



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

---

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

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

November 30, 2012

Sandy Sherwood, Superintendent  
Dryden Central School District  
P.O. Box 88  
Dryden, NY 13053

Dear Superintendent Sherwood:

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

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

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

Thank you again for your hard work.

Sincerely,



John B. King, Jr.  
Commissioner

Attachment

c: William Speck

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

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

# Annual Professional Performance Reviews: 2012-13

Created Wednesday, May 02, 2012  
Updated Friday, November 16, 2012

---

## 1

### Disclaimers

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

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

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

### 1. SCHOOL DISTRICT INFORMATION

#### 1.1) School District's BEDS Number : 610301060000

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

*610301060000*

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

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

*DRYDEN CSD*

#### 1.3) School Improvement Grant (SIG) Districts Only

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

*Not applicable*

#### 1.4) Award Classification

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

*(No response)*

## 1.5) Assurances

Please check all of the boxes below:

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

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

*Re-submission to address deficiencies*

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

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

*Annual (2012-13)*

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

Created Monday, June 25, 2012

Updated Friday, November 30, 2012

---

### Page 1

#### STATE-PROVIDED MEASURES OF STUDENT GROWTH

(25 points with an approved value-added measure)

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

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

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

#### 2.1) Assurances

Please check the boxes below:

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

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

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

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

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

If no State assessment or Regents exam exists:

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

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

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

State assessments, *required if one exists*

List of State-approved 3rd party assessments

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

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

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

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

## 2.2) Grades K-3 ELA

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

	ELA	Assessment
K	School-or BOCES-wide, group or team results based on State assessments	4th and 5th Grade State ELA Assessment
1	School-or BOCES-wide, group or team results based on State assessments	4th and 5th Grade State ELA Assessment
2	School-or BOCES-wide, group or team results based on State assessments	4th and 5th Grade State ELA Assessment

	ELA	Assessment
3	State assessment	3rd Grade State Assessment

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

Use this box, if needed, to describe the general process for assigning HEDI categories for these grades/subjects in this subcomponent. If needed, you may upload a table or graphic at 2.11, below.	See the uploaded attachment for HEDI SLO assignment process for 3rd grade ELA State Assessment
Highly Effective (18 - 20 points) Results are well-above state average for similar students (or District goals if no state test).	76-100% of students meet target set by the district of an increase our MGP by at least 2.5 percentile points on both the 4th grade and 5th grade ELA assessments.
Effective (9 - 17 points) Results meet state average for similar students (or District goals if no state test).	65-75% of students meet target set by the district of an increase our MGP by at least 2.5 percentile points on both the 4th grade and 5th grade ELA assessments.
Developing (3 - 8 points) Results are below state average for similar students (or District goals if no state test).	53-64% of students meet target set by the district of an increase our MGP by at least 2.5 percentile points on both the 4th grade and 5th grade ELA assessments.
Ineffective (0 - 2 points) Results are well-below state average for similar students (or District goals if no state test).	0-52% of students meet target set by the district of an increase our MGP by at least 2.5 percentile points on both the 4th grade and 5th grade ELA assessments.

## 2.3) Grades K-3 Math

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

	Math	Assessment
K	School-or BOCES-wide, group or team results based on State assessments	4th and 5th Grade State Math Assessment
1	School-or BOCES-wide, group or team results based on State assessments	4th and 5th Grade State Math Assessment
2	School-or BOCES-wide, group or team results based on State assessments	4th and 5th Grade State Math Assessment

	Math	Assessment
3	State assessment	3rd Grade State Assessment

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

Use this box, if needed, to describe the general process for assigning HEDI categories for these grades/subjects in this subcomponent. If needed, you may upload a table or graphic at 2.11, below.	See the uploaded attachment for HEDI SLO assignment process for 3rd grade Math State Assessment
Highly Effective (18 - 20 points) Results are well-above state average for similar students (or District goals if no state test).	76-100% of students meet target set by the district of an increase our MGP by at least 2.5 percentile points on both the 4th grade and 5th grade Math assessments
Effective (9 - 17 points) Results meet state average for similar students (or District goals if no state test).	65-75% of students meet target set by the district of an increase our MGP by at least 2.5 percentile points on both the 4th grade and 5th grade Math assessments
Developing (3 - 8 points) Results are below state average for similar students (or District goals if no state test).	53-64% of students meet target set by the district of an increase our MGP by at least 2.5 percentile points on both

the 4th grade and 5th grade Math assessments

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

0-52% of students meet target set by the district of an increase our MGP by at least 2.5 percentile points on both the 4th grade and 5th grade Math assessments

## 2.4) Grades 6-8 Science

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

	Science	Assessment
6	District, regional or BOCES-developed assessment	Dryden developed 6th Grade Science assessment
7	District, regional or BOCES-developed assessment	Dryden developed 7th Grade Science assessment
8	State assessment	8th Grade State Science Assessment

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

Use this box, if needed, to describe the general process for assigning HEDI categories for these grades/subjects in this subcomponent. If needed, you may upload a table or graphic at 2.11, below.	(No response)
Highly Effective (18 - 20 points) Results are well-above state average for similar students (or District goals if no state test).	76-100% of students meet growth target set by the teacher in conjunction with the principal using a pre-assessment in the fall and a post-assessment in the late spring
Effective (9 - 17 points) Results meet state average for similar students (or District goals if no state test).	65-75% of students meet growth target set by the teacher in conjunction with the principal using a pre-assessment in the fall and a post-assessment in the late spring
Developing (3 - 8 points) Results are below state average for similar students (or District goals if no state test).	53-64% of students meet growth target set by the teacher in conjunction with the principal using a pre-assessment in the fall and a post-assessment in the late spring
Ineffective (0 - 2 points) Results are well-below state average for similar students (or District goals if no state test).	0-52% of students meet growth target set by the teacher in conjunction with the principal using a pre-assessment in the fall and a post-assessment in the late spring

## 2.5) Grades 6-8 Social Studies

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

	Social Studies	Assessment
6	District, regional or BOCES-developed assessment	Dryden developed 6th Grade Social Studies assessment

7	District, regional or BOCES-developed assessment	Dryden developed 7th Grade Social Studies assessment
8	District, regional or BOCES-developed assessment	Dryden 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 student performance.

Use this box, if needed, to describe the general process for assigning HEDI categories for these grades/subjects in this subcomponent. If needed, you may upload a table or graphic at 2.11, below.	(No response)
Highly Effective (18 - 20 points) Results are well-above District goals for similar students.	76-100% of students meet growth target set by the teacher in conjunction with the principal using a pre-assessment in the fall and a post-assessment in the late spring
Effective (9 - 17 points) Results meet District goals for similar students.	65-75% of students meet growth target set by the teacher in conjunction with the principal using a pre-assessment in the fall and a post-assessment in the late spring
Developing (3 - 8 points) Results are below District goals for similar students.	53-64% of students meet growth target set by the teacher in conjunction with the principal using a pre-assessment in the fall and a post-assessment in the late spring
Ineffective (0 - 2 points) Results are well-below District goals for similar students.	0-52% of students meet growth target set by the teacher in conjunction with the principal using a pre-assessment in the fall and a post-assessment in the late spring

## 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	TST BOCES developed Global 1 assessment

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

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

Use this box, if needed, to describe the general process for assigning HEDI categories for these grades/subjects in this subcomponent. If needed, you may upload a table or graphic at 2.11, below.	(No response)
Highly Effective (18 - 20 points) Results are well-above District goals for similar students.	76-100% of students meet growth target set by the teacher in conjunction with the principal using a pre-assessment in the fall and a post-assessment in the late spring or a Regents (if available)
Effective (9 - 17 points) Results meet District goals for similar students.	65-75% of students meet growth target set by the teacher in conjunction with the principal using a pre-assessment in the fall and a post-assessment in the late spring or a Regents (if available)
Developing (3 - 8 points) Results are below District goals for similar students.	53-64% of students meet growth target set by the teacher in conjunction with the principal using a pre-assessment in the fall and a post-assessment in the late spring or a Regents (if available)
Ineffective (0 - 2 points) Results are well-below District goals for similar students.	0-52% of students meet growth target set by the teacher in conjunction with the principal using a pre-assessment in the fall and a post-assessment in the late spring or a Regents (if available)

## 2.7) High School Science Regents Courses

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

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

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

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

Use this box, if needed, to describe the general process for assigning HEDI categories for these grades/subjects in this subcomponent. If needed, you may upload a table or graphic at 2.11, below.	(No response)
Highly Effective (18 - 20 points) Results are well-above District goals for similar students.	76-100% of students meet growth target set by the teacher in conjunction with the principal using a pre-assessment in the fall and a Regents exam in June
Effective (9 - 17 points) Results meet District goals for similar students.	65-75% of students meet growth target set by the teacher in conjunction with the principal using a pre-assessment in the fall and a Regents exam in June

Developing (3 - 8 points) Results are below District goals for similar students.	53-64% of students meet growth target set by the teacher in conjunction with the principal using a pre-assessment in the fall and a Regents exam in June
Ineffective (0 - 2 points) Results are well-below District goals for similar students.	0-52% of students meet growth target set by the teacher in conjunction with the principal using a pre-assessment in the fall and a Regents exam in June

## 2.8) High School Math Regents Courses

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

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

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

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

Use this box, if needed, to describe the general process for assigning HEDI categories for these grades/subjects in this subcomponent. If needed, you may upload a table or graphic at 2.11, below.	(No response)
Highly Effective (18 - 20 points) Results are well-above District goals for similar students.	76-100% of students meet growth target set by the teacher in conjunction with the principal using a pre-assessment in the fall and a Regents exam in June
Effective (9 - 17 points) Results meet District goals for similar students.	65-75% of students meet growth target set by the teacher in conjunction with the principal using a pre-assessment in the fall and a Regents exam in June
Developing (3 - 8 points) Results are below District goals for similar students.	53-64% of students meet growth target set by the teacher in conjunction with the principal using a pre-assessment in the fall and a Regents exam in June
Ineffective (0 - 2 points) Results are well-below District goals for similar students.	0-52% of students meet growth target set by the teacher in conjunction with the principal using a pre-assessment in the fall and a Regents exam in June

## 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.



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

Use this box, if needed, to describe the general process for assigning HEDI categories for these grades/subjects in this subcomponent. If needed, you may upload a table or graphic at 2.11, below.	See the uploaded attachment for HEDI SLO assignment process
Highly Effective (18 - 20 points) Results are well-above District goals for similar students.	76-100% of MS students meet growth target set by the district of an increase our MGP by at least 2 percentile points for MS courses; 86-100% of HS students meeting growth target on all attempted Regents exams
Effective (9 - 17 points) Results meet District goals for similar students.	65-75% of students meet growth target set by the district of an increase our MGP by at least 2 percentile points for MS courses; 65-85% of HS students meeting growth target on all attempted Regents exams
Developing (3 - 8 points) Results are below District goals for similar students.	53-64% of students meet growth target set by the district of an increase our MGP by at least 2 percentile points for MS courses; 53-64% of HS students meeting growth target on all attempted Regents exams
Ineffective (0 - 2 points) Results are well-below District goals for similar students.	0-52% of students meet growth target set by the district of an increase our MGP by at least 2 percentile points for MS courses; 0-52% of HS students meeting growth target on all attempted Regents exams

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/5364/145586-TXEttx9bQW/Dryden-TeacherHEDI-StateSLOChart.doc*

## 2.12) Locally Developed Controls

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

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

*(No response)*

## 2.13) Teachers with more than one growth measure

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

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

## 2.14) Assurances

Please check all of the boxes below:

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

### 3. Local Measures (Teachers)

Created Monday, June 25, 2012

Updated Thursday, November 29, 2012

---

#### Page 1

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

Measures based on:

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

### 3.1) Grades 4-8 ELA

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

	Locally-Selected Measure from List of Approved Measures	Assessment
4	4) State-approved 3rd party assessments	STAR Reading Enterprise
5	4) State-approved 3rd party assessments	STAR Reading Enterprise
6	4) State-approved 3rd party assessments	STAR Reading Enterprise
7	4) State-approved 3rd party assessments	STAR Reading Enterprise
8	4) State-approved 3rd party assessments	STAR Reading Enterprise

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.	Teachers and their building administrator will collaboratively develop [growth] goals based on their student rosters using available background and baseline data. Appropriate and rigorous targets will be set. After the summative assessment is administered and scored, the teacher and the building administrator will determine the percentage of students who met the differentiated targets. After this percentage is determined, the attached chart will be used to determine the appropriate points and HEDI category for each teacher.
Highly Effective (14 - 15 points) Results are well above District- or BOCES-adopted expectations for growth or achievement for grade/subject.	76-100% of students meet growth target determined by the teacher in conjunction with the principal
Effective (8- 13 points) Results meet District- or BOCES-adopted expectations for growth or achievement for grade/subject.	65-75% of students meet growth target determined by the teacher in conjunction with the principal
Developing (3 - 7 points) Results are below District- or BOCES-adopted expectations for growth or achievement for grade/subject.	53-64% of students meet growth target determined by the teacher in conjunction with the principal
Ineffective (0 - 2 points) Results are well below District- or BOCES-adopted expectations for growth or achievement for grade/subject.	0-52% of students meet growth target determined by the teacher in conjunction with the principal

### 3.2) Grades 4-8 Math

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

	Locally-Selected Measure from List of Approved Measures	Assessment
4	4) State-approved 3rd party assessments	STAR MATH Enterprise
5	4) State-approved 3rd party assessments	STAR MATH Enterprise
6	4) State-approved 3rd party assessments	STAR MATH Enterprise
7	4) State-approved 3rd party assessments	STAR MATH Enterprise
8	4) State-approved 3rd party assessments	STAR MATH Enterprise

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.	Teachers and their building administrator will collaboratively develop [growth] goals based on their student rosters using available background and baseline data. Appropriate and rigorous targets will be set. After the summative assessment is administered and scored, the teacher and the building administrator will determine the percentage of students who met the differentiated targets. After this percentage is determined, the attached chart will be used to determine the appropriate points and HEDI category for each teacher.
Highly Effective (14 - 15 points) Results are well above District- or BOCES-adopted expectations for growth or achievement for grade/subject.	76-100% of students meet growth target determined by the teacher in conjunction with the principal
Effective (8- 13 points) Results meet District- or BOCES-adopted expectations for growth or achievement for grade/subject.	65-75% of students meet growth target determined by the teacher in conjunction with the principal
Developing (3 - 7 points) Results are below District- or BOCES-adopted expectations for growth or achievement for grade/subject.	53-64% of students meet growth target determined by the teacher in conjunction with the principal
Ineffective (0 - 2 points) Results are well below District- or BOCES-adopted expectations for growth or achievement for grade/subject.	0-52% of students meet growth target determined by the teacher in conjunction with the principal

### 3.3) HEDI Tables or Graphics

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

*assets/survey-uploads/5139/145599-rhJdBgDruP/Dryden-TeacherHEDI-LocalSLOChart.doc*

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

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

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

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

Measures based on:

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

### 3.4) Grades K-3 ELA

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

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

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

*Note: when completing the HEDI boxes below, it is not acceptable to just repeat the text descriptions from the regulations and/or*

assurances listed to the left of each box.

Use this box, if needed, to describe the general process for assigning HEDI categories for these grades/subjects in this subcomponent. If needed, you may upload a table or graphic at 3.13, below.	Teachers and their building administrator will collaboratively develop [growth] goals based on their student rosters using available background and baseline data. Appropriate and rigorous targets will be set. After the summative assessment is administered and scored, the teacher and the building administrator will determine the percentage of students who met the differentiated targets. After this percentage is determined, the attached chart will be used to determine the appropriate points and HEDI category for each teacher.
Highly Effective (18-20 points) Results are well above District- or BOCES-adopted expectations for growth or achievement for grade/subject.	76-100% of students meet growth target determined by the teacher in conjunction with the principal
Effective (9-17 points) Results meet District- or BOCES-adopted expectations for growth or achievement for grade/subject.	65-75% of students meet growth target determined by the teacher in conjunction with the principal
Developing (3 - 8 points) Results are below District- or BOCES-adopted expectations for growth or achievement for grade/subject.	53-64% of students meet growth target determined by the teacher in conjunction with the principal
Ineffective (0 - 2 points) Results are well below District- or BOCES-adopted expectations for growth or achievement for grade/subject.	0-52% of students meet growth target determined by the teacher in conjunction with the principal

### 3.5) Grades K-3 Math

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

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

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.	Teachers and their building administrator will collaboratively develop [growth] goals based on their student rosters using available background and baseline data. Appropriate and rigorous targets will be set. After the summative assessment is administered and scored, the teacher and the building administrator will determine the percentage of students who met the differentiated targets. After this percentage is determined, the attached chart will
---	---

	be used to determine the appropriate points and HEDI category for each teacher.
Highly Effective (18-20 points) Results are well above District- or BOCES-adopted expectations for growth or achievement for grade/subject.	76-100% of students meet growth target determined by the teacher in conjunction with the principal
Effective (9-17 points) Results meet District- or BOCES-adopted expectations for growth or achievement for grade/subject.	65-75% of students meet growth target determined by the teacher in conjunction with the principal
Developing (3 - 8 points) Results are below District -or BOCES-adopted expectations for growth or achievement for grade/subject.	53-64% of students meet growth target determined by the teacher in conjunction with the principal
Ineffective (0 - 2 points) Results are well below District- or BOCES-adopted expectations for growth or achievement for grade/subject.	0-52% of students meet growth target determined by the teacher in conjunction with the principal

### 3.6) Grades 6-8 Science

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

	Locally-Selected Measure from List of Approved Measures	Assessment
6	7) Student Learning Objectives	Dryden developed grade 6 Science assessment
7	7) Student Learning Objectives	Dryden developed grade 7 Science assessment
8	7) Student Learning Objectives	Dryden developed grade 8 Science assessment

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

Use this box, if needed, to describe the general process for assigning HEDI categories for these grades/subjects in this subcomponent. If needed, you may upload a table or graphic at 3.13, below.	Teachers and their building administrator will collaboratively develop [achievement] goals based on their student rosters using available background and baseline data. Appropriate and rigorous targets will be set. After the summative assessment is administered and scored, the teacher and the building administrator will determine the percentage of students who met the differentiated targets. After this percentage is determined, the attached chart will be used to determine the appropriate points and HEDI category for each teacher.
Highly Effective (18 - 20 points) Results are well above District- or BOCES-adopted expectations for growth or achievement for grade/subject.	76-100% of students meet achievement target determined by the teacher in conjunction with the principal
Effective (9 - 17 points) Results meet District- or BOCES-adopted expectations for growth or achievement for grade/subject.	65-75% of students meet achievement target determined by the teacher in conjunction with the principal
Developing (3 - 8 points) Results are below District- or BOCES-adopted expectations for growth or achievement for grade/subject.	53-64% of students meet achievement target determined by the teacher in conjunction with the principal

Ineffective (0 - 2 points) Results are well below District- or BOCES-adopted expectations for growth or achievement for grade/subject.	0-52% of students meet achievement target determined by the teacher in conjunction with the principal
--	---

### 3.7) Grades 6-8 Social Studies

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

	Locally-Selected Measure from List of Approved Measures	Assessment
6	7) Student Learning Objectives	Dryden developed grade 6 social studies assessment
7	7) Student Learning Objectives	Dryden developed grade 7 social studies assessment
8	7) Student Learning Objectives	Dryden developed grade 8 social studies assessment

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

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

Use this box, if needed, to describe the general process for assigning HEDI categories for these grades/subjects in this subcomponent. If needed, you may upload a table or graphic at 3.13, below.	Teachers and their building administrator will collaboratively develop [achievement] goals based on their student rosters using available background and baseline data. Appropriate and rigorous targets will be set. After the summative assessment is administered and scored, the teacher and the building administrator will determine the percentage of students who met the differentiated targets. After this percentage is determined, the attached chart will be used to determine the appropriate points and HEDI category for each teacher.
Highly Effective (18 - 20 points) Results are well above District- or BOCES-adopted expectations for growth or achievement for grade/subject.	76-100% of students meet achievement target determined by the teacher in conjunction with the principal
Effective (9 - 17 points) Results meet District- or BOCES-adopted expectations for growth or achievement for grade/subject.	65-75% of students meet achievement target determined by the teacher in conjunction with the principal
Developing (3 - 8 points) Results are below District- or BOCES-adopted expectations for growth or achievement for grade/subject.	53-64% of students meet achievement target determined by the teacher in conjunction with the principal
Ineffective (0 - 2 points) Results are well below District- or BOCES-adopted expectations for growth or achievement for grade/subject.	0-52% of students meet achievement target determined by the teacher in conjunction with the principal

### 3.8) High School Social Studies

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

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

	Locally-Selected Measure from List of Approved Measures	Assessment
Global 1	7) Student Learning Objectives	Dryden developed Global 1 assessment
Global 2	7) Student Learning Objectives	Dryden developed Global 2 assessment
American History	7) Student Learning Objectives	Dryden developed American History assessment

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.	Teachers and their building administrator will collaboratively develop [growth] goals based on their student rosters using available background and baseline data. Appropriate and rigorous targets will be set. After the summative assessment is administered and scored, the teacher and the building administrator will determine the percentage of students who met the differentiated targets. After this percentage is determined, the attached chart will be used to determine the appropriate points and HEDI category for each teacher.
Highly Effective (18 - 20 points) Results are well above District- or BOCES-adopted expectations for growth or achievement for grade/subject.	76-100% of students meet growth target determined by the teacher in conjunction with the principal
Effective (9 - 17 points) Results meet District- or BOCES-adopted expectations for growth or achievement for grade/subject.	65-75% of students meet growth target determined by the teacher in conjunction with the principal
Developing (3 - 8 points) Results are below District- or BOCES-adopted expectations for growth or achievement for grade/subject.	53-64% of students meet growth target determined by the teacher in conjunction with the principal
Ineffective (0 - 2 points) Results are well below District- or BOCES-adopted expectations for growth or achievement for grade/subject.	0-52% of students meet growth target determined by the teacher in conjunction with the principal

### 3.9) High School Science

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

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

	Locally-Selected Measure from List of Approved Measures	Assessment
Living Environment	7) Student Learning Objectives	Dryden developed Biology Assessment
Earth Science	7) Student Learning Objectives	Dryden developed Earth Science Assessment
Chemistry	7) Student Learning Objectives	Dryden developed Chemistry Assessment
Physics	7) Student Learning Objectives	Dryden developed Physics Assessment

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

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

Use this box, if needed, to describe the general process for assigning HEDI categories for these grades/subjects in this subcomponent. If needed, you may upload a table or graphic at 3.13, below.	Teachers and their building administrator will collaboratively develop [growth] goals based on their student rosters using available background and baseline data. Appropriate and rigorous targets will be set. After the summative assessment is administered and scored, the teacher and the building administrator will determine the percentage of students who met the differentiated targets. After this percentage is determined, the attached chart will be used to determine the appropriate points and HEDI category for each teacher.
Highly Effective (18-20 points) Results are well above District- or BOCES-adopted expectations for growth or achievement for grade/subject.	76-100% of students meet growth target determined by the teacher in conjunction with the principal
Developing (3 - 8 points) Results are below District- or BOCES-adopted expectations for growth or achievement for grade/subject.	65-75% of students meet growth target determined by the teacher in conjunction with the principal
Effective (9 - 17points) Results meet District- or BOCES-adopted expectations for growth or achievement for grade/subject.	53-64% of students meet growth target determined by the teacher in conjunction with the principal
Ineffective (0 - 2 points) Results are well below District- or BOCES-adopted expectations for growth or achievement for grade/subject.	0-52% of students meet growth target determined by the teacher in conjunction with the principal

### 3.10) High School Math

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

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

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

Algebra 1	7) Student Learning Objectives	Dryden developed Algebra 1 Assessment
Geometry	7) Student Learning Objectives	Dryden developed Geometry Assessment
Algebra 2	7) Student Learning Objectives	Dryden developed Algebra 2 Assessment

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

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

Use this box, if needed, to describe the general process for assigning HEDI categories for these grades/subjects in this subcomponent. If needed, you may upload a table or graphic at 3.13, below.	Teachers and their building administrator will collaboratively develop [growth] goals based on their student rosters using available background and baseline data. Appropriate and rigorous targets will be set. After the summative assessment is administered and scored, the teacher and the building administrator will determine the percentage of students who met the differentiated targets. After this percentage is determined, the attached chart will be used to determine the appropriate points and HEDI category for each teacher.
Highly Effective (18 - 20 points) Results are well above District- or BOCES-adopted expectations for growth or achievement for grade/subject.	76-100% of students meet growth target determined by the teacher in conjunction with the principal
Effective (9 - 17 points) Results meet District- or BOCES-adopted expectations for growth or achievement for grade/subject.	65-75% of students meet growth target determined by the teacher in conjunction with the principal
Developing (3 - 8 points) Results are below District- or BOCES-adopted expectations for growth or achievement for grade/subject.	53-64% of students meet growth target determined by the teacher in conjunction with the principal
Ineffective (0 - 2 points) Results are well below District- or BOCES-adopted expectations for growth or achievement for grade/subject.	0-52% of students meet growth target determined by the teacher in conjunction with the principal

### 3.11) High School English Language Arts

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

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

	Locally-Selected Measure from List of Approved Measures	Assessment
Grade 9 ELA	7) Student Learning Objectives	TST BOCES developed Grade 9 ELA Assessment



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

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

<p>Use this box, if needed, to describe the general process for assigning HEDI categories for these grades/subjects in this subcomponent. If needed, you may upload a table or graphic at 3.13, below.</p>	<p>Teachers and their building administrator will collaboratively develop [growth] goals based on their student rosters using available background and baseline data. Appropriate and rigorous targets will be set. After the summative assessment is administered and scored, the teacher and the building administrator will determine the percentage of students who met the differentiated targets. After this percentage is determined, the attached chart will be used to determine the appropriate points and HEDI category for each teacher.</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>76-100% of students meet growth target determined by the teacher in conjunction with the principal</p>
<p>Effective (9 - 17 points) Results meet District- or BOCES-adopted expectations for growth or achievement for grade/subject.</p>	<p>65-75% of students meet growth target determined by the teacher in conjunction with the principal</p>
<p>Developing (3 - 8 points) Results are below District- or BOCES-adopted expectations for growth or achievement for grade/subject.</p>	<p>53-64% of students meet growth target determined by the teacher in conjunction with the principal</p>
<p>Ineffective (0 - 2 points) Results are well below District- or BOCES-adopted expectations for growth or achievement for grade/subject.</p>	<p>0-52% of students meet growth target determined by the teacher in conjunction with the principal</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/5139/145599-y92vNseFa4/Dryden-TeacherHEDI-LocalSLOChart.doc*

### 3.14) Locally Developed Controls

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

(No response)

### 3.15) Teachers with More Than One Locally Selected Measure

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

*The district will use direct ratios to calculate the weight of multiple measures based on numbers of students taking the assessment (for example, a 4th grade teacher has locally-selected measures for both ELA and Math - assuming the same number of students participate in both, the measures would be equally weighted; a High School teacher with two SLOs with the first SLO based on 70 students and the second on 30 would have the SLOs weighted so the first would comprise 70% of the score and the second would make up the other 30%)*

### 3.16) Assurances

Please check all of the boxes below:

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

## 4. Other Measures of Effectiveness (Teachers)

Created Wednesday, July 25, 2012

Updated Sunday, September 30, 2012

---

### Page 1

#### 4.1) Teacher Practice Rubric

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

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

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

*Danielson's Framework for Teaching (2011 Revised Edition)*

*Not Applicable*

#### 4.2) Points Within Other Measures

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

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

Is the following points assignment applicable to all teachers?

*Yes*

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

*(No response)*

Multiple (at least two) classroom observations by principal or other trained administrator, at least one of which must be unannounced [at least 31 points]	60
One or more observation(s) by trained independent evaluators	0
Observations by trained in-school peer teachers	0
Feedback from students using State-approved survey tool	0
Feedback from parents/caregivers using State-approved survey tool	0
Structured reviews of lesson plans, student portfolios and other teacher artifacts	0

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

(No response)

### 4.3) Survey Tools (if applicable)

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

(No response)

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

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

### 4.4) Assurances

Please check all of the boxes below:

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

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

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

*We are assigning the following points to the Danielson 2011 rubric:*

*Domain 1 - Planning and Preparation = 16 points*

*Domain 2 - Classroom Environment = 16 points*

*Domain 3 - Instruction = 16 points*

*Domain 4 - Professional Responsibilities = 12 points*

*The rubric has four levels from 1 point to 4 points attainable for each component. A teacher will score a set number of points in each domain depending upon the evidence provided - that score will be mathematically calculated from a raw score to a scaled score for that particular domain. The scaled scores from each domain will be added together to create the total rubric score. The conversion of*

*the rubric score to HEDI ratings is on the attached table.*

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/5091/155212-eka9yMJ855/DrydenHEDI-RubricConversionScale\_1.doc*

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

Highly Effective: Overall performance and results exceed NYS Teaching Standards.	Overall teacher performance and student achievement exceed the NYS Teaching Standards as demonstrated on the Danielson (Teachscape) rubric with an overall rating of 3.51-4.00.
Effective: Overall performance and results meet NYS Teaching Standards.	Overall teacher performance and student achievement meet the NYS Teaching Standards as demonstrated on the Danielson (Teachscape) rubric with an overall rating of 2.51-3.50.
Developing: Overall performance and results need improvement in order to meet NYS Teaching Standards.	Overall teacher performance and student achievement need improvement in order to meet the NYS Teaching Standards as demonstrated on the Danielson (Teachscape) rubric with an overall rating of 1.51-2.50.
Ineffective: Overall performance and results do not meet NYS Teaching Standards.	Overall teacher performance and student achievement do not meet the NYS Teaching Standards as demonstrated on the Danielson (Teachscape) rubric of 0-1.50.

Provide the ranges for the 60-point scoring bands.

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

#### 4.6) Observations of Probationary Teachers

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

By building principals or other trained administrators

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

By trained in-school peer teachers or other trained reviewers

Formal/Long	0
Informal/Short	0

Independent evaluators

Formal/Long	0
Informal/Short	0

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

- 
- In Person
- 

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

- 
- In Person
- 

## 4.7) Observations of Tenured Teachers

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

By building principals or other trained administrators

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

By trained in-school peer teachers or other trained reviewers

Formal/Long	0
Informal/Short	0

Independent evaluators

Formal/Long	0
Informal/Short	0

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

- 
- In Person
-

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

---

- In Person
-

# 5. Composite Scoring (Teachers)

Created Wednesday, July 25, 2012

Updated Sunday, September 30, 2012

---

## Page 1

### **Standards for Rating Categories**

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

#### **Locally-selected Measures of**

#### **growth or achievement**

#### **Other Measures of Effectiveness**

#### **(Teacher and Leader standards)**

#### **Highly**

#### **Effective**

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

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

Overall performance and results exceed NYS Teaching Standards.

#### **Effective**

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

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

Overall performance and results meet NYS Teaching Standards.

#### **Developing**

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

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

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

#### **Ineffective**

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

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

Overall performance and results do not meet NYS Teaching Standards.

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

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

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

**Growth or Comparable Measures**

**Locally-selected Measures of**

**growth or achievement**

**Other Measures of Effectiveness**

**(60 points)**

**Overall**

**Composite Score**

**Highly Effective**

**18-20**

**18-20**

**Ranges determined locally--see below**

**91-100**

**Effective**

**9-17**

**9-17**

**75-90**

**Developing**

**3-8**

**3-8**

**65-74**

**Ineffective**

**0-2**

**0-2**

**0-64**

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

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

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

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

**Growth or Comparable Measures**

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

**Other Measures of Effectiveness**

**(60 points)**

**Overall**

**Composite Score**

**Highly Effective**

**22-25**

**14-15**

**Ranges determined locally--see above**

**91-100**

**Effective**

**10-21**

**8-13**

**75-90**

**Developing**

**3-9**

**3-7**

**65-74**

**Ineffective**

**0-2**

**0-2**

**0-64**

## 6. Additional Requirements - Teachers

Created Wednesday, July 25, 2012

Updated Thursday, November 29, 2012

---

### Page 1

#### 6.1) Assurances -- Improvement Plans

Please check the boxes below:

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

#### 6.2) Attachment: Teacher Improvement Plan Forms

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

[assets/survey-uploads/5265/155218-Df0w3Xx5v6/APPR-Teachscape-based TIP form\\_1.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:

*The Appeals Process was incorporated into the law because of the possibility of an expedited hearing if two consecutive Ineffective ratings were attained. Therefore, only an Ineffective rating may be appealed. It is acknowledged that an appeal may be based on either a procedural or a substantive issue. All appeals must be filed within 30 school days of receiving the Ineffective rating. Appeals will be filed with the Superintendent and the Association President who will meet within ten (10) school days of receipt of the appeal and select the Appeals Committee.*

*The Appeals Committee will be comprised of the Superintendent (or his/her representative), the Association President (or his/her representative) and a third party jointly selected by the superintendent (or his/her representative) and the Association President (or his/her representative). The Appeals Committee reserves the right to interview the administrator(s) or the staff member identified on the appeals form. The Committee should meet as soon as possible but no later than ten (10) school days after their selection. The Committee will render their decision which may include adjustments to the total composite scoring or any part thereof. The Committee decision is binding and will be delivered by registered mail to the staff member that initiated the appeal no later than ten (10) school days after the Committee meeting. If the rating of Ineffective is changed to Effective, the Superintendent may choose to eliminate a TIP or may recommend continuation or modification of the TIP.*

*A procedural appeal would be filed when a member believes his/her APPR process was flawed (for example, timelines not met, uncorrected class roster errors, or documentation omitted). The faculty member would complete Form 2012-N9 and include APPR language that the member believes was violated.*

*A substantive appeal would be filed when a member is contesting either a rubric score or a part of a SLO score. The member would need to provide an explanation and any supporting documents to the Appeal Committee.*

*At not time shall the appeal process take more than 45 school days to complete.*

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

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

*Lead Teacher/Principal Evaluators will be trained by TST BOCES who is our regional trainer from SED. All administrators have been or will be trained by TST BOCES and then be certified by the Dryden Board of Education. The initial training comprises 30 hours of evidence-based observation, use of a rubric, and specific training for SWD and ELL students. Part of the training through BOCES includes inter-rater reliability as well as calibration training specific to the Teachscape rubric.*

*Following the initial Lead Teacher/Principal Evaluator training, TST BOCES will provide required updates and follow-up training in order to re-certify evaluators. There will be a minimum of three (3) trainings per year by TST BOCES which will focus on the observation process, inter-rater reliability and calibration to the rubric.*

*This training may be available to faculty association members in the future.*

## 6.5) Assurances -- Evaluators

Please check the boxes below:

- 
- Checked
- 

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

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

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

(4) application and use of the State-approved teacher or principal rubric(s) selected by the district or BOCES for use in evaluations,

including training on the effective application of such rubrics to observe a teacher or principal's practice

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

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

(7) use of the Statewide Instructional Reporting System

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

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

- 
- Checked
- 

## 6.6) Assurances -- Teachers

Please check all of the boxes below:

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

## 6.7) Assurances -- Data

Please check all of the boxes below:

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

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

Created Wednesday, July 25, 2012  
Updated Tuesday, November 27, 2012

## Page 1

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

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

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

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

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

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

Please check the boxes below:

7.2) Assurances -- State-Provided Measures of Student Growth   Assure that the value-added growth score provided by NYSED will be used, where applicable	Checked
7.2) Assurances -- State-Provided Measures of Student Growth   Assure that the State-provided growth measure will be used if a value-added measure has not been approved for 2012-13	Checked

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

Student Learning Objectives will be the other comparable growth measures for principals in buildings or programs in which fewer than 30% of students take Grades 4-8 ELA, Math, and/or High School courses with State or Regents assessments. SLOs will be developed using the assessment covering the most students in the school or program and continuing until at least 30% of students in the school or program are covered by SLOs. District-determined assessments from the options below may be used as evidence of student learning within the SLO:

State assessments, *required if one exists*

District, regional, or BOCES-developed assessments that are rigorous and comparable across classrooms

List of State-approved 3rd party assessments

First, list the school or program type this SLO applies to. Then, using the drop-down boxes below, please select the assessment that will be used for SLOs for the school/program listed. Finally, name the specific assessment listing the full name of the assessment. Districts or BOCES that intend to use a district, regional, or BOCES-developed assessment must include the name, grade, and subject of the assessment. For example, a regionally-developed 7th grade Social Studies assessment would be written as follows: [INSERT SPECIFIC NAME OF REGION]-developed 7th grade Social Studies assessment.

***Please remember that State assessments must be used with SLOs if applicable to the school or program type.***

School or Program Type	SLO with Assessment Option	Name of the Assessment
K-3	State-approved 3rd party assessment	STAR Early Literacy Enterprise
9-12	State assessment	NYS English 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.

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.	Teachers and their building administrator will collaboratively develop [growth] goals based on their student rosters using available background and baseline data. Appropriate and rigorous targets will be set. After the summative assessment is administered and scored, the teacher and the building administrator will determine the percentage of students who met the differentiated targets. After this percentage is determined, the attached chart will be used to determine the appropriate points and HEDI category for each teacher.
Highly Effective (18 - 20 points) Results are well above state average for similar students (or District goals if no state test).	81-100% of students meet achievement target based on student data
Effective (9 - 17 points) Results meet state average for similar students (or District goals if no state test).	65-80% of student meet achievement target based on student data
Developing (3 - 8 points) Results are below state average for similar students (or District goals if no state test).	53-64% of students meet achievement target based on student data
Ineffective (0 - 2 points) Results are well below state average for similar students (or District goals if no state test).	0-52% of students meet achievement target based on student data

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.

## 7.4) Special Considerations for Comparable Growth Measures

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

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

*(No response)*

## 7.5) Principals with More Than One Growth Measure

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

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

## 7.6) Assurances -- Comparable Growth Measures

Please check all of the boxes below:

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

# 8. Local Measures (Principals)

Created Friday, August 03, 2012

Updated Tuesday, November 27, 2012

---

## Page 1

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

Grade Configuration	Locally-Selected Measure from List of Approved Measures	Assessment
K-5	(a) achievement on State assessments	NYS 4th Grade Science Assessment
6-8	(a) achievement on State assessments	NYS 8th Grade Science Assessment
9-12	(a) achievement on State assessments	NYS HS English Regents Exam

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

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

Use this box, if needed, to describe the process for assigning HEDI categories. If needed, you may upload a table or graphic below.	(No response)
Highly Effective (14 - 15 points) Results are well above District- or BOCES-adopted expectations for growth or achievement for grade/subject.	81-100% of students meet achievement target based on student data
Effective (8- 13 points) Results meet District- or BOCES-adopted expectations for growth or achievement for grade/subject.	65-80% of students meet achievement target based on student data
Developing (3 - 7 points) Results are below District- or BOCES-adopted expectations for growth or achievement for grade/subject.	53-64% of students meet achievement target based on student data
Ineffective (0 - 2 points) Results are well below District- or BOCES-adopted expectations for growth or achievement for grade/subject.	0-52% of students meet achievement target based on student data

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

*(No response)*

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

*assets/survey-uploads/5366/158847-qBFVOWF7fC/Dryden-PrincipalHEDI-LocalSLOChart.doc*

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

Grade Configuration	Locally-Selected Measure from List of Approved Measures	Assessment
K-3	(i) Student Learning Objectives	STAR Early Literacy Enterprise
9-12	(i) Student Learning Objectives	NYS ELA Regents

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

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

Use this box, if needed, to describe the process for assigning HEDI categories. If needed, you may upload a table or graphic below.	(No response)
Highly Effective (18 - 20 points) Results are well above District- or BOCES-adopted expectations for growth or achievement for grade/subject.	81-100% of students meet achievement target based on student data
Effective (9- 17 points) Results meet District- or BOCES-adopted expectations for growth or achievement for grade/subject.	65-80% of students meet achievement target based on student data
Developing (3 - 8 points) Results are below District- or BOCES-adopted expectations for growth or achievement for grade/subject.	53-64% of students meet achievement target based on student data
Ineffective (0 - 2 points) Results are well below District- or BOCES-adopted expectations for growth or achievement for grade/subject.	0-52% of students meet achievement target based on student data

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

*(No response)*

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

### 8.3) Locally Developed Controls

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

*(No response)*

### 8.4) Principals with More Than One Locally Selected Measure

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

*While we do not foresee a principal having more than one measure, if he/she did, we would use a ratio model based on the number of students participating in each measure (as we did with the teachers locally selected measure component).*

### 8.5) Assurances

Please check all of the boxes below:

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

# 9. Other Measures of Effectiveness (Principals)

Created Wednesday, July 25, 2012  
Updated Tuesday, November 27, 2012

---

## Page 1

### 9.1) Principal Practice Rubric

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

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

*Multidimensional Principal Performance Rubric*

*(No response)*

### 9.2) Points Within Other Measures

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

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

Is the following points assignment for all principals?

*Yes*

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

*(No response)*

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

Broad assessment of principal leadership and management actions based on the practice rubric by the supervisor, a trained administrator or a trained independent evaluator. This must incorporate multiple school visits by supervisor, trained administrator, or trained independent evaluator, at least one of which must be from a supervisor, and at least one of which must be unannounced. [At least 31 points]	40
---	----

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.	20
--	----

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

(No response)

### 9.3) Assurances -- Goals

Please check the boxes below (if applicable):

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

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

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

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

### 9.5) Survey Tool(s) (if applicable)

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

(No response)

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

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

## 9.6) Assurances

Please check all of the boxes below:

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

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

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

*For the principal evaluation, 40 of the 60 points will be assigned using the Multi-Dimensional rubric. The remaining 20 points will be earned by evaluating the Principal's evaluation of the teachers as evidenced through direct meetings and review of teacher evaluation documentation. One of the announced observations will involve meetings between the Lead Evaluator and the principal to review the principal's work on his/her teachers' APPRs, to date. The principal will be responsible for two (2) formal teacher observations for tenured teachers and generally no more than three (3) formal teacher observations for probationary teachers, although the principal or his/her designee may perform more observations at their discretion or at the direction of the Superintendent of Schools. The Lead Evaluator's announced observation of the principal will be to review at least one of the two evaluations the principal or his/her designee is required to complete.*

*The principal's teachers' APPRs will be reviewed for application of the teachers' practice rubric, areas of improvement noted, constructive feedback given, required forms if any, and any follow-up with the teacher. This announced observation is to occur by the mid-year point of the school year. This review of the principal's work on teachers' APPR is worth 20 points out of the 60 points for the Other Measures of Effectiveness.*

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/5143/155222-pMADJ4gk6R/DrydenHEDI-RubricConversionScale\\_1.doc](#)

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

Highly Effective: Overall performance and results exceed standards.	Overall performance and student achievement exceed ISLLC standards as demonstrated through evidence on the rubric and review of the principal's work on teachers' APPR
Effective: Overall performance and results meet standards.	Overall performance and student achievement meet ISLLC standards as demonstrated through evidence on the rubric and review of the principal's work on teachers' APPR
Developing: Overall performance and results need improvement in order to meet standards.	Overall performance and student achievement need improvement in order to meet ISLLC standards as demonstrated through evidence on the rubric and review of the

	principal's work on teachers' APPR
Ineffective: Overall performance and results do not meet standards.	Overall performance and student achievement does not meet ISLLC standards as demonstrated through evidence on the rubric and review of the principal's work on teachers' APPR

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	3
By trained administrator	0
By trained independent evaluator	0
Enter Total	3

#### **Tenured Principals**

By supervisor	3
By trained administrator	0
By trained independent evaluator	0
Enter Total	3

# 10. Composite Scoring (Principals)

Created Wednesday, July 25, 2012

Updated Saturday, November 17, 2012

---

## Page 1

### **Standards for Rating Categories**

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

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

#### **Other Measures of Effectiveness**

#### **(Teacher and Leader standards)**

#### **Highly**

##### **Effective**

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

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

Overall performance and results exceed ISLLC leadership standards.

##### **Effective**

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

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

Overall performance and results meet ISLLC leadership standards.

##### **Developing**

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

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

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

##### **Ineffective**

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

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

Overall performance and results do not meet ISLLC leadership standards.

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

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

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

**Growth or Comparable Measures**

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

**Other Measures of Effectiveness**

**(60 points)**

**Overall**

**Composite Score**

**Highly Effective**

**18-20**

**18-20**

**Ranges determined locally--see below**

**91-100**

**Effective**

**9-17**

**9-17**

**75-90**

**Developing**

**3-8**

**3-8**

**65-74**

**Ineffective**

**0-2**

**0-2**

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

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

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

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

**Growth or Comparable Measures**

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

**Other Measures of Effectiveness**

**(60 points)**

**Overall**

**Composite Score**

**Highly Effective**

22-25

14-15

Ranges determined locally--see above

91-100

**Effective**

10-21

8-13

75-90

**Developing**

3-9

3-7

**65-74**

**Ineffective**

**0-2**

**0-2**

**0-64**

# 11. Additional Requirements - Principals

Created Wednesday, July 25, 2012

Updated Thursday, November 29, 2012

---

## Page 1

### 11.1) Assurances -- Improvement Plans

Please check the boxes below.

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

### 11.2) Attachment: Principal Improvement Plan Forms

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

[assets/survey-uploads/5276/155226-Df0w3Xx5v6/Dryden Principal Improvement Plan.doc](#)

### 11.3) Appeals Process

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

(1) the substance of the annual professional performance review

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

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

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

*9.1 To the extent a principal wishes to challenge his/her performance review and/or improvement plan (PIP) under the new APPR system; the District has developed an appeals procedure. A principal who receives an effectiveness composite score rating of "ineffective" may appeal his/her performance review. Ratings of "highly effective", "effective" or "developing" cannot be appealed.*

*9.2 This appeals procedure does not diminish the authority of the School Board to terminate probationary principals during their probationary period except as allowed under law. While the APPR shall be a "significant factor" in tenure and other employment*

decisions, nothing herein requires an appeal be exhausted before a tenure determination can be made. In addition, appeal procedures shall not cause a principal to acquire tenure when an evaluation appeal is pending.

9.3 In accordance with the law, for purposes of disciplinary proceedings under Education Law 3020-a, a “pattern” of ineffective teaching or performance shall be defined as two consecutive annual ineffective ratings received by a principal through the APPR process.

9.4 In order to implement the requirements of N.Y. Education Law §3012-c, the District and the Association hereby agree as follows:

A. Where and to the extent applicable, the Annual Professional Performance Review of principals shall be a significant factor for employment decisions and principal development, and will be subject to any procedures, which may in the future be negotiated by the District and the Association.

B. A unit member holding the position of principal may appeal only the substance of the Annual Professional Performance Review, the District’s adherence to the standards and methodologies required for such review, and the District’s compliance with its procedures for conducting the Annual Professional Performance Review, or its issuance and/or implementation of the terms of the Principal Improvement Plan.

9.5 Only tenured principals may file an appeal at Level 1 and Level 2. Non-tenured principals will have the right to add a response to the annual evaluation, which will be kept in his/her personnel file with the annual evaluation and may initiate a Level 1 appeal only. Only “ineffective” ratings may be appealed. A principal may not file multiple appeals regarding the same performance review. All grounds for appealing a particular performance review must be raised within the same appeal. Any grounds not raised at the time the appeal is filed shall be deemed waived.

9.6 The principal bringing an appeal has the burden of demonstrating a clear legal right to the relief requested and the burden of establishing that there is no substantial evidence upon which to base the District’s conclusion.

9.7 Level 1. Such appeal must be submitted in writing to the Superintendent. The writing must explain in detail the specific basis for the appeal, and provide any documents in support of the appeal. The appeal must be submitted within ten (10) school days of the principal’s receipt of the final Annual Professional Performance Review or Principal Improvement Plan, or other act under this section, which is the subject of the appeal, or it is deemed waived. Within fifteen (15) school days, the Superintendent shall provide the principal with a written response.

9.8 Level 2. A tenured principal may appeal the Superintendent’s Level 1 written response by filing an appeal in writing within fifteen (15) school days of receipt of the Superintendent’s Level 1 written response. The written appeal shall include all materials in support of the appeal at the time it is submitted. Upon receipt of the written appeal, the appeal shall be referred to the District Superintendent of Schools of the T-S-T BOCES who shall designate a hearing officer within ten (10) school days. The hearing officer shall be provided with a copy of the written appeal and any written response from the Superintendent. The hearing officer shall render a decision based on the written submissions, this APPR Plan and memorandum of agreement, and Education Law §3012-c and any implementing regulations. The hearing officer shall issue a written decision within thirty (30) days after receiving such written appeal. The hearing officer’s decision shall be final, binding, and unreviewable.

At not time shall the appeal process take more than 90 school days to complete.

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

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

6.1 The Superintendent will ensure that he/she and any evaluators of principals have been trained and that all lead evaluators have been trained and certified in accordance with regulation. The District will utilize 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 ISLLC Leadership 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 principal or principal rubric(s), including training on the effective application of such rubrics to observe a principal or principal's practice;*

*(5) Application and use of any assessment tools that the school district or BOCES utilizes to evaluate its classroom principals or building principals, including but not limited to, structured portfolio reviews; student, parent, principal 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 principals or principals;*

*(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 principal's or principal's overall rating and their subcomponent ratings; and*

*(9) Specific considerations in evaluating principals and principals of English language learners and students with disabilities.*

*(10) Initial training will consist of a minimum of six hours. Additional training and annual re-certification will consist of a minimum of six hours which will focus on the observation process and inter-rater reliability.*

*The Superintendent will ensure that lead evaluators participate in annual training and are re-certified on an annual basis. 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.*

## 11.5) Assurances -- Evaluators

Please check the boxes below:

- 
- Checked
- 

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

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

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

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

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

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

(7) use of the Statewide Instructional Reporting System

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

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

- 
- Checked
- 

## 11.6) Assurances -- Principals

Please check all of the boxes below:

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

## 11.7) Assurances -- Data

Please check all of the boxes below:

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

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

Checked

## 12. Joint Certification of APPR Plan

Created Thursday, August 09, 2012

Updated Thursday, November 29, 2012

---

### Page 1

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

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

<assets/survey-uploads/5581/161048-3Uqgn5g9Iu/DrydenCSDAPPR Plan District Cert Form 11-26-12.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.

Teacher – State Student Learning Objective Chart

After the pre-test is administered and scored, a class average using those currently on the class roster will be calculated and the range of scores and a class average will be determined. From this baseline data, the target score will be developed by the Principal in consultation with the teacher. The target score shall be developed no later than the end of the seventh week of the course. After the final examination is administered and scored, the percentage of students meeting the target shall be determined. The following will be used to determine points achieved by a teacher:

Highly Effective	76% - 100% of students meet SLO target	18-20 points
Effective	65% - 75% of students meet SLO target	9-17 points
Developing	53% - 64% of students meet SLO target	3-8 points
Ineffective	Less than 52% of students meet SLO target	0-2 points

<b>% of Students Meeting SLO Target</b>	<b>Points For State Measure</b>
91-100	20
85-90	19
76-84	18
75	17
74	16
73	15
72	14
71	13
70	12
69	11
67-68	10
65-66	9
63-64	8
61-62	7
59-60	6
57-58	5
55-56	4
53-54	3
51-52	2
48-50	1
Less than 48	0

Teacher – Local Student Learning Objective Chart

The local assessment goal of 75% will be considered an effective rating equivalent. The score is converted to points in the following table for non-value added model:

HEDI Level	HEDI Point Score Range	Achievement %	Points
Highly Effective	18-20	95-100%	20
		85-94%	19
		76-84%	18
Effective	9-17	75%	17
		74%	16
		73%	15
		72%	14
		71%	13
		70%	12
		69%	11
		67-68%	10
Developing	3-8	65-66%	9
		63-64%	8
		61-62%	7
		59-60%	6
		57-58%	5
		55-56%	4
		53-54%	3
Ineffective	0-2	51-52%	2
		49-50%	1
		0-48%	0

The local assessment goal of 75% will be considered an effective rating equivalent. The score is converted to points in the following table for value added model:

HEDI Level	HEDI Point Score Range	Achievement %	Points
Highly Effective	14-15	90-100%	15
		76-89%	14
Effective	8-13	75%	13
		73-74%	12
		71-72%	11
		69-70%	10
		67-68%	9
		65-66%	8
Developing	3-7	62-64%	7
		59-61%	6
		57-58%	5
		55-56%	4
		53-54%	3
Ineffective	0-2	51-52%	2
		48-50%	1
		0-47%	0

Teacher – Local Student Learning Objective Chart

The local assessment goal of 75% will be considered an effective rating equivalent. The score is converted to points in the following table for non-value added model:

HEDI Level	HEDI Point Score Range	Achievement %	Points
Highly Effective	18-20	95-100%	20
		85-94%	19
		76-84%	18
Effective	9-17	75%	17
		74%	16
		73%	15
		72%	14
		71%	13
		70%	12
		69%	11
		67-68%	10
		65-66%	9
Developing	3-8	63-64%	8
		61-62%	7
		59-60%	6
		57-58%	5
		55-56%	4
		53-54%	3
Ineffective	0-2	51-52%	2
		49-50%	1
		0-48%	0

The local assessment goal of 75% will be considered an effective rating equivalent. The score is converted to points in the following table for value added model:

HEDI Level	HEDI Point Score Range	Achievement %	Points
Highly Effective	14-15	90-100%	15
		76-89%	14
Effective	8-13	75%	13
		73-74%	12
		71-72%	11
		69-70%	10
		67-68%	9
		65-66%	8
Developing	3-7	62-64%	7
		59-61%	6
		57-58%	5
		55-56%	4
		53-54%	3
Ineffective	0-2	51-52%	2
		48-50%	1
		0-47%	0

Conversion scale to take the raw rubric score on four (4) to the HEDI value ranges based on the concept that if the majority of the elemental scores received is Ineffective the score should be Ineffective, similarly if the majority of the elemental scores received is Developing, Effective or Highly effective than the overall converted score should reflect the respective classification.

HEDI Level	HEDI Point Score Range	Calculated Rubric Score	Converted Score for Other Measures of Effectiveness
Highly Effective	59-60	3.76-4.00	60
		3.51-3.75	59
Effective	57-58	3.11-3.50	58
		2.60-3.10	57
Developing	50-56	2.40-2.59	56
		2.25-2.39	55
		2.10-2.24	54
		1.95-2.09	53
		1.80-1.94	52
		1.65-1.79	51
		1.50-1.64	50
Ineffective	0-49	1.49	49
		1.48	48
		1.47	47
		1.46	46
		1.45	45
		1.44	44
		1.43	43
		1.42	42
		1.41	41
		1.40	40
		1.39	39
		1.38	38
		1.37	37
		1.36	36
		1.35	35
		1.34	34
		1.33	33
		1.32	32
		1.31	31
		1.30	30
		1.29	29
		1.28	28
		1.27	27
		1.26	26
		1.25	25
		1.24	24
		1.23	23
		1.22	22
		1.21	21
		1.20	20
		1.19	19
		1.18	18
		1.17	17
		1.16	16
		1.15	15
		1.14	14
		1.13	13
		1.12	12
		1.11	11
		1.10	10
		1.09	9
		1.08	8
		1.07	7
		1.06	6
		1.05	5
		1.04	4
		1.03	3
		1.02	2
		1.01	1
		1.00	0

Principal – State Student Learning Objective Chart

After the pre-test is administered and scored, a class average using those currently on the class roster will be calculated and the range of scores will be determined. From this baseline data, the Principal in consultation with the teacher will develop the target score for that class. The target score shall be developed no later than the end of the 6<sup>th</sup> week of the course. After the District developed final examination (where State ELA and Math assessments are not available) is administered and scored, the total number of all students in the building meeting the target for their respective class shall be determined. A percentage of students in the building meeting the target will be determined by dividing the number of students meeting the target by the number of students tested. The following will be used to determine points achieved by a Principal:

Highly Effective	81% - 100% of students meet SLO target	18-20 points
Effective	65% - 80% of students meet SLO target	9-17 points
Developing	50% - 64% of students meet SLO target	3-8 points
Ineffective	Less than 50% of students meet SLO target	0-2 points

The state assessment goal of 80% will be considered an effective rating equivalent for principals. The score is converted to points in the following table for non-value added model:

HEDI Level	HEDI Point Score Range	Achievement %	Points
Highly Effective	18-20	91-100%	20
		85-90%	19
		81-84%	18
Effective	9-17	78-80%	17
		76-77%	16
		74-75%	15
		72-73%	14
		71%	13
		70%	12
		69%	11
		67-68%	10
Developing	3-8	65-66%	9
		63-64%	8
		61-62%	7
		59-60%	6
		57-58%	5
		55-56%	4
Ineffective	0-2	53-54%	3
		51-52%	2
		48-50%	1
		0-47%	0

The local assessment goal of 75% will be considered an effective rating equivalent. The score is converted to points in the following table for value added model:

HEDI Level	HEDI Point Score Range	Achievement %	Points
Highly Effective	22-25	95-100%	25
		90-94%	24
		85-89%	23
		81-84%	22
Effective	10-21	79-80%	21
		77-78%	20
		75-76%	19
		73-74%	18
		71-72%	17
		69-70%	16
		68%	15
		67%	12
		66%	11
		65%	10
Developing	3-9	63-64%	9
		61-62%	8
		59-60%	7
		57-58%	6
		55-56%	5
		54%	4
		53%	3
Ineffective	0-2	51-52%	2
		48-50%	1
		0-47%	0

Conversion scale to take the raw rubric score on four (4) to the HEDI value ranges based on the concept that if the majority of the elemental scores received is Ineffective the score should be Ineffective, similarly if the majority of the elemental scores received is Developing, Effective or Highly effective than the overall converted score should reflect the respective classification.

HEDI Level	HEDI Point Score Range	Calculated Rubric Score	Converted Score for Other Measures of Effectiveness
Highly Effective	59-60	3.76-4.00	60
		3.51-3.75	59
Effective	57-58	3.11-3.50	58
		2.60-3.10	57
Developing	50-56	2.40-2.59	56
		2.25-2.39	55
		2.10-2.24	54
		1.95-2.09	53
		1.80-1.94	52
		1.65-1.79	51
		1.50-1.64	50
Ineffective	0-49	1.49	49
		1.48	48
		1.47	47
		1.46	46
		1.45	45
		1.44	44
		1.43	43
		1.42	42
		1.41	41
		1.40	40
		1.39	39
		1.38	38
		1.37	37
		1.36	36
		1.35	35
		1.34	34
		1.33	33
		1.32	32
		1.31	31
		1.30	30
		1.29	29
		1.28	28
		1.27	27
		1.26	26
		1.25	25
		1.24	24
		1.23	23
		1.22	22
		1.21	21
		1.20	20
		1.19	19
		1.18	18
		1.17	17
		1.16	16
		1.15	15
		1.14	14
		1.13	13
		1.12	12
		1.11	11
		1.10	10
		1.09	9
		1.08	8
		1.07	7
		1.06	6
		1.05	5
		1.04	4
		1.03	3
		1.02	2
		1.01	1
		1.00	0

Principal – Local Student Learning Objective Chart

***K-3 Elementary Local Assessment applies to all K-3 elementary principals***

The elementary principal’s local assessment measure will be an achievement value based on the K-3 principal’s SLO. Each principal will select the percent of achievement based on the population characteristics of his/her respective schools and the goals of the district. Once the local assessment goal has been set the breakdown of the points awarded will be as follows:

The percentage goal selected will be considered an effective rating equivalent and the principal would receive seventeen (17) points on a non-value added model or thirteen (13) points on a value-added model. For every half (1/2) percentage point above the goal an additional one (1) point would be added to the respective effective score until the maximum respective score is attained. For every one (1) percentage point below the targeted goal that is attained, one half (1/2) point would be deducted from the respective effective goal value until the lowest value of zero (0) is attained.

Table illustrates the scoring for the non-value-added model.

<b>% Of Students Meeting SLO Target</b>	<b>Points For Local Measure</b>
91-100	20
80-90	19
76-79	18
75	17
74	16
73	15
72	14
71	13
70	12
69	11
67-68	10
65-66	9
60-64	8
58-59	7
56-57	6
54-55	5
52-53	4
50-51	3
33-49	2
17-32	1
0-16	0

***K-5 Elementary Local Assessment applies to all K-5 elementary principals***

The elementary principal's local assessment measure will be an achievement goal of 80% proficiency of all fourth grade students on the State assessment in science. The local assessment goal shall have the HEDI points awarded as follows:

The percentage goal selected will be considered an effective rating equivalent and the principal would receive seventeen (17) points on a non-value added model or thirteen (13) points on a value-added model. For every half (1/2) percentage point above the goal an additional one (1) point would be added to the respective effective score until the maximum respective score is attained. For every one (1) percentage point below the targeted goal that is attained, one half (1/2) point would be deducted from the respective effective goal value until the lowest value of zero (0) is attained.

Table illustrates the scoring for the non-value-added model.

Achievement Goal - 80% of 4th grade students will achieve proficiency in the 4th grade state assessment in science.	
Achievement %	Points
83%-100%	20.0
82%	19.0
81%	18.0
80%	17.0
78-79%	16.0
76-77%	15.0
74-75%	14.0
72-73%	13.0
70-71%	12.0
68-69%	11.0
66-67%	10.0
65%	9.0
63-64%	8.0
61-62%	7.0
59-60%	6.0
57-58%	5.0
55-56%	4.0
53-54%	3.0
51-52%	2.0
49-50%	1.0
0%-48%	0

The following table illustrates the scoring for the value-added model.

Achievement Goal - 80% of 4th grade students will achieve proficiency in the 4th grade state assessment in science	
Achievement %	Points
91%-100%	15.0
81-90%	14.0
78-80%	13.0
76-77%	12.0
74-75%	11.0
72-73%	10.0
70-71%	9.0
68-69%	8.0
66-67%	7.0
64-65%	6.0
63%	5.0
61-62%	4.0
59-60%	3.0
57-58%	2.0
55-56%	1.0
0%-54%	0

***Middle School Local Assessment – Middle School principal***

The Middle School principal’s local assessment measure achievement goal will be 80% proficiency of all eighth grade students on the State assessment in science. The local assessment goal shall have the HEDI points awarded as follows:

The percentage goal selected will be considered an effective rating equivalent and the principal would receive seventeen (17) points on a non-value added model or thirteen (13) points on a value-added model. For every half (1/2) percentage point above the goal an additional one (1) point would be added to the respective effective score until the maximum respective score is attained. For every one (1) percentage point below the targeted goal that is attained, one half (1/2) point would be deducted from the respective effective goal value until the lowest value of zero (0) is attained.

Table illustrates the scoring for the non-value-added model.

Achievement Goal - 80% of 8th grade students will achieve proficiency in the 8th grade state assessment in science.	
83%-100%	20.0
82%	19.0
81%	18.0
80%	17.0
78-79%	16.0
76-77%	15.0
74-75%	14.0
72-73%	13.0
70-71%	12.0
68-69%	11.0
66-67%	10.0
65%	9.0
63-64%	8.0
61-62%	7.0
59-60%	6.0
57-58%	5.0
55-56%	4.0
53-54%	3.0
51-52%	2.0
49-50%	1.0
0%-48%	0

The following table illustrates the scoring for the value-added model.

Achievement Goal - 80% of 8th grade students will achieve proficiency in the 8th grade state assessment in science.	
Achievement %	Points
Achievement %	Points
91%-100%	15.0
81-90%	14.0
78-80%	13.0
76-77%	12.0
74-75%	11.0
72-73%	10.0
70-71%	9.0
68-69%	8.0
66-67%	7.0
64-65%	6.0
63%	5.0
61-62%	4.0
59-60%	3.0
57-58%	2.0
55-56%	1.0
0%-54%	0

***High School Local Assessment – applies to High School principal***

The High School principal’s local assessment measure achievement goal will be 80% proficiency of all eleventh grade students on the State regents in English. The local assessment goal shall have the HEDI points awarded as follows:

The percentage goal selected will be considered an effective rating equivalent and the principal would receive seventeen (17) points on a non-value added model or thirteen (13) points on a value-added model. For every half (1/2) percentage point above the goal an additional one (1) point would be added to the respective effective score until the maximum respective score is attained. For every one (1) percentage point below the targeted goal that is attained, one half (1/2) point would be deducted from the respective effective goal value until the lowest value of zero (0) is attained.

Table illustrates the scoring for the non-value-added model.

Achievement Goal - 80% of 11th grade students will achieve proficiency in the 11th grade state regents in English.	
83%-100%	20.0
82%	19.0
81%	18.0
80%	17.0
78-79%	16.0
76-77%	15.0
74-75%	14.0
72-73%	13.0
70-71%	12.0
68-69%	11.0
66-67%	10.0
65%	9.0
63-64%	8.0
61-62%	7.0
59-60%	6.0
57-58%	5.0
55-56%	4.0
53-54%	3.0
51-52%	2.0
49-50%	1.0
0%-48%	0

The following table illustrates the scoring for the value-added model.

Achievement Goal - 80% of 11th grade students will achieve proficiency in the 11th grade state regents in English.	
Achievement %	Points
91%-100%	15.0
81-90%	14.0
78-80%	13.0
76-77%	12.0
74-75%	11.0
72-73%	10.0
70-71%	9.0
68-69%	8.0
66-67%	7.0
64-65%	6.0
63%	5.0
61-62%	4.0
59-60%	3.0
57-58%	2.0
55-56%	1.0
0%-54%	0

Principal – Local Student Learning Objective Chart

***K-3 Elementary Local Assessment applies to all K-3 elementary principals***

The elementary principal’s local assessment measure will be an achievement value based on the K-3 principal’s SLO. Each principal will select the percent of achievement based on the population characteristics of his/her respective schools and the goals of the district. Once the local assessment goal has been set the breakdown of the points awarded will be as follows:

The percentage goal selected will be considered an effective rating equivalent and the principal would receive seventeen (17) points on a non-value added model or thirteen (13) points on a value-added model. For every half (1/2) percentage point above the goal an additional one (1) point would be added to the respective effective score until the maximum respective score is attained. For every one (1) percentage point below the targeted goal that is attained, one half (1/2) point would be deducted from the respective effective goal value until the lowest value of zero (0) is attained.

Table illustrates the scoring for the non-value-added model.

<b>% Of Students Meeting SLO Target</b>	<b>Points For Local Measure</b>
91-100	20
80-90	19
76-79	18
75	17
74	16
73	15
72	14
71	13
70	12
69	11
67-68	10
65-66	9
60-64	8
58-59	7
56-57	6
54-55	5
52-53	4
50-51	3
33-49	2
17-32	1
0-16	0

***K-5 Elementary Local Assessment applies to all K-5 elementary principals***

The elementary principal's local assessment measure will be an achievement goal of 80% proficiency of all fourth grade students on the State assessment in science. The local assessment goal shall have the HEDI points awarded as follows:

The percentage goal selected will be considered an effective rating equivalent and the principal would receive seventeen (17) points on a non-value added model or thirteen (13) points on a value-added model. For every half (1/2) percentage point above the goal an additional one (1) point would be added to the respective effective score until the maximum respective score is attained. For every one (1) percentage point below the targeted goal that is attained, one half (1/2) point would be deducted from the respective effective goal value until the lowest value of zero (0) is attained.

Table illustrates the scoring for the non-value-added model.

Achievement Goal - 80% of 4th grade students will achieve proficiency in the 4th grade state assessment in science.	
Achievement %	Points
83%-100%	20.0
82%	19.0
81%	18.0
80%	17.0
78-79%	16.0
76-77%	15.0
74-75%	14.0
72-73%	13.0
70-71%	12.0
68-69%	11.0
66-67%	10.0
65%	9.0
63-64%	8.0
61-62%	7.0
59-60%	6.0
57-58%	5.0
55-56%	4.0
53-54%	3.0
51-52%	2.0
49-50%	1.0
0%-48%	0

The following table illustrates the scoring for the value-added model.

Achievement Goal - 80% of 4th grade students will achieve proficiency in the 4th grade state assessment in science	
Achievement %	Points
91%-100%	15.0
81-90%	14.0
78-80%	13.0
76-77%	12.0
74-75%	11.0
72-73%	10.0
70-71%	9.0
68-69%	8.0
66-67%	7.0
64-65%	6.0
63%	5.0
61-62%	4.0
59-60%	3.0
57-58%	2.0
55-56%	1.0
0%-54%	0

***Middle School Local Assessment – Middle School principal***

The Middle School principal’s local assessment measure achievement goal will be 80% proficiency of all eighth grade students on the State assessment in science. The local assessment goal shall have the HEDI points awarded as follows:

The percentage goal selected will be considered an effective rating equivalent and the principal would receive seventeen (17) points on a non-value added model or thirteen (13) points on a value-added model. For every half (1/2) percentage point above the goal an additional one (1) point would be added to the respective effective score until the maximum respective score is attained. For every one (1) percentage point below the targeted goal that is attained, one half (1/2) point would be deducted from the respective effective goal value until the lowest value of zero (0) is attained.

Table illustrates the scoring for the non-value-added model.

Achievement Goal - 80% of 8th grade students will achieve proficiency in the 8th grade state assessment in science.	
83%-100%	20.0
82%	19.0
81%	18.0
80%	17.0
78-79%	16.0
76-77%	15.0
74-75%	14.0
72-73%	13.0
70-71%	12.0
68-69%	11.0
66-67%	10.0
65%	9.0
63-64%	8.0
61-62%	7.0
59-60%	6.0
57-58%	5.0
55-56%	4.0
53-54%	3.0
51-52%	2.0
49-50%	1.0
0%-48%	0

The following table illustrates the scoring for the value-added model.

Achievement Goal - 80% of 8th grade students will achieve proficiency in the 8th grade state assessment in science.	
Achievement %	Points
Achievement %	Points
91%-100%	15.0
81-90%	14.0
78-80%	13.0
76-77%	12.0
74-75%	11.0
72-73%	10.0
70-71%	9.0
68-69%	8.0
66-67%	7.0
64-65%	6.0
63%	5.0
61-62%	4.0
59-60%	3.0
57-58%	2.0
55-56%	1.0
0%-54%	0

***High School Local Assessment – applies to High School principal***

The High School principal’s local assessment measure achievement goal will be 80% proficiency of all eleventh grade students on the State regents in English. The local assessment goal shall have the HEDI points awarded as follows:

The percentage goal selected will be considered an effective rating equivalent and the principal would receive seventeen (17) points on a non-value added model or thirteen (13) points on a value-added model. For every half (1/2) percentage point above the goal an additional one (1) point would be added to the respective effective score until the maximum respective score is attained. For every one (1) percentage point below the targeted goal that is attained, one half (1/2) point would be deducted from the respective effective goal value until the lowest value of zero (0) is attained.

Table illustrates the scoring for the non-value-added model.

Achievement Goal - 80% of 11th grade students will achieve proficiency in the 11th grade state regents in English.	
83%-100%	20.0
82%	19.0
81%	18.0
80%	17.0
78-79%	16.0
76-77%	15.0
74-75%	14.0
72-73%	13.0
70-71%	12.0
68-69%	11.0
66-67%	10.0
65%	9.0
63-64%	8.0
61-62%	7.0
59-60%	6.0
57-58%	5.0
55-56%	4.0
53-54%	3.0
51-52%	2.0
49-50%	1.0
0%-48%	0

The following table illustrates the scoring for the value-added model.

Achievement Goal - 80% of 11th grade students will achieve proficiency in the 11th grade state regents in English.	
Achievement %	Points
91%-100%	15.0
81-90%	14.0
78-80%	13.0
76-77%	12.0
74-75%	11.0
72-73%	10.0
70-71%	9.0
68-69%	8.0
66-67%	7.0
64-65%	6.0
63%	5.0
61-62%	4.0
59-60%	3.0
57-58%	2.0
55-56%	1.0
0%-54%	0

# Teacher Improvement Plan

School Year: \_\_\_\_\_ Teaching Assignment: \_\_\_\_\_ Tenure Status: \_\_\_\_\_

**Staff Member:** \_\_\_\_\_  
(print name) (signature indicating agreement to plan) (date)

**Administrator:** \_\_\_\_\_  
(print name) (signature indicating agreement to plan) (date)

**Domain Component(s) of Concern with Supporting Evidence:**

**Plan for Improvement:** (specific outcomes, strategies for growth, evaluation process, resources)

**Timeline:** (completed by mid-May)

**Progress Review Meeting Dates:**

--	--	--	--	--	--	--

*Note: If the member and administrator cannot agree on a plan, a meeting will be held with the superintendent who will determine the contents of the plan. The plan will be completed and this form returned to the member no more than ten school days after this meeting.*

*Evaluation of Plan Completion:*

\_\_\_\_\_ **Satisfactory Completion**

\_\_\_\_\_ **Incomplete**

\_\_\_\_\_ **Unsatisfactory:** Growth Demonstrated, TIP to continue with revised goals and timeline

\_\_\_\_\_ **Unsatisfactory:** In need of intense remediation

*Summary:*

**Dryden Principal Improvement Plan**

**NAME** \_\_\_\_\_ **SCHOOL** \_\_\_\_\_

**SCHOOL YEAR** \_\_\_\_\_

**Rubric Domain:** \_\_\_\_\_ **Rubric Element** \_\_\_\_\_

**State Assessment** \_\_\_\_\_ **Local Assessment** \_\_\_\_\_

Area(s) in Need of Improvement	Desired Outcomes	Activities to Support the Achievement of the Desired Outcomes	Timeline for Completion	Resources to be provided by the District	Evidence to Support Achievement of Goal	Was Desired Outcome Achieved (Y/N date )

Duplicate as necessary

**Definition of the terms used on the Principal's Improvement Plan:**

**Area(s) in Need of Improvement-**The Lead Evaluator will only list those areas in need of improvement that were directly responsible for the principal receiving an Ineffective or Developing Rating.

**Desired Outcomes-**The Lead Evaluator will provide specific success driven outcome/goal statements

**Activities to Support the Achievement of the Desired Outcomes-**The Lead Evaluator will list the activities that the principal should engage in to meet the desired outcomes.

**Timeline for Completion-**The Lead Evaluator will meet with the Principal monthly to assess the progress of the Principal. If at any time the Lead Evaluator determines that a goal has been met, it will be noted on the attached chart.

**Resources to be provided by the District-**The Lead Evaluator will list the resources that will be provided to assist the Principal in achieving the desired outcomes.

**Evidence to Support Achievement of Goal-**The Lead Evaluator and the Principal will mutually decide what items will be presented in support of goal attainment.

**Was Desired Outcome Achieved (Y/N date)**—The Lead Evaluator will indicate on the chart when specific outcome has been met.

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

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

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

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

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

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

**Signatures, dates**

Superintendent Signature:      Date: 11/26/2012

*Sandra R Sherwood*

Teachers Union President Signature:      Date: 11/26/12

*Cynthia Waterman*

Administrative Union President Signature:      Date: 11/26/12

*Andrew L Ryan*

Board of Education President Signature:      Date:

*Kevin S. Matti*      11, 26, 2012