



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

December 6, 2012

Clifton J. Hebert, III, Superintendent  
Cooperstown Central School District  
39 Linden Avenue  
Cooperstown, NY 13326

Dear Superintendent Hebert:

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

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

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

Thank you again for your hard work.

Sincerely,



John B. King, Jr.  
Commissioner

Attachment

c: Nicholas Savin

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

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

# Annual Professional Performance Reviews: 2012-13

Created Wednesday, May 02, 2012

Updated Wednesday, November 14, 2012

---

## 1

### Disclaimers

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

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

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

### 1. SCHOOL DISTRICT INFORMATION

#### 1.1) School District's BEDS Number : 471701040000

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

471701040000

#### 1.2) School District Name: COOPERSTOWN CSD

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

COOPERSTOWN 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 09, 2012

Updated Wednesday, December 05, 2012

---

### Page 1

#### STATE-PROVIDED MEASURES OF STUDENT GROWTH

(25 points with an approved value-added measure)

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

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

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

#### 2.1) Assurances

Please check the boxes below:

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

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

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

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

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

If no State assessment or Regents exam exists:

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

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

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

State assessments, *required if one exists*

List of State-approved 3rd party assessments

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

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

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

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

## 2.2) Grades K-3 ELA

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

	ELA	Assessment
K	State-approved 3rd party assessment	Measures of Academic Progress (Primary Grades)
1	State-approved 3rd party assessment	Measures of Academic Progress (Primary Grades)
2	State-approved 3rd party assessment	Measures of Academic Progress (Primary Grades)

	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	For ELA K-2, the Cooperstown Central School District will be using conditional growth index (CGI) based on the
---	--

this subcomponent. If needed, you may upload a table or graphic at 2.11, below.

Measures of Academic Progress (Primary Grades) assessment to calculate teacher-level effectiveness ratings for the comparable growth measures in ELA in grades K-2. The conditional growth index captures the contributions educators make to student learning on the NWEA MAP assessments, by comparing actual student growth to the student growth norms. These norms reflect the amount of growth that might be expected from these students based on their grade, subject, and starting RIT score. CGI scores are expressed in standard deviation units, or z-scores, with scores above zero indicating students exceeded the growth norms, whereas scores below zero indicate growth less than the growth norm. CGI scores of zero are indicative of students meeting their growth norms.

To construct an evaluative rating, CGI scores for all students linked to a particular teacher will be averaged, with this average CGI score converted to the four-category HEDI range. The objective is to facilitate valid and fair comparisons of productivity with respect to student outcomes, given that teachers often serve very different student populations. Major modeling and score translation decisions were decided by a Technical Advisory Panel made up of volunteer districts from across the state.

To assign teachers to HEDI categories, we will assume a normal distribution of teacher effects centered on 13. From this point, we will use the following cut points to assign teachers to categories:

Highly Effective: Greater than or equal to .9 standard deviations above average (13)

Effective: Less than .9 standard deviations above average and greater than or equal to -.9 standard deviations below average

Developing: Less than -.9 standard deviations below average and greater than or equal to -2.1 standard deviations below average

Ineffective: Less than -2.1 standard deviations below average

### ELA 3

For ELA 3 the Cooperstown Central School District will use the conditional growth index (CGI) based on Measures of Academic Progress (Primary Grades) assessment to calculate base level student proficiency levels.

Using NWEA Projected Proficiency Summary Reports, principals and teachers will set targets for all students.

HEDI categories by assigning a target HEDI score of 13 to that percentage of students projected to score at level 3 or higher on the New York State ELA assessment.

HEDI scores in the “Highly Effective” and “Effective” ranges are defined by the number of steps between the Anchor Point selected and 100%. For example, at Anchor Point 9, there are eleven equal steps to 100%. Thus, all

steps in the the “Highly Effective” and “Effective” ranges represent 1/11 of the difference between the Anchor Point and 100%.

HEDI scores in the “Developing” and “Ineffective” ranges are defined by the nine scores (0 to 8) in these ranges. Each step is diminished by 1/9th of the score cited for HEDI level 9.

Highly Effective (18 - 20 points) Results are well-above state average for similar students (or District goals if no state test).

Within the category of Highly Effective, those teachers who fall at greater than or equal to .9 standard deviations above average, we further divide the distribution to determine specific points. The specific point breakdown, with upper and lower bounds denoted in standard deviation units, is as follows:

APPR Point  $\geq$  <  
18 0.9 1.1  
19 1.1 1.3  
20 1.3

ELA 3  
See Attached SLO Conversion Chart

Effective (9 - 17 points) Results meet state average for similar students (or District goals if no state test).

Within the category of Effective, those teachers who fall at less than .9 standard deviations above average and greater than or equal to -.9 standard deviations below average, we further divide the distribution to determine specific points. The specific point breakdown, with upper and lower bounds denoted in standard deviation units, is as follows:

APPR Point  $\geq$  <  
9 -0.9 -0.7  
10 -0.7 -0.5  
11 -0.5 -0.3  
12 -0.3 -0.1  
13 -0.1 0.1  
14 0.1 0.3  
15 0.3 0.5  
16 0.5 0.7  
17 0.7 0.9

ELA 3  
See Attached SLO Conversion Chart

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

Within the category of Developing, those teachers who fall at less than -.9 standard deviations below average and greater than or equal to -2.1 standard deviations below average, we further divide the distribution to determine specific points. The specific point breakdown, with upper and lower bounds denoted in standard deviation units, is as follows:

APPR Point  $\geq$  <  
3 -2.1 -1.9  
4 -1.9 -1.7  
5 -1.7 -1.5  
6 -1.5 -1.3  
7 -1.3 -1.1  
8 -1.1 -0.9

ELA 3  
See Attached SLO Conversion Chart

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

Within the category of Ineffective, those teachers who fall at less than -2.1 standard deviations below average, we further divide the distribution to determine specific points. The specific point breakdown, with upper and lower bounds denoted in standard deviation units, is as follows:

APPR Point  $\geq <$   
0 -2.5  
1 -2.5 -2.3  
2 -2.3 -2.1

ELA 3  
See Attached SLO Conversion Chart

### 2.3) Grades K-3 Math

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

	Math	Assessment
K	State-approved 3rd party assessment	Measures of Academic Progress (Primary Grades)
1	State-approved 3rd party assessment	Measures of Academic Progress (Primary Grades)
2	State-approved 3rd party assessment	Measures of Academic Progress (Primary Grades)

	Math	Assessment
3	State assessment	3rd Grade State Assessment

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

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

For K-2 math the Cooperstown Central School District will be using conditional growth index (CGI) based on the Measures of Academic Progress (Primary Grades) assessment to calculate teacher-level effectiveness ratings for the comparable growth measures in math in grades K-2. The conditional growth index captures the contributions educators make to student learning on the NWEA MAP assessments, by comparing actual student growth to the student growth norms. These norms reflect the amount of growth that might be expected from these students based on their grade, subject, and starting RIT score.. CGI scores are expressed in standard deviation units, or z-scores, with scores above zero indicating students exceeded the growth norms, whereas scores below zero indicate growth less than the growth norm. CGI scores of zero are indicative of students meeting their growth norms.

To construct an evaluative rating, CGI scores for all

students linked to a particular teacher will be averaged, with this average CGI score converted to the four-category HEDI range. The objective is to facilitate valid and fair comparisons of productivity with respect to student outcomes, given that teachers often serve very different student populations. Major modeling and score translation decisions were decided by a Technical Advisory Panel made up of volunteer districts from across the state. To assign teachers to HEDI categories, we will assume a normal distribution of teacher effects centered on 13. From this point, we will use the following cut points to assign teachers to categories:

- Highly Effective: Greater than or equal to .9 standard deviations above average (13)
- Effective: Less than .9 standard deviations above average and greater than or equal to -.9 standard deviations below average
- Developing: Less than -.9 standard deviations below average and greater than or equal to -2.1 standard deviations below average
- Ineffective: Less than -2.1 standard deviations below average

### Math 3

For ELA 3 the Cooperstown Central School District will use the conditional growth index (CGI) based on Measures of Academic Progress (Primary Grades) assessment to calculate base level student proficiency levels.

Using NWEA Projected Proficiency Summary Reports, principals and teachers will set HEDI categories by assigning a target HEDI score of 13 to that percentage of students projected to score at level 3 or higher on the New York State ELA assessment.

HEDI scores in the “Highly Effective” and “Effective” ranges are defined by the number of steps between the Anchor Point selected and 100%. For example, at Anchor Point 9, there are eleven equal steps to 100%. Thus, all steps in the the “Highly Effective” and “Effective” ranges represent 1/11 of the difference between the Anchor Point and 100%.

HEDI scores in the “Developing” and “Ineffective” ranges are defined by the nine scores (0 to 8) in these ranges. Each step is diminished by 1/9th of the score cited for HEDI level 9.

---

Highly Effective (18 - 20 points) Results are well-above state average for similar students (or District goals if no state test).

Within the category of Highly Effective, those teachers who fall at greater than or equal to .9 standard deviations above average, we further divide the distribution to determine specific points. The specific point breakdown, with upper and lower bounds denoted in standard deviation units, is as follows:

APPR Point  $\geq$  <  
18 0.9 1.1  
19 1.1 1.3  
20 1.3

Math 3  
See Attached SLO Conversion Chart

Effective (9 - 17 points) Results meet state average for similar students (or District goals if no state test).

Within the category of Effective, those teachers who fall at less than .9 standard deviations above average and greater than or equal to -.9 standard deviations below average, we further divide the distribution to determine specific points. The specific point breakdown, with upper and lower bounds denoted in standard deviation units, is as follows:

APPR Point  $\geq$  <  
9 -0.9 -0.7  
10 -0.7 -0.5  
11 -0.5 -0.3  
12 -0.3 -0.1  
13 -0.1 0.1  
14 0.1 0.3  
15 0.3 0.5  
16 0.5 0.7  
17 0.7 0.9

Math 3  
See Attached SLO Conversion Chart

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

Within the category of Developing, those teachers who fall at less than -.9 standard deviations below average and greater than or equal to -2.1 standard deviations below average, we further divide the distribution to determine specific points. The specific point breakdown, with upper and lower bounds denoted in standard deviation units, is as follows:

APPR Point  $\geq$  <  
3 -2.1 -1.9  
4 -1.9 -1.7  
5 -1.7 -1.5  
6 -1.5 -1.3  
7 -1.3 -1.1  
8 -1.1 -0.9

Math 3  
See Attached SLO Conversion Chart

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

Within the category of Ineffective, those teachers who fall at less than -2.1 standard deviations below average, we further divide the distribution to determine specific points. The specific point breakdown, with upper and lower bounds denoted in standard deviation units, is as follows:

APPR Point  $\geq$  <  
0 -2.5  
1 -2.5 -2.3  
2 -2.3 -2.1

Math 3  
See Attached SLO Conversion Chart

## 2.4) Grades 6-8 Science

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

	Science	Assessment
6	State-approved 3rd party assessment	Measures of Academic Progress (Science)
7	State-approved 3rd party assessment	Measures of Academic Progress (Science)

  

	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.

**Science 6-7**

For science 6-7 the Cooperstown Central School District will be using conditional growth index (CGI) based on the Measures of Academic Progress (Science) assessment to calculate teacher-level effectiveness ratings for the comparable growth measures in science in grades 6-7. The conditional growth index captures the contributions educators make to student learning on the NWEA MAP assessments, by comparing actual student growth to the student growth norms. These norms reflect the amount of growth that might be expected from these students based on their grade, subject, and starting RIT score. CGI scores are expressed in standard deviation units, or z-scores, with scores above zero indicating students exceeded the growth norms, whereas scores below zero indicate growth less than the growth norm. CGI scores of zero are indicative of students meeting their growth norms.

To construct an evaluative rating, CGI scores for all students linked to a particular teacher will be averaged, with this average CGI score converted to the four-category HEDI range. The objective is to facilitate valid and fair comparisons of productivity with respect to student outcomes, given that teachers often serve very different student populations. Major modeling and score translation decisions were decided by a Technical Advisory Panel made up of volunteer districts from across the state. To assign teachers to HEDI categories, we will assume a normal distribution of teacher effects centered on 13. From this point, we will use the following cut points to assign teachers to categories:

- Highly Effective: Greater than or equal to .9 standard deviations above average (13)
- Effective: Less than .9 standard deviations above average and greater than or equal to -.9 standard deviations below average
- Developing: Less than -.9 standard deviations below average and greater than or equal to -2.1 standard deviations below average

Ineffective: Less than -2.1 standard deviations below average

Science 8

For grade 8 science, we will use a Cooperstown Central School District approved assessment to provide a base line of data for comparison with the final assessment. Principals and teachers will agree on growth targets for all students. If 80% of a teacher's students attain that growth target the resulting HEDI rating will be 13.

HEDI scores in the "Highly Effective" and "Effective" ranges are defined by the number of steps between the Anchor Point selected and 100%. For example, at Anchor Point 9, there are eleven equal steps to 100%. Thus, all steps in the the "Highly Effective" and "Effective" ranges represent 1/11 of the difference between the Anchor Point and 100%.

HEDI scores in the "Developing" and "Ineffective" ranges are defined by the nine scores (0 to 8) in these ranges. Each step is diminished by 1/9th of the score cited for HEDI level 9.

Highly Effective (18 - 20 points) Results are well-above state average for similar students (or District goals if no state test).

Within the category of Highly Effective, those science 6-7 teachers who fall at greater than or equal to .9 standard deviations above average, we further divide the distribution to determine specific points. The specific point breakdown, with upper and lower bounds denoted in standard deviation units, is as follows:

APPR Point  $\geq$  <  
18 0.9 1.1  
19 1.1 1.3  
20 1.3

Science 8

See Attached SLO Conversion Chart

Effective (9 - 17 points) Results meet state average for similar students (or District goals if no state test).

Within the category of Effective, those science 6-7 teachers who fall at less than .9 standard deviations above average and greater than or equal to -.9 standard deviations below average, we further divide the distribution to determine specific points. The specific point breakdown, with upper and lower bounds denoted in standard deviation units, is as follows:

APPR Point  $\geq$  <  
9 -0.9 -0.7  
10 -0.7 -0.5  
11 -0.5 -0.3  
12 -0.3 -0.1  
13 -0.1 0.1  
14 0.1 0.3  
15 0.3 0.5  
16 0.5 0.7  
17 0.7 0.9

Science 8

See Attached SLO Conversion Chart

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

Within the category of Developing, those science 6-7 teachers who fall at less than -.9 standard deviations below average and greater than or equal to -2.1 standard deviations below average, we further divide the distribution to determine specific points. The specific point breakdown, with upper and lower bounds denoted in standard deviation units, is as follows:

APPR Point  $\geq <$   
 3 -2.1 -1.9  
 4 -1.9 -1.7  
 5 -1.7 -1.5  
 6 -1.5 -1.3  
 7 -1.3 -1.1  
 8 -1.1 -0.9

Science 8  
 See Attached SLO Conversion Chart

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

Within the category of Ineffective, those science 6-7 teachers who fall at less than -2.1 standard deviations below average, we further divide the distribution to determine specific points. The specific point breakdown, with upper and lower bounds denoted in standard deviation units, is as follows:

APPR Point  $\geq <$   
 0 -2.5  
 1 -2.5 -2.3  
 2 -2.3 -2.1

Science 8  
 See Attached SLO Conversion Chart

## 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	Cooperstown CSD District Approved Social Studies Assessment
7	District, regional or BOCES-developed assessment	Cooperstown CSD District Approved Social Studies Assessment
8	District, regional or BOCES-developed assessment	Cooperstown CSD Approved Social Studies Assessment

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

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

For all teachers we will use a Cooperstown Central School District approved assessment to provide a base line of data for comparison with the final assessment. Principals and teachers will agree on growth targets for all students. If 80% of a teacher's students attain that growth target the

resulting HEDI rating will be 13.

HEDI scores in the “Highly Effective” and “Effective” ranges are defined by the number of steps between the Anchor Point selected and 100%. For example, at Anchor Point 9, there are seven equal steps to 100%. Thus, all steps in the the “Highly Effective” and “Effective” ranges represent 1/11 of the difference between the Anchor Point and 100%.

HEDI scores in the “Developing” and “Ineffective” ranges are defined by the nine scores (0 to 8) in these ranges. Each step is diminished by 1/9th of the score cited for HEDI level 9.

Highly Effective (18 - 20 points) Results are well-above District goals for similar students.	See Attached SLO Conversion Chart
Effective (9 - 17 points) Results meet District goals for similar students.	See Attached SLO Conversion Chart
Developing (3 - 8 points) Results are below District goals for similar students.	See Attached SLO Conversion Chart
Ineffective (0 - 2 points) Results are well-below District goals for similar students.	See Attached SLO Conversion Chart

## 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	Cooperstown CSD District Approved Global 1 Assessment

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

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

Use this box, if needed, to describe the general process for assigning HEDI categories for these grades/subjects in this subcomponent. If needed, you may upload a table or graphic at 2.11, below.	<p>Global II/US History</p> <p>For all teachers we will use a Cooperstown Central School District approved assessment to provide a base line of data for comparison with the final assessment. Principals and teachers will agree on growth targets for all students. If 80% of a teacher's students attain that growth target the resulting HEDI rating will be 10.</p>
---	--

HEDI scores in the “Highly Effective” and “Effective” ranges are defined by the number of steps between the Anchor Point selected and 100%. For example, at Anchor Point 9, there are eleven equal steps to 100%. Thus, all steps in the the “Highly Effective” and “Effective” ranges represent 1/11 of the difference between the Anchor Point and 100%.

HEDI scores in the “Developing” and “Ineffective” ranges are defined by the nine scores (0 to 8) in these ranges. Each step is diminished by 1/9th of the score cited for HEDI level 9.

#### Global 1

For all teachers we will use a Cooperstown Central School District approved assessment to provide a base line of data for comparison with the final assessment. Principals and teachers will agree on growth targets for all students. If 80% of a teacher's students attain that growth target the resulting HEDI rating will be 13.

HEDI scores in the “Highly Effective” and “Effective” ranges are defined by the number of steps between the Anchor Point selected and 100%. For example, at Anchor Point 9, there are eleven equal steps to 100%. Thus, all steps in the the “Highly Effective” and “Effective” ranges represent 1/11 of the difference between the Anchor Point and 100%.

HEDI scores in the “Developing” and “Ineffective” ranges are defined by the nine scores (0 to 8) in these ranges. Each step is diminished by 1/9th of the score cited for HEDI level 9.

Highly Effective (18 - 20 points) Results are well-above District goals for similar students.	See Attached SLO Conversion Chart
Effective (9 - 17 points) Results meet District goals for similar students.	See Attached SLO Conversion Chart
Developing (3 - 8 points) Results are below District goals for similar students.	See Attached SLO Conversion Chart
Ineffective (0 - 2 points) Results are well-below District goals for similar students.	See Attached SLO Conversion Chart

## 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

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.	<p>For all teachers we will use a Cooperstown Central School District approved assessment to provide a base line of data for comparison with the final assessment. Principals and teachers will agree on growth targets for all students. If 80% of a teacher's students attain that growth target the resulting HEDI rating will be 10.</p> <p>HEDI scores in the "Highly Effective" and "Effective" ranges are defined by the number of steps between the Anchor Point selected and 100%. For example, at Anchor Point 9, there are eleven equal steps to 100%. Thus, all steps in the the "Highly Effective" and "Effective" ranges represent 1/11 of the difference between the Anchor Point and 100%.</p> <p>HEDI scores in the "Developing" and "Ineffective" ranges are defined by the nine scores (0 to 8) in these ranges. Each step is diminished by 1/9th of the score cited for HEDI level 9.</p>
Highly Effective (18 - 20 points) Results are well-above District goals for similar students.	See Attached SLO Conversion Chart
Effective (9 - 17 points) Results meet District goals for similar students.	See Attached SLO Conversion Chart
Developing (3 - 8 points) Results are below District goals for similar students.	See Attached SLO Conversion Chart
Ineffective (0 - 2 points) Results are well-below District goals for similar students.	See Attached SLO Conversion Chart

## 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.

For all teachers we will use a Cooperstown Central School District approved assessment to provide a base line of data for comparison with the final assessment. Principals and teachers will agree on growth targets for all students. If 80% of a teacher's students attain that growth target the resulting HEDI rating will be 10.

HEDI scores in the "Highly Effective" and "Effective" ranges are defined by the number of steps between the Anchor Point selected and 100%. For example, at Anchor Point 9, there are eleven equal steps to 100%. Thus, all steps in the the "Highly Effective" and "Effective" ranges represent 1/11 of the difference between the Anchor Point and 100%.

HEDI scores in the "Developing" and "Ineffective" ranges are defined by the nine scores (0 to 8) in these ranges. Each step is diminished by 1/9th of the score cited for HEDI level 9.

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

See Attached SLO Conversion Chart

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

See Attached SLO Conversion Chart

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

See Attached SLO Conversion Chart

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

See Attached SLO Conversion Chart

## 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	State approved 3rd party assessment	Measures of Academic Progress (ELA)
Grade 10 ELA	State approved 3rd party assessment	Measures of Academic Progress (ELA)
Grade 11 ELA	Regents assessment	English Regents assessment

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

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

Grade 11 ELA  
For all teachers we will use a Cooperstown Central School District approved assessment to provide a base line of data for comparison with the final assessment. Principals and teachers will agree on growth targets for all students. If 80% of a teacher's students attain that growth target the

resulting HEDI rating will be 10.

HEDI scores in the “Highly Effective” and “Effective” ranges are defined by the number of steps between the Anchor Point selected and 100%. For example, at Anchor Point 9, there are eleven equal steps to 100%. Thus, all steps in the the “Highly Effective” and “Effective” ranges represent 1/11 of the difference between the Anchor Point and 100%.

HEDI scores in the “Developing” and “Ineffective” ranges are defined by the nine scores (0 to 8) in these ranges. Each step is diminished by 1/9th of the score cited for HEDI level 9.

#### Grade 9 and 10 ELA

For ELA grades 9 and 10, the Cooperstown Central School District will be using conditional growth index (CGI) based on Measures of Academic Progress (ELA) assessment to calculate teacher-level effectiveness ratings for the comparable growth measures in ELA. The conditional growth index captures the contributions educators make to student learning on the NWEA MAP assessments, by comparing actual student growth to the student growth norms. These norms reflect the amount of growth that might be expected from these students based on their grade, subject, and starting RIT score. CGI scores are expressed in standard deviation units, or z-scores, with scores above zero indicating students exceeded the growth norms, whereas scores below zero indicate growth less than the growth norm. CGI scores of zero are indicative of students meeting their growth norms.

To construct an evaluative rating, CGI scores for all students linked to a particular teacher will be averaged, with this average CGI score converted to the four-category HEDI range. The objective is to facilitate valid and fair comparisons of productivity with respect to student outcomes, given that teachers often serve very different student populations. Major modeling and score translation decisions were decided by a Technical Advisory Panel made up of volunteer districts from across the state.

To assign teachers to HEDI categories, we will assume a normal distribution of teacher effects centered on 13. From this point, we will use the following cut points to assign teachers to categories:

- Highly Effective: Greater than or equal to .9 standard deviations above average (13)
- Effective: Less than .9 standard deviations above average and greater than or equal to -.9 standard deviations below average
- Developing: Less than -.9 standard deviations below average and greater than or equal to -2.1 standard deviations below average
- Ineffective: Less than -2.1 standard deviations below average

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

ELA 11  
See Attached SLO Conversion Chart

ELA 9

Within the category of Highly Effective, those teachers who fall at greater than or equal to .9 standard deviations above average, we further divide the distribution to determine specific points. The specific point breakdown, with upper and lower bounds denoted in standard deviation units, is as follows:

APPR Point ≥ <  
18 0.9 1.1  
19 1.1 1.3  
20 1.3

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

See Attached SLO Conversion Chart

ELA 9

Within the category of Effective, those teachers who fall at less than .9 standard deviations above average and greater than or equal to -.9 standard deviations below average, we further divide the distribution to determine specific points. The specific point breakdown, with upper and lower bounds denoted in standard deviation units, is as follows:

APPR Point ≥ <  
9 -0.9 -0.7  
10 -0.7 -0.5  
11 -0.5 -0.3  
12 -0.3 -0.1  
13 -0.1 0.1  
14 0.1 0.3  
15 0.3 0.5  
16 0.5 0.7  
17 0.7 0.9

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

See Attached SLO Conversion Chart

ELA 9

Within the category of Developing, those teachers who fall at less than -.9 standard deviations below average and greater than or equal to -2.1 standard deviations below average, we further divide the distribution to determine specific points. The specific point breakdown, with upper and lower bounds denoted in standard deviation units, is as follows:

APPR Point ≥ <  
3 -2.1 -1.9  
4 -1.9 -1.7  
5 -1.7 -1.5  
6 -1.5 -1.3  
7 -1.3 -1.1  
8 -1.1 -0.9

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

See Attached SLO Conversion Chart

ELA 9

Within the category of Ineffective, those teachers who fall at less than -2.1 standard deviations below average, we further divide the distribution to determine specific points. The specific point breakdown, with upper and lower

bounds denoted in standard deviation units, is as follows:

APPR Point  $\geq <$   
 0 -2.5  
 1 -2.5 -2.3  
 2 -2.3 -2.1

## 2.10) All Other Courses

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

Course(s) or Subject(s)	Option	Assessment
Technology	District, Regional or BOCES-developed	Cooperstown CSD District Approved Technology Assessment
Art	District, Regional or BOCES-developed	Cooperstown CSD District Approved D Art Assessment
Music	District, Regional or BOCES-developed	Cooperstown CSD District Approved Music Assessment
Languages Other Than English	District, Regional or BOCES-developed	Cooperstown CSD District Approved LOTE Assessment
Physical Education	District, Regional or BOCES-developed	Cooperstown CSD District Approved PE Assessment
Driver Education	District, Regional or BOCES-developed	Cooperstown CSD District Approved Driver Education Assessment
AIS	State-approved 3rd party assessment	Measures of Academic Performance (ELA and/or Math)
Special Education	State-approved 3rd party assessment	Measures of Academic Performance (ELA and/or Math)

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

<p>Use this box, if needed, to describe the general process for assigning HEDI categories for these grades/subjects in this subcomponent. If needed, you may upload a table or graphic at 2.11, below.</p>	<p>For all teachers we will use a Cooperstown Central School District approved assessment to provide a base line of data for comparison with the final assessment. Principals and teachers will agree on growth targets for all students. If 80% of a teacher's students attain that growth target the resulting HEDI rating will be 13.</p> <p>HEDI scores in the "Highly Effective" and "Effective" ranges are defined by the number of steps between the Anchor Point selected and 100%. For example, at Anchor Point 9, there are eleven equal steps to 100%. Thus, all steps in the the "Highly Effective" and "Effective" ranges</p>
--	--

represent 1/11 of the difference between the Anchor Point and 100%.

HEDI scores in the "Developing" and "Ineffective" ranges are defined by the nine scores (0 to 8) in these ranges. Each step is diminished by 1/9th of the score cited for HEDI level 9.

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

See Attached SLO Conversion Chart

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

See Attached SLO Conversion Chart

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

See Attached SLO Conversion Chart

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

See Attached SLO Conversion Chart

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/5364/127487-TXEttx9bQW/Variable SLO calculator.xlsx>

## 2.12) Locally Developed Controls

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

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

*(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: <a href="http://usny.nysed.gov/rttt/teachers-leaders/slo/home.html">http://usny.nysed.gov/rttt/teachers-leaders/slo/home.html</a> ).	Checked
2.14) Assurances   Assure that past academic performance and/or baseline academic data of students will be taken into account when developing an SLO.	Checked
2.14) Assurances   Assure that the process for assigning points for SLOs for the Growth Subcomponent will use the narrative HEDI descriptions described in the regulations to effectively differentiate educators in ways that improve student learning and instruction.	Checked
2.14) Assurances   Assure that it is possible for an educator to earn each point, including 0, for SLOs in the Growth subcomponent scoring range.	Checked
2.14) Assurances   Assure that processes are in place to monitor SLOs to ensure rigor and comparability across classrooms.	Checked

### 3. Local Measures (Teachers)

Created Thursday, September 06, 2012  
Updated Wednesday, December 05, 2012

---

#### Page 1

#### Locally Selected Measures of Student Achievement or Growth

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

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

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

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

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

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

**Growth or achievement measure(s) from these options.**

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

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

Measures based on:

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

### 3.1) Grades 4-8 ELA

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

	Locally-Selected Measure from List of Approved Measures	Assessment
4	4) State-approved 3rd party assessments	Measures of Academic Progress (ELA)
5	4) State-approved 3rd party assessments	Measures of Academic Progress (ELA)
6	4) State-approved 3rd party assessments	Measures of Academic Progress (ELA)
7	4) State-approved 3rd party assessments	Measures of Academic Progress (ELA)

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

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

Use this box, if needed, to describe the general process for assigning HEDI categories for these grades/subjects in this subcomponent. If needed, you may upload a table or graphic at 3.3, below.

The Cooperstown Central School District will be using value-added measures based on the NWEA Measures of Academic Progress (ELA) assessment to calculate teacher-level effectiveness ratings for the locally selected measures of student growth in ELA in grades 4-8. The term "value-added" refers to the contributions educators and schools make to student outcomes, such as performance on standardized assessments. Value-added models provide a way to measure this contribution separately from factors that influence student outcomes, but over which a teacher or school has no control. They do this by statistically controlling for factors such as students' socio-economic status and projecting how students will perform on assessments based on actual outcomes from similar students in the state. This allows the model to produce estimates of productivity – value-added indicators – under the counterfactual assumption that all schools serve the same group of students. This facilitates apples-to-apples teacher comparisons, rather than apples-to-oranges comparisons. The objective is to facilitate valid and fair comparisons of productivity with respect to student outcomes, given that teachers often serve very different student populations. Cooperstown CSD's analyses will be conducted by the Value-Added Research Center on NWEA's MAP assessment. Major modeling decisions were decided by a Technical Advisory Panel made up of volunteer districts from across the state. To assign teachers to HEDI categories, we will assume a normal distribution of teacher effects centered on 13. From this point, we will use the following cut points to assign teachers to categories:

Highly Effective: Greater than or equal to .9 standard deviations above average (13)

Effective: Less than .9 standard deviations above average and greater than or equal to -.9 standard deviations below average

Developing: Less than -.9 standard deviations below average and greater than or equal to -2.1 standard deviations below average

Ineffective: Less than -2.1 standard deviations below average

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

Within the category of Highly Effective, those teachers who fall at greater than or equal to .9 standard deviations above average, we further divide the distribution to determine specific points. The specific point breakdown, with upper and lower bounds denoted in standard

deviation units, is as follows:

Growth Model

APPR Point  $\geq$  <

18 0.9 1.1

19 1.1 1.3

20 1.3

Value-Added Model

APPR Point  $\geq$  <

14 0.9 1.2

15 1.2

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

Within the category of Effective, those teachers who fall at less than .9 standard deviations above average and greater than or equal to -.9 standard deviations below average, we further divide the distribution to determine specific points. The specific point breakdown, with upper and lower bounds denoted in standard deviation units, is as follows:

Growth Model

APPR Point  $\geq$  <

9 -0.9 -0.7

10 -0.7 -0.5

11 -0.5 -0.3

12 -0.3 -0.1

13 -0.1 0.1

14 0.1 0.3

15 0.3 0.5

16 0.5 0.7

17 0.7 0.9

Value-Added Model

APPR Point  $\geq$  <

8 -0.9 -0.6

9 -0.6 -0.3

10 -0.3 0.0

11 0.0 0.3

12 0.3 0.6

13 0.6 0.9

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

Within the category of Developing, those teachers who fall at less than -.9 standard deviations below average and greater than or equal to -2.1 standard deviations below average, we further divide the distribution to determine specific points. The specific point breakdown, with upper and lower bounds denoted in standard deviation units, is as follows:

Growth Model

APPR Point  $\geq$  <

3 -2.1 -1.9

4 -1.9 -1.7  
 5 -1.7 -1.5  
 6 -1.5 -1.3  
 7 -1.3 -1.1  
 8 -1.1 -0.9

Value-Added Model

APPR Point  $\geq$  <  
 3 -2.4 -2.1  
 4 -2.1 -1.8  
 5 -1.8 -1.5  
 6 -1.5 -1.2  
 7 -1.2 -0.9

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

Within the category of Ineffective, those teachers who fall at less than -2.1 standard deviations below average, we further divide the distribution to determine specific points. The specific point breakdown, with upper and lower bounds denoted in standard deviation units, is as follows:

Growth Model

APPR Point  $\geq$  <  
 0 -2.5  
 1 -2.5 -2.3  
 2 -2.3 -2.1

Value-Added Model

APPR Point  $\geq$  <  
 0 -3.0  
 1 -3.0 -2.7  
 2 -2.7 -2.4

### 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	4) State-approved 3rd party assessments	Measures of Academic Progress (math)
5	4) State-approved 3rd party assessments	Measures of Academic Progress (math)
6	4) State-approved 3rd party assessments	Measures of Academic Progress (math)
7	4) State-approved 3rd party assessments	Measures of Academic Progress (math)
8	4) State-approved 3rd party assessments	Measures of Academic Progress (math)

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*

Use this box, if needed, to describe the general process for assigning HEDI categories for these grades/subjects in this subcomponent. If needed, you may upload a table or graphic at 3.3, below.

The Cooperstown Central School District will be using value-added measures based on the NWEA Measures of Academic Progress (Math) assessment to calculate teacher-level effectiveness ratings for the locally selected measures of student growth in math in grades 4-8. The term “value-added” refers to the contributions educators and schools make to student outcomes, such as performance on standardized assessments. Value-added models provide a way to measure this contribution separately from factors that influence student outcomes, but over which a teacher or school has no control. They do this by statistically controlling for factors such as students’ socio-economic status and projecting how students will perform on assessments based on actual outcomes from similar students in the state. This allows the model to produce estimates of productivity – value-added indicators – under the counterfactual assumption that all schools serve the same group of students. This facilitates apples-to-apples teacher comparisons, rather than apples-to-oranges comparisons. The objective is to facilitate valid and fair comparisons of productivity with respect to student outcomes, given that teachers often serve very different student populations. Cooperstown CSD’s analyses will be conducted by the Value-Added Research Center on NWEA’s MAP assessment. Major modeling decisions were decided by a Technical Advisory Panel made up of volunteer districts from across the state. To assign teachers to HEDI categories, we will assume a normal distribution of teacher effects centered on 13. From this point, we will use the following cut points to assign teachers to categories:

- Highly Effective: Greater than or equal to .9 standard deviations above average (13)
- Effective: Less than .9 standard deviations above average and greater than or equal to -.9 standard deviations below average
- Developing: Less than -.9 standard deviations below average and greater than or equal to -2.1 standard deviations below average
- Ineffective: Less than -2.1 standard deviations below average

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

Within the category of Highly Effective, those teachers who fall at greater than or equal to .9 standard deviations above average, we further divide the distribution to determine specific points. The specific point breakdown, with upper and lower bounds denoted in standard deviation units, is as follows:

Growth Model

APPR Point	≥	<
18	0.9	1.1
19	1.1	1.3
20	1.3	

Value-Added Model

APPR Point  $\geq$  <  
14 0.9 1.2  
15 1.2

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

Within the category of Effective, those teachers who fall at less than .9 standard deviations above average and greater than or equal to -.9 standard deviations below average, we further divide the distribution to determine specific points. The specific point breakdown, with upper and lower bounds denoted in standard deviation units, is as follows:

Growth Model

APPR Point  $\geq$  <  
9 -0.9 -0.7  
10 -0.7 -0.5  
11 -0.5 -0.3  
12 -0.3 -0.1  
13 -0.1 0.1  
14 0.1 0.3  
15 0.3 0.5  
16 0.5 0.7  
17 0.7 0.9

Value-Added Model

APPR Point  $\geq$  <  
8 -0.9 -0.6  
9 -0.6 -0.3  
10 -0.3 0.0  
11 0.0 0.3  
12 0.3 0.6  
13 0.6 0.9

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

Within the category of Developing, those teachers who fall at less than -.9 standard deviations below average and greater than or equal to -2.1 standard deviations below average, we further divide the distribution to determine specific points. The specific point breakdown, with upper and lower bounds denoted in standard deviation units, is as follows:

Growth Model

APPR Point  $\geq$  <  
3 -2.1 -1.9  
4 -1.9 -1.7  
5 -1.7 -1.5  
6 -1.5 -1.3  
7 -1.3 -1.1  
8 -1.1 -0.9

Value-Added Model

APPR Point  $\geq$  <  
3 -2.4 -2.1  
4 -2.1 -1.8  
5 -1.8 -1.5

6 -1.5 -1.2  
7 -1.2 -0.9

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

Within the category of Ineffective, those teachers who fall at less than -2.1 standard deviations below average, we further divide the distribution to determine specific points. The specific point breakdown, with upper and lower bounds denoted in standard deviation units, is as follows:

Growth Model

APPR Point  $\geq$  <  
0 -2.5  
1 -2.5 -2.3  
2 -2.3 -2.1

Value-Added Model

APPR Point  $\geq$  <  
0 -3.0  
1 -3.0 -2.7  
2 -2.7 -2.4

### 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.

*(No response)*

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

**Growth or achievement measure(s) from these options.**

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

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

Measures based on:

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

### 3.4) Grades K-3 ELA

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

	Locally-Selected Measure from List of Approved Measures	Assessment
K	4) State-approved 3rd party assessments	Measures of Academic Progress (Primary Grades ELA)
1	4) State-approved 3rd party assessments	Measures of Academic Progress (Primary Grades ELA)
2	4) State-approved 3rd party assessments	Measures of Academic Progress (Primary Grades ELA)
3	4) State-approved 3rd party assessments	Measures of Academic Progress (ELA)

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

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

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

The Cooperstown Central School District will be using value-added measures based on the NWEA Measures of Academic Progress (ELA Primary Grades ) assessment to calculate teacher-level effectiveness ratings for the locally selected measures of student growth in ELA in grades K-2 (MAP/ELA for 3). The term “value-added” refers to the contributions educators and schools make to student outcomes, such as performance on standardized assessments. Value-added models provide a way to measure this contribution separately from factors that influence student outcomes, but over which a teacher or school has no control. They do this by statistically controlling for factors such as students’ socio-economic status and projecting how students will perform on assessments based on actual outcomes from similar students in the state. This allows the model to produce estimates of productivity – value-added indicators – under the counterfactual assumption that all schools serve the same group of students. This facilitates apples-to-apples teacher comparisons, rather than apples-to-oranges comparisons. The objective is to facilitate valid and fair comparisons of productivity with respect to student outcomes, given that teachers often serve very different student populations. Cooperstown CSD’s analyses will be conducted by the Value-Added Research Center on NWEA’s MAP assessment. Major modeling decisions were decided by a Technical Advisory Panel made up of volunteer districts from across the state. To assign teachers to HEDI categories, we will assume a normal distribution of teacher effects centered on 13. From this point, we will use the following cut points to assign teachers to categories:

Highly Effective: Greater than or equal to .9 standard deviations above average (13)  
Effective: Less than .9 standard deviations above average and greater than or equal to -.9 standard deviations below average  
Developing: Less than -.9 standard deviations below average and greater than or equal to -2.1 standard deviations below average  
Ineffective: Less than -2.1 standard deviations below average

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

Within the category of Highly Effective, those teachers who fall at greater than or equal to .9 standard deviations above average, we further divide the distribution to determine specific points. The specific point breakdown, with upper and lower bounds denoted in standard deviation units, is as follows:

APPR Point  $\geq$  <  
18 0.9 1.1  
19 1.1 1.3  
20 1.3

Effective (9-17 points) Results meet District- or BOCES-adopted expectations for growth or achievement for grade/subject.	Within the category of Effective, those teachers who fall at less than .9 standard deviations above average and greater than or equal to -.9 standard deviations below average, we further divide the distribution to determine specific points. The specific point breakdown, with upper and lower bounds denoted in standard deviation units, is as follows:
	APPR Point $\geq <$ 9 -0.9 -0.7 10 -0.7 -0.5 11 -0.5 -0.3 12 -0.3 -0.1 13 -0.1 0.1 14 0.1 0.3 15 0.3 0.5 16 0.5 0.7 17 0.7 0.9
Developing (3 - 8 points) Results are below District- or BOCES-adopted expectations for growth or achievement for grade/subject.	Within the category of Developing, those teachers who fall at less than -.9 standard deviations below average and greater than or equal to -2.1 standard deviations below average, we further divide the distribution to determine specific points. The specific point breakdown, with upper and lower bounds denoted in standard deviation units, is as follows:
	APPR Point $\geq <$ 3 -2.1 -1.9 4 -1.9 -1.7 5 -1.7 -1.5 6 -1.5 -1.3 7 -1.3 -1.1 8 -1.1 -0.9
Ineffective (0 - 2 points) Results are well below District- or BOCES-adopted expectations for growth or achievement for grade/subject.	Within the category of Ineffective, those teachers who fall at less than -2.1 standard deviations below average, we further divide the distribution to determine specific points. The specific point breakdown, with upper and lower bounds denoted in standard deviation units, is as follows:
	APPR Point $\geq <$ 0 -2.5 1 -2.5 -2.3 2 -2.3 -2.1

### 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	4) State-approved 3rd party assessments	Measures of Academic Progress (Primary Grades Math)
1	4) State-approved 3rd party assessments	Measures of Academic Progress (Primary Grades Math)

2	4) State-approved 3rd party assessments	Measures of Academic Progress (Primary Grades Math)
3	4) State-approved 3rd party assessments	Measures of Academic Progress (Math)

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

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

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

The Cooperstown Central School District will be using value-added measures based on the NWEA Measures of Academic Progress (Math Primary Grades ) assessment to calculate teacher-level effectiveness ratings for the locally selected measures of student growth in ELA in grades K-2 (MAP/Math for 3). The term “value-added” refers to the contributions educators and schools make to student outcomes, such as performance on standardized assessments. Value-added models provide a way to measure this contribution separately from factors that influence student outcomes, but over which a teacher or school has no control. They do this by statistically controlling for factors such as students’ socio-economic status and projecting how students will perform on assessments based on actual outcomes from similar students in the state. This allows the model to produce estimates of productivity – value-added indicators – under the counterfactual assumption that all schools serve the same group of students. This facilitates apples-to-apples teacher comparisons, rather than apples-to-oranges comparisons. The objective is to facilitate valid and fair comparisons of productivity with respect to student outcomes, given that teachers often serve very different student populations. Cooperstown CSD’s analyses will be conducted by the Value-Added Research Center on NWEA’s MAP assessment. Major modeling decisions were decided by a Technical Advisory Panel made up of volunteer districts from across the state. To assign teachers to HEDI categories, we will assume a normal distribution of teacher effects centered on 13. From this point, we will use the following cut points to assign teachers to categories:

- Highly Effective: Greater than or equal to .9 standard deviations above average (13)
- Effective: Less than .9 standard deviations above average and greater than or equal to -.9 standard deviations below average
- Developing: Less than -.9 standard deviations below average and greater than or equal to -2.1 standard deviations below average
- Ineffective: Less than -2.1 standard deviations below average

<p>Highly Effective (18-20 points) Results are well above District- or BOCES-adopted expectations for growth or achievement for grade/subject.</p>	<p>Within the category of Highly Effective, those teachers who fall at greater than or equal to .9 standard deviations above average, we further divide the distribution to determine specific points. The specific point breakdown, with upper and lower bounds denoted in standard deviation units, is as follows:</p>
	<p>APPR Point <math>\geq</math> &lt;  18 0.9 1.1  19 1.1 1.3  20 1.3</p>
<p>Effective (9-17 points) Results meet District- or BOCES-adopted expectations for growth or achievement for grade/subject.</p>	<p>Within the category of Effective, those teachers who fall at less than .9 standard deviations above average and greater than or equal to -.9 standard deviations below average, we further divide the distribution to determine specific points. The specific point breakdown, with upper and lower bounds denoted in standard deviation units, is as follows:</p>
	<p>APPR Point <math>\geq</math> &lt;  9 -0.9 -0.7  10 -0.7 -0.5  11 -0.5 -0.3  12 -0.3 -0.1  13 -0.1 0.1  14 0.1 0.3  15 0.3 0.5  16 0.5 0.7  17 0.7 0.9</p>
<p>Developing (3 - 8 points) Results are below District -or BOCES-adopted expectations for growth or achievement for grade/subject.</p>	<p>Within the category of Developing, those teachers who fall at less than -.9 standard deviations below average and greater than or equal to -2.1 standard deviations below average, we further divide the distribution to determine specific points. The specific point breakdown, with upper and lower bounds denoted in standard deviation units, is as follows:</p>
	<p>APPR Point <math>\geq</math> &lt;  3 -2.1 -1.9  4 -1.9 -1.7  5 -1.7 -1.5  6 -1.5 -1.3  7 -1.3 -1.1  8 -1.1 -0.9</p>
<p>Ineffective (0 - 2 points) Results are well below District- or BOCES-adopted expectations for growth or achievement for grade/subject.</p>	<p>Within the category of Ineffective, those teachers who fall at less than -2.1 standard deviations below average, we further divide the distribution to determine specific points. The specific point breakdown, with upper and lower bounds denoted in standard deviation units, is as follows:</p>
	<p>APPR Point <math>\geq</math> &lt;  0 -2.5  1 -2.5 -2.3  2 -2.3 -2.1</p>

### 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	4) State-approved 3rd party assessments	Measures of Academic Progress (Science)
7	4) State-approved 3rd party assessments	Measures of Academic Progress (Science)
8	3) Teacher specific achievement or growth score computed locally	NYS Science 8 Exam

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.

Science 6 and 7:

The Cooperstown Central School District will be using value-added measures based on the NWEA Measures of Academic Progress (Science) assessment to calculate teacher-level effectiveness ratings for the locally selected measures of student growth in science 6-7. The term “value-added” refers to the contributions educators and schools make to student outcomes, such as performance on standardized assessments. Value-added models provide a way to measure this contribution separately from factors that influence student outcomes, but over which a teacher or school has no control. They do this by statistically controlling for factors such as students’ socio-economic status and projecting how students will perform on assessments based on actual outcomes from similar students in the state. This allows the model to produce estimates of productivity – value-added indicators – under the counterfactual assumption that all schools serve the same group of students. This facilitates apples-to-apples teacher comparisons, rather than apples-to-oranges comparisons. The objective is to facilitate valid and fair comparisons of productivity with respect to student outcomes, given that teachers often serve very different student populations. Cooperstown CSD’s analyses will be conducted by the Value-Added Research Center on NWEA’s MAP assessment. Major modeling decisions were decided by a Technical Advisory Panel made up of volunteer districts from across the state. To assign teachers to HEDI categories, we will assume a normal distribution of teacher effects centered on 13. From this point, we will use the following cut points to assign teachers to categories:

- Highly Effective: Greater than or equal to .9 standard deviations above average (13)
- Effective: Less than .9 standard deviations above average and greater than or equal to -.9 standard deviations below average
- Developing: Less than -.9 standard deviations below average and greater than or equal to -2.1 standard

deviations below average  
Ineffective: Less than -2.1 standard deviations below average

Science 8:

To assign teachers to HEDI categories we will assume a normal distribution centered on 10. If a teacher's state assessment pass rate equals the 3-year state average Regents pass rate, a HEDI score of 10 will be assigned.

See attached HEDI Chart A.

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

Science 6 and 7:

Within the category of Highly Effective, those teachers who fall at greater than or equal to .9 standard deviations above average, we further divide the distribution to determine specific points. The specific point breakdown, with upper and lower bounds denoted in standard deviation units, is as follows:

APPR Point  $\geq <$   
18 0.9 1.1  
19 1.1 1.3  
20 1.3

Science 8:

See attached conversion Chart A

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

Science 6 and 7:

Within the category of Effective, those teachers who fall at less than .9 standard deviations above average and greater than or equal to -.9 standard deviations below average, we further divide the distribution to determine specific points. The specific point breakdown, with upper and lower bounds denoted in standard deviation units, is as follows:

APPR Point  $\geq <$   
9 -0.9 -0.7  
10 -0.7 -0.5  
11 -0.5 -0.3  
12 -0.3 -0.1  
13 -0.1 0.1  
14 0.1 0.3  
15 0.3 0.5  
16 0.5 0.7  
17 0.7 0.9

Science 8:

See attached conversion Chart A

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

Science 6 and 7:

Within the category of Developing, those teachers who fall at less than -.9 standard deviations below average and greater than or equal to -2.1 standard deviations below average, we further divide the distribution to determine

specific points. The specific point breakdown, with upper and lower bounds denoted in standard deviation units, is as follows:

APPR Point  $\geq <$   
 3 -2.1 -1.9  
 4 -1.9 -1.7  
 5 -1.7 -1.5  
 6 -1.5 -1.3  
 7 -1.3 -1.1  
 8 -1.1 -0.9

Science 8:

See attached conversion Chart A

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

Science 6 and 7:

Within the category of Ineffective, those teachers who fall at less than -2.1 standard deviations below average, we further divide the distribution to determine specific points. The specific point breakdown, with upper and lower bounds denoted in standard deviation units, is as follows:

APPR Point  $\geq <$   
 0 -2.5  
 1 -2.5 -2.3  
 2 -2.3 -2.1

Science 8:

See attached conversion Chart A

### 3.7) Grades 6-8 Social Studies

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

	Locally-Selected Measure from List of Approved Measures	Assessment
6	5) District, regional, or BOCES—developed assessments	Cooperstown CSD District Approved Social Studies 6 Assessment
7	5) District, regional, or BOCES—developed assessments	Cooperstown CSD District Approved Social Studies 7 Assessment
8	5) District, regional, or BOCES—developed assessments	Cooperstown CSD District Approved Social Studies 8 Assessment

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

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

Use this box, if needed, to describe the general process for assigning HEDI categories for these grades/subjects in this subcomponent. If needed, you may upload a table or graphic at 3.13, below.	To assign teachers with district approved assessments to HEDI categories we will assume a normal distribution centered on 13. The teacher and principal will agree upon a passing rate for students that is representative of effective range performance based on past student competence and the teacher's experience with the section taught. Subsequently, that agreed-upon pass rate shall be given a HEDI score of 13.  See attached HEDI Chart B.
Highly Effective (18 - 20 points) Results are well above District- or BOCES-adopted expectations for growth or achievement for grade/subject.	See attached HEDI Chart B.
Effective (9 - 17 points) Results meet District- or BOCES-adopted expectations for growth or achievement for grade/subject.	See attached HEDI Chart B.
Developing (3 - 8 points) Results are below District- or BOCES-adopted expectations for growth or achievement for grade/subject.	See attached HEDI Chart B.
Ineffective (0 - 2 points) Results are well below District- or BOCES-adopted expectations for growth or achievement for grade/subject.	See attached HEDI Chart B.

### 3.8) High School Social Studies

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

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

	Locally-Selected Measure from List of Approved Measures	Assessment
Global 1	5) District, regional, or BOCES–developed assessments	Cooperstown CSD District Approved Global 1 Assessment
Global 2	3) Teacher specific achievement or growth score computed locally	Global Regents
American History	3) Teacher specific achievement or growth score computed locally	US History Regents

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.	Global 1: To assign teachers with district approved assessments to HEDI categories we will assume a normal distribution
---	--

<p>graphic at 3.13, below.</p>	<p>centered on 13. The teacher and principal will agree upon a passing rate for students that is representative of effective range performance based on past student competence and the teacher's experience with the section taught. Subsequently, that agreed-upon pass rate shall be given a HEDI score of 13.</p> <p>See attached HEDI Chart B.</p> <p>Global 2 and American History: To assign teachers to HEDI categories we will assume a normal distribution centered on 10. If a teacher's Regents pass rate equals the 3-year state average Regents pass rate, a HEDI score of 10 will be assigned.</p> <p>See attached HEDI Chart A.</p>
<p>Highly Effective (18 - 20 points) Results are well above District- or BOCES-adopted expectations for growth or achievement for grade/subject.</p>	<p>Global I See attached HEDI Chart B.</p> <p>Global II and US History: See attached HEDI Chart A.</p>
<p>Effective (9 - 17 points) Results meet District- or BOCES-adopted expectations for growth or achievement for grade/subject.</p>	<p>Global I See attached HEDI Chart B.</p> <p>Global II and US History: See attached HEDI Chart A.</p>
<p>Developing (3 - 8 points) Results are below District- or BOCES-adopted expectations for growth or achievement for grade/subject.</p>	<p>Global I See attached HEDI Chart B.</p> <p>Global II and US History: See attached HEDI Chart A.</p>
<p>Ineffective (0 - 2 points) Results are well below District- or BOCES-adopted expectations for growth or achievement for grade/subject.</p>	<p>Global I See attached HEDI Chart B.</p> <p>Global II and US History: See attached HEDI Chart A.</p>

### 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	3) Teacher specific achievement or growth score computed locally	Living Environment Regents Examination
Earth Science	3) Teacher specific achievement or growth score computed locally	Earth Science Regents Examination
Chemistry	3) Teacher specific achievement or growth score computed locally	Chemistry Regents Examination

Physics	3) Teacher specific achievement or growth score computed locally	Physics Regents Examination
---------	--	-----------------------------

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.	High School Science: To assign teachers to HEDI categories we will assume a normal distribution centered on 10. If a teacher's Regents pass rate equals the 3-year state average Regents pass rate, a HEDI score of 10 will be assigned.  See attached HEDI Chart A.
Highly Effective (18-20 points) Results are well above District- or BOCES-adopted expectations for growth or achievement for grade/subject.	See attached HEDI Chart A.
Developing (3 - 8 points) Results are below District- or BOCES-adopted expectations for growth or achievement for grade/subject.	See attached HEDI Chart A.
Effective (9 - 17points) Results meet District- or BOCES-adopted expectations for growth or achievement for grade/subject.	See attached HEDI Chart A.
Ineffective (0 - 2 points) Results are well below District- or BOCES-adopted expectations for growth or achievement for grade/subject.	See attached HEDI Chart A.

### 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	3) Teacher specific achievement or growth score computed locally	Algebra I Regents Exam
Geometry	3) Teacher specific achievement or growth score computed locally	Geometry Regents Exam
Algebra 2	3) Teacher specific achievement or growth score computed locally	Algebra II Regents Exam

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.	High School Math: To assign teachers to HEDI categories we will assume a normal distribution centered on 10. If a teacher's Regents pass rate equals the 3-year state average Regents pass rate, a HEDI score of 10 will be assigned.  See attached HEDI Chart A.
Highly Effective (18 - 20 points) Results are well above District- or BOCES-adopted expectations for growth or achievement for grade/subject.	See attached HEDI Chart A.
Effective (9 - 17 points) Results meet District- or BOCES-adopted expectations for growth or achievement for grade/subject.	See attached HEDI Chart A.
Developing (3 - 8 points) Results are below District- or BOCES-adopted expectations for growth or achievement for grade/subject.	See attached HEDI Chart A.
Ineffective (0 - 2 points) Results are well below District- or BOCES-adopted expectations for growth or achievement for grade/subject.	See attached HEDI Chart A.

### 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	4) State-approved 3rd party assessments	Measures of Academic Progress (ELA)
Grade 10 ELA	4) State-approved 3rd party assessments	Measures of Academic Progress (ELA)
Grade 11 ELA	3) Teacher specific achievement or growth score computed locally	ELA Regents Exam

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.

ELA 9 and 10:

To assign teachers with district approved assessments to HEDI categories we will assume a normal distribution centered on 13. The teacher and principal will agree upon a passing rate for students that is representative of effective range performance based on past student competence and the teacher's experience with the section taught. Subsequently, that agreed-upon pass rate shall be given a HEDI score of 13.

Highly Effective: Greater than or equal to .9 standard deviations above average (13)

Effective: Less than .9 standard deviations above average and greater than or equal to -.9 standard deviations below average

Developing: Less than -.9 standard deviations below average and greater than or equal to -2.1 standard deviations below average

Ineffective: Less than -2.1 standard deviations below average

ELA 11:

To assign teachers to HEDI categories we will assume a normal distribution centered on 10. If a teacher's Regents pass rate equals the 3-year state average Regents pass rate, a HEDI score of 10 will be assigned.

See attached HEDI Chart A.

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

ELA 9 and 10:

Within the category of Highly Effective, those teachers who fall at greater than or equal to .9 standard deviations above average, we further divide the distribution to determine specific points. The specific point breakdown, with upper and lower bounds denoted in standard deviation units, is as follows:

APPR Point  $\geq$  <

18 0.9 1.1

19 1.1 1.3

20 1.3

ELA 11

See attached HEDI Chart A.

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

ELA 9 and 10:

Within the category of Effective, those teachers who fall at less than .9 standard deviations above average and greater than or equal to -.9 standard deviations below average, we further divide the distribution to determine specific points. The specific point breakdown, with upper and lower bounds denoted in standard deviation units, is as follows:

APPR Point  $\geq$  <

9 -0.9 -0.7

10 -0.7 -0.5

11 -0.5 -0.3

12 -0.3 -0.1

13 -0.1 0.1

14 0.1 0.3

15 0.3 0.5  
 16 0.5 0.7  
 17 0.7 0.9

ELA 11:  
 See attached HEDI Chart A.

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

ELA 9 and 10:  
 Within the category of Developing, those teachers who fall at less than -.9 standard deviations below average and greater than or equal to -2.1 standard deviations below average, we further divide the distribution to determine specific points. The specific point breakdown, with upper and lower bounds denoted in standard deviation units, is as follows:

APPR Point  $\geq$  <  
 3 -2.1 -1.9  
 4 -1.9 -1.7  
 5 -1.7 -1.5  
 6 -1.5 -1.3  
 7 -1.3 -1.1  
 8 -1.1 -0.9

ELA 11:  
 See attached HEDI Chart A.

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

Within the category of Ineffective, those teachers who fall at less than -2.1 standard deviations below average, we further divide the distribution to determine specific points. The specific point breakdown, with upper and lower bounds denoted in standard deviation units, is as follows:

APPR Point  $\geq$  <  
 0 -2.5  
 1 -2.5 -2.3  
 2 -2.3 -2.1

ELA 11:  
 See attached HEDI Chart A.

### 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
Technology	5) District/regional/BOCES–developed	Cooperstown CSD District Approved Technology Assessment
Art	5) District/regional/BOCES–developed	Cooperstown CSD District Approved Art Assessment
Music	5) District/regional/BOCES–developed	Cooperstown CSD District Approved Music Assessment
Languages Other Than English	5) District/regional/BOCES–developed	Cooperstown CSD District Approved LOTE Assessment
Physical Education	5) District/regional/BOCES–developed	Cooperstown CSD District Approved PE Assessment

Driver Education	5) District/regional/BOCES–developed	Cooperstown CSD District Approved Driver Education Assessment
AIS	4) State-approved 3rd party	Measures of Academic Progress (ELA/Math)
Special Education	4) State-approved 3rd party	Measures of Academic Progress (ELA/Math)

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

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

<p>Use this box, if needed, to describe the general process for assigning HEDI categories for these grades/subjects in this subcomponent. If needed, you may upload a table or graphic at 3.13, below.</p>	<p>To assign teachers with district approved assessments in technology, art, music, LOTE, PE and Driver Education to HEDI categories we will assume a normal distribution centered on 13. The teacher and principal will agree upon a passing rate for students that is representative of effective range performance based on past student competence and the teacher's experience with the section taught. Subsequently, that agreed-upon pass rate shall be given a HEDI score of 13.</p> <p>See attached HEDI Chart B.</p> <p>AIS and Special Education: The Cooperstown Central School District will be using value-added measures based on the NWEA Measures of Academic Progress (ELA and/or math as appropriate ) assessment to calculate teacher-level effectiveness ratings for the locally selected measures of student growth in ELA in grades K-2 (MAP/ELA for 3). The term “value-added” refers to the contributions educators and schools make to student outcomes, such as performance on standardized assessments. Value-added models provide a way to measure this contribution separately from factors that influence student outcomes, but over which a teacher or school has no control. They do this by statistically controlling for factors such as students’ socio-economic status and projecting how students will perform on assessments based on actual outcomes from similar students in the state. This allows the model to produce estimates of productivity – value-added indicators – under the counterfactual assumption that all schools serve the same group of students. This facilitates apples-to-apples teacher comparisons, rather than apples-to-oranges comparisons. The objective is to facilitate valid and fair comparisons of productivity with</p>
--	--

respect to student outcomes, given that teachers often serve very different student populations. Cooperstown CSD's analyses will be conducted by the Value-Added Research Center on NWEA's MAP assessment. Major modeling decisions were decided by a Technical Advisory Panel made up of volunteer districts from across the state. To assign teachers to HEDI categories, we will assume a normal distribution of teacher effects centered on 13. From this point, we will use the following cut points to assign teachers to categories:

Highly Effective: Greater than or equal to .9 standard deviations above average (13)  
Effective: Less than .9 standard deviations above average and greater than or equal to -.9 standard deviations below average  
Developing: Less than -.9 standard deviations below average and greater than or equal to -2.1 standard deviations below average  
Ineffective: Less than -2.1 standard deviations below average

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

Technology, art, music, LOTE, PE and driver education:  
See attached HEDI Chart B.

AIS and special education:  
Within the category of Highly Effective, those teachers who fall at greater than or equal to .9 standard deviations above average, we further divide the distribution to determine specific points. The specific point breakdown, with upper and lower bounds denoted in standard deviation units, is as follows:

APPR Point  $\geq$  <  
18 0.9 1.1  
19 1.1 1.3  
20 1.3

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

Technology, art, music, LOTE, PE and driver education:  
See attached HEDI Chart B.

AIS and special education:  
Within the category of Effective, those teachers who fall at less than .9 standard deviations above average and greater than or equal to -.9 standard deviations below average, we further divide the distribution to determine specific points. The specific point breakdown, with upper and lower bounds denoted in standard deviation units, is as follows:

APPR Point  $\geq$  <  
9 -0.9 -0.7  
10 -0.7 -0.5  
11 -0.5 -0.3  
12 -0.3 -0.1  
13 -0.1 0.1  
14 0.1 0.3  
15 0.3 0.5

16 0.5 0.7  
17 0.7 0.9

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

Technology, art, music, LOTE, PE and driver education:  
See attached HEDI Chart B.

AIS and special education:  
Within the category of Developing, those teachers who fall at less than -.9 standard deviations below average and greater than or equal to -2.1 standard deviations below average, we further divide the distribution to determine specific points. The specific point breakdown, with upper and lower bounds denoted in standard deviation units, is as follows:

APPR Point  $\geq <$   
3 -2.1 -1.9  
4 -1.9 -1.7  
5 -1.7 -1.5  
6 -1.5 -1.3  
7 -1.3 -1.1  
8 -1.1 -0.9

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

Technology, art, music, LOTE, PE and driver education:  
See attached HEDI Chart B.

AIS and special education:  
Within the category of Ineffective, those teachers who fall at less than -2.1 standard deviations below average, we further divide the distribution to determine specific points. The specific point breakdown, with upper and lower bounds denoted in standard deviation units, is as follows:

APPR Point  $\geq <$   
0 -2.5  
1 -2.5 -2.3  
2 -2.3 -2.1

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

*(No response)*

### 3.13) HEDI Tables or Graphics

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

*assets/survey-uploads/5139/172877-y92vNseFa4/HEDI Conversion Charts (A and B).xlsx*

### 3.14) Locally Developed Controls

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

(No response)

### 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.

*To combine multiple locally selected measures, we will take a population-weighted average of the measures. We will independently calculate value-added measures for each grade and subject area. We then average these measures employing statistical correction for regression to the mean when a teacher teaches multiple subjects or sections. Finally, we assign each teacher to a HEDI category and point based on the distribution of teachers.*

### 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 09, 2012

Updated Wednesday, December 05, 2012

---

## Page 1

### 4.1) Teacher Practice Rubric

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

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

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

*NYSUT Teacher Practice Rubric*

*(No response)*

### 4.2) Points Within Other Measures

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

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

Is the following points assignment applicable to all teachers?

*Yes*

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

*(No response)*

Multiple (at least two) classroom observations by principal or other trained administrator, at least one of which must be unannounced [at least 31 points]	40
One or more observation(s) by trained independent evaluators	(No response)
Observations by trained in-school peer teachers	(No response)
Feedback from students using State-approved survey tool	(No response)
Feedback from parents/caregivers using State-approved survey tool	(No response)
Structured reviews of lesson plans, student portfolios and other teacher artifacts	20

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

(No response)

### 4.3) Survey Tools (if applicable)

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

(No response)

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

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

### 4.4) Assurances

Please check all of the boxes below:

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

### 4.5) Process for Assigning Points and Determining HEDI Ratings

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

*The Cooperstown Central School District will use the configurations on Pages 30 - 32 of the NYSUT TED Workbook to calculate the 60 points for the NYSUT Teacher Rubric. Forty points will be assigned for multiple observations and 20 points will be assigned for the Structured Reviews of Lesson Plans, Student portfolios, and other teacher artifacts.*  
*Standard 1 = 10*  
*Standard 2 = 18*  
*Standard 3 = 17*  
*Standard 4 = 12*  
*Standard 5 = 13*

Standard 6 = 18

Standard 7 = 9

These equal 97 elements will be scored on a 1-4 scale and will be weighted equally and subsequently averaged into an overall rubric score. Please see conversion chart below.

Normal rounding rules will apply.

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.	Highly Effective 59-60 3.5 = 59 3.6 = 59.3 3.7 = 59.5 3.8 = 59.8 3.9 = 60 4.0 = 60
Effective: Overall performance and results meet NYS Teaching Standards.	Effective 57-58 2.5 = 57 2.6 = 57.2 2.7 = 57.4 2.8 = 57.6 2.9 = 57.8 3 = 58 3.1 = 58.2 3.2 = 58.4 3.3 = 58.6 3.4 = 58.8
Developing: Overall performance and results need improvement in order to meet NYS Teaching Standards.	Developing 50-56 1.5 = 50 1.6 = 50.7 1.7 = 51.4 1.8 = 52.1 1.9 = 52.8 2 = 53.5 2.1 = 54.2 2.2 = 54.9 2.3 = 55.6 2.4 = 56.3
Ineffective: Overall performance and results do not meet NYS Teaching Standards.	Ineffective 0-49 1.000 = 0 1.008 = 1 1.017 = 2 1.025 = 3 1.033 = 4 1.042 = 5 1.050 = 6 1.058 = 7 1.067 = 8

1.075 = 9  
 1.083 = 10  
 1.092 = 11  
 1.100 = 12  
 1.108 = 13  
 1.115 = 14  
 1.123 = 15  
 1.131 = 16  
 1.138 = 17  
 1.146 = 18  
 1.154 = 19  
 1.162 = 20  
 1.169 = 21  
 1.177 = 22  
 1.185 = 23  
 1.192 = 24  
 1.200 = 25  
 1.208 = 26  
 1.217 = 27  
 1.225 = 28  
 1.233 = 29  
 1.242 = 30  
 1.250 = 31  
 1.258 = 32  
 1.267 = 33  
 1.275 = 34  
 1.283 = 35  
 1.292 = 36  
 1.300 = 37  
 1.308 = 38  
 1.317 = 39  
 1.325 = 40  
 1.333 = 41  
 1.341 = 42  
 1.350 = 43  
 1.358 = 44  
 1.367 = 45  
 1.375 = 46  
 1.383 = 47  
 1.392 = 48  
 1.400 = 49

Provide the ranges for the 60-point scoring bands.

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

#### 4.6) Observations of Probationary Teachers

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

By building principals or other trained administrators

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

By trained in-school peer teachers or other trained reviewers

Formal/Long	0
Informal/Short	0

Independent evaluators

Formal/Long	0
Informal/Short	0

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

- 
- Both
- 

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

- 
- In Person
- 

## 4.7) Observations of Tenured Teachers

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

By building principals or other trained administrators

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

By trained in-school peer teachers or other trained reviewers

Formal/Long	0
Informal/Short	0

Independent evaluators

Formal/Long	0
Informal/Short	0

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

- 
- Both
- 

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

- 
- In Person
-

# 5. Composite Scoring (Teachers)

Created Wednesday, May 09, 2012

Updated Wednesday, September 12, 2012

---

## Page 1

### **Standards for Rating Categories**

#### **Growth or Comparable Measures**

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

#### **Other Measures of Effectiveness (Teacher and Leader standards)**

#### **Highly**

#### **Effective**

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

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

Overall performance and results exceed NYS Teaching Standards.

#### **Effective**

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

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

Overall performance and results meet NYS Teaching Standards.

#### **Developing**

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

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

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

#### **Ineffective**

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

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

Overall performance and results do not meet NYS Teaching Standards.

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

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

**2012-13 where there is no Value-Added measure**

**Growth or Comparable Measures**

**Locally-selected Measures of**

**growth or achievement**

**Other Measures of Effectiveness**

**(60 points)**

**Overall**

**Composite Score**

**Highly Effective**

**18-20**

**18-20**

**Ranges determined locally--see below**

**91-100**

**Effective**

**9-17**

**9-17**

**75-90**

**Developing**

**3-8**

**3-8**

**65-74**

**Ineffective**

**0-2**

**0-2**

**0-64**

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

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

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

**2012-13 where Value-Added growth measure applies**

**Growth or Comparable Measures**

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

**Other Measures of Effectiveness**

**(60 points)**

**Overall**

**Composite Score**

**Highly Effective**

**22-25**

**14-15**

**Ranges determined locally--see above**

**91-100**

**Effective**

**10-21**

**8-13**

**75-90**

**Developing**

**3-9**

**3-7**

**65-74**

**Ineffective**

**0-2**

**0-2**

**0-64**

# 6. Additional Requirements - Teachers

Created Thursday, September 06, 2012

Updated Tuesday, November 27, 2012

---

## Page 1

### 6.1) Assurances -- Improvement Plans

Please check the boxes below:

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

### 6.2) Attachment: Teacher Improvement Plan Forms

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

[assets/survey-uploads/5265/173030-Df0w3Xx5v6/Teacher Improvement Plan Form.docx](#)

### 6.3) Appeals Process

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

(1) the substance of the annual professional performance review

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

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

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

#### *VII. Appeal Process*

*A. Appeals of teacher evaluations must be made formally in writing within ten (10) school days of receipt of the completed evaluation.*

*B. Appeals shall be submitted to the evaluator with a copy to the superintendent.*

*C. Appeals may be made for the following reasons:*

1. Failure of the evaluator/evaluation to adhere to the APPR plan
2. Failure of the evaluator/evaluation to adhere to the Commissioner's regulations applicable to the APPR process
3. Failure of the evaluator/evaluation to adhere to the tenets of Education Law Section 3012-c
4. Failure of the evaluator/district to comply with the terms set forth in a teacher improvement plan

D. Within fifteen (15) business days of the appeal, the evaluator or administrator responsible for the issuance of the teacher improvement plan must submit a detailed written response to the appeal.

E. A detailed written description of the specific areas of disagreement must accompany all appeals along with any additional documentation or materials relevant to the appeal.

F. After reviewing the original evaluation/teacher improvement plan, the teacher appeal and the evaluator/administrator response, the superintendent of schools shall convene an informal hearing to allow all parties to be heard on the matter. The evidence shall be limited to any documents, video or audio recordings upon which the evaluation was based and the testimony of the teacher and/or evaluator.

G. A final written decision on the merits of the appeal shall be rendered by the superintendent no later than thirty (30) business days from the date upon which the teacher filed his/her appeal.

H. The superintendent's decision shall set forth the reasons and factual basis for each determination on each of the specific issues raised in the teacher's appeal.

I. If the appeal is sustained, the reviewer may set aside a rating if it has been affected by substantial error or defect or order a new evaluation if the procedures have been violated.

J. Multiple appeals shall not be filed regarding the same performance review or improvement plan. All grounds for appeal must be included in the original appeal. Any grounds not raised at the time of appeal shall be deemed waived.

K. A copy of the decision shall be provided to the teacher and the evaluator/administrator.

L. All teacher evaluation appeal decisions shall be final.

M. If the appeal decision results in the pursuit of disciplinary action in accordance with Section 3020-a of the New York State Education Law, the Cooperstown Central School Faculty Association reserves the right to represent the impacted member in any and all proceedings that might ensue.

## 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.

*Teacher lead evaluators will obtain training on the stipulated 9 elements via training sessions held by the ONC BOCES Network Team. Lead evaluators will be trained on the use of the NYSUT rubric by NYSUT trainers over the course of a five (5) day training. Other trainings will take place throughout the year.*

*Lead evaluators will participate in follow-up and "refresher" trainings on the 9 elements held by the ONC BOCES Network Team along with district provided calibration trainings using the NYSCOSS sponsored LEAF materials to ensure inter-rater reliability.*

*Evaluators and Lead Evaluators shall be certified by the Cooperstown Board of Education on a yearly basis.*

## 6.5) Assurances -- Evaluators

Please check the boxes below:

- 
- Checked
-

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, September 19, 2012

Updated Wednesday, September 26, 2012

## Page 1

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

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

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

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

K-6
7-12
(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.	NA
Highly Effective (18 - 20 points) Results are well above state average for similar students (or District goals if no state test).	NA
Effective (9 - 17 points) Results meet state average for similar students (or District goals if no state test).	NA
Developing (3 - 8 points) Results are below state average for similar students (or District goals if no state test).	NA
Ineffective (0 - 2 points) Results are well below state average for similar students (or District goals if no state test).	NA

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.

## 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: <a href="http://usny.nysed.gov/rttt/teachers-leaders/slo/home.html">http://usny.nysed.gov/rttt/teachers-leaders/slo/home.html</a> .	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, September 12, 2012

Updated Wednesday, December 05, 2012

---

## Page 1

### Locally-Selected Measures of Student Achievement or Growth

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

Grade Configuration	Locally-Selected Measure from List of Approved Measures	Assessment
K-6	(d) measures used by district for teacher evaluation	Measures of Academic Progress (ELA, math and science)
7-12	(g) % achieving specific level on Regents or alternatives	All Regents Examinations

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

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

<p>Use this box, if needed, to describe the process for assigning HEDI categories. If needed, you may upload a table or graphic below.</p>	<p>An average of students' Measures of Academic Progress Value Added Scores on ELA, Math and science assessments will be used for the K-6 principal's measure resulting in a growth score as follows:          To assign teachers to HEDI categories, we will assume a normal distribution of teacher effects centered on 13.          From this point, we will use the following cut points to assign teachers to categories:</p> <p>Highly Effective: Greater than or equal to .9 standard deviations above average (13)          Effective: Less than .9 standard deviations above average and greater than or equal to -.9 standard deviations below average          Developing: Less than -.9 standard deviations below average and greater than or equal to -2.1 standard deviations below average          Ineffective: Less than -2.1 standard deviations below average</p>
--	--

The 7-12 principal will set an achievement target for all students on all Regents examinations given. To assign secondary principals to HEDI categories we will assume a normal distribution centered on 10.

HEDI scores in the “Highly Effective” and “Effective” ranges are defined by the number of steps between the Anchor Point selected and 100%. For example, at Anchor Point 10, there are ten equal steps to 100%. Thus, all steps in the the “Highly Effective” and “Effective” ranges represent 1/10 of the difference between the Anchor Point and 100%.

HEDI scores in the “Developing” and “Ineffective” ranges are defined by the nine scores (0 to 8) in these ranges. Each step is diminished by 1/9th of the score cited for HEDI level 9. Regents examinations to bench mark HEDI conversions.

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

K-6 principal:

Within the category of Highly Effective, those principals who fall at greater than or equal to .9 standard deviations above average, we further divide the distribution to determine specific points. The specific point breakdown, with upper and lower bounds denoted in standard deviation units, is as follows:

Growth Model:  
APPR Point  $\geq$  <  
18 0.9 1.1  
19 1.1 1.3  
20 1.3

Value-Added Model:  
APPR Point  $\geq$  <  
14 0.9 1.2  
15 1.2

7-12 principal:

See attached conversion chart

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

K-6 principal:

Within the category of Effective, those principals who fall at less than .9 standard deviations above average and greater than or equal to -.9 standard deviations below average, we further divide the distribution to determine specific points. The specific point breakdown, with upper and lower bounds denoted in standard deviation units, is as follows:

APPR Point  $\geq$  <  
9 -0.9 -0.7  
10 -0.7 -0.5  
11 -0.5 -0.3  
12 -0.3 -0.1  
13 -0.1 0.1  
14 0.1 0.3

15 0.3 0.5  
16 0.5 0.7  
17 0.7 0.9

Value-Added Model  
APPR Point  $\geq$  <  
8 -0.9 -0.6  
9 -0.6 -0.3  
10 -0.3 0.0  
11 0.0 0.3  
12 0.3 0.6  
13 0.6 0.9

7-12 principal:

See attached conversion chart

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

K-6 principal:

Within the category of Developing, those principals who fall at less than -.9 standard deviations below average and greater than or equal to -2.1 standard deviations below average, we further divide the distribution to determine specific points. The specific point breakdown, with upper and lower bounds denoted in standard deviation units, is as follows:

APPR Point  $\geq$  <  
3 -2.1 -1.9  
4 -1.9 -1.7  
5 -1.7 -1.5  
6 -1.5 -1.3  
7 -1.3 -1.1  
8 -1.1 -0.9

Value-Added Model  
APPR Point  $\geq$  <  
3 -2.4 -2.1  
4 -2.1 -1.8  
5 -1.8 -1.5  
6 -1.5 -1.2  
7 -1.2 -0.9

7-12 principal:

See attached conversion chart

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

PreK-6 principal:

Within the category of Ineffective, those principals who fall at less than -2.1 standard deviations below average, we further divide the distribution to determine specific points. The specific point breakdown, with upper and lower bounds denoted in standard deviation units, is as follows:

APPR Point  $\geq$  <  
0 -2.5  
1 -2.5 -2.3  
2 -2.3 -2.1

Value-Added Model

APPR Point  $\geq$  <

0 -3.0

1 -3.0 -2.7

2 -2.7 -2.4

7-12 principal:

See attached conversion chart

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/5366/175947-qBFVOWF7fC/Variable Local Calculator of State Assessments(Principal).xlsx*

## 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-6	(d) measures used by district for teacher evaluation	Measures of Academic Progress (ELA, math and science)
7-12	(g) % achieving specific level on Regents or alternatives	All Regents Examinations

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

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

<p>Use this box, if needed, to describe the process for assigning HEDI categories. If needed, you may upload a table or graphic below.</p>	<p>An average of students' Measures of Academic Progress Value Added Scores on ELA, Math and Science assessments will be used for the K-6 principal's measure resulting in a growth score as follows: To assign teachers to HEDI categories, we will assume a normal distribution of teacher effects centered on 13. From this point, we will use the following cut points to assign teachers to categories:</p> <p>Highly Effective: Greater than or equal to .9 standard deviations above average (13) Effective: Less than .9 standard deviations above average and greater than or equal to -.9 standard deviations below average</p>
--	---

Developing: Less than -.9 standard deviations below average and greater than or equal to -.21 standard deviations below average  
Ineffective: Less than -.21 standard deviations below average

The 7-12 principal will set an achievement target for all students on all Regents examinations given. To assign secondary principals to HEDI categories we will assume a normal distribution centered on 10.

HEDI scores in the "Highly Effective" and "Effective" ranges are defined by the number of steps between the Anchor Point selected and 100%. For example, at Anchor Point 10, there are ten equal steps to 100%. Thus, all steps in the the "Highly Effective" and "Effective" ranges represent 1/10 of the difference between the Anchor Point and 100%.

HEDI scores in the "Developing" and "Ineffective" ranges are defined by the nine scores (0 to 8) in these ranges. Each step is diminished by 1/9th of the score cited for HEDI level 9. Regents examinations to bench mark HEDI conversions.

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

K-6 principal:

Within the category of Highly Effective, those principals who fall at greater than or equal to .9 standard deviations above average, we further divide the distribution to determine specific points. The specific point breakdown, with upper and lower bounds denoted in standard deviation units, is as follows:

APPR Point  $\geq$  <  
18 0.9 1.1  
19 1.1 1.3  
20 1.3

7-12 principal:

See attached conversion chart

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

K-6 principal:

Within the category of Effective, those principals who fall at less than .9 standard deviations above average and greater than or equal to -.9 standard deviations below average, we further divide the distribution to determine specific points. The specific point breakdown, with upper and lower bounds denoted in standard deviation units, is as follows:

APPR Point  $\geq$  <  
9 -0.9 -0.7  
10 -0.7 -0.5  
11 -0.5 -0.3  
12 -0.3 -0.1  
13 -0.1 0.1  
14 0.1 0.3  
15 0.3 0.5

16 0.5 0.7

17 0.7 0.9

7-12 principal:

See attached conversion chart

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

K-6 principal:

Within the category of Developing, those principals who fall at less than -.9 standard deviations below average and greater than or equal to -2.1 standard deviations below average, we further divide the distribution to determine specific points. The specific point breakdown, with upper and lower bounds denoted in standard deviation units, is as follows:

APPR Point  $\geq <$

3 -2.1 -1.9

4 -1.9 -1.7

5 -1.7 -1.5

6 -1.5 -1.3

7 -1.3 -1.1

8 -1.1 -0.9

7-12 principal:

See attached conversion chart

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

PreK-6 principal:

Within the category of Ineffective, those principals who fall at less than -2.1 standard deviations below average, we further divide the distribution to determine specific points. The specific point breakdown, with upper and lower bounds denoted in standard deviation units, is as follows:

APPR Point  $\geq <$

0 -2.5

1 -2.5 -2.3

2 -2.3 -2.1

7-12 principal:

See attached conversion chart

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

*(No response)*

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

*assets/survey-uploads/5366/175947-T8MIGWUVm1/Variable Local Calculator of State Assessments(Principal).xlsx*

### 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.

*In the instance where multiple, locally selected measures are combined for a HEDI category score, a pro-rational formula based on the number of students covered by the measure will be used. For example, if a principal's locally selected growth measures include cohorts of 50 students, 25 students and 25 students respectively, the resulting HEDI weighting shall equal  $50\% + 25\% + 25\% = 100\%$  of the total points available for said category.*

### 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, September 26, 2012

Updated Wednesday, December 05, 2012

---

## Page 1

### 9.1) Principal Practice Rubric

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

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

*Multidimensional Principal Performance Rubric*

*(No response)*

### 9.2) Points Within Other Measures

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

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

Is the following points assignment for all principals?

*Yes*

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

*(No response)*

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

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

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

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

(No response)

### 9.3) Assurances -- Goals

Please check the boxes below (if applicable):

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

### 9.4) Sources of Evidence (if applicable)

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

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

### 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:

- Checked

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

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

## 9.6) Assurances

Please check all of the boxes below:

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

## 9.7) Process for Assigning Points and Determining HEDI Ratings

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

*Each of the Domains in the Multidimensional Principal Performance Rubric will be assessed on a 1-4 scale. All domains will be averaged to obtain an overall 1-4 weighting. All domains are weighted equally.  
Please see attached chart describing the 0-60 point conversion 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.

*assets/survey-uploads/5143/182570-pMADJ4gk6R/HEDI Conversion Chart (Principals).xlsx*

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

Highly Effective: Overall performance and results exceed standards.	Principals in this category consistently exceed the district's expectations and over the multiple visits to the school building are observed to be Highly Effective in the Domains of the MPPR.
Effective: Overall performance and results meet standards.	Principals in this category meet the district's expectations and over the multiple visits to the school building are observed to be Effective in the Domains of the MPPR.
Developing: Overall performance and results need improvement in order to meet standards.	Principals in this category experience some difficulty in meeting the district's expectations and over the multiple visits to the school building are observed to be Developing in the Domains of the MPPR.
Ineffective: Overall performance and results do not meet standards.	Principals in this category are not meeting the district's expectations and over the multiple visits to the school building are observed to be

Ineffective in the Domains of the MPPR.

Please provide the locally-negotiated 60 point scoring bands.

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

### 9.8) School Visits

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

#### **Probationary Principals**

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

#### **Tenured Principals**

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

# 10. Composite Scoring (Principals)

Created Wednesday, September 26, 2012

---

## Page 1

### **Standards for Rating Categories**

#### **Growth or Comparable Measures**

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

#### **Other Measures of Effectiveness (Teacher and Leader standards)**

#### **Highly**

##### **Effective**

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

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

Overall performance and results exceed ISLLC leadership standards.

##### **Effective**

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

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

Overall performance and results meet ISLLC leadership standards.

##### **Developing**

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

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

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

##### **Ineffective**

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

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

Overall performance and results do not meet ISLLC leadership standards.

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

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

**2012-13 where there is no Value-Added measure**

**Growth or Comparable Measures**

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

**Other Measures of Effectiveness**

**(60 points)**

**Overall**

**Composite Score**

**Highly Effective**

**18-20**

**18-20**

**Ranges determined locally--see below**

**91-100**

**Effective**

**9-17**

**9-17**

**75-90**

**Developing**

**3-8**

**3-8**

**65-74**

**Ineffective**

**0-2**

**0-2**

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

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

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

**2012-13 where Value-Added growth measure applies**

**Growth or Comparable Measures**

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

**Other Measures of Effectiveness**

**(60 points)**

**Overall**

**Composite Score**

**Highly Effective**

22-25

14-15

Ranges determined locally--see above

91-100

**Effective**

10-21

8-13

75-90

**Developing**

3-9

3-7

**65-74**

**Ineffective**

**0-2**

**0-2**

**0-64**

# 11. Additional Requirements - Principals

Created Wednesday, September 26, 2012

Updated Wednesday, November 28, 2012

---

## Page 1

### 11.1) Assurances -- Improvement Plans

Please check the boxes below.

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

### 11.2) Attachment: Principal Improvement Plan Forms

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

[assets/survey-uploads/5276/182597-Df0w3Xx5v6/Principal Improvement Plan Form.docx](#)

### 11.3) Appeals Process

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

(1) the substance of the annual professional performance review

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

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

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

#### *I. Appeal Process*

*A. Appeals of principal evaluations must be made formally in writing within ten(10) business days of receipt of the completed evaluation.*

*B. Appeals may be made for the following reasons:*

*1. Failure of the evaluator/evaluation to adhere to the APPR plan*

2. Failure of the evaluator/evaluation to adhere to the Commissioner's regulations applicable to the APPR process
3. Failure of the evaluator/evaluation to adhere to the tenets of Education Law Section 3012-c
4. Failure of the evaluator/district to comply with the terms set forth in a principal improvement plan

C. Within fifteen (15) business days of the appeal, the evaluator or administrator responsible for the issuance of the evaluation or principal improvement plan must submit a detailed written response to the appeal.

D. A detailed written description of the specific areas of disagreement must accompany all appeals along with any additional documentation or materials relevant to the appeal.

E. A three member panel shall be convened to hear principal appeals. The panel will consist of the superintendent of schools, an Otsego-Northern Catskill area superintendent selected by the appealing principal and an Otsego-Northern Catskill area superintendent selected by the Cooperstown Central School District Superintendent of Schools. After reviewing the original evaluation/principal improvement plan, the principal appeal and the evaluator/administrator response, the appointed appeal panel shall convene an informal hearing to allow all parties to be heard on the matter. The evidence shall be limited to any documents, video or audio recordings upon which the evaluation was based and the testimony of the principal and/or evaluator.

F. A final written decision on the merits of the appeal shall be rendered by the panel no later than thirty (30) business days from the date upon which the principal filed his/her appeal.

G. The appeal panel's decision shall set forth the reasons and factual basis for each determination on each of the specific issues raised in the principal's appeal.

H. If the appeal is sustained, the appeal panel may set aside a rating if it has been affected by substantial error or defect or order a new evaluation if the procedures have been violated.

I. Multiple appeals shall not be filed regarding the same performance review or improvement plan. All grounds for appeal must be included in the original appeal. Any grounds not raised at the time of appeal shall be deemed waived.

J. A copy of the decision shall be provided to the principal.

K. All principal evaluation appeal decisions shall be final.

L. If the appeal decision results in the pursuit of disciplinary action in accordance with Section 3020-a of the New York State Education Law, the Cooperstown Central School Faculty Association reserves the right to represent the impacted member in any and all proceedings that might ensue.

## 11.4) Training and Certification of Lead Evaluators and Evaluators

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

Lead principal evaluators will continue to attend calibration trainings (to ensure inter-rater reliability) held by the Otsego-Northern Catskill BOCES and by the NYSED Network Team Institute. These trainings have taken place over the 2011-2012 school year. Evaluators will also work collaboratively with principals within the district to ensure that site visits are consistent in their make-up.

Lead principal evaluators and principal evaluators will be re-certified by the Cooperstown Board of Education on an annual basis.

## 11.5) Assurances -- Evaluators

Please check the boxes below:

- 
- Checked
-

their related functions, as applicable

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

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

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

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

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

(7) use of the Statewide Instructional Reporting System

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

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

---

• Checked

---

## 11.6) Assurances -- Principals

Please check all of the boxes below:

11.6) Assurances -- Principals   Assure the entire APPR plan will be completed for each principal as soon as practicable, but in no case later than September 1 of the school year next following the school year for which the building principal's performance is being measured.	Checked
---	---------

11.6) Assurances -- Principals   Assure that the district will provide the principal's score and rating on the locally selected measures subcomponent, if available, and on the other measures of principal effectiveness subcomponent for a principal's annual professional performance review, in writing, no later than the last school day of the school year for which the principal is being measured.	Checked
--	---------

11.6) Assurances -- Principals   Assure that the APPR will be put on the district website by September 10 or within 10 days after approval, whichever is later.	Checked
11.6) Assurances -- Principals   Assure that the evaluation system will be used as a significant factor for employment decisions.	Checked
11.6) Assurances -- Principals   Assure that principals will receive timely and constructive feedback as part of the evaluation process.	Checked
11.6) Assurances -- Principals   Assure the district has appeal procedures that are consistent with the regulations and that they provide for the timely and expeditious resolution of an appeal.	Checked

## 11.7) Assurances -- Data

Please check all of the boxes below:

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

## 12. Joint Certification of APPR Plan

Created Monday, October 01, 2012

Updated Wednesday, December 05, 2012

---

### Page 1

#### 12.1) Upload the Joint Certification of the APPR Plan

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

[assets/survey-uploads/5581/185467-3Uqgn5g9Iu/District Certification Form APPR Teacher \(11-30-12\)\\_1.pdf](assets/survey-uploads/5581/185467-3Uqgn5g9Iu/District%20Certification%20Form%20APPR%20Teacher%20(11-30-12)_1.pdf)

#### File types supported for uploads

PDF (preferred)

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

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

Open Office (.odt, .ott)

Images (.jpg, .gif)

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

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

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

## HEDI Translation Template for SLO Scores Counting as 20% of Composi

Enter HEDI Anchor Point (range 9-17) and anticipated SLO Target Percent (as a percent) in the **green** boxes.

The chart below will automatically change to reflect the entries.

HEDI Anchor Point - 9 to 17

**13**

SLO Target Percent - as %

**80%**

**Note: The point values and ranges on the HEDI point scale (from zero to 20) are determined by SED regulations.**

	HEDI Points	SLO Target or Mastery Achieved	HEDI scores and Mastery Range
Ineffective	0	0.00%	0.00% to 7.61%
	1	7.62%	7.62% to 15.23%
	2	15.24%	15.24% to 22.85%
Developing	3	22.86%	22.86% to 30.47%
	4	30.48%	30.48% to 38.09%
	5	38.10%	38.10% to 45.70%
	6	45.71%	45.71% to 53.32%
	7	53.33%	53.33% to 60.94%
	8	60.95%	60.95% to 68.56%
Effective	9	68.57%	68.57% to 71.42%
	10	71.43%	71.43% to 74.28%
	11	74.29%	74.29% to 77.13%
	12	77.14%	77.14% to 79.99%
	13	80.00%	80.00% to 82.85%
	14	82.86%	82.86% to 85.70%
	15	85.71%	85.71% to 88.56%
	16	88.57%	88.57% to 91.42%
	17	91.43%	91.43% to 94.28%
Highly Effective	18	94.29%	94.29% to 97.13%
	19	97.14%	97.14% to 98.57%
	20	100.00%	98.58% to 100.00%

This template trans...  
SLO to a HEDI score...  
required for that SI...  
17) selected.

HEDI scores in the ‘...  
are defined by the i...  
selected and 100%.  
are five equal steps...  
“Highly Effective” a...  
the difference betw...

HEDI scores in the...  
are defined by the i...  
step is diminished

**For a given Anchor...  
useful translation t...  
and target combin...**

See other tab for 1...

ite

## HEDI Calculator

HEDI Calculator	Number of students	SLO Target or Percent Mastery Selected	Percent Mastery Achieved	HEDI score	HEDI Points Awarded
SLO 1	30	90%	92	14	5.7
SLO 2	21	65%	70	14	4.0
SLO 3	23	80%	78	12	3.7
SLO 4					0.0
SLO 5					0.0
SLO 6					0.0
<b>Total</b>	<b>74</b>				<b>13.4</b>

Calculated values are printed in red.

template translates a percent mastery achieved on an HEDI score. Each translation is based on the target for that SLO and the HEDI Anchor Point (from 9 to 15). Calculated values are printed in red.

Percent mastery achieved on an HEDI score. Each translation is based on the target for that SLO and the HEDI Anchor Point (from 9 to 15). Calculated values are printed in red.

Percent mastery achieved on an HEDI score. Each translation is based on the target for that SLO and the HEDI Anchor Point (from 9 to 15). Calculated values are printed in red.

Percent mastery achieved on an HEDI score. Each translation is based on the target for that SLO and the HEDI Anchor Point (from 9 to 15). Calculated values are printed in red.

Percent mastery achieved on an HEDI score. Each translation is based on the target for that SLO and the HEDI Anchor Point (from 9 to 15). Calculated values are printed in red.

## HEDI Translation Template for Local Scores Counting as 15% of Composite

The teacher and principal shall determine an appropriate "pass" point that students are expected to attain. If 80% of students attain the approved "pass" point, a HEDI score of 13 shall be assigned. All other point conversions shall be assigned as follows:

HEDI Anchor Point -  
Target Percent - as %

11	<b>11</b>
	<b>80%</b>

**Note: The point values and ranges on the HEDI point scale (from**

	HEDI Points	Percent Mastery Achieved	HEDI scores and Mastery Range		
Ineffective	0	0.00%	0.00%	to	8.12%
	1	8.13%	8.13%	to	16.24%
	2	16.25%	16.25%	to	24.37%
Developing	3	24.38%	24.38%	to	32.49%
	4	32.50%	32.50%	to	40.62%
	5	40.63%	40.63%	to	48.74%
	6	48.75%	48.75%	to	56.87%
Effective	7	56.88%	56.88%	to	64.99%
	8	65.00%	65.00%	to	69.99%
	9	70.00%	70.00%	to	74.99%
	10	75.00%	75.00%	to	79.99%
	11	80.00%	80.00%	to	84.99%
	12	85.00%	85.00%	to	89.99%
Highly Effective	13	90.00%	90.00%	to	94.99%
	14	95.00%	95.00%	to	97.50%
	15	100.00%	97.51%	to	100.00%

This template translates the pass rate and the principal for the course in question to HEDI score. Each translation for that SLO and the HEDI /

HEDI scores in the "Highly Effective" defined by the number of scores selected and 100%. For example, four equal steps to 100%. "Effective" and "Effective" range difference between the Anchor

HEDI scores in the "Developing" defined by the eight scores is diminished by 1/8th of the

## HEDI Calculator

HEDI Calculator	Number of students	SLO Target or		HEDI score	HEDI Points Awarded
		Percent Mastery Selected	Percent Mastery Achieved		
SLO 1	30	90%	92	14	5.7
SLO 2	21	65%	70	14	4.0
SLO 3	23	80%	78	12	3.7
SLO 4					0.0
SLO 5					0.0
SLO 6					0.0
<b>Total</b>	<b>74</b>				<b>13.4</b>

Calculated values are printed in red.

the comparison between a teacher's  
 al-approved achievement expectation  
 n and converts that relationship to a  
 tion is based on the target required  
 H Anchor Point 11.

y Effective” and “Effective” ranges are  
 f steps between the Anchor Point  
 example, at Anchor Point 11, there are  
 3. Thus, all steps in the the “Highly  
 ” ranges represent 1/4 of the  
 nchor Point and 100%.

Developing” and “Ineffective” ranges are  
 es (0 to 7) in these ranges. Each step  
 f the score cited for HEDI level 9.

**Cooperstown Central School District**

**TEACHER IMPROVEMENT PLAN**

Be it understood by all parties that this document is designed to facilitate clear communication and guidance for the teacher in question. The areas of improvement specified in this plan are in no way meant to be all inclusive of a teacher's responsibility in the classroom. Rather, the teacher improvement plan outlines specific areas of concern and associated steps to build professional capacity in those areas. It should also be noted that completion of all plan components in no way guarantees an overall APPR rating of "effective."

**Teacher:** \_\_\_\_\_

**Grade/Subject(s) :** \_\_\_\_\_

**Plan Timeline:** \_\_\_\_\_

List the dates that the plan will cover including plan review.

**Specific Areas of Concern:**

Attach a detailed description of the areas of deficiency noted and how each was detected.

---

---

---

---

---

---

---

---

---

---

**Teacher Supports:**

Indicate how the teacher will be provided with assistance in improving his/her professional performance. Clearly stipulate who will be responsible for each component of the plan.

---

---

---

---

---

---

---

---

---

---

**Plan Evaluation:**

Give a detailed description of how the plan will be evaluated including dates, deadlines and format for all written submissions.

---

---

---

---

---

---

---

---

---

---

---

Teacher

---

Date

---

Evaluator

---

Date

## HEDI Translation Template for Local Scores Counting as 20% of C

Enter HEDI Anchor Point (range 9-17) and three year state assessment

The chart below will automatically change to reflect the entries.

HEDI Anchor Point - 9 to 17

<b>10</b>
<b>75%</b>

State Assessment Pass Rate - as %

**Note: The point values and ranges on the HEDI point scale (from zero to 20) are determined by SED regulations.**

	HEDI Points	SLO Target or Percent Mastery Achieved	HEDI scores and Mastery Range
<b>Ineffective</b>	0	0.00%	0.00% to 8.05%
	1	8.06%	8.06% to 16.10%
	2	16.11%	16.11% to 24.16%
<b>Developing</b>	3	24.17%	24.17% to 32.21%
	4	32.22%	32.22% to 40.27%
	5	40.28%	40.28% to 48.32%
	6	48.33%	48.33% to 56.38%
	7	56.39%	56.39% to 64.43%
	8	64.44%	64.44% to 72.49%
<b>Effective</b>	9	72.50%	72.50% to 74.99%
	10	75.00%	75.00% to 77.49%
	11	77.50%	77.50% to 79.99%
	12	80.00%	80.00% to 82.49%
	13	82.50%	82.50% to 84.99%
	14	85.00%	85.00% to 87.49%
	15	87.50%	87.50% to 89.99%
	16	90.00%	90.00% to 92.49%
	17	92.50%	92.50% to 94.99%
<b>Highly Effective</b>	18	95.00%	95.00% to 97.49%
	19	97.50%	97.50% to 98.75%
	20	100.00%	98.76% to 100.00%

This ten principal average translates the HEDI

HEDI scores are defined as selected are ten "Highly the difference

HEDI scores are defined as step is

See other

## Composite

**This template translates the comparison between a principal's Regents pass rate and the three-year state average and converts that relationship to a HEDI score. Each translation is based on the target required for that SLO and the HEDI Anchor Point (from 9 to 17) selected.**

HEDI scores in the “Highly Effective” and “Effective” ranges are defined by the number of steps between the Anchor Point selected and 100%. For example, at Anchor Point 10, there are ten equal steps to 100%. Thus, all steps in the the “Highly Effective” and “Effective” ranges represent 1/10 of the difference between the Anchor Point and 100%.

HEDI scores in the “Developing” and “Ineffective” ranges are defined by the nine scores (0 to 8) in these ranges. Each step is diminished by 1/9th of the score cited for HEDI level 9.

[See other tab for 15 pt variable calculator.](#)

## HEDI Translation Template for Local Scores Counting as 20% of C

Enter HEDI Anchor Point (range 9-17) and three year state assessment  
The chart below will automatically change to reflect the entries.

HEDI Anchor Point - 9 to 17

<b>10</b>
<b>75%</b>

State Assessment Pass Rate - as %

**Note: The point values and ranges on the HEDI point scale (from zero to 20) are determined by SED regulations.**

	HEDI Points	SLO Target or Percent Mastery Achieved	HEDI scores and Mastery Range
<b>Ineffective</b>	0	0.00%	0.00% to 8.05%
	1	8.06%	8.06% to 16.10%
	2	16.11%	16.11% to 24.16%
<b>Developing</b>	3	24.17%	24.17% to 32.21%
	4	32.22%	32.22% to 40.27%
	5	40.28%	40.28% to 48.32%
	6	48.33%	48.33% to 56.38%
	7	56.39%	56.39% to 64.43%
	8	64.44%	64.44% to 72.49%
<b>Effective</b>	9	72.50%	72.50% to 74.99%
	10	75.00%	75.00% to 77.49%
	11	77.50%	77.50% to 79.99%
	12	80.00%	80.00% to 82.49%
	13	82.50%	82.50% to 84.99%
	14	85.00%	85.00% to 87.49%
	15	87.50%	87.50% to 89.99%
	16	90.00%	90.00% to 92.49%
	17	92.50%	92.50% to 94.99%
<b>Highly Effective</b>	18	95.00%	95.00% to 97.49%
	19	97.50%	97.50% to 98.75%
	20	100.00%	98.76% to 100.00%

This ten principal average translates the HEDI

HEDI scores are defined as selected are ten "Highly the difference

HEDI scores are defined as step is

See other

## Composite

**This template translates the comparison between a principal's Regents pass rate and the three-year state average and converts that relationship to a HEDI score. Each translation is based on the target required for that SLO and the HEDI Anchor Point (from 9 to 17) selected.**

HEDI scores in the “Highly Effective” and “Effective” ranges are defined by the number of steps between the Anchor Point selected and 100%. For example, at Anchor Point 10, there are ten equal steps to 100%. Thus, all steps in the the “Highly Effective” and “Effective” ranges represent 1/10 of the difference between the Anchor Point and 100%.

HEDI scores in the “Developing” and “Ineffective” ranges are defined by the nine scores (0 to 8) in these ranges. Each step is diminished by 1/9th of the score cited for HEDI level 9.

[See other tab for 15 pt variable calculator.](#)

HEDI Conversion Chart for Site Visitations and Professional Binder

Ineffective: Overall performance and results do not meet ISLLC 2008 Leadership Standards.

Ineffective 0-49

1.000 = 0  
1.008 = 1  
1.017 = 2  
1.025 = 3  
1.033 = 4  
1.042 = 5  
1.050 = 6  
1.058 = 7  
1.067 = 8  
1.075 = 9  
1.083 = 10  
1.092 = 11  
1.100 = 12  
1.108 = 13  
1.115 = 14  
1.123 = 15  
1.131 = 16  
1.138 = 17  
1.146 = 18  
1.154 = 19  
1.162 = 20  
1.169 = 21  
1.177 = 22  
1.185 = 23  
1.192 = 24  
1.200 = 25  
1.208 = 26  
1.217 = 27  
1.225 = 28  
1.233 = 29  
1.242 = 30  
1.250 = 31  
1.258 = 32  
1.267 = 33  
1.275 = 34  
1.283 = 35  
1.292 = 36  
1.300 = 37  
1.308 = 38  
1.317 = 39  
1.325 = 40  
1.333 = 41  
1.341 = 42  
1.350 = 43  
1.358 = 44  
1.367 = 45  
1.375 = 46  
1.383 = 47  
1.392 = 48  
1.400 = 49

Developing: Overall performance and results need improvement in order to meet ISLLC 2008 Leadership Standards.

Developing 50-56

1.5 = 50  
1.6 = 50.7  
1.7 = 51.4  
1.8 = 52.1  
1.9 = 52.8  
2 = 53.5  
2.1 = 54.2  
2.2 = 54.9  
2.3 = 55.6  
2.4 = 56.3

Effective: Overall performance and results meet ISLLC 2008 Leadership Standards.

Effective 57-58

2.5 = 57  
2.6 = 57.2  
2.7 = 57.4  
2.8 = 57.6  
2.9 = 57.8  
3 = 58  
3.1 = 58.2  
3.2 = 58.4  
3.3 = 58.6  
3.4 = 58.8

Highly Effective: Overall performance and results exceed ISLLC 2008 Leadership Standards.

Highly Effective 59-60

3.5 = 59  
3.6 = 59.3  
3.7 = 59.5  
3.8 = 59.8  
3.9 = 60  
4.0 = 60

**Cooperstown Central School District**

**PRINCIPAL IMPROVEMENT PLAN**

Be it understood by all parties that this document is designed to facilitate clear communication and guidance for the principal in question. The areas of improvement specified in this plan are in no way meant to be all inclusive of a principal's role and responsibility level. Rather, the principal improvement plan outlines specific areas of concern and associated steps to build professional capacity in those areas. It should also be noted that completion of all plan components in no way guarantees an overall APPR rating of "effective."

**Principal:** \_\_\_\_\_

**Building/Level :** \_\_\_\_\_

**Plan Timeline:** \_\_\_\_\_

List the dates that the plan will cover including plan review.

**Specific Areas of Concern:**

Attach a detailed description of the areas of deficiency noted and how each was detected.

---

---

---

---

---

---

---

---

---

---

**Principal Supports:**

Indicate how the teacher will be provided with assistance in improving his/her professional performance. Clearly stipulate who will be responsible for each component of the plan.

---

---

---

---

---

---

---

---

---

---

**Plan Evaluation:**

Give a detailed description of how the plan will be evaluated including dates, deadlines and format for all written submissions.

---

---

---

---

---

---

---

---

---

---

---

Principal

---

Date

---

Evaluator

---

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:

11/30/12

*C. J. Hebert*

Teachers Union President Signature:

Date:

*Ann Elmstead* 11/30/12

Administrative Union President Signature: Date:

*Michael D. Craig* 11/30/12

Board of Education President Signature:

Date:

11/28/12

*Ralph Pugh*