



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 29, 2012

Timothy P. Ryan, Superintendent  
Fabius-Pompey Central School District  
1211 Mill Street  
Fabius, NY 13063

Dear Superintendent Ryan:

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: J. Francis Manning

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 Thursday, August 02, 2012  
Updated Friday, November 09, 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 : 420601040000

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

*420601040000*

#### 1.2) School District Name: FABIOUS-POMPEY CSD

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

*FABIOUS-POMPEY 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 Thursday, May 10, 2012

Updated Monday, November 26, 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	District, regional, or BOCES-developed assessment	Fabius-Pompey Locally developed K Assessment-ELA
1	District, regional, or BOCES-developed assessment	Fabius-Pompey locally developed Grade 1 Assessment-ELA
2	District, regional, or BOCES-developed assessment	Fabius-Pompey locally developed Grade 2 Assessment-ELA
	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 2.11
Highly Effective (18 - 20 points) Results are well-above state average for similar students (or District goals if no state test).	Courses with a local final exam or local year-end assessment - The average (mean) score on the local final exam or local year-end assessment far exceeds the SLO goal set as the beginning of the school year. Courses with a course ending in a New York State Regents Exam or a New York State Assessment - The passing rate for the teacher's students on the New York State Regents Exam or New York State Assessment far exceeds the SLO set at the beginning of the school year.
Effective (9 - 17 points) Results meet state average for similar students (or District goals if no state test).	Courses with a local final exam or local year-end assessment -The average (mean) score on the local final exam or local year-end assessment is in line with the SLO goal set as the beginning of the school year. Courses with a course ending in a New York State Regents Exam or a New York State Assessment - The passing rate for the teacher's students on the New York State Regents Exam or a New York State Assessment meets the SLO goal set at the beginning of the school year.
Developing (3 - 8 points) Results are below state average for similar students (or District goals if no state test).	Courses with a local final exam or local year-end assessment -The average (mean) score on the local final exam or local year-end assessment is below the SLO goal set as the beginning of the school year. Courses with a course ending in a New York State Regents Exam or a New York State Assessment - The passing rate for the teacher's students on the New York State Regents Exam or a New York State Assessment falls below the SLO goal set at the beginning of the school year.
Ineffective (0 - 2 points) Results are well-below state average for similar students (or District goals if no state test).	Courses with a local final exam or local year-end assessment -The average (mean) score on the local final exam or local year-end assessment is well below the SLO goal set as the beginning of the school year. Courses with a course ending in a New York State Regents Exam or a New York State Assessment - The passing rate for the teacher's students on the New York State Regents Exam or a New York State Assessment fall far below the SLO goal set as the beginning of the year.

### 2.3) Grades K-3 Math

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

	Math	Assessment
K	District, regional, or BOCES-developed assessment	Fabius-Pompey Locally developed K Assessment-Math
1	District, regional, or BOCES-developed assessment	Fabius-Pompey Locally developed 1 Assessment-Math

2	District, regional, or BOCES-developed assessment	Fabius-Pompey Locally developed 2 Assessment-Math
	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 2.11
Highly Effective (18 - 20 points) Results are well-above state average for similar students (or District goals if no state test).	<p>Courses with a local final exam or local year-end assessment - The average (mean) score on the local final exam or local year-end assessment far exceeds the SLO goal set as the beginning of the school year.</p> <p>Courses with a course ending in a New York State Regents Exam or a New York State Assessment - The passing rate for the teacher's students on the New York State Regents Exam or New York State Assessment far exceeds the SLO set at the beginning of the school year.</p>
Effective (9 - 17 points) Results meet state average for similar students (or District goals if no state test).	<p>Courses with a local final exam or local year-end assessment</p> <p>-The average (mean) score on the local final exam or local year-end assessment is in line with the SLO goal set as the beginning of the school year.</p> <p>Courses with a course ending in a New York State Regents Exam or a New York State Assessment - The passing rate for the teacher's students on the New York State Regents Exam or a New York State Assessment meets the SLO goal set at the beginning of the school year.</p>
Developing (3 - 8 points) Results are below state average for similar students (or District goals if no state test).	<p>Courses with a local final exam or local year-end assessment</p> <p>-The average (mean) score on the local final exam or local year-end assessment is below the SLO goal set as the beginning of the school year.</p> <p>Courses with a course ending in a New York State Regents Exam or a New York State Assessment - The passing rate for the teacher's students on the New York State Regents Exam or a New York State Assessment falls below the SLO goal set at the beginning of the school year.</p>
Ineffective (0 - 2 points) Results are well-below state average for similar students (or District goals if no state test).	<p>Courses with a local final exam or local year-end assessment</p> <p>-The average (mean) score on the local final exam or local year-end assessment is well below the SLO goal set as the beginning of the school year.</p> <p>Courses with a course ending in a New York State Regents Exam or a New York State Assessment - The passing rate for the teacher's students on the New York State Regents Exam or a New York State Assessment fall</p>

## 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	Fabius-Pompey Locally developed 6 Assessment-Science
7	District, regional or BOCES-developed assessment	Fabius-Pompey Locally developed 7 Assessment-Science
	Science	Assessment
8	State assessment	8th Grade State Science Assessment

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

Use this box, if needed, to describe the general process for assigning HEDI categories for these grades/subjects in this subcomponent. If needed, you may upload a table or graphic at 2.11, below.	see 2.11
Highly Effective (18 - 20 points) Results are well-above state average for similar students (or District goals if no state test).	Courses with a local final exam or local year-end assessment - The average (mean) score on the local final exam or local year-end assessment far exceeds the SLO goal set as the beginning of the school year. Courses with a course ending in a New York State Regents Exam or a New York State Assessment - The passing rate for the teacher's students on the New York State Regents Exam or New York State Assessment far exceeds the SLO set at the beginning of the school year.
Effective (9 - 17 points) Results meet state average for similar students (or District goals if no state test).	Courses with a local final exam or local year-end assessment -The average (mean) score on the local final exam or local year-end assessment is in line with the SLO goal set as the beginning of the school year. Courses with a course ending in a New York State Regents Exam or a New York State Assessment - The passing rate for the teacher's students on the New York State Regents Exam or a New York State Assessment meets the SLO goal set at the beginning of the school year.
Developing (3 - 8 points) Results are below state average for similar students (or District goals if no state test).	Courses with a local final exam or local year-end assessment -The average (mean) score on the local final exam or local year-end assessment is below the SLO goal set as the beginning of the school year. Courses with a course ending in a New York State Regents Exam or a New York State Assessment - The passing rate for the teacher's students on the New York

State Regents Exam or a New York State Assessment falls below the SLO goal set at the beginning of the school year.

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

Courses with a local final exam or local year-end assessment  
 -The average (mean) score on the local final exam or local year-end assessment is well below the SLO goal set as the beginning of the school year.  
 Courses with a course ending in a New York State Regents Exam or a New York State Assessment - The passing rate for the teacher's students on the New York State Regents Exam or a New York State Assessment fall far below the SLO goal set as the beginning of the year.

## 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	Fabius Pompey-Locally developed 6 Assessment-Social Studies
7	District, regional or BOCES-developed assessment	Fabius-Pompey Locally developed 7 Assessment-Social Studies
8	District, regional or BOCES-developed assessment	Fabius-Pompey Locally developed 8 Assessment-Social Studies

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

Use this box, if needed, to describe the general process for assigning HEDI categories for these grades/subjects in this subcomponent. If needed, you may upload a table or graphic at 2.11, below.	see 2.11
Highly Effective (18 - 20 points) Results are well-above District goals for similar students.	Courses with a local final exam or local year-end assessment - The average (mean) score on the local final exam or local year-end assessment far exceeds the SLO goal set as the beginning of the school year.
Effective (9 - 17 points) Results meet District goals for similar students.	Courses with a local final exam or local year-end assessment -The average (mean) score on the local final exam or local year-end assessment is in line with the SLO goal set as the beginning of the school year.
Developing (3 - 8 points) Results are below District goals for similar students.	Courses with a local final exam or local year-end assessment -The average (mean) score on the local final exam or local year-end assessment is below the SLO goal set as the beginning of the school year.
Ineffective (0 - 2 points) Results are well-below District goals for similar students.	Courses with a local final exam or local year-end assessment -The average (mean) score on the local final exam or local year-end assessment is well below the SLO goal set as the beginning of the school year.

## 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	Fabius-Pompey Locally 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.	see 2.11
Highly Effective (18 - 20 points) Results are well-above District goals for similar students.	<p>Courses with a local final exam or local year-end assessment - The average (mean) score on the local final exam or local year-end assessment far exceeds the SLO goal set as the beginning of the school year.</p> <p>Courses with a course ending in a New York State Regents Exam or a New York State Assessment - The passing rate for the teacher's students on the New York State Regents Exam or New York State Assessment far exceeds the SLO set at the beginning of the school year.</p>
Effective (9 - 17 points) Results meet District goals for similar students.	<p>Courses with a local final exam or local year-end assessment</p> <p>-The average (mean) score on the local final exam or local year-end assessment is in line with the SLO goal set as the beginning of the school year.</p> <p>Courses with a course ending in a New York State Regents Exam or a New York State Assessment - The passing rate for the teacher's students on the New York State Regents Exam or a New York State Assessment meets the SLO goal set at the beginning of the school year.</p>
Developing (3 - 8 points) Results are below District goals for similar students.	<p>Courses with a local final exam or local year-end assessment</p> <p>-The average (mean) score on the local final exam or local year-end assessment is below the SLO goal set as the beginning of the school year.</p> <p>Courses with a course ending in a New York State Regents Exam or a New York State Assessment - The passing rate for the teacher's students on the New York</p>

State Regents Exam or a New York State Assessment falls below the SLO goal set at the beginning of the school year.

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

Courses with a local final exam or local year-end assessment  
 -The average (mean) score on the local final exam or local year-end assessment is well below the SLO goal set as the beginning of the school year.  
 Courses with a course ending in a New York State Regents Exam or a New York State Assessment - The passing rate for the teacher's students on the New York State Regents Exam or a New York State Assessment fall far below the SLO goal set as the beginning of the year.

## 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.	see 2.11
Highly Effective (18 - 20 points) Results are well-above District goals for similar students.	Courses with a course ending in a New York State Regents Exam or a New York State Assessment - The passing rate for the teacher's students on the New York State Regents Exam or New York State Assessment far exceeds the SLO set at the beginning of the school year.
Effective (9 - 17 points) Results meet District goals for similar students.	Courses with a course ending in a New York State Regents Exam or a New York State Assessment - The passing rate for the teacher's students on the New York State Regents Exam or a New York State Assessment meets the SLO goal set at the beginning of the school year.
Developing (3 - 8 points) Results are below District goals for similar students.	Courses with a course ending in a New York State Regents Exam or a New York State Assessment - The passing rate for the teacher's students on the New York State Regents Exam or a New York State Assessment falls below the SLO goal set at the beginning of the school year.

year.

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

Courses with a course ending in a New York State Regents Exam or a New York State Assessment - The passing rate for the teacher's students on the New York State Regents Exam or a New York State Assessment fall far below the SLO goal set as the beginning of the year.

## 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.	see 2.11
Highly Effective (18 - 20 points) Results are well-above District goals for similar students.	Courses with a course ending in a New York State Regents Exam or a New York State Assessment - The passing rate for the teacher's students on the New York State Regents Exam or New York State Assessment far exceeds the SLO set at the beginning of the school year.
Effective (9 - 17 points) Results meet District goals for similar students.	Courses with a course ending in a New York State Regents Exam or a New York State Assessment - The passing rate for the teacher's students on the New York State Regents Exam or a New York State Assessment meets the SLO goal set at the beginning of the school year.
Developing (3 - 8 points) Results are below District goals for similar students.	Courses with a course ending in a New York State Regents Exam or a New York State Assessment - The passing rate for the teacher's students on the New York State Regents Exam or a New York State Assessment falls below the SLO goal set at the beginning of the school year.
Ineffective (0 - 2 points) Results are well-below District goals for similar students.	Courses with a course ending in a New York State Regents Exam or a New York State Assessment - The passing rate for the teacher's students on the New York State Regents Exam or a New York State Assessment fall far below the SLO goal set as the beginning of the year.

## 2.9) High School English Language Arts

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

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

	High School English Courses	Assessment
Grade 9 ELA	District, regional or BOCES-developed assessment	Fabius-Pompey Locally developed ELA 9 Assessment
Grade 10 ELA	District, regional or BOCES-developed assessment	Fabius-Pompey Locally developed ELA 10 Assessment
Grade 11 ELA	Regents assessment	Grade 11 Comprehensive English Regents Exam

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

Use this box, if needed, to describe the general process for assigning HEDI categories for these grades/subjects in this subcomponent. If needed, you may upload a table or graphic at 2.11, below.	see 2.11
Highly Effective (18 - 20 points) Results are well-above District goals for similar students.	Courses with a local final exam or local year-end assessment - The average (mean) score on the local final exam or local year-end assessment far exceeds the SLO goal set as the beginning of the school year. Courses with a course ending in a New York State Regents Exam or a New York State Assessment - The passing rate for the teacher's students on the New York State Regents Exam or New York State Assessment far exceeds the SLO set at the beginning of the school year.
Effective (9 - 17 points) Results meet District goals for similar students.	Courses with a local final exam or local year-end assessment -The average (mean) score on the local final exam or local year-end assessment is in line with the SLO goal set as the beginning of the school year. Courses with a course ending in a New York State Regents Exam or a New York State Assessment - The passing rate for the teacher's students on the New York State Regents Exam or a New York State Assessment meets the SLO goal set at the beginning of the school year.
Developing (3 - 8 points) Results are below District goals for similar students.	Courses with a local final exam or local year-end assessment -The average (mean) score on the local final exam or local year-end assessment is below the SLO goal set as the beginning of the school year. Courses with a course ending in a New York State Regents Exam or a New York State Assessment - The passing rate for the teacher's students on the New York State Regents Exam or a New York State Assessment



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/5364/128050-TXEttx9bQW/SLO Local and Regents2.docx*

## 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 locally developed controls.*

## 2.13) Teachers with more than one growth measure

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

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

## 2.14) Assurances

Please check all of the boxes below:

2.14) Assurances   Assure the application of locally developed controls will be rigorous, fair, and transparent and only those used for State Growth will be used for Comparable Growth Measures.	Checked
2.14) Assurances   Assure that use of locally developed controls will not have a disparate impact on underrepresented students in accordance with applicable civil rights laws.	Checked
2.14) Assurances   Assure that enrolled students in accordance with teacher of record policies are included and may not be excluded.	Checked
2.14) Assurances   Assure that procedures for ensuring data accuracy and integrity are being utilized.	Checked
2.14) Assurances   Assure that district will develop SLOs according to the rules established by SED (see: <a href="http://usny.nysed.gov/rttt/teachers-leaders/slo/home.html">http://usny.nysed.gov/rttt/teachers-leaders/slo/home.html</a> ).	Checked

2.14) Assurances   Assure that past academic performance and/or baseline academic data of students will be taken into account when developing an SLO.	Checked
2.14) Assurances   Assure that the process for assigning points for SLOs for the Growth Subcomponent will use the narrative HEDI descriptions described in the regulations to effectively differentiate educators in ways that improve student learning and instruction.	Checked
2.14) Assurances   Assure that it is possible for an educator to earn each point, including 0, for SLOs in the Growth subcomponent scoring range.	Checked
2.14) Assurances   Assure that processes are in place to monitor SLOs to ensure rigor and comparability across classrooms.	Checked

### 3. Local Measures (Teachers)

Created Thursday, May 10, 2012

Updated Monday, November 26, 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	AIMSweb
5	4) State-approved 3rd party assessments	AIMSweb
6	4) State-approved 3rd party assessments	AIMSweb
7	4) State-approved 3rd party assessments	AIMSweb
8	4) State-approved 3rd party assessments	AIMSweb

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.*

<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 3.3, below.</p>	<p>Using AIMSweb as an assessment tool as a growth measure (students will be assessed in fall, winter and spring), AIMSweb will provide the district with a educator evaluation score. The educator evaluation score will be converted to the HEDI scale. In case there is no valued we use the same scale described for the other subjects and grade levels. see 3.3</p>
<p>Highly Effective (14 - 15 points) Results are well above District- or BOCES-adopted expectations for growth or achievement for grade/subject.</p>	<p>Results are well above District goals for student growth. Averaged growth scores for a teacher's students are well above the mid-point of the norm referenced average growth score, also known as the educator evaluation score, which is provided by Pearson (AIMSweb) at the end of the school year. Specifically this is growth as measured by fall, winter, and spring administrations of the appropriate AIMSweb assessment.</p>
<p>Effective (8- 13 points) Results meet District- or BOCES-adopted expectations for growth or achievement for grade/subject.</p>	<p>Results meet District goals for student growth. Averaged growth scores for a teacher's students are at the mid-point of the norm referenced average growth score, also known as the educator evaluation score, which is provided by Pearson (AIMSweb) at the end of the school year. Specifically this is growth as measured by fall, winter, and spring administrations of the appropriate AIMSweb assessment.</p>
<p>Developing (3 - 7 points) Results are below District- or BOCES-adopted expectations for growth or achievement for grade/subject.</p>	<p>Results are below District goals for student growth. Averaged growth scores for a teacher's students are below the mid-point of the norm referenced average growth score, also known as the educator evaluation score, which is provided by Pearson (AIMSweb) at the end of the school year. Specifically this is growth as measured by fall, winter, and spring administrations of the appropriate AIMSweb assessment.</p>
<p>Ineffective (0 - 2 points) Results are well below District- or BOCES-adopted expectations for growth or achievement for grade/subject.</p>	<p>Results are well below District goals for student growth. Averaged growth scores for a teacher's students are well below the mid-point of the norm referenced average growth score, also known as the educator evaluation score, which is provided by Pearson (AIMSweb) at the end of the school year. Specifically this is growth as measured by fall, winter, and spring administrations of the appropriate AIMSweb assessment.</p>

### 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	AIMSweb

5	4) State-approved 3rd party assessments	AIMSweb
6	4) State-approved 3rd party assessments	AIMSweb
7	4) State-approved 3rd party assessments	AIMSweb
8	4) State-approved 3rd party assessments	AIMSweb

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.	Using AIMSweb as an assessment tool as a growth measure (students will be assessed in fall, winter and spring), AIMSweb will provide the district with an educator evaluation score. The educator evaluation score will be converted to the HEDI scale. In case there is no valued we use the same scale described for the other subjects and grade levels. see 3.3
Highly Effective (14 - 15 points) Results are well above District- or BOCES-adopted expectations for growth or achievement for grade/subject.	Results are well above District goals for student growth. Averaged growth scores for a teacher's students are well above the mid-point of the norm referenced average growth score, also known as the educator evaluation score, which is provided by Pearson (AIMSweb) at the end of the school year. Specifically this is growth as measured by fall, winter, and spring administrations of the appropriate AIMSweb assessment.
Effective (8- 13 points) Results meet District- or BOCES-adopted expectations for growth or achievement for grade/subject.	Results meet District goals for student growth. Averaged growth scores for a teacher's students are at the mid-point of the norm referenced average growth score, also known as the educator evaluation score, which is provided by Pearson (AIMSweb) at the end of the school year. Specifically this is growth as measured by fall, winter, and spring administrations of the appropriate AIMSweb assessment.
Developing (3 - 7 points) Results are below District- or BOCES-adopted expectations for growth or achievement for grade/subject.	Results are below District goals for student growth. Averaged growth scores for a teacher's students are below the mid-point of the norm referenced average growth score, also known as the educator evaluation score, which is provided by Pearson (AIMSweb) at the end of the school year. Specifically this is growth as measured by fall, winter, and spring administrations of the appropriate AIMSweb assessment.
Ineffective (0 - 2 points) Results are well below District- or BOCES-adopted expectations for growth or achievement for grade/subject.	Results are well below District goals for student growth. Averaged growth scores for a teacher's students are well below the mid-point of the norm referenced average growth score, also known as the educator evaluation score, which is provided by Pearson (AIMSweb) at the end of the school year. Specifically this is growth as measured by fall, winter, and spring administrations of the appropriate AIMSweb assessment.

### 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/5139/128184-rhJdBgDruP/Local 15 or 20 grades 4-8 AIMSweb\_3.docx*

### 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	AIMSweb
1	4) State-approved 3rd party assessments	AIMSweb
2	4) State-approved 3rd party assessments	AIMSweb
3	4) State-approved 3rd party assessments	AIMSweb

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.	Using AIMSweb as an assessment tool as a growth measure (students will be assessed in fall, winter and spring), AIMSweb will provide the district with an educator evaluation score. The educator evaluation score will be converted to the HEDI scale. See 3.13
Highly Effective (18-20 points) Results are well above District- or BOCES-adopted expectations for growth or achievement for grade/subject.	Results are well above District goals for student growth. Averaged growth scores for a teacher's students are well above the mid-point of the norm referenced average growth score, also known as the educator evaluation score, which is provided by Pearson (AIMSweb) at the end of the school year. Specifically this is growth as measured by fall, winter, and spring administrations of the appropriate AIMSweb assessment.
Effective (9-17 points) Results meet District- or BOCES-adopted expectations for growth or achievement for grade/subject.	Results meet District goals for student growth. Averaged growth scores for a teacher's students are at the mid-point of the norm referenced average growth score, also known as the educator evaluation score, which is provided by Pearson (AIMSweb) at the end of the school year. Specifically this is growth as measured by fall, winter, and spring administrations of the appropriate AIMSweb assessment.

Developing (3 - 8 points) Results are below District- or BOCES-adopted expectations for growth or achievement for grade/subject.	Results are below District goals for student growth. Averaged growth scores for a teacher's students are below the mid-point of the norm referenced average growth score, also known as the educator evaluation score, which is provided by Pearson (AIMSweb) at the end of the school year. Specifically this is growth as measured by fall, winter, and spring administrations of the appropriate AIMSweb assessment.
Ineffective (0 - 2 points) Results are well below District- or BOCES-adopted expectations for growth or achievement for grade/subject.	Results are well below District goals for student growth. Averaged growth scores for a teacher's students are well below the mid-point of the norm referenced average growth score, also known as the educator evaluation score, which is provided by Pearson (AIMSweb) at the end of the school year. Specifically this is growth as measured by fall, winter, and spring administrations of the appropriate AIMSweb assessment.

### 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	AIMSweb
1	4) State-approved 3rd party assessments	AIMSweb
2	4) State-approved 3rd party assessments	AIMSweb
3	4) State-approved 3rd party assessments	AIMSweb

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.	Using AIMSweb as an assessment tool as a growth measure (students will be assessed in fall, winter and spring), AIMSweb will provide the district with a educator evaluation score. The educator evaluation score will be converted to the HEDI scale. See Attachment 3.13
Highly Effective (18-20 points) Results are well above District- or BOCES-adopted expectations for growth or achievement for grade/subject.	Results are well above District goals for student growth. Averaged growth scores for a teacher's students are well above the mid-point of the norm referenced average growth score, also known as the educator evaluation score, which is provided by Pearson (AIMSweb) at the end of the school year. Specifically this is growth as measured by fall, winter, and spring administrations of the appropriate AIMSweb assessment.
Effective (9-17 points) Results meet District- or BOCES-adopted expectations for growth or achievement for grade/subject.	Results meet District goals for student growth. Averaged growth scores for a teacher's students are at the mid-point of the norm referenced average growth score, also known

as the educator evaluation score, which is provided by Pearson (AIMSweb) at the end of the school year. Specifically this is growth as measured by fall, winter, and spring administrations of the appropriate AIMSweb assessment.

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

Results are below District goals for student growth. Averaged growth scores for a teacher's students are below the mid-point of the norm referenced average growth score, also known as the educator evaluation score, which is provided by Pearson (AIMSweb) at the end of the school year. Specifically this is growth as measured by fall, winter, and spring administrations of the appropriate AIMSweb assessment

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

Results are well below District goals for student growth. Averaged growth scores for a teacher's students are well below the mid-point of the norm referenced average growth score, also known as the educator evaluation score, which is provided by Pearson (AIMSweb) at the end of the school year. Specifically this is growth as measured by fall, winter, and spring administrations of the appropriate AIMSweb assessment.

### 3.6) Grades 6-8 Science

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

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

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.

Using AIMSweb as an assessment tool as a growth measure (students will be assessed in fall, winter and spring), AIMSweb will provide the district with a educator evaluation score. The educator evaluation score will be converted to the HEDI scale. see attachment 3.13

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

Results are well above District goals for student growth. Averaged growth scores for a teacher's students are well above the mid-point of the norm referenced average growth score, also known as the educator evaluation score, which is provided by Pearson (AIMSweb) at the end of the school year. Specifically this is growth as measured by fall, winter, and spring administrations of the appropriate AIMSweb assessment.

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

Results meet District goals for student growth. Averaged growth scores for a teacher's students are at the mid-point of the norm referenced average growth score, also known as the educator evaluation score, which is provided by

Pearson (AIMSweb) at the end of the school year. Specifically this is growth as measured by fall, winter, and spring administrations of the appropriate AIMSweb assessment.

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

Results are below District goals for student growth. Averaged growth scores for a teacher's students are below the mid-point of the norm referenced average growth score, also known as the educator evaluation score, which is provided by Pearson (AIMSweb) at the end of the school year. Specifically this is growth as measured by fall, winter, and spring administrations of the appropriate AIMSweb assessment

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

Results are well below District goals for student growth. Averaged growth scores for a teacher's students are well below the mid-point of the norm referenced average growth score, also known as the educator evaluation score, which is provided by Pearson (AIMSweb) at the end of the school year. Specifically this is growth as measured by fall, winter, and spring administrations of the appropriate AIMSweb assessment.

### 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	4) State-approved 3rd party assessments	AIMSweb
7	4) State-approved 3rd party assessments	AIMSweb
8	4) State-approved 3rd party assessments	AIMSweb

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.

Using AIMSweb as an assessment tool as a growth measure (students will be assessed in fall, winter and spring), AIMSweb will provide the district with a educator evaluation score. The educator evaluation score will be converted to the HEDI scale. see attachment 3.13

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

Results are well above District goals for student growth. Averaged growth scores for a teacher's students are well above the mid-point of the norm referenced average growth score, also known as the educator evaluation score, which is provided by Pearson (AIMSweb) at the end of the school year. Specifically this is growth as measured by fall, winter, and spring administrations of the appropriate AIMSweb assessment.

Effective (9 - 17 points) Results meet District- or BOCES-adopted expectations for growth or achievement for grade/subject.	Results meet District goals for student growth. Averaged growth scores for a teacher's students are at the mid-point of the norm referenced average growth score, also known as the educator evaluation score, which is provided by Pearson (AIMSweb) at the end of the school year. Specifically this is growth as measured by fall, winter, and spring administrations of the appropriate AIMSweb assessment.
Developing (3 - 8 points) Results are below District- or BOCES-adopted expectations for growth or achievement for grade/subject.	Results are below District goals for student growth. Averaged growth scores for a teacher's students are below the mid-point of the norm referenced average growth score, also known as the educator evaluation score, which is provided by Pearson (AIMSweb) at the end of the school year. Specifically this is growth as measured by fall, winter, and spring administrations of the appropriate AIMSweb assessment
Ineffective (0 - 2 points) Results are well below District- or BOCES-adopted expectations for growth or achievement for grade/subject.	Results are well below District goals for student growth. Averaged growth scores for a teacher's students are well below the mid-point of the norm referenced average growth score, also known as the educator evaluation score, which is provided by Pearson (AIMSweb) at the end of the school year. Specifically this is growth as measured by fall, winter, and spring administrations of the appropriate AIMSweb assessment.

### 3.8) High School Social Studies

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

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

	Locally-Selected Measure from List of Approved Measures	Assessment
Global 1	6(ii) School wide measure computed locally	Fabius-Pompey Mastery Percentage for Regents-Integrated Algebra, Geometry, Algebra2/Trigonometry, Earth Science, Chemistry, Physics, Biology, Global History Geography, U.S. History Government, English
Global 2	6(ii) School wide measure computed locally	Fabius-Pompey Mastery Percentage for Regents-Integrated Algebra, Geometry, Algebra2/Trigonometry, Earth Science, Chemistry, Physics, Biology, Global History Geography, U.S. History Government, English
American History	6(ii) School wide measure computed locally	Fabius-Pompey Mastery Percentage for Regents-Integrated Algebra, Geometry, Algebra2/Trigonometry, Earth Science, Chemistry, Physics, Biology, Global History Geography, U.S. History Government, English

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.

<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>All high school teachers will receive the same point total. This point total will be based upon the aggregate average mastery level on all exams administered as it relates to the District's five year aggregate average master level for similar exams completed during the previous five June administration periods. See attachment 3.13 for HEDI scoring bands.</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>Results are well above District expectations for student's achievement. The aggregate building-wide percentage of Fabius-Pompey students scoring at the mastery level (85 or better), on the June Administration of New York State Regents exams, exceeds the five year average of Fabius-Pompey students scoring at the mastery level on all Regents exams completed during the previous five June administration periods.</p>
<p>Effective (9 - 17 points) Results meet District- or BOCES-adopted expectations for growth or achievement for grade/subject.</p>	<p>Results meet District expectations for student achievement. The aggregate building-wide percentage of Fabius-Pompey students scoring at the mastery level (85 or better) on the June administration of New York State Regents exams is in line with the five year average of Fabius-Pompey students scoring at the mastery level on all Regents exams completed during the previous five June administration periods.</p>
<p>Developing (3 - 8 points) Results are below District- or BOCES-adopted expectations for growth or achievement for grade/subject.</p>	<p>Results are below District expectations for student achievement. The aggregate building-wide percentage of Fabius-Pompey students scoring at the mastery level (85 or better) on the June administration of New York State Regents exams is below the five year average of students scoring at the mastery level on all Regents exams completed during the previous five June administration periods.</p>
<p>Ineffective (0 - 2 points) Results are well below District- or BOCES-adopted expectations for growth or achievement for grade/subject.</p>	<p>Results are well-below District expectations for student achievement. The aggregate building-wide percentage of Fabius-Pompey students scoring at the mastery level (85 or better) on the June administration of New York State Regents exams is well-below the five year average of students scoring at the mastery level on all Regents exams completed during the previous five June administration periods.</p>

### 3.9) High School Science

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

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

	Locally-Selected Measure from List of Approved Measures	Assessment
Living Environment	6(ii) School wide measure computed locally	Fabius-Pompey Mastery Percentage for Regents-Integrated Algebra, Geometry, Algebra2/Triginometry, Earth Science, Chemistry, Physics, Biology, Global History Geography, U.S.

		History Government, English
Earth Science	6(ii) School wide measure computed locally	Fabius-Pompey Mastery Percentage for Regents-Integrated Algebra, Geometry, Algebra2/Trigonometry, Earth Science, Chemistry, Physics, Biology, Global History Geography, U.S. History Government, English
Chemistry	6(ii) School wide measure computed locally	Fabius-Pompey Mastery Percentage for Regents-Integrated Algebra, Geometry, Algebra2/Trigonometry, Earth Science, Chemistry, Physics, Biology, Global History Geography, U.S. History Government, English
Physics	6(ii) School wide measure computed locally	Fabius-Pompey Mastery Percentage for Regents-Integrated Algebra, Geometry, Algebra2/Trigonometry, Earth Science, Chemistry, Physics, Biology, Global History Geography, U.S. History Government, English

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.	All high school teachers will receive the same point total. This point total will be based upon the aggregate average mastery level on all exams administered as it relates to the District's five year aggregate average master level for similar exams completed during the previous five June administration periods. See attachment 3.13 for HEDI scoring bands.
Highly Effective (18-20 points) Results are well above District- or BOCES-adopted expectations for growth or achievement for grade/subject.	Results are well above District expectations for student's achievement. The aggregate building-wide percentage of Fabius-Pompey students scoring at the mastery level (85 or better), on the June Administration of New York State Regents exams, exceeds the five year average of Fabius-Pompey students scoring at the mastery level on all Regents exams completed during the previous five June administration periods.
Developing (3 - 8 points) Results are below District- or BOCES-adopted expectations for growth or achievement for grade/subject.	Results meet District expectations for student achievement. The aggregate building-wide percentage of Fabius-Pompey students scoring at the mastery level (85 or better) on the June administration of New York State Regents exams is in line with the five year average of Fabius-Pompey students scoring at the mastery level on all Regents exams completed during the previous five June administration periods.
Effective (9 - 17points) Results meet District- or BOCES-adopted expectations for growth or achievement for grade/subject.	Results are below District expectations for student achievement. The aggregate building-wide percentage of Fabius-Pompey students scoring at the mastery level (85 or better) on the June administration of New York State Regents exams is below the five year average of students scoring at the mastery level on all Regents exams completed during the previous five June administration periods.

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

Results are well-below District expectations for student achievement. The aggregate building-wide percentage of Fabius-Pompey students scoring at the mastery level (85 or better) on the June administration of New York State Regents exams is well-below the five year average of students scoring at the mastery level on all Regents exams completed during the previous five June administration periods.

### 3.10) High School Math

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

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

	Locally-Selected Measure from List of Approved Measures	Assessment
Algebra 1	6(ii) School wide measure computed locally	Fabius-Pompey Mastery Percentage for Regents-Integrated Algebra, Geometry, Algebra2/Trigonometry, Earth Science, Chemistry, Physics, Biology, Global History Geography, U.S. History Government, English
Geometry	6(ii) School wide measure computed locally	Fabius-Pompey Mastery Percentage for Regents-Integrated Algebra, Geometry, Algebra2/Trigonometry, Earth Science, Chemistry, Physics, Biology, Global History Geography, U.S. History Government, English
Algebra 2	6(ii) School wide measure computed locally	Fabius-Pompey Mastery Percentage for Regents-Integrated Algebra, Geometry, Algebra2/Trigonometry, Earth Science, Chemistry, Physics, Biology, Global History Geography, U.S. History Government, English

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.

All high school teachers will receive the same point total. This point total will be based upon the aggregate average mastery level on all exams administered as it relates to the District's five year aggregate average master level for similar exams completed during the previous five June administration periods. See attachment 3.13 for HEDI scoring bands.

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

Results are well above District expectations for student's achievement. The aggregate building-wide percentage of Fabius-Pompey students scoring at the mastery level (85 or better), on the June Administration of New York State Regents exams, exceeds the five year average of Fabius-Pompey students scoring at the mastery level on

all Regents exams completed during the previous five June administration periods.

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

Results meet District expectations for student achievement. The aggregate building-wide percentage of Fabius-Pompey students scoring at the mastery level (85 or better) on the June administration of New York State Regents exams is in line with the five year average of Fabius-Pompey students scoring at the mastery level on all Regents exams completed during the previous five June administration periods.

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

Results are below District expectations for student achievement. The aggregate building-wide percentage of Fabius-Pompey students scoring at the mastery level (85 or better) on the June administration of New York State Regents exams is below the five year average of students scoring at the mastery level on all Regents exams completed during the previous five June administration periods.

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

Results are well-below District expectations for student achievement. The aggregate building-wide percentage of Fabius-Pompey students scoring at the mastery level (85 or better) on the June administration of New York State Regents exams is well-below the five year average of students scoring at the mastery level on all Regents exams completed during the previous five June administration periods.

### 3.11) High School English Language Arts

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

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

	Locally-Selected Measure from List of Approved Measures	Assessment
Grade 9 ELA	6(ii) School wide measure computed locally	Fabius-Pompey Mastery Percentage for Regents-Integrated Algebra, Geometry, Algebra2/Trigonometry, Earth Science, Chemistry, Physics, Biology, Global History Geography, U.S. History Government, English
Grade 10 ELA	6(ii) School wide measure computed locally	Fabius-Pompey Mastery Percentage for Regents-Integrated Algebra, Geometry, Algebra2/Trigonometry, Earth Science, Chemistry, Physics, Biology, Global History Geography, U.S. History Government, English
Grade 11 ELA	6(ii) School wide measure computed locally	Fabius-Pompey Mastery Percentage for Regents-Integrated Algebra, Geometry, Algebra2/Trigonometry, Earth Science, Chemistry, Physics, Biology, Global History Geography, U.S. History Government, English

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

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

<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>All high school teachers will receive the same point total. This point total will be based upon the aggregate average mastery level on all exams administered as it relates to the District's five year aggregate average master level for similar exams completed during the previous five June administration periods. See attachment 3.13 for HEDI scoring bands.</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>Results are well above District expectations for student's achievement. The aggregate building-wide percentage of Fabius-Pompey students scoring at the mastery level (85 or better), on the June Administration of New York State Regents exams, exceeds the five year average of Fabius-Pompey students scoring at the mastery level on all Regents exams completed during the previous five June administration periods.</p>
<p>Effective (9 - 17 points) Results meet District- or BOCES-adopted expectations for growth or achievement for grade/subject.</p>	<p>Results meet District expectations for student achievement. The aggregate building-wide percentage of Fabius-Pompey students scoring at the mastery level (85 or better) on the June administration of New York State Regents exams is in line with the five year average of Fabius-Pompey students scoring at the mastery level on all Regents exams completed during the previous five June administration periods.</p>
<p>Developing (3 - 8 points) Results are below District- or BOCES-adopted expectations for growth or achievement for grade/subject.</p>	<p>Results are below District expectations for student achievement. The aggregate building-wide percentage of Fabius-Pompey students scoring at the mastery level (85 or better) on the June administration of New York State Regents exams is below the five year average of students scoring at the mastery level on all Regents exams completed during the previous five June administration periods.</p>
<p>Ineffective (0 - 2 points) Results are well below District- or BOCES-adopted expectations for growth or achievement for grade/subject.</p>	<p>Results are well-below District expectations for student achievement. The aggregate building-wide percentage of Fabius-Pompey students scoring at the mastery level (85 or better) on the June administration of New York State Regents exams is well-below the five year average of students scoring at the mastery level on all Regents exams completed during the previous five June administration periods.</p>

### 3.12) All Other Courses

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

Course(s) or Subject(s)	Locally-Selected Measure from List of Approved Measures	Assessment
English 12	6(ii) School wide measure computed locally	Fabius-Pompey Mastery Percentage for Regents-Integrated Algebra, Geometry, Algebra2/Trigonometry, Earth Science, Chemistry, Physics, Biology, Global History Geography, U.S.

		History Government, English
Pre-Calc	6(ii) School wide measure computed locally	Fabius-Pompey Mastery Percentage for Regents-Integrated Algebra, Geometry, Algebra2/Trigonometry, Earth Science, Chemistry, Physics, Biology, Global History Geography, U.S. History Government, English
Studio Art	6(ii) School wide measure computed locally	Fabius-Pompey Mastery Percentage for Regents-Integrated Algebra, Geometry, Algebra2/Trigonometry, Earth Science, Chemistry, Physics, Biology, Global History Geography, U.S. History Government, English
Algebra 2/Trigonometry	6(ii) School wide measure computed locally	Fabius-Pompey Mastery Percentage for Regents-Integrated Algebra, Geometry, Algebra2/Trigonometry, Earth Science, Chemistry, Physics, Biology, Global History Geography, U.S. History Government, English
Physical Education 9-12	6(ii) School wide measure computed locally	Fabius-Pompey Mastery Percentage for Regents-Integrated Algebra, Geometry, Algebra2/Trigonometry, Earth Science, Chemistry, Physics, Biology, Global History Geography, U.S. History Government, English
HS Band	6(ii) School wide measure computed locally	Fabius-Pompey Mastery Percentage for Regents-Integrated Algebra, Geometry, Algebra2/Trigonometry, Earth Science, Chemistry, Physics, Biology, Global History Geography, U.S. History Government, English
Spanish II	6(ii) School wide measure computed locally	Fabius-Pompey Mastery Percentage for Regents-Integrated Algebra, Geometry, Algebra2/Trigonometry, Earth Science, Chemistry, Physics, Biology, Global History Geography, U.S. History Government, English
Resource Room Grades 11	6(ii) School wide measure computed locally	Fabius-Pompey Mastery Percentage for Regents-Integrated Algebra, Geometry, Algebra2/Trigonometry, Earth Science, Chemistry, Physics, Biology, Global History Geography, U.S. History Government, English
Resource Room Grade 9	6(ii) School wide measure computed locally	Fabius-Pompey Mastery Percentage for Regents-Integrated Algebra, Geometry, Algebra2/Trigonometry, Earth Science, Chemistry, Physics, Biology, Global History Geography, U.S. History Government, English
Resource Room Grades 3-5	4) State-approved 3rd party	AIMSweb
Writing Specialist Grades K, 2, 5	4) State-approved 3rd party	AIMSweb
Math Specialist Grades 2,4	4) State-approved 3rd party	AIMSweb
Reading Specialist Grades 3,4	4) State-approved 3rd party	AIMSweb
Grades K, 3, 5 Art	4) State-approved 3rd party	AIMSweb
Grades 3-5 Music	4) State-approved 3rd party	AIMSweb
Grades 3-5 Physical Education	4) State-approved 3rd party	AIMSweb

Integrated Co-teaching 6 ELA	4) State-approved 3rd party	AIMSweb
Health Grades 6,7	4) State-approved 3rd party	AIMSweb
Spanish 8	4) State-approved 3rd party	AIMSweb
Chorus 7 and 8	4) State-approved 3rd party	AIMSweb

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>All high school teachers will receive the same point total. This point total will be based upon the aggregate average mastery level on all exams administered as it relates to the District's five year aggregate average master level for similar exams completed during the previous five June administration periods. See attachment 3.13 for HEDI scoring bands.</p> <p>Teachers with 51% of students in grade levels K-8 - Using AIMSweb as an assessment tool as a growth measure (students will be assessed in fall, winter and spring), AIMSweb will provide the district with an educator evaluation score. The educator evaluation score will be converted to the HEDI scale. See Attachment 3.13</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>All high school teachers - Results are well above District expectations for student's achievement. The aggregate building-wide percentage of Fabius-Pompey students scoring at the mastery level (85 or better), on the June Administration of New York State Regents exams, exceeds the five year average of Fabius-Pompey students scoring at the mastery level on all Regents exams completed during the previous five June administration periods.</p> <p>Teachers with 51% of students in grade levels K-8 - Results are well above District goals for student growth. Averaged growth scores for a teacher's students are well above the mid-point of the norm referenced average growth score, also known as the educator evaluation score, which is provided by Pearson (AIMSweb) at the end of the school year. Specifically this is growth as measured by fall, winter, and spring administrations of the appropriate AIMSweb assessment.</p>
<p>Effective (9 - 17 points) Results meet District- or BOCES-adopted expectations for growth or achievement for grade/subject.</p>	<p>All high school teachers - Results meet District expectations for student achievement. The aggregate building-wide percentage of Fabius-Pompey students scoring at the mastery level (85 or better) on the June administration of New York State Regents exams is in line with the five year average of Fabius-Pompey students scoring at the mastery level on all Regents exams completed during the previous five June administration periods.</p> <p>Teachers with 51% of students in grade levels K-8 -</p>

Results meet District goals for student growth. Averaged growth scores for a teacher's students are at the mid-point of the norm referenced average growth score, also known as the educator evaluation score, which is provided by Pearson (AIMSweb) at the end of the school year. Specifically this is growth as measured by fall, winter, and spring administrations of the appropriate AIMSweb assessment.

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

All high school teachers - Results are below District expectations for student achievement. The aggregate building-wide percentage of Fabius-Pompey students scoring at the mastery level (85 or better) on the June administration of New York State Regents exams is below the five year average of students scoring at the mastery level on all Regents exams completed during the previous five June administration periods.

Teachers with 51% of students in grade levels K-8 - Results are below District goals for student growth. Averaged growth scores for a teacher's students are below the mid-point of the norm referenced average growth score, also known as the educator evaluation score, which is provided by Pearson (AIMSweb) at the end of the school year. Specifically this is growth as measured by fall, winter, and spring administrations of the appropriate AIMSweb assessment

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

All high school teachers - Results are well-below District expectations for student achievement. The aggregate building-wide percentage of Fabius-Pompey students scoring at the mastery level (85 or better) on the June administration of New York State Regents exams is well-below the five year average of students scoring at the mastery level on all Regents exams completed during the previous five June administration periods.

Teachers with 51% of students in grade levels K-8 - Results are well below District goals for student growth. Averaged growth scores for a teacher's students are well below the mid-point of the norm referenced average growth score, also known as the educator evaluation score, which is provided by Pearson (AIMSweb) at the end of the school year. Specifically this is growth as measured by fall, winter, and spring administrations of the appropriate AIMSweb assessment.

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)

[assets/survey-uploads/5139/128184-Rp0Ol6pk1T/Form3\\_12\\_FPAllOtherCourses\\_1.doc](#)

### 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/5139/128184-y92vNseFa4/Local valued K-3 and Regents final3.docx](#)

### 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.

*None will be used at this time.*

### 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.

*Proportional based upon student enrollment in applicable courses.*

### 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 Thursday, May 10, 2012

Updated Wednesday, November 14, 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*

*(No response)*

#### 4.2) Points Within Other Measures

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

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

Is the following points assignment applicable to all teachers?

*Yes*

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

*(No response)*

Multiple (at least two) classroom observations by principal or other trained administrator, at least one of which must be unannounced [at least 31 points]	60
One or more observation(s) by trained independent evaluators	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.

*Domains 2 and 3 have been assigned 40 points of the 60 because they are based directly upon evidence collected during classroom observations. Domains 1 and 4 have been assigned 20 points of the 60. Each domain will be scored as follows:*

*Highly Effective = 4  
Effective = 3  
Developing = 2  
Ineffective = 1*

*Components within each of the 4 domains are weighted based upon a scale resulting from negotiation with the FPEA .*

See attachment.

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/5091/128049-eka9yMJ855/Danielson weight assignments and scoring procedure final\_5.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.	A score is calculated for each teaching standard. These scores are combined for a total score. A total score of 59-60 is highly effective.
Effective: Overall performance and results meet NYS Teaching Standards.	A score is calculated for each teaching standard. These scores are combined for a total score. A total score of 57-58 is effective.
Developing: Overall performance and results need improvement in order to meet NYS Teaching Standards.	A score is calculated for each teaching standard. These scores are combined for a total score. A total score of 50-56 is developing.
Ineffective: Overall performance and results do not meet NYS Teaching Standards.	A score is calculated for each teaching standard. These scores are combined for a total score. A total score of 0-49 is ineffective.

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	1
4.6) Observations of Probationary Teachers   Informal/Short	8
4.6) Observations of Probationary Teachers   Enter Total	9

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	0
4.7) Observations of Tenured Teachers   Informal/Short	8
4.7) Observations of Tenured Teachers   Total	8

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 Thursday, May 10, 2012

Updated Wednesday, September 26, 2012

---

## Page 1

### **Standards for Rating Categories**

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

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

#### **growth or achievement**

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

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

#### **Highly**

#### **Effective**

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

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

Overall performance and results exceed NYS Teaching Standards.

#### **Effective**

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

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

Overall performance and results meet NYS Teaching Standards.

#### **Developing**

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

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

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

#### **Ineffective**

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

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

Overall performance and results do not meet NYS Teaching Standards.

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

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

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

**Growth or Comparable Measures**

**Locally-selected Measures of**

**growth or achievement**

**Other Measures of Effectiveness**

**(60 points)**

**Overall**

**Composite Score**

**Highly Effective**

**18-20**

**18-20**

**Ranges determined locally--see below**

**91-100**

**Effective**

**9-17**

**9-17**

**75-90**

**Developing**

**3-8**

**3-8**

**65-74**

**Ineffective**

**0-2**

**0-2**

**0-64**

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

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

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

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

**Growth or Comparable Measures**

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

**Other Measures of Effectiveness**

**(60 points)**

**Overall**

**Composite Score**

**Highly Effective**

**22-25**

**14-15**

**Ranges determined locally--see above**

**91-100**

**Effective**

**10-21**

**8-13**

**75-90**

**Developing**

**3-9**

**3-7**

**65-74**

**Ineffective**

**0-2**

**0-2**

**0-64**

# 6. Additional Requirements - Teachers

Created Thursday, May 10, 2012  
Updated Friday, October 05, 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/5265/128054-Df0w3Xx5v6/TEACHER IMPROVEMENT PLAN.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:

*If a teacher's performance is evaluated as "ineffective" or "developing", the supervisor shall be required to develop a Teacher Improvement Plan (TIP) in consultation with the staff member. Such Plan will be provided to the staff member and implemented within ten days of the start of the school year within which the Plan will be applied. The Plan shall include, but not be limited to, an identification of the areas in need of improvement, a timeline for achieving improvement, suggestions for improvement, support to be provided, and measurable outcomes to be evaluated.*

*The plan will describe the professional learning activities that the teacher must complete. These activities will be connected to the areas needing improvement. The artifacts that the teacher must produce that could serve as benchmarks for improvement and as evidence for the successful completion of their improvement plan will be described and could include such items as lessons, student work, or unit plans for a teacher and for a principal. The plan will include the additional support and assistance that will be provided to the teacher. Upon completion of the improvement plan, the supervisor will meet with the teacher to review the plan, including artifacts and evidence in order to provide a final, summative rating for the staff member.*

## *APPR APPEAL PROCESS*

*Definitions: Following are several terms used in this document.*

- 1. APPR is the acronym for Annual Professional Performance Review.*
- 2. TIP is the acronym for Teacher Improvement Plan.*
- 3. "Performance Review" shall mean a teacher's annual performance review required by Education Law and the regulations of the Commissioner of Education.*
- 4. "Highly effective," "effective," "developing," and "ineffective" shall have the same meaning given to those terms in Commissioner of Education regulations.*
- 5. "Teacher" shall mean a member of the FPEA who is evaluated by an APPR. "Petitioner" shall mean a teacher evaluated by an APPR who is requesting an appeal.*
- 6. "Day" shall mean school day.*
- 7. "Evaluator of Record" shall mean the administrator responsible for the final APPR or TIP.*

*Acknowledgments:*

- 1. The district and FPEA agree that no decisions with monetary implications will be derived from a teacher's rating of either effective or highly effective. Therefore, teachers may write a written response to be added to the annual evaluation.*
- 2. It is clearly understood that Commissioner of Education regulations grant "the unfettered right to terminate a probationary teacher for any reason unless the employee establishes that he or she was terminated for a constitutionally impermissible reason or in violation of a statutory proscription."*
- 3. A teacher may not file multiple appeals regarding the same APPR. All grounds for appeal must be raised with specificity within one appeal, and any grounds not raised at the time of the appeal shall be deemed null and void.*
- 4. In an appeal, the teacher has the burden of demonstrating a clear and legal right to the relief requested and the burden of establishing the facts upon which the petitioner seeks relief.*
- 5. An appeal relates directly to the APPR only. A teacher may not resort to any other contractual grievance procedure for resolution of the challenges and appeals related to an APPR.*
- 6. Teachers may file an appeal only if it will result in a score that changes the overall evaluation level, or if there is a blatant clerical or mathematical error.*
- 7. At the completion of the appeal process, the original appeal form will be placed in the teacher's personnel file, and all of the appeal documentation will be returned to the petitioner.*

*Timeline:*

- 1. A completed form and supporting documentation must be submitted to the Evaluator of Record no later than 10 days from the date the teacher receives his/her APPR.*
  - a. Any documentation submitted later will not be considered.*
  - b. The Evaluator of Record may request a conference with the petitioner to clarify the submitted documents.*
- 2. The Evaluator of Record must render a decision within 5 days of receipt of the form and supporting documentation.*
  - a. If the Evaluator of Record rules in favor of the petitioner, then corrections on the APPR will be made. A copy of the revised APPR will be added to the personnel file, and a revised copy of the evaluation will be given to the petitioner within 3 days, and the original APPR will be returned to the teacher.*
  - b. If the Evaluator of Record rules against the petitioner, the form and supporting documentation shall be submitted to the Superintendent of Schools within 3 days of said decision, and the petitioner shall be notified.*
- 3. An appeal of a TIP must also be submitted to the Evaluator of Record within 10 of the teacher receiving the plan. Any information submitted later will not be considered.*
  - a. If the Evaluator of Record rules in favor of the petitioner, then changes and/or corrections to the TIP will be made. A revised copy of the TIP will be added to the personnel file, and a copy will be given to the petitioner within 3 days, and the original TIP will be returned to the teacher.*
  - b. If the Evaluator of Record rules against the petitioner, the form and supporting documentation shall be submitted to the Superintendent of Schools within 3 days of said decision, and the petitioner shall be notified.*
- 4. The Superintendent will convene the Appeals Committee within 5 days of the receipt of the appeal form and documentation.*

5. A decision will be delivered to the teacher within 5 days of the convening of the Appeals Committee. The decision of the Committee will be final and binding and the appeal shall be deemed completed upon the issuance of that decision.

6. The decision shall be binding on all parties and shall not be subject to any further appeal through any other process including contractual grievance procedures, adjudication before an administrative body or individual, or court action.

*Committee Findings: The Appeals Committee (defined below) is empowered to:*

1. Overturn a section of the evaluation, and the committee may recommend the redistribution of points. Said ability to overturn a section of the evaluation does not negate the fact that the evaluation was timely completed;

2. Overturn the entire evaluation if the evaluation is procedurally flawed, and recommend a solution;

3. To overturn a section or the entire evaluation, and require a course of action so as to enhance the professional growth of the teacher;

4. To affirm the evaluation, and require a course of action so as to enhance the professional growth of the teacher;

5. To affirm the evaluation.

*What May Be Challenged In An Appeal:*

*Appeal procedures are limited under Education Law 3012-c to the following:*

1. The school district's adherence to the standards and methodologies (the rubric) required for APPR;

2. The adherence to the Commissioner's regulations, as applicable to APPR;

3. Compliance with any applicable locally negotiated procedures applicable to APPR and TIP; and

4. The school district's issuance or implementation of the terms of the TIP.

*Appeals Committee:*

*The Appeals Committee shall consist of the Superintendent of Schools, one administrator (other than the Superintendent) who did not perform observations or was not otherwise involved in the APPR for the petitioning teacher, and three members of the FPEA other than its presiding officers. The process for selecting the FPEA members to serve is as follows:*

1. One FPEA member of the Appeals Committee shall be the association's building representative of the building not of the petitioning teacher, and two members shall be a teachers of the building not of the petitioning teacher. In effect, there shall be two teacher groups available to serve, one from the elementary building and one from the MS/HS building.

2. To facilitate fairness, the members will have staggered terms as committee members. The building representative from each building may serve unlimited terms for as long as he/she continues to be elected to the position. The two teachers will serve two years as committee members, with one teacher first serving a one year term in 2013-14 to begin the staggered process. A teacher for will then be elected in 2014-15 to serve two years creating a rotation of only one new member (possibly two with a new bldg. rep.) each year.

3. Teachers may run as incumbents and serve unlimited consecutive terms; however, the FPEA will maintain records of the time served so as to preserve the staggered rotation of committee members.

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

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

*The Board of Education will ensure that all evaluators have been trained and that all lead evaluators have been trained and certified in accordance with regulation. The district will utilize the OCM BOCES Network Team evaluator/ lead evaluator training in accordance with SED procedures and processes. The training will occur on a monthly basis throughout the school year with the total training time commensurate with SED expectations. Lead evaluator training will include training on:*

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

2) Evidence-based observation techniques that are grounded in research;

3) Application and use of the student growth percentile model and the value-added growth model;

4) Application and use of the teacher or principal rubric(s), 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 locally selected measures of student achievement used by the district evaluate its teachers 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 teacher's or principal's overall rating and their subcomponent ratings; and  
9) Specific considerations in evaluating teachers and principals of English language learners and students with disabilities.  
Upon completion of the initial year-long training for evaluators/lead evaluators, administrators will be certified as lead evaluators. Administrators responsible for teacher evaluation will continue training on an annual basis through participation in the annual follow-up training for evaluators/lead evaluators provided by the OCM BOCES Network Team. This training will support the continued growth in understanding of the nine elements of performance review listed above. Administrators who complete the annual follow-up training will be recertified as lead evaluators. The Board of Education designates the superintendent to ensure that lead evaluators participate in the initial year-long training for lead evaluators and then participate in ongoing training on an annual basis for purposes of continued growth in understanding of the teacher performance evaluation process. The OCM BOCES Network Team will be utilized to provide the initial training as well as the ongoing annual training. The initial training for evaluators/lead evaluators and the annual training, thereafter, for purposes of continued growth, will maintain inter-rater reliability of evaluators over time.

## 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 Thursday, September 06, 2012

Updated Friday, October 05, 2012

## Page 1

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

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

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

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

K-5
6-12
(No response)

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

Please check the boxes below:

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

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

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

State assessments, *required if one exists*

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

List of State-approved 3rd party assessments

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

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

School or Program Type	SLO with Assessment Option	Name of the Assessment
N/A		

Describe the district-adopted expectations for the level of performance required for each HEDI rating category and the process for assigning points to principals based on SLO results, consistent with regulations and assurances in the Comparable Growth Measures subcomponent. Include any district-determined expectations for student performance.

Use this box, if needed, to describe the process for assigning HEDI categories in this subcomponent. If needed, you may upload a table or graphic below.	N/A
Highly Effective (18 - 20 points) Results are well above state average for similar students (or District goals if no state test).	N/A
Effective (9 - 17 points) Results meet state average for similar students (or District goals if no state test).	N/A
Developing (3 - 8 points) Results are below state average for similar students (or District goals if no state test).	N/A
Ineffective (0 - 2 points) Results are well below state average for similar students (or District goals if no state test).	N/A

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

*(No response)*

## 7.4) Special Considerations for Comparable Growth Measures

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

Note: The only allowable controls or adjustments for Comparable Growth Measures are those used in State Growth measures, which include: prior student achievement results, students with disabilities, English language learners, students in poverty, and, in the future,

any other student-, classroom-, and school-level characteristics approved by the Board of Regents.

*(No response)*

## 7.5) Principals with More Than One Growth Measure

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

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

## 7.6) Assurances -- Comparable Growth Measures

Please check all of the boxes below:

7.6) Assurances -- Comparable Growth Measures   Assure the application of locally developed controls will be rigorous, fair, and transparent and only those used for State Growth will be used for Comparable Growth Measures.	Checked
7.6) Assurances -- Comparable Growth Measures   Assure that use of locally developed controls will not have a disparate impact on underrepresented students in accordance with applicable civil rights laws.	Checked
7.6) Assurances -- Comparable Growth Measures   Assure that procedures for ensuring data accuracy and integrity are being utilized.	Checked
7.6) Assurances -- Comparable Growth Measures   Assure that district will develop SLOs according to the rules established by NYSED for principal SLOs: <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 Thursday, September 06, 2012  
Updated Wednesday, November 21, 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	(d) measures used by district for teacher evaluation	AIMSweb
6-12	(d) measures used by district for teacher evaluation	Fabius Pompey Mastery Percentage on Regents Exams-Algebra, Geometry, Algebra2/Triginometry, Global History and Geography, U.S. History and Government, Earth Science, Living Environment, Chemistry, Physics, English Language Arts

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

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

Use this box, if needed, to describe the process for assigning HEDI categories. If needed, you may upload a table or graphic below.	see attachment Locally Selected Measure of Student Achievement - 15 points K-5 Principal Student Growth as Measured by AIMSweb Locally Selected Measure of Student Achievement. - 20 points 6-12 Principal Mastery on Regents Exam.
Highly Effective (14 - 15 points) Results are well above District- or BOCES-adopted expectations for growth or achievement for grade/subject.	K-5 Principal - Results are well above District goals for student growth. Averaged growth scores for students are well above the mid-point of the norm referenced average growth score, also known as the educator evaluation score, which is provided by Pearson (AIMSweb) at the end of the school year. Specifically this is growth as measured by fall, winter, and spring administrations of the appropriate AIMSweb assessment. 6-12 Principal - Results are well above District expectations for student's achievement. The aggregate

building-wide percentage of Fabius-Pompey students scoring at the mastery level (85 or better), on the June Administration of New York State Regents exams, exceeds the five year average of Fabius-Pompey students scoring at the mastery level on all Regents exams completed during the previous five June administration periods.

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

K-5 Principal - Results meet District goals for student growth. Averaged growth scores for students are at the mid-point of the norm referenced average growth score, also known as the educator evaluation score, which is provided by Pearson (AIMSweb) at the end of the school year. Specifically this is growth as measured by fall, winter, and spring administrations of the appropriate AIMSweb assessment.

6-12 Principal - Results meet District expectations for student achievement. The aggregate building-wide percentage of Fabius-Pompey students scoring at the mastery level (85 or better) on the June administration of New York State Regents exams is in line with the five year average of Fabius-Pompey students scoring at the mastery level on all Regents exams completed during the previous five June administration periods.

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

K-5 Principal - Results are below District goals for student growth. Averaged growth scores for students are below the mid-point of the norm referenced average growth score, also known as the educator evaluation score, which is provided by Pearson (AIMSweb) at the end of the school year. Specifically this is growth as measured by fall, winter, and spring administrations of the appropriate AIMSweb assessment.

6-12 Principal - Results are below District expectations for student achievement. The aggregate building-wide percentage of Fabius-Pompey students scoring at the mastery level (85 or better) on the June administration of New York State Regents exams is below the five year average of students scoring at the mastery level on all Regents exams completed during the previous five June administration periods.

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

K-5 Principal - Results are well below District goals for student growth. Averaged growth scores for students are well below the mid-point of the norm referenced average growth score, also known as the educator evaluation score, which is provided by Pearson (AIMSweb) at the end of the school year. Specifically this is growth as measured by fall, winter, and spring administrations of the appropriate AIMSweb assessment.

6-12 Principal - Results are well-below District expectations for student achievement. The aggregate building-wide percentage of Fabius-Pompey students scoring at the mastery level (85 or better) on the June administration of New York State Regents exams is well-below the five year average of students scoring at the mastery level on all Regents exams completed during the previous five June administration periods.

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/5366/172986-qBFVOWF7fC/Locally selected ES principal and HS principal\_4.docx*

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

Grade Configuration	Locally-Selected Measure from List of Approved Measures	Assessment
6-12	(d) measures used by district for teacher evaluation	Fabius Pompey Mastery Percentage on Regents Exams-Algebra, Geometry, Algebra2/Trigonometry, Global History and Geography, U.S. History and Government, Earth Science, Living Environment, Chemistry, Physics, English Language Arts

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

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

Use this box, if needed, to describe the process for assigning HEDI categories. If needed, you may upload a table or graphic below.	see attachment Locally Selected Measure of Student Achievement - 20 points 6-12 Principal Mastery on Regents Exam
Highly Effective (18 - 20 points) Results are well above District- or BOCES-adopted expectations for growth or achievement for grade/subject.	6-12 Principal - Results are well above District expectations for student's achievement. The aggregate building-wide percentage of Fabius-Pompey students scoring at the mastery level (85 or better), on the June Administration of New York State Regents exams, exceeds the five year average of Fabius-Pompey students scoring at the mastery level on all Regents exams completed during the previous five June administration periods.
Effective (9- 17 points) Results meet District- or BOCES-adopted expectations for growth or achievement for grade/subject.	6-12 Principal - Results meet District expectations for student achievement. The aggregate building-wide percentage of Fabius-Pompey students scoring at the mastery level (85 or better) on the June administration of New York State Regents exams is in line with the five year average of Fabius-Pompey students scoring at the mastery level on all Regents exams completed during the previous five June administration periods.
Developing (3 - 8 points) Results are below District- or BOCES-adopted expectations for growth or achievement for grade/subject.	6-12 Principal - Results are below District expectations for student achievement. The aggregate building-wide percentage of Fabius-Pompey students scoring at the mastery level (85 or better) on the June administration of New York State Regents exams is below the five year

average of students scoring at the mastery level on all Regents exams completed during the previous five June administration periods.

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

6-12 Principal - Results are well-below District expectations for student achievement. The aggregate building-wide percentage of Fabius-Pompey students scoring at the mastery level (85 or better) on the June administration of New York State Regents exams is well-below the five year average of students scoring at the mastery level on all Regents exams completed during the previous five June administration periods.

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

*(No response)*

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

*assets/survey-uploads/5366/172986-T8MIGWUVm1/Locally selected measures 6-12 principals.docx*

### 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.

*None at this time.*

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

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

*(No response)*

### 8.5) Assurances

Please check all of the boxes below:

8.5) Assurances   Assure that the application of locally developed controls will be rigorous, fair, and transparent	Check
8.5) Assurances   Assure that use of locally developed controls will not have a disparate impact on underrepresented students, in accordance with any applicable civil rights laws.	Check
8.5) Assurances   Assure that enrolled students are included in accordance with policies for student assignment to schools and may not be excluded.	Check
8.5) Assurances   Assure that procedures for ensuring data accuracy and integrity are being utilized.	Check

8.5) Assurances   Assure that the process for assigning points for locally selected measures will use the narrative HEDI descriptions described in the regulations to effectively differentiate principals' performance in ways that improve student learning and instruction.	Check
8.5) Assurances   Assure that it is possible for a principal to earn each point, including 0, for the locally selected measures subcomponent.	Check
8.5) Assurances   Assure that locally-selected measures are rigorous and comparable across all principals in the same or similar programs or grade configurations across the district.	Check
8.5) Assurances   If more than one type of locally-selected measure is used for different groups of principals in the same or similar grade configuration or program, certify that the measures are comparable based on the Standards of Educational and Psychological Testing.	Check
8.5) Assurances   Assure that all locally-selected measures for a principal are different than any measures used for the State assessment or other comparable measures subcomponent.	Check

# 9. Other Measures of Effectiveness (Principals)

Created Thursday, September 06, 2012

Updated Monday, November 19, 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.

*Marshall's Principal Evaluation Rubric*

*(No response)*

### 9.2) Points Within Other Measures

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

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

Is the following points assignment for all principals?

*Yes*

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

*(No response)*

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

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

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

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

*(No response)*

### 9.3) Assurances -- Goals

Please check the boxes below (if applicable):

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

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

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

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

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

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

*(No response)*

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

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

## 9.6) Assurances

Please check all of the boxes below:

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

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

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

*The remaining 60% (or 60 out of the total 100 point composite score) of the composite effectiveness score is based on other measures of effectiveness consistent with ISSLC standards prescribed by the Commissioner in regulation. The District and the Fabius-Pompey Administrators have agreed that the Marshall's Principal Performance Rubric will be utilized by the district to score this section of the evaluation..*

*The following six domains will each be worth ten (10) points toward the total possible score of 60 points:*

*Domain 1: Diagnosis and Planning*

*Domain 2: Priority Management and Communication*

*Domain 3: Curriculum and Data*

*Domain 4: Supervision and Professional Development*

*Domain 5: Discipline and Parent Involvement*

*Domain 6: Management and External Relations*

*Highly Effective- 8-10*

*Effective - 5-7*

*Developing - 2-4*

*Ineffective - 0-1*

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

*(No response)*

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

Highly Effective: Overall performance and results exceed standards.

In order for a principal to receive a highly effective rating in this section, the evidence collected must clearly demonstrate that the principal exceeds classroom expectations in the vast majority of indicators on the rubric. In order to get a score of 59-60 in this section, the principal must exceed effectiveness in most, but not all, categories on the rubric.

Effective: Overall performance and results meet standards.	In order for a principal to receive an effective rating, the principal must score between 57-58 once all of the points are totaled. This would require that principals, through evidence collection have demonstrated effectiveness in most, but not all of the key elements. A principal in this category may have some areas that are in the highly effective range, but not enough to cause their rating (and point total) to place them at or above 59 points.
Developing: Overall performance and results need improvement in order to meet standards.	Evidence collection would point to a principal who is working towards, but has not accomplished, the expected competence in the key elements on the rubric. A score of 50-56 is considered in the developmental range. A principal in this range will most likely have a PIP for the following year (assuming that their composite score was in the developing or ineffective range).
Ineffective: Overall performance and results do not meet standards.	A principal who is showing great deficiencies in most, if not all, key elements on the rubric will receive a rating of 0-49. Through the agreed observation process, a principal receiving an ineffective score on this section would have little or no evidence that could be collected to show competence in most domains. Again, principals in this category will almost certainly have a PIP for the following school year (assuming a composite score in the developing or ineffective range).

Please provide the locally-negotiated 60 point scoring bands.

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

## 9.8) School Visits

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

### **Probationary Principals**

By supervisor	2
By trained administrator	2
By trained independent evaluator	0
Enter Total	4

### **Tenured Principals**

By supervisor	2
---------------	---

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

# 10. Composite Scoring (Principals)

Created Thursday, September 06, 2012

Updated Friday, November 09, 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 Thursday, September 06, 2012

Updated Friday, November 09, 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/5276/172989-Df0w3Xx5v6/PrincipalImprovement Plan\\_1.docx](assets/survey-uploads/5276/172989-Df0w3Xx5v6/PrincipalImprovement Plan_1.docx)

### 11.3) Appeals Process

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

(1) the substance of the annual professional performance review

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

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

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

#### **PROFESSIONAL IMPROVEMENT PLANS**

*If a principal's performance is evaluated as "ineffective" or "developing", the supervisor shall be required to develop a Principal Improvement Plan (PIP) in consultation with the staff member. Such Plan will be provided to the principal and implemented within ten days of the start of the school year within which the Plan will be applied. The Plan shall include, but not be limited to, an identification of the areas in need of improvement, a timeline for achieving improvement, suggestions for improvement, support to be provided, and measurable outcomes to be evaluated.*

*The plan will describe the professional learning activities that the principal must complete. These activities will be connected to the*

areas needing improvement. The artifacts that the principal must produce that could serve as benchmarks for improvement and as evidence for the successful completion of their improvement plan will be described and could include such items as lessons, student work, or unit plans for a principal. The plan will include the additional support and assistance that will be provided to the principal. Upon completion of the improvement plan, the supervisor will meet with the principal within 10 business days to review the plan, including artifacts and evidence in order to provide a final, summative rating for the principal.

## *APPR APPEAL PROCESS*

*Definitions: Following are several terms used in this document.*

- 1. APPR is the acronym for Annual Professional Performance Review.*
- 2. PIP is the acronym for Principal Improvement Plan.*
- 3. "Performance Review" shall mean a principal's annual performance review required by Education Law and the regulations of the Commissioner of Education.*
- 4. "Highly effective," "effective," "developing," and "ineffective" shall have the same meaning given to those terms in Commissioner of Education regulations.*
- 5. "Principal" shall mean a member of the building administrative team who is evaluated by an APPR. "Petitioner" shall mean a principal evaluated by an APPR who is requesting an appeal.*
- 6. "Day" shall mean school day.*
- 7. "Evaluator of Record" shall mean the Superintendent responsible for the final APPR or PIP.*

*Acknowledgments:*

- 1. The district and Fabius-Pompey School Administrators agree that no decisions with monetary implications will be derived from a principal's rating of either effective or highly effective. Therefore, principals may write a written response to be added to the annual evaluation.*
- 2. It is clearly understood that Commissioner of Education regulations grant "the unfettered right to terminate a probationary principal for any reason unless the employee establishes that he or she was terminated for a constitutionally impermissible reason or in violation of a statutory proscription."*
- 3. A principal may not file multiple appeals regarding the same APPR. All grounds for appeal must be raised with specificity within one appeal, and any grounds not raised at the time of the appeal shall be deemed null and void.*
- 4. In an appeal, the principal has the burden of demonstrating a clear and legal right to the relief requested and the burden of establishing the facts upon which the petitioner seeks relief.*
- 5. An appeal relates directly to the APPR only. A principal may not resort to any other contractual grievance procedure for resolution of the challenges and appeals related to an APPR.*
- 6. Principals may file an appeal only if it will result in a score that changes the overall evaluation level, or if there is a blatant clerical or mathematical error.*
- 7. At the completion of the appeal process, the original appeal form will be placed in the principal's personnel file, and all of the appeal documentation will be returned to the petitioner.*

*Timeline:*

- 1. A completed form and supporting documentation must be submitted to the Evaluator of Record no later than 10 days from the date the principal receives his/her APPR.*
  - a. Any documentation submitted later will not be considered.*
  - b. The Evaluator of Record may request a conference with the petitioner to clarify the submitted documents.*
- 2. The Evaluator of Record must render a decision within 5 days of receipt of the form and supporting documentation.*
  - a. If the Evaluator of Record rules in favor of the petitioner, then corrections on the APPR will be made. A copy of the revised APPR will be added to the personnel file, and a revised copy of the evaluation will be given to the petitioner within 3 days, and the original APPR will be returned to the principal.*
  - b. If the Evaluator of Record rules against the petitioner, the form and supporting documentation shall be submitted to the Superintendent of Schools within 3 days of said decision, and the petitioner shall be notified.*
- 3. An appeal of a PIP must also be submitted to the Evaluator of Record within 10 of the principal receiving the plan. Any information submitted later will not be considered.*
  - a. If the Evaluator of Record rules in favor of the petitioner, then changes and/or corrections to the PIP will be made. A revised copy of the PIP will be added to the personnel file, and a copy will be given to the petitioner within 3 days, and the original PIP will be returned to the principal.*
  - b. If the Evaluator of Record rules against the petitioner, the form and supporting documentation shall be submitted to the Superintendent of Schools within 3 days of said decision, and the petitioner shall be notified.*

4. The Superintendent will convene the Appeals Committee within 5 days of the receipt of the appeal form and documentation.
5. A decision will be delivered to the principal within 5 days of the convening of the Appeals Committee. The decision of the Committee will be final and binding and the appeal shall be deemed completed upon the issuance of that decision.
6. The decision shall be binding on all parties and shall not be subject to any further appeal through any other process including contractual grievance procedures, adjudication before an administrative body or individual, or court action.

*Committee Findings: The Appeals Committee (defined below) is empowered to:*

1. Overturn a section of the evaluation, and the committee may recommend the redistribution of points. Said ability to overturn a section of the evaluation does not negate the fact that the evaluation was timely completed;
2. Overturn the entire evaluation if the evaluation is procedurally flawed, and recommend a solution;
3. To overturn a section or the entire evaluation, and require a course of action so as to enhance the professional growth of the principal;
4. To affirm the evaluation, and require a course of action so as to enhance the professional growth of the principal;
5. To affirm the evaluation.

*What May Be Challenged In An Appeal:*

*Appeal procedures are limited under Education Law 3012-c to the following:*

1. The school district's adherence to the standards and methodologies (the rubric) required for APPR;
2. The adherence to the Commissioner's regulations, as applicable to APPR;
3. Compliance with any applicable locally negotiated procedures applicable to APPR and PIP; and
4. The school district's issuance or implementation of the terms of the PIP.

*Appeals Committee:*

*The Appeals Committee shall consist of the Superintendent of Schools, one administrator appointed by the Fabius-Pompey School Administrators and a third party mutually agreed upon by the building Fabius-Pompey School Administrators.*

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

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

*The Board of Education will ensure that all evaluators have been trained and that all lead evaluators have been trained and certified in accordance with regulation. The district will utilize the OCM BOCES Network Team evaluator/ lead evaluator training in accordance with SED procedures and processes. The training will occur on a monthly basis throughout the school year with the total training time commensurate with SED expectations. Lead evaluator training will include training on:*

- 1) *The New York State Teaching Standards, and their related elements and performance indicators and the Leadership Standards and their related functions, as applicable;*
- 2) *Evidence-based observation techniques that are grounded in research;*
- 3) *Application and use of the student growth percentile model and the value-added growth model;*
- 4) *Application and use of the teacher or principal rubric(s), 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 locally selected measures of student achievement used by the district evaluate its teachers 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 teacher's or principal's overall rating and their subcomponent ratings; and*
- 9) *Specific considerations in evaluating teachers and principals of English language learners and students with disabilities.*

*Upon completion of the initial year-long training for evaluators/lead evaluators, administrators will be certified as lead evaluators. Administrators responsible for teacher/principal evaluation will continue training on an annual basis through participation in the annual follow-up training for evaluators/lead evaluators provided by the OCM BOCES Network Team. This training will support the continued growth in understanding of the nine elements of performance review listed above. Administrators who complete the annual follow-up training will be recertified as lead evaluators. The Board of Education designates the superintendent to ensure that lead evaluators participate in the initial year-long training for lead evaluators and then participate in ongoing training on an annual basis*

*for purposes of continued growth in understanding of the teacher performance evaluation process. The OCM BOCES Network Team will be utilized to provide the initial training as well as the ongoing annual training. The initial training for evaluators/lead evaluators and the annual training, thereafter, for purposes of continued growth, will maintain inter-rater reliability of evaluators over time.*

## 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, May 10, 2012

Updated Wednesday, November 28, 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/5581/128048-3Uqgn5g9Iu/FP certification signatures.pdf](assets/survey-uploads/5581/128048-3Uqgn5g9Iu/FP%20certification%20signatures.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.

**Comparable Growth Measures – 20 points**  
**SLO's for Courses Ending in Locally Created Final Exams**  
**or Year-End Local Assessments**

**Description of the General Process** - District goals will be set based upon the following data, which will vary according to grade levels: Guided Reading Instructional Levels; Running Record results; AIMSweb data; Writing Snapshots; prior years New York State Regents Exam or New York State Assessment results for Fabius-Pompey students; prior years State and local assessment results for Fabius-Pompey students; prior results on similar local final exams or local end of year assessments; results from subject specific/grade specific baseline assessments, aligned to a course's most important learning and typically administered at the beginning of the school year. A teacher's growth goal will be set during his/her Fall Planning Meeting with the building principal, and will then be specifically defined in that teacher's SLO. The goal will be stated in terms of the average (mean) score the teacher's students achieve on the locally created final exam or on locally created year-end assessment. Locally created exams and year-end assessments are created at the department level. The same exam/assessment will be administered to all students enrolled in the same course or at the same grade level. Points will be awarded according to the attached table.

**Highly Effective (18-20 points)** - Results are well above District goals. The average (mean) score on the local final exam or local year-end assessment far exceeds the SLO goal set at the beginning of the school year.

**Effective (9-17 points)** - Results meet District goals. The average (mean) score on the local final exam or local year-end assessment is in line with the SLO goal set at the beginning of the school year.

**Developing (3-8 points)** - Results are below District goals. The average (mean) score on the local final exam or local year-end assessment is below the SLO goal set at the beginning of the school year.

**Ineffective (0-2 points)** – Results are well below District goals. The average (mean) score on the local final exam or local year-end assessment is well below the SLO goal set at the beginning of the school year.

**Comparable Growth Measures – 20 points**  
**SLO's for Courses Ending in Locally Created Final Exams**  
**or Year-End Local Assessments**

Percentage points over/under the SLO goal. SLO goals are set in terms of the average (mean) score on a locally created final exam or year-end assessment.

Percentage over/under the SLO Goal:	Points out of 20	
+5.6 or greater	20	Exceeds
+4.6 - 5.5%	19	District's
+3.6 - 4.5%	18	Goals
<hr/>		
+3.1 - 3.5%	17	
+2.6 - 3.0%	16	
+/- 2.5%	15	Meets
-2.6 - 3.0%	14	District's
-3.1 - 3.5%	13	Goals
-3.6 - 4.0%	12	
-4.1 - 4.5%	11	
-4.6 - 5.0%	10	
-5.1 - 5.5%	9	
<hr/>		
-5.6 - 6.0%	8	
-6.1 - 6.5%	7	Below
-6.6 - 7.0%	6	District's
-7.1 - 7.5%	5	Goals
-7.6 - 8.0%	4	
-8.1 - 8.5%	3	
<hr/>		
-8.6 - 9.5%	2	Well-below
-9.6 - 10.5%	1	District's
-10.6% or greater	0	Goals

**Comparable Growth Measures – 20 Points**  
**SLO's for Courses Ending in a New York State Regents Exam**  
**or a New York State Assessment**

**Description of the General Process** - Teachers and their building administrator will collaboratively develop SLO's based on their student rosters using available background and baseline data. Appropriate and rigorous targets will be set for each SLO. 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, based on each SLO. 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 goals for similar students. The passing rate for the teacher's students on the New York State Regents Exam or New York State Assessment far exceeds the SLO goal set at the beginning of the school year.

**Effective (9-17 points)** - Results meet District goals for similar students. The passing rate for the teacher's students on the New York State Regents Exam or New York State Assessment meets the SLO goal set at the beginning of the school year.

**Developing (3-8 points)** - Results are below District goals for similar students. The passing rate for the teacher's students on the New York State Regents Exam or New York State Assessment falls below the SLO goal set at the beginning of the school year.

**Ineffective (0-2 points)** - Results are well below District goals for similar students. The passing rate for the teacher's students on the New York State Regents Exam or New York State Assessment fall far below the SLO goal set at the beginning of the school year.

**Comparable Growth Measures – 20 Points**  
**SLO's for Courses Ending in a New York State Regents Exam**  
**or a New York State Assessment**  
**HEDI bands based on teacher's growth goal - student passing rate (percentage)**

**85% Goal**

HIGHLY EFFECTIVE			EFFECTIVE									DEVELOPING						INEFFECTIVE		
20	19	18	17	16	<u>15</u>	14	13	12	11	10	9	8	7	6	5	4	3	2	1	0
100-97	96-93	92-89	88	87	86-85	84-80	79-75	74-70	69-65	64-60	59-55	54-50	49-45	44-40	39-35	34-30	29-25	24-20	19-15	14-0

**80% Goal**

HIGHLY EFFECTIVE			EFFECTIVE									DEVELOPING						INEFFECTIVE		
20	19	18	17	16	<u>15</u>	14	13	12	11	10	9	8	7	6	5	4	3	2	1	0
100-97	96-93	92-89	88-86	85-83	82-80	79-75	74-70	69-65	64-60	59-55	54-50	49-45	44-40	39-35	34-30	29-25	24-20	19-15	14-10	9-0

**75% Goal**

HIGHLY EFFECTIVE			EFFECTIVE									DEVELOPING						INEFFECTIVE		
20	19	18	17	16	<u>15</u>	14	13	12	11	10	9	8	7	6	5	4	3	2	1	0
100-97	96-93	92-89	88-84	83-80	79-75	74-71	70-66	65-61	60-56	55-51	50-46	45-41	40-36	35-31	30-26	25-21	20-16	15-11	10-6	5-0

**70% Goal**

HIGHLY EFFECTIVE			EFFECTIVE									DEVELOPING						INEFFECTIVE		
20	19	18	17	16	<u>15</u>	14	13	12	11	10	9	8	7	6	5	4	3	2	1	0
100-97	96-93	92-89	88-83	82-74	73-70	69-65	64-60	59-55	54-50	49-45	44-40	39-36	35-31	31-28	27-24	23-20	19-16	15-12	11-8	7-0

65% Goal

HIGHLY EFFECTIVE			EFFECTIVE									DEVELOPING					INEFFECTIVE			
20	19	18	17	16	<u>15</u>	14	13	12	11	10	9	8	7	6	5	4	3	2	1	0
97-100	96-93	92-89	88-83	82-74	73-65	64-61	60-57	56-53	52-49	48-45	44-41	40-37	36-33	32-29	28-25	24-21	20-17	16-13	12-9	8-0

60% Goal

HIGHLY EFFECTIVE			EFFECTIVE									DEVELOPING					INEFFECTIVE			
20	19	18	17	16	<u>15</u>	14	13	12	11	10	9	8	7	6	5	4	3	2	1	0
97-100	96-93	92-89	88-80	79-70	69-60	59-56	55-52	51-48	47-44	43-40	39-36	35-32	31-28	27-24	23-20	19-16	15-12	11-8	7-4	3-0

55% Goal

HIGHLY EFFECTIVE			EFFECTIVE									DEVELOPING					INEFFECTIVE			
20	19	18	17	16	<u>15</u>	14	13	12	11	10	9	8	7	6	5	4	3	2	1	0
97-100	96-93	92-89	88-77	76-66	65-55	54-51	50-47	46-43	42-39	38-35	34-31	30-27	26-23	22-19	18-15	14-11	10-7	6-5	4-2	1-0

50% Goal

HIGHLY EFFECTIVE			EFFECTIVE									DEVELOPING					INEFFECTIVE			
20	19	18	17	16	<u>15</u>	14	13	12	11	10	9	8	7	6	5	4	3	2	1	0
97-100	96-93	92-89	88-76	75-63	62-50	49-47	46-44	43-41	40-38	37-35	34-32	31-29	28-26	25-23	22-20	19-17	16-14	13-11	10-8	7-0

**Locally Selected Measure of Student Achievement – 15 Points (if valued added)**  
**K-8 Teachers**  
**Student Growth as Measured by AIMSweb**

**Description of the General Process** – Teachers with 51% of students in grade levels K-8 will receive points for the locally-selected measure of student achievement in the following manner. Points will be allocated based upon a teacher’s evaluation score, relative to one of four specific measures of student growth, as provided to the District by Pearson (AIMSweb), and then converted using the table below. The specific measures of student growth are determined using one of the following seven assessment tools: Grade K-will use the Letter Naming Fluency (LNF assessment) used to assess letter naming, Letter Sound Fluency (LSF assessment) used to assess identification of letter sounds or the Number Identification assessment (NIM), a number naming measure along with the Missing Number task (MNM), which assesses students’ ability to sequence numbers. Grade 1 will use the Nonsense Word Fluency (NWF) assessment to assess sound-symbol knowledge and blending skills, or the M-COMP assessment (used to measure math computation). Grades 2-8, depending upon subject area and grade level, will use the R-CBM assessment (used to measure growth in reading fluency), and/or the M-CAP assessment (used to measure growth in math reasoning skills).

**Highly Effective (14-15 points)** – Results are well above District goals for student growth. Averaged growth scores for a teacher’s students are well above the mid-point of the norm referenced average growth score, also known as the educator evaluation score, which is provided by Pearson (AIMSweb) at the end of the school year. Specifically this is growth as measured by fall, winter, and spring administrations of the appropriate AIMSweb assessment.

**Effective (8-13 points)** – Results meet District goals for student growth. Averaged growth scores for a teacher’s students are at the mid-point of the norm referenced average growth score, also known as the educator evaluation score, which is provided by Pearson (AIMSweb) at the end of the school year. Specifically this is growth as measured by fall, winter, and spring administrations of the appropriate AIMSweb assessment.

**Developing (3-7 points)** – Results are below District goals for student growth. Averaged growth scores for a teacher’s students are below the mid-point of the norm referenced average growth score, also known as the educator evaluation score, which is provided by Pearson (AIMSweb) at the end of the school year. Specifically this is growth as measured by fall, winter, and spring administrations of the appropriate AIMSweb assessment.

**Ineffective (0-2 points)** – Results are well below District goals for student growth. Averaged growth scores for a teacher’s students are well below the mid-point of the norm referenced average growth score, also known as the educator evaluation score, which is provided by Pearson (AIMSweb) at the end of the school year. Specifically this is growth as measured by fall, winter, and spring administrations of the appropriate AIMSweb assessment.

**Locally Selected Measure of Student Achievement – 15 Points (if value added)**  
**K-8 Teachers**  
**Student Growth as Measured by AIMSweb**

Average Growth Score Provided By Pearson (AIMSweb)	Points out of 15	
16.1 or greater	15	Well Above
12.6 – 16.0	14	District's Goals
10.6 – 12.5	13	
9.6 – 10.5	12	Meets District's
8.6 – 9.5	11	Goals
7.6 – 8.5	10	
7.1 – 7.5	9	
6.6 – 7.0	8	
6.1 – 6.5	7	Below District's
5.6 – 6.0	6	Goals
5.1 – 5.5	5	
4.6 – 5.0	4	
4.1 – 4.5	3	
2.6 – 4.0	2	Well-Below
1.1 – 2.5	1	District's
Less than 1.0	0	Goals

**Locally Selected Measure of Student Achievement – 20 Points (if no value added)**  
**K-8 Teachers**  
**Student Growth as Measured by AIMSweb**

Average Growth Score Provided By Pearson (AIMSweb)	Points out of 20	
16.1 or greater	20	Well Above
14.1 – 16.0	19	District’s Goals
12.6 – 14.0	18	
11.1 – 12.5	17	
10.6 – 11.0	16	
10.1 – 10.5	15	Meets District’s
9.6 – 10.0	14	Goals
9.1 – 9.5	13	
8.6 – 9.0	12	
8.1 – 8.5	11	
7.6 – 8.0	10	
7.1 – 7.5	9	
6.6 – 7.0	8	
6.1 – 6.5	7	Below District’s
5.6 – 6.0	6	Goals
5.1 – 5.5	5	
4.6 – 5.0	4	
4.1 – 4.5	3	
2.6 – 4.0	2	Well-Below
1.1 – 2.5	1	District’s
Less than 1.0	0	Goals

**Form 3.12) All Other Courses**

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

	<b>Course(s) or Subject(s)</b>	<b>Locally-Selected Measure from List of Approved Measures</b>	<b>Assessment</b>
	Chorus 6	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li><input type="radio"/> 1) Change in % of student performance level on State</li> <li><input type="radio"/> 2) Teacher specific growth computed by NYSED</li> <li><input type="radio"/> 3) Teacher specific achievement/growth score computed locally</li> <li><input checked="" type="radio"/> 4) State-approved 3rd party</li> <li><input type="radio"/> 5) District/regional/BOCES–developed</li> <li><input type="radio"/> 6(i) School-wide measure based on State-provided measure</li> <li><input type="radio"/> 6(ii) School wide measure computed locally</li> <li><input type="radio"/> 7) Student Learning Objectives</li> </ul>	AIMSweb
	Band 7 and 8	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li><input type="radio"/> 1) Change in % of student performance level on State</li> <li><input type="radio"/> 2) Teacher specific growth computed by NYSED</li> <li><input type="radio"/> 3) Teacher specific achievement/growth score computed locally</li> <li><input checked="" type="radio"/> 4) State-approved 3rd party</li> <li><input type="radio"/> 5) District/regional/BOCES–developed</li> <li><input type="radio"/> 6(i) School-wide measure based on State-provided measure</li> <li><input type="radio"/> 6(ii) School wide measure computed locally</li> <li><input type="radio"/> 7) Student Learning Objectives</li> </ul>	AIMSweb
	Physical Education 6	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li><input type="radio"/> 1) Change in % of student performance level on State</li> </ul>	AIMSweb

	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li><input type="radio"/> 2) Teacher specific growth computed by NYSED</li> <li><input type="radio"/> 3) Teacher specific achievement/growth score computed locally</li> <li><input checked="" type="radio"/> 4) State-approved 3rd party</li> <li><input type="radio"/> 5) District/regional/BOCES–developed</li> <li><input type="radio"/> 6(i) School-wide measure based on State-provided measure</li> <li><input type="radio"/> 6(ii) School wide measure computed locally</li> <li><input type="radio"/> 7) Student Learning Objectives</li> </ul>	
<b>Course(s) or Subject(s)</b>	<b>Locally-Selected Measure from List of Approved Measures</b>	<b>Assessment</b>
Physical Education 7-8	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li><input type="radio"/> 1) Change in % of student performance level on State</li> <li><input type="radio"/> 2) Teacher specific growth computed by NYSED</li> <li><input type="radio"/> 3) Teacher specific achievement/growth score computed locally</li> <li><input checked="" type="radio"/> 4) State-approved 3rd party</li> <li><input type="radio"/> 5) District/regional/BOCES–developed</li> <li><input type="radio"/> 6(i) School-wide measure based on State-provided measure</li> <li><input type="radio"/> 6(ii) School wide measure computed locally</li> <li><input type="radio"/> 7) Student Learning Objectives</li> </ul>	AIMSweb
<b>Course(s) or Subject(s)</b>	<b>Locally-Selected Measure from List of Approved Measures</b>	<b>Assessment</b>
Home and Careers 7	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li><input type="radio"/> 1) Change in % of student performance level on State</li> <li><input type="radio"/> 2) Teacher specific growth computed by NYSED</li> </ul>	AIMSweb

	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li><input type="radio"/> 3) Teacher specific achievement/growth score computed locally</li> <li><input checked="" type="radio"/> 4) State-approved 3rd party</li> <li><input type="radio"/> 5) District/regional/BOCES–developed</li> <li><input type="radio"/> 6(i) School-wide measure based on State-provided measure</li> <li><input type="radio"/> 6(ii) School wide measure computed locally</li> <li><input type="radio"/> 7) Student Learning Objectives</li> </ul>	
<b>Course(s) or Subject(s)</b>	<b>Locally-Selected Measure from List of Approved Measures</b>	<b>Assessment</b>
Home and Careers 8	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li><input type="radio"/> 1) Change in % of student performance level on State</li> <li><input type="radio"/> 2) Teacher specific growth computed by NYSED</li> <li><input type="radio"/> 3) Teacher specific achievement/growth score computed locally</li> <li><input checked="" type="radio"/> 4) State-approved 3rd party</li> <li><input type="radio"/> 5) District/regional/BOCES–developed</li> <li><input type="radio"/> 6(i) School-wide measure based on State-provided measure</li> <li><input type="radio"/> 6(ii) School wide measure computed locally</li> <li><input type="radio"/> 7) Student Learning Objectives</li> </ul>	AIMSweb
<b>Course(s) or Subject(s)</b>	<b>Locally-Selected Measure from List of Approved Measures</b>	<b>Assessment</b>
Art 8	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li><input type="radio"/> 1) Change in % of student performance level on State</li> <li><input type="radio"/> 2) Teacher specific growth computed by NYSED</li> <li><input type="radio"/> 3) Teacher specific achievement/growth score computed locally</li> </ul>	AIMSweb



	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>● 4) State-approved 3rd party</li> <li>○ 5) District/regional/BOCES–developed</li> <li>○ 6(i) School-wide measure based on State-provided measure</li> <li>○ 6(ii) School wide measure computed locally</li> <li>○ 7) Student Learning Objectives</li> </ul>	
<b>Course(s) or Subject(s)</b>	<b>Locally-Selected Measure from List of Approved Measures</b>	<b>Assessment</b>
Art 7	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>○ 1) Change in % of student performance level on State</li> <li>○ 2) Teacher specific growth computed by NYSED</li> <li>○ 3) Teacher specific achievement/growth score computed locally</li> <li>● 4) State-approved 3rd party</li> <li>○ 5) District/regional/BOCES–developed</li> <li>○ 6(i) School-wide measure based on State-provided measure</li> <li>○ 6(ii) School wide measure computed locally</li> <li>○ 7) Student Learning Objectives</li> </ul>	AIMSweb
<b>Course(s) or Subject(s)</b>	<b>Locally-Selected Measure from List of Approved Measures</b>	<b>Assessment</b>
Technology 8	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>○ 1) Change in % of student performance level on State</li> <li>○ 2) Teacher specific growth computed by NYSED</li> <li>○ 3) Teacher specific achievement/growth score computed locally</li> <li>● 4) State-approved 3rd party</li> <li>○ 5) District/regional/BOCES–developed</li> </ul>	AIMSweb

	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li><input type="radio"/> 6(i) School-wide measure based on State-provided measure</li> <li><input type="radio"/> 6(ii) School wide measure computed locally</li> <li><input type="radio"/> 7) Student Learning Objectives</li> </ul>	
<b>Course(s) or Subject(s)</b>	<b>Locally-Selected Measure from List of Approved Measures</b>	<b>Assessment</b>
Technology 7	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li><input type="radio"/> 1) Change in % of student performance level on State</li> <li><input type="radio"/> 2) Teacher specific growth computed by NYSED</li> <li><input type="radio"/> 3) Teacher specific achievement/growth score computed locally</li> <li><input checked="" type="radio"/> 4) State-approved 3rd party</li> <li><input type="radio"/> 5) District/regional/BOCES–developed</li> <li><input type="radio"/> 6(i) School-wide measure based on State-provided measure</li> <li><input type="radio"/> 6(ii) School wide measure computed locally</li> <li><input type="radio"/> 7) Student Learning Objectives</li> </ul>	AIMSweb
<b>Course(s) or Subject(s)</b>	<b>Locally-Selected Measure from List of Approved Measures</b>	<b>Assessment</b>
Math 7 AIS	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li><input type="radio"/> 1) Change in % of student performance level on State</li> <li><input type="radio"/> 2) Teacher specific growth computed by NYSED</li> <li><input type="radio"/> 3) Teacher specific achievement/growth score computed locally</li> <li><input checked="" type="radio"/> 4) State-approved 3rd party</li> <li><input type="radio"/> 5) District/regional/BOCES–developed</li> <li><input type="radio"/> 6(i) School-wide measure based on State-provided measure</li> </ul>	AIMSweb

	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li><input type="radio"/> 6(ii) School wide measure computed locally</li> <li><input type="radio"/> 7) Student Learning Objectives</li> </ul>	
<b>Course(s) or Subject(s)</b>	<b>Locally-Selected Measure from List of Approved Measures</b>	<b>Assessment</b>
Math 8 AIS	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li><input type="radio"/> 1) Change in % of student performance level on State</li> <li><input type="radio"/> 2) Teacher specific growth computed by NYSED</li> <li><input type="radio"/> 3) Teacher specific achievement/growth score computed locally</li> <li><input checked="" type="radio"/> 4) State-approved 3rd party</li> <li><input type="radio"/> 5) District/regional/BOCES–developed</li> <li><input type="radio"/> 6(i) School-wide measure based on State-provided measure</li> <li><input type="radio"/> 6(ii) School wide measure computed locally</li> <li><input type="radio"/> 7) Student Learning Objectives</li> </ul>	AIMSweb

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.

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.	Using AIMSweb as an assessment tool as a growth measure (students will be assessed in fall, winter and spring), AIMSweb will
---	--

	<p>provide the district with a educator evaluation score. The educator evaluation score will be converted to the HEDI scale. In case there is no valued we use the same scale described for the other subjects and grade levels. see 3.3</p>
<p>Highly Effective (14 - 15 points) Results are well above District- or BOCES - adopted expectations for growth or achievement for grade/subject.</p>	<p>Results are well above District goals for student growth. Averaged growth scores for a teacher's students are well above the mid-point of the norm referenced average growth score, also known as the educator evaluation score, which is provided by Pearson (AIMSweb) at the end of the school year.</p>

	<p>Specifically this is growth as measured by fall, winter, and spring administrations of the appropriate AIMSweb assessment.</p>
<p>Effective (8- 13 points) Results meet District- or BOCES-adopted expectations for growth or achievement for grade/subject.</p>	<p>Results meet District goals for student growth. Averaged growth scores for a teacher's students are at the mid-point of the norm referenced average growth score, also known as the educator evaluation score, which is provided by Pearson (AIMSweb) at the end of the school year. Specifically this is growth as measured by fall, winter, and spring administrations of the appropriate AIMSweb assessment.</p>

<p>Developing (3 - 7 points) Results are below District- or BOCES-adopted expectations for growth or achievement for grade/subject.</p>	<p>Results are below District goals for student growth. Averaged growth scores for a teacher's students are below the mid-point of the norm referenced average growth score, also known as the educator evaluation score, which is provided by Pearson (AIMSweb) at the end of the school year. Specifically this is growth as measured by fall, winter, and spring administrations of the appropriate AIMSweb assessment.</p>
<p>Ineffective (0 - 2 points) Results are well below District- or BOCES-adopted expectations for growth or achievement for grade/subject.</p>	<p>Results are well below District goals for student growth. Averaged growth scores for a teacher's students are</p>

	<p>well below the mid-point of the norm referenced average growth score, also known as the educator evaluation score, which is provided by Pearson (AIMSweb) at the end of the school year. Specifically this is growth as measured by fall, winter, and spring administrations of the appropriate AIMSweb assessment.</p>
--	--

**Locally Selected Measure of Student Achievement – 20 points**  
**Grades K-8 Teachers**  
**Student Growth as Measured by AIMSweb**

**Description of the General Process** – Teachers with 51% of students in grade levels K-8 will receive points for the locally-selected measure of student achievement in the following manner. Points will be allocated based upon a teacher’s evaluation score, relative to one of four specific measures of student growth, as provided to the District by Pearson (AIMSweb), and then converted using the table below. The specific measures of student growth are determined using one of the following seven assessment tools: Grade K-will use the Letter Naming Fluency (LNF assessment) used to assess letter naming, Letter Sound Fluency (LSF assessment) used to assess identification of letter sounds or the Number Identification assessment (NIM), a number naming measure along with the Missing Number task (MNM), which assesses students’ ability to sequence numbers. Grade 1 will use the Nonsense Word Fluency (NWF) assessment to assess sound-symbol knowledge and blending skills, or the M-COMP assessment (used to measure math computation). Grades 2-8, depending upon subject area and grade level, will use the R-CBM assessment (used to measure growth in reading fluency), and/or the M-CAP assessment (used to measure growth in math reasoning skills).

**Highly Effective (18-20 points)** – Results are well above District goals for student growth. Averaged growth scores for a teacher’s students are well above the mid-point of the norm referenced average growth score, also known as the educator evaluation score, which is provided by Pearson (AIMSweb) at the end of the school year. Specifically this is growth as measured by fall, winter, and spring administrations of the appropriate AIMSweb assessment.

**Effective (9-17 points)** – Results meet District goals for student growth. Averaged growth scores for a teacher’s students are at the mid-point of the norm referenced average growth score, also known as the educator evaluation score, which is provided by Pearson (AIMSweb) at the end of the school year. Specifically this is growth as measured by fall, winter, and spring administrations of the appropriate AIMSweb assessment.

**Developing (3-8 points)** – Results are below District goals for student growth. Averaged growth scores for a teacher’s students are below the mid-point of the norm referenced average growth score, also known as the educator evaluation score, which is provided by Pearson (AIMSweb) at the end of the school year. Specifically this is growth as measured by fall, winter, and spring administrations of the appropriate AIMSweb assessment.

**Ineffective (0-2 points)** – Results are well below District goals for student growth. Averaged growth scores for a teacher’s students are well below the mid-point of the norm referenced average growth score, also known as the educator evaluation score, which is provided by Pearson (AIMSweb) at the end of the school year. Specifically this is growth as measured by fall, winter, and spring administrations of the appropriate AIMSweb assessment.

**Locally Selected Measure of Student Achievement – 20 Points**  
**Grades K-8**  
**Student Growth as Measured by AIMSweb**

Average Growth Score Provided By Pearson (AIMSweb)	Points out of 20	
16.1 or greater	20	Well Above
14.1 – 16.0	19	District's Goals
12.6 – 14.1	18	
11.1 – 12.5	17	
10.6 – 11.0	16	
10.1 – 10.5	15	Meets District's
9.6 – 10.0	14	Goals
9.1 – 9.5	13	
8.6 – 9.0	12	
8.1 – 8.5	11	
7.6 – 8.0	10	
7.1 – 7.5	9	
6.6 – 7.0	8	
6.1 – 6.5	7	Below District's
5.6 – 6.0	6	Goals
5.1 – 5.5	5	
4.6 – 5.0	4	
4.1 – 4.5	3	
2.6 – 4.0	2	Well-Below
1.1 – 2.5	1	District's
Less than 1.0	0	Goals

**Locally-selected Measure of Student Achievement – 20 points**  
**Grades 9-12 Teachers**  
**Mastery on Regents Exams**

**Description of the General Process** – Teachers, with 51% of students in grades 9-12, will receive points for a locally-selected measure of student achievement in the following manner. Points will be awarded based upon the aggregate building-wide percentage of Fabius-Pompey students scoring at the mastery level (85 or better), on the June administration of New York State Regents exams. All high school teachers will receive the same point total. This point total will be based upon the aggregate average mastery level on all exams administered, as it relates to the District’s five year aggregate average mastery level for similar exams, according to the table at (3.13), below.

**Highly Effective (18-20 points)** – Results are well above District expectations for student’s achievement. The aggregate building-wide percentage of Fabius-Pompey students scoring at the mastery level (85 or better), on the June Administration of New York State Regents exams, exceeds the five year average of Fabius-Pompey students scoring at the mastery level on all Regents exams completed during the previous five June administration periods.

**Effective (9-17 points)** – Results meet District expectations for student achievement. The aggregate building-wide percentage of Fabius-Pompey students scoring at the mastery level (85 or better) on the June administration of New York State Regents exams is in line with the five year average of Fabius-Pompey students scoring at the mastery level on all Regents exams completed during the previous five June administration periods.

**Developing (3-8 points)** – Results are below District expectations for student achievement. The aggregate building-wide percentage of Fabius-Pompey students scoring at the mastery level (85 or better) on the June administration of New York State Regents exams is below the five year average of students scoring at the mastery level on all Regents exams completed during the previous five June administration periods.

**Ineffective (0-2 points)** – Results are well-below District expectations for student achievement. The aggregate building-wide percentage of Fabius-Pompey students scoring at the mastery level (85 or better) on the June administration of New York State Regents exams is well-below the five year average of students scoring at the mastery level on all Regents exams completed during the previous five June administration periods.

**Locally-selected Measure of Student Achievement – 20 points**  
**Grades 9-12 Teachers**  
**Mastery on Regents Exams**

Percentage of Student Achieving Mastery Relative to the Five Year Average	Points out of 20	
+ 4.76% or greater	20	Exceeds
+3.26% - 4.75%	19	District
+2.01% - 3.25%	18	Expectation
+0.99% - 2.00%	17	Meets District's Expectations
+0.01% - 1.00%	16	
-2.50% - 0.00%	15	
-2.51% - 3.50%	14	
-3.51% - 4.50%	13	
-4.51% - 5.50%	12	
-5.51% - 6.50%	11	
-6.51% - 7.50%	10	
-7.51% - 8.50%	9	Below District's Expectations
-8.51% - 9.50%	8	
-9.51% - 10.50%	7	
-10.51% - 11.50%	6	
-11.51% - 12.50%	5	
-12.51% - 13.50%	4	
-13.51% - 14.50%	3	Well-Below District's Expectations
-14.51% - 15.75%	2	
-15.76% - 17.25%	1	
-17.26 or below	0	



Appendix A

**Fabius-Pompey Central School District**

Teacher \_\_\_\_\_

Grade Level/Subject Area: \_\_\_\_\_

Date \_\_\_\_\_

**Domain I: Planning and Preparation Heidi Scale 1 -4 each subcomponent is the weighted ( )**

Component	Inefficient	Developing	Effective	Highly Effective
<b>1a: Demonstrating Knowledge of content and Pedagogy</b>  (3)	<input type="checkbox"/> The teacher's plans and practice display little knowledge of the content, prerequisite relationships between different aspects of the content, or the instructional practice specific to that discipline.	<input type="checkbox"/> The teacher's plans and practice reflect some awareness of the important concepts in the discipline, prerequisite relationships between them, and the instructional practices specific to that discipline.	<input type="checkbox"/> The teacher's plans and practice reflect solid knowledge of the content, prerequisite relationships between important concepts, and the instructional practices specific to that discipline.	<input type="checkbox"/> The teacher's plans and practice reflect extensive knowledge of the content and the structure of the discipline. The teacher actively builds on knowledge of prerequisites and misconceptions when describing instruction or seeking causes for student misunderstanding.
<b>1b: Demonstrating Knowledge of Students</b>  (1)	<input type="checkbox"/> The teacher demonstrates little or no knowledge of students' backgrounds, cultures, skills, language proficiency, interests, and special needs, and does not seek such understanding.	<input type="checkbox"/> The teacher indicates the importance of understanding students' backgrounds, cultures, skills, language proficiency, interests, and special needs, and attains this knowledge for the class as a whole.	<input type="checkbox"/> The teacher actively seeks knowledge of student's backgrounds, cultures, skills, language proficiency, interests, and special needs, and attains this knowledge for groups of students.	<input type="checkbox"/> The teacher actively seeks knowledge of student's backgrounds, cultures, skills, language proficiency, interests, and special needs from a variety of sources, and attains this knowledge for individual students.
<b>1c: Setting Instructional Outcomes</b>  (1)	<input type="checkbox"/> Instructional outcomes are unsuitable for students, represent trivial or low-level learning, or are stated only as activities. They do not permit viable methods of assessment.	<input type="checkbox"/> Instructional outcomes are of moderate rigor and are suitable for some students, but consist of a combination of activities and goals, some of which permit viable methods of assessment. They reflect more than one type of learning, but the teacher makes no attempt at coordination or integration.	<input type="checkbox"/> Instructional outcomes are stated as goals reflecting high-level learning and curriculum standards. They are suitable for most students in the class, represent different types of learning, and can be assessed. The outcomes reflect opportunities for coordination.	<input type="checkbox"/> Instructional outcomes are stated as goals that can be assessed, reflecting rigorous learning and curriculum standards. They represent different types of content, offer opportunities for both coordination and integration, and take account of the needs of individual students.
<b>1d: Demonstrating Knowledge of Resources</b>	<input type="checkbox"/> The teacher demonstrates little or no familiarity with resources to enhance own knowledge, to	<input type="checkbox"/> The teacher demonstrates some familiarity with resources available through the school or	<input type="checkbox"/> The teacher is full aware of the resources available through the school or district to enhance	<input type="checkbox"/> The teacher seeks out resources in and beyond the school or district in professional organizations, on the

(1)	use in teaching, or for students who need them. The teacher does not seek such knowledge.	district to enhance own knowledge, to use in teaching, or for students who need them. The teacher does not seek to extend such knowledge.	own knowledge, to use in teaching, or for students who need them.	Internet, and in the community to enhance own knowledge, to use in teaching, and for students who need them.
<b>1e: Designing Coherent Instruction</b>  (2)	<input type="checkbox"/> The series of learning experiences is poorly aligned with the instructional outcomes and does not represent a coherent structure. The experiences are suitable for only some students.	<input type="checkbox"/> The series of learning experiences demonstrates partial alignment with instructional outcome, and some of the experiences are likely to engage students in significant learning. The lesson or unit has a recognizable structure and reflects partial knowledge of students and resources.	<input type="checkbox"/> The teacher coordinates knowledge of content, of students, and of resources to design a series of learning experiences aligned to instructional outcomes and suitable for groups of students. The lesson or unit has a clear structure and is likely to engage students in significant learning.	<input type="checkbox"/> The teacher coordinates knowledge of content, of students, and of resources, to design a series of learning experiences aligned to instructional outcomes, differentiated where appropriate to make them suitable to all students and likely to engage them in significant learning. The lesson or unit structure is clear and allows for different pathways according to student needs.
<b>1f: Designing Student Assessments</b>  (2)	<input type="checkbox"/> The teacher's plan for assessing student learning contains no clear criteria or standards, is poorly aligned with the instructional outcomes, or is inappropriate for many students. The results of assessment have minimal impact on the design of future instruction.	<input type="checkbox"/> The teacher's plan for student assessment is partially aligned with the instructional outcomes, without clear criteria, and inappropriate for at least some students. The teacher intends to use assessment results to plan for future instruction for the class as a whole.	<input type="checkbox"/> The teacher's plan for student assessment is aligned with the instructional outcomes, uses clear criteria, and is appropriate to the needs of students. The teacher intends to use assessment results to plan for future instruction for groups of students.	<input type="checkbox"/> The teacher's plan for student assessment is fully aligned with the instructional outcomes, with clear criteria and standards that show evidence of student contribution to their development. Assessment methodologies may have been adapted for individuals, and the teacher intends to use assessment results to plan future instruction for individual students.

## Domain 2: The Classroom Environment

Heidi Scale 1 -4 each subcomponent is the weighted ( )

Component	Inefficient	Developing	Effective	Highly Effective
<b>2a: Creating an Environment of Respect and Rapport</b>  (3)	<input type="checkbox"/> Classroom interactions, both between the teacher and students and among students, are negative to students' cultural backgrounds and are characterized by sarcasm, put-downs, or conflict.	<input type="checkbox"/> Classroom interactions, both between the teacher and students and among students, are generally appropriate and free from conflict, but may be characterized by occasional displays of insensitivity or lack of responsiveness to cultural or developmental differences among students.	<input type="checkbox"/> Classroom interactions, both between the teacher and students and among students, are polite and respectful, reflecting general warmth and caring, and are appropriate to the cultural and developmental differences among groups of students.	<input type="checkbox"/> Classroom interactions, both between the teacher and students and among students, are highly respectful, reflecting genuine warmth and caring and sensitivity to students' cultures and levels of development. Students themselves ensure high levels of civility among members of the class.
<b>2b: Establishing a Culture for Learning</b>  (6)	<input type="checkbox"/> The classroom environment conveys a negative culture for learning, characterized by low teacher commitment to the subject, low expectations for student achievement, and little or no student pride in work.	<input type="checkbox"/> The teacher's attempt to create a culture for learning is partially successful, with little teacher commitment to the subject, modest expectations for student achievement, and little student pride in work. Both the teacher and students appear to be "going through the motions."	<input type="checkbox"/> The classroom culture is characterized by high expectations for most students and genuine commitment to the subject by both teacher and students, with students demonstrating pride in their work.	<input type="checkbox"/> High levels of student energy and teacher passion for the subject create a culture for learning in which everyone shares a belief in the importance of the subject and all students hold themselves to high standards of performance – for example, by initiating improvements to their work.
<b>2c: Managing Classroom Procedures</b>  (6)	<input type="checkbox"/> Much instructional time is lost because of inefficient classroom routines and procedures for transitions, handling of supplies, and performance of non-instructional duties.	<input type="checkbox"/> Some instructional time is lost because of routines and procedures for transitions, handling of supplies, and performance of non-instructional duties are only partially effective.	<input type="checkbox"/> Little instructional time is lost because of classroom routines and procedures for transitions, handling of supplies, and performance of non-instructional duties, which occur smoothly.	<input type="checkbox"/> Students contribute to the seamless operation of classroom routines and procedures for transitions, handling of supplies, and performance of non-instructional duties.
<b>2d: Managing Student Behavior</b>  (4)	<input type="checkbox"/> There is no evidence that standards of conduct have been established and little or no teacher monitoring of student behavior. Response to	<input type="checkbox"/> It appears that the teacher has made an effort to establish standards of conduct for students. The teacher tries, with uneven results, to	<input type="checkbox"/> Standards of conduct appear to be clear to students, and the teacher monitors student behavior against those standards. The	<input type="checkbox"/> Standards of conduct are clear, with evidence of student participation in setting them. The teacher's monitoring of student behavior is subtle and

	student misbehavior is repressive or disrespectful of student dignity.	monitor student behavior and respond to student misbehavior.	teacher's response to student misbehavior is appropriate and respects the students' dignity.	preventive, and the teacher's response to student misbehavior is sensitive to individual student needs. Students take an active role in monitoring the standards of behavior.
<b>2e: Organizing Physical Space</b>  (1)	<input type="checkbox"/> The physical environment is unsafe, or some students don't have access to learning. Alignment between the physical arrangement and the lesson activities is poor.	<input type="checkbox"/> The classroom is safe, and essential learning is accessible to most students; the teacher's use of physical resources, including computer technology, is moderately effective. The teacher may attempt to modify the physical arrangement to suit learning activities, with partial success.	<input type="checkbox"/> The classroom is safe, and learning is accessible to all students; the teacher ensures that the physical arrangement is appropriate to the learning activities. The teacher makes effective use of physical resources, including computer technology.	<input type="checkbox"/> The classroom is safe, and the physical environment ensures the learning of all students, including those with special needs. Students contribute to the use of adaptation of the physical environment to advance learning. Technology is used skillfully, as appropriate to the lesson

### Domain 3: Instruction

Heidi Scale 1 -4 each subcomponent is the weighted ( )

Component	Inefficient	Developing	Effective	Highly Effective
<b>3a: Communicating with Students</b>	<input type="checkbox"/> Expectations for learning, directions and procedures, and explanations of	<input type="checkbox"/> Expectations for learning, directions and procedures, and explanations of content	<input type="checkbox"/> Expectations for learning, directions and procedures, and explanations of	<input type="checkbox"/> Expectations for learning, directions and procedures, and explanations of content

(4)	content are unclear or confusing to students. The teacher's use of language contains errors or is inappropriate for students' cultures or levels of development.	are clarified after initial confusion; the teacher's use of language is correct but may not be completely appropriate for students' cultures or levels of development.	content are clear to students. Communications are appropriate for students' cultures and levels of development.	are clear to students. The teacher's oral and written communication is clear and expressive, appropriate for students' cultures and levels of development, and anticipates possible student misconceptions.
<b>3b: Using Questioning and Discussion Techniques</b>  (3)	<input type="checkbox"/> The teacher's questions are low-level or inappropriate, eliciting limited student participation and recitation rather than discussion.	<input type="checkbox"/> Some of the teacher's questions elicit a thoughtful response, but most are low-level, posed in rapid succession. The teacher's attempts to engage all students in the discussion are only partially successful.	<input type="checkbox"/> Most of the teacher's questions elicit a thoughtful response, and the teacher allows sufficient time for students to answer. All students participate in the discussion, with the teacher stepping aside when appropriate.	<input type="checkbox"/> Questions reflect high expectations and are culturally and developmentally appropriate. Students formulate many of the high-level questions and ensure that all voice are heard.
<b>3c: Engaging Students in Learning</b>  (5)	<input type="checkbox"/> Activities and assignments, materials, and groupings of students are inappropriate for the instructional outcomes or students' cultures or levels of understanding, resulting in little intellectual engagement. The lesson has no structure or is poorly paced.	<input type="checkbox"/> Activities and assignments, materials, and groupings of students are partially appropriate to the instructional outcomes or students' cultures or levels of understanding, resulting in moderate intellectual engagement. The lesson has a recognizable structure, but that structure is not fully maintained.	<input type="checkbox"/> Activities and assignments, materials, and groupings of students are fully appropriate for the instructional outcomes and students' cultures and levels of understanding. All students are engaged in work of a high level of rigor. The lesson's structure is coherent, with appropriate pace.	<input type="checkbox"/> Activities and assignments, materials, and groupings of students are highly intellectually engaged in significant learning, and make material contributions to the activities, student groupings, and materials. The lesson is adapted as necessary to the needs of individuals, and the structure and pacing allow for student reflection and closure.
<b>3d: Using Assessment in Instruction</b>  (4)	<input type="checkbox"/> Assessment is not used in instruction, either through monitoring of progress by the teacher or students, or through feedback to students. Students are	<input type="checkbox"/> Assessment is occasionally used in instruction, through some monitoring of progress of learning by the teacher and/or students. Feedback to students is uneven, and students are aware of	<input type="checkbox"/> Assessment is regularly used in instruction, through self-assessment by students, monitoring of progress of learning by the teacher and/or students, and high-quality feedback to	<input type="checkbox"/> Assessment is used in a sophisticated manner in instruction, through student involvement in establishing the assessment criteria, self-assessment by students, monitoring of

	unaware of the assessment criteria used to evaluate their work.	only some of the assessment criteria used to evaluate their work.	students. Students are fully aware of the assessment criteria used to evaluate their work.	progress by both students and teacher, and high-quality feedback to students from a variety of sources.
<b>3e: Demonstrating Flexibility and Responsiveness</b>  (4)	<input type="checkbox"/> The teacher adheres to the instruction plan, even when a change would improve the lesson or address students' lack of interest. The teacher brushes aside student questions; when students experience difficulty, the teacher blames the students or their home environment.	<input type="checkbox"/> The teacher attempts to modify the lesson when needed and to respond to student questions, with moderate success. The teacher accepts responsibility for student success, but has only a limited repertoire of strategies to draw upon.	<input type="checkbox"/> The teacher promotes the successful learning of all students, making adjustments as needed to instruction plans and accommodating student questions, needs, and interests.	<input type="checkbox"/> The teacher seizes an opportunity to enhance learning, building on a spontaneous event or student interests. The teacher ensures the success of all students, using an extensive repertoire of instructional strategies.

#### Domain 4: Professional Responsibilities

Heidi Scale 1 -4 each subcomponent is the weighted ( )

Component	Ineffective	Developing	Effective	Highly Effective
<b>4a: Reflecting on Teaching</b>  (3)	<input type="checkbox"/> The teacher does not accurately assess the effectiveness of the lesson and has no idea about how the lesson could be improved.	<input type="checkbox"/> The teacher provides a partially accurate and objective description of the lesson but does not cite specific evidence. The teacher makes only general	<input type="checkbox"/> The teacher provides an accurate and objective description of the lesson, citing specific evidence. The teacher makes some specific suggestions as to how	<input type="checkbox"/> The teacher's reflection on the lesson is thoughtful and accurate, citing specific evidence. The teacher draws on an extensive repertoire to suggest alternative

		suggestions as to how the lesson might be improved.	the lesson might be improved.	strategies and predicts the likely success of each.
<b>4b: Maintaining Accurate Records</b>  (2)	<input type="checkbox"/> The teacher's systems for maintaining both instructional and non-instructional records are either nonexistent or in disarray, resulting in errors and confusion.	<input type="checkbox"/> The teacher's systems for maintaining both instructional and non-instructional records are rudimentary and only partially effective.	<input type="checkbox"/> The teacher's systems for maintaining both instructional and non-instructional records are accurate, efficient, and effective.	<input type="checkbox"/> The teacher's systems for maintaining both instructional and non-instructional records are accurate, efficient, and effective, and students contribute to its maintenance.
<b>4c: Communicating with Families</b>  (2)	<input type="checkbox"/> The teacher's communication with families about the instructional program or about individual students is sporadic or culturally inappropriate. The teacher makes no attempt to engage families in the instructional program.	<input type="checkbox"/> The teacher adheres to school procedures for communicating with families and makes modest attempts to engage families in the instructional program. But communications are not always appropriate to the cultures of those families.	<input type="checkbox"/> The teacher communicates frequently with families and successfully engages them in the instructional program. Information to families about individual students is conveyed in a culturally appropriate manner.	<input type="checkbox"/> The teacher's communication with families is frequent and sensitive to cultural traditions; students participate in the communication. The teacher successfully engages families in the instructional program, as appropriate.
<b>4d: Participating in a Professional Community</b>  (1)	<input type="checkbox"/> The teacher avoids participating in professional community or in school and district events and projects; relationships with colleagues are negative or self-serving.	<input type="checkbox"/> The teacher becomes involved in the professional community and in school and district events and projects when specifically asked; relationships with colleagues are cordial.	<input type="checkbox"/> The teacher participates actively in the professional community and in school and district events and projects, and maintains positive and productive relationships with colleagues.	<input type="checkbox"/> The teacher makes a substantial contribution to the professional community and to school and district events and projects, and assumes a leadership role among the faculty.
<b>4e: Growing and Developing Professionally</b>  (1)	<input type="checkbox"/> The teacher does not participate in professional development activities and makes no effort to share knowledge with colleagues. The teacher is resistant to feedback from supervisors or colleagues.	<input type="checkbox"/> The teacher participates in professional development activities that are convenient or are required, and makes limited contributions to the profession. The teacher accepts, with some reluctance, feedback from supervisors and	<input type="checkbox"/> The teacher seeks out opportunities for professional development based on an individual assessment of need and actively shares expertise with others. The teacher welcomes feedback from supervisors and colleagues.	<input type="checkbox"/> The teacher actively pursues professional development opportunities and initiates activities to contribute to the profession. In addition, the teacher seeks feedback from supervisors and colleagues.

		colleagues.		
<b>4f: Showing Professionalism</b>  <p style="text-align: center;">(1)</p>	<input type="checkbox"/> The teacher has little sense of ethics and professionalism and contributes to practices that are self-serving or harmful to students. The teacher fails to comply with school and district regulations and time lines.	<input type="checkbox"/> The teacher is honest and well intentioned in serving students and contributing to decisions in the school, but the teacher's attempts to serve students are limited. The teacher complies minimally with school and district regulations, doing just enough to get by.	<input type="checkbox"/> The teacher displays a high level of ethics and professionalism in dealings with both students and colleagues and complies fully and voluntarily with school and district regulations.	<input type="checkbox"/> The teacher is proactive and assumes a leadership role in making sure that school practices and procedures ensure that all students, particularly those traditionally underserved, are honored in the school. The teacher displays the highest standards of ethical conduct and takes a leadership role in seeing that colleagues comply with school and district regulations.

Weighted scoring

Each Domain receives a Heidi rating given by evaluator 1-4 (1- ineffective, 2- developing, 3- effective, 4- highly effective) multiplied by weight given to each component equals the total points for that component. Add all rubric scores up to get your total rubric score then divide that number by 60. Use the conversion chart to find you HEDI rating. Chart will start with 0 and all scores will be rounded to the nearest whole number. 60.25 will round down to 60 points.

Highly effective = 59-60

Effective = 57-58

Developing = 50-56

Ineffective = 0-49

Domain and component	Heidi (1-4) rubric	Multiple by Weight	Rubric score
1a		3	
1b		1	
1c		1	
1d		1	
1e		2	
1f		2	
2a		3	
2b		6	
2c		6	
2d		4	
2e		1	
3a		4	
3b		3	
3c		5	
3d		4	
3e		4	
4a		3	
4b		2	
4c		2	
4d		1	
4e		1	
		Total rubric score	
		Divide total rubric score by 60 to get the total average rubric score	
		Subcomponent score (using the conversion chart)	
		HEDI rating	

Rubric Score to

### Sub-Component Conversion Chart

Chart will start with 0 and all scores for composite are rounded to the nearest whole number. 60.25 will round down to 60 points.

Total Average Rubric	Category	Conversion score for composite
----------------------	----------	--------------------------------

Score		
0	Ineffective 0-49	0
1		0
1.008		1
1.017		2
1.025		3
1.033		4
1.042		5
1.05		6
1.058		7
1.067		8
1.075		9
1.083		10
1.092		11
1.1		12
1.108		13
1.115		14
1.123		15
1.131		16
1.138		17
1.146		18
1.154		19
1.162		20
1.169		21
1.177		22
1.185		23
1.192		24
1.2		25
1.208		26
1.217		27
1.225		28
1.233		29
1.242		30
1.25		31
1.258		32
1.267		33
1.275		34
1.283		35
1.292		36
1.3		37
1.308		38
1.317		39
1.325		40
1.342		42
1.35		43
1.358		44
1.367		45
1.375		46
1.383		47
1.392		48

1.4		49
1.5	Developing 50-56	50
1.6		51
1.7		51
1.8		52
1.9		53
2		54
2.1		54
2.2		55
2.3		56
2.4		56
2.5	Effective 57-58	57
2.6		57
2.7		57
2.8		58
2.9		58
3		58
3.1		58
3.2		58
3.3	Highly Effective 59-60	59
3.4		59
3.5		59
3.6		59
3.7		60
3.8		60
3.9		60
4		60.25 (round to 60)

TEACHER IMPROVEMENT PLAN  
FORM

Teacher Name \_\_\_\_\_ Date \_\_\_\_\_  
School Building \_\_\_\_\_ Department \_\_\_\_\_

1. Areas Identified as in Need of Improvement based upon Annual Professional Performance Review during the \_\_\_\_\_ School Year

2. Specific Activities/ Strategies Teacher Should Complete to Support Improvement in Each Identified Area

3. Support and/or Assistance to be provided to the Teacher

4. Specific Evidence to be submitted as Evidence of Improvement

5. Timeline for Submission of Evidence

6. Meeting Date with Supervisor to Review Plan Once All Evidence is Submitted \_\_\_\_\_

7. Analysis of Evidence by Supervisor and Final Summative Rating

8. Signature of Supervisor

Signature of Teacher

\_\_\_\_\_

\_\_\_\_\_ Date \_\_\_\_\_

**Locally Selected Measure of Student Achievement – 15 Points (if value added)**  
**K-5 Elementary Principal**  
**Student Growth as Measured by AIMSweb**

**Description of the General Process** – The K-5 Elementary Principal will receive points for the locally-selected measure of student achievement in the following manner. Points will be allocated based upon a composite average growth score from AIMSweb using ELA and Math Assessments for Fabius-Pompey students grade K-5, relative to one of four specific measures of student growth, as provided to the District by Pearson (AIMSweb), and then converted using the table below. The specific measures of student growth are determined using one of the following seven assessment tools: Grade K-will use the Letter Naming Fluency (LNF assessment) used to assess letter naming, Letter Sound Fluency (LSF assessment) used to assess identification of letter sounds or the Number Identification assessment (NIM), a number naming measure along with the Missing Number task (MNM), which assesses students’ ability to sequence numbers. Grade 1 will use the Nonsense Word Fluency (NWF) assessment to assess sound-symbol knowledge and blending skills, or the M-COMP assessment (used to measure math computation). Grades 2-5, depending upon subject area and grade level, will use the R-CBM assessment (used to measure growth in reading fluency), and/or the M-CAP assessment (used to measure growth in math reasoning skills).

**Highly Effective (14-15 points)** – Results are well above District goals for student growth. Averaged growth scores for students are well above the mid-point of the norm referenced average growth score, also known as the educator evaluation score, which is provided by Pearson (AIMSweb) at the end of the school year. Specifically this is growth as measured by fall, winter, and spring administrations of the appropriate AIMSweb assessment.

**Effective (8-13 points)** – Results meet District goals for student growth. Averaged growth scores for students are at the mid-point of the norm referenced average growth score, also known as the educator evaluation score, which is provided by Pearson (AIMSweb) at the end of the school year. Specifically this is growth as measured by fall, winter, and spring administrations of the appropriate AIMSweb assessment.

**Developing (3-7 points)** – Results are below District goals for student growth. Averaged growth scores for students are below the mid-point of the norm referenced average growth score, also known as the educator evaluation score, which is provided by Pearson (AIMSweb) at the end of the school year. Specifically this is growth as measured by fall, winter, and spring administrations of the appropriate AIMSweb assessment.

**Ineffective (0-2 points)** – Results are well below District goals for student growth. Averaged growth scores for students are well below the mid-point of the norm referenced average growth score, also known as the educator evaluation score, which is provided by Pearson (AIMSweb) at the end of the school year. Specifically this is growth as measured by fall, winter, and spring administrations of the appropriate AIMSweb assessment.

**Locally Selected Measure of Student Achievement – 15 Points (if value added)**  
**K-5 principal**  
**Student Growth as Measured by AIMSweb**

Average Growth Score Provided By Pearson (AIMSweb)	Points out of 15	
16.1 or greater	15	Well Above
12.6 – 16.0	14	District's Goals
<hr/>		
10.6 – 12.5	13	
9.6 – 10.5	12	Meets District's
8.6 – 9.6	11	Goals
7.6 – 8.5	10	
7.1 – 7.5	9	
6.6 – 7.0	8	
<hr/>		
6.1 – 6.5	7	Below District's
5.6 – 6.0	6	Goals
5.1 – 5.5	5	
4.6 – 5.0	4	
4.1 – 4.5	3	
<hr/>		
2.6 – 4.0	2	Well-Below
1.1 – 2.5	1	District's
Less than 1.0	0	Goals

**Locally Selected Measure of Student Achievement – 20 Points (no value added)**  
**K-5 Elementary Principal**  
**Student Growth as Measured by AIMSweb**

Average Growth Score Provided By Pearson (AIMSweb)	Points out of 20	
16.1 or greater	20	Well Above
14.1 – 16.0	19	District’s Goals
12.6 – 14.0	18	
11.1 – 12.5	17	
10.6 – 11.0	16	
10.1 – 10.5	15	Meets District’s
9.6 – 10.0	14	Goals
9.1 – 9.5	13	
8.6 – 9.0	12	
8.1 – 8.5	11	
7.6 – 8.0	10	
7.1 – 7.5	9	
6.6 – 7.0	8	
6.1 – 6.5	7	Below District’s
5.6 – 6.0	6	Goals
5.1 – 5.5	5	
4.6 – 5.0	4	
4.1 – 4.5	3	
2.6 – 4.0	2	Well-Below
1.1 – 2.5	1	District’s
Less than 1.0	0	Goals

**Locally-selected Measure of Student Achievement – 15 points (if value added)**  
**6-12 Principal**  
**Mastery on Regents Exams**

**Description of the General Process** – The 6-12 Principal will receive points for a locally-selected measure of student achievement in the following manner. Points will be awarded based upon the aggregate building-wide percentage of Fabius-Pompey students scoring at the mastery level (85 or better), on the June administration of New York State Regents exams. All high school teachers will receive the same point total. This point total will be based upon the aggregate average mastery level on all exams administered, as it relates to the District’s five year aggregate average mastery level for similar exams, according to the table at (3.13), below.

**Highly Effective (14-15 points)** – Results are well above District expectations for student’s achievement. The aggregate building-wide percentage of Fabius-Pompey students scoring at the mastery level (85 or better), on the June Administration of New York State Regents exams, exceeds the five year average of Fabius-Pompey students scoring at the mastery level on all Regents exams completed during the previous five June administration periods.

**Effective (8-13 points)** – Results meet District expectations for student achievement. The aggregate building-wide percentage of Fabius-Pompey students scoring at the mastery level (85 or better) on the June administration of New York State Regents exams is in line with the five year average of Fabius-Pompey students scoring at the mastery level on all Regents exams completed during the previous five June administration periods.

**Developing (3-7 points)** – Results are below District expectations for student achievement. The aggregate building-wide percentage of Fabius-Pompey students scoring at the mastery level (85 or better) on the June administration of New York State Regents exams is below the five year average of students scoring at the mastery level on all Regents exams completed during the previous five June administration periods.

**Ineffective (0-2 points)** – Results are well-below District expectations for student achievement. The aggregate building-wide percentage of Fabius-Pompey students scoring at the mastery level (85 or better) on the June administration of New York State Regents exams is well-below the five year average of students scoring at the mastery level on all Regents exams completed during the previous five June administration periods.

**Locally-selected Measure of Student Achievement – 15 points (if value added)**  
**6-12 Principal**  
**Mastery on Regents Exams**

Percentage of Student Achieving Mastery Relative to the Five Year Average	Points out of 15	
+ 4.76% or greater	15	Exceeds District Expectation
+0.01% - 4.75%	14	
+0.00% - 2.50%	13	Meets District's Expectations
-2.51% - 3.50%	12	
-3.51% - 5.50%	11	
-5.51% - 7.50%	10	
-7.51% - 8.50%	9	
-8.51% - 9.50%	8	
-9.51% - 10.50%	7	Below District's Expectations
-10.51% - 11.50%	6	
-11.51% - 12.50%	5	
-12.51% - 13.50%	4	
-13.51% - 14.50%	3	
-14.51% - 15.75%	2	Well-Below District's Expectations
-15.76% - 17.25%	1	
-17.26 or below	0	

**Locally-selected Measure of Student Achievement – 20 points (if no value added)**  
**6-12 Principal**  
**Mastery on Regents Exams**

Percentage of Student Achieving Mastery Relative to the Five Year Average	Points out of 20	
+ 4.76% or greater	20	Exceeds
+3.26% - 4.75%	19	District
+2.01% - 3.25%	18	Expectation
+0.99% - 2.00%	17	Meets District's Expectations
+0.01% - 1.00%	16	
-2.50% - 0.00%	15	
-2.51% - 3.50%	14	
-3.51% - 4.50%	13	
-4.51% - 5.50%	12	
-5.51% - 6.50%	11	
-6.51% - 7.50%	10	
-7.51% - 8.50%	9	Below District's Expectations
-8.51% - 9.50%	8	
-9.51% - 10.50%	7	
-10.51% - 11.50%	6	
-11.51% - 12.50%	5	
-12.51% - 13.50%	4	
-13.51% - 14.50%	3	Well-Below District's Expectations
-14.51% - 15.75%	2	
-15.76% - 17.25%	1	
-17.26 or below	0	

**Locally-selected Measure of Student Achievement – 20 points**  
**6-12 Principal**  
**Mastery on Regents Exams**

**Description of the General Process** – The 6-12 Principal will receive points for a locally-selected measure of student achievement in the following manner. Points will be awarded based upon the aggregate building-wide percentage of Fabius-Pompey students scoring at the mastery level (85 or better), on the June administration of New York State Regents exams. All high school teachers will receive the same point total. This point total will be based upon the aggregate average mastery level on all exams administered, as it relates to the District’s five year aggregate average mastery level for similar exams, according to the table at (3.13), below.

**Highly Effective (18-20 points)** – Results are well above District expectations for student’s achievement. The aggregate building-wide percentage of Fabius-Pompey students scoring at the mastery level (85 or better), on the June Administration of New York State Regents exams, exceeds the five year average of Fabius-Pompey students scoring at the mastery level on all Regents exams completed during the previous five June administration periods.

**Effective (9-17 points)** – Results meet District expectations for student achievement. The aggregate building-wide percentage of Fabius-Pompey students scoring at the mastery level (85 or better) on the June administration of New York State Regents exams is in line with the five year average of Fabius-Pompey students scoring at the mastery level on all Regents exams completed during the previous five June administration periods.

**Developing (3-8 points)** – Results are below District expectations for student achievement. The aggregate building-wide percentage of Fabius-Pompey students scoring at the mastery level (85 or better) on the June administration of New York State Regents exams is below the five year average of students scoring at the mastery level on all Regents exams completed during the previous five June administration periods.

**Ineffective (0-2 points)** – Results are well-below District expectations for student achievement. The aggregate building-wide percentage of Fabius-Pompey students scoring at the mastery level (85 or better) on the June administration of New York State Regents exams is well-below the five year average of students scoring at the mastery level on all Regents exams completed during the previous five June administration periods.

**Locally-selected Measure of Student Achievement – 20 points**  
**6-12 Principal**  
**Mastery on Regents Exams**

Percentage of Student Achieving Mastery Relative to the Five Year Average	Points out of 20	
+ 4.76% or greater	20	Exceeds
+3.26% - 4.75%	19	District
+2.01% - 3.25%	18	Expectation
+0.99% - 2.00%	17	Meets District's Expectations
+0.01% - 1.00%	16	
-2.50% - 0.00%	15	
-2.51% - 3.50%	14	
-3.51% - 4.50%	13	
-4.51% - 5.50%	12	
-5.51% - 6.50%	11	
-6.51% - 7.50%	10	
-7.51% - 8.50%	9	Below District's Expectations
-8.51% - 9.50%	8	
-9.51% - 10.50%	7	
-10.51% - 11.50%	6	
-11.51% - 12.50%	5	
-12.51% - 13.50%	4	
-13.51% - 14.50%	3	Well-Below District's Expectations
-14.51% - 15.75%	2	
-15.76% - 17.25%	1	
-17.26 or below	0	

PRINCIPAL IMPROVEMENT PLAN  
FORM

Name \_\_\_\_\_ Date \_\_\_\_\_

School Building \_\_\_\_\_

1. Areas Identified as in Need of Improvement based upon Annual Professional Performance Review during the \_\_\_\_\_ School Year

2. Specific Activities/ Strategies Principal Should Complete to Support Improvement in Each Identified Area

3. Support and/or Assistance to be provided to the Principal

4. Specific Evidence to be submitted as Evidence of Improvement

5. Timeline for Submission of Evidence

6. Meeting Date with Supervisor to Review Plan Once All Evidence is Submitted \_\_\_\_\_

7. Analysis of Evidence by Supervisor and Final Summative Rating

8. Signature of Supervisor Signature of Principal

\_\_\_\_\_ Date \_\_\_\_\_

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

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

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

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

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

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

**Signatures, dates**

Superintendent Signature:      Date: *11/27/2012*

*Christopher P. Ryan*

Teachers Union President Signature:      Date: *11/27/2012*

*William Gunn*

Administrative Union President Signature:      Date:

*Not App.*

Board of Education President Signature:      Date: *11/27/2012*

*Donald Neugebauer*