



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

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

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

January 14, 2013

Dr. Alan B. Groveman, Superintendent
Connetquot Central School District
780 Ocean Avenue
Bohemia, NY 11716

Dear Superintendent Groveman:

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

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

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

Thank you again for your hard work.

Sincerely,


John B. King, Jr.
Commissioner

Attachment

c: Dean Lucera

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

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

Annual Professional Performance Reviews: 2012-13

Created Tuesday, May 29, 2012

Updated Thursday, January 03, 2013

1

Disclaimers

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

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

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

1. SCHOOL DISTRICT INFORMATION

1.1) School District's BEDS Number :

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

580507060000

1.2) School District Name:

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

CONNETQUOT CSD

1.3) School Improvement Grant (SIG) Districts Only

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

(No response)

1.4) Award Classification

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

(No response)

1.5) Assurances

Please check all of the boxes below:

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

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

Re-submission to address deficiencies

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

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

Annual (2012-13)

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

Created Wednesday, May 30, 2012

Updated Wednesday, January 09, 2013

Page 1

STATE-PROVIDED MEASURES OF STUDENT GROWTH

(25 points with an approved value-added measure)

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

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

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

2.1) Assurances

Please check the boxes below:

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

STUDENT LEARNING OBJECTIVES AS COMPARABLE GROWTH MEASURES (20 points)

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

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

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

If no State assessment or Regents exam exists:

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

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

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

State assessments, *required if one exists*

List of State-approved 3rd party assessments

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

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

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

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

2.2) Grades K-3 ELA

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

	ELA	Assessment
K	School-or BOCES-wide, group or team results based on State assessments	NYS Grades 4 5 ELA assessment
1	School-or BOCES-wide, group or team results based on State assessments	NYS Grades 4 5 ELA assessment
2	School-or BOCES-wide, group or team results based on State assessments	NYS Grades 4 5 ELA assessment

	ELA	Assessment
3	State assessment	3rd Grade State Assessment

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

Use this box, if needed, to describe the general process for assigning HEDI categories for these grades/subjects in this subcomponent. If needed, you may upload a table or graphic at 2.11, below.	The teachers, in collaboration with the principal, will establish individual student-growth targets using pre-assessment baseline data. Based on the overall percentage of students who meet their individual student growth target, a corresponding 0-20 HEDI score will be determined using the uploaded conversion chart in Item 2.11.
Highly Effective (18 - 20 points) Results are well-above state average for similar students (or District goals if no state test).	See 2.11 attachment
Effective (9 - 17 points) Results meet state average for similar students (or District goals if no state test).	See 2.11 attachment
Developing (3 - 8 points) Results are below state average for similar students (or District goals if no state test).	See 2.11 attachment
Ineffective (0 - 2 points) Results are well-below state average for similar students (or District goals if no state test).	See 2.11 attachment

2.3) Grades K-3 Math

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

	Math	Assessment
K	School-or BOCES-wide, group or team results based on State assessments	NYS Grades 4 5 Math assessment
1	School-or BOCES-wide, group or team results based on State assessments	NYS Grades 4 5 Math assessment
2	School-or BOCES-wide, group or team results based on State assessments	NYS Grades 4 5 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.	The teachers, in collaboration with the principal, will establish individual student-growth targets using pre-assessment baseline data. Based on the overall percentage of students who meet their individual student growth target, a corresponding 0-20 HEDI score will be determined using the uploaded conversion chart in Item 2.11.
Highly Effective (18 - 20 points) Results are well-above state average for similar students (or District goals if no state test).	See 2.11 attachment
Effective (9 - 17 points) Results meet state average for similar students (or District goals if no state test).	See 2.11 attachment

Developing (3 - 8 points) Results are below state average for similar students (or District goals if no state test).	See 2.11 attachment
Ineffective (0 - 2 points) Results are well-below state average for similar students (or District goals if no state test).	See 2.11 attachment

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	Connetquot developed grade 6 science assessment
7	District, regional or BOCES-developed assessment	Connetquot-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.	The teachers, in collaboration with the principal, will establish individual student-growth targets using pre-assessment baseline data. Based on the overall percentage of students who meet their individual student growth target, a corresponding 0-20 HEDI score will be determined using the uploaded conversion chart in Item 2.11.
Highly Effective (18 - 20 points) Results are well-above state average for similar students (or District goals if no state test).	See 2.11 attachment
Effective (9 - 17 points) Results meet state average for similar students (or District goals if no state test).	See 2.11 attachment
Developing (3 - 8 points) Results are below state average for similar students (or District goals if no state test).	See 2.11 attachment
Ineffective (0 - 2 points) Results are well-below state average for similar students (or District goals if no state test).	See 2.11 attachment

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	Connetquot District-developed grade 6 social studies
7	District, regional or BOCES-developed assessment	Connetquot District-developed grade 7 social studies
8	District, regional or BOCES-developed assessment	Connetquot District-developed grade 8 social studies

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

Use this box, if needed, to describe the general process for assigning HEDI categories for these grades/subjects in this subcomponent. If needed, you may upload a table or graphic at 2.11, below.	The teachers, in collaboration with the principal, will establish individual student-growth targets using pre-assessment baseline data. Based on the overall percentage of students who meet their individual student growth target, a corresponding 0-20 HEDI score will be determined using the uploaded conversion chart in Item 2.11.
Highly Effective (18 - 20 points) Results are well-above District goals for similar students.	See 2.11 attachment
Effective (9 - 17 points) Results meet District goals for similar students.	See 2.11 attachment
Developing (3 - 8 points) Results are below District goals for similar students.	See 2.11 attachment
Ineffective (0 - 2 points) Results are well-below District goals for similar students.	See 2.11 attachment

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	Connetquot District-developed Global 1 Summative

	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.	The teachers, in collaboration with the principal, will establish individual student-growth targets using pre-assessment baseline data. Based on the overall percentage of students who meet their individual student growth target, a corresponding 0-20 HEDI score will be determined using the uploaded conversion chart in Item 2.11.
Highly Effective (18 - 20 points) Results are well-above District goals for similar students.	See 2.11 attachment
Effective (9 - 17 points) Results meet District goals for similar students.	See 2.11 attachment
Developing (3 - 8 points) Results are below District goals for similar students.	See 2.11 attachment
Ineffective (0 - 2 points) Results are well-below District goals for similar students.	See 2.11 attachment

2.7) High School Science Regents Courses

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

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

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

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

Use this box, if needed, to describe the general process for assigning HEDI categories for these grades/subjects in this subcomponent. If needed, you may upload a table or graphic at 2.11, below.	The teachers, in collaboration with the principal, will establish individual student-growth targets using pre-assessment baseline data. Based on the overall percentage of students who meet their individual student growth target, a corresponding 0-20 HEDI score will be determined using the uploaded conversion chart in Item 2.11.
Highly Effective (18 - 20 points) Results are well-above District goals for similar students.	See 2.11 attachment
Effective (9 - 17 points) Results meet District goals for similar students.	See 2.11 attachment
Developing (3 - 8 points) Results are below District goals for similar students.	See 2.11 attachment
Ineffective (0 - 2 points) Results are well-below District goals for similar students.	See 2.11 attachment

2.8) High School Math Regents Courses

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

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

	Math Regents Courses	Assessment
Algebra 1	Regents assessment	Regents assessment
Geometry	Regents assessment	Regents assessment
Algebra 2	Regents assessment	Regents assessment

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

Use this box, if needed, to describe the general process for assigning HEDI categories for these grades/subjects in this subcomponent. If needed, you may upload a table or graphic at 2.11, below.	The teachers, in collaboration with the principal, will establish individual student-growth targets using pre-assessment baseline data. Based on the overall percentage of students who meet their individual student growth target, a corresponding 0-20 HEDI score will be determined using the uploaded conversion chart in Item 2.11.
Highly Effective (18 - 20 points) Results are well-above District goals for similar students.	See 2.11 attachment
Effective (9 - 17 points) Results meet District goals for similar students.	See 2.11 attachment
Developing (3 - 8 points) Results are below District goals for similar students.	See 2.11 attachment
Ineffective (0 - 2 points) Results are well-below District goals for similar students.	See 2.11 attachment

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	Connetquot District-developed grade 9 ELA
Grade 10 ELA	District, regional or BOCES-developed assessment	Connetquot District-developed grade 10 ELA
Grade 11 ELA	Regents assessment	Comprehensive English Regents Assessment

graphic at 2.11, below.	percentage of students who meet their individual student growth target, a corresponding 0-20 HEDI score will be determined using the uploaded conversion chart in Item 2.11.
Highly Effective (18 - 20 points) Results are well-above District goals for similar students.	See 2.11 attachment
Effective (9 - 17 points) Results meet District goals for similar students.	See 2.11 attachment
Developing (3 - 8 points) Results are below District goals for similar students.	See 2.11 attachment
Ineffective (0 - 2 points) Results are well-below District goals for similar students.	See 2.11 attachment

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

(No response)

2.11) HEDI Tables or Graphics

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

assets/survey-uploads/5364/136517-TXEttx9bQW/2.11 Conversion of Targets to HEDI Scores 1-8-13.pdf

2.12) Locally Developed Controls

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

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

(No response)

2.13) Teachers with more than one growth measure

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

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

2.14) Assurances

Please check all of the boxes below:

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

3. Local Measures (Teachers)

Created Wednesday, May 30, 2012

Updated Monday, January 14, 2013

Page 1

Locally Selected Measures of Student Achievement or Growth

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

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

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

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

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

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

Growth or achievement measure(s) from these options.

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

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

Measures based on:

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

3.1) Grades 4-8 ELA

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

	Locally-Selected Measure from List of Approved Measures	Assessment
4	6(ii) School wide measure computed locally	NYS ELA grades 3-5, Math grades 3-5, Science grade 4
5	6(ii) School wide measure computed locally	NYS ELA grades 3-5, Math grades 3-5, Science grade 4

6	6(ii) School wide measure computed locally	NYS ELA grades 6-8, Math grades 6-8, Science 8
7	6(ii) School wide measure computed locally	NYS ELA grades 6-8, Math grades 6-8, Science 8
8	6(ii) School wide measure computed locally	NYS ELA grades 6-8, Math grades 6-8, Science 8

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.	See uploaded 3.3 attachment for step by step process.
Highly Effective (14 - 15 points) Results are well above District- or BOCES-adopted expectations for growth or achievement for grade/subject.	See 3.3 attachment
Effective (8- 13 points) Results meet District- or BOCES-adopted expectations for growth or achievement for grade/subject.	See 3.3 attachment
Developing (3 - 7 points) Results are below District- or BOCES-adopted expectations for growth or achievement for grade/subject.	See 3.3 attachment
Ineffective (0 - 2 points) Results are well below District- or BOCES-adopted expectations for growth or achievement for grade/subject.	See 3.3 attachment

3.2) Grades 4-8 Math

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

	Locally-Selected Measure from List of Approved Measures	Assessment
4	6(ii) School wide measure computed locally	NYS ELA grades 3-5, Math grades 3-5, Science grade 4
5	6(ii) School wide measure computed locally	NYS ELA grades 3-5, Math grades 3-5, Science grade 4
6	6(ii) School wide measure computed locally	NYS ELA grades 6-8, Math grades 6-8, Science 8
7	6(ii) School wide measure computed locally	NYS ELA grades 6-8, Math grades 6-8, Science 8
8	6(ii) School wide measure computed locally	NYS ELA grades 6-8, Math grades 6-8, Science 8

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.	See uploaded 3.3 attachment for step by step process.
Highly Effective (14 - 15 points) Results are well above District- or BOCES-adopted expectations for growth or achievement for grade/subject.	See 3.3 attachment
Effective (8- 13 points) Results meet District- or BOCES-adopted expectations for growth or achievement for grade/subject.	See 3.3 attachment
Developing (3 - 7 points) Results are below District- or BOCES-adopted expectations for growth or achievement for grade/subject.	See 3.3 attachment
Ineffective (0 - 2 points) Results are well below District- or BOCES-adopted expectations for growth or achievement for grade/subject.	See 3.3 attachment

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/5139/136518-rhJdBgDruP/3.3.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	6(ii) School-wide measure computed locally	NYS ELA grades 3-5, Math grades 3-5, Science grade 4
1	6(ii) School-wide measure computed locally	NYS ELA grades 3-5, Math grades 3-5, Science grade 4
2	6(ii) School-wide measure computed locally	NYS ELA grades 3-5, Math grades 3-5, Science grade 4
3	6(ii) School-wide measure computed locally	NYS ELA grades 3-5, Math grades 3-5, Science grade 4

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.	See uploaded 3.13 attachment for step by step process
Highly Effective (18-20 points) Results are well above District- or BOCES-adopted expectations for growth or achievement for grade/subject.	See 3.13 attachment
Effective (9-17 points) Results meet District- or BOCES-adopted expectations for growth or achievement for grade/subject.	See 3.13 attachment
Developing (3 - 8 points) Results are below District- or BOCES-adopted expectations for growth or achievement for grade/subject.	See 3.13 attachment
Ineffective (0 - 2 points) Results are well below District- or BOCES-adopted expectations for growth or achievement for grade/subject.	See 3.13 attachment

3.5) Grades K-3 Math

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

	Locally-Selected Measure from List of Approved Measures	Assessment
K	6(ii) School-wide measure computed locally	NYS ELA grades 3-5, Math grades 3-5, Science grade 4
1	6(ii) School-wide measure computed locally	NYS ELA grades 3-5, Math grades 3-5, Science grade 4
2	6(ii) School-wide measure computed locally	NYS ELA grades 3-5, Math grades 3-5, Science grade 4
3	6(ii) School-wide measure computed locally	NYS ELA grades 3-5, Math grades 3-5, Science grade 4

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.	See uploaded 3.13 attachment for step by step process
Highly Effective (18-20 points) Results are well above District- or BOCES-adopted expectations for growth or achievement for grade/subject.	See 3.13 attachment
Effective (9-17 points) Results meet District- or BOCES-adopted expectations for growth or achievement for grade/subject.	See 3.13 attachment
Developing (3 - 8 points) Results are below District -or BOCES-adopted expectations for growth or achievement for grade/subject.	See 3.13 attachment
Ineffective (0 - 2 points) Results are well below District- or BOCES-adopted expectations for growth or achievement for grade/subject.	See 3.13 attachment

3.6) Grades 6-8 Science

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

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

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.	See uploaded 3.13 attachment for step by step process
Highly Effective (18 - 20 points) Results are well above District- or BOCES-adopted expectations for growth or achievement for grade/subject.	See 3.13 attachment
Effective (9 - 17 points) Results meet District- or BOCES-adopted expectations for growth or achievement for grade/subject.	See 3.13 attachment
Developing (3 - 8 points) Results are below District- or BOCES-adopted expectations for growth or achievement for grade/subject.	See 3.13 attachment
Ineffective (0 - 2 points) Results are well below District- or BOCES-adopted expectations for growth or achievement for grade/subject.	See 3.13 attachment

3.7) Grades 6-8 Social Studies

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

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

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.	See uploaded 3.13 attachment for step by step process
Highly Effective (18 - 20 points) Results are well above District- or BOCES-adopted expectations for growth or achievement for grade/subject.	See 3.13 attachment
Effective (9 - 17 points) Results meet District- or BOCES-adopted expectations for growth or achievement for grade/subject.	See 3.13 attachment
Developing (3 - 8 points) Results are below District- or BOCES-adopted expectations for growth or achievement for grade/subject.	See 3.13 attachment
Ineffective (0 - 2 points) Results are well below District- or BOCES-adopted expectations for growth or achievement for grade/subject.	See 3.13 attachment

3.8) High School Social Studies

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

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

	Locally-Selected Measure from List of Approved Measures	Assessment
Global 1	6(ii) School wide measure computed locally	Regents - all required for an Advanced diploma
Global 2	6(ii) School wide measure computed locally	Regents - all required for an Advanced diploma
American History	6(ii) School wide measure computed locally	Regents - all required for an Advanced diploma

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 Connetquot CSD will utilize an achievement measure based on the overall percentage of students who earn the Advanced regents designation on their diploma. This percentage will then correspond to a 0-20 HEDI score using the uploaded conversion chart in Task 3.13.
Highly Effective (18 - 20 points) Results are well above District- or BOCES-adopted expectations for growth or achievement for grade/subject.	See 3.13 attachment
Effective (9 - 17 points) Results meet District- or BOCES-adopted expectations for growth or achievement for grade/subject.	See 3.13 attachment

Developing (3 - 8 points) Results are below District- or BOCES-adopted expectations for growth or achievement for grade/subject.	See 3.13 attachment
Ineffective (0 - 2 points) Results are well below District- or BOCES-adopted expectations for growth or achievement for grade/subject.	See 3.13 attachment

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	Regents - all required for an Advanced diploma
Earth Science	6(ii) School wide measure computed locally	Regents - all required for an Advanced diploma
Chemistry	6(ii) School wide measure computed locally	Regents - all required for an Advanced diploma
Physics	6(ii) School wide measure computed locally	Regents - all required for an Advanced diploma

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 Connetquot CSD will utilize an achievement measure based on the overall percentage of students who earn the Advanced regents designation on their diploma. This percentage will then correspond to a 0-20 HEDI score using the uploaded conversion chart in Task 3.13.
Highly Effective (18-20 points) Results are well above District- or BOCES-adopted expectations for growth or achievement for grade/subject.	See 3.13 attachment
Developing (3 - 8 points) Results are below District- or BOCES-adopted expectations for growth or achievement for grade/subject.	See 3.13 attachment
Effective (9 - 17points) Results meet District- or BOCES-adopted expectations for growth or achievement for grade/subject.	See 3.13 attachment
Ineffective (0 - 2 points) Results are well below District- or BOCES-adopted expectations for growth or achievement	See 3.13 attachment

for grade/subject.

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	Regents - all required for an Advanced diploma
Geometry	6(ii) School wide measure computed locally	Regents - all required for an Advanced diploma
Algebra 2	6(ii) School wide measure computed locally	Regents - all required for an Advanced diploma

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

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

Use this box, if needed, to describe the general process for assigning HEDI categories for these grades/subjects in this subcomponent. If needed, you may upload a table or graphic at 3.13, below.	The Connetquot CSD will utilize an achievement measure based on the overall percentage of students who earn the Advanced regents designation on their diploma. This percentage will then correspond to a 0-20 HEDI score using the uploaded conversion chart in Task 3.13.
Highly Effective (18 - 20 points) Results are well above District- or BOCES-adopted expectations for growth or achievement for grade/subject.	See attached 3.13
Effective (9 - 17 points) Results meet District- or BOCES-adopted expectations for growth or achievement for grade/subject.	See attached 3.13
Developing (3 - 8 points) Results are below District- or BOCES-adopted expectations for growth or achievement for grade/subject.	See attached 3.13
Ineffective (0 - 2 points) Results are well below District- or BOCES-adopted expectations for growth or achievement for grade/subject.	See attached 3.13

3.11) High School English Language Arts

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

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

	Locally-Selected Measure from List of Approved Measures	Assessment
Grade 9 ELA	6(ii) School wide measure computed locally	Regents - all required for an Advanced diploma
Grade 10 ELA	6(ii) School wide measure computed locally	Regents - all required for an Advanced diploma
Grade 11 ELA	6(ii) School wide measure computed locally	Regents - all required for an Advanced diploma

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 Connetquot CSD will utilize an achievement measure based on the overall percentage of students who earn the Advanced regents designation on their diploma. This percentage will then correspond to a 0-20 HEDI score using the uploaded conversion chart in Task 3.13.
Highly Effective (18 - 20 points) Results are well above District- or BOCES-adopted expectations for growth or achievement for grade/subject.	See 3.13 attachment
Effective (9 - 17 points) Results meet District- or BOCES-adopted expectations for growth or achievement for grade/subject.	See 3.13 attachment
Developing (3 - 8 points) Results are below District- or BOCES-adopted expectations for growth or achievement for grade/subject.	See 3.13 attachment
Ineffective (0 - 2 points) Results are well below District- or BOCES-adopted expectations for growth or achievement for grade/subject.	See 3.13 attachment

3.12) All Other Courses

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

Course(s) or Subject(s)	Locally-Selected Measure from List of Approved Measures	Assessment
All other k-5	6(ii) School wide measure computed locally	NYS ELA Grades 3-5, Math grades 3-4, Science grade4
All other 6-8	6(ii) School wide measure computed locally	NYS ELA Grades 6-8, math grades 6-8, Science 8

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.

On occasion, a Special Education or English as a Second Language program is moved from one school building to another. The District and the CTA agree to evaluate the impact of inclusion of these students to the local measures on teachers in both buildings and allocate the scores between the two in an equitable manner. However, for this current school year we are not using controls, but reserve the right to in accordance with Education law 3012c procedures.

3.15) Teachers with More Than One Locally Selected Measure

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

Teachers with multiple locally selected measures (LSM) that are calculated on the same population of students shall have each LSM HEDI score weighted equally. For teachers with multiple LSMs where each LSM is calculated on a different population of students (e.g., high school teacher with multiple courses), each LSM HEDI score will be weighted based upon each LSM class roster.

3.16) Assurances

Please check all of the boxes below:

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

4. Other Measures of Effectiveness (Teachers)

Created Wednesday, May 30, 2012

Updated Thursday, January 10, 2013

Page 1

4.1) Teacher Practice Rubric

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

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

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

Danielson's Framework for Teaching

Not Applicable

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]	31
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	29

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)

assets/survey-uploads/5091/136520-2UoxI2HPmn/Task 4 5.pdf

4.3) Survey Tools (if applicable)

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

(No response)

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

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

4.4) Assurances

Please check all of the boxes below:

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

4.5) Process for Assigning Points and Determining HEDI Ratings

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

See uploaded Task 4.5 for step by step process.

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

(No response)

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

Highly Effective: Overall performance and results exceed NYS Teaching Standards.	See 4.5 attachment
Effective: Overall performance and results meet NYS Teaching Standards.	See 4.5 attachment
Developing: Overall performance and results need improvement in order to meet NYS Teaching Standards.	See 4.5 attachment
Ineffective: Overall performance and results do not meet NYS Teaching Standards.	See 4.5 attachment

Provide the ranges for the 60-point scoring bands.

Highly Effective	59-60
Effective	57-58
Developing	55-56
Ineffective	0-54

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	3
4.6) Observations of Probationary Teachers Informal/Short	0
4.6) Observations of Probationary Teachers Enter Total	3

By trained in-school peer teachers or other trained reviewers

Formal/Long	0
Informal/Short	0

Independent evaluators

Formal/Long	0
Informal/Short	0

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

- In Person

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

-
- Not Applicable
-

4.7) Observations of Tenured Teachers

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

By building principals or other trained administrators

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

By trained in-school peer teachers or other trained reviewers

Formal/Long	0
Informal/Short	0

Independent evaluators

Formal/Long	0
Informal/Short	0

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

-
- In Person
-

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

-
- Not Applicable
-

5. Composite Scoring (Teachers)

Created Wednesday, May 30, 2012

Updated Thursday, January 03, 2013

Page 1

Standards for Rating Categories

Growth or Comparable Measures

Locally-selected Measures of

growth or achievement

Other Measures of Effectiveness

(Teacher and Leader standards)

Highly

Effective

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

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

Overall performance and results exceed NYS Teaching Standards.

Effective

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

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

Overall performance and results meet NYS Teaching Standards.

Developing

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

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

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

Ineffective

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

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

Overall performance and results do not meet NYS Teaching Standards.

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

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

2012-13 where there is no Value-Added measure

Growth or Comparable Measures

Locally-selected Measures of

growth or achievement

Other Measures of Effectiveness

(60 points)

Overall

Composite Score

Highly Effective

18-20

18-20

Ranges determined locally--see below

91-100

Effective

9-17

9-17

75-90

Developing

3-8

3-8

65-74

Ineffective

0-2

0-2

0-64

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

Highly Effective	59-60
Effective	57-58
Developing	55-56
Ineffective	0-54

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

2012-13 where Value-Added growth measure applies

Growth or Comparable Measures

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

Other Measures of Effectiveness

(60 points)

Overall

Composite Score

Highly Effective

22-25

14-15

Ranges determined locally--see above

91-100

Effective

10-21

8-13

75-90

Developing

3-9

3-7

65-74

Ineffective

0-2

0-2

0-64

6. Additional Requirements - Teachers

Created Wednesday, May 30, 2012

Updated Tuesday, January 08, 2013

Page 1

6.1) Assurances -- Improvement Plans

Please check the boxes below:

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

6.2) Attachment: Teacher Improvement Plan Forms

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

[assets/survey-uploads/5265/136522-Df0w3Xx5v6/6.2 Teacher Improvement Plan.pdf](#)

6.3) Appeals Process

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

(1) the substance of the annual professional performance review

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

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

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

A. General

The appeal procedures shall provide for the timely and expeditious resolution of the appeal. All tenured teachers who meet the appeal process criteria identified below may use this appeal process. A teacher may not file multiple appeals regarding the same performance review or TIP. All grounds for appeal must be raised within one appeal.

B. Grounds for an Appeal

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

- a) The substance of the Annual Professional Performance Review;*
- b) The district's failure to adhere to the standards and methodologies required for the Annual Professional Performance Review, pursuant to Education Law §3012-c and applicable rules and regulations;*
- c) The district's issuance and/or implementation of the terms of a teacher's improvement plan;*
- d) The district's failure to comply with locally negotiated procedures pertaining to the APPR.*

C. Notification of the Appeal

1. Within ten (10) business days, occurring during the school year including summer recess, of the receipt of a teacher's annual evaluation, the teacher may request, in writing, a review by the Superintendent of Schools or his/her designee.

2. The appeal writing shall articulate in detail the basis of the appeal to the Superintendent of Schools or his/her designee. Failure to articulate a particular basis for the appeal in the aforesaid appeal writing shall be deemed a waiver of that claim. The evaluated teacher may only challenge the substance, rating and/or adherence to the parties' annual professional performance review plan adopted pursuant to 8 NYCRR 30-2 and Education Law 3012-c.

12

E. Decisions on Appeal

Within ten (10) business days, occurring during the school year including summer recess, of receipt of the appeal, the Superintendent of Schools or his/her designee shall render an initial determination, in writing, respecting the appeal. Thereafter, within ten (10) days of receipt of the Superintendent's initial determination, the affected teacher may elect review of the appeal papers by one outside expert who will be chosen from a panel of three persons selected by the District and CTA. In the event the affected teacher fails to elect review by a panelist within said timeframe, the Superintendent's initial determination shall be final. The panel shall be as follows:

i) Alan Gerstenlauer ii) Candy Swensen iii) Les Black

a) The panel composition shall be reviewed annually beginning on July 1, 2013. The panelists shall be selected in rotating order; if a panelist is unavailable, the next listed panelist will be chosen. The cost of expert review shall be shared equally between the District and the CTA. The expert may recommend a modification of the TIP, or a modification of the rating, along with his/her rationale for the same. Expert review shall be completed within ten (10) days of delivery of the written request for review to the panel member. No hearing shall be held and the review shall be based solely upon the original appeal, the Superintendent's initial determination, supporting papers submitted by the teacher and/or a response to the appeal by the teacher's evaluator. The panelist written review recommendation shall be transmitted to the Superintendent and appellant upon completion. The Superintendent shall consider the written review recommendation of the panelist and shall issue a written decision with ten (10) days thereof. The determination of the Superintendent of Schools, or his/her designee, shall be final and shall not be grievable, arbitral, nor reviewable in any other forum; however, the failure of either party to abide by the above agreed-upon process shall be subject to the grievance procedure.

b) An overall performance rating of "ineffective" on the annual evaluation is the only rating subject to appeal. Teachers who receive a rating of "highly effective" or "effective" or "developing" shall not be permitted to appeal their rating. Tenured teachers who are rated effective, highly effective or developing may elect to submit a written response to their overall rating, which response shall be appended to the APPR evaluation and filed in the teacher's personnel file. Such response shall be filed within ten (10) business days, occurring during the school year including summer recess, of the teachers of the APPR evaluation.

c) Non-tenured teachers shall not be permitted to appeal any aspect of their annual evaluation, but may appeal the school district's issuance and/or implementation of the terms of a teacher improvement plan. Probationary teachers who are rated ineffective, effective, highly effective or developing may elect to submit a written response to their overall rating, which response shall be appended to the APPR evaluation and filed in the teacher's personnel file. Such response shall be filed within ten (10) business days, occurring during the school year including summer recess, of the teachers of the APPR evaluation.

6.4) Training and Certification of Lead Evaluators and Evaluators

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

The Superintendent will ensure that all evaluators have been trained and that all lead evaluators have been trained and certified in accordance with regulation. All Lead Evaluators were trained in the Nine Elements described in the New York State Teaching Standards through the lens of the Charlotte Danielson ASCD rubric. Dr. Joan Daly-Lewis, who received training at NYSED through the Network Team model, provided 15 days of training over the course of three years comprising over 25 hours of training focused on interpreting the rubric, evidence-based observation techniques and inter-rater reliability. Dr. Daly-Lewis provided a crosswalk between the Danielson rubric and the New York State Teaching Standards in order to ensure that the evaluators are able to collect evidence that links the rubric to the Standard expectations. The district will ensure that evaluator training and lead evaluator training and certification will continue to be in accordance with SED procedures and processes. Lead evaluators of principals attended over 25 hours of BOCES provided network team based training and will continue to attend BOCES-provided and in-district training during the 2012-2013 school year that meets the minimum requirements prescribed in the Commissioner's regulations. New administrative educators will receive the same or equivalent training upon hire. Lead evaluators will be periodically recertified to ensure inter-rater reliability. Evaluators will meet periodically to discuss the evidence that has been collected throughout the evaluation process to ensure objectivity and specificity, alignment to the standards, and that all performance indicators and elements are addressed.

6.5) Assurances -- Evaluators

Please check the boxes below:

-
- Checked
-

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

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

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

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

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

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

(7) use of the Statewide Instructional Reporting System

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

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

-
- Checked
-

6.6) Assurances -- Teachers

Please check all of the boxes below:

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

6.7) Assurances -- Data

Please check all of the boxes below:

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

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

Created Wednesday, May 30, 2012

Updated Monday, January 14, 2013

Page 1

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

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

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

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

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

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

(No response)

7.4) Special Considerations for Comparable Growth Measures

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

Note: The only allowable controls or adjustments for Comparable Growth Measures are those used in State Growth measures, which

include: prior student achievement results, students with disabilities, English language learners, students in poverty, and, in the future, any other student-, classroom-, and school-level characteristics approved by the Board of Regents.

(No response)

7.5) Principals with More Than One Growth Measure

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

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

7.6) Assurances -- Comparable Growth Measures

Please check all of the boxes below:

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

8. Local Measures (Principals)

Created Wednesday, May 30, 2012

Updated Monday, January 14, 2013

Page 1

Locally-Selected Measures of Student Achievement or Growth

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

Grade Configuration	Locally-Selected Measure from List of Approved Measures	Assessment
K-5	(d) measures used by district for teacher evaluation	NYS Grades 3-5 ELA and Math, NYS 4th Grade Science
6-8	(d) measures used by district for teacher evaluation	NYS Grade 6-8 ELA and Math, Grade 8 Science, Earth Science Regents
9-12	(d) measures used by district for teacher evaluation	The following NYS Regents: English, Living Environment, US History, Algebra I

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.	See uploaded 8.1 document for step by step process
Highly Effective (14 - 15 points) Results are well above District- or BOCES-adopted expectations for growth or achievement for grade/subject.	See 8.1 attachment
Effective (8- 13 points) Results meet District- or BOCES-adopted expectations for growth or achievement for grade/subject.	See 8.1 attachment
Developing (3 - 7 points) Results are below District- or BOCES-adopted expectations for growth or achievement for grade/subject.	See 8.1 attachment
Ineffective (0 - 2 points) Results are well below District- or BOCES-adopted expectations for growth or achievement for grade/subject.	See 8.1 attachment

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/5366/136524-qBFVOWF7fC/8.1.doc

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

Grade Configuration	Locally-Selected Measure from List of Approved Measures	Assessment
K-5	(d) measures used by district for teacher evaluation	NYS Grades 3-5 ELA and Math, NYS 4th Grade Science
6-8	(d) measures used by district for teacher evaluation	NYS Grade 6-8 ELA and Math, Grade 8 Science, Earth Science Regents
9-12	(d) measures used by district for teacher evaluation	The following NYS Regents: English, Living Environment, US History, Algebra I

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.	See uploaded 8.1 document for step by step process
Highly Effective (18 - 20 points) Results are well above District- or BOCES-adopted expectations for growth or achievement for grade/subject.	See 8.1 attachment
Effective (9- 17 points) Results meet District- or BOCES-adopted expectations for growth or achievement for grade/subject.	See 8.1 attachment
Developing (3 - 8 points) Results are below District- or BOCES-adopted expectations for growth or achievement for grade/subject.	See 8.1 attachment
Ineffective (0 - 2 points) Results are well below District- or BOCES-adopted expectations for growth or achievement for grade/subject.	See 8.1 attachment

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.

8.3) Locally Developed Controls

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

(No response)

8.4) Principals with More Than One Locally Selected Measure

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

See 8.1 attachment

8.5) Assurances

Please check all of the boxes below:

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

9. Other Measures of Effectiveness (Principals)

Created Wednesday, May 30, 2012
Updated Thursday, January 10, 2013

Page 1

9.1) Principal Practice Rubric

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

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

Multidimensional Principal Performance Rubric

(No response)

9.2) Points Within Other Measures

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

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

Is the following points assignment for all principals?

Yes

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

(No response)

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

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

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

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

(No response)

9.3) Assurances -- Goals

Please check the boxes below (if applicable):

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

9.4) Sources of Evidence (if applicable)

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

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

9.5) Survey Tool(s) (if applicable)

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

(No response)

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

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

Principal Evaluation Tripod School Perception Survey (Combined Parent Survey)	(No response)
Principal Evaluation Tripod School Perception Survey (Combined Student Surveys)	(No response)

9.6) Assurances

Please check all of the boxes below:

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

9.7) Process for Assigning Points and Determining HEDI Ratings

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

1. The parties agree that principals shall be evaluated using the Multidimensional Principal Performance Rubric for the Other Measures subcomponent. The assessment of Other Measures on the rubric shall account for 60% of a Principal's HEDI rating.

2. Each element of the Multidimensional domain shall be rated using the HEDI criteria which shall be converted to a four point scale: Highly Effective = 4 points, Effective = 3 points, Developing = 2 points, and Ineffective = 1 points. Each observed element within a domain will receive a score of 1-4. Once all elements are scored within a domain, they will be averaged together resulting in a domain score of 1-4. Once all domain scores are calculated, they will be averaged together resulting in an overall rubric score of 1-4. This overall rubric score will be converted to an overall HEDI score using the conversion chart uploaded below.

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/5143/136525-pMADJ4gk6R/9 7.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.	See uploaded 9.7 for step by step process
Effective: Overall performance and results meet standards.	See 9.7 attachment
Developing: Overall performance and results need improvement in order to meet standards.	See 9.7 attachment
Ineffective: Overall performance and results do not meet standards.	See 9.7 attachment

Please provide the locally-negotiated 60 point scoring bands.

Highly Effective	59-60
Effective	57-58
Developing	55-56
Ineffective	0-54

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	1
By trained administrator	1
By trained independent evaluator	0
Enter Total	2

Tenured Principals

By supervisor	1
By trained administrator	1
By trained independent evaluator	0
Enter Total	2

10. Composite Scoring (Principals)

Created Wednesday, May 30, 2012

Updated Wednesday, December 05, 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	55-56
Ineffective	0-54

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

2012-13 where Value-Added growth measure applies

Growth or Comparable Measures

Locally-selected Measures of growth or achievement

Other Measures of Effectiveness

(60 points)

Overall

Composite Score

Highly Effective

22-25

14-15

Ranges determined locally--see above

91-100

Effective

10-21

8-13

75-90

Developing

3-9

3-7

65-74

Ineffective

0-2

0-2

0-64

11. Additional Requirements - Principals

Created Wednesday, May 30, 2012

Updated Wednesday, January 09, 2013

Page 1

11.1) Assurances -- Improvement Plans

Please check the boxes below.

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

11.2) Attachment: Principal Improvement Plan Forms

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

<assets/survey-uploads/5276/136540-Df0w3Xx5v6/11.2.pdf>

11.3) Appeals Process

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

(1) the substance of the annual professional performance review

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

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

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

As to the appeals process, the following shall constitute compliance with Section 3012(c):

- 1. A draft evaluation shall be presented to the Building Principal in a meeting between the Building Principal and the Assistant Superintendent of Schools, no later than April 1st for an untenured Building Principal and May 1st for a tenured Building Principal in each school year. At said meeting, the Building Principal and Assistant Superintendent shall discuss possible changes to the draft before it becomes finalized.*
- 2. Within twelve (12) business days after the meeting, the Assistant Superintendent will present the evaluation to the Building*

Principal.

3. Within twelve (12) business days after actual receipt of the final APPR composite score from the Assistant Superintendent, the Building Principal may appeal the evaluation to the Superintendent of Schools. The time limitation for filing an appeal may be extended by mutual agreement of the parties or for extenuating circumstances.

4. Any procedural issues regarding the appeal process shall be subject to the parties' grievance procedure.

5. Within twelve (12) business days after receipt of the appeal, the Superintendent shall make a final written determination of the appeal. Except as outlined in 4 above, the determination shall not be grievable. Notwithstanding the aforementioned language, nothing herein shall be construed as limiting the right of the employee to challenge the evaluation nor the Superintendent determination on the appeal in any proceeding brought pursuant to Education Law Section 3020-a.

In all cases, the appeals process will be completed in a timely manner.

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 Board of Education will certify The Superintendent and central office administrators will ensure that all lead evaluators of have been trained and that all lead evaluators of principals have been trained and certified in accordance with regulation. All Lead Evaluators were trained in the Nine Elements described in the New York State Teaching Standards through the lens of the Charlotte Danielson ASCD rubric. Lead Evaluators of principals were additionally provided over 25 hours of training in the Leadership Standards and specific training in the Multidimensional Principal Performance Rubric provided by Eastern Suffolk BOCES. The district will ensure that evaluator training and lead evaluator training and certification will continue to be in accordance with SED procedures and processes. Lead evaluators of principals will continue to attend BOCES-provided and in-district training during the 2012-2013 school year that meets the minimum requirements prescribed in the Commissioner's regulations. New administrative educators will receive the same or equivalent training upon hire. Lead principal evaluators will be periodically recertified to ensure inter-rater reliability. Evaluators will meet periodically to discuss the evidence that has been collected throughout the evaluation process to ensure objectivity and specificity, alignment to the standards, and that all performance indicators and elements are addressed.

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	Checked
--	---------

prescribed by the Commissioner.

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

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

12. Joint Certification of APPR Plan

Created Tuesday, May 29, 2012

Updated Monday, January 14, 2013

Page 1

12.1) Upload the Joint Certification of the APPR Plan

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

[assets/survey-uploads/5581/135447-3Uqgn5g9Iu/District Certification Form.pdf](assets/survey-uploads/5581/135447-3Uqgn5g9Iu/District%20Certification%20Form.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.

2.11

Conversion of Targets to HEDI Scores (SLOs)

HEDI Range	Highly Effective			Effective									Developing					Ineffective			
0-20 Points	20	19	18	17	16	15	14	13	12	11	10	9	8	7	6	5	4	3	2	1	0
% of students meeting target	96% - 100%	90% - 95%	85% - 89%	83% - 84%	81% - 82%	80%	78% - 79%	76% - 77%	75%	73% - 74%	71% - 72%	70%	66% - 69%	62% - 65%	59% - 61%	56% - 58%	53% - 55%	50% - 52%	33% - 49%	16% - 32%	0% - 15%

**DESCRIPTION OF THE LOCAL 20% FOR THE APPR
(15% FOR GRADES WITH A VAM)**

3.3

Step	Description
1	The percent reaching proficiency (i.e., level 3 and 4) were listed for each grade (i.e., 3, 4 and 5 for elementary and grades 6, 7 and 8 for middle school) and subject area (i.e., ELA, math and science) within each school for years 2005-2006 through 2011-2012.
2	The state proficiency for each subject within each grade was gathered for school years 2005-2006 through 2011-2012.
3	The difference between each school's proficiency rate and the State's proficiency rate within each subject and grade and for each year was calculated. The comparison to the State was included in the calculation to control for the State's change in the criteria that determined proficiency in the school year 2009-2010 and the possibility that this will occur in the future.
4	The mean and standard deviation for the differences calculated in step 3 were computed utilizing all subject areas, grades and years (i.e., 2005-2006 through 2011-2012) within each school. This was done within each school to determine an overall level of proficiency in comparison to the State proficiency rate for the particular school. The mean and standard deviation calculated for each school will be used for comparison purposes for the school year 2012-2013 to determine local achievement.
5	The overall mean proficiency rate in comparison to the State for the 2012-2013 school year within each school will be calculated utilizing the same procedure outlined in step 3, except it will only be for the 2012-2013 school year (i.e., not across multiple years). This mean proficiency rate in comparison to the State will be indicative of achievement for the local part of the APPR.
6	The 20 points for the local measure (15 points for those grades that have a value-added model) will be based on a comparison (in standard deviation units) between the overall proficiency rate in comparison to the State within each school for year 2012-2013 and average proficiency rate in comparison to the State for school years 2005-2006 through 2011-2012 within the same school.
	EXAMPLE: The Cherokee Elementary School was on the average 5.08% above the State in proficiency rate across grades 3, 4 and 5 for subjects ELA, math and science for school years 2005-2006 through 2011-2012. The standard deviation was 5.25%. If in 2012-2013, the overall proficiency rate in comparison to the State was 7.00%, then Cherokee would receive a score of .366. This number indicates that for the school year 2012-2013, overall Cherokee's proficiency rate was .366 standard deviations above the average proficiency for school years 2005-2006 to 2011-2012. This .366 would be converted to a point value and HEDI category using the attached table.

**POINT ASSIGNMENT FOR LOCAL MEASURE
FOR GRADES K-8 WITHOUT VALUE ADDED MODEL**

Points Assigned (without Value Added Model)			Points Assigned (without Value Added Model)	
0	3.41 or more than standard deviations below the historic mean for the building		11	Between 1.76 and 2.0 standard deviations below the historic mean for the building
1	Between 3.26 and 3.40 standard deviations below the historic mean for the building		12	Between 1.51 and 1.75 standard deviations below the historic mean for the building
2	Between 3.16 and 3.25 standard deviations below the historic mean for the building		13	Between 1.51 and 1.50 standard deviations below the historic mean for the building
3	Between 3.01 and 3.15 standard deviations below the historic mean for the building		14	Between 1.26 and 1.50 standard deviations below the historic mean for the building
4	Between 2.86 and 3.00 standard deviations below the historic mean for the building		15	Between .76 and 1.25 standard deviations below the historic mean for the building
5	Between 2.76 and 2.85 standard deviations below the historic mean for the building		16	Between .01 and .75 standard deviations below the historic mean for the building
6	Between 2.66 and 2.75 standard deviations below the historic mean for the building		17	Between .00 and .75 standard deviations above the historic mean for the building
7	Between 2.51 and 2.65 standard deviations below the historic mean for the building		18	Between .76 and 1.25 standard deviations above the historic mean for the building
8	Between 2.41 and 2.50 standard deviations below the historic mean for the building		19	Between 1.26 and 2.0 standard deviations above the historic mean for the building
9	Between 2.26 and 2.40 standard deviations below the historic mean for the building		20	2.01 standard deviations or greater above the historic mean for the building
10	Between 2.01 and 2.25 standard deviations below the historic mean for the building			

**POINT ASSIGNMENT FOR LOCAL MEASURE
FOR GRADES K- 8 WITH VALUE ADDED MODEL**

Points Assigned (with Value Added Model)		Points Assigned (with Value Added Model)	
0	3.51 or more than standard deviations below the historic mean for the building	8	Between 2.01 and 2.5 standard deviations below the historic mean for the building
1	Between 3.26 and 3.5 standard deviations below the historic mean for the building	9	Between 1.51 and 2.00 standard deviations below the historic mean for the building
2	Between 3.16 and 3.25 standard deviations below the historic mean for the building	10	Between 1.26 and 1.5 standard deviations below the historic mean for the building
3	Between 3.01 and 3.15 standard deviations below the historic mean for the building	11	Between .76 and 1.25 standard deviations below the historic mean for the building
4	Between 2.86 and 3.0 standard deviations below the historic mean for the building	12	Between .01 and .75 standard deviations below the historic mean for the building
5	Between 2.76 and 2.85 standard deviations below the historic mean for the building	13	Between .00 and .75 standard deviations above the historic mean for the building
6	Between 2.66 and 2.75 standard deviations below the historic mean for the building	14	Between .76 and 2.00 standard deviations above the historic mean for the building
7	Between 2.51 and 2.65 standard deviations below the historic mean for the building	15	Greater than 2.01 standard deviations above the historic mean for the building

**DESCRIPTION OF THE LOCAL 20% FOR THE APPR FOR GRADE 9-12
(15% FOR GRADES WITH A VAM)**

Step	Description
1	The percent of students receiving the advanced regents diploma (ARD) per school year will be calculated for the school years 2004-2005 to 2011-2012.
2	The mean and standard deviation for the percent of students receiving the ARD per school year for school years 2004-2005 to 2011-2012 will be calculated.
3	The percent receiving the ARD for the school year 2012-2013 will be calculated.
4	Based on the difference in standard deviation units of the ARD in 2012-2013 from the mean ARD calculated in step 2, the school will be assigned a point value and a HEDI band. The difference from the mean (in standard deviation units) for 2012-2013 will be calculated as follows: $\frac{(\text{percent receiving ARD 2012-2013}) - (\text{Mean ARD per year for 2004-2005 to 2011-2012})}{(\text{Standard Deviation of ARD for 2004-2005 to 2011-2012})}$
5	The 20 points for the local measure (15 points for those subjects that have a value-added model) will be based on the magnitude and direction of the difference between the ARD obtained in 2012-2013 and the mean ARD calculated in step 2 in standard deviation units.
	EXAMPLE: On the average, Connetquot High School graduated 54% of its students with an ARD per year from 2004-2004 to 2011-2012. The standard deviation for these school years was 3%. In 2012-2013, 57% of the students at Connetquot High School received an ARD. Therefore, in 2012-2013, Connetquot High School was one standard deviation unit above (i.e., $(57\%-54\%)/3\%$) the mean for school years 2004-2005 to 2012-2013. This calculation would be used to determine the point value and HEDI category for the local 20% (15% with VAM) utilizing the attached conversion chart.

**POINT ASSIGNMENT FOR LOCAL MEASURE GRADES 9-12
FOR SUBJECTS WITHOUT VALUE ADDED MODEL**

Points Assigned (without Value Added Model)		Points Assigned (without Value Added Model)	
0	3.71 or more than standard deviations below the mean ARD rate for CHS	11	Between 2.26 and 2.50 standard deviations below the mean ARD rate for CHS
1	Between 3.61 and 3.70 standard deviations below the mean ARD rate for CHS	12	Between 2.01 and 2.25 standard deviations below the mean ARD rate for CHS
2	Between 3.51 and 3.60 standard deviations below the mean ARD rate for CHS	13	Between 1.76 and 2.00 standard deviations below the mean ARD rate for CHS
3	Between 3.41 and 3.50 standard deviations below the mean ARD rate for CHS	14	Between 1.26 and 1.75 standard deviations below the mean ARD rate for CHS
4	Between 3.31 and 3.40 standard deviations below the mean ARD rate for CHS	15	Between .76 and 1.25 standard deviations below the mean ARD rate for CHS
5	Between 3.21 and 3.30 standard deviations below the mean ARD rate for CHS	16	Between .75 and .01 standard deviations below the mean ARD rate for CHS
6	Between 3.11 and 3.20 standard deviations below the mean ARD rate for CHS	17	Between .00 and .50 standard deviations above the mean ARD rate for CHS
7	Between 2.96 and 3.10 standard deviations below the mean ARD rate for CHS	18	Between .51 and 1.00 standard deviations above the mean ARD rate for CHS
8	Between 2.81 and 2.95 standard deviations below the mean ARD rate for CHS	19	Between 1.01 and 2.00 standard deviations above the mean ARD rate for CHS
9	Between 2.66 and 2.80 standard deviations below the mean ARD rate for CHS	20	2.01 standard deviations or greater above the mean ARD rate for CHS
10	Between 2.51 and 2.65 standard deviations below the mean ARD rate for CHS		

**POINT ASSIGNMENT FOR LOCAL MEASURE GRADES 9-12
FOR SUBJECTS WITH VALUE ADDED MODEL**

Points Assigned (with Value Added Model)		Points Assigned (with Value Added Model)	
0	3.61 or more than standard deviations below the mean ARD for CHS	8	Between 2.01 and 2.25 standard deviations below the mean ARD for CHS
1	Between 3.51 and 3.60 standard deviations below the mean ARD for CHS	9	Between 1.76 and 2.00 standard deviations below the mean ARD for CHS
2	Between 3.41 and 3.50 standard deviations below the mean ARD for CHS	10	Between 1.51 and 1.75 standard deviations below the mean ARD for CHS
3	Between 3.21 and 3.40 standard deviations below the mean ARD for CHS	11	Between 1.26 and 1.50 standard deviations below the mean ARD for CHS
4	Between 3.01 and 3.20 standard deviations below the mean ARD for CHS	12	Between .76 and 1.25 standard deviations below the mean ARD for CHS
5	Between 2.76 and 3.00 standard deviations below the mean ARD for CHS	13	Between .75 and .01 standard deviations below the mean ARD for CHS
6	Between 2.51 and 2.75 standard deviations below the mean ARD for CHS	14	Between .00 and 1.50 standard deviations above the mean ARD for CHS
7	Between 2.26 and 2.50 standard deviations below the mean ARD for CHS	15	Greater than 1.50 standard deviations above the mean ARD for CHS

Below is the conversion chart that configures the scoring mechanism for student achievement:

Rating Category	Highly Effective	Effective	Developing	Ineffective
Performance Level	Well-Above District Expectations	Meets District Expectations	Below District Expectations	Well Below District Expectations
% of Target	101% or more	75-100%	30-74%	0-29%
Points Awarded	101-104% - 18 105-108% - 19 >108% - 20	75-77% - 9 78-80% - 10 81-84% - 11 85-87% - 12 88-90% - 13 91-93% - 14 94-96% - 15 97-99% - 16 100% - 17	30-34% - 3 35-43% - 4 44-50% - 5 51-58% - 6 59-65% - 7 66-74% - 8	0-10% - 0 11-20% - 1 21-29% - 2

The HEDI categories will be based upon a composite score obtained by each principal. In each building, the percentage of 3's and 4's on the NYS grades 3-8 math and ELA assessments and a score of 65 and above on Regents received for the total number of identified assessments used for the local measure will be the composite score to determine the principal's HEDI according the target.

The principal and the lead evaluator will mutually agree to establish the Connetquot Building Target annually at the beginning of the year for students who meet or exceed proficiency benchmarks.

After the post summative assessments are given, the percentage of students who met or exceeded the set target will be determined.

The composite score is determined by the dividing the percentage of students who score a 3 or higher or a 65 or higher on the applicable NYS assessments into the target percentage.

The resulting percentage will correspond to a 0-15 or 0-20 HEDI score using the conversion chart listed above.

Highly Effective (18-20 points) A principal who achieves over 100% of the target shall be considered well above the district expectations and receive a rating of Highly Effective.

Effective (9-17 points) A principal who achieves 75% - 100% of the target shall be considered meeting the district expectations and receive a rating of Effective.

Developing (3-8 points) A principal who achieves 30% - 74% of the target shall be considered below the district expectations and receive a rating of Developing

Ineffective (0-2 points) A principal who achieves less than 30% of the target shall be considered well below the district expectations and receive a rating of Ineffective.

Ratings shall be established based upon the following (no value added):

Ratings shall be established based upon the following if value-added is in effect:

Rating Category	Highly Effective	Effective	Developing	Ineffective
Performance Level	Well-Above District Expectations	Meets District Expectations	Below District Expectations	Well Below District Expectations
% of Target	101% or more	75-100%	35-74%	0-34%
Points Awarded	101-106% - 14 >106% - 15	75-79% - 8 80-84% - 9 85-89% - 10 90-94% - 11 95-99% - 12 100% - 13	35-42% - 3 43-50% - 4 51-58% - 5 59-66% - 6 67-74% - 7	0-11% - 0 12-23% - 1 24-34% - 2

The HEDI categories will be based upon a composite score obtained by each principal. In each building, the percentage of 3's and 4's on the NYS grades 3-8 math and ELA assessments and a score of 65 and above on Regents received for the total number of identified assessments used for the local measure will be the composite score to determine the principal's HEDI according the target.

The principal and the lead evaluator will mutually agree to establish the Connetquot Building Target annually at the beginning of the year for students who meet or exceed proficiency benchmarks.

After the post summative assessments are given, the percentage of students who met or exceeded the set target will be determined.

The composite score is determined by the dividing the percentage of students who score a 3 or higher or a 65 or higher on the applicable NYS assessments into the target percentage.

The resulting percentage will correspond to a 0-15 or 0-20 HEDI score using the conversion chart listed above.

Highly Effective (14-15 points) A principal who achieves over 100% of the target shall be considered well above the district expectations and receive a rating of Highly Effective.

Effective (8-13 points) A principal who achieves 75% - 100% of the target shall be considered meeting the district expectations and receive a rating of Effective.

Developing (3-7 points) A principal who achieves 30% - 74% of the target shall be considered below the district expectations and receive a rating of Developing

Ineffective (0-2 points) A principal who achieves less than 30% of the target shall be considered well below the district expectations and receive a rating of Ineffective.

Below is the conversion chart that configures the scoring mechanism for student achievement:

Rating Category	Highly Effective	Effective	Developing	Ineffective
Performance Level	Well-Above District Expectations	Meets District Expectations	Below District Expectations	Well Below District Expectations
% of Target	101% or more	75-100%	30-74%	0-29%
Points Awarded	101-104% - 18 105-108% - 19 >108% - 20	75-77% - 9 78-80% - 10 81-84% - 11 85-87% - 12 88-90% - 13 91-93% - 14 94-96% - 15 97-99% - 16 100% - 17	30-34% - 3 35-43% - 4 44-50% - 5 51-58% - 6 59-65% - 7 66-74% - 8	0-10% - 0 11-20% - 1 21-29% - 2

The HEDI categories will be based upon a composite score obtained by each principal. In each building, the percentage of 3's and 4's on the NYS grades 3-8 math and ELA assessments and a score of 65 and above on Regents received for the total number of identified assessments used for the local measure will be the composite score to determine the principal's HEDI according the target.

The principal and the lead evaluator will mutually agree to establish the Connetquot Building Target annually at the beginning of the year for students who meet or exceed proficiency benchmarks.

After the post summative assessments are given, the percentage of students who met or exceeded the set target will be determined.

The composite score is determined by the dividing the percentage of students who score a 3 or higher or a 65 or higher on the applicable NYS assessments into the target percentage.

The resulting percentage will correspond to a 0-15 or 0-20 HEDI score using the conversion chart listed above.

Highly Effective (18-20 points) A principal who achieves over 100% of the target shall be considered well above the district expectations and receive a rating of Highly Effective.

Effective (9-17 points) A principal who achieves 75% - 100% of the target shall be considered meeting the district expectations and receive a rating of Effective.

Developing (3-8 points) A principal who achieves 30% - 74% of the target shall be considered below the district expectations and receive a rating of Developing

Ineffective (0-2 points) A principal who achieves less than 30% of the target shall be considered well below the district expectations and receive a rating of Ineffective.

Ratings shall be established based upon the following (no value added):

Ratings shall be established based upon the following if value-added is in effect:

Rating Category	Highly Effective	Effective	Developing	Ineffective
Performance Level	Well-Above District Expectations	Meets District Expectations	Below District Expectations	Well Below District Expectations
% of Target	101% or more	75-100%	35-74%	0-34%
Points Awarded	101-106% - 14 >106% - 15	75-79% - 8 80-84% - 9 85-89% - 10 90-94% - 11 95-99% - 12 100% - 13	35-42% - 3 43-50% - 4 51-58% - 5 59-66% - 6 67-74% - 7	0-11% - 0 12-23% - 1 24-34% - 2

The HEDI categories will be based upon a composite score obtained by each principal. In each building, the percentage of 3's and 4's on the NYS grades 3-8 math and ELA assessments and a score of 65 and above on Regents received for the total number of identified assessments used for the local measure will be the composite score to determine the principal's HEDI according the target.

The principal and the lead evaluator will mutually agree to establish the Connetquot Building Target annually at the beginning of the year for students who meet or exceed proficiency benchmarks.

After the post summative assessments are given, the percentage of students who met or exceeded the set target will be determined.

The composite score is determined by the dividing the percentage of students who score a 3 or higher or a 65 or higher on the applicable NYS assessments into the target percentage.

The resulting percentage will correspond to a 0-15 or 0-20 HEDI score using the conversion chart listed above.

Highly Effective (14-15 points) A principal who achieves over 100% of the target shall be considered well above the district expectations and receive a rating of Highly Effective.

Effective (8-13 points) A principal who achieves 75% - 100% of the target shall be considered meeting the district expectations and receive a rating of Effective.

Developing (3-7 points) A principal who achieves 30% - 74% of the target shall be considered below the district expectations and receive a rating of Developing

Ineffective (0-2 points) A principal who achieves less than 30% of the target shall be considered well below the district expectations and receive a rating of Ineffective.

9.7

RUBRIC SCORING METHODOLOGY

1. The parties agree that principals shall be evaluated using the Multidimensional Principal Performance Rubric for the Other Measures subcomponent. The assessment of Other Measures on the rubric shall account for 60% of a Principal’s HEDI rating.
2. Each element of the Multidimensional domain shall be rated using the HEDI criteria which shall be converted to a four point scale: Highly Effective = 4 points, Effective = 3 points, Developing = 2 points, and Ineffective = 1 points. The element scores shall be averaged to determine a rubric score which shall be converted to a HEDI rating and points pursuant to the following chart.

Rubric Score	Subcomponent Points
Ineffective	
1.00	0
1.01	1
1.02	2
1.03	3
1.04	4
1.05	5
1.06	6
1.07	7
1.08	8
1.09	9
1.10	10
1.11	11
1.12	12
1.13	13
1.14	14
1.15	15
1.16	16
1.17	17
1.18	18
1.19	19
1.20	20
1.21	21
1.22	22
1.23	23
1.24	24
1.25	25
1.26	26
1.27	27
1.28	28
1.29	29
1.30	30
1.31	31
1.32	32
1.33	33
1.34	34
1.35	35
1.36	36
1.37	37
1.38	38
1.39	39
1.40	40
1.41	41
1.42	42
1.43	43

1.44	44
1.45	45
1.46	46
1.47	47
1.48	48
1.49	49
1.50	50
1.51	51
1.52	52
1.53	53
1.54	54
Developing	
1.55-2.00	55
2.01 -2.50	56
Effective	
2.51-3.00	57
3.01-3.50	58
Highly Effective	
3.51-3.74	59
3.75-4.00	60

The following describes the level of performance required for each HEDI rating categories, consistent with the narrative descriptions in the regulations for the “other measures” subcomponent.

Highly Effective: Overall performance and results exceed standards	A highly effective rating is achieved by demonstrating exemplary performance in the following areas: creating a shared vision of learning; school culture and instructional program; safe, efficient, effective learning environment; community; integrity, fairness, ethics; and political, social, economic, legal and cultural context. The overall composite score for a rating of highly effective will range from 59-60 points.
Effective: Overall performance and results meets standards	An effective rating is achieved by demonstrating strong performance in the following areas: creating a shared vision of learning; school culture and instructional program; safe, efficient, effective learning environment; community; integrity, fairness, ethics; and political, social, economic, legal and cultural context. The overall composite score for a rating of highly effective will range from 57-58 points.
Developing: Overall performance and results need improvement in order to meet standards.	A developing rating is achieved by demonstrating a need for improvement in the following areas: creating a shared vision of learning; school culture and instructional program; safe, efficient, effective learning environment; community; integrity, fairness, ethics; and political, social, economic, legal and cultural context. The overall composite score for a rating of highly effective will range from

	55-56 points.
Ineffective: Overall performance and results do not meet standards.	An ineffective rating is achieved by demonstrating poor performance in the following areas: creating a shared vision of learning; school culture and instructional program; safe, efficient, effective learning environment; community; integrity, fairness, ethics; and political, social, economic, legal and cultural context. The overall composite score for a rating of highly effective will range from 0-54 points.

CONNETQUOT CENTRAL SCHOOL DISTRICT PRINCIPAL IMPROVEMENT PLAN

Date of the PIP planning session _____

Date PIP agreed to _____

Ineffective areas to be of focus:

Growth _____

Local Measure _____

LCI Element(s) _____

Resources (check all that apply):

- Mentor/coach, internal or external
- Visitations and shadowing
- Workshops and seminars
- On-line courses and seminar
- Advanced degree work
- Professional texts, periodicals, and other literature
- Collegial circles
- Guided observations
- Self-assessments
- Other _____

Monthly Meeting Dates

Final Summary:

Principal's Comments:

The signature indicates agreement of the contents of this plan between the lead evaluator and the principal.

Lead evaluator

Principal

DANIELSON MODEL

There are three hierarchical levels to the Danielson Model:

The Domain level includes four different domains that address separate aspects of the teaching process. These Domains include Planning and Preparation, Classroom Management, Instruction and Professional responsibility.

The Component Level: Each of the four domains listed above contains a certain amount of components. These components relate to their assigned Domains. Teachers will receive a score on each of the 22 components that are contained in the four domains. This will be discussed further below.

Element level: Each component has several elements that provide a measure of the component at a more granular level. Each element contains specific school and classroom-based behaviors and/or teaching-relevant behaviors that can be evaluated based on observation or through artifacts.

The manner in which the scoring of each element is arithmetically combined to determine the teachers' score on each component and their overall rubric score, which in turn is converted to the 60 point scale, is explained below.

SCORING OF THE DANIELSON MODEL

The Daniel Model is scored first by scoring each element.

Element Level Scoring: Teachers will receive a score 0 (ineffective), 3 (developing), 4 (effective), 4.5 (highly effective), NO Score (Not Assessed)

Component Level Scoring: Elements will receive a weighting of 1, .5 or 0 to determine how much influence each has in the component score.

Each element score is then multiplied by their weight and a product is obtained. These products are added together and divided by the sum of the weights. This will result in each component receiving a score between 0 to 4.5.

Example

Domain 4: Component 4 has 20 elements: 15 receive full weighting, two receive .5 weighting and three receive no weighting. The sum of the weightings is 16 (i.e., $(15 \times 1) + (2 \times .5) + (3 \times 0)$).

If the teacher was effective in all areas, then she would receive a total component score of 64 (i.e., $(15 \times 4) + (.5 \times 4) + (.5 \times 4)$). This number would then be divided by the sum of the weights discussed above (i.e., 16). Her component score for Domain 4 Component 4 would be a 4 (i.e., $64/16$).

RUBRIC SCORE

The component scores computed above are then added together to compute the teachers' performance on a 99 point scale. The 99 point scale was created by multiplying the 22 components of the Danielson Model by 4.5. The 99 points is the highest score a teacher can receive. Based on the teachers' score out of the 99 points, they will be assigned a score and HEDI band based on a 0 to 60 scale (see conversion chart)

The Danielson Rubric is broken down into 22 components. 12 of these components are directly observable during a lesson observation. The other 10 may not be as easily observed, and may be better evaluated through artifact collection. It must be noted that the term artifacts is understood to mean the collection of evidence through professional conference and does not refer to a list of documents or items that are collected by an evaluator. The observable components are 1a, 1e, 2a-e, and 3a-e. These represent 54 of the 99 total points available (54.5%). The artifact based components are 1b-d, 1f, 4a-f. These represent the remaining 45 points (45.5%). Together these components will determine the score out of 60 for this portion of the APPR.

Raw (out of 99)	HEDI Band	Score (out of 60)	Raw (out of 99)	HEDI Band	Score (out of 60)	Raw (out of 99)	HEDI Band	Score (out of 60)
95-99	H	60	39	I	39	19	I	19
89-94	H	59	38	I	38	18	I	18
79-88	E	58	37	I	37	17	I	17
67-78	E	57	36	I	36	16	I	16
65-66	D	56	35	I	35	15	I	15
60-64	D	55	34	I	34	14	I	14
56-59	I	54	33	I	33	13	I	13
53-55	I	53	32	I	32	12	I	12
52	I	52	31	I	31	11	I	11
51	I	51	30	I	30	10	I	10
50	I	50	29	I	29	9	I	9
49	I	49	28	I	28	8	I	8
48	I	48	27	I	27	7	I	7
47	I	47	26	I	26	6	I	6
46	I	46	25	I	25	5	I	5
45	I	45	24	I	24	4	I	4
44	I	44	23	I	23	3	I	3
43	I	43	22	I	22	2	I	2
42	I	42	21	I	21	1	I	1
41	I	41	20	I	20	0	I	0

DELINEATION OF OBSERVATION AND ARTIFACT COMPONENTS AND ELEMENT WEIGHTS

Those components with an (O) next them are measured by observation and those with an (A) are measured through artifact. The weighting for each element in component is provided in the third column to the right.

Domain I: Planning and Preparation

COMPONENT	ELEMENT	WEIGHTING
Component 1A: (O)		
	1	1
	2	1
	3	1
Component 1B: (A)		
	1	1
	2	1
	3	1
	4	1
	5	1
Component 1C: (A)		
	1	1
	2	1
	3	1
	4	1
Component 1D: (A)		
	1	1
	2	1
	3	1
Component 1E: (O)		
	1	1
	2	1
	3	1
	4	1
Component 1F: (A)		
	1	1
	2	1
	3	1
	4	1

Domain II: Classroom Environment

COMPONENT	ELEMENT	WEIGHTING
Component 2A: (0)	1	1
	2	0
Component 2B: (0)	1	.5
	2	1
	3	0
Component 2C: (0)	1	1
	2	1
	3	1
	4	1
	5	.5
Component 2D: (0)	1	1
	2	1
	3	1
Component 2E: (0)	1	1
	2	1

Domain III: Instruction

COMPONENT	ELEMENT	WEIGHTING
Component 3A: (0)		
	1	1
	2	1
	3	1
	4	1
Component 3B: (0)		
	1	1
	2	1
	3	1
Component 3C: (0)		
	1	1
	2	1
	3	1
	4	1
Component 3D: (0)		
	1	1
	2	1
	3	1
	4	1
Component 3E: (0)		
	1	1
	2	1
	3	1

Domain IV: Professional Responsibilities

COMPONENT	ELEMENT	WEIGHTING
Component 4A: (A)		
	1	1
	2	1
Component 4B: (A)		
	1	1
	2	1
	3	1
Component 4C: (A)		
	1	1
	2	.5
	3	0
Component 4D: (A)		
	1	1
	2	.5
	3	0
	4	0
Component 4E: (A)		
	1	1
	2	1
	3	1
Component 1F: (A)		
	1	1
	2	1
	3	1
	4	1
	5	1

APPENDIX 2
Connetquot CSD Teacher Improvement Plan

The goal of the TIP is to provide resources and support for teachers who have been rated as “developing” or “ineffective” on their summative evaluation. The evaluator and teacher will jointly determine the strategies to be undertaken to correct the deficiencies.

Teacher: _____ Date _____
 Grade/Subject: _____
 Evaluator: _____
 CTA Representative: _____

List the area(s) needing improvement. If there are several, indicate the priority order for addressing them.

Priority	Area needing Improvement	Performance Goal

Describe the plan for improvement with specific, measurable objectives, timeline, and process the teacher must meet in order to achieve an effective rating.

Describe the professional development opportunities (which will be included in the teacher’s contractually obligated PD hours), materials, resources, and supports the District will make available at no cost to the teacher.

Describe any independent activities that are chosen by the teacher.

Connetquot CSD Teacher Improvement Plan

Assignment of a mentor teacher? Yes No

If yes, name of mentor: _____

If yes, describe the frequency and structure of the meetings between the mentor and teacher.

The teacher, evaluator, mentor (if applicable), and a CTA representative (if requested by the teacher) shall meet

_____ (Indicate specific dates/times) to assess the effectiveness and appropriateness of the TIP in assisting the teacher to achieve the goals set forth in the TIP. Based on the outcome of this assessment, the TIP shall be modified accordingly.

Evaluator's Signature _____

Date _____

Teacher's 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:

 1/11/13


Teachers Union President Signature: Date:

 1-11-13

Administrative Union President Signature: Date:

 1/11/13

Board of Education President Signature: Date:

 1/11/13