



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

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

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

January 3, 2013

Donald R. Covell, Superintendent
Dalton-Nunda Central School District (Keshequa)
13 Mill Street
Nunda, NY 14517

Dear Superintendent Covell:

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: Michael Glover

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

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

Annual Professional Performance Reviews: 2012-13

Created Monday, October 29, 2012

Updated Wednesday, January 02, 2013

1

Disclaimers

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

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

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

1. SCHOOL DISTRICT INFORMATION

1.1) School District's BEDS Number : 241101040000

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

241101040000

1.2) School District Name: DALTON-NUNDA CSD (KESHEQUA)

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

DALTON-NUNDA CSD (KESHEQUA)

1.3) School Improvement Grant (SIG) Districts Only

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

Not applicable

1.4) Award Classification

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

(No response)

1.5) Assurances

Please check all of the boxes below:

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

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

Re-submission to address deficiencies

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

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

Annual (2012-13)

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

Created Thursday, November 01, 2012

Updated Wednesday, January 02, 2013

Page 1

STATE-PROVIDED MEASURES OF STUDENT GROWTH

(25 points with an approved value-added measure)

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

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

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

2.1) Assurances

Please check the boxes below:

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

STUDENT LEARNING OBJECTIVES AS COMPARABLE GROWTH MEASURES (20 points)

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

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

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

If no State assessment or Regents exam exists:

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

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

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

State assessments, *required if one exists*

List of State-approved 3rd party assessments

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

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

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

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

2.2) Grades K-3 ELA

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

	ELA	Assessment
K	District, regional, or BOCES-developed assessment	GVEP BOCES Regionally-Developed Kindergarten ELA Summative Assessment
1	District, regional, or BOCES-developed assessment	GVEP BOCES Regionally-Developed 1st Grade ELA Summative Assessment
2	District, regional, or BOCES-developed assessment	GVEP BOCES Regionally-Developed 2nd Grade ELA Summative Assessment

	ELA	Assessment
3	State assessment	3rd Grade State Assessment

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

Use this box, if needed, to describe the general process for assigning HEDI categories for these grades/subjects in this subcomponent. If needed, you may upload a table or graphic at 2.11, below.	At the beginning of the school year pre-assessments and other information the teacher deems necessary will be reviewed or administered in order to obtain a base-line of student's knowledge. From this base line a teacher will create individual targets for student growth that is reasonable and measurable over the course of the school year (or semester for half year courses). Principals will approve all targets. Scores will be based on the percentage of students reaching the target which will then be converted to determine the teacher's State 20 % Score using the chart below in 2:11.
Highly Effective (18 - 20 points) Results are well-above state average for similar students (or District goals if no state test).	86-100 percent of students meets targeted expectations.
Effective (9 - 17 points) Results meet state average for similar students (or District goals if no state test).	55-85 percent of students meets targeted expectations.
Developing (3 - 8 points) Results are below state average for similar students (or District goals if no state test).	30-54 percent of students meets targeted expectations.
Ineffective (0 - 2 points) Results are well-below state average for similar students (or District goals if no state test).	0-29 percent of students meets targeted expectations.

2.3) Grades K-3 Math

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

	Math	Assessment
K	District, regional, or BOCES-developed assessment	GVEP BOCES Regionally Developed Kindergarten Math Summative Assessment
1	District, regional, or BOCES-developed assessment	GVEP BOCES Regionally Developed 1st Grade Math Summative Assessment
2	District, regional, or BOCES-developed assessment	GVEP BOCES Regionally Developed 2nd Grade Math Summative Assessment

	Math	Assessment
3	State assessment	3rd Grade State Assessment

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

Use this box, if needed, to describe the general process for assigning HEDI categories for these grades/subjects in this subcomponent. If needed, you may upload a table or graphic at 2.11, below.	At the beginning of the school year pre-assessments and other information the teacher deems necessary will be reviewed or administered in order to obtain a base-line of student's knowledge. From this base line a teacher will create individual targets for student growth that is reasonable and measurable over the course of the school year (or semester for half year courses). Principals will approve all targets. Scores will be based on the percentage of students reaching the target which will then
---	---

	be converted to determine the teacher's State 20 % Score using the chart below in 2:11.
Highly Effective (18 - 20 points) Results are well-above state average for similar students (or District goals if no state test).	86-100 percent of students meets targeted expectations.
Effective (9 - 17 points) Results meet state average for similar students (or District goals if no state test).	55-85 percent of students meets targeted expectations.
Developing (3 - 8 points) Results are below state average for similar students (or District goals if no state test).	30-54 percent of students meets targeted expectations.
Ineffective (0 - 2 points) Results are well-below state average for similar students (or District goals if no state test).	0-29 percent of students meets targeted expectations.

2.4) Grades 6-8 Science

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

	Science	Assessment
6	District, regional or BOCES-developed assessment	Dalton-Nunda District-Developed 6th Grade Science Summative Assessment
7	District, regional or BOCES-developed assessment	Dalton-Nunda District-Developed 7th Grade Science Summative Assessment

	Science	Assessment
8	State assessment	8th Grade State Science Assessment

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

Use this box, if needed, to describe the general process for assigning HEDI categories for these grades/subjects in this subcomponent. If needed, you may upload a table or graphic at 2.11, below.	At the beginning of the school year pre-assessments and other information the teacher deems necessary will be reviewed or administered in order to obtain a base-line of student's knowledge. From this base line a teacher will create individual targets for student growth that is reasonable and measurable over the course of the school year (or semester for half year courses). Principals will approve all targets. Scores will be based on the percentage of students reaching the target which will then be converted to determine the teacher's State 20 % Score using the chart below in 2:11.
Highly Effective (18 - 20 points) Results are well-above state average for similar students (or District goals if no state test).	86-100 percent of students meets targeted expectations.
Effective (9 - 17 points) Results meet state average for similar students (or District goals if no state test).	55-85 percent of students meets targeted expectations.
Developing (3 - 8 points) Results are below state average for similar students (or District goals if no state test).	30-54 percent of students meets targeted expectations.

Ineffective (0 - 2 points) Results are well-below state average for similar students (or District goals if no state test).	0-29 percent of students meets targeted expectations.
--	---

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	Dalton-Nunda District-Developed 6th Grade Social Studies Summative Assessment
7	District, regional or BOCES-developed assessment	Dalton-Nunda District-Developed 7th Grade Social Studies Summative Assessment
8	District, regional or BOCES-developed assessment	Dalton-Nunda District-Developed 8th Grade Social Studies Summative 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.	At the beginning of the school year pre-assessments and other information the teacher deems necessary will be reviewed or administered in order to obtain a base-line of student's knowledge. From this base line a teacher will create individual targets for student growth that is reasonable and measurable over the course of the school year (or semester for half year courses). Principals will approve all targets. Scores will be based on the percentage of students reaching the target which will then be converted to determine the teacher's State 20 % Score using the chart below in 2:11.
Highly Effective (18 - 20 points) Results are well-above District goals for similar students.	86-100 percent of students meets targeted expectations.
Effective (9 - 17 points) Results meet District goals for similar students.	55-85 percent of students meets targeted expectations.
Developing (3 - 8 points) Results are below District goals for similar students.	30-54 percent of students meets targeted expectations.
Ineffective (0 - 2 points) Results are well-below District goals for similar students.	0-29 percent of students meets targeted expectations.

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	GVEP BOCES Regionally Developed Global 1 Summative 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.	At the beginning of the school year pre-assessments and other information the teacher deems necessary will be reviewed or administered in order to obtain a base-line of student's knowledge. From this base line a teacher will create individual targets for student growth that is reasonable and measurable over the course of the school year (or semester for half year courses). Principals will approve all targets. Scores will be based on the percentage of students reaching the target which will then be converted to determine the teacher's State 20 % Score using the chart below in 2:11.
Highly Effective (18 - 20 points) Results are well-above District goals for similar students.	86-100 percent of students meets targeted expectations.
Effective (9 - 17 points) Results meet District goals for similar students.	55-85 percent of students meets targeted expectations.
Developing (3 - 8 points) Results are below District goals for similar students.	30-54 percent of students meets targeted expectations.
Ineffective (0 - 2 points) Results are well-below District goals for similar students.	0-29 percent of students meets targeted expectations.

2.7) High School Science Regents Courses

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

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

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

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

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

Use this box, if needed, to describe the general process for assigning HEDI categories for these grades/subjects in this subcomponent. If needed, you may upload a table or graphic at 2.11, below.	At the beginning of the school year pre-assessments and other information the teacher deems necessary will be reviewed or administered in order to obtain a base-line of student's knowledge. From this base line a teacher will create individual targets for student growth that is reasonable and measurable over the course of the school year (or semester for half year courses). Principals will approve all targets. Scores will be based on the percentage of students reaching the target which will then be converted to determine the teacher's State 20 % Score using the chart below in 2:11.
Highly Effective (18 - 20 points) Results are well-above District goals for similar students.	86-100 percent of students meets targeted expectations.
Effective (9 - 17 points) Results meet District goals for similar students.	55-85 percent of students meets targeted expectations.
Developing (3 - 8 points) Results are below District goals for similar students.	30-54 percent of students meets targeted expectations.
Ineffective (0 - 2 points) Results are well-below District goals for similar students.	0-29 percent of students meets targeted expectations.

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.	At the beginning of the school year pre-assessments and other information the teacher deems necessary will be reviewed or administered in order to obtain a base-line of student's knowledge. From this base line a teacher will create individual targets for student growth that is reasonable and measurable over the course of the school year (or semester for half year courses). Principals will approve all targets. Scores will be based on the percentage of students reaching the target which will then be converted to determine the teacher's State 20 % Score using the chart below in 2:11.
Highly Effective (18 - 20 points) Results are well-above District goals for similar students.	86-100 percent of students meets targeted expectations.

Effective (9 - 17 points) Results meet District goals for similar students.	55-85 percent of students meets targeted expectations.
Developing (3 - 8 points) Results are below District goals for similar students.	30-54 percent of students meets targeted expectations.
Ineffective (0 - 2 points) Results are well-below District goals for similar students.	0-29 percent of students meets targeted expectations.

2.9) High School English Language Arts

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

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

	High School English Courses	Assessment
Grade 9 ELA	District, regional or BOCES-developed assessment	GVEP BOCES-Developed ELA 9th Grade ELA Summative Assessment
Grade 10 ELA	District, regional or BOCES-developed assessment	GVEP BOCES-Developed ELA 10th Grade ELA Summative Assessment
Grade 11 ELA	Regents assessment	ELA 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.	At the beginning of the school year pre-assessments and other information the teacher deems necessary will be reviewed or administered in order to obtain a base-line of student's knowledge. From this base line a teacher will create individual targets for student growth that is reasonable and measurable over the course of the school year (or semester for half year courses). Principals will approve all targets. Scores will be based on the percentage of students reaching the target which will then be converted to determine the teacher's State 20 % Score using the chart below in 2:11.
Highly Effective (18 - 20 points) Results are well-above District goals for similar students.	86-100 percent of students meets targeted expectations.
Effective (9 - 17 points) Results meet District goals for similar students.	55-85 percent of students meets targeted expectations.
Developing (3 - 8 points) Results are below District goals for similar students.	30-54 percent of students meets targeted expectations.
Ineffective (0 - 2 points) Results are well-below District goals for similar students.	0-29 percent of students meets targeted expectations.

2.10) All Other Courses

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/5364/214295-TXEttx9bQW/SLO CONVERSION CHART for Review Room.doc

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.

None

2.13) Teachers with more than one growth measure

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

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

2.14) Assurances

Please check all of the boxes below:

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

2.14) Assurances | Assure that processes are in place to monitor SLOs to ensure rigor and comparability across classrooms.

Checked

3. Local Measures (Teachers)

Created Thursday, November 01, 2012

Updated Wednesday, January 02, 2013

Page 1

Locally Selected Measures of Student Achievement or Growth

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

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

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

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

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

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

Growth or achievement measure(s) from these options.

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

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

Measures based on:

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

3.1) Grades 4-8 ELA

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

	Locally-Selected Measure from List of Approved Measures	Assessment
4	6(ii) School wide measure computed locally	Math 5 Spring 2013 State Assessment
5	6(ii) School wide measure computed locally	Math 5 Spring 2013 State Assessment
6	6(ii) School wide measure computed locally	Math 8 Spring 2013 State Assessment
7	6(ii) School wide measure computed locally	Math 8 Spring 2013 State Assessment

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

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

Use this box, if needed, to describe the general process for assigning HEDI categories for these grades/subjects in this subcomponent. If needed, you may upload a table or graphic at 3.3, below.	The average level of performance will be calculated using the state results of the Spring 2013 State Math 5 or 8 exam. The methodology for determining a point value will include calculating the number of students within each of the four performance levels (1,2,3,4) and multiplying the number of students within said performance level by the numerical value assigned to the performance level (example: number of students x 1 - Not Meeting Learning Standards) for the Math exam. This process will be applied to each of the four performance levels, each of the four scores will be added together to get one larger number. This number then will be divided by the total number of students to determine an average level of performance which will then be converted to HEDI point scores (see uploaded chart). All teachers K-5 will receive the same score, based on the Math 5 NYS Assessment; all teachers 6-8 will receive the same score based on the Math 8 NYS Assessment.
Highly Effective (14 - 15 points) Results are well above District- or BOCES-adopted expectations for growth or achievement for grade/subject.	An average level performance of 3.5 to 4.0 is considered highly effective achievement (see chart attached). The average level of performance listed is the minimum level needed to achieve the corresponding HEDI score.
Effective (8- 13 points) Results meet District- or BOCES-adopted expectations for growth or achievement for grade/subject.	An average level performance of 2.5 to 3.4 is considered highly effective achievement (see chart attached). The average level of performance listed is the minimum level needed to achieve the corresponding HEDI score.
Developing (3 - 7 points) Results are below District- or BOCES-adopted expectations for growth or achievement for grade/subject.	An average level performance of 1.5 to 2.4 is considered highly effective achievement (see chart attached). The average level of performance listed is the minimum level needed to achieve the corresponding HEDI score.
Ineffective (0 - 2 points) Results are well below District- or BOCES-adopted expectations for growth or achievement for grade/subject.	An average level performance of 1.0 to 1.4 is considered highly effective achievement (see chart attached). The average level of performance listed is the minimum level needed to achieve the corresponding HEDI score.

3.2) Grades 4-8 Math

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

	Locally-Selected Measure from List of Approved Measures	Assessment
4	6(ii) School wide measure computed locally	Math 5 Spring 2013 State Assessment

5	6(ii) School wide measure computed locally	Math 5 Spring 2013 State Assessment
6	6(ii) School wide measure computed locally	Math 8 Spring 2013 State Assessment
7	6(ii) School wide measure computed locally	Math 8 Spring 2013 State Assessment
8	6(ii) School wide measure computed locally	Math 8 Spring 2013 State Assessment

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

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

Use this box, if needed, to describe the general process for assigning HEDI categories for these grades/subjects in this subcomponent. If needed, you may upload a table or graphic at 3.3, below.	The average level of performance will be calculated using the state results of the Spring 2013 State Math 5 or 8 exam. The methodology for determining a point value will include calculating the number of students within each of the four performance levels (1,2,3,4) and multiplying the number of students within said performance level by the numerical value assigned to the performance level (example: number of students x 1 - Not Meeting Learning Standards) for the Math exam. This process will be applied to each of the four performance levels; each of the four scores will be added together to get one larger number. This number then will be divided by the total number of students to determine an average level of performance which will then be converted to HEDI point scores (see uploaded chart). All teachers K-5 will receive the same score, based on the Math 5 NYS assessment; all teachers 6-8 will receive the same score based on the Math 8 NYS Assessment.
Highly Effective (14 - 15 points) Results are well above District- or BOCES-adopted expectations for growth or achievement for grade/subject.	An average level performance of 3.5 to 4.0 is considered highly effective achievement (see chart attached). The average level of performance listed is the minimum level needed to achieve the corresponding HEDI score.
Effective (8- 13 points) Results meet District- or BOCES-adopted expectations for growth or achievement for grade/subject.	An average level performance of 2.5 to 3.4 is considered highly effective achievement (see chart attached). The average level of performance listed is the minimum level needed to achieve the corresponding HEDI score.
Developing (3 - 7 points) Results are below District- or BOCES-adopted expectations for growth or achievement for grade/subject.	An average level performance of 1.5 to 2.4 is considered highly effective achievement (see chart attached). The average level of performance listed is the minimum level needed to achieve the corresponding HEDI score.
Ineffective (0 - 2 points) Results are well below District- or BOCES-adopted expectations for growth or achievement for grade/subject.	An average level performance of 1.0 to 1.4 is considered highly effective achievement (see chart attached). The average level of performance listed is the minimum level needed to achieve the corresponding HEDI score.

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.

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

Growth or achievement measure(s) from these options.

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

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

Measures based on:

- 1) The change in percentage of a teacher's students who achieve a specific level of performance as determined locally, on such assessments/examinations compared to those students' level of performance on such assessments/examinations in the previous school year (e.g., a three percentage point increase in students earning the proficient level (three) or better performance level on the 7th grade math State assessment compared to those same students' performance levels on the 6th grade math State assessment, or an increase in the percentage of a teacher's students earning the advanced performance level (four) on the 4th grade ELA or math State assessments compared to those students' performance levels on the 3rd grade ELA or math State assessments)
- 2) Teacher specific growth score computed by the Department based on the percent of the teacher's students earning a State determined level of growth. The methodology to translate such growth into the State-established sub-component scoring ranges shall be determined locally
- 3) Teacher specific achievement or growth score computed in a manner determined locally based on a measure of student performance on the State assessments, Regents examinations and/or Department approved alternative examinations other than the measure described in 1) or 2), above
- 4) Student growth or achievement computed in a manner determined locally based on a State-approved 3rd party assessment
- 5) Student growth or achievement computed in a manner determined locally based on a district, regional or BOCES-developed assessment that is rigorous and comparable across classrooms
- 6) A school-wide measure of either student growth or achievement based on either:
 - (i) A State-provided student growth score covering all students in the school that took the State assessment in ELA or Math in Grades 4-8; or
 - (ii) A school-wide measure of student growth or achievement computed in a manner determined locally based on a State, State-approved 3rd party, or district, regional or BOCES developed assessment that is rigorous and comparable across classrooms

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

3.4) Grades K-3 ELA

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

	Locally-Selected Measure from List of Approved Measures	Assessment
K	6(ii) School-wide measure computed locally	Math 5 Spring 2013 State Assessment
1	6(ii) School-wide measure computed locally	Math 5 Spring 2013 State Assessment
2	6(ii) School-wide measure computed locally	Math 5 Spring 2013 State Assessment
3	6(ii) School-wide measure computed locally	Math 5 Spring 2013 State Assessment

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

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

Use this box, if needed, to describe the general process for assigning HEDI categories for these grades/subjects in this subcomponent. If needed, you may upload a table or graphic at 3.13, below.	The average level of performance will be calculated using the state results of the Spring 2013 State Math 5 exam. The methodology for determining a point value will include calculating the number of students within each of the four performance levels (1,2,3,4) and multiplying the number of students within said performance level by the numerical value assigned to the performance level (example: number of students x 1 - Not Meeting Learning Standards) for the Math exam. This process will be applied to each of the four performance levels; each of the four scores will be added together to get one larger number. This number then will be divided by the total number of students to determine an average level of performance which will then be converted to HEDI point scores (see uploaded chart). All teachers K-5 will receive the same score.
Highly Effective (18-20 points) Results are well above District- or BOCES-adopted expectations for growth or achievement for grade/subject.	An average level performance of 3.5 to 4.0 is considered highly effective achievement (see chart attached). The average level of performance listed is the minimum level needed to achieve the corresponding HEDI score.
Effective (9-17 points) Results meet District- or BOCES-adopted expectations for growth or achievement for grade/subject.	An average level performance of 2.5 to 3.4 is considered highly effective achievement (see chart attached). The average level of performance listed is the minimum level needed to achieve the corresponding HEDI score.
Developing (3 - 8 points) Results are below District- or BOCES-adopted expectations for growth or achievement for grade/subject.	An average level performance of 1.5 to 2.4 is considered highly effective achievement (see chart attached). The average level of performance listed is the minimum level needed to achieve the corresponding HEDI score.

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

An average level performance of 1.0 to 1.4 is considered highly effective achievement (see chart attached). The average level of performance listed is the minimum level needed to achieve the corresponding HEDI score.

3.5) Grades K-3 Math

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

	Locally-Selected Measure from List of Approved Measures	Assessment
K	6(ii) School-wide measure computed locally	Math 5 Spring 2013 State Assessment
1	6(ii) School-wide measure computed locally	Math 5 Spring 2013 State Assessment
2	6(ii) School-wide measure computed locally	Math 5 Spring 2013 State Assessment
3	6(ii) School-wide measure computed locally	Math 5 Spring 2013 State Assessment

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

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

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

The average level of performance will be calculated using the state results of the Spring 2013 State Math 5 exam. The methodology for determining a point value will include calculating the number of students within each of the four performance levels (1,2,3,4) and multiplying the number of students within said performance level by the numerical value assigned to the performance level (example: number of students x 1 - Not Meeting Learning Standards) for the Math exams. This process will be applied to each of the four performance levels; each of the four scores will be added together to get one larger number. This number then will be divided by the total number of students to determine an average level of performance which will then be converted to HEDI point scores (see uploaded chart). All teachers K-5 will receive the same score.

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

An average level performance of 3.5 to 4.0 is considered highly effective achievement (see chart attached). The average level of performance listed is the minimum level needed to achieve the corresponding HEDI score.

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

An average level performance of 2.5 to 3.4 is considered highly effective achievement (see chart attached). The average level of performance listed is the minimum level needed to achieve the corresponding HEDI score.

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

An average level performance of 1.5 to 2.4 is considered highly effective achievement (see chart attached). The average level of performance listed is the minimum level needed to achieve the corresponding HEDI score.

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

An average level performance of 1.0 to 1.4 is considered highly effective achievement (see chart attached). The average level of performance listed is the minimum level needed to achieve the corresponding HEDI score.

3.6) Grades 6-8 Science

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

	Locally-Selected Measure from List of Approved Measures	Assessment
6	6(ii) School wide measure computed locally	Math 8 Spring 2013 State Assessment
7	6(ii) School wide measure computed locally	Math 8 Spring 2013 State Assessment
8	6(ii) School wide measure computed locally	Math 8 Spring 2013 State Assessment

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

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

The average level of performance will be calculated using the state results of the Spring 2013 State Math 8 exam. The methodology for determining a point value will include calculating the number of students within each of the four performance levels (1,2,3,4) and multiplying the number of students within said performance level by the numerical value assigned to the performance level (example: number of students x 1 - Not Meeting Learning Standards) for the Math exam. This process will be applied to each of the four performance levels, each of the four scores will be added together to get one larger number. This number then will be divided by the total number of students to determine an average level of performance which will then be converted to HEDI point scores (see uploaded chart). All teachers 6-8 will receive the same score.

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

An average level performance of 3.5 to 4.0 is considered highly effective achievement (see chart attached). The average level of performance listed is the minimum level needed to achieve the corresponding HEDI score.

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

An average level performance of 2.5 to 3.4 is considered highly effective achievement (see chart attached). The average level of performance listed is the minimum level needed to achieve the corresponding HEDI score.

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

An average level performance of 1.5 to 2.4 is considered highly effective achievement (see chart attached). The average level of performance listed is the minimum level needed to achieve the corresponding HEDI score.

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

An average level performance of 1.0 to 1.4 is considered highly effective achievement (see chart attached). The average level of performance listed is the minimum level needed to achieve the corresponding HEDI score.

3.7) Grades 6-8 Social Studies

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

	Locally-Selected Measure from List of Approved Measures	Assessment
6	6(ii) School wide measure computed locally	Math 8 Spring 2013 State Assessment
7	6(ii) School wide measure computed locally	Math 8 Spring 2013 State Assessment
8	6(ii) School wide measure computed locally	Math 8 Spring 2013 State Assessment

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

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

Use this box, if needed, to describe the general process for assigning HEDI categories for these grades/subjects in this subcomponent. If needed, you may upload a table or graphic at 3.13, below.	The average level of performance will be calculated using the state results of the Spring 2013 State Math 8 exam. The methodology for determining a point value will include calculating the number of students within each of the four performance levels (1,2,3,4) and multiplying the number of students within said performance level by the numerical value assigned to the performance level (example: number of students x 1 - Not Meeting Learning Standards) for the Math exams This process will be applied to each of the four performance levels; each of the four scores will be added together to get one larger number. This number then will be divided by the total number of students to determine an average level of performance which will then be converted to HEDI point scores (see uploaded chart). All teachers 6-8 will receive the same score.
Highly Effective (18 - 20 points) Results are well above District- or BOCES-adopted expectations for growth or achievement for grade/subject.	An average level performance of 3.5 to 4.0 is considered highly effective achievement (see chart attached). The average level of performance listed is the minimum level needed to achieve the corresponding HEDI score.
Effective (9 - 17 points) Results meet District- or BOCES-adopted expectations for growth or achievement for grade/subject.	An average level performance of 2.5 to 3.4 is considered highly effective achievement (see chart attached). The average level of performance listed is the minimum level needed to achieve the corresponding HEDI score.
Developing (3 - 8 points) Results are below District- or BOCES-adopted expectations for growth or achievement for grade/subject.	An average level performance of 1.5 to 2.4 is considered highly effective achievement (see chart attached). The average level of performance listed is the minimum level needed to achieve the corresponding HEDI score.
Ineffective (0 - 2 points) Results are well below District- or BOCES-adopted expectations for growth or achievement for grade/subject.	An average level performance of 1.0 to 1.4 is considered highly effective achievement (see chart attached). The average level of performance listed is the minimum level needed to achieve the corresponding HEDI score.

3.8) High School Social Studies

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

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

	Locally-Selected Measure from List of Approved Measures	Assessment
Global 1	6(ii) School wide measure computed locally	Algebra 1, Global History, US History, English 11 and Living Environment Regents Exams
Global 2	6(ii) School wide measure computed locally	Algebra 1, Global History, US History, English 11 and Living Environment Regents Exams
American History	6(ii) School wide measure computed locally	Algebra 1, Global History, US History, English 11 and Living Environment Regents Exams

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

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

Use this box, if needed, to describe the general process for assigning HEDI categories for these grades/subjects in this subcomponent. If needed, you may upload a table or graphic at 3.13, below.	The average of each student's scores on each of the five Regents exams necessary for graduation will be calculated. The average of all combined scores will be applied to the attached 0-100 conversion chart. The five Regents used will be Algebra 1, Global History, US History, English 11 and Living Environment. All High School teachers will receive the same score.
Highly Effective (18 - 20 points) Results are well above District- or BOCES-adopted expectations for growth or achievement for grade/subject.	An 85-100 average of all five 2013 Regents exams listed above will be considered highly effective (see chart attached). The range listed is the minimum points needed to achieve the corresponding HEDI points.
Effective (9 - 17 points) Results meet District- or BOCES-adopted expectations for growth or achievement for grade/subject.	An 65-84 average of all five 2013 Regents exams listed above will be considered highly effective (see chart attached). The range listed is the minimum points needed to achieve the corresponding HEDI points.
Developing (3 - 8 points) Results are below District- or BOCES-adopted expectations for growth or achievement for grade/subject.	An 55-64 average of all five 2013 Regents exams listed above will be considered highly effective (see chart attached). The range listed is the minimum points needed to achieve the corresponding HEDI points.
Ineffective (0 - 2 points) Results are well below District- or BOCES-adopted expectations for growth or achievement for grade/subject.	An 0-54 average of all five 2013 Regents exams listed above will be considered highly effective (see chart attached). The range listed is the minimum points needed to achieve the corresponding HEDI points.

3.9) High School Science

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

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

	Locally-Selected Measure from List of Approved Measures	Assessment
Living Environment	6(ii) School wide measure computed locally	Algebra 1, Global History, US History, English 11 and Living Environment Regents Exams
Earth Science	6(ii) School wide measure computed locally	Algebra 1, Global History, US History, English 11 and Living Environment Regents Exams
Chemistry	6(ii) School wide measure computed locally	Algebra 1, Global History, US History, English 11 and Living Environment Regents Exams
Physics	6(ii) School wide measure computed locally	Algebra 1, Global History, US History, English 11 and Living Environment Regents Exams

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

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

Use this box, if needed, to describe the general process for assigning HEDI categories for these grades/subjects in this subcomponent. If needed, you may upload a table or graphic at 3.13, below.	The average of each student's scores on each of the five Regents exams necessary for graduation will be calculated. The average of all combined scores will be applied to the attached 0-100 conversion chart. The five Regents used will be Algebra 1, Global History, US History, English 11 and Living Environment. All High School teachers will receive the same score.
Highly Effective (18-20 points) Results are well above District- or BOCES-adopted expectations for growth or achievement for grade/subject.	An 85-100 average of all five 2013 Regents exams listed above will be considered highly effective (see chart attached). The range listed is the minimum points needed to achieve the corresponding HEDI points.
Developing (3 - 8 points) Results are below District- or BOCES-adopted expectations for growth or achievement for grade/subject.	An 65-84 average of all five 2013 Regents exams listed above will be considered highly effective (see chart attached). The range listed is the minimum points needed to achieve the corresponding HEDI points.
Effective (9 - 17points) Results meet District- or BOCES-adopted expectations for growth or achievement for grade/subject.	An 55-64 average of all five 2013 Regents exams listed above will be considered highly effective (see chart attached). The range listed is the minimum points needed to achieve the corresponding HEDI points.
Ineffective (0 - 2 points) Results are well below District- or BOCES-adopted expectations for growth or achievement for grade/subject.	An 0-54 average of all five 2013 Regents exams listed above will be considered highly effective (see chart attached). The range listed is the minimum points needed to achieve the corresponding HEDI points.

3.10) High School Math

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

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

	Locally-Selected Measure from List of Approved Measures	Assessment
Algebra 1	6(ii) School wide measure computed locally	Algebra 1, Global History, US History, English 11 and Living Environment Regents Exams
Geometry	6(ii) School wide measure computed locally	Algebra 1, Global History, US History, English 11 and Living Environment Regents Exams
Algebra 2	6(ii) School wide measure computed locally	Algebra 1, Global History, US History, English 11 and Living Environment Regents Exams

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

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

Use this box, if needed, to describe the general process for assigning HEDI categories for these grades/subjects in this subcomponent. If needed, you may upload a table or graphic at 3.13, below.	The average of each student's scores on each of the five Regents exams necessary for graduation will be calculated. The average of all combined scores will be applied to the attached 0-100 conversion chart. The five Regents used will be Algebra 1, Global History, US History, English 11 and Living Environment. All High School teachers will receive the same score.
Highly Effective (18 - 20 points) Results are well above District- or BOCES-adopted expectations for growth or achievement for grade/subject.	An 85-100 average of all five 2013 Regents exams listed above will be considered highly effective (see chart attached). The range listed is the minimum points needed to achieve the corresponding HEDI points.
Effective (9 - 17 points) Results meet District- or BOCES-adopted expectations for growth or achievement for grade/subject.	An 65-84 average of all five 2013 Regents exams listed above will be considered highly effective (see chart attached). The range listed is the minimum points needed to achieve the corresponding HEDI points.
Developing (3 - 8 points) Results are below District- or BOCES-adopted expectations for growth or achievement for grade/subject.	An 55-64 average of all five 2013 Regents exams listed above will be considered highly effective (see chart attached). The range listed is the minimum points needed to achieve the corresponding HEDI points.
Ineffective (0 - 2 points) Results are well below District- or BOCES-adopted expectations for growth or achievement for grade/subject.	An 0-54 average of all five 2013 Regents exams listed above will be considered highly effective (see chart attached). The range listed is the minimum points needed to achieve the corresponding HEDI points.

3.11) High School English Language Arts

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

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

	Locally-Selected Measure from List of Approved Measures	Assessment
Grade 9 ELA	6(ii) School wide measure computed locally	Algebra 1, Global History, US History, English 11 and Living Environment Regents Exams
Grade 10 ELA	6(ii) School wide measure computed locally	Algebra 1, Global History, US History, English 11 and Living Environment Regents Exams
Grade 11 ELA	6(ii) School wide measure computed locally	Algebra 1, Global History, US History, English 11 and Living Environment Regents Exams

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

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

Use this box, if needed, to describe the general process for assigning HEDI categories for these grades/subjects in this subcomponent. If needed, you may upload a table or graphic at 3.13, below.	The average of each student's scores on each of the five Regents exams necessary for graduation will be calculated. The average of all combined scores will be applied to the attached 0-100 conversion chart. The five Regents used will be Algebra 1, Global History, US History, English 11 and Living Environment. All High School teachers will receive the same score.
Highly Effective (18 - 20 points) Results are well above District- or BOCES-adopted expectations for growth or achievement for grade/subject.	An 85-100 average of all five 2013 Regents exams listed above will be considered highly effective (see chart attached). The range listed is the minimum points needed to achieve the corresponding HEDI points.
Effective (9 - 17 points) Results meet District- or BOCES-adopted expectations for growth or achievement for grade/subject.	An 65-84 average of all five 2013 Regents exams listed above will be considered highly effective (see chart attached). The range listed is the minimum points needed to achieve the corresponding HEDI points.
Developing (3 - 8 points) Results are below District- or BOCES-adopted expectations for growth or achievement for grade/subject.	An 55-64 average of all five 2013 Regents exams listed above will be considered highly effective (see chart attached). The range listed is the minimum points needed to achieve the corresponding HEDI points.
Ineffective (0 - 2 points) Results are well below District- or BOCES-adopted expectations for growth or achievement for grade/subject.	An 0-54 average of all five 2013 Regents exams listed above will be considered highly effective (see chart attached). The range listed is the minimum points needed to achieve the corresponding HEDI points.

3.12) All Other Courses

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

Course(s) or Subject(s)	Locally-Selected Measure from List of Approved Measures	Assessment
All other courses K-5	6(ii) School wide measure computed locally	Math 5 State Assessment Spring 2013

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 local adjustments.

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.

Not applicable

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 Tuesday, November 06, 2012
Updated Wednesday, January 02, 2013

Page 1

4.1) Teacher Practice Rubric

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

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

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

Danielson's Framework for Teaching (2011 Revised Edition)

(No response)

4.2) Points Within Other Measures

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

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

Is the following points assignment applicable to all teachers?

Yes

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

(No response)

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

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

(No response)

4.3) Survey Tools (if applicable)

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

(No response)

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

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

4.4) Assurances

Please check all of the boxes below:

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

4.5) Process for Assigning Points and Determining HEDI Ratings

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

a. For tenured unit members' yearly evaluations will consist of a minimum of two observations – one announced and one unannounced - and another structured review consistent with Commissioner's regulations.

b. For non-tenured members, yearly evaluations will consist of a minimum of three (3) observations (Two (2) announced and one (1) unannounced) and another structured review consistent with the Commissioner's Regulations.

c. In addition to the observations, there will be three (3) collegial conversations between a member and an administrator during the school year as set forth in Section 4 below. Additional meetings may be scheduled as needed.

d. Unit members will be evaluated utilizing the approved rubric.

e. Evaluations scores will be recorded on a running record throughout the school year as a result of a professional conversation.

f. Scores will be calculated by assigning a rating to subcomponent areas observed or demonstrated (i.e. Domain 1a) of Highly Effective, Effective, Developing, or Ineffective. A corresponding number shall be assigned to each rating (4 for Highly Effective, 3 for Effective, 2 for Developing, and 1 for Ineffective). Final rubric score then will be calculated by averaging the total of all scores (one domain could have multiple scores, or no scores at all.) Each subcomponent score will have equal weight in calculating the average.

g. Other Structured Review. At the September Collegial Conversation, each unit member will indicate his or her goals for meeting the requirements of the four (4) areas of the rubric being addressed by the other structured review. Although there is flexibility as to the activities that a member may choose (i.e. lesson plans, student portfolios, and other artifacts of teacher practices) it is important that a unit member's rating will be based on the agreed upon criteria. The teacher and administrator will provide evidence throughout the year to support the unit member's progress, but it is the unit member's responsibility to provide sufficient evidence to support the ratings found in the rubric.

h. The average score shall be converted to a 0-60 score based on the conversion chart attached below. Rounding rules will apply (all decimal values will be rounded down).

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

[assets/survey-uploads/5091/219813-eka9yMJ855/Other Measures 60 Point Conversion Scale.doc](#)

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

Highly Effective: Overall performance and results exceed NYS Teaching Standards.	Teachers who score 3.5 - 4.0 as outline above will have an overall scoring range of 59-60 based on the conversion chart attached under 4.5 above
Effective: Overall performance and results meet NYS Teaching Standards.	Teachers who score 2.5-3.4 as outline above will have an overall scoring range of 57-58 based on the conversion chart attached under 4.5 above
Developing: Overall performance and results need improvement in order to meet NYS Teaching Standards.	Teachers who score 1.5-2.4 as outline above will have an overall scoring range of 50-56 based on the conversion chart attached under 4.5 above
Ineffective: Overall performance and results do not meet NYS Teaching Standards.	Teachers who score 1.0-1.4 as outline above will have an overall scoring range of 0-49 based on the conversion chart attached under 4.5 above

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?

-
- In Person
-

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

-
- In Person
-

4.7) Observations of Tenured Teachers

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

By building principals or other trained administrators

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

By trained in-school peer teachers or other trained reviewers

Formal/Long	0
-------------	---

Informal/Short	0
----------------	---

Independent evaluators

Formal/Long	0
Informal/Short	0

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

-
- In Person
-

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

-
- In Person
-

5. Composite Scoring (Teachers)

Created Tuesday, November 06, 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 Tuesday, November 06, 2012

Updated Wednesday, January 02, 2013

Page 1

6.1) Assurances -- Improvement Plans

Please check the boxes below:

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

6.2) Attachment: Teacher Improvement Plan Forms

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

assets/survey-uploads/5265/219835-Df0w3Xx5v6/Teacher Improvement Plan.doc

6.3) Appeals Process

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

(1) the substance of the annual professional performance review

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

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

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

APPEALS PROCESS

Eligibility

Appeals are limited to tenured teachers with a composite rating of "Ineffective" or "Developing". AND whose 60 point rating is lower than either of their 20 point ratings. Unit members may submit written rebuttals of determinations of "Effective" and "Highly

Effective” if desired, but may not appeal such ratings at this time.

Subjects for Appeals

Appeals are limited to adherence to commissioner’s regulations, compliance to negotiated procedures, and adherence to education law. Additionally, areas designated by the teacher in the Running Record, with their supporting documentation attached at the time, in the observation process that are contrary to the evaluator’s ratings, may serve as the basis for an appeal subject to the criteria as outlined above.

One Appeal

A teacher may not file multiple appeals regarding the same performance review or teacher improvement plan (TIP). All grounds for appeal, as outlined above, must be raised with specificity within one appeal. Any grounds not raised at the time the appeal is filed shall be deemed waived.

Burden of Proof

The teacher filing the appeal has the burden of demonstrating a right to the relief requested and the burden of establishing the facts upon which relief is sought.

Decision-Making

Appeals shall be submitted to the Superintendent. Upon receipt of such appeal, the Superintendent, or designee, shall notify the President of the Association. A committee of two [2] teachers, who have received a composite rating of Effective or Highly Effective, selected by the President of the Association, and two [2] administrators, neither of whom evaluated the appellant, selected by the Superintendent, or designee, shall be convened to hear the appeal. If a Principal is selected to the committee, he/she must also have received a composite rating of Effective or Highly Effective.

Decision

A majority opinion is required to sustain the appeal. The decision shall be based on the written record, comprised of the teacher’s appeal papers and any documentary evidence which accompanied the appeal, as well as the District’s response to the appeal and additional documentary evidence, (written, tangible, or otherwise) submitted with such papers. Such decision shall be final and binding on the parties, and shall not be subject to any further appeal through any other process including grievance or arbitration procedures contained in the parties’ collective bargaining agreement. A written decision, sustaining or denying the appeal, shall be sent to the appellant, evaluator of the appellant, and Superintendent, setting forth the reasons and factual basis for each determination on each of the specific issues raised by the appeal. If the appeal is sustain, the rating may be modified or set aside (new evaluation in whole or in part). In the case of a 2-2 split, while the appeal is denied, the rationale for both views will be stated in writing.

Timeframe

All appeals must be submitted, in writing, to the Superintendent no later than ten [10] calendar days from receipt of the composite score. The evaluator of the appellant has five [5] calendar days to respond to the appeal upon notification from the committee. The committee has ten [10] calendar days, from receipt of the above information, to meet, render a decision and notify all parties of said decision.

Exclusivity of Appeal Procedure

The appeal procedure shall constitute the exclusive means for challenging any rating, scoring, or element of observation/evaluation commentary related to a teacher’s APPR or TIP.

Exclusivity of Grievance Procedure

Only those areas deemed in violation of the contractually negotiated APPR procedures may be subject to the grievance procedures. Such areas include adherence to the negotiated time frames, minimum number of observations and meetings, and use of appropriate forms. The resolution requested will not be more than the appropriate forms are utilized, or that the agreed to observation and/or meetings are completed. At no time may the grievance procedure be utilized to challenge the results of an observation or evaluation, the rating or scoring of any rubric component, or the commentary of a teacher’s APPR. Should a grievance become necessary, the goal would be to correct a process flaw immediately so that the evaluation process may continue with the negotiated intent intact. Grievance procedures will be conducted in a timely and expeditious manner.

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.

EVALUATOR TRAINING:

1. The District will certify lead evaluators as qualified to conduct teacher evaluations under 3012-c and Commissioner's Regulation

30-2. [30-2.9(a)]

2. The District will ensure training of evaluators and lead evaluators through the Genesee Valley BOCES Educational Partnership and other neighboring BOCES RTTT Evaluator Training programs throughout the 2012-13 school year. Evaluator training will occur regionally and will replicate the recommended State Education Department ("SED") model certification process incorporating the Regulations that were enacted to implement Education Law 3012-c. Evaluators will attend this BOCES training throughout the year at a duration as offered by Genesee Valley BOCES. This training will include the following Requirements for Lead Evaluators/Evaluators:

of training per each of the required components, including but not limited to:

- a. NYS Teaching and Leadership Standards
- b. Evidence-Based Observation Techniques
- c. Application and use of Student Growth and Value-Added Models
- d. Application and Use of State-Approved Rubrics
- e. Application and Use of State-Approved Locally Developed Measures of Student Achievement
- f. Use of the Statewide Instructional Reporting System
- g. The Scoring Methodology Used by the Department and/or Your District
- h. Specific Considerations in Evaluating Teachers and Principals of ELL and SWD
- i. Work Toward Inter-Rater Reliability

3. School visits required by this APPR plan may be commenced September 5, 2012, provided of course, that the administrator performing such visits are properly credentialed school administrators for such purpose. [30-2.9(a)]

INTER-RATER RELIABILITY

Lead evaluators will maintain inter-rater reliability over time. Evaluators and lead evaluators will be trained through the Genesee Valley BOCES Educational Partnership and other neighboring BOCES RTTT Evaluator Training programs in maintaining inter-rater reliability. As part of such training, Lead Evaluators will participate in activities to promote inter-rater reliability at least three times per school year.

RECERTIFICATION

Lead evaluators and evaluators who received initial certification will be recertified with at least two half day trainings to review the process for effectively conducting observations through the collection of evidence, bias-awareness exercises and calibration of ratings..

6.5) Assurances -- Evaluators

Please check the boxes below:

-
- Checked
-

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

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

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

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

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

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

(7) use of the Statewide Instructional Reporting System

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

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

• Checked

6.6) Assurances -- Teachers

Please check all of the boxes below:

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

6.7) Assurances -- Data

Please check all of the boxes below:

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

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

Created Wednesday, November 28, 2012

Updated Thursday, December 27, 2012

Page 1

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

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

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

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

K-5
6-12
(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.	Both building principals will have SED provided Growth measures, so HEDI ratings will be consistent with SED rating categories.
Highly Effective (18 - 20 points) Results are well above state average for similar students (or District goals if no state test).	N/A
Effective (9 - 17 points) Results meet state average for similar students (or District goals if no state test).	N/A
Developing (3 - 8 points) Results are below state average for similar students (or District goals if no state test).	N/A
Ineffective (0 - 2 points) Results are well below state average for similar students (or District goals if no state test).	N/A

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

(No response)

7.4) Special Considerations for Comparable Growth Measures

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

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

(No response)

7.5) Principals with More Than One Growth Measure

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

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

7.6) Assurances -- Comparable Growth Measures

Please check all of the boxes below:

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

8. Local Measures (Principals)

Created Wednesday, November 28, 2012

Updated Wednesday, January 02, 2013

Page 1

Locally-Selected Measures of Student Achievement or Growth

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

Grade Configuration	Locally-Selected Measure from List of Approved Measures	Assessment
K-5	(d) measures used by district for teacher evaluation	Genesee Valley Educational Partnership developed ELA summative assessments Grades K, 1, 2, 3
6-12	(d) measures used by district for teacher evaluation	Genesee Valley Educational Partnership developed ELA and Math summative assessments in grades 6, 7, and 8 and the following New York State Regents Exams: English, Global, U.S. History, Algebra I, and Living Environment.

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>The K-5 Principal will receive a Local Measure of Achievement based on the percentage of students who meet or exceed established proficiency benchmarks for grades K-3 on Genesee Valley Educational Partnership summative assessments in ELA. Proficiency is defined as earning a 65% or higher score on the assessment. HEDI Methodology: Determine what percentage of all students taking the Genesee Valley Educational Partnership developed ELA summative assessment in grades K, 1, 2, and 3 earned a score of 65% or higher. This will be done by taking the total number of students that scored a 65% or higher on all Genesee Valley Educational Partnership developed ELA summative assessments in grades K, 1, 2, and 3 and dividing that number by the total number of students who took the exam. The resulting percent will be applied to the attached HEDI chart.</p>
--	---

The 6-12 Principal will receive a Local Measure of Achievement based on the average percentage of students passing the “gatekeeper” Regents exams in English, Global, U.S. History, Algebra I, Living Environment, and the Genesee Valley Educational Partnership developed ELA and Math summative assessments in grades 6, 7, and 8. Proficiency is defined as earning a 65 or higher score on the assessment. HEDI Methodology: 11 content area assessments will be utilized. Part 1: Determine what percentage of all students taking the five gatekeeper Regents earned a score of 65 or higher. This will be done by taking the total number of students that scored a 65 or higher on all five Regents exams and dividing that number by the total number of students who took all five Regents exams. Part 2: Determine what percentage of all students taking the six Genesee Valley Educational Partnership developed ELA and Math summative assessments in grades 6, 7, and 8 earned a score of 65% or higher. This will be done by taking the total number of students that scored a 65% or higher on all Genesee Valley Educational Partnership developed ELA and Math summative assessments in grades 6, 7, and 8 and dividing that number by the total number of students who took all six Genesee Valley Educational Partnership developed ELA and Math summative assessments in grades 6, 7, and 8 exams. Part 3: The final two averages from Part 1 and Part 2 will be added together and divided by 2 for the final building wide average. This will be the average used to compute the HEDI score.

Principals will receive a rating of Highly Effective if results are well above the District goal (86-100% of students reached the target). Principals will receive a rating of Effective if results meet the district goal (55-85% of students reached the target). Principals will receive a rating of Developing if results are below the District goal (30-54% of students met the target). Principals will receive a rating of Ineffective if results are well below the District goal (0-29% of students met the target)

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

Principals will receive a rating of Highly Effective if results are well above the District goal (86-100% of students reached the target).

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

Principals will receive a rating of Effective if results meet the district goal (55-85% of students reached the target).

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

Principals will receive a rating of Developing if results are below the District goal (30-54% of students met the target).

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

Principals will receive a rating of Ineffective if results are well below the District goal (0-29% of students met the target)

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

(No response)

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

assets/survey-uploads/5366/253742-qBFVOWF7fC/LOCAL HEDI CONVERSION TABLE - PRINCIPALS.docx

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

Use this box, if needed, to describe the process for assigning HEDI categories. If needed, you may upload a table or graphic below.	No other grade configurations apply.
Highly Effective (18 - 20 points) Results are well above District- or BOCES-adopted expectations for growth or achievement for grade/subject.	No other grade configurations apply.
Effective (9- 17 points) Results meet District- or BOCES-adopted expectations for growth or achievement for grade/subject.	No other grade configurations apply.
Developing (3 - 8 points) Results are below District- or BOCES-adopted expectations for growth or achievement for grade/subject.	No other grade configurations apply.
Ineffective (0 - 2 points) Results are well below District- or BOCES-adopted expectations for growth or achievement for grade/subject.	No other grade configurations apply.

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.

(No response)

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.

(No response)

8.5) Assurances

Please check all of the boxes below:

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

9. Other Measures of Effectiveness (Principals)

Created Monday, December 03, 2012
Updated Wednesday, January 02, 2013

Page 1

9.1) Principal Practice Rubric

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

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

Multidimensional Principal Performance Rubric

(No response)

9.2) Points Within Other Measures

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

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

Is the following points assignment for all principals?

Yes

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

(No response)

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

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

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

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

(No response)

9.3) Assurances -- Goals

Please check the boxes below (if applicable):

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

9.4) Sources of Evidence (if applicable)

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

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

9.5) Survey Tool(s) (if applicable)

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

(No response)

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

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

9.6) Assurances

Please check all of the boxes below:

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

9.7) Process for Assigning Points and Determining HEDI Ratings

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

To assure that all of the six 2008 ISLLC Standards are evaluated each year, we will use the Multidimensional Principal Performance Rubric. The Superintendent will visit each principal's building twice, and principals will submit other evidence to address the standards not covered by the school visits. Final scores for the 60 points will be tied to final average rubric scores between 0-4. Each principal's rating will be calculated using the "Rubric Score to Sub-Component Conversion Chart." (see attachment) Note that rounding rules will apply (any score with a decimal value less than .5 will be rounded to the nearest whole number below, any score with a decimal value greater than or equal to .5 will be rounded up to the next whole number.) unless explicitly stated otherwise on the attached chart. All rubric scores for every component of the 60 points will be documented on the "Annual Administrative Professional Performance Review" document (see attached). The average sub-component score (0-60 points) will be added to the "Final APPR Evaluation Form for Principals" upon completion (see attached). The Superintendent will be responsible for scheduling two visits to each principal's building. For the "other evidence" to be submitted, each principal and the Superintendent will identify what evidence will be submitted and the due date.

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/5143/261784-pMADJ4gk6R/Principals APPR Rubric Document_1.docx

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

Highly Effective: Overall performance and results exceed standards.	Principals will receive a rating of Highly Effective for the "other measures" sub-component when they earn a final average rubric score between 3.5-4.0, as identified on the conversion chart.
Effective: Overall performance and results meet standards.	Principals will receive a rating of Effective for the "other measures" sub-component when they earn a final average rubric score between 2.5-3.4, as identified on the conversion chart.
Developing: Overall performance and results need improvement in order to meet standards.	Principals will receive a rating of Developing for the "other measures" sub-component when they earn a final average rubric score between 1.5-2.4, as identified on the conversion

Ineffective: Overall performance and results do not meet standards.	chart. Principals will receive a rating of Ineffective for the "other measures" sub-component when they earn a final average rubric score between 1.0-1.4, as identified on the conversion chart.
---	--

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

Tenured Principals

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

10. Composite Scoring (Principals)

Created Monday, December 03, 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 Monday, December 03, 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/5276/261829-Df0w3Xx5v6/Principal Improvement Plan.docx](#)

11.3) Appeals Process

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

- (1) the substance of the annual professional performance review

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

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

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

APPEALS PROCESS
The purpose of the internal appeals process is to foster and nurture growth of the professional staff in order to maintain a highly qualified and effective work force. The following appeal process is designed to further this goal. The burden of proof will be on the appellant to establish by the preponderance of the evidence that the rating given by the lead evaluator was not justified.

- All tenured and probationary principals who meet the appeal process criteria may use this appeal process.
- Said appeal process will be available to employees to appeal either a procedural error in the evaluation process or appeal a

substantive portion of the evaluation. All aspects of an evaluation must be presented when initiating an appeal. A principal cannot file multiple appeals on the same review, thus all issues must be raised at the time the appeal is filed or are deemed waived.

• Only principals who receive a "Developing" or "Ineffective" rating in one or more of the evaluative criteria for (a) an observation, or (b) an annual professional performance review (composite score) may process an appeal. The evaluative criteria categories that may be appealed are the elements associated with the Multidimensional Principal Performance Rubric (MPPR) or a procedural error.

1. **GOVERNING BODY TO ADJUDICATE THE APPEAL:** The governing body will be defined as the "Principal Evaluation Appeals Committee" (PEAC). The PEAC make up will be:

a. One Superintendent-Selected administrator. The administrator appointed to the PEAC will not be the administrator who authored the evaluation and will be chosen by the Superintendent or his/her designee. Said appointee will be a practicing administrator, with knowledge and understanding of the MPPR.

b. Two Principal-Selected administrators. The principals appointed to the PEAC will be chosen by the Principal (also the appellant) or his/her designee. Said appointees will be practicing administrators, with knowledge and understanding of the MPPR.

2. **APPEALS DECISION MAKING**

a. The PEAC will have the right to ask questions of the appellant, the lead evaluator, and any other relevant participants. They have the right to collect any and all information necessary to make an informed decision.

b. The PEAC will reach their findings (see Section 4 below) through unanimous vote.

c. If a unanimous vote is not reached, the PEAC will write up the opposing viewpoints and submit the opposing viewpoints to the lead evaluator, the appellant, and the Superintendent.

d. At this point, a District Evaluation Appeals Committee (DEAC) made up of two (2) Superintendent appointees and one (1) principal appointee will review the evaluation and position papers and by majority vote determine which of the opposing viewpoints will be the final outcome.

3. **TIMELINE**

a. The employee must attempt to resolve the appeal informally within five (5) business days of receipt of the evaluation through an informal conference with the lead evaluator.

b. The employee must forward the evaluation appeal within five (5) business days of an unsuccessful informal conference in writing to the Superintendent of Schools, requesting a review by the PEAC to be completed.

c. The Superintendent will charge the PEAC to hold a Conference within five (5) business days of receipt of the appeal.

d. The PEAC will issue its findings to the Superintendent, the principal and the lead evaluator within five (5) business days of the Conference.

e. If the DEAC is utilized, they will be given five (5) business days to meet and render their final decision by majority vote.

4. **COMMITTEE FINDINGS**

a. The PEAC/DEAC is empowered to overturn a section of the evaluation and assign a new rating to that section. Said ability to overturn a section of the evaluation does not negate the fact that the evaluation was timely completed.

b. The PEAC/DEAC is empowered to overturn the entire evaluation if the evaluation was procedurally flawed and assign a new rating where appropriate.

c. The PEAC/DEAC is empowered to overturn a section or the entire evaluation and require a course of action so as to enhance the professional growth of the principal.

d. The PEAC/DEAC is empowered to affirm the evaluation and require a course of action so as to enhance the professional growth of the principal.

e. The PEAC/DEAC is empowered to affirm the evaluation.

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.

EVALUATOR TRAINING:

1. The District will certify lead evaluators as qualified to conduct principal evaluations under 3012-c and Commissioner's Regulation 30-2. [30-2.9(a)]

2. The District will ensure training of evaluators and lead evaluators through the Genesee Valley BOCES Educational Partnership and other neighboring BOCES RTTT Evaluator Training programs throughout the 2012-13 school year. Evaluator training will occur regionally and will replicate the recommended State Education Department ("SED") model certification process incorporating the Regulations that were enacted to implement Education Law 3012-c. Evaluators will attend this BOCES training throughout the year at a duration as offered by Genesee Valley BOCES. This training will include the following Requirements for Lead

Evaluators/Evaluators:

of training per each of the required components, including but not limited to:

- a. NYS Teaching and Leadership Standards*
- b. Evidence-Based Observation Techniques*
- c. Application and use of Student Growth and Value-Added Models*
- d. Application and Use of State-Approved Rubrics*
- e. Application and Use of State-Approved Locally Developed Measures of Student Achievement*
- f. Use of the Statewide Instructional Reporting System*
- g. The Scoring Methodology Used by the Department and/or Your District*
- h. Specific Considerations in Evaluating Teachers and Principals of ELL and SWD*
- i. Work Toward Inter-Rater Reliability*

3. School visits required by this APPR plan may be commenced September 5, 2012, provided of course, that the administrator performing such visits are properly credentialed school administrators for such purpose. [30-2.9(a)]

INTER-RATER RELIABILITY

Lead evaluators will maintain inter-rater reliability over time. Evaluators and lead evaluators will be trained through the Genesee Valley BOCES Educational Partnership and other neighboring BOCES RTTT Evaluator Training programs in maintaining inter-rater reliability. As part of such training, Lead Evaluators will participate in activities to promote inter-rater reliability at least three times per school year, and as many times as needed to develop at least three benchmarks of reasonable reliability as verified by the District Superintendent, within said school year. See 30-2.9(b)(5)

RECERTIFICATION

Lead evaluators and evaluators who received initial certification will be recertified with at least two half day trainings to review the process for effectively conducting observations through the collection of evidence, bias-awareness exercises and calibration of ratings..

11.5) Assurances -- Evaluators

Please check the boxes below:

-
- Checked
-

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

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

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

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

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

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

(7) use of the Statewide Instructional Reporting System

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

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

-
- Checked
-

11.6) Assurances -- Principals

Please check all of the boxes below:

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

11.7) Assurances -- Data

Please check all of the boxes below:

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

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

Checked

12. Joint Certification of APPR Plan

Created Wednesday, December 05, 2012

Updated Thursday, January 03, 2013

Page 1

12.1) Upload the Joint Certification of the APPR Plan

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

[assets/survey-uploads/5581/265973-3Uqgn5g9Iu/District Certification Form APPR Plan.pdf](assets/survey-uploads/5581/265973-3Uqgn5g9Iu/District%20Certification%20Form%20APPR%20Plan.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.

SLO CONVERSION CHART

RATING	INEFFECTIVE	DEVELOPING	EFFECTIVE	HIGHLY EFFECTIVE
Points	0-2 Points	3-8 Points	9 -17 Points	18-20 Points
Percentages of students whose progress meets targeted expectations.	0 – 29% of students meet target 0 – 10% = 0 points 11- 20% = 1 point 21 – 29%= 2 points	30 – 54% of students meet target 30-35% = 3 points 36-40% = 4 points 41-45% = 5 points 46-50% = 6 points 51-52% = 7 points 53-54% = 8 points	55 – 85% of students meet target 55-60% = 9 points 61-65% = 10 points 66-69% = 11 points 70-72% = 12 points 73-75% = 13 points 76-78% = 14 points 79-81% = 15 points 82-83% = 16 points 84-85% = 17 points	86% + of students meet target 86-90% = 18 points 91-94% = 19 points 95-100% = 20 points

Local Measures Parameters

**THIS CHART TO BE USED FOR AGREED UPON SPECIFIC SCORES FOR
LOCAL MEASURES OF STUDENT ACHEIVEMENT**

LOCAL 0 – 100 POINT SCALE CONVERSION CHART (To be used for High School Regents Courses)		LOCAL 20/15 1 – 4 POINT CONVERSION CHART (To be used for 3-8 Math Assessments)	
BASED ON A 100 POINT SCALE	CONVERTED TO A 1 – 4 RATING	BASED ON A 1 – 4 RUBRIC RATING	20 POINT/ 15 POINT CONVERSION
INEFFECTIVE		INEFFECTIVE	
0 -14	1	1	0 0
15 – 27	1.1	1.1	1 1
28 – 40	1.2	1.2	2 2
41 – 53	1.3	1.3	2 2
54	1.4	1.4	2 2
DEVELOPING		DEVELOPING	
55	1.5	1.5	3 3
56	1.6	1.6	3 3
57	1.7	1.7	4 4
58	1.8	1.8	4 4
59	1.9	1.9	5 5
60	2.0	2.0	6 6
61	2.1	2.1	6 6
62	2.2	2.2	7 7
63	2.3	2.3	7 7
64	2.4	2.4	8 7
EFFECTIVE		EFFECTIVE	
65 – 66	2.5	2.5	9 8
67 – 68	2.6	2.6	10 9
69 – 70	2.7	2.7	10 10
71 – 72	2.8	2.8	11 11
73 – 74	2.9	2.9	12 11
75 – 76	3.0	3.0	13 12
77 – 78	3.1	3.1	14 12
79 – 81	3.2	3.2	15 13
82 – 83	3.3	3.3	16 13
84	3.4	3.4	17 13
HIGHLY EFFECTIVE		HIGHLY EFFECTIVE	
85 – 87	3.5	3.5	18 14
88 – 90	3.6	3.6	18 14
91 – 93	3.7	3.7	18 14
94 – 96	3.8	3.8	19 15
97 – 99	3.9	3.9	19 15
100	4.0	4.0	20 15

Local Measures Parameters

**THIS CHART TO BE USED FOR AGREED UPON SPECIFIC SCORES FOR
LOCAL MEASURES OF STUDENT ACHEIVEMENT**

LOCAL 0 – 100 POINT SCALE CONVERSION CHART (To be used for High School Regents Courses)		LOCAL 20/15 1 – 4 POINT CONVERSION CHART (To be used for 3-8 Math Assessments)		
BASED ON A 100 POINT SCALE	CONVERTED TO A 1 – 4 RATING	BASED ON A 1 – 4 RUBRIC RATING	20 POINT/ 15 POINT CONVERSION	
INEFFECTIVE		INEFFECTIVE		
0 -14	1	1	0	0
15 – 27	1.1	1.1	1	1
28 – 40	1.2	1.2	2	2
41 – 53	1.3	1.3	2	2
54	1.4	1.4	2	2
DEVELOPING		DEVELOPING		
55	1.5	1.5	3	3
56	1.6	1.6	3	3
57	1.7	1.7	4	4
58	1.8	1.8	4	4
59	1.9	1.9	5	5
60	2.0	2.0	6	6
61	2.1	2.1	6	6
62	2.2	2.2	7	7
63	2.3	2.3	7	7
64	2.4	2.4	8	7
EFFECTIVE		EFFECTIVE		
65 – 66	2.5	2.5	9	8
67 – 68	2.6	2.6	10	9
69 – 70	2.7	2.7	10	10
71 – 72	2.8	2.8	11	11
73 – 74	2.9	2.9	12	11
75 – 76	3.0	3.0	13	12
77 – 78	3.1	3.1	14	12
79 – 81	3.2	3.2	15	13
82 – 83	3.3	3.3	16	13
84	3.4	3.4	17	13
HIGHLY EFFECTIVE		HIGHLY EFFECTIVE		
85 – 87	3.5	3.5	18	14
88 – 90	3.6	3.6	18	14
91 – 93	3.7	3.7	18	14
94 – 96	3.8	3.8	19	15
97 – 99	3.9	3.9	19	15
100	4.0	4.0	20	15

The follow conversion chart will be used to Convert a Rubric Score to a Composite Score”

Total Average Rubric Score	Category	Conversion score for composite
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

1.342		42
1.350		43
1.358		44
1.367		45
1.375		46
1.383		47
1.392		48
1.400		49
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 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 59-60		
3.5		59
3.6		59.3
3.7		59.5
3.8		59.8
3.9		60
4		60.25 (round to 60)

Teacher Improvement Plan (TIP) Form
(To be completed jointly by the Teacher and the Administrator)

Name: _____ School: _____

TIP is based on composite score from _____ school year → Grade/ Subject: _____

School year TIP will be implemented: _____ → Grade/ Subject: _____

Date of initial TIP conference: _____ → Grade/ Subject: _____

Date of Follow-up Meeting (s): _____

AREA (S) NEEDING IMPROVEMENT	ACTION PLAN (Description of Steps to be taken)	TIMELINE FOR COMPLETION	EVIDENCE OF COMPLETION

Teacher Comments:

Administrator Comments:

To be signed when Teacher Improvement Plan is Initiated:	Action Steps Completed	Satisfactory Progress	Comments
CIRCLE: YES NO	CIRCLE: YES NO	CIRCLE: YES NO	(Indicate if there are Comments written on the back of this form)
Teacher Signature: _____ Date: _____	Teacher Initials/Date: _____	Teacher Initials/Date: _____	
Union Representative Signature: _____ Date: _____	Union Rep. Initials/Date: _____	Union Rep. Initials/Date: _____	
Administrator Signature: _____ Date: _____	Admin. Initials/Date: _____	Admin. Initials/Date: _____	
Superintendent Signature: _____ Date: _____	Superint. Initials/Date: _____	Superint. Initials/Date: _____	

Keshequa Central School District

Principal Evaluation

LOCAL HEDI CONVERSION TABLE

HIGHLY EFFECTIVE			EFFECTIVE									DEVELOPING					INEFFECTIVE			
20	19	18	17	16	15	14	<u>13</u>	12	11	10	9	8	7	6	5	4	3	2	1	0
95-100%	91-94%	86-90%	84-85%	82-83%	79-81%	76-78%	73-75%	70-72%	66-69%	61-65%	55-60%	53-54%	51-52%	46-50%	41-45%	36-40%	30-35%	21-29%	11-20%	0-10%

LOCAL HEDI CONVERSION TABLE – WITH VALUE ADDED MODEL

HIGHLY EFFECTIVE			EFFECTIVE									DEVELOPING					INEFFECTIVE			
15	15	14	13	13	12	12	11	11	10	9	8	7	7	6	5	4	3	2	1	0
95-100%	91-94%	86-90%	84-85%	82-83%	79-81%	76-78%	73-75%	70-72%	66-69%	61-65%	55-60%	53-54%	51-52%	46-50%	41-45%	36-40%	30-35%	21-29%	11-20%	0-10%

Rubric Score to Sub-Component Conversion Chart
Principals' APPR

TOTAL AVERAGE RUBRIC SCORE	HEDI RATING CATEGORY	CONVERSION SCORE FOR COMPOSITE
	Ineffective 0-49	
1.0		0
1.1		12
1.2		25
1.3		37
1.4		49
	Developing 50-56	
1.5		50
1.6		50.7
1.7		51.4
1.8		52.1
1.9		52.8
2.0		53.5
2.1		54.2
2.2		54.9
2.3		55.6
2.4		56.3
	Effective 57-58	
2.5		57
2.6		57.2
2.7		57.4
2.8		57.6
2.9		57.8
3.0		58
3.1		58.2
3.2		58.4
3.3		58.6 (round to 58)
3.4		58.8 (round to 58)
	Highly Effective 59-60	
3.5		59
3.6		59.3
3.7		59.5
3.8		59.8
3.9		60
4.0		60.25 (round to 60)

When necessary, rounding rules apply.



KESHEQUA CENTRAL SCHOOLS ANNUAL ADMINISTRATIVE PROFESSIONAL PERFORMANCE REVIEW

This portion of the annual MPPR meets the requirements for the 60% of principal observation as completed by the superintendent. 20% will be measured through state testing and the remaining 20% by local assessments.

Name: _____ (circle) Probationary/Tenured Year Completed: _____

School: _____ Tenure _____ Grade levels (circle): Elementary/Middle School/High School/District
 Definition of terms used in rating scale will be found in the scoring rubric. All items checked Ineffective must be explained in the comment section.

COMPONENTS OF PROFESSIONAL PRACTICE Based in ISLLC Standards	HIGHLY EFFECTIVE 4.0	EFFECTIVE 3.0	DEVELOPING 2.0	INEFFECTIVE 1.0
Standard 1: Setting a widely shared vision for learning				
Culture				
Sustainability				
Standard 2: Developing a school culture and instructional program conducive to student learning and staff professional growth				
Culture				
Instructional Program				
Capacity Building				
Sustainability and Strategic Planning Process				
Standard 3: Ensuring effective management of the organization, operation, and resources for a safe, efficient, and effective learning environment				
Capacity Building and Culture				
Sustainability				
Instructional Program				
Standard 4: Collaborating with faculty and community members, responding to diverse community interests and needs, and mobilizing community resources				
Strategic Planning Process: Inquiry				
Culture and Sustainability				
Standard 5: Acting with integrity, fairness, and in an ethical manner				
Sustainability				
Culture				
Standard 6: Understanding, responding to, and influencing the political, social, legal, and cultural contexts				
Sustainability				
Culture				
TOTALS				
COMMENTS:				TOTAL / 4.0
ADDITIONAL COMMENTS:				

This evaluation is based on:

- () Daily routine contacts with principal
- () Conferences with principal
- () Building observation
- () Other (specify)

Scoring Ranges (based on total points)
 Highly Effective: 59-60 Developing 50-56
 Effective: 57-58 Ineffective: 0-49

Principal's signature

Evaluator's signature

Date of Conference _____

*This signature indicates that the principal and evaluator together discussed this report. It does not necessarily denote agreement with all factors of the evaluation. The principal will have the right to submit a written response to such material and it shall be attached to the file copies.

Distribution of copies:

1. Principal/Superintendent/District Personnel File



Keshequa Central School District FINAL APPR EVALUATION FORM

Principal Name: _____

Date: _____

Multiple Measures Sub-Component Score	
Locally Selected Measures Sub-Component Score	
State Provided or Comparable Sub-Component Score	
Total Overall Composite Score	

FINAL HEDI RATING:
(based on information below)

Improvement Plan Required? Yes No

2012-2013 where there is no Value-Added Measure	Growth or Comparable Measures	Locally-selected Measures of growth or Achievement	Other Measures of Effectiveness	Overall Composite Score
Highly Effective	18-20	18-20	59-60	91-100
Effective	9-17	9-17	57-58	75-90
Developing	3-8	3-8	50-56	65-74
Ineffective	0-2	0-2	0-49	0-64

2012-2013 where Value-Added Measures apply	Growth or Comparable Measures	Locally-selected Measures of growth or Achievement	Other Measures of Effectiveness	Overall Composite Score
Highly Effective	22-25	14-15	59-60	91-100
Effective	10-21	8-13	57-58	75-90
Developing	3-9	3-7	50-56	65-74
Ineffective	0-2	0-2	0-49	0-64

Principal Signature**

Date

Evaluator Signature**

Date

**The above signatures indicate that all parties have reviewed this form. These signatures do not necessarily denote agreement with all factors of the evaluation.



**Keshequa Central School District
PRINCIPAL IMPROVEMENT PLAN**

Principal _____

Building _____

School Year _____

Multi-Dimensional Rubric Domains

Shared Vision & Learning

School Culture & Instructional Program

Safe, Efficient, Effective Learning Environment

Community

Political, Social, Economic, Legal, Cultural

Integrity, Fairness, Ethics

Areas of Refinement	Action Plan	Evidence of Improvement	Timeline For Completion of Recommended Strategies, Meetings and PIP Review	Status (Successfully Completed, Date, Continued, Date or Unsuccessfully Completed Date)

Signatures:

_____ Building Principal/Date

_____ Superintendent/Date

“The principal’s signature which appears on this form simply signifies that the principal has seen the form and is aware of the contents therein. It does not indicate approval or disapproval of the evaluation.”

“All evaluation practices shall be pursuant to the contractual agreement.”

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:

Donald R. Coull 01/02/13

Teachers Union President Signature: Date:

Stephanie A. Gehrig 1/3/13

Administrative Union President Signature: Date:

Paul M. Hunt 1/3/13

Board of Education President Signature: Date:

Debra Buchinger 1/3/13