



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

September 26, 2013

Revised

Paul Alioto, Superintendent
Dansville Central School District
284 Main Street
Dansville, NY 14437

Dear Superintendent Alioto:

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. 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: Kevin MacDonald

NOTE:

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

Created Tuesday, April 30, 2013

Updated Monday, August 19, 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 considers void any other signed agreements between and among parties in any form that prevent, conflict, or interfere with full implementation of the APPR Plan approved by the Department. The Department also 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 : 241001060000

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

241001060000

1.2) School District Name: DANSVILLE CSD

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

DANSVILLE CSD

1.3) Assurances

Please check all of the boxes below:

1.3) 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
1.3) 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

1.3) 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

1.4) Submission Status

For BOCES or charter schools that did not have an approved APPR plan for the 2012-13 school year only, is this a first-time submission, a re-submission, or a submission of material changes to an approved APPR plan? For districts, BOCES or charter schools that did have an approved APPR plan for the 2012-13 school year, this must be listed as a submission of material changes to the approved APPR plan.

Submission of material changes to an approved APPR plan

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

Created Tuesday, April 30, 2013

Updated Friday, August 30, 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, 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.	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 in the following format: “[Name of your District/Region/BOCES] developed [Grade] [Subject] Assessment.” For example, a BOCES-developed 7th grade Social Studies assessment would be written as follows: “GVEP-Developed Grade 7 Social Studies Assessment.”

2.2) Grades K-3 ELA

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

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

	ELA	Assessment
3	State assessment	3rd Grade State Assessment

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

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.	Analyzing baseline data, teachers will set individual targets to be approved by the principal. Teachers will be given HEDI ratings based on the percentage of students that meet their individual targets, as specified in the SLO. A table setting forth the ratings has been uploaded in section 2.11. This HEDI scale is applicable to all teachers requiring SLOs.
Highly Effective (18 - 20 points) Results are well-above state average for similar students (or District goals if no state test).	The work of the teacher results in exceptional student growth beyond expectations during the school year. 89% or more of students met or exceeded the SLO target.
Effective (9 - 17 points) Results meet state average for similar students (or District goals if no state test).	The work of the teacher results in acceptable, measurable and appropriate student growth. 75-88% of students met or exceeded the SLO target.
Developing (3 - 8 points) Results are below state average for similar students (or District goals if no state test).	The work of the teacher results in student growth that does not meet the established target. 65-74% of students met or exceeded the SLO target.

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

The work of the teacher does not result in acceptable student growth. Fewer than 65% of students met or exceeded the SLO target.

2.3) Grades K-3 Math

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

	Math	Assessment
K	State-approved 3rd party assessment	STAR MATH Enterprise
1	State-approved 3rd party assessment	STAR MATH Enterprise
2	State-approved 3rd party assessment	STAR MATH Enterprise

	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 measuring student growth on the assessments listed for this Task.

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.

Analyzing baseline data, teachers will set individual targets to be approved by the principal. Teachers will be given HEDI ratings based on the percentage of students that meet their individual targets, as specified in the SLO. A table setting forth the ratings has been uploaded in section 2.11. This HEDI scale is applicable to all teachers requiring SLOs.

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

The work of the teacher results in exceptional student growth beyond expectations during the school year. 89% or more of students met or exceeded the SLO target.

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

The work of the teacher results in acceptable, measurable and appropriate student growth. 75-88% of students met or exceeded the SLO target.

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

The work of the teacher results in student growth that does not meet the established target. 65-74% of students met or exceeded the SLO target.

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

The work of the teacher does not result in acceptable student growth. Fewer than 65% of students met or exceeded the SLO target.

2.4) Grades 6-8 Science

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

	Science	Assessment
6	Not applicable	Common branch
7	District, regional or BOCES-developed assessment	Dansville CSD Developed Science 7 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 measuring student growth on the assessments listed for this Task.

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.	Analyzing baseline data, teachers will set individual targets to be approved by the principal. Teachers will be given HEDI ratings based on the percentage of students that meet their individual targets, as specified in the SLO. A table setting forth the ratings has been uploaded in section 2.11. This HEDI scale is applicable to all teachers requiring SLOs.
Highly Effective (18 - 20 points) Results are well-above state average for similar students (or District goals if no state test).	The work of the teacher results in exceptional student growth beyond expectations during the school year. 89% or more of students met or exceeded the SLO target.
Effective (9 - 17 points) Results meet state average for similar students (or District goals if no state test).	The work of the teacher results in acceptable, measurable and appropriate student growth. 75-88% of students met or exceeded the SLO target.
Developing (3 - 8 points) Results are below state average for similar students (or District goals if no state test).	The work of the teacher results in student growth that does not meet the established target. 65-74% of students met or exceeded the SLO target.
Ineffective (0 - 2 points) Results are well-below state average for similar students (or District goals if no state test).	The work of the teacher does not result in acceptable student growth. Fewer than 65% of students met or exceeded the SLO target.

2.5) Grades 6-8 Social Studies

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

	Social Studies	Assessment
6	Not applicable	Common branch
7	District, regional or BOCES-developed assessment	Dansville CSD-Developed 7th Grade Social Studies Assessment
8	District, regional or BOCES-developed assessment	Dansville CSD-Developed 8th Grade Social Studies Assessment

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

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.	Analyzing baseline data, teachers will set individual targets to be approved by the principal. Teachers will be given HEDI ratings based on the percentage of students that meet their individual targets, as specified in the SLO. A table setting forth the ratings has been uploaded in section 2.11. This HEDI scale is applicable to all teachers requiring SLOs.
---	--

Highly Effective (18 - 20 points) Results are well-above District goals for similar students.	The work of the teacher results in exceptional student growth beyond expectations during the school year. 89% or more of students met or exceeded the SLO target.
Effective (9 - 17 points) Results meet District goals for similar students.	The work of the teacher results in acceptable, measurable and appropriate student growth. 75-88% of students met or exceeded the SLO target.
Developing (3 - 8 points) Results are below District goals for similar students.	The work of the teacher results in student growth that does not meet the established target. 65-74% of students met or exceeded the SLO target.
Ineffective (0 - 2 points) Results are well-below District goals for similar students.	The work of the teacher does not result in acceptable student growth. Fewer than 65% of students met or exceeded the SLO target.

2.6) High School Social Studies Regents Courses

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

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

		Assessment
Global 1	District, regional, or BOCES-developed assessment	Dansville CSD-Developed 9th Grade Global I 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 measuring student growth on the assessments listed for this Task.

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.	Analyzing baseline data, teachers will set individual targets to be approved by the principal. Teachers will be given HEDI ratings based on the percentage of students that meet their individual targets, as specified in the SLO. A table setting forth the ratings has been uploaded in section 2.11. This HEDI scale is applicable to all teachers requiring SLOs.
Highly Effective (18 - 20 points) Results are well-above District goals for similar students.	The work of the teacher results in exceptional student growth beyond expectations during the school year. 89% or more of students met or exceeded the SLO target.
Effective (9 - 17 points) Results meet District goals for similar students.	The work of the teacher results in acceptable, measurable and appropriate student growth. 75-88% of students met or exceeded the SLO target.
Developing (3 - 8 points) Results are below District goals for similar students.	The work of the teacher results in student growth that does not meet the established target. 65-74% of students met or exceeded the SLO target.

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

The work of the teacher does not result in acceptable student growth. Fewer than 65% of students met or exceeded the SLO target.

2.7) High School Science Regents Courses

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

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

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

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

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.

Analyzing baseline data, teachers will set individual targets to be approved by the principal. Teachers will be given HEDI ratings based on the percentage of students that meet their individual targets, as specified in the SLO. A table setting forth the ratings has been uploaded in section 2.11. This HEDI scale is applicable to all teachers requiring SLOs.

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

The work of the teacher results in exceptional student growth beyond expectations during the school year. 89% or more of students met or exceeded the SLO target.

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

The work of the teacher results in acceptable, measurable and appropriate student growth. 75-88% of students met or exceeded the SLO target.

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

The work of the teacher results in student growth that does not meet the established target. 65-74% of students met or exceeded the SLO target.

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

The work of the teacher does not result in acceptable student growth. Fewer than 65% of students met or exceeded the SLO target.

2.8) High School Math Regents Courses

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

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

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

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

NOTE: For Algebra 1, please specify whether your district will be offering the Integrated Algebra Regents, the Common Core Algebra Regents, or both and how the HEDI process will be adjusted accordingly.

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.	Analyzing baseline data, teachers will set individual targets to be approved by the principal. Teachers will be given HEDI ratings based on the percentage of students that meet their individual targets, as specified in the SLO. A table setting forth the ratings has been uploaded in section 2.11. This HEDI scale is applicable to all teachers requiring SLOs. The District will employ the NYS Integrated Algebra Regents in addition to the Common Core Algebra Regents. The District will use the higher of the two scores.
Highly Effective (18 - 20 points) Results are well-above District goals for similar students.	The work of the teacher results in exceptional student growth beyond expectations during the school year. 89% or more of students met or exceeded the SLO target.
Effective (9 - 17 points) Results meet District goals for similar students.	The work of the teacher results in acceptable, measurable and appropriate student growth. 75-88% of students met or exceeded the SLO target.
Developing (3 - 8 points) Results are below District goals for similar students.	The work of the teacher results in student growth that does not meet the established target. 65-74% of students met or exceeded the SLO target.
Ineffective (0 - 2 points) Results are well-below District goals for similar students.	The work of the teacher does not result in acceptable student growth. Fewer than 65% of students met or exceeded the SLO target.

2.9) High School English Language Arts

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

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

	High School English Courses	Assessment
Grade 9 ELA	District, regional or BOCES-developed assessment	DCSD Developed 9th Grade English Assessment
Grade 10 ELA	District, regional or BOCES-developed assessment	DCSD Developed 10th Grade English Assessment

Comparable Growth Measures subcomponent. Include any district-determined expectations for measuring student growth on the assessments listed for this Task.

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.	Analyzing baseline data, teachers will set individual targets to be approved by the principal. Teachers will be given HEDI ratings based on the percentage of students that meet their individual targets, as specified in the SLO. A table setting forth the ratings has been uploaded in section 2.11. This HEDI scale is applicable to all teachers requiring SLOs.
Highly Effective (18 - 20 points) Results are well-above District goals for similar students.	The work of the teacher results in exceptional student growth beyond expectations during the school year. 89% or more of students met or exceeded the SLO target.
Effective (9 - 17 points) Results meet District goals for similar students.	The work of the teacher results in acceptable, measurable and appropriate student growth. 75-88% of students met or exceeded the SLO target.
Developing (3 - 8 points) Results are below District goals for similar students.	The work of the teacher results in student growth that does not meet the established target. 65-74% of students met or exceeded the SLO target.
Ineffective (0 - 2 points) Results are well-below District goals for similar students.	The work of the teacher does not result in acceptable student growth. Fewer than 65% of students met or exceeded the SLO target.

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

(No response)

2.11) HEDI Tables or Graphics

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

assets/survey-uploads/5364/155795-TXEttx9bQW/State 20 HEDI Scale.xlsx

2.12) Locally Developed Controls

Describe any adjustments, controls, or other special considerations that will be used assigning points to a teacher's score for this subcomponent, 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 the following: student prior academic history, students with disabilities, English language learners, and students in poverty.

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://www.engageny.org/resource/student-learning-objectives-guidance-document).	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 Tuesday, April 30, 2013

Updated Friday, August 30, 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. Additionally, please provide a brief explanation in the HEDI general description box of why you have listed the grade/course as "Not Applicable" (e.g., district/BOCES does not offer this grade/subject; common branch teacher).

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 in the following format: "[Name of your District/Region/BOCES] developed [Grade] [Subject] Assessment." For example, a BOCES-developed 7th grade Social Studies assessment would be written as follows: "GVEP-Developed Grade 7 Social Studies Assessment."

NOTE: If your district/BOCES is using the same assessment for both the State growth and other comparable measures subcomponent and the locally-selected measures subcomponent, be sure that a *different* measure of student performance is being used with the assessment (e.g., achievement rather than growth; growth measured in a different manner).

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 measure that will be used as the locally-selected measure of student achievement. Then name the specific assessment that will be used with the locally-selected measure, listing the full name of the assessment.

	Locally-Selected Measure from List of Approved Measures	Assessment
4	6(ii) School wide measure computed locally	NYS Grade 3-8 Math & ELA Assessments
5	6(ii) School wide measure computed locally	NYS Grade 3-8 Math & ELA Assessments
6	6(ii) School wide measure computed locally	NYS Grade 3-8 Math & ELA Assessments
7	6(ii) School wide measure computed locally	NYS Grade 3-8 Math & ELA Assessments
8	6(ii) School wide measure computed locally	NYS Grade 3-8 Math & ELA Assessments

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.	Aspirational measure of success. We will use a school-wide measure based on district-wide goals for aspirational measures of success. HEDI points will be assigned based upon the increase in the percentage of students achieving a 3 and 4 on NYS assessments as compared to the previous school year. All teachers in a building will receive the same score based upon the percentage of students achieving aspirational measures.
Highly Effective (14 - 15 points) Results are well above District- or BOCES-adopted expectations for growth or achievement for grade/subject.	Please see chart in 3.3.
Effective (8- 13 points) Results meet District- or BOCES-adopted expectations for growth or achievement for grade/subject.	Please see chart in 3.3.
Developing (3 - 7 points) Results are below District- or BOCES-adopted expectations for growth or achievement for grade/subject.	Please see chart in 3.3.
Ineffective (0 - 2 points) Results are well below District- or BOCES-adopted expectations for growth or achievement for grade/subject.	Please see chart in 3.3.

3.2) Grades 4-8 Math

Using the drop-down boxes below, select the measure that will be used as the locally-selected measure of student achievement. Then name the specific assessment that will be used with the locally-selected measure, listing the full name of the assessment.

	Locally-Selected Measure from List of Approved Measures	Assessment
4	6(ii) School wide measure computed locally	NYS Grade 3-8 Math & ELA Assessments
5	6(ii) School wide measure computed locally	NYS Grade 3-8 Math & ELA Assessments
6	6(ii) School wide measure computed locally	NYS Grade 3-8 Math & ELA Assessments
7	6(ii) School wide measure computed locally	NYS Grade 3-8 Math & ELA Assessments
8	6(ii) School wide measure computed locally	NYS Grade 3-8 Math & ELA Assessments

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.	Aspirational measure of success. We will use a school-wide measure based on district-wide goals for aspirational measures of success. HEDI points will be assigned based upon the increase in the percentage of students achieving a 3 and 4 on NYS assessments as compared to the previous school year. All teachers in a building will receive the same score based upon the percentage of students achieving aspirational measures.
Highly Effective (14 - 15 points) Results are well above District- or BOCES-adopted expectations for growth or achievement for grade/subject.	Please see chart in 3.3.
Effective (8- 13 points) Results meet District- or BOCES-adopted expectations for growth or achievement for grade/subject.	Please see chart in 3.3.
Developing (3 - 7 points) Results are below District- or BOCES-adopted expectations for growth or achievement for grade/subject.	Please see chart in 3.3.
Ineffective (0 - 2 points) Results are well below District- or BOCES-adopted expectations for growth or achievement for grade/subject.	Please see chart in 3.3.

3.3) HEDI Tables or Graphics

For questions 3.1 and 3.2 above, if you are using tables or other graphics to explain your general process for assigning HEDI categories, please combine all such tables or graphics into a single file, labeling each so it is clear which grades/subjects it applies to, and upload that file here.

assets/survey-uploads/12149/595867-rhJdBgDruP/Local 15 & 20 Point Teacher HEDI Scales_1.xlsx

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 measure that will be used as the locally-selected measure of student achievement. Then name the specific assessment that will be used with the locally-selected measure, listing the full name of the assessment.

	Locally-Selected Measure from List of Approved Measures	Assessment
K	6(ii) School-wide measure computed locally	NYS Grade 3-8 ELA Assessments
1	6(ii) School-wide measure computed locally	NYS Grade 3-8 ELA Assessments
2	6(ii) School-wide measure computed locally	NYS Grade 3-8 ELA Assessments
3	6(ii) School-wide measure computed locally	NYS Grade 3-8 ELA Assessments

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.	Aspirational measure of success. We will use a school-wide measure based on district-wide goals for aspirational measures of success. HEDI points will be assigned based upon the increase in the percentage of students achieving a 3 and 4 on NYS assessments as compared to the previous school year. All teachers in a building will receive the same score based upon the
---	--

	percentage of students achieving aspirational measures.
Highly Effective (18-20 points) Results are well above District- or BOCES-adopted expectations for growth or achievement for grade/subject.	When compared to the DCSD aggregate mean performance score for 3-8 math and ELA in the current school year, the percentage of students earning a 3 and/or 4 increased by 5% or more.
Effective (9-17 points) Results meet District- or BOCES-adopted expectations for growth or achievement for grade/subject.	When compared to the DCSD aggregate mean performance score for 3-8 math and ELA in the current school year, the percentage of students earning a 3 and/or 4 ranges from an increase of up to 4% to a decrease of down to -4%.
Developing (3 - 8 points) Results are below District- or BOCES-adopted expectations for growth or achievement for grade/subject.	When compared to the DCSD aggregate mean performance score for 3-8 math and ELA in the current school year, the percentage of students earning a 3 and/or 4 ranges from a decrease of -5% down to a decrease of -10%.
Ineffective (0 - 2 points) Results are well below District- or BOCES-adopted expectations for growth or achievement for grade/subject.	When compared to the DCSD aggregate mean performance score for 3-8 math and ELA in the current school year, the percentage of students earning a 3 and/or 4 decreases below -10%.

3.5) Grades K-3 Math

Using the drop-down boxes below, select the measure that will be used as the locally-selected measure of student achievement. Then name the specific assessment that will be used with the locally-selected measure, listing the full name of the assessment.

	Locally-Selected Measure from List of Approved Measures	Assessment
K	6(ii) School-wide measure computed locally	NYS Grade 3-8 Math Assessments
1	6(ii) School-wide measure computed locally	NYS Grade 3-8 Math Assessments
2	6(ii) School-wide measure computed locally	NYS Grade 3-8 Math Assessments
3	6(ii) School-wide measure computed locally	NYS Grade 3-8 Math Assessments

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.	Aspirational measure of success. We will use a school-wide measure based on district-wide goals for aspirational measures of success. HEDI points will be assigned based upon the increase in the percentage of students achieving a 3 and 4 on NYS assessments as compared to the previous school year. All teachers in a building will receive the same score based upon the percentage of students achieving aspirational measures.
Highly Effective (18-20 points) Results are well above District- or BOCES-adopted expectations for growth or achievement for grade/subject.	When compared to the DCSD aggregate mean performance score for 3-8 math and ELA in the current school year, the percentage of students earning a 3 and/or 4 increased by 5% or more.
Effective (9-17 points) Results meet District- or BOCES-adopted expectations for growth or achievement for grade/subject.	When compared to the DCSD aggregate mean performance score for 3-8 math and ELA in the current school year, the percentage of students earning a 3 and/or 4 ranges from an

increase of up to 4% to a decrease of down to -4%.

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

When compared to the DCSD aggregate mean performance score for 3-8 math and ELA in the current school year, the percentage of students earning a 3 and/or 4 ranges from a decrease of -4% down to a decrease of -10%.

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

When compared to the DCSD aggregate mean performance score for 3-8 math and ELA in the current school year, the percentage of students earning a 3 and/or 4 decreases below -10%.

3.6) Grades 6-8 Science

Using the drop-down boxes below, select the measure that will be used as the locally-selected measure of student achievement. Then name the specific assessment that will be used with the locally-selected measure, listing the full name of the assessment.

	Locally-Selected Measure from List of Approved Measures	Assessment
6	6(ii) School wide measure computed locally	NYS Grade 3-8 Math & ELA Assessments
7	6(ii) School wide measure computed locally	NYS Grade 3-8 Math & ELA Assessments
8	6(ii) School wide measure computed locally	NYS Grade 3-8 Math & ELA Assessments

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.

Aspirational measure of success. We will use a school-wide measure based on district-wide goals for aspirational measures of success. HEDI points will be assigned based upon the increase in the percentage of students achieving a 3 and 4 on NYS assessments as compared to the previous school year. All teachers in a building will receive the same score based upon the percentage of students achieving aspirational measures.

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

When compared to the DCSD aggregate mean performance score for 3-8 math and ELA in the current school year, the percentage of students earning a 3 and/or 4 increased by 5% or more.

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

When compared to the DCSD aggregate mean performance score for 3-8 math and ELA in the current school year, the percentage of students earning a 3 and/or 4 ranges from an increase of up to 4% to a decrease of down to -4%.

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

When compared to the DCSD aggregate mean performance score for 3-8 math and ELA in the current school year, the percentage of students earning a 3 and/or 4 ranges from a decrease of -4% down to a decrease of -10%.

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

When compared to the DCSD aggregate mean performance score for 3-8 math and ELA in the current school year, the percentage of students earning a 3 and/or 4 decreases below -10%.

3.7) Grades 6-8 Social Studies

Using the drop-down boxes below, select the measure that will be used as the locally-selected measure of student achievement. Then name the specific assessment that will be used with the locally-selected measure, listing the full name of the assessment.

	Locally-Selected Measure from List of Approved Measures	Assessment
6	6(ii) School wide measure computed locally	NYS Grade 3-8 Math & ELA Assessments
7	6(ii) School wide measure computed locally	NYS Grade 3-8 Math & ELA Assessments
8	6(ii) School wide measure computed locally	NYS Grade 3-8 Math & ELA Assessments

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.	Aspirational measure of success. We will use a school-wide measure based on district-wide goals for aspirational measures of success. HEDI points will be assigned based upon the increase in the percentage of students achieving a 3 and 4 on NYS assessments as compared to the previous school year. All teachers in a building will receive the same score based upon the percentage of students achieving aspirational measures.
Highly Effective (18 - 20 points) Results are well above District- or BOCES-adopted expectations for growth or achievement for grade/subject.	When compared to the DCSD aggregate mean performance score for 3-8 math and ELA in the current school year, the percentage of students earning a 3 and/or 4 increased by 5% or more.
Effective (9 - 17 points) Results meet District- or BOCES-adopted expectations for growth or achievement for grade/subject.	When compared to the DCSD aggregate mean performance score for 3-8 math and ELA in the current school year, the percentage of students earning a 3 and/or 4 ranges from an increase of up to 4% to a decrease of down to -4%.
Developing (3 - 8 points) Results are below District- or BOCES-adopted expectations for growth or achievement for grade/subject.	When compared to the DCSD aggregate mean performance score for 3-8 math and ELA in the current school year, the percentage of students earning a 3 and/or 4 ranges from a decrease of -5% down to a decrease of -10%.
Ineffective (0 - 2 points) Results are well below District- or BOCES-adopted expectations for growth or achievement for grade/subject.	When compared to the DCSD aggregate mean performance score for 3-8 math and ELA in the current school year, the percentage of students earning a 3 and/or 4 decreases below -10%.

3.8) High School Social Studies

Using the drop-down boxes below, select the measure that will be used as the locally-selected measure of student achievement. Then name the specific assessment that will be used with the locally-selected measure, 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	NYS American History, Global, Living Environment, Integrated/Common Core Algebra I and Comprehensive English Regents Exams
Global 2	6(ii) School wide measure computed locally	NYS American History, Global, Living Environment, Integrated/Common Core Algebra I and Comprehensive English Regents Exams
American History	6(ii) School wide measure computed locally	NYS American History, Global, Living Environment, Integrated/Common Core Algebra I and Comprehensive English 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.	Aspirational measure of success. We will use a school-wide measure based on district-wide goals for aspirational measures of success. HEDI points will be based upon the increase in the percentage of students passing the American History, Global, Living Environment, Common Core Algebra/Integrated Algebra I and Comprehensive English Regents Exams. All 9-12 teachers will receive the same score based upon the percentage of students achieving aspirational measures. The District use the higher of the two algebra scores.
Highly Effective (18 - 20 points) Results are well above District- or BOCES-adopted expectations for growth or achievement for grade/subject.	When compared to the DCSD aggregate mean performance score for the 5 required Regents Examinations in the current school year, the percentage of students passing with a minimum grade of 65 increased by 5% or more.
Effective (9 - 17 points) Results meet District- or BOCES-adopted expectations for growth or achievement for grade/subject.	When compared to the DCSD aggregate mean performance score for the 5 required Regents Examinations in the current school year, the percentage of students passing with a minimum grade of 65 ranges from an increase of up to 4 % down to a decrease of -4%.
Developing (3 - 8 points) Results are below District- or BOCES-adopted expectations for growth or achievement for grade/subject.	When compared to the DCSD aggregate mean performance score for the 5 required Regents Examinations in the current school year, the percentage of students passing with a minimum grade of 65 ranges from a decrease of -5% to down to a decrease of -10%.
Ineffective (0 - 2 points) Results are well below District- or BOCES-adopted expectations for growth or achievement for grade/subject.	When compared to the DCSD aggregate mean performance score for the 5 required Regents Examinations in the current school year, the percentage of students passing with a minimum grade of 65 decreases below -10%.

3.9) High School Science

Using the drop-down boxes below, select the measure that will be used as the locally-selected measure of student achievement. Then name the specific assessment that will be used with the locally-selected measure, 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	NYS American History, Global, Living Environment, Integrated/Common Core Algebra I and Comprehensive English Regents Exams
Earth Science	6(ii) School wide measure computed locally	NYS American History, Global, Living Environment, Integrated/Common Core Algebra I and Comprehensive English Regents Exams
Chemistry	6(ii) School wide measure computed locally	NYS American History, Global, Living Environment, Integrated/Common Core Algebra I and Comprehensive English Regents Exams
Physics	6(ii) School wide measure computed locally	NYS American History, Global, Living Environment, Integrated/Common Core Algebra I and Comprehensive English 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.	Aspirational measure of success. We will use a school-wide measure based on district-wide goals for aspirational measures of success. HEDI points will be based upon the increase in the percentage of students passing the American History, Global, Living Environment, Common Core Algebra/Integrated Algebra I and Comprehensive English Regents Exams. All 9-12 teachers will receive the same score based upon the percentage of students achieving aspirational measures. The District use the higher of the two algebra scores.
Highly Effective (18-20 points) Results are well above District- or BOCES-adopted expectations for growth or achievement for grade/subject.	When compared to the DCSD aggregate mean performance score for the 5 required Regents Examinations in the current school year, the percentage of students passing with a minimum grade of 65 increased by 5% or more.
Developing (3 - 8 points) Results are below District- or BOCES-adopted expectations for growth or achievement for grade/subject.	When compared to the DCSD aggregate mean performance score for the 5 required Regents Examinations in the current school year, the percentage of students passing with a minimum grade of 65 ranges from an increase of up to 4% down to a decrease of -4%.
Effective (9 - 17points) Results meet District- or BOCES-adopted expectations for growth or achievement for grade/subject.	When compared to the DCSD aggregate mean performance score for the 5 required Regents Examinations in the current school year, the percentage of students passing with a minimum grade of 65 ranges from a decrease of -5% to down to a decrease of -10%.
Ineffective (0 - 2 points) Results are well below District- or BOCES-adopted expectations for growth or achievement for grade/subject.	When compared to the DCSD aggregate mean performance score for the 5 required Regents Examinations in the current school year, the percentage of students passing with a minimum grade of 65 decreases below -10%.

3.10) High School Math

Using the drop-down boxes below, select the measure that will be used as the locally-selected measure of student achievement. Then name the specific assessment that will be used with the locally-selected measure, 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	NYS American History, Global, Living Environment, Integrated/Common Core Algebra I and Comprehensive English Regents Exams
Geometry	6(ii) School wide measure computed locally	NYS American History, Global, Living Environment, Integrated/Common Core Algebra I and Comprehensive English Regents Exams
Algebra 2	6(ii) School wide measure computed locally	NYS American History, Global, Living Environment, Integrated/Common Core Algebra I and Comprehensive English 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.

NOTE: As applicable, please specify whether your district will be offering the Integrated Algebra Regents, the Common Core Algebra Regents, or both and how the HEDI process will be adjusted accordingly.

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.	Aspirational measure of success. We will use a school-wide measure based on district-wide goals for aspirational measures of success. HEDI points will be based upon the increase in the percentage of students passing the American History, Global, Living Environment, Common Core Algebra/Integrated Algebra I and Comprehensive English Regents Exams. All 9-12 teachers will receive the same score based upon the percentage of students achieving aspirational measures. The District use the higher of the two algebra scores.
Highly Effective (18 - 20 points) Results are well above District- or BOCES-adopted expectations for growth or achievement for grade/subject.	When compared to the DCSD aggregate mean performance score for the 5 required Regents Examinations in the current school year, the percentage of students passing with a minimum grade of 65 increased by 5% or more.
Effective (9 - 17 points) Results meet District- or BOCES-adopted expectations for growth or achievement for grade/subject.	When compared to the DCSD aggregate mean performance score for the 5 required Regents Examinations in the current school year, the percentage of students passing with a minimum grade of 65 ranges from an increase of up to 4% down to a decrease of -4%.
Developing (3 - 8 points) Results are below District- or BOCES-adopted expectations for growth or achievement for	When compared to the DCSD aggregate mean performance score for the 5 required Regents Examinations in the current

grade/subject.	school year, the percentage of students passing with a minimum grade of 65 ranges from a decrease of -5% to down to a decrease of -10%.
Ineffective (0 - 2 points) Results are well below District- or BOCES-adopted expectations for growth or achievement for grade/subject.	When compared to the DCSD aggregate mean performance score for the 5 required Regents Examinations in the current school year, the percentage of students passing with a minimum grade of 65 decreases below -10%.

3.11) High School English Language Arts

Using the drop-down boxes below, select the measure that will be used as the locally-selected measure of student achievement. Then name the specific assessment that will be used with the locally-selected measure, 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	NYS American History, Global, Living Environment, Integrated/Common Core Algebra I and Comprehensive English Regents Exams
Grade 10 ELA	6(ii) School wide measure computed locally	NYS American History, Global, Living Environment, Integrated/Common Core Algebra I and Comprehensive English Regents Exams
Grade 11 ELA	6(ii) School wide measure computed locally	NYS American History, Global, Living Environment, Integrated/Common Core Algebra I and Comprehensive English 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.

NOTE: As applicable, please specify whether your district will be offering the Comprehensive English Regents, the Common Core English Regents, or both and how the HEDI process will be adjusted accordingly.

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.	Aspirational measure of success. We will use a school-wide measure based on district-wide goals for aspirational measures of success. HEDI points will be based upon the increase in the percentage of students passing the American History, Global, Living Environment, Common Core Algebra/Integrated Algebra I and Comprehensive English Regents Exams. All 9-12 teachers will receive the same score based upon the percentage of students achieving aspirational measures. The District use the higher of the two algebra scores.
Highly Effective (18 - 20 points) Results are well above District- or BOCES-adopted expectations for growth or	When compared to the DCSD aggregate mean performance score for the 5 required Regents Examinations in the current

<p>subcomponent. If needed, you may upload a table or graphic at 3.13, below.</p>	<p>of success. HEDI points will be based upon the increase in the percentage of students passing the American History, Global, Living Environment, Common Core Algebra/Integrated Algebra I and Comprehensive English Regents Exams. All 9-12 teachers will receive the same score based upon the percentage of students achieving aspirational measures. The District use the higher of the two algebra scores.</p> <p>HEDI scores will be assigned based upon the increase in the percentage of students achieving a 3 and 4 on NYS assessments. All K-8 teachers will receive the same score based upon the percentage of students achieving aspirational measures.</p>
<p>Highly Effective (18 - 20 points) Results are well above District- or BOCES -adopted expectations for growth or achievement for grade/subject.</p>	<p>When compared to the DCSD aggregate mean performance score for the 5 required Regents Examinations over the current school year, the percentage of students passing with a minimum grade of 65 increased by 5% or more.</p> <p>When compared to the DCSD aggregate mean performance score for 3-8 math and ELA in the current school year, the percentage of students earning a 3 and/or 4 increased by 5% or more.</p>
<p>Effective (9 - 17 points) Results meet District- or BOCES-adopted expectations for growth or achievement for grade/subject.</p>	<p>When compared to the DCSD aggregate mean performance score for the 5 required Regents Examinations over the current school year, the percentage of students passing with a minimum grade of 65 ranges from an increase of up to 4% down to a decrease of -4%.</p> <p>When compared to the DCSD aggregate mean performance score for 3-8 math and ELA in the current school year, the percentage of students earning a 3 and/or 4 ranges from an increase of up to 4% to a decrease of down to -4%.</p>
<p>Developing (3 - 8 points) Results are below District- or BOCES-adopted expectations for growth or achievement for grade/subject.</p>	<p>When compared to the DCSD aggregate mean performance score for the 5 required Regents Examinations over the current school year, the percentage of students passing with a minimum grade of 65 ranges from a decrease of -5% to down to a decrease of -10%.</p> <p>When compared to the DCSD aggregate mean performance score for 3-8 math and ELA in the current school year, the percentage of students earning a 3 and/or 4 ranges from a decrease of -5% down to a decrease of -10%.</p>
<p>Ineffective (0 - 2 points) Results are well below District- or BOCES-adopted expectations for growth or achievement for grade/subject.</p>	<p>When compared to the DCSD aggregate mean performance score for the 5 required Regents Examinations over the current school year, the percentage of students passing with a minimum grade of 65 decreases below -10%.</p> <p>When compared to the DCSD aggregate mean performance score for 3-8 math and ELA in the current school year, the percentage of students earning a 3 and/or 4 ranges from a decreases below -10%.</p>

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

(No response)

3.13) HEDI Tables or Graphics

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

assets/survey-uploads/12149/595867-y92vNseFa4/2013-14 Local 20 Point HEDI Scales.xlsx

3.14) Locally Developed Controls

Describe any adjustments, controls, or other special considerations that will be used in assigning points to a teacher's score for this subcomponent, the rationale for including such factors, and the processes that will be used to mitigate potentially problematic incentives associated with the controls or adjustments.

NA

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.

NA

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, April 30, 2013

Updated Monday, September 16, 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.)

Marshall's Teacher Evaluation Rubric

(No response)

4.2) Points Within Other Measures

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

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

Is the following points assignment applicable to all teachers?

Yes

If you checked "no" above, fill in the group of teachers covered by the points assignment indicated immediately below (e.g., "probationary teachers"):

(No response)

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

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, label accordingly, and 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.

Teachers will be assessed using the Marshall Teaching Effectiveness Rubric. Each subcomponent of each domain will be assessed. Points will be assigned by using an average domain score of 1-4. Teachers will be rated according to the rubric, and then the rating within each subcomponent will be averaged, converted to a 60-point scale and account for other measures. General rounding rules will apply. Rounding will not result in a teacher's HEDI score to move to another HEDI category.

Section I: Multiple Measures of Teaching Practice – the 60%

The District and the DTA agree that a properly administered unit member teaching practice appraisal program is desirable and that such program shall be a constructive attempt to aid unit members to develop toward their full potential. It shall be the District's responsibility to provide resources and services as appropriate in an effort to help teachers develop towards that potential as they work to meet the goals of the District. It shall be the teacher's responsibility to implement District curriculum and keep their skills current. It is understood that professional development is a shared responsibility.

Classroom Observations – 40/60 points

The District and DTA believe that the purpose of observation, assessment and evaluation is to improve student learning by informing professional practice. We agree that the Kim Marshall Teacher Evaluation Rubrics shall serve as the foundation upon which effectiveness shall be determined. Marshall's Rethinking Teacher Supervision and Evaluation (2009) is the resource used to guide conversations about teaching and learning and shall be referenced when determining expectations for observations and professional responsibilities.

Tenured Teachers

Tenured teachers may select one of two paths for observation.

Option One consists of brief unannounced observations of no less than 15 minutes each. Option One benefits the tenured teacher who prefers multiple authentic classroom observations. The principal or certified designee will make no fewer than 5 unannounced visits to the teacher's classroom throughout the year.

Option Two consists of one formal announced observation for a full class period or lesson and a minimum of one mini unannounced observation of no less than 15 minutes. Option Two benefits the tenured teacher who prefers clinical observation including the preconference, observation and formal post-conference.

Either option will contribute 40 points to a total of 60 points within the total teacher evaluation.

Option One - Mini-Observations:

Will be unannounced and occur a minimum of five times throughout the school year.

Will be completed by the building principal or certified designee.

Will be completed by June 1st with at least three completed by February 1st.

Will typically be accompanied by informal post observation feedback within 48 hours.

Will be documented and shared with the teacher within 5 school days of the observation. If there are questions or concerns about documentation either party can call a meeting. Once agreed upon, the documentation for this observation will not be added to or deleted from.

If the administrator or teacher desire to schedule a formal announced observation they can do so at any time.

Evidence from mini-observations will inform the Professional Teacher Summative Evaluation ratings constituting 40 points.

Option Two - Formal and Mini Observation(s):

At least one mutually acceptable formal observation will be scheduled by the teacher and administrator. There will be a preconference no more than five days prior to the observation, an observation of a full lesson and a post-conference no more than five days after the observation.

At least one mutually acceptable formal observation will be scheduled by the teacher and administrator. There will be a preconference no more than five days prior to the observation, an observation of a full lesson and a post-conference no more than five days after the observation.

- o The purpose of this meeting will be to discuss the teacher appraisal criteria, District goals and expectations, and appraisal instruments. In this meeting the teacher and supervising administrator will discuss the planning of the lesson, the lesson structure, the lesson placement within the unit plan, and the applicable content standards. They may also review any relevant measurable criteria that may not be seen in the lesson, but are critical parts of the process.

- o If the administrator or unit member is unable to meet the scheduled observation time and date, or the administrator is unable to stay for the entire scheduled time period, that observation will be rescheduled. The person who cancels an observation or the administrator who is unable to stay the entire period has the responsibility to reschedule the observation within five (5) school days.

- o The purpose of the post-observation meeting will be to discuss the criteria and evidence that were observed and collected during the observation. The administrator will discuss and review the ratings and evidence that are relevant to that particular observation. A documentation record will be utilized to identify and score ratings in the components/elements observed in the lesson. The ratings will

be dated and initialed by the administrator at that time. Evidence will be attached for the areas in which there are disagreement between the appraiser and the unit member.

o If the administrator or unit member is not satisfied with the ratings assigned of the progress of the unit member either party may request additional announced observation. The additional announced observation will follow the same prescriptive pattern as the original announced observation. The purpose of the additional observation will be to address the areas of concern raised in the earlier post-observation meeting. The ratings will be recorded along with the ratings from the previous observation(s) on the running record form. The new ratings and evidence will be dated.

Formal Observations will be conducted by the building principal or other appropriate certified supervisors, as determined by the Superintendent.

All formal observations will be conducted on the appropriate form and a rating will be assigned to the teacher at the conclusion of the observation and be presented to the teacher within 5 days of the post observation meeting.

The administrator will conduct at least one mini observation. It will be documented and shared with the teacher within 5 school days of the observation. If there are questions or concerns about documentation either party can call a meeting. Once agreed upon, the documentation for this observation will not be added to or deleted from.

If the administrator or teacher desire to schedule a formal announced observation they can do so at any time.

The formal and mini observations will be completed by June 1st.

Evidence from formal and mini observation(s) will inform Professional Teacher Summative Evaluation ratings and will constitute 40 points. All domains within the rubric will be rated 1-4 and averaged together to get a single rubric score. The 1-4 rubric score will be converted to a corresponding 0-60 HEDI score using the uploaded chart. That resulting number will be divided by 60 and multiplied by 40 to result in an observation score for the teacher. Scores earned on all observations will be averaged together. This process will apply to pre-tenured and tenured teachers.

Pre-tenured Teachers

Probationary teachers will be observed via mini and clinical observations. Scores earned on the formal evaluation will be averaged with the total score earned on all mini observations. The average of the two will contribute 40 points to a total of 60 points within the total teacher evaluation.

Mini-Observations:

Will be unannounced and occur a minimum of five times throughout the school year.

Will be completed by the building principal or certified designee.

Will be completed by June 1st with at least three completed by February 1st.

Will typically be accompanied by informal post observation feedback within 48 hours.

Will be documented and shared with the teacher within 5 school days of the observation. If there are questions or concerns about documentation either party can call a meeting. Once agreed upon, the documentation for this observation will not be added to or deleted from.

If the administrator or teacher desire to schedule a formal announced observation they can do so at any time.

Formal Observations:

At least one mutually acceptable formal observation will be scheduled by the teacher and administrator. There will be a preconference no more than five days prior to the observation, an observation of a full lesson and a post-conference no more than five days after the observation.

o The purpose of this meeting will be to discuss the teacher appraisal criteria, District goals and expectations, and appraisal instruments. In this meeting the teacher and supervising administrator will discuss the planning of the lesson, the lesson structure, the lesson placement within the unit plan, and the applicable content standards. They may also review any relevant measurable criteria that may not be seen in the lesson, but are critical parts of the process.

o If the administrator or unit member is unable to meet the scheduled observation time and date, or the administrator is unable to stay for the entire scheduled time period, that observation will be rescheduled. The person who cancels an observation or the administrator who is unable to stay the entire period has the responsibility to reschedule the observation within five (5) school days.

o The purpose of the post-observation meeting will be to discuss the criteria and evidence that were observed and collected during the observation. The administrator will discuss and review the ratings and evidence that are relevant to that particular observation. A documentation record will be utilized to identify and score ratings in the components/elements observed in the lesson. The ratings will be dated and initialed by the administrator at that time. Evidence will be attached for the areas in which there are disagreement between the appraiser and the unit member.

o If the administrator or unit member is not satisfied with the ratings assigned of the progress of the unit member either party may request additional announced observation. The additional announced observation will follow the same prescriptive pattern as the original announced observation. The purpose of the additional observation will be to address the areas of concern raised in the earlier

post-observation meeting. The ratings will be recorded along with the ratings from the previous observation(s) on the running record form. The new ratings and evidence will be dated

Formal Observations will be conducted by the building principal or other appropriate certified supervisors, as determined by the Superintendent.

All formal observations will be conducted on the appropriate form and a rating will be assigned to the teacher at the conclusion of the observation and be presented to the teacher within five (5) days of the post observation meeting.

Structured/Summative Review – 20/60 points

Tenured Teachers:

Tenured teachers will establish a mutually acceptable annual goal. This goal will focus on one of Marshall’s six effective teaching domains. The tenured teacher’s annual goal will be submitted by October 1st of each year. Progress toward achieving the annual goal will be assessed during the final summative evaluation meeting in May or June. Evidence will be rated using the Marshall rubric. Each subcomponent of the domain may earn up to 2 points.

Scoring

The summative evaluation will satisfy 20 of the 60 points allocated to Other Measures. For the purpose of summative evaluation the tenured teacher will focus on one domain. Each element is worth 2 points for a maximum domain allocation of 20 points.

Within each subcomponent of each domain, a teacher’s portfolio evidence may be rated Highly Effective, Effective, Developing and Ineffective.

A Highly Effective rating will receive 2 full points, an Effective Rating will receive 1.5 points, Developing will receive 1 point and Ineffective will receive 0 points.

Pre-tenured Teachers: Portfolio

The purpose of the probationary teacher portfolio is to demonstrate evidence of teacher effectiveness and professional development. The portfolio process contributes to probationary teacher assessment and constitutes 20 of the 60 “Other Measures” points required by the NYSED. Portfolio assessment may influence tenure, and/or dismissal decisions. Portfolio assessment might also be applied as part of a tenured or non-tenured Teacher Improvement Plan (TIP).

Portfolio Process

The portfolio process facilitates teacher development by encouraging individual and group reflection. The portfolio demonstrates what you have learned, how you have learned it and how you have grown through trial and error, reflection, observation of colleagues, conference attendance and/or other experiences. This process is a form of authentic assessment, a type of evaluation in which the data (materials in a portfolio) are said to be a “real” or “authentic” representation of a teacher’s growth and competence. This form of assessment places the responsibility for learning on the learner because she/he is required to think about her/his own development.

The portfolio process requires at least two committee meetings each year. The committee is composed of the teacher, his/her mentor, the curriculum or grade level team leader and the principal.

1. The initial meeting is conducted during or immediately preceding the first month of school and is facilitated by the principal. The committee discusses portfolio development goals, data gathering, evidence of effectiveness and/or growth and schedules future meetings.
2. Subsequent informal meetings include a review of the evidence and a discussion of future activities.
3. The final meeting occurs in February when all non-tenured teachers gather to review and present their portfolios to committee members, teachers, administrators, community and Board members. Pre-tenured teachers will submit the portfolio to the principal at the final summative meeting. The principal will score it based upon teacher effectiveness domains and rubrics. Scoring will be based upon 20 points.

Additional meetings may be conducted upon the request of the teacher, mentor or principal. The District is responsible for coordinating and facilitating portfolio processes, scheduling events and providing guidance to teachers developing portfolios.

Calendar of Events – Pre-tenured Staff

Event Purpose Persons Responsible

Initial Meeting

August-September Review and discuss domain focus areas. Discuss the types of evidence that may demonstrate teacher effectiveness

for each element of each domain.

Principal schedules meeting and invites probationary teacher and mentor

Informal Meetings

September through January as needed Review, discuss and select evidence of effective teaching.

Discuss presentation strategy as we approach Final Meeting.

Probationary teacher, mentor and or principal may schedule meetings

Final Meeting

February Present portfolio to peers and audience. Celebrate teaching and learning. Superintendent schedules event and invites all probationary teachers, faculty, principals and others.

Basic Requirements

All portfolios will include:

1. Evidence (artifacts, data, materials from teaching and learning experiences) that demonstrates teacher effectiveness as measured by the NYS teaching standards.
2. Thematic sections based on the Marshall teacher effectiveness domains.
3. A rationale for evidence and materials at the beginning of each section answering:
What is in the section?
How does the evidence demonstrate that the teaching standard has been met?
4. A general reflection at the end of each section that discusses the teacher's professional growth throughout the semester.
5. A general overview and table of contents.
6. Some type of binder or container that assists in storing and presenting the portfolio. The medium might also be electronic.

Kim Marshall Teacher Effectiveness Rubric

These rubrics are organized around six domains covering all aspects of a teacher's job performance:

I. Planning and Preparation for Learning

II. Classroom Management

III. Delivery of Instruction

IV. Monitoring, Assessment, and Follow-Up

V. Family and Community Outreach

VI. Professional Responsibilities

The rubrics use a four-level rating scale with the following labels:

4 – Highly Effective

3 – Effective

2 – Developing

1 – Ineffective

Scoring

The end of year portfolio evaluation will satisfy 20 of the 60 points allocated to Other Measures. For the purpose of portfolio development and evaluation the pre-tenured teacher will focus on two domains during each year of the three year probationary period. Each domain is structured with 10 essential elements. Each element is worth 1 point for a maximum domain allocation of 10 points.

Within each element of each domain, a teacher's portfolio evidence may be rated Highly Effective, Effective, Developing and Ineffective.

A Highly Effective rating will receive 1 full point, an Effective Rating will receive $\frac{3}{4}$ point, Developing will receive $\frac{1}{2}$ point and Ineffective will receive 0 points.

A probationary teacher with a two year probationary period will focus on three domains each year. In such cases the total number of points out of 30 will be divided by 30 and multiplied by 20.

The final observation out of 40 points and the final portfolio/summative evaluation score out of 20 points will be added together to arrive at a single Other Measures score out of 60 points.

Annual Focus Areas

Year 1

Planning and Preparation for Learning
Classroom Management

Year 2
Delivery of Instruction
Monitoring, Assessment, and Follow-Up

Year 3
Family and Community Outreach
Professional Responsibilities

Possible Pieces of Evidence

Resume, personal statement, reflective journal entries, lesson plans, photos, student work, projects, writing samples, letters of recommendation, thank you cards or letters, awards, coaching “stuff,” travel experiences, outdoor experiences, teaching videos, etc. Teachers will present the portfolio to the committee during the final meeting. Committee members will provide feedback on the portfolio and collaboratively complete the rubric.

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/5091/184633-eka9yMJ855/DCSD Other Measures - 60 Point Conversion Chart_1.xlsx

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

Highly Effective: Overall performance and results exceed NYS Teaching Standards.	59-60 Overall performance and results are exceptional and exceed NYS teaching standards of professional practice.
Effective: Overall performance and results meet NYS Teaching Standards.	57-58 Overall performance and results are acceptable meet NYS teaching standards of professional practice.
Developing: Overall performance and results need improvement in order to meet NYS Teaching Standards.	50-56 Overall performance and results need improvement in order to meet NYS teaching standards of professional practice.
Ineffective: Overall performance and results do not meet NYS Teaching Standards.	0-49 Overall performance and results are not acceptable and do not meet NYS teaching standards of professional practice.

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	3
4.6) Observations of Probationary Teachers Informal/Short	1
4.6) Observations of Probationary Teachers Enter Total	4

By trained in-school peer teachers or other trained reviewers

Formal/Long	0
Informal/Short	0

Independent evaluators

Formal/Long	0
Informal/Short	0

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

-
- In Person
-

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

-
- In Person
-

4.7) Observations of Tenured Teachers

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

By building principals or other trained administrators

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

By trained in-school peer teachers or other trained reviewers

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

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

Independent evaluators

Formal/Long	0
Informal/Short	0

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

-
- In Person
-

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

-
- In Person
-

5. Composite Scoring (Teachers)

Created Tuesday, April 30, 2013

Updated Wednesday, August 28, 2013

Page 1

Standards for Rating Categories

Growth or Comparable Measures

Locally-selected Measures of growth or achievement

Other Measures of Effectiveness (Teacher and Leader standards)

Highly Effective

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

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

Overall performance and results exceed NYS Teaching Standards.

Effective

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

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

Overall performance and results meet NYS Teaching Standards.

Developing

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

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

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

Ineffective

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

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

Overall performance and results do not meet NYS Teaching Standards.

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 scoring ranges for educators for whom there is no approved Value-Added measure of student growth will be:

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 scoring ranges for educators for whom there is an approved Value-Added measure for student growth will be:

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, April 30, 2013

Updated Wednesday, September 18, 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. All TIP plans must include: 1) identification of needed areas of improvement, 2) a timeline for achieving improvement, 3) the manner in which the improvement will be assessed, and, where appropriate, 4) differentiated activities to support a teacher's improvement in those areas. For a list of supported file types, go to the Resources folder (above) and click Technical Tips. Please be sure to update a document with a form layout, with fillable spaces and not just a narrative.

assets/survey-uploads/5265/197162-Df0w3Xx5v6/Teachers TIP FORM.docx

6.3) Appeals Process

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

(1) the substance of the annual professional performance review

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

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

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

Dansville Central School District
Appeal Process

Section 3012-c of the Education Law establishes a comprehensive annual evaluation system for classroom teachers as well as the issuance and implementation of improvement plans for teachers whose performance is assessed as either Developing or Ineffective. This appeal procedure addresses a Dansville Teacher Association unit member's due process rights while ensuring that appeals are resolved in an expeditious manner.

APPEALS OF INEFFECTIVE AND DEVELOPING RATINGS ONLY

Appeals of APPR overall rating should be limited to those that rate a DTA unit member as Ineffective or Developing only. This appeals process does not diminish the authority of the Board of Education to terminate probationary DTA unit members during the probationary term for statutorily and constitutionally permissible reasons other than performance.

WHAT MAY BE CHALLENGED IN AN APPEAL

Appeal procedures should limit the scope of appeals under Education Law §3012-c to the following subjects: the school district's adherence to the standards and methodologies required for such reviews, pursuant to Education Law §3012-c; the Commissioner's regulation, and locally negotiated APPR procedures

PROHIBITION AGAINST MORE THAN ONE APPEAL

A DTA unit member may not file multiple appeals regarding the same performance review. All grounds for appeal must be raised with specificity within one appeal. Any grounds not raised at the time the appeal is filed shall be deemed waived.

BURDEN OF PROOF

In an appeal, the DTA unit member has the burden of demonstrating a clear legal right to the relief requested and the burden of establishing the facts upon which petitioner seeks relief. The grounds of the appeal are limited to Education Law §3012-c, the Commissioner's regulation, and/or the locally negotiated APPR Procedures.

TIME FRAME FOR FILING APPEAL

All appeals must be submitted in writing, and personally delivered by the DTA unit member to the Superintendent (no later than 5 work days when the District is open) of the date when the teacher receives his or her APPR overall rating. The failure to file an appeal within these timeframes shall be deemed a waiver of the right to appeal and the appeal shall be deemed abandoned and not subject to review in any other forum. If a teacher receives his or her APPR overall rating after June 30th, the teacher has 5 days after Labor Day to submit the appeal.

When filing an appeal, the DTA unit member must submit to the Superintendent or designee a detailed written description of the specific areas of disagreement over his or her performance review, or the issuance and/or implementation of the terms of his or her improvement plan and any additional documents or materials relevant to the appeal. The APPR overall rating being challenged must also be submitted with the appeal. Any information not submitted at the time the appeal is filed shall not be considered.

Appeals of the score and/or TIP must be made by the teacher within 5 days.

TIME FRAME FOR DISTRICT

Within 15 work days of receipt of an appeal, the school district staff member(s) who issued the APPR overall rating, must submit a detailed written response to the appeal. The response must include any and all additional documents or written materials specific to the point(s) of disagreement that support the school district's response and are relevant to the resolution of the appeal. Any such information that is not submitted at the time the response is filed shall not be considered in the deliberations related to the resolution of the appeal. The DTA unit member initiating the appeal shall receive a copy of the response filed by the school district, and any and all additional information submitted with the response, at the same time the school district files its response.

APPEALS REVIEW COMMITTEE

A DTA unit member has the option of having his/her appeal reviewed by a joint appeals committee prior to the appeals being submitted to the Superintendent of Schools for a decision. The appeals committee will consist of two members from the DTA and two members of District administration. The Appeals Review Committee does not have the authority to make decisions regarding the

appeal; the purpose of the committee is to provide the Superintendent of Schools with their feedback prior to the Superintendent rendering the final decision. The specific makeup of the Committee will be determined by the certification/grade level of the member appealing.

A DTA unit member also has the option of going directly to the Superintendent of Schools. During this meeting with the Superintendent of Schools, the DTA unit member may request union representation.

DECISION-MAKER ON APPEAL

A decision shall be rendered by the Superintendent of Schools or the Superintendent's designee except that an appeal may not be decided by the same individual who was responsible for making the final rating decision. Prior to rendering a decision, the Superintendent or designee and/or the appealing member may request a hearing with the DTA unit member and/or school district staff member(s) who issued the APPR overall rating.

DECISION

A written decision on the merits of the appeal shall be rendered no later than 30 calendar days from the date upon which the teacher filed his or her appeal. The appeal shall be based on a written record and hearing (if hearing occurred), comprised of the DTA unit member's appeal papers and any documentary evidence accompanying the appeal, as well as the school district response to the appeal and additional documentary evidence submitted with such papers. Such decision shall be final.

The decision shall set forth the reasons and factual basis for each determination on each of the specific issues raised in the DTA unit member's appeal. If the appeal is sustained, the reviewer may set aside a rating if it has been affected by substantial error or defect, modify a rating if it is affected by substantial error or defect or order a new evaluation if procedures have been violated. A copy of the decision shall be provided to the DTA unit member and the evaluator or the person responsible for issuing the APPR overall rating, if that person is different. Furthermore, a copy of this decision, appeal, and supporting documents, if any, shall be placed in the DTA unit member's personnel file.

EXCLUSIVITY OF §3012-C APPEAL PROCEDURE

The 3012-c appeal procedure shall constitute the exclusive means for initiating, reviewing and resolving any and all challenges and appeals related to a teacher APPR overall rating. A DTA unit member may not resort to any other contractual grievance procedures for the resolution of challenges and appeals related to a professional performance review, except as otherwise authorized by law.

6.4) Training of Lead Evaluators and Evaluators and Certification of Lead Evaluators

Describe the process for training lead evaluators and evaluators. Your description must include 1) the process for training lead evaluators and evaluators, 2) the process for the certification and re-certification of lead evaluators, 3) the process for ensuring inter-rater reliability, 4) the nature (content) and the duration (how many hours, days) of such training.

EVALUATOR TRAINING

- 1 The superintendent will ensure that all evaluators have been trained and that all lead evaluators have been trained and certified in accordance with regulation. The district will utilize GV BOCES Network Team evaluator training and lead evaluator training and certification in accordance with SED procedures and processes. Lead evaluator training will include training on:
- (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;
 - (4) Application and use of the teacher rubric, including training on the effective application of such rubrics to observe a teacher's practice
 - (5) Application and use of any assessment tools that the school district or BOCES utilizes to evaluate its classroom teachers, 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 locally selected measures of student achievement used by the district evaluate its teachers;
 - (7) Use of the Statewide Instructional Reporting System;
 - (8) The scoring methodology 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 overall rating and their subcomponent ratings; and
 - (9) Specific considerations in evaluating teachers of English language learners and students with disabilities.

The Superintendent will ensure that lead evaluators participate in initial 3-5 day certification training and are re-certified on a periodic basis as determined by SED. The BOCES Network Team will be utilized to provide the training and recertification. Any individual who fails to achieve required training or certification or re-certification, as applicable, shall not conduct or complete evaluations. All DCSD administrators have been participating in ongoing inter-rater reliability training as provided by the GV BOCES network team and schedules are already in place for continued training throughout the coming year.

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

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 Tuesday, April 30, 2013

Updated Monday, September 16, 2013

Page 1

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

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

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

Please list the grade configurations of the school(s)/program(s) in your district/BOCES where it is expected that 30-100% of a principal's students are taking assessments with a State-provided growth or value-added measure, (e.g., K-5, PK-6, 6-8, 6-12, 9-12, etc.).

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):

3-6
7-9
10-12
(No response)
(No response)
(No response)
(No response)

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

Please check the boxes below:

7.2) Assurances -- State-Provided Measures of Student Growth Assure that the value-added growth score(s) 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	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 assessments 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. The district must select the type of assessment that will be used with the SLO from the options below.

If any grade/course in the building has a State-provided growth measure AND the principal must have SLOs because fewer than 30% of students in the building are covered, then the SLOs will begin first with the SGP/VA results.

Additional SLOs will then be set based on grades/subjects with State assessments, where applicable.

If additional SLOs are necessary, principals must begin with the grade(s)/course(s) that have the largest number of students using school-wide student results from one of the following assessment options: State-approved 3rd party or district/regional/BOCES-developed assessments that are rigorous and comparable across classrooms.

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 grade configuration of the school or program the SLO applies to. Then, using the drop-down boxes below, please select the type of 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 in the following format: “[Name of your District/Region/BOCES] developed [Grade] [Subject] Assessment.” For example, a BOCES-developed 7th grade Social Studies assessment would be written as follows: “GVEP-Developed Grade 7 Social Studies Assessment.” For State-approved 3rd party assessments, please include the name of the assessment exactly as it appears in RED on the State-approved list. For State assessments or Regents examinations, please indicate as such in the assessment name.

School or Program Type	SLO with Assessment Option	Name of the Assessment
Primary School PK-2	State-approved 3rd party assessment	STAR Enterprise Reading & Math assessments
10-12 Principal	State assessment	NYS Comprehensive English, US History and Global Studies Regents Exams

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. Please describe the process your district is using to measure student growth on the assessments listed for this Task. If applicable, please also include a description of the process for combining the State-provided growth score with the SLO(s) for this Task.

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.	Analyzing baseline data, principals will set individual growth targets to be approved by the superintendent. Principals will be given HEDI ratings based on the percentage of students who meet their individual growth targets.
Highly Effective (18 - 20 points) Results are well above state average for similar students (or District goals if no state test).	The work of the principal results in exceptional student growth beyond expectations during the school year. 89% or more of students met or exceeded SLO targets.
Effective (9 - 17 points) Results meet state average for similar students (or District goals if no state test).	The work of the principal results in acceptable, measurable and appropriate student growth. 75-88% of students met or exceeded the SLO targets.
Developing (3 - 8 points) Results are below state average for similar students (or District goals if no state test).	The work of the principal results in student growth that does not meet the established target. 65-74% of students met or exceeded the SLO targets.

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

The work of the principal does not result in acceptable student growth. Fewer than 65% of students met or exceeded the SLO targets.

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

assets/survey-uploads/12156/595871-lha0DogRNw/7.3 STUDENT LEARNING OBJECTIVES AS COMPARABLE GROWTH MEASURES (20 points).xlsx

7.4) Special Considerations for Comparable Growth Measures

Describe any adjustments, controls, or other special considerations that will be used in assigning points to a principal's score for this subcomponent, 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 the following: prior student achievement results, students with disabilities, English language learners, and students in poverty.

None

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://www.engageny.org/resource/student-learning-objectives-guidance-document .	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 Tuesday, April 30, 2013

Updated Thursday, September 19, 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.

Districts or BOCES that intend to use a district, regional, or BOCES-developed assessment must include the name, grade, and subject of the assessment in the following format: “[Name of your District/Region/BOCES] developed [Grade] [Subject] Assessment.” For example, a BOCES-developed 7th grade Social Studies assessment would be written as follows: “GVEP-Developed Grade 7 Social Studies Assessment.”

Also note: if your district/BOCES is using the same assessment for both the State growth or other comparable measures subcomponent and the locally-selected measures subcomponents, be sure that a *different* measure of student performance is being used with the assessment (e.g., achievement rather than growth; growth measured in a different manner).

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

In the table below, please list the grade configurations of the school(s)/program(s) in your district/BOCES where it is expected that 30-100% of a principal’s students are taking assessments with a State-provided growth or value-added measure (e.g., K-5, 6-8, 9-12). Then for each grade configuration, select a measure of growth or achievement from the drop-down menu. As a reminder, the grade configurations/programs listed in Task 8.1 should be the same as those listed in Task 7.1.

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/Program	Locally-Selected Measure from List of Approved Measures	Assessment
3-6	(d) measures used by district for teacher evaluation	NYS Grade 3-8 Math & ELA Assessments and NYS American History, Global, Living Environment, Integrated/Common Core Algebra I and Comprehensive English Regents Exams
7-9	(d) measures used by district for teacher evaluation	NYS Grade 3-8 Math & ELA Assessments and NYS American History, Global, Living Environment, Integrated/Common Core Algebra I and Comprehensive English Regents Exams
10-12	(d) measures used by district for teacher evaluation	NYS Grade 3-8 Math & ELA Assessments and NYS American History, Global, Living Environment, Integrated/Common Core Algebra I and Comprehensive English Regents Exams

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>Aspirational measure of success. We will use a school-wide measure based on district-wide goals for aspirational measures of success. Targets will be established by principals and reviewed and approved by the superintendent. Increase the percentage of students achieving a 3 and 4 on NYS assessments and increase the percentage of students earning a 65 or better on the five required Regents exams. The building principal will receive a score based upon the percentage of students achieving</p>
--	---

aspirational measures. Principals will use the higher score of the two Algebra Regents Exams.

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

When compared to the DCSD aggregate mean performance score for 3-8 math and ELA and the percentage of students earning a 65 or better on five required Regents exams in the current school year, the percentage of students earning a 3 and/or 4 and a 65 or better increased by 3% or more.

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

When compared to the DCSD aggregate mean performance score for 3-8 math and ELA and the percentage of students earning a 65 or better on Regents exams in the current school year, the percentage of students earning a 3 and/or 4 or a 65 or better ranges from an increase of up to 2% down to a decrease of -3%.

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

When compared to the DCSD aggregate mean performance score for 3-8 math and ELA and the percentage of students earning a 65 or better on Regents exams in the current school year, the percentage of students earning a 3 and/or 4 or a 65 or better ranges from a decrease of -4% to down to a decrease of -8%.

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

When compared to the DCSD aggregate mean performance score for 3-8 math and ELA and the percentage of students earning a 65 or better on Regents exams in the current school year, the percentage of students earning a 3 and/or 4 or a 65 or better decreases more than or equal to -9%.

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/12190/595872-qBFVOWF7fC/Local 15 & 20 Point Principal HEDI Scales_1.xlsx

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

In the table below, list all of the grade configurations/programs used in your district or BOCES in which the district/BOCES expects that fewer than 30% of students will receive a State-provided growth score (e.g., K-2, K-3, CTE). Then for each grade configuration, select a measure from the drop-down menu. As a reminder, the grade configurations/programs listed in Task 8.2 should be the same as those listed in Task 7.3.

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
PK-2	(d) measures used by district for teacher evaluation	NYS Grade 3-8 Math & ELA Assessments and NYS American History, Global, Living Environment, Integrated/Common Core Algebra I and Comprehensive English Regents Exams
10-12	(d) measures used by district for teacher evaluation	NYS Grade 3-8 Math & ELA Assessments and NYS American History, Global, Living Environment, Integrated/Common Core Algebra I and Comprehensive English Regents Exams

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.	Aspirational measure of success. We will use a school-wide measure based on district-wide goals for aspirational measures of success. Targets will be established by principals and reviewed and approved by the superintendent. HEDI points will
---	---

be assigned based upon the increase the percentage of students achieving a 3 and 4 on NYS assessments or a 65 or better on the listed Regents exams. The building principal will receive a score based upon the percentage of students achieving aspirational measures.

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

When compared to the DCSD aggregate mean performance score for 3-8 math and ELA and the percentage of students earning a 65 or better on five required Regents exams in the current school year, the percentage of students earning a 3 and/or 4 and a 65 or better increased by 5% or more.

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

When compared to the DCSD aggregate mean performance score for 3-8 math and ELA and the percentage of students earning a 65 or better on Regents exams in the current school year, the percentage of students earning a 3 and/or 4 or a 65 or better from an increase of up to 4% to a decrease of down to -4%.

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

When compared to the DCSD aggregate mean performance score for 3-8 math and ELA and the percentage of students earning a 65 or better on Regents exams in the current school year, the percentage of students earning a 3 and/or 4 or a 65 or better decreases from -5% down to a decrease of -10%.

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

When compared to the DCSD aggregate mean performance score for 3-8 math and ELA and the percentage of students earning a 65 or better on Regents exams in the current school year, the percentage of students earning a 3 and/or 4 or a 65 or better decreases more than -10%.

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

(No response)

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

assets/survey-uploads/12190/595872-T8MIGWUVm1/ADMIN local 20_1.xlsx

8.3) Locally Developed Controls

Describe any adjustments, controls, or other special considerations that will be used in assigning points to a teacher's score for this subcomponent, the rationale for including such factors, and the processes that will be used to mitigate potentially problematic incentives associated with the controls or adjustments.

None

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 Tuesday, April 30, 2013

Updated Thursday, August 29, 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 point 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 point 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, label accordingly, 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 assigning any points to "ambitious and measurable goals":

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 updated, this list will be updated within the drop-down menu of approved survey tools.

Principal Evaluation Tripod School Perception Survey for Teachers	(No response)
---	---------------

K12 Insight Student Survey (Grades 3-5) for Principal Evaluation in New York	(No response)
--	---------------

K12 Insight Student Survey (Grades 6-12) for Principal Evaluation in New York	(No response)
---	---------------

K12 Insight Parent Survey for Principal Evaluation in New York	(No response)
--	---------------

K12 Insight Teacher/Staff Survey for Principal Evaluation in New York	(No response)
---	---------------

District variance	(No response)
Principal Evaluation Tripod School Perception Survey (Combined Parent Survey)	(No response)
Principal Evaluation Tripod School Perception Survey (Combined Student Surveys)	(No response)
NYC School Survey-2012 Parent Survey	(No response)
NYC School Survey-2012 Student Survey	(No response)
NYC School Survey-2012 Teacher Survey	(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.

Using the MPPR, each element of all domains will be assessed by the evaluator. Based on the evidence collected, principals will be awarded points by the evaluator using a holistic approach. Please see the attached uploaded file.

The Superintendent will make multiple visits to the principal's school and will collect evidence on the rubric domains throughout the year. Using the rubric, the Superintendent will circle the descriptor for each item that best matches the principal's performance. Using a holistic approach, a HEDI rating and point value shall then be determined for each domain and then added together to achieve an overall score based on the rubric. Points will be converted according to the attached chart. We provide assurance that everything in this attachment is consistent with our APPR Plan and with Education Law 3012-c.

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/5143/223401-pMADJ4gk6R/revised DCSD Principals Other Measures - 60 Point Conversion Chart.xlsx](#)

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

Highly Effective: Overall performance and results exceed standards.	Principal performance and results on other measures exceed the ISLLC Standards.
Effective: Overall performance and results meet standards.	Principal performance and results on other measures meet the ISLLC Standards.

Developing: Overall performance and results need improvement in order to meet standards.	Principal performance and results on other measures are below the ISLLC Standards.
Ineffective: Overall performance and results do not meet standards.	Principal performance and results on other measures are well-below the ISLLC Standards.

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 Tuesday, April 30, 2013

Updated Monday, August 19, 2013

Page 1

Standards for Rating Categories

Growth or Comparable Measures

Locally-selected Measures of growth or achievement

Other Measures of Effectiveness (Teacher and Leader standards)

Highly Effective

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

Results are well above District- or BOCES- adopted expectations for 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.

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 scoring ranges for principals for whom there is no approved Value-Added measure of student growth will be:

Where there is no Value-Added measure

Growth or Comparable Measures
Locally-selected Measures of growth or achievement
Other Measures of Effectiveness
(60 points)

Overall Composite Score
Highly Effective
18-20
18-20
Ranges determined locally--see below
91-100
Effective
9-17
9-17
75-90
Developing
3-8
3-8
65-74
Ineffective
0-2
0-2
0-64

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

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

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

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 Tuesday, April 30, 2013

Updated Thursday, August 29, 2013

Page 1

11.1) Assurances -- Improvement Plans

Please check the boxes below.

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

11.2) Attachment: Principal Improvement Plan Forms

As a required attachment to this APPR plan, upload the PIP forms that are used in the school district or BOCES. All PIP plans must include: 1) identification of needed areas of improvement, 2) a timeline for achieving improvement, 3) the manner in which the improvement will be assessed, and, where appropriate, 4) differentiated activities to support a principal's improvement in those areas.

For a list of supported file types, go to the Resources folder (above) and click Technical Tips. Please be sure to update a document with a form layout, with fillable spaces and not just a narrative.

[assets/survey-uploads/12168/595875-Df0w3Xx5v6/Principal PIP FORM.docx](#)

11.3) Appeals Process

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

(1) the substance of the annual professional performance review

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

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

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

VI. Appeals Process

A. Appeals are limited to those identified by Education Law §3012-c, as follows:

1. The substance of the annual professional performance review;
2. The school district's or board of cooperative educational services' adherence to the standards and methodologies required for such reviews;
3. The adherence to the Commissioner's regulations, as applicable to such reviews;
4. Compliance with any applicable locally negotiated procedures applicable to annual professional performance reviews or improvement plans; and
5. The school district's or board of cooperative educational services' issuance and/or implementation of the terms of the principal improvement plan.

B. Appeals of annual professional performance reviews for tenured principals may be brought only for an overall rating of ineffective, developing or for any overall rating tied to compensation. Appeals of annual professional performance reviews for non-tenured principals may be brought only for an overall rating of ineffective or any overall rating tied to compensation.

C. A principal may not file multiple appeals regarding the same annual professional performance review. The issuance of an improvement plan may prompt an appeal independent of the annual professional performance review. The implementation of an improvement plan may be appealed upon each alleged breach thereof. All grounds for appeal must be raised with specificity within such appeal. Any grounds not raised shall be deemed waived.

D. The principal (the appealing party) has the burden of establishing that the overall rating given was not justified or that the principal improvement plan was inappropriately issued and/or implemented.

E. All appeals shall be filed in writing and submitted to the Superintendent's Office with receipt provided by the Superintendent's Office.

F. An appeal of a performance review must be filed no later than fifteen (15) business days of the date when the principal receives their final and complete annual professional performance review. The failure to file an appeal within this timeframe shall be deemed a waiver of the right to appeal and the appeal shall be deemed abandoned.

G. If a principal is challenging the issuance of a principal improvement plan, appeals must be filed with fifteen (15) business days of issuance of such plan. An appeal of the implementation of an improvement plan shall be within fifteen (15) business days of the failure of the district to implement any component of the plan. The failure to file an appeal within these timeframes shall be deemed a waiver of the right to appeal and the appeal shall be deemed abandoned.

H. When filing an appeal, the principal must submit a written description of the specific areas of disagreement over his or her performance review, or the issuance and/or implementation of the terms of his or her improvement plan. Supportive evidence about the challenges may also be submitted with the appeal. Any additional documents or materials relevant to the appeal must be provided by the district upon written request for same. The performance review and/or improvement plan being challenged must also be submitted with the appeal.

I. Within ten (10) business days of receipt of an appeal, the district must submit a detailed written response to the appeal. The response must include all additional documents or written materials relevant to the point(s) of disagreement that support the district's response. Any such information that is not submitted at the time the response is filed shall not be considered on behalf of the district in the deliberations related to the resolution of the appeal. The principal initiating the appeal shall receive a copy of the response filed by the school district, and all additional information submitted with the response, at the same time the school district files its response.

J. The principal may submit a response to the district's detailed written response within two (2) business days of the date the district's written response is submitted. The district may then submit a written response to the principal's response within two (2) business days of its submission.

K. The Superintendent and Association President shall at the beginning of the school year mutually agree upon no less than two and no more than four hearing officers. The hearing officer for a specific appeal will be assigned by lottery from this list within five (5) business days of the district's response.

L. The hearing officer shall review the documents submitted by the principal and the District. The appeal shall be decided based solely on the written record, comprised of the principal's appeal papers and any documentary evidence accompanying the appeal, as well as the District's response to the appeal and any additional documentary evidence submitted with such response papers.

M. A written decision on the merits of the appeal shall be rendered no later than ten (10) business days from the date the hearing officer is chosen or assigned pursuant to (K) above. Such decision shall be a final administrative decision. The decision shall set forth the reasons and factual basis for the determination on each of the specific issues raised in the appeal. The reviewer must either affirm or set aside a district's rating or improvement plan. A copy of the decision shall be provided to the principal and the district representative.

N. This appeal procedure shall constitute the exclusive means for initiating, reviewing and resolving challenges to a principal's annual performance review or improvement plan. A principal may not resort to any other contractual grievance procedures for the resolution of challenges and appeals related to a professional performance review and/or improvement plan.

O. In the event that the principal's appeal is sustained, the District shall pay the cost of the hearing officer. In the event that the principal's appeal is not sustained, the District and the Association shall share the cost of the hearing officer.

P. In addition to any further limitations agreed to within the APPR agreement, an evaluation shall not be placed in a principal's personnel file until either the expiration of the fifteen (15) business day period in which to file a notice of appeal without action being taken by the principal or the conclusion of the appeal process described herein, whichever is later.

Q. A principal who takes advantage of the appeals process described herein does not waive his/her right to submit a written rebuttal to the final evaluation. A principal who elects to submit a written rebuttal to his/her evaluation prior to the expiration of the fifteen (15) business days in which to file a notice of appeal does not waive her/his right to file an appeal.

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

Describe the process for training lead evaluators and evaluators. Your description must include 1) the process for training lead evaluators and evaluators, 2) the process for the certification and re-certification of lead evaluators, 3) the process for ensuring inter-rater reliability, 4) the nature (content) and the duration (how many hours, days) of such training.

The lead evaluator has participated in NYSED approved training provided by the GV and Monroe 2 BOCES. The five day training addresses inter-rater reliability, SED approved teacher evaluation rubrics and clinical supervision of instruction. Certification was provided and re-certification is required annually.

The training included all of the state-prescribed components:

New York State Teaching Standards and Leadership Standards

Evidence-based observation

Application and use of Student Growth Percentile and VA Growth Model data

Application and use of the State-approved teacher or principal rubrics

Application and use of any assessment tools used to evaluate teachers and principals

Application and use of State-approved locally selected measures of student achievement

Use of the Statewide Instructional Reporting System

Scoring methodology used to evaluate teachers and principals

Specific considerations in evaluating teachers and principals of ELLs and students with disabilities

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 Tuesday, April 30, 2013

Updated Wednesday, September 25, 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. Please note that Review Room timestamps each revision and signatures cannot be dated earlier than the last revision.

<assets/survey-uploads/12158/595876-3Uqgn5g9Iu/DCSD APPR JOINT CERTIFICATION 9-25-13.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.

State 20 HEDI Scale

All PK-12 teachers

Highly Effective			Effective					
20	19	18	17	16	15	14	13	12
97-100%	93-96	89-92	83-88	82	81	80	79	78

			Developing					
11	10	9	8	7	6	5	4	3
77	76	75	73-74	71-72	69-70	67-68	66	65

Ineffective		
2	1	0
55-64	45-54	44-0

The numbers in the scales below represent the percent increase or decrease in student proficiency as c

Local PK-12 Teachers 15 Point HEDI Scale

Highly Effective		Effective					
15	14	13	12	11	10	9	8
3.75%	3%	2%	1%	0%	-1%	-2%	-3%

Local 4-8 20 Point HEDI Scale

Highly Effective			Effective				
20	19	18	17	16	15	14	13
7	6	5	4	3	2	1	0

The 20 point scale will be used when the 15 point value added model is not available.

ompared to the prior year.

Developing					Ineffective		
7	6	5	4	3	2	1	0
-4%	-5%	-6%	-7%	-8%	-9%	-10%	-11%

				Developing				
12	11	10	9	8	7	6	5	4
-1	-2	-3	-4	-5	-6	-7	-8	-9

	Ineffective			
3	2	1	0	
-10	-11	-12	-13	

The numbers in the scales below represent the percent increase or decrease in student proficiency as c

Local PK-8 20 Point HEDI Scale

All PK-8 teachers

Highly Effective			Effective					
20	19	18	17	16	15	14	13	12
7	6	5	4	3	2	1	0	-1

Local 9-12 20 Point HEDI Scale

All 9-12 teachers

Highly Effective			Effective					
20	19	18	17	16	15	14	13	12
7	6	5	4	3	2	1	0	-1

ompared to the prior year.

			Developing						
11	10	9	8	7	6	5	4	3	
-2	-3	-4	-5	-6	-7	-8	-9	-10	

			Developing						
11	10	9	8	7	6	5	4	3	
-2	-3	-4	-5	-6	-7	-8	-9	-10	

Ineffective		
2	1	0
-11	-12	-13

Ineffective		
2	1	0
-11	-12	-13

Developing

11	10	9	8	7	6	5	4	3
-2	-3	-4	-5	-6	-7	-8	-9	-10

EFFECTIVE	
1	0

Ineffective

2	1	0
-11	-12	-13

STUDENT LEARNING OBJECTIVES AS COMPARABLE GROWTH MEASURES (20 points)

Highly Effective			Effective					
20	19	18	17	16	15	14	13	12
97-100%	93-96	89-92	83-88	82	81	80	79	78

			Developing					
11	10	9	8	7	6	5	4	3
77	76	75	73-74	71-72	69-70	67-68	66	65

Ineffective		
2	1	0
55-64	45-54	44-0

The numbers in the scales below represent the percent increase or decrease in student proficiency as c

Local Principals 15 Point HEDI Scale

Highly Effective		Effective						
15	14	13	12	11	10	9	8	7
3.75%	3%	2%	1%	0%	-1%	-2%	-3%	-4%

Local Principals 20 Point HEDI Scale

Highly Effective		Effective							
20	19	18	17	16	15	14	13	12	
7	6	5	4	3	2	1	0	-1	

The 20 point scale will be used when there is no value added model.

ompared to the prior year.

Developing				Ineffective		
6	5	4	3	2	1	0
-5%	-6%	-7%	-8%	-9%	-10%	-11%

Developing								
11	10	9	8	7	6	5	4	3
-2	-3	-4	-5	-6	-7	-8	-9	-10

Ineffective

2	1	0
-11	-12	-13

Local Principals 20 Point HEDI Scale

Highly Effective			Effective					
20	19	18	17	16	15	14	13	12
7	6	5	4	3	2	1	0	-1

The numbers in the scales below represent the percent increase or decrease in student proficiency as c

			Developing					
11	10	9	8	7	6	5	4	3
-2	-3	-4	-5	-6	-7	-8	-9	-10

ompared to the prior year.

Ineffective		
2	1	0
-11	-12	-13

Multidimensional Rubric					
Scoring Bands					
Domain	Total Possible	Ineffective	Developing	Effective	Highly Effective
1	10	0-6	7	8-9	10
2	20	0-12	13-14	15-18	19-20
3	10	0-6	7	8-9	10
4	5	0-2	3	4	5
5	10	0-6	7	8-9	10
6	5	0-2	3	4	5
Conversion Chart					
Rubric Score	Composite	HEDI Rating	Rubric Score	Composite	HEDI Rating
0	0	Ineffective	31	54	Developing
1	2	Ineffective	32	54	Developing
2	4	Ineffective	33	55	Developing
3	7	Ineffective	34	55	Developing
4	10	Ineffective	35	55	Developing
5	13	Ineffective	36	55	Developing
6	16	Ineffective	37	56	Developing
7	19	Ineffective	38	56	Developing
8	22	Ineffective	39	56	Developing
9	25	Ineffective	40	56	Developing
10	28	Ineffective	41	57	Effective
11	31	Ineffective	42	57	Effective
12	34	Ineffective	43	57	Effective
13	37	Ineffective	44	57	Effective
14	40	Ineffective	45	57	Effective
15	43	Ineffective	46	57	Effective
16	46	Ineffective	47	58	Effective
17	49	Ineffective	48	58	Effective
18	50	Developing	49	58	Effective
19	50	Developing	50	58	Effective
20	51	Developing	51	58	Effective
21	51	Developing	52	58	Effective
22	52	Developing	53	58	Effective
23	52	Developing	54	59	Highly Effective
24	52	Developing	55	59	Highly Effective
25	53	Developing	56	59	Highly Effective
26	53	Developing	57	60	Highly Effective
27	53	Developing	58	60	Highly Effective
28	53	Developing	59	60	Highly Effective
29	54	Developing	60	60	Highly Effective
30	54	Developing			

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 certify that this APPR plan is the district's or BOCES' complete APPR plan and that such plan will be fully implemented by the school district or BOCES; that there are no collective bargaining agreements, memoranda of understanding or any other agreements in any form that prevent, conflict or interfere with full implementation of the APPR Plan; and that no material changes will be made to the plan through collective bargaining or otherwise except with the approval of the Commissioner in accordance with Subpart 30-2 of the Rules of the Board of Regents.

The school district and its collective bargaining agent(s), where applicable, also acknowledge that if approval of this APPR plan is rejected or rescinded for any reason, any State aid increases received as a result of the Commissioner's approval of this APPR plan will be returned or forfeited to the State pursuant to Chapter 57 of the Laws of 2012 and/or 2013, as applicable.

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, 2013, assure that this was the result of unresolved collective bargaining negotiations

Signatures, dates

Superintendent Signature: Date:

 9/25/13

Teachers Union President Signature: Date:

 9/25/13

Administrative Union President Signature: Date:

 9/25/13

Board of Education President Signature: Date:

 9/25/13