each supervisory visitation will include building/classroom walk-throughs and/or a discussion regarding school leadership and management efforts and initiatives.

During December, the Superintendent and Building Principal will meet to review status/progress of goals as well as areas of professional growth, building management, and topics pertinent to the principal's professional development.

By July 15th, the Building Principal must present his/her portfolio (description below) to the Superintendent.

By August 15th, the Superintendent and Building Principal will meet for the purposes of an Annual Professional Performance Review conference. Superintendent and Principal may refer to the Principal's Portfolio and year's goals during this conference. The context of the conference will involve Principal's strengths and areas for improvement as well as the Principal's Self-Evaluation using the Marzano School Administrator Evaluation System and Rubric.

The portfolio and APPR conference will be evaluated according to the Marzano School Administrator Evaluation System and Rubric. After the conference has taken place, the Superintendent will write a narrative account of the meeting that will address principal's growth and strength in each of the APPR leadership categories.

Portfolio Description:

The Principal's portfolio must be constructed using the Marzano School Administrator Evaluation System and Rubric. The portfolio will be constructed using the five domains of the Marzano School Administrator Evaluation System:

- 1) Data Driven Focus on Student Achievement*
- 2) Continuous Improvement of Instruction,*
- 3) Guaranteed and Viable Curriculum,*
- 4) Cooperation and Collaboration, and*
- 5) School Climate.*

The five domains of the Marzano School Administrator Evaluation System will be associated with the six ISLLC Educational Leadership Policy Standards (2008).

Principals will submit evidence from the current school year applicable to each domain and ISLLC standard. The portfolio will also contain information, feedback, and documents related to Elements B and C.

Document Review Description:

During year-end Annual Professional Performance Review conference, Principal and Superintendent will review documents/data pertaining to the past school year. Such documents may include but not limited to: student data pertaining to building goals/grade level goals, data from year's Universal Screening reports, student/teacher attendance, report card information, and such.

The final component of the Building Principal's Portfolio will be a self-evaluation using the Marzano Rubric. This self-evaluation will be incorporated throughout the discussion between Building Principal and Superintendent at the year - end APPR conference.

On an annual basis, each principal will meet with the superintendent in portfolio conference. The conference represents an opportunity for the principal and superintendent to engage in reflection and dialogue around the principal's professional growth as measured by the indicators in the ISLLC Standards and accompanying Domain Rubrics of the Marzano Administrator Evaluation Model. The superintendent will prompt the principal to discuss how the artifacts chosen by the principal are representative of professional growth, understanding, and skill development in each domain of the Marzano Administrator Evaluation System.

Material submitted as artifacts shall be retained by the superintendent until the scoring is complete at which time items will be returned to the principal. Such materials will not be copied, disseminated or otherwise made public without the principal's written agreement.

The Superintendent (lead evaluator) will utilize the Marzano School Administrator Evaluation Rubrics to make judgments for each element that comprise the Other Measures of Principal Effectiveness.

The lead evaluator will determine which rubrics correspond to a particular element for the other measures of principal effectiveness.

Rubric scores for each element are calculated on a 0-4 point scale (including 1/2 point variables). The scores for each element are averaged to determine the overall 0-4 point score for each element section. The overall score 0-4 point score for each element is then weighted according to the chart uploaded and entitled "Weighting for Other Measures of Principal Effectiveness".

Portfolio Review of Principal Artifact Evidence

The principal's understanding, knowledge and skill development for each of the ISLLC standards and Domains of the Marzano Administrator Evaluation system as evidenced by selected artifacts in the principal portfolio and dialogue between the principal and superintendent, will be judged using rubrics potentially from all five domains of the Marzano Administrator Evaluation System. A single rubric score (four-point scale) will be calculated for each Domain from the average of rubric scores utilized in judgment of portfolio artifacts, supervisory visitation logs, principal self-evaluation, and APPR conference dialogue.

Level Overall rubric average score 60 point distribution for composite

Ineffective 1-1.4 0-49

Developing 1.5-2.4 50-56

Effective 2.5-3.4 57-58

Highly Effective 3.5-4 59-60

The detailed conversion look-up table (uploaded file) is used to convert the average weighted rubric score to a specific principal score for the other measures of principal effectiveness sub-component.

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/5143/151521-pMADJ4gk6R/Admin_APPR_ProcessAssigningPointsREV_1.pdf

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

Highly Effective: Overall performance and results exceed standards.	Average weighted rubric score: 3.5—4.0 59-60 Points
Effective: Overall performance and results meet standards.	Average weighted rubric score: 2.5—3.4 57-58 Points
Developing: Overall performance and results need improvement in order to meet standards.	Average weighted rubric score: 1.5—2.4 50-56 Points
Ineffective: Overall performance and results do not meet standards.	Average weighted rubric score: 0—1.4 0-49 Points

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	20
By trained administrator	0
By trained independent evaluator	0
Enter Total	20

Tenured Principals

By supervisor	20
By trained administrator	0
By trained independent evaluator	0
Enter Total	20

10. Composite Scoring (Principals)

Created Friday, July 13, 2012

Updated Wednesday, August 22, 2012

Page 1

Standards for Rating Categories

Growth or Comparable Measures

Locally-selected Measures of growth or achievement

Other Measures of Effectiveness (Teacher and Leader standards)

Highly

Effective

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

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

Overall performance and results exceed ISLLC leadership standards.

Effective

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

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

Overall performance and results meet ISLLC leadership standards.

Developing

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

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

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

Ineffective

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

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

Overall performance and results do not meet ISLLC leadership standards.

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

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

2012-13 where there is no Value-Added measure

Growth or Comparable Measures

Locally-selected Measures of

growth or achievement

Other Measures of Effectiveness

(60 points)

Overall

Composite Score

Highly Effective

18-20

18-20

Ranges determined locally--see below

91-100

Effective

9-17

9-17

75-90

Developing

3-8

3-8

65-74

Ineffective

0-2

0-2

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

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

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

2012-13 where Value-Added growth measure applies

Growth or Comparable Measures

Locally-selected Measures of growth or achievement

Other Measures of Effectiveness

(60 points)

Overall

Composite Score

Highly Effective

22-25

14-15

Ranges determined locally--see above

91-100

Effective

10-21

8-13

75-90

Developing

3-9

3-7

65-74

Ineffective

0-2

0-2

0-64

11. Additional Requirements - Principals

Created Friday, July 13, 2012

Updated Thursday, August 23, 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/5276/151573-Df0w3Xx5v6/CCSD_PIP_2012.doc

11.3) Appeals Process

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

(1) the substance of the annual professional performance review

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

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

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

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

B. The principal must submit a written description which must explain in detail the specific areas which are the basis for the appeal.

The performance review and/or improvement plan being challenged must also be submitted with the appeal. Any information not submitted at the time the appeal is filed shall not be considered. Appeals are limited to those matters that may be appealed as prescribed in Section 3012-c of the Education Law:

- (1) The substance of the annual professional performance review;*
- (2) The District's adherence to the standards and methodologies required for such reviews, pursuant to Education Law §3012-c;*
- (2) The adherence to the Commissioner's regulations, as applicable to such reviews;*
- (3) Compliance with any applicable locally negotiated procedures applicable to annual professional performance reviews or improvement plans; and*
- (4) The District's issuance and/or implementation of the terms of a principal's improvement plan under Education Law §3012-c.*

C. A principal may not file more than one appeal on the same APPR or improvement plan. All grounds for an appeal of an APPR or improvement plan must be raised with specificity as a part of the initial submission of the appeal. Any grounds not raised at the time the appeal is filed shall be deemed waived.

D. The principal initiating the appeal has the burden of demonstrating a clear legal right to the relief requested and the burden of establishing the facts upon which relief is sought.

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

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

G. Appeal Process:

Step One

Administrator will officially appeal to Superintendent.

Appellant and Superintendent to meet to discuss appeal.

Appellant must follow appeal process and present written appeal response.

Step Two

In the event first step does not change rating, appellant will have the right to access the Appeal Panel Panel:*

- District Office Representative (selected by Superintendent)*
- Outside Evaluator* (selected by Superintendent)*
- Outside Evaluator* (selected by Appellant)*

**A pool of 5 evaluators will be mutually selected in the beginning of the school year from the BOCES list of available outside evaluators.*

H. The Appeal Process shall provide the principal with the opportunity to meet with the panel within 7 business days of the date of the principal's request was received (or such other convenient time as may be determined by the panel) and shall render a final recommendation on the appeal within seven (7) business days after the principal was provided the opportunity to meet with the Panel.

I. Nothing in this appeals process shall in any way restrict or affect the District's non-reviewable authority to terminate the appointment of or deny tenure to a probationary principal, during the pendency of an appeal for statutorily and constitutionally permissible reasons other than the principal's performance that is subject of the appeal, and any such termination or denial shall not in any way be subject to challenge through the grievance and arbitration provisions of the collective negotiations agreement between the Parties or in any other forum.

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

K. The above appeals procedure shall constitute the exclusive means for initiating, reviewing, and resolving any and all challenges and appeals related to principal's APPR or Improvement Plan. A principal may not resort to any other grievance or arbitration procedures contained within the collective bargaining agreement or to any administrative or judicial forum for the resolution of challenges and appeals related to the APPR or Improvement Plan.

L. A challenge or determination under this appeal process shall not be the subject of a grievance, and the arbitration provisions of the Collective Negotiations Agreement shall not apply to any such challenge or determination. The principal retains any defenses he or she may have in the event the APPR or PIP is utilized in a subsequent 3020-a proceeding.

M. Upon request by either the District or the Association, this appeal process will be annually reviewed to assess its effectiveness. Any changes will be mutually agreed to in writing by both parties.

11.4) Training and Certification of Lead Evaluators and Evaluators

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

The District will establish procedures to train and certify lead evaluators. The District will use a combination of the training programs listed below to establish proficiency and certify lead evaluators:

- Direct training contracted from Learning Sciences International on the Marzano Causal Teaching Rubric and Art & Science of Teaching Framework (August 20-21, 2012 & August 27, 2012).

- Direct training from Learning Sciences International on Domain 1 Rubrics and Framework for entire teaching and administrative staff (October 26, 2012).

- Direct training on the iObservation web-based utility for archiving and communicating APPR ratings from Learning Sciences International and Erie 1 BOCES (August 13, 2012).

- Summer 2012 training (June 27-28, 2012; July 16, 2012; August 27, 2012; August 29-30, 2012) from District-level administrators and Erie 1 BOCES on the Art & Science of Teaching Framework, and the Marzano Administrator Evaluation System, including the use of Clarence teaching videos compiled during the 2011-12 school year.

- Continued training on inter-rater reliability during monthly administrative meetings over the course of the 2012-2013 school year.

- Training on Marzano Framework at particular faculty meetings held during the 2012-2013 school year in all school buildings.

- Online training on the Marzano Causal Teaching Rubric and Marzano Administrator Evaluation System provided by Learning Sciences International (8 specific 30-hour online courses, two of which will be available to all staff in 2012-13).

- The following books were purchased for administrators and used in training sessions during the summer of 2012 and the 2012-13 school year:

- o The Art & Science of Teaching*
- o Handbook for the Art and Science of Teaching*
- o Designing & Teaching Learning Goals & Objectives*
- o Formative Assessment & Standards-Based Grading*
- o The Highly Engaged Classroom*
- o Teaching & Assessing 21st Century Skills*
- o Becoming a Reflective Teacher*

Inter-rater reliability for all lead evaluators will be facilitated by individual and small group scoring of teacher videos provided by the District, ASCD, Learning Sciences International, and SED. Principals will practice utilizing rubrics associated with the Marzano Causal Teaching Evaluation System to judge videos of lessons. The scores will be calibrated and practice will continue until inter-rater reliability is assured. Inter-rater reliability training will take place during the summer of 2012 and during the first three months of the 2012-13 school year.

The Superintendent of Schools shall certify all lead evaluators and evaluators annually at the completion of the training sessions.

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 Thursday, May 10, 2012

Updated Wednesday, August 29, 2012

Page 1

12.1) Upload the Joint Certification of the APPR Plan

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

assets/survey-uploads/5581/128005-3Uqgn5g9Iu/APPR_District_Certification.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
Peer Group Connection, Freshman Outreach, Youth Leadership, Child Development & Nutrition, Clothing & Textiles, Fashion Merch I, Fashion Merch II, Food/Nutrition, Interior Design, Hospital Intern	<input type="radio"/> State Assessment <input type="radio"/> State-approved 3rd party assessment <input checked="" type="radio"/> District, Regional or BOCES-developed <input type="radio"/> School/BOCES-wide/group/team results based on State	District developed assessment for the Family and Consumer Science Courses - Peer Group Connection, Freshman Outreach, Youth Leadership, Child Development & Nutrition, Clothing & Textiles, Fashion Merch I, Fashion Merch II, Food/Nutrition, Interior Design, Hospital Intern
SUPA Public Affairs, SUPA Sociology, SUPA Forensics	<input type="radio"/> State Assessment <input type="radio"/> State-approved 3rd party assessment <input checked="" type="radio"/> District, Regional or BOCES-developed <input type="radio"/> School/BOCES-wide/group/team results based on State	Syracuse University Assessment for College Level Public Affairs and Sociology courses
AP Latin Vergil, AP Spanish Language, French 2R, French 3R, French 4R, French 4H, Latin 1R, Latin 2R, Latin 3R, Latin 4R, Latin 4H, Spanish 2R, Spanish 3R, Spanish 4R, Spanish 4H	<input type="radio"/> State Assessment <input type="radio"/> State-approved 3rd party assessment <input checked="" type="radio"/> District, Regional or BOCES-developed <input type="radio"/> School/BOCES-wide/group/team results based on State	District developed assessment for the LOTE Courses - AP Latin Vergil, AP Spanish Language, French 2R, French 3R, French 4R, French 4H, Latin 1R, Latin 2R, Latin 3R, Latin 4R, Latin 4H, Spanish 2R, Spanish 3R, Spanish 4R, Spanish 4H
Adv. Photo 1, Adv. Photo 2, Drawing/Painting 1, Drawing/Painting 2, Studio Art, Studio Crafts 1, Studio Crafts 2, Studio in Photo, Studio in Video, Studio Sculpture, Theater - Performance	<input type="radio"/> State Assessment <input type="radio"/> State-approved 3rd party assessment <input checked="" type="radio"/> District, Regional or BOCES-developed <input type="radio"/> School/BOCES-wide/group/team results based on State	District developed assessment for the Art Courses - Adv. Photo 1, Adv. Photo 2, Drawing/Painting 1, Drawing/Painting 2, Studio Art, Studio Crafts 1, Studio Crafts 2, Studio in Photo, Studio in Video, Studio Sculpture, Theater - Performance

Course(s) or Subject(s)	Option	Assessment
3D Computer Modeling, Advanced Studio Video, Architectural CAD, CISCO Networking 1, Civil Engineering, Computer/Manufacturing, Digital Electronics, Engineering Design & Development, Engineering Principles, Material Processes, Metal Systems, Principles of Engineering, Production Systems Wood, Residential Structures, Robotics 1, Robotics 2, Welding 1	<input type="radio"/> State Assessment <input type="radio"/> State-approved 3rd party assessment <input checked="" type="radio"/> District, Regional or BOCES-developed <input type="radio"/> School/BOCES-wide/group/team results based on State	District developed assessment for the Technology Education Courses -3D Computer Modeling, Advanced Studio Video, Architectural CAD, CISCO Networking 1, Civil Engineering, Computer/Manufacturing, Digital Electronics, Engineering Design & Development, Engineering Principles, Material Processes, Metal Systems, Principles of Engineering, Production Systems Wood, Residential Structures, Robotics 1, Robotics 2, Welding 1
Accounting 1, Business Law 1, Business Law 2, Career Exploration Internship, Finance/Banking, Computer Applications/Keyboard, Entrepreneurship, Graphic Design 1, Graphic Design 2, Intro. To Business, Virtual Enterprise, Web Design	<input type="radio"/> State Assessment <input type="radio"/> State-approved 3rd party assessment <input checked="" type="radio"/> District, Regional or BOCES-developed <input type="radio"/> School/BOCES-wide/group/team results based on State	District developed assessment for the Business Education Courses - Accounting 1, Business Law 1, Business Law 2, Career Exploration Internship, Finance/Banking, Computer Applications/Keyboard, Entrepreneurship, Graphic Design 1, Graphic Design 2, Intro. To Business, Virtual Enterprise, Web Design
Integrated English, Integrated Science	<input checked="" type="radio"/> State Assessment <input type="radio"/> State-approved 3rd party assessment <input type="radio"/> District, Regional or BOCES-developed <input type="radio"/> School/BOCES-wide/group/team results based on State	NYSAA
Resource Room Grade 9, Resource Room Grade 10, Resource Room Grade 11, Resource Room Grade 12	<input type="radio"/> State Assessment <input type="radio"/> State-approved 3rd party assessment <input checked="" type="radio"/> District, Regional or BOCES-developed <input type="radio"/> School/BOCES-wide/group/team results based on State	District developed assessment for Resource Room in grades 9, 10, 11, 12

Course(s) or Subject(s)	Option	Assessment
AP Music Theory, Chorale, Music Composition, Concert Band, Concert Orchestra, Mixed Chorus, Symphonic Band, Symphonic Orchestra, Treble Chorus, Wind Ensemble, Studio Drawing	<input type="radio"/> State Assessment <input type="radio"/> State-approved 3rd party assessment <input checked="" type="radio"/> District, Regional or BOCES-developed <input type="radio"/> School/BOCES-wide/group/team results based on State	District developed assessment for Music Courses - AP Music Theory, Chorale, Music Composition, Concert Band, Concert Orchestra, Mixed Chorus, Symphonic Band, Symphonic Orchestra, Treble Chorus, Wind Ensemble, Studio Drawing
Physical Education 9, Physical Education 10, Physical Education 11, Physical Education 12, Team Sports, Lifetime Sports, Health	<input type="radio"/> State Assessment <input type="radio"/> State-approved 3rd party assessment <input checked="" type="radio"/> District, Regional or BOCES-developed <input type="radio"/> School/BOCES-wide/group/team results based on State	District developed assessment for HPE Courses - Physical Education 9, Physical Education 10, Physical Education 11, Physical Education 12, Team Sports, Lifetime Sports, Health
Resource Room Grade 6, Resource Room Grade 7, Resource Room Grade 8	<input type="radio"/> State Assessment <input type="radio"/> State-approved 3rd party assessment <input checked="" type="radio"/> District, Regional or BOCES-developed <input type="radio"/> School/BOCES-wide/group/team results based on State	District developed assessment for Special Education Courses - Resource Room Grade 6, Resource Room Grade 7, Resource Room Grade 8
English 12, Consumer Chemistry, Environmental Science	<input type="radio"/> State Assessment <input type="radio"/> State-approved 3rd party assessment <input checked="" type="radio"/> District, Regional or BOCES-developed <input type="radio"/> School/BOCES-wide/group/team results based on State	District developed assessment for English 12, Consumer Chemistry, Environmental Science
PreCalculus H, PreCalculus R, Math 5	<input type="radio"/> State Assessment <input type="radio"/> State-approved 3rd party assessment <input checked="" type="radio"/> District, Regional or BOCES-developed <input type="radio"/> School/BOCES-wide/group/team results based on State	District developed assessment for PreCalculus H, PreCalculus R, Math 5

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.

<p>Use this box, if needed, to describe the general process for assigning HEDI categories for these grades/subjects in this subcomponent. If needed, you may upload a table or graphic at 2.11.</p>	<p>Targets for SLOs shall be determined by teachers in the same grade level/subject or course and approved by building principals. Targets will be established in accordance with guidance from the Commissioner and State Education Department. Regardless of how the target for individual courses/grade levels/subject areas is established, the scoring bands listed below will be utilized to determine the number of points assigned to teachers. See graphic upload.</p>
<p>Highly Effective (18 - 20 points) Results are well-above District goals for similar students.</p>	<p>Point values for the rating of “Highly Effective” range from 18-20 with a low of 81% of students who met the target and a high of >90% of students who met the target.</p>
<p>Effective (9 - 17 points) Results meet District goals for similar students.</p>	<p>The HEDI scoring band was created by first establishing the highest percentage of students who need to meet the target in order for a teacher to be considered “Effective” at 80%, which would yield 17 points, and then establishing the lowest percentage of students who would need to meet the target in order for a teacher to be considered “Effective” at 61%, which would yield 9 points. Point values between 9 and 17 were then determined associated with percentages of students who met the target ranging from 61% to 80%.</p>
<p>Developing (3 - 8 points) Results are below District goals for similar students.</p>	<p>Point values for the rating of “Developing” range from 3-8 with a low of 41% of students who met the target and a high of 60% of students who met the target.</p>
<p>Ineffective (0 - 2 points) Results are well-below District goals for similar students.</p>	<p>Point values for the rating of “Ineffective” range from 0-2, corresponding with a low of $\leq 14\%$ of students who met the target and a high of 40% of students who met the target.</p>

Clarence Central School District
HEDI Scales for Comparable Measures (SLO)
20 Point Conversion + 15 Point Conversion

20 Point HEDI Scale for SLO Conversion – Based on % of students who met specified target

0 - 40%		41 - 60 %		61 - 80%		81 - 100%	
INEFFECTIVE Results are well-below state average for similar students (or District goals if no state test)		DEVELOPING Results are below state average for similar students (or District goals if no state test)		EFFECTIVE Results meet state average for similar students (or District goals if no state test)		HIGHLY EFFECTIVE Results are well-above state average for similar students (or District goals if no state test)	
0	≤14%	3	41%-45%	9	61%-63%	18	81%-85%
1	15-27%	4	46%-48%	10	64%-66%	19	86%-90%
2	28-40%	5	49%-51%	11	67%-68%	20	>90%
		6	52%-54%	12	69%-70%		
		7	55%-57%	13	71%-72%		
		8	58%-60%	14	73%-74%		
				15	75%-76%		
				16	77%-78%		
				17	79%-80%		

20 Point HEDI Scale for SLO Conversion - Based on Calculating Targets on 4-Point Rubric

Ineffective 0-2		Developing 3-8		Effective 9-17		Highly Effective 18-20	
Total Average Rubric Score	Conversion score for composite	Total Average Rubric Score	Conversion score for composite	Total Average Rubric Score	Conversion score for composite	Total Average Rubric Score	Conversion score for composite
1	0	1.5	3	2.5	9	3.5	18
1.1-1.2	1	1.6	4	2.6-2.7	10	3.6-3.7	19
1.3-1.4	2	1.7-1.8	5	2.8	11	3.8-4.0	20
		1.9-2.0	6	2.9	12		
		2.1-2.2	7	3	13		
		2.3-2.4	8	3.1	14		
				3.2	15		
				3.3	16		
				3.4	17		

**Clarence Central School District
HEDI Scales for Comparable Measures (SLO)
20 Point Conversion + 15 Point Conversion**

15 Point HEDI Scale For SLO Conversion – Based on % of students who met specified target

0-2 Points		3-7 Points		8-13 Points		14-15 Points	
0 - 40%		41 - 60 %		61 - 80%		81 - 100%	
INEFFECTIVE		DEVELOPING		EFFECTIVE		HIGHLY EFFECTIVE	
Results are well-below state average for similar students (or District goals if no state test)		Results are below state average for similar students (or District goals if no state test)		Results meet state average for similar students (or District goals if no state test)		Results are well-above state average for similar students (or District goals if no state test)	
0	≤14%	3	41%-44%	8	61%-63%	14	81%-90%
1	15-27%	4	45%-48%	9	64%-66%	15	>90%
2	28-40%	5	49%-53%	10	67%-69%		
		6	54%-57%	11	70%-72%		
		7	58%-60%	12	73%-76%		
				13	77%-80%		

15 Point HEDI Scale for SLO Conversion - Based on Calculating Targets on 4-Point Rubric

Ineffective 0-2		Developing 3-7		Effective 8-13		Highly Effective 14-15	
Total Average Rubric Score	Conversion score for composite	Total Average Rubric Score	Conversion score for composite	Total Average Rubric Score	Conversion score for composite	Total Average Rubric Score	Conversion score for composite
1	0	1.6-1.7	3	2.5	8	3.6-3.7	14
1.1-1.3	1	1.8-1.9	4	2.6-2.7	9	3.8-4.0	15
1.4-1.5	2	2.0-2.1	5	2.8-2.9	10		
		2.2-2.3	6	3.0-3.1	11		
		2.4	7	3.3-3.3	12		
				3.4-3.5	13		

**Clarence Central School District
15-Point HEDI Scale for Locally Selected Measures
Questions 3.1 & 3.2**

15 Point HEDI Scale For SLO Conversion – Based on % of students who met specified target

0-2 Points		3-7 Points		8-13 Points		14-15 Points	
0 - 40%		41 - 60 %		61 - 80%		81 - 100%	
INEFFECTIVE		DEVELOPING		EFFECTIVE		HIGHLY EFFECTIVE	
Results are well-below state average for similar students (or District goals if no state test)		Results are below state average for similar students (or District goals if no state test)		Results meet state average for similar students (or District goals if no state test)		Results are well-above state average for similar students (or District goals if no state test)	
0	≤14%	3	41%-44%	8	61%-63%	14	81%-90%
1	15-27%	4	45%-48%	9	64%-66%	15	>90%
2	28-40%	5	49%-53%	10	67%-69%		
		6	54%-57%	11	70%-72%		
		7	58%-60%	12	73%-76%		
				13	77%-80%		

15 Point HEDI Scale for SLO Conversion - Based on Calculating Targets on 4-Point Rubric

Ineffective 0-2		Developing 3-7		Effective 8-13		Highly Effective 14-15	
Total Average Rubric Score	Conversion score for composite	Total Average Rubric Score	Conversion score for composite	Total Average Rubric Score	Conversion score for composite	Total Average Rubric Score	Conversion score for composite
1	0	1.6-1.7	3	2.5	8	3.6-3.7	14
1.1-1.3	1	1.8-1.9	4	2.6-2.7	9	3.8-4.0	15
1.4-1.5	2	2.0-2.1	5	2.8-2.9	10		
		2.2-2.3	6	3.0-3.1	11		
		2.4	7	3.3-3.3	12		
				3.4-3.5	13		

Form 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 an attachment.

Course(s) or Subject(s)	Locally-Selected Measure from List of Approved Measures	Assessment
Accounting 1, Business Law 1, Business Law 2, Career Exploration Internship, Computer Applications, Keyboarding, Entrepreneurship, Finance/Banking, Graphic Design 1, Graphic Design 2, Intro. To Business, Virtual Enterprise, Web Design	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <input type="radio"/> 1) Change in % of student performance level on State <input type="radio"/> 2) Teacher specific growth computed by NYSED <input type="radio"/> 3) Teacher specific achievement/growth score computed locally <input type="radio"/> 4) State-approved 3rd party <input checked="" type="radio"/> 5) District/regional/BOCES–developed <input type="radio"/> 6(i) School-wide measure based on State-provided measure <input type="radio"/> 6(ii) School wide measure computed locally <input type="radio"/> 	District developed assessment for Accounting 1, Business Law 1, Business Law 2, Career Exploration Internship, Computer Applications, Keyboarding, Entrepreneurship, Finance/Banking, Graphic Design 1, Graphic Design 2, Intro. To Business, Virtual Enterprise, Web Design
Chorale, Music Composition, Concert Band, Concert Orchestra, Mixed Chorus, Symphonic Band, Symphonic Orchestra, Treble Chorus, Wind Ensemble	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <input type="radio"/> 1) Change in % of student performance level on State <input type="radio"/> 2) Teacher specific growth computed by NYSED <input type="radio"/> 3) Teacher specific achievement/growth score computed locally <input type="radio"/> 4) State-approved 3rd party <input checked="" type="radio"/> 5) District/regional/BOCES–developed <input type="radio"/> 6(i) School-wide measure based on State-provided measure <input type="radio"/> 6(ii) School wide measure computed locally <input type="radio"/> 	District developed assessment for Chorale, Music Composition, Concert Band, Concert Orchestra, Mixed Chorus, Symphonic Band, Symphonic Orchestra, Treble Chorus, Wind Ensemble
Physical Education – Grade 9, Physical Education – Grade 10, Physical Education – Grade 12, Team Sports, Lifetime Sports, Health	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <input type="radio"/> 1) Change in % of student performance level on State <input type="radio"/> 2) Teacher specific growth computed by NYSED 	District developed assessment for Physical Education – Grade 9, Physical Education – Grade 10, Physical

	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <input type="radio"/> 3) Teacher specific achievement/growth score computed locally <input type="radio"/> 4) State-approved 3rd party <input checked="" type="radio"/> 5) District/regional/BOCES–developed <input type="radio"/> 6(i) School-wide measure based on State-provided measure <input type="radio"/> 6(ii) School wide measure computed locally <input type="radio"/> 7) Student Learning Objectives 	Education – Grade 12, Team Sports, Lifetime Sports, Health
--	---	--

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.

<p>20-Point Scale</p> <p>Use this box, if needed, to describe the general process for assigning HEDI categories for these grades/subjects in this subcomponent. If needed, you may upload a table or graphic at 3.13, below.</p>	<p>The locally-selected measure may use the same assessment, State-approved 3rd party assessment, or district/BOCES-developed assessment as the SLO used for the State growth or other comparable measures subcomponent. If the same assessment it used, it will measure achievement rather than growth. Subsequent to determining the option utilized for Locally-Selected Measures of Achievement, targets or cut scores shall be determined by teachers in the same grade level/subject or course and approved by building principals. Targets or cut scores will be established in accordance with guidance from the Commissioner and State Education Department. Regardless of how the target or cut score for individual courses/grade levels/subject areas is established, the scoring band listed below will be utilized to determine the number of points assigned to teachers. See the uploaded graphic.</p>
<p>Highly Effective (18 - 20 points) Results are well above District- or BOCES -adopted expectations for growth or achievement for grade/subject.</p>	<p>Point values for the rating of “Highly Effective” range from 18-20 with a low of 81% of students who met the target and a high of >90% of students who met the target.</p>
<p>Effective (9 - 17 points) Results meet District- or BOCES-adopted expectations for growth or achievement for grade/subject.</p>	<p>The HEDI scoring band was created by first establishing the highest percentage of students who need to meet the target in order for a teacher to be considered “Effective” at 80%, which would yield 17 points, and then establishing the lowest percentage of students who would need to meet the target in order for a teacher to be considered “Effective” at 61%, which would yield 9 points. Point values between 9 and 17 were then determined associated with percentages of students who met the target ranging from 61% to 80%.</p>

Developing (3 - 8 points) Results are below District- or BOCES-adopted expectations for growth or achievement for grade/subject.	Point values for the rating of “Developing” range from 3-8 with a low of 41% of students who met the target and a high of 60% of students who met the target.
Ineffective (0 - 2 points) Results are well below District- or BOCES-adopted expectations for growth or achievement for grade/subject.	Point values for the rating of “Ineffective” range from 0-2, corresponding with a low of ≤14% of students who met the target and a high of 40% of students who met the target.

<p>15-Point Scale</p> <p>Use this box, if needed, to describe the general process for assigning HEDI categories for these grades/subjects in this subcomponent. If needed, you may upload a table or graphic at 3.13, below.</p>	<p>The locally-selected measure may use the same assessment, State-approved 3rd party assessment, or district/BOCES-developed assessment as the SLO used for the State growth or other comparable measures subcomponent. If the same assessment it used, it will measure achievement rather than growth. Subsequent to determining the option utilized for Locally-Selected Measures of Achievement, targets or cut scores shall be determined by teachers in the same grade level/subject or course and approved by building principals. Targets or cut scores will be established in accordance with guidance from the Commissioner and State Education Department. Regardless of how the target or cut score for individual courses/grade levels/subject areas is established, the scoring band listed below will be utilized to determine the number of points assigned to teachers. See the uploaded graphic.</p>
<p>Highly Effective (14 - 15 points) Results are well above District- or BOCES -adopted expectations for growth or achievement for grade/subject.</p>	<p>Point values for the rating of “Highly Effective” range from 14-15 with a low of 81% of students who met the target and a high of >90% of students who met the target.</p>
<p>Effective (8- 13 points) Results meet District- or BOCES-adopted expectations for growth or achievement for grade/subject.</p>	<p>The HEDI scoring bands were created by first establishing the highest percentage of students who need to meet the target in order for a teacher to be considered “Effective” at 80%, which would yield 13 points, and then establishing the lowest percentage of students who would need to meet the target in order for a teacher to be considered “Effective” at 61%, which would yield 8 points. Point values between 8 and 13 were then determined associated with percentages of students who met the target ranging from 61% to 80%</p>
<p>Developing (3 - 7 points) Results are below District- or BOCES-adopted</p>	<p>Point values for the rating of “Developing” range from 3-7 with a low</p>

<p>expectations for growth or achievement for grade/subject.</p>	<p>of 41% of students who met the target and a high of 60% of students who met the target.</p>
<p>Ineffective (0 - 2 points) Results are well below District- or BOCES-adopted expectations for growth or achievement for grade/subject.</p>	<p>Point values for the rating of “Ineffective” range from 0-2, corresponding with a low of $\leq 14\%$ of students who met the target and a high of 40% of students who met the target.</p>

**Clarence Central School District
HEDI Scales for Locally Selected Measures
20 Point Conversion + 15 Point Conversion**

20 Point HEDI Scale for SLO Conversion – Based on % of students who met specified target

0 - 40%		41 - 60 %		61 - 80%		81 - 100%	
INEFFECTIVE Results are well-below state average for similar students (or District goals if no state test)		DEVELOPING Results are below state average for similar students (or District goals if no state test)		EFFECTIVE Results meet state average for similar students (or District goals if no state test)		HIGHLY EFFECTIVE Results are well-above state average for similar students (or District goals if no state test)	
0	≤14%	3	41%-45%	9	61%-63%	18	81%-85%
1	15-27%	4	46%-48%	10	64%-66%	19	86%-90%
2	28-40%	5	49%-51%	11	67%-68%	20	>90%
		6	52%-54%	12	69%-70%		
		7	55%-57%	13	71%-72%		
		8	58%-60%	14	73%-74%		
				15	75%-76%		
				16	77%-78%		
				17	79%-80%		

20 Point HEDI Scale for SLO Conversion - Based on Calculating Targets on 4-Point Rubric

Ineffective 0-2		Developing 3-8		Effective 9-17		Highly Effective 18-20	
Total Average Rubric Score	Conversion score for composite	Total Average Rubric Score	Conversion score for composite	Total Average Rubric Score	Conversion score for composite	Total Average Rubric Score	Conversion score for composite
1	0	1.5	3	2.5	9	3.5	18
1.1-1.2	1	1.6	4	2.6-2.7	10	3.6-3.7	19
1.3-1.4	2	1.7-1.8	5	2.8	11	3.8-4.0	20
		1.9-2.0	6	2.9	12		
		2.1-2.2	7	3	13		
		2.3-2.4	8	3.1	14		
				3.2	15		
				3.3	16		
				3.4	17		

**Clarence Central School District
HEDI Scales for Locally Selected Measures
20 Point Conversion + 15 Point Conversion**

15 Point HEDI Scale For SLO Conversion – Based on % of students who met specified target

0-2 Points		3-7 Points		8-13 Points		14-15 Points	
0 - 40%		41 - 60 %		61 - 80%		81 - 100%	
INEFFECTIVE		DEVELOPING		EFFECTIVE		HIGHLY EFFECTIVE	
Results are well-below state average for similar students (or District goals if no state test)		Results are below state average for similar students (or District goals if no state test)		Results meet state average for similar students (or District goals if no state test)		Results are well-above state average for similar students (or District goals if no state test)	
0	≤14%	3	41%-44%	8	61%-63%	14	81%-90%
1	15-27%	4	45%-48%	9	64%-66%	15	>90%
2	28-40%	5	49%-53%	10	67%-69%		
		6	54%-57%	11	70%-72%		
		7	58%-60%	12	73%-76%		
				13	77%-80%		

15 Point HEDI Scale for SLO Conversion - Based on Calculating Targets on 4-Point Rubric

Ineffective 0-2		Developing 3-7		Effective 8-13		Highly Effective 14-15	
Total Average Rubric Score	Conversion score for composite	Total Average Rubric Score	Conversion score for composite	Total Average Rubric Score	Conversion score for composite	Total Average Rubric Score	Conversion score for composite
1	0	1.6-1.7	3	2.5	8	3.6-3.7	14
1.1-1.3	1	1.8-1.9	4	2.6-2.7	9	3.8-4.0	15
1.4-1.5	2	2.0-2.1	5	2.8-2.9	10		
		2.2-2.3	6	3.0-3.1	11		
		2.4	7	3.3-3.3	12		
				3.4-3.5	13		

Clarence Central School District

Teacher APPR - 60 Point Conversion Chart - Other Teacher Measures

Average Rubric Score Conversion - Look Up Table

Ineffective 0-49		Developing 50-56		Effective 57-58		Highly Effective 59-60	
Average Rubric Score	Point Conversion	Average Rubric Score	Point Conversion	Average Rubric Score	Point Conversion	Average Rubric Score	Point Conversion
1	0	1.5	50	2.5	57	3.5	59
1.008	1	1.6	50.7	2.6	57.1	3.6	59.2
1.017	2	1.7	51.4	2.7	57.2	3.7	59.3
1.025	3	1.8	52.1	2.8	57.3	3.8	59.4
1.033	4	1.9	52.8	2.9	57.4	3.9	60
1.042	5	2	53.5	3	58	4	60.25 (round to 60)
1.05	6	2.1	54.2	3.1	58.1		
1.058	7	2.2	54.9	3.2	58.2		
1.067	8	2.3	55.6	3.3	58.3		
1.075	9	2.4	56.3	3.4	58.4		
1.083	10						
1.092	11						
1.1	12						
1.108	13						
1.115	14	1.258	32				
1.123	15	1.267	33				
1.131	16	1.275	34				
1.138	17	1.283	35				
1.146	18	1.292	36				
1.154	19	1.3	37				
1.162	20	1.308	38				
1.169	21	1.317	39				
1.177	22	1.325	40				
1.185	23	1.333	41				
1.192	24	1.342	42				
1.2	25	1.35	43				
1.208	26	1.358	44				
1.217	27	1.367	45				
1.225	28	1.375	46				
1.233	29	1.383	47				
1.242	30	1.392	48				
1.25	31	1.4	49				

Clarence Central School District: Teacher Improvement Plan Template

Name of Teacher: _____

Participants in the formulation of this TIP:

Identify the area(s) of improvement identified in the annual evaluation:

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

This plan will begin on: _____

The parties to this agreement will meet on the following dates to review and evaluate the plan and formulate modifications if necessary:

Any changes or modification to the plan must be in writing and will be appended to this document.

Teacher

Date

Administrator

Date

Union Representative

Date

Attach a copy of the teacher's evaluation to this form

Area Needing Improvement: _____

Timeline for improvement:

Manner in which improvement will be assessed:

Differentiated Activities to Support Improvement:

Activity: _____
Time: _____
Location: _____
Goal: _____
Other personnel involved: _____

Activity: _____
Time: _____
Location: _____
Goal: _____
Other personnel involved: _____

Activity: _____
Time: _____
Location: _____
Goal: _____
Other personnel involved: _____

Activity: _____
Time: _____
Location: _____
Goal: _____
Other personnel involved: _____

Complete this form for each area identified as needing improvement

**Clarence Central School District
Administrative SLO - 20-Point Conversion Table**

0 - 40%		41 - 60 %		61 - 75%		76 - 100%	
INEFFECTIVE Results are well-below state average for similar students (or District goals if no state test)		DEVELOPING Results are below state average for similar students (or District goals if no state test)		EFFECTIVE Results meet state average for similar students (or District goals if no state test)		HIGHLY EFFECTIVE Results are well-above state average for similar students (or District goals if no state test)	
0	≤14%	3	41%-44%	9	61%-63%	18	76%-80%
1	15-27%	4	45%-48%	10	64%-66%	19	81%-85%
2	28-40%	5	49%-51%	11	67%-68%	20	>85%
		6	52%-54%	12	69%-70%		
		7	55%-57%	13	71%		
		8	58%-60%	14	72%		
				15	73%		
				16	74%		
				17	75%		

Clarence Central School District

Administrative Local Assessment - 15-Point Conversion Table - % of students meeting the target

0 - 40%		41 - 60 %		61 - 75%		76% - 100%	
INEFFECTIVE		DEVELOPING		EFFECTIVE		HIGHLY EFFECTIVE	
Results are well-below state average for similar students (or District goals if no state test)		Results are below state average for similar students (or District goals if no state test)		Results meet state average for similar students (or District goals if no state test)		Results are well-above state average for similar students (or District goals if no state test)	
0	≤14%	3	41%-44%	8	61%-65%	14	76%-84%
1	15-27%	4	45%-49%	9	66%-69%	15	≥85%
2	28-40%	5	50%-52%	10	70%		
		6	53%-55%	11	71%		
		7	56%-60%	12	72-73%		
				13	74-75%		

**Clarence Central School District
Administrative SLO - 20-Point Conversion Table**

0 - 40%		41 - 60 %		61 - 75%		76 - 100%	
INEFFECTIVE Results are well-below state average for similar students (or District goals if no state test)		DEVELOPING Results are below state average for similar students (or District goals if no state test)		EFFECTIVE Results meet state average for similar students (or District goals if no state test)		HIGHLY EFFECTIVE Results are well-above state average for similar students (or District goals if no state test)	
0	≤14%	3	41%-44%	9	61%-63%	18	76%-80%
1	15-27%	4	45%-48%	10	64%-66%	19	81%-85%
2	28-40%	5	49%-51%	11	67%-68%	20	>85%
		6	52%-54%	12	69%-70%		
		7	55%-57%	13	71%		
		8	58%-60%	14	72%		
				15	73%		
				16	74%		
				17	75%		

**Clarence Central School District
Process for Assigning Points and Determining HEDI Ratings Using Principal Practice Rubric**

The Superintendent (lead evaluator) will utilize the Marzano School Administrator Evaluation Rubrics to make judgments for each element that comprises the Other Measures of Principal Effectiveness.

The lead evaluator will determine which rubrics correspond to a particular element for the other measures of principal effectiveness.

Rubric scores for each element are calculated on a 0-4 point scale (including 1/2 point variables). The scores for each element are averaged to determine the overall 0-4 point score for each element section.

Weighting for Other Measures of Principal Effectiveness

Other Measures of Principal Effectiveness Element	Marzano Admin. Evaluation Rubric Domains	Total Points	Weighted Percentage
<i>Supervisory Visits – (2 per month)</i> <i>Principal Portfolio – (includes data review)</i> <i>APPR Conferences</i> <i>Principal Self-Evaluation</i>	1: A Data Driven Focus on Student Achievement 2: Continuous Improvement of Instruction 3: A guaranteed & viable curriculum 4: Cooperation & Collaboration 5: School Climate	60	100%

Portfolio Review of Principal Artifact Evidence

The principal’s understanding, knowledge and skill development for each of the ISLLC standards and Domains of the Marzano Administrator Evaluation system as evidenced by selected artifacts in the principal portfolio and dialogue between the principal and superintendent, will be judged using rubrics potentially from all five domains of the Marzano Administrator Evaluation System. A single rubric score (four-point scale) will be calculated for each Domain from the average of rubric scores utilized in judgment of portfolio artifacts, supervisory visitation logs, principal self-evaluation, and APPR conference dialogue.

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

The detailed conversion look-up table on this page and the next page is used to convert the average weighted rubric score to a specific principal score for the other measures of principal effectiveness sub-component.

Rubric Score to Sub-Component Conversion Chart – Other Measures of Principal Effectiveness

Ineffective 0-49		Developing 50-56		Effective 57-58		Highly Effective 59-60	
Average Rubric Score	Point Conversion	Average Rubric Score	Point Conversion	Average Rubric Score	Point Conversion	Average Rubric Score	Point Conversion
1.000	0	1.5	50	2.5	57	3.5	59
1.008	1	1.6	50.7	2.6	57.1	3.6	59.2
1.017	2	1.7	51.4	2.7	57.2	3.7	59.3
1.025	3	1.8	52.1	2.8	57.3	3.8	59.4
1.033	4	1.9	52.8	2.9	57.4	3.9	60
1.042	5	2	53.5	3	58	4	60.25 <small>(round to 60)</small>
1.050	6	2.1	54.2	3.1	58.1		
1.058	7	2.2	54.9	3.2	58.2		
1.067	8	2.3	55.6	3.3	58.3		
1.075	9	2.4	56.3	3.4	58.4		
1.083	10						
1.092	11						
1.100	12						
1.108	13						
1.115	14						
1.123	15						
1.131	16						
1.138	17						
1.146	18						
1.154	19						
1.162	20						
1.169	21						
1.177	22						
1.185	23						
1.192	24						
1.200	25						
1.208	26						
1.217	27						
1.225	28						
1.233	29						
1.242	30						
1.250	31						
1.258	32						
1.267	33						
1.275	34						
1.283	35						
1.292	36						
1.300	37						
1.308	38						
1.317	39						
1.325	40						
1.333	41						
1.342	42						
1.350	43						
1.358	44						
1.367	45						
1.375	46						
1.383	47						
1.392	48						
1.400	49						

Clarence Central School District Principal Improvement Plan

NAME _____

SCHOOL BUILDING _____

ACADEMIC YEAR _____

Deficient areas that promulgated the “developing or ineffective” performance rating:

Improvement

Goal/Outcome: _____

Action Steps/Activities:

Timeline for completion: _____

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

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

December _____

March _____

Other if needed _____

Evidence of Goal Achievement:

Assessment Summary: Superintendent or his designee will attach a narrative summary of improvement progress, including verification of the provision of support and resources as outlined above.

Principal Signature: _____

Date: _____

Superintendent Signature: _____

Date: _____

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

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

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

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

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

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

Signatures, dates

Superintendent Signature: Date: 8/27/12

Geoffrey M. Held

Teachers Union President Signature: Date: 8/27/12

Elizabeth M. Danne

Administrative Union President Signature: Date: 8/27/12

Susan H. Corrie

Board of Education President Signature: Date: 8/27/12

Michael B. Lee