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 Avenue, Room 111
Albany, New York 12234

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

February 20, 2015

Revised

Dr. Ivan Katz, Superintendent
Fallsburg Central School District
115 Brickman Road
Fallsburg, NY 12733

Dear Superintendent Katz:

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

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

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

Thank you again for your hard work.

Sincerely,

Elizabeth R. Berlin
Acting Commissioner

Attachment

c: Charles Khoury

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

Annual Professional Performance Reviews

Created Tuesday, April 30, 2013
Updated Thursday, October 09, 2014

1

Disclaimers

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

The Department will not review any attachments other than those required in the online form. Any additional attachments supplied by the school district or BOCES are for informational purposes only for the teachers and principals reviewed under this APPR plan. Statements and/or materials in such additional attachments have not been approved and/or endorsed by the Department. However, the Department considers void any other signed agreements between and among parties in any form that prevent, conflict, or interfere with full implementation of the APPR Plan approved by the Department. The Department also reserves the right to request further information from the school district or BOCES, as necessary, as part of its review.

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

1. SCHOOL DISTRICT INFORMATION

1.1) School District's BEDS Number : 590501060000

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

590501060000

1.2) School District Name: FALLSBURG CSD

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

FALLSBURG CSD

1.3) Assurances

Please check all of the boxes below:

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

1.4) Submission Status

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

Submission of material changes to an approved APPR plan

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

Created Tuesday, April 30, 2013
Updated Friday, December 12, 2014

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 where there is no State-provided measure. Teachers with 50 – 100% of students covered by State-provided growth measures will receive a growth score from the State for the full Growth subcomponent score of their evaluation. Teachers with 0 – 49% of students covered by State-provided growth measures must have SLOs for the Growth subcomponent of their evaluation and one SLO must use the State-provided measure if applicable for any courses. (See Guidance for more detail on teachers with State-provided measures AND SLOs.)

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

2.1) Assurances

Please check the boxes below:

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

STUDENT LEARNING OBJECTIVES AS COMPARABLE GROWTH MEASURES (20 points)

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

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

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

If no State assessment or Regents exam exists:

District-determined assessments from list of State-approved 3rd party assessments; or
District, regional or BOCES-developed assessments provided that it is rigorous and comparable across classrooms

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

State assessments, required if one exists
List of State-approved 3rd party assessments
District, regional, or BOCES-developed assessments provided that it is rigorous and comparable across classrooms
School- or BOCES-wide, group or team results based on State assessments

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

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

2.2) Grades K-3 ELA

Using the drop-down boxes below, please first select the assessment that will be used for SLOs for the grade/subject listed. Then name the specific assessment, listing the full name of the assessment. State assessments must be used where applicable. Please note that no APPR plan shall be approved by the Commissioner for use in the 2014-2015 school year or thereafter that provides for the administration of traditional standardized assessments for use with students in kindergarten through grade two for APPR purposes (see: http://www.engageny.org/resource/guidance-on-the-approved-regulatory-amendments-to-appr-to-help-reduce-local-testing).

	ELA	Assessment
K	3rd party non-"traditional standardized" assessment that meets NYSED guidance requirements	Measures of Academic Progress for Primary Grades (ELA)
1	3rd party non-"traditional standardized" assessment that meets NYSED guidance requirements	Measures of Academic Progress for Primary Grades (ELA)
2	3rd party non-"traditional standardized" assessment that meets NYSED guidance requirements	Measures of Academic Progress (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 measuring student growth on the assessments listed for this Task.

Use this box, if needed, to describe the general process for assigning HEDI categories for these grades/subjects in this subcomponent. If needed, you may upload a table or graphic at 2.11, below.	Principal and teacher will examine fall or spring (prior year) benchmark data to set targets for student growth. Measures of Academic Progress (2nd grade) and Measures of Academic Progress for Primary Grades (KG–1) establish individual student fall-to-spring growth targets in ELA. 3rd grade teachers will be expected to create individual growth targets for students based on fall benchmark/pre-assessment results in ELA. The principal will be approving the targets set by teachers in his or

	her building. The HEDI table attached to 2.11 illustrates how teachers may receive 0–20 scores in this subcomponent.
Highly Effective (18 - 20 points) Results are well-above state average for similar students (or District goals if no state test).	Results are well-above District expectations for students attaining growth targets set by Measures of Academic Progress (2nd grade); Measures of Academic Progress for Primary Grades (K–1); or, in grade 3, teachers and principals based on a review of the fall (i.e., beginning of the year) benchmarks of NYS Common Core State Standards for each grade in ELA. 85% or more of a teacher's students would meet their growth targets to be considered highly-effective.
Effective (9 - 17 points) Results meet state average for similar students (or District goals if no state test).	Results meet District expectations for students attaining growth targets set by Measures of Academic Progress (2nd grade); Measures of Academic Progress for Primary Grades (K–1); or, in grade 3, teachers and principals based on a review of the fall (i.e., beginning of the year) benchmarks of NYS Common Core State Standards for each grade in ELA. 50%–84% of a teacher's students would meet their growth targets to be considered effective.
Developing (3 - 8 points) Results are below state average for similar students (or District goals if no state test).	Results do not meet District expectations for students attaining growth targets set by Measures of Academic Progress (2nd grade); Measures of Academic Progress for Primary Grades (K–1); or, in grade 3, teachers and principals based on a review of the fall (i.e., beginning of the year) benchmarks of NYS Common Core State Standards for each grade in ELA. 20%–49% of a teacher's students would meet their growth targets to be considered developing.
Ineffective (0 - 2 points) Results are well-below state average for similar students (or District goals if no state test).	Results are far below District expectations for students attaining growth targets set by Measures of Academic Progress (2nd grade); Measures of Academic Progress for Primary Grades (K–1); or, in grade 3, teachers and principals based on a review of the fall (i.e., beginning of the year) benchmarks of NYS Common Core State Standards for each grade in ELA. 19% or fewer of a teacher's students would meet their growth targets to be considered ineffective.

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. Please note that no APPR plan shall be approved by the Commissioner for use in the 2014-2015 school year or thereafter that provides for the administration of traditional standardized assessments for use with students in kindergarten through grade two for APPR purposes (see: http://www.engageny.org/resource/guidance-on-the-approved-regulatory-amendments-to-appr-to-help-reduce-local-testing).

	Math	Assessment
K	3rd party non-“traditional standardized” assessment that meets NYSED guidance requirements	Measures of Academic Progress for Primary Grades (Math)
1	3rd party non-“traditional standardized” assessment that meets NYSED guidance requirements	Measures of Academic Progress for Primary Grades (Math)
2	3rd party non-“traditional standardized” assessment that meets NYSED guidance requirements	Measures of Academic Progress (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 measuring student growth on the assessments listed for this Task.

Use this box, if needed, to describe the general process for assigning HEDI categories for these grades/subjects in this subcomponent. If needed, you may upload a table or graphic at 2.11, below.	Principal and teacher will examine fall or spring (prior year) benchmark data to set targets for student growth. Measures of Academic Progress (2nd grade) and Measures of Academic Progress for Primary Grades (KG–1) establish individual student fall-to-spring growth targets in math. 3rd grade teachers will be expected to create individual growth targets for students based on fall benchmark/pre-assessment results in math. The principal will be approving the targets set by teachers in his or her building. The HEDI table attached to 2.11 illustrates how teachers may receive 0–20 scores in this subcomponent.
Highly Effective (18 - 20 points) Results are well-above state average for similar students (or District goals if no state test).	Results are well-above District expectations for students attaining growth targets set by Measures of Academic Progress (2nd grade); Measures of Academic Progress for Primary Grades (K–1); or, in grade 3, teachers and principals based on a review of the fall (i.e., beginning of the year) benchmarks of NYS Common Core State Standards for each grade in math. 85% or more of a teacher's students would meet their growth targets to be considered highly-effective.
Effective (9 - 17 points) Results meet state average for similar students (or District goals if no state test).	Results meet District expectations for students attaining growth targets set by Measures of Academic Progress (2nd grade); Measures of Academic Progress for Primary Grades (K–1); or, in grade 3, teachers and principals based on a review of the fall (i.e., beginning of the year) benchmarks of NYS Common Core State Standards for each grade in math. 50%–84% of a teacher's students would meet their growth targets to be considered effective.
Developing (3 - 8 points) Results are below state average for similar students (or District goals if no state test).	Results do not meet District expectations for students attaining growth targets set by Measures of Academic Progress (2nd grade); Measures of Academic Progress for Primary Grades (K–1); or, in grade 3, teachers and principals based on a review of the fall (i.e., beginning of the year) benchmarks of NYS Common Core State Standards for each grade in math. 20%–49% of a teacher's students would meet their growth targets to be considered developing.
Ineffective (0 - 2 points) Results are well-below state average for similar students (or District goals if no state test).	Results are far below District expectations for students attaining growth targets set by Measures of Academic Progress (2nd grade); Measures of Academic Progress for Primary Grades (K–1); or, in grade 3, teachers and principals based on a review of the fall (i.e., beginning of the year) benchmarks of NYS Common Core State Standards for each grade in math. 19% or fewer of a teacher's students would meet their growth targets to be considered ineffective.

2.4) Grades 6-8 Science

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

	Science	Assessment
6	Not applicable	Grade 6 is Common Branch
7	District, regional or BOCES-developed assessment	Fallsburg Central School District-Developed 7th Grade Science Assessment

	Science	Assessment
8	State assessment	8th Grade State Science Assessment

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

Use this box, if needed, to describe the general process for assigning HEDI categories for these grades/subjects in this subcomponent. If needed, you may upload a table or graphic at 2.11, below.	Principal and teacher will examine fall or spring (prior year) benchmark data to set targets for student growth. Seventh- and eighth-grade science teachers will be expected to create individual growth targets for students based on prior year (for 8th grade teachers) or fall benchmark/pre-assessment (for 7th grade teachers) results in science. The principal will be approving the targets set by teachers in his or her building. The HEDI table attached to 2.11 illustrates how teachers may receive 0–20 scores in this subcomponent.
Highly Effective (18 - 20 points) Results are well-above state average for similar students (or District goals if no state test).	Results are well-above District expectations for students attaining growth targets set by teachers and principals based on a review of the fall (i.e., beginning of the year) or spring (i.e., prior year) benchmarks of NYS Standards for each grade in science. 85% or more of a teacher's students would meet their growth targets to be considered highly-effective.
Effective (9 - 17 points) Results meet state average for similar students (or District goals if no state test).	Results meet District expectations for students attaining growth targets set by teachers and principals based on a review of the fall (i.e., beginning of the year) or spring (i.e., prior year) benchmarks of NYS Standards for each grade in science. 60%–84% of a teacher's students would meet their growth targets to be considered effective.
Developing (3 - 8 points) Results are below state average for similar students (or District goals if no state test).	Results do not meet District expectations for students attaining growth targets set by teachers and principals based on a review of the fall (i.e., beginning of the year) or spring (i.e., prior year) benchmarks of NYS Standards for each grade in science. 25%–59% of a teacher's students would meet their growth targets to be considered developing.
Ineffective (0 - 2 points) Results are well-below state average for similar students (or District goals if no state test).	Results are far below District expectations for students attaining growth targets set by teachers and principals based on a review of the fall (i.e., beginning of the year) or spring (i.e., prior year) benchmarks of NYS Standards for each grade in science. 24% or fewer of a teacher's students would meet their growth targets to be considered ineffective.

2.5) Grades 6-8 Social Studies

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

	Social Studies	Assessment
6	Not applicable	Grade 6 is Common Branch
7	District, regional or BOCES-developed assessment	Fallsburg Central School District-Developed 7th Grade Social Studies Assessment
8	District, regional or BOCES-developed assessment	Fallsburg Central School District-Developed 8th Grade Social Studies Assessment

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

Use this box, if needed, to describe the general process for assigning HEDI categories for these grades/subjects in this subcomponent. If needed, you may upload a table or graphic at 2.11, below.	Principal and teacher will examine fall or spring (prior year) benchmark data to set targets for student growth. Seventh- and eighth-grade social studies teachers will be expected to create individual growth targets for students based on prior year (for 8th grade teachers) or fall benchmark/pre-assessment (for 7th grade teachers) results in social studies. The principal will be approving the targets set by teachers in his or her building. The HEDI table attached to 2.11 illustrates how teachers may receive 0–20 scores in this subcomponent.
Highly Effective (18 - 20 points) Results are well-above District goals for similar students.	Results are well-above District expectations for students attaining growth targets set by teachers and principals based on a review of the fall (i.e., beginning of the year) or spring (i.e., prior year) benchmarks of NYS Standards for each grade in social studies. 85% or more of a teacher's students would meet their growth targets to be considered highly-effective.
Effective (9 - 17 points) Results meet District goals for similar students.	Results meet District expectations for students attaining growth targets set by teachers and principals based on a review of the fall (i.e., beginning of the year) or spring (i.e., prior year) benchmarks of NYS Standards for each grade in social studies. 60%–84% of a teacher's students would meet their growth targets to be considered effective.
Developing (3 - 8 points) Results are below District goals for similar students.	Results do not meet District expectations for students attaining growth targets set by teachers and principals based on a review of the fall (i.e., beginning of the year) or spring (i.e., prior year) benchmarks of NYS Standards for each grade in social studies. 25%–59% of a teacher's students would meet their growth targets to be considered developing.
Ineffective (0 - 2 points) Results are well-below District goals for similar students.	Results are far below District expectations for students attaining growth targets set by teachers and principals based on a review of the fall (i.e., beginning of the year) or spring (i.e., prior year) benchmarks of NYS Standards for each grade in social studies. 24% or fewer of a teacher's students would meet their growth targets to be considered ineffective.

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	Fallsburg Central School District-Developed 9th Grade Global Studies Assessment

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

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

Use this box, if needed, to describe the general process for assigning HEDI categories for these grades/subjects in this subcomponent. If needed, you may upload a table or graphic at 2.11, below.	Principal and teacher will examine fall benchmark data to set targets for student growth. Global studies and American history social studies teachers will be expected to create individual growth targets for students based on fall benchmark/pre-assessment results in social studies. The principal will be approving the targets set by teachers in his or her building. The HEDI table attached to 2.11 illustrates how teachers may receive 0–20 scores in this subcomponent.
Highly Effective (18 - 20 points) Results are well-above District goals for similar students.	Results are well-above District expectations for students attaining growth targets set by teachers and principals based on a review of the fall (i.e., beginning of the year) benchmarks of NYS Standards for each course in social studies. 85% or more of a teacher's students would meet their growth targets to be considered highly-effective.
Effective (9 - 17 points) Results meet District goals for similar students.	Results meet District expectations for students attaining growth targets set by teachers and principals based on a review of the fall (i.e., beginning of the year) benchmarks of NYS Standards for each course in social studies. 60%–84% of a teacher's students would meet their growth targets to be considered effective.
Developing (3 - 8 points) Results are below District goals for similar students.	Results do not meet District expectations for students attaining growth targets set by teachers and principals based on a review of the fall (i.e., beginning of the year) benchmarks of NYS Standards for each course in social studies. 25%–59% of a teacher's students would meet their growth targets to be considered developing.
Ineffective (0 - 2 points) Results are well-below District goals for similar students.	Results are far below District expectations for students attaining growth targets set by teachers and principals based on a review of the fall (i.e., beginning of the year) benchmarks of NYS Standards for each course in social studies. 24% or fewer of a teacher's students would meet their growth targets to be considered ineffective.

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	Not applicable	Not applicable

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

Use this box, if needed, to describe the general process for assigning HEDI categories for these grades/subjects in this subcomponent. If needed, you may upload a table or graphic at 2.11, below.	Principal and teacher will examine fall benchmark data to set targets for student growth. Living environment, earth science, and chemistry teachers will be expected to create individual growth targets for students based on fall benchmark/pre-assessment results in science. The principal will be approving the targets set by teachers in his or her building. The HEDI table attached to 2.11 illustrates how teachers may receive 0–20 scores in this subcomponent.
Highly Effective (18 - 20 points) Results are well-above District goals for similar students.	Results are well-above District expectations for students attaining growth targets set by teachers and principals based on a review of the fall (i.e., beginning of the year) benchmarks of NYS Standards for each course in science. 85% or more of a teacher's students would meet their growth targets to be considered highly-effective.
Effective (9 - 17 points) Results meet District goals for similar students.	Results meet District expectations for students attaining growth targets set by teachers and principals based on a review of the fall (i.e., beginning of the year) benchmarks of NYS Standards for each course in science. 60%–84% of a teacher's students would meet their growth targets to be considered effective.
Developing (3 - 8 points) Results are below District goals for similar students.	Results do not meet District expectations for students attaining growth targets set by teachers and principals based on a review of the fall (i.e., beginning of the year) benchmarks of NYS Standards for each course in science. 25%–59% of a teacher's students would meet their growth targets to be considered developing.
Ineffective (0 - 2 points) Results are well-below District goals for similar students.	Results are far below District expectations for students attaining growth targets set by teachers and principals based on a review of the fall (i.e., beginning of the year) benchmarks of NYS Standards for each course in science. 24% or fewer of a teacher's students would meet their growth targets to be considered ineffective.

2.8) High School Math Regents Courses

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

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

Math Regents Courses	Assessment

Algebra 1	Regents assessment	Regents assessment
Geometry	Regents assessment	Regents assessment
Algebra 2	Regents assessment	Regents assessment

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

NOTE: For Algebra 1 and Geometry, please specify whether your district will be offering the 2005 Learning Standards version of the assessment in addition to the Common Core version, or just the latter, and how the HEDI process will be adjusted accordingly.

Use this box, if needed, to describe the general process for assigning HEDI categories for these grades/subjects in this subcomponent. If needed, you may upload a table or graphic at 2.11, below.	Principal and teacher will examine fall benchmark data to set targets for student growth. Math teachers will be expected to create individual growth targets for students based on fall benchmark/pre-assessment results in math. The principal will be approving the targets set by teachers in his or her building. The HEDI table attached to 2.11 illustrates how teachers may receive 0–20 scores in this subcomponent. For Algebra I, students in Common Core courses will take the NYS Common Core Algebra Regents. For students in courses aligned to the 2005 NYS math standards, we will only administer the Integrated Algebra Regents, for as long as it is available. Geometry students in Common Core courses will take both versions of the Regents, so long as permissible. Where a student takes both students of the Regents, the higher of the two scores will be used for APPR purposes.
Highly Effective (18 - 20 points) Results are well-above District goals for similar students.	Results are well-above District expectations for students attaining growth targets set by teachers and principals based on a review of the fall (i.e., beginning of the year) benchmarks of NYS Common Core State Standards for each course in math. 85% or more of a teacher's students would meet their growth targets to be considered highly-effective.
Effective (9 - 17 points) Results meet District goals for similar students.	Results meet District expectations for students attaining growth targets set by teachers and principals based on a review of the fall (i.e., beginning of the year) benchmarks of NYS Common Core State Standards for each course in math. 60%–84% of a teacher's students would meet their growth targets to be considered effective.
Developing (3 - 8 points) Results are below District goals for similar students.	Results do not meet District expectations for students attaining growth targets set by teachers and principals based on a review of the fall (i.e., beginning of the year) benchmarks of NYS Common Core State Standards for each course in math. 25%–59% of a teacher's students would meet their growth targets to be considered developing.
Ineffective (0 - 2 points) Results are well-below District goals for similar students.	Results are far below District expectations for students attaining growth targets set by teachers and principals based on a review of the fall (i.e., beginning of the year) benchmarks of NYS Common Core State Standards for each course in math. 24% or fewer of a teacher's students would meet their growth targets to be considered ineffective.

2.9) High School English Language Arts

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

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

	High School English Courses	Assessment
Grade 9 ELA	State approved 3rd party assessment	Measures of Academic Progress (ELA)
Grade 10 ELA	State approved 3rd party assessment	Measures of Academic Progress (ELA)
Grade 11 ELA	Regents assessment	Grade 11 Comprehensive and Common Core English NYS Regents Assessment

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

NOTE: For Grade 11 ELA, please specify whether your district will be offering the Comprehensive English Regents in addition to the Common Core English Regents, or just the latter, how the HEDI process will be adjusted accordingly.

Use this box, if needed, to describe the general process for assigning HEDI categories for these grades/subjects in this subcomponent. If needed, you may upload a table or graphic at 2.11, below.	Principal and teacher will examine fall benchmark data to set targets for student growth. Measures of Academic Progress (grades 9–10) establishes individual student fall-to-spring growth targets in ELA. 11th grade ELA teachers will be expected to create individual growth targets for students based on fall benchmark/pre-assessment results in ELA. The principal will be approving the targets set by teachers in his or her building. The HEDI table attached to 2.11 illustrates how teachers may receive 0–20 scores in this subcomponent. For 11th grade ELA, students in Common Core courses will take the NYS Common Core English Regents and/or, where permissible, the NYS Comprehensive English Regents (2005 Standards). In a situation where an eligible student has taken both exams, the District will use the higher of the two scores for APPR purposes.
Highly Effective (18 - 20 points) Results are well-above District goals for similar students.	Results are well-above District expectations for students attaining growth targets set by Measures of Academic Progress (grades 9–10) or teachers (11th grade) and principal based on a review of the fall (i.e., beginning of the year) benchmarks of NYS Common Core State Standards for each grade in ELA. 85% or more of a teacher's students would meet their growth targets to be considered highly-effective.
Effective (9 - 17 points) Results meet District goals for similar students.	Results meet District expectations for students attaining growth targets set by Measures of Academic Progress (grades 9–10) or teachers (11th grade) and principal based on a review of the fall (i.e., beginning of the year) benchmarks of NYS Common Core State Standards for each grade in ELA. 60%–84% of a teacher's students would meet their growth targets to be considered effective for 11th grade; 50%–84% of a teacher's students would

	meet their growth targets to be considered effective for 9th–10th grades.
Developing (3 - 8 points) Results are below District goals for similar students.	Results do not meet District expectations for students attaining growth targets set by Measures of Academic Progress (grades 9–10) or teachers (11th grade) and principal based on a review of the fall (i.e., beginning of the year) benchmarks of NYS Common Core State Standards for each grade in ELA. 25%–59% of a teacher's students would meet their growth targets to be considered developing for 11th grade; 20%–49% of a teacher's students would meet their growth targets to be considered developing for 9th–10th grades.
Ineffective (0 - 2 points) Results are well-below District goals for similar students.	Results are far below District expectations for students attaining growth targets set by Measures of Academic Progress (grades 9–10) or teachers (11th grade) and principal based on a review of the fall (i.e., beginning of the year) benchmarks of NYS Common Core State Standards for each grade in ELA. 24% or fewer of a teacher's students would meet their growth targets to be considered ineffective for 11th grade; 19% or fewer of a teacher's students would meet their growth targets to be considered ineffective for 9th–10th grades.

2.10) All Other Courses

Fill in, as applicable, for all other teachers in additional grades/subjects that have Student Learning Objectives. If you need additional space, duplicate this form and upload (below) as an attachment to your APPR plan. You may combine into one line any groups of teachers for whom the answers in the boxes are the same including, for example, "all other teachers not named above". Please note that no APPR plan shall be approved by the Commissioner for use in the 2014-2015 school year or thereafter that provides for the administration of traditional standardized assessments for use with students in kindergarten through grade two for APPR purposes (see: http://www.engageny.org/resource/guidance-on-the-approved-regulatory-amendments-to-appr-to-help-reduce-local-testing).

Please also note that, for students using 3d party assessments in this Task, the 2nd drop-down option applies to grades 3 and above and the 5th drop-down option applies to grades K-2.

Course(s) or Subject(s)	Option	Assessment
ESL, KG–12	State Assessment	NYSESLAT
Music, KG–8	District, Regional or BOCES-developed	Fallsburg Central School District-Developed Music Grade-specific Assessments
Art, KG–12	District, Regional or BOCES-developed	Fallsburg Central School District-Developed Art Grade-specific Assessments
Band, 5–12	District, Regional or BOCES-developed	Fallsburg Central School District-Developed Music Grade-specific Performance Assessments
Chorus, 7–12	District, Regional or BOCES-developed	Fallsburg Central School District-Developed Music Grade-specific Peformance Assessments
Technology, KG–12	District, Regional or BOCES-developed	Fallsburg Central School District-Developed Technology Grade-specific Assessments
Reading, KG-1	Grades K-2: 3rd party non-“traditional standardized” assessment that meets NYSED guidance requirements	Measures of Academic Progress for Primary Grades (ELA)
Business Math, 9–12	District, Regional or BOCES-developed	Fallsburg Central School District-Developed Business Math Assessments

	Home & Careers, 7–8	District, Regional or BOCES-developed	Fallsburg Central School District-Developed Home & Careers Grade-specific Assessments
	Reading, 2nd grade	Grades K-2: 3rd party non-“traditional standardized” assessment that meets NYSED guidance requirements	Measures of Academic Progress (ELA)
	PreBiology	District, Regional or BOCES-developed	Fallsburg Central School District-Developed PreBiology Assessments
	Physical Education, KG–12	District, Regional or BOCES-developed	Fallsburg Central School District-Developed Physical Education Grade-specific Assessments
	Health, 7–12	District, Regional or BOCES-developed	Fallsburg Central School District-Developed Health Grade-specific Assessments
	Economics	District, Regional or BOCES-developed	Fallsburg Central School District-Developed Economics Assessment
	Spanish, 7–12	District, Regional or BOCES-developed	Fallsburg Central School District-Developed Spanish Grade-specific Assessments
	ELA, 12th grade	District, Regional or BOCES-developed	Fallsburg Central School District-Developed English 12 Assessment
	Participation in Government	District, Regional or BOCES-developed	Fallsburg Central School District-Developed Participation in Government Assessment
	Library, K–6	District, Regional or BOCES-developed	Fallsburg Central School District-Developed Elementary Library Grade-specific Assessments
	Accounting, 9–12	District, Regional or BOCES-developed	Fallsburg Central School District-Developed Accounting Assessments
	Reading, 3rd grade	State Assessment	NYS Grade 3 ELA Assessment

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

Use this box, if needed, to describe the general process for assigning HEDI categories for these grades/subjects in this subcomponent. If needed, you may upload a table or graphic at 2.11, below.	Principal and teacher will examine fall or spring (prior year) benchmark data to set targets for student growth. Measures of Academic Progress (2nd grade) and Measures of Academic Progress for Primary Grades (KG–1) establish individual student fall-to-spring growth targets in ELA and math. Teachers will be expected to create individual growth targets for students based on spring (prior year) or fall benchmark/pre-assessment results in their related subject area. The principal will be approving the targets set by teachers in his or her building. The HEDI table attached to 2.11 illustrates how teachers may receive 0–20 scores in this subcomponent.
Highly Effective (18 - 20 points) Results are well-above District goals for similar students.	Results are well-above District expectations for students attaining growth targets set by Measures of Academic Progress (2nd grade); Measures of Academic Progress for Primary Grades (K–1); or teachers and principals based on a review of spring (prior year) or fall (i.e., beginning of the year) benchmarks of NYS standards for each particular content area. 85% or more of a teacher's students would meet their growth targets to be considered highly-effective.

Effective (9 - 17 points) Results meet District goals for similar students.	Results meet District expectations for students attaining growth targets set by Measures of Academic Progress (2nd grade); Measures of Academic Progress for Primary Grades (K–1); or teachers and principals based on a review of spring (prior year) or fall (i.e., beginning of the year) benchmarks of NYS standards for each particular content area. a. For teachers of reading and math AIS in grades K–3: 50%–84% of a teacher's students would meet their growth targets to be considered effective. b. For all other teachers listed in 2.10: 60%–84% of a teacher's students would meet their growth targets to be considered effective.
Developing (3 - 8 points) Results are below District goals for similar students.	Results do not meet District expectations for students attaining growth targets set by Measures of Academic Progress (2nd grade); Measures of Academic Progress for Primary Grades (K–1); or teachers and principals based on a review of spring (prior year) or fall (i.e., beginning of the year) benchmarks of NYS standards for each particular content area. a. For teachers of reading and math AIS in grades K–3: 20%–49% of a teacher's students would meet their growth targets to be considered developing. b. For all other teachers listed in 2.10: 25%–59% of a teacher's students would meet their growth targets to be considered developing.
Ineffective (0 - 2 points) Results are well-below District goals for similar students.	Results are far below District expectations for students attaining growth targets set by Measures of Academic Progress (2nd grade); Measures of Academic Progress for Primary Grades (K–1); or teachers and principals based on a review of spring (prior year) or fall (i.e., beginning of the year) benchmarks of NYS standards for each particular content area. a. For teachers of reading and math AIS in grades K–3: 19% or fewer of a teacher's students would meet their growth targets to be considered ineffective. b. For all other teachers listed in 2.10: 24% or fewer of a teacher's students would meet their growth targets to be considered ineffective.

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)

assets/survey-uploads/12186/890943-avH4IQNZMh/2.10 Fallsburg CSD additional teachers list--2014-15--December 2014.docx

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/12186/890943-TXEtxx9bQW/Fallsburg CSD HEDI Scales for SLO--2013–14.pdf

2.12) Locally Developed Controls

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

Note: The only allowable controls or adjustments for Comparable Growth Measures are the following: student prior academic history, students with disabilities, English language learners, and students in poverty.

This is not applicable.

2.13) Teachers with more than one growth measure

If educators have more than one state-provided growth or value-added measure, those measures will be combined into one HEDI rating and score for the growth subcomponent according to a formula determined by the Commissioner. (Examples: Common branch teacher with state-provided value-added measures for both ELA and Math in 4th grades; Middle school math teacher with both 7th and 8th grade math courses.)
If educators have more than one SLO for comparable growth (or a State-provided growth measure and an SLO for comparable growth), the measures will each earn a score from 0-20 points which Districts must weight proportionately based on the number of students in each SLO.

2.14) Assurances

Please check all of the boxes below:

2.14) Assurances | Assure the application of locally developed controls will be rigorous, fair, and transparent and only those used for State Growth will be used for Comparable Growth Measures.	Checked
2.14) Assurances | Assure that use of locally developed controls will not have a disparate impact on underrepresented students in accordance with applicable civil rights laws.	Checked
2.14) Assurances | Assure that enrolled students in accordance with teacher of record policies are included and may not be excluded.	Checked
2.14) Assurances | Assure that procedures for ensuring data accuracy and integrity are being utilized.	Checked
2.14) Assurances | Assure that district will develop SLOs according to the rules established by SED (see: http://www.engageny.org/resource/student-learning-objectives-guidance-document).	Checked
2.14) Assurances | Assure that past academic performance and/or baseline academic data of students will be taken into account when developing an SLO.	Checked
2.14) Assurances | Assure that the process for assigning points for SLOs for the Growth Subcomponent will use the narrative HEDI descriptions described in the regulations to effectively differentiate educators in ways that improve student learning and instruction.	Checked
2.14) Assurances | Assure that it is possible for an educator to earn each point, including 0, for SLOs in the Growth subcomponent scoring range.	Checked
2.14) Assurances | Assure that processes are in place to monitor SLOs to ensure rigor and comparability across classrooms.	Checked
2.14) Assurances | Assure that the amount of time devoted to traditional standardized assessments that are not specifically required by state or federal law for each classroom or program within a grade level does not exceed, in the aggregate, one percent of the minimum required annual instructional hours for the grade.	Checked
2.14) Assurances | Assure that, as applicable, any third party assessment that is administered to students in kindergarten, first, or second grade, and being used for APPR purposes, is consistent with the State's APPR Assessment Guidance and is not a traditional standardized assessment.	Checked

3. Local Measures (Teachers)

Created Tuesday, April 30, 2013
Updated Wednesday, January 14, 2015

Page 1

Locally Selected Measures of Student Achievement or Growth

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

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

Locally selected measures for common branch teachers: This form calls for locally selected measures in both ELA and math in grades typically served by common branch teachers. Districts may select local measures for common branch teachers that involve subjects other than ELA and math. Whatever local measure is selected for common branch teachers, please enter it under ELA and/or math and describe the assessment used, including the subject. Use N/A for other lines in that grade level that are served by common branch teachers. Describe the HEDI criteria for the measure in the same section where you identified the locally selected measure and assessment. Additionally, please provide a brief explanation in the HEDI general description box of why you have listed the grade/course as “Not Applicable” (e.g., district/BOCES does not offer this grade/subject; common branch teacher).

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

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

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

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

Growth or achievement measure(s) from these options.

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

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

Measures based on:

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

the percentage of a teacher's students earning the advanced performance level (four) on the 4th grade ELA or math State assessments compared to those students' performance levels on the 3rd grade ELA or math State assessments)

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

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

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

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

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

(i) A State-provided student growth score covering all students in the school that took the State assessment in ELA or Math in Grades 4-8; or
(ii) A school-wide measure of student growth or achievement computed in a manner determined locally based on a State, State-approved 3rd party, or district, regional or BOCES developed assessment that is rigorous and comparable across classrooms.

3.1) Grades 4-8 ELA

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

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

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

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

Use this box, if needed, to describe the general process for assigning HEDI categories for these grades/subjects in this subcomponent. If needed, you may upload a table or graphic at 3.3, below.	The Fallsburg Central School District will be using value-added measures based on the NWEA Measures of Academic Progress assessments to calculate teacher-level effectiveness ratings for the locally selected measures of student growth in ELA in grades 4-8. The term "value-added" refers to the contributions educators and schools make to student outcomes, such as performance on standardized assessments. Value-added models provide a way to measure this contribution separately from factors that influence student outcomes, but over which a teacher or school has no control. They do this by statistically controlling for factors such as students' socioeconomic status

	and projecting how students will perform on assessments based on actual outcomes from similar students in the state. This allows the model to produce estimates of productivity – value-added indicators – under the counterfactual assumption that all schools serve the same group of students. This facilitates apples-to-apples teacher comparisons, rather than apples-to-oranges comparisons. The objective is to facilitate valid and fair comparisons of productivity with respect to student outcomes, given that teachers often serve very different student populations. The Fallsburg Central School District's analyses will be conducted by the Value-Added Research Center on NWEA's Measures of Academic Progress assessments. Major modeling decisions were decided by a Technical Advisory Panel made up of volunteer districts from across the state. For a more detailed description of the value-added model used, please see 3.3. To assign teachers to HEDI categories, we will assume a normal distribution of teacher effects centered on 11. A zero (0) on the conversion chart represents the expected level of growth based on state norms. From this point, we will use the following cut points to assign teachers to categories: Highly Effective: Greater than or equal to .9 standard deviations above average Effective: Less than .9 standard deviations above average and greater than or equal to -.9 standard deviations below average Developing: Less than -.9 standard deviations below average and greater than or equal to -2.4 standard deviations below average Ineffective: Less than -2.4 standard deviations below average The 20-point conversion chart in task 3.13 will be used until the state value-added model is implemented.
Highly Effective (14 - 15 points) Results are well above District- or BOCES-adopted expectations for growth or achievement for grade/subject.	Within the category of Highly Effective, those teachers who fall at greater than or equal to .9 standard deviations above average, we further divide the distribution to determine specific points.
Effective (8- 13 points) Results meet District- or BOCES-adopted expectations for growth or achievement for grade/subject.	Within the category of Effective, those teachers who fall at less than .9 standard deviations above average and greater than or equal to -.9 standard deviations below average, we further divide the distribution to determine specific points.
Developing (3 - 7 points) Results are below District- or BOCES-adopted expectations for growth or achievement for grade/subject.	Within the category of Developing, those teachers who fall at less than -.9 standard deviations below average and greater than or equal to -2.4 standard deviations below average, we further divide the distribution to determine specific points.
Ineffective (0 - 2 points) Results are well below District- or BOCES-adopted expectations for growth or achievement for grade/subject.	Within the category of Ineffective, those teachers who fall at less than -2.4 standard deviations below average, we further divide the distribution to determine specific points.

3.2) Grades 4-8 Math

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

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

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

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

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

Use this box, if needed, to describe the general process for assigning HEDI categories for these grades/subjects in this subcomponent. If needed, you may upload a table or graphic at 3.3, below.	The Fallsburg Central School District will be using value-added measures based on the NWEA Measures of Academic Progress assessments to calculate teacher-level effectiveness ratings for the locally selected measures of student growth in math in grades 4-8. The term “value-added” refers to the contributions educators and schools make to student outcomes, such as performance on standardized assessments. Value-added models provide a way to measure this contribution separately from factors that influence student outcomes, but over which a teacher or school has no control. They do this by statistically controlling for factors such as students’ socioeconomic status and projecting how students will perform on assessments based on actual outcomes from similar students in the state. This allows the model to produce estimates of productivity – value-added indicators – under the counterfactual assumption that all schools serve the same group of students. This facilitates apples-to-apples teacher comparisons, rather than apples-to-oranges comparisons. The objective is to facilitate valid and fair comparisons of productivity with respect to student outcomes, given that teachers often serve very different student populations. The Fallsburg Central School District’s analyses will be conducted by the Value-Added Research Center on NWEA’s Measures of Academic Progress assessments. Major modeling decisions were decided by a Technical Advisory Panel made up of volunteer districts from across the state. For a more detailed description of the value-added model used, please see 3.3. To assign teachers to HEDI categories, we will assume a normal distribution of teacher effects centered on 11. A zero (0) on the conversion chart represents the expected level of growth based on state norms. From this point, we will use the following cut points to assign teachers to categories: Highly Effective: Greater than or equal to .9 standard deviations above average Effective: Less than .9 standard deviations above average and greater than or equal to -.9 standard deviations below average Developing: Less than -.9 standard deviations below average and greater than or equal to -2.4 standard deviations below average Ineffective: Less than -2.4 standard deviations below average The 20-point conversion chart in task 3.13 will be used until the state value-added model is implemented.

Highly Effective (14 - 15 points) Results are well above District- or BOCES-adopted expectations for growth or achievement for grade/subject.	Within the category of Highly Effective, those teachers who fall at greater than or equal to .9 standard deviations above average, we further divide the distribution to determine specific points.
Effective (8- 13 points) Results meet District- or BOCES-adopted expectations for growth or achievement for grade/subject.	Within the category of Effective, those teachers who fall at less than .9 standard deviations above average and greater than or equal to -.9 standard deviations below average, we further divide the distribution to determine specific points.
Developing (3 - 7 points) Results are below District- or BOCES-adopted expectations for growth or achievement for grade/subject.	Within the category of Developing, those teachers who fall at less than -.9 standard deviations below average and greater than or equal to -2.4 standard deviations below average, we further divide the distribution to determine specific points.
Ineffective (0 - 2 points) Results are well below District- or BOCES-adopted expectations for growth or achievement for grade/subject.	Within the category of Ineffective, those teachers who fall at less than -2.4 standard deviations below average, we further divide the distribution to determine specific points.

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/5139/206142-rhJdBgDruP/Review Room 3.3 HEDI Tables for 4–8 ELA & Math.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 measure that will be used as the locally-selected measure of student achievement. Then name the specific assessment that will be used with the locally-selected measure, listing the full name of the assessment. Please note that no APPR plan shall be approved by the Commissioner for use in the 2014-2015 school year or thereafter that provides for the administration of traditional standardized assessments for use with students in kindergarten through grade two for APPR purposes (see: http://www.engageny.org/resource/guidance-on-the-approved-regulatory-amendments-to-appr-to-help-reduce-local-testing).

	Locally-Selected Measure from List of Approved Measures	Assessment
K	4) Grades K-2: 3rd party non-“traditional standardized” assessment that meets NYSED guidance requirements	Measures of Academic Progress for Primary Grades (ELA)
1	4) Grades K-2: 3rd party non-“traditional standardized” assessment that meets NYSED guidance requirements	Measures of Academic Progress for Primary Grades (ELA)
2	4) Grades K-2: 3rd party non-“traditional standardized” assessment that meets NYSED guidance requirements	Measures of Academic Progress (ELA)
3	9) Grades 3 and up: State-approved 3rd party assessments	Measures of Academic Progress (ELA)

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

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

Use this box, if needed, to describe the general process for assigning HEDI categories for these grades/subjects in this subcomponent. If needed, you may upload a table or graphic at 3.13, below.	The Fallsburg Central School District will be using value-added measures based on the NWEA Measures of Academic Progress assessments—Measures for Academic Progress (Primary Grades) for KG–1—to calculate teacher-level effectiveness ratings for the locally selected measures of student growth in ELA in grades K-3 (Measures for Academic Progress, Primary Grades for KG–1). The term “value-added” refers to the contributions educators and schools make to student outcomes, such as performance on standardized assessments. Value-added models provide a way to measure this contribution separately from factors that influence student outcomes, but over which a teacher or school has no control. They do this by statistically controlling for factors such as students’ socioeconomic status and projecting how students will perform on assessments based on actual outcomes from similar students in the state. This allows the model to produce estimates of productivity – value-added indicators – under the counterfactual assumption that all schools serve the same group of students. This facilitates apples-to-apples teacher comparisons, rather than

	apples-to-oranges comparisons. The objective is to facilitate valid and fair comparisons of productivity with respect to student outcomes, given that teachers often serve very different student populations. The Fallsburg Central School District's analyses will be conducted by the Value-Added Research Center on NWEA's Measures of Academic Progress assessment. Major modeling decisions were decided by a Technical Advisory Panel made up of volunteer districts from across the state. For a more detailed description of the value-added model used, please see 3.13. To assign teachers to HEDI categories, we will assume a normal distribution of teacher effects centered on 13. A zero (0) on the conversion chart represents the expected level of growth based on state norms. From this point, we will use the following cut points to assign teachers to categories: Highly Effective: Greater than or equal to .9 standard deviations above average Effective: Less than .9 standard deviations above average and greater than or equal to -.9 standard deviations below average Developing: Less than -.9 standard deviations below average and greater than or equal to -2.1 standard deviations below average Ineffective: Less than -2.1 standard deviations below average
Highly Effective (18-20 points) Results are well above District- or BOCES-adopted expectations for growth or achievement for grade/subject.	Within the category of Highly Effective, those teachers who fall at greater than or equal to .9 standard deviations above average, we further divide the distribution to determine specific points.
Effective (9-17 points) Results meet District- or BOCES-adopted expectations for growth or achievement for grade/subject.	Within the category of Effective, those teachers who fall at less than .9 standard deviations above average and greater than or equal to -.9 standard deviations below average, we further divide the distribution to determine specific points.
Developing (3 - 8 points) Results are below District- or BOCES-adopted expectations for growth or achievement for grade/subject.	Within the category of Developing, those teachers who fall at less than -.9 standard deviations below average and greater than or equal to -2.1 standard deviations below average, we further divide the distribution to determine specific points.
Ineffective (0 - 2 points) Results are well below District- or BOCES-adopted expectations for growth or achievement for grade/subject.	Within the category of Ineffective, those teachers who fall at less than -2.1 standard deviations below average, we further divide the distribution to determine specific points.

3.5) Grades K-3 Math

Using the drop-down boxes below, select the measure that will be used as the locally-selected measure of student achievement. Then name the specific assessment that will be used with the locally-selected measure, listing the full name of the assessment. Please note that no APPR plan shall be approved by the Commissioner for use in the 2014-2015 school year or thereafter that provides for the administration of traditional standardized assessments for use with students in kindergarten through grade two for APPR purposes (see: http://www.engageny.org/resource/guidance-on-the-approved-regulatory-amendments-to-appr-to-help-reduce-local-testing).

	Locally-Selected Measure from List of Approved Measures	Assessment
K	4) Grades K-2: 3rd party non-"traditional standardized" assessment that meets NYSED guidance requirements	Measures of Academic Progress for Primary Grades (Math)
1	4) Grades K-2: 3rd party non-"traditional standardized" assessment that meets NYSED guidance requirements	Measures of Academic Progress for Primary Grades (Math)
2	4) Grades K-2: 3rd party non-"traditional standardized" assessment that meets NYSED guidance requirements	Measures of Academic Progress (Math)

3	9) Grades 3 and up: State-approved 3rd party assessments	Measures of Academic Progress (Math)

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

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

Use this box, if needed, to describe the general process for assigning HEDI categories for these grades/subjects in this subcomponent. If needed, you may upload a table or graphic at 3.13, below.	The Fallsburg Central School District will be using value-added measures based on the NWEA Measures of Academic Progress assessments—Measures for Academic Progress (Primary Grades) for KG–1—to calculate teacher-level effectiveness ratings for the locally selected measures of student growth in math in grades K-3 (Measures for Academic Progress, Primary Grades for KG–1). The term “value-added” refers to the contributions educators and schools make to student outcomes, such as performance on standardized assessments. Value-added models provide a way to measure this contribution separately from factors that influence student outcomes, but over which a teacher or school has no control. They do this by statistically controlling for factors such as students’ socioeconomic status and projecting how students will perform on assessments based on actual outcomes from similar students in the state. This allows the model to produce estimates of productivity – value-added indicators – under the counterfactual assumption that all schools serve the same group of students. This facilitates apples-to-apples teacher comparisons, rather than apples-to-oranges comparisons. The objective is to facilitate valid and fair comparisons of productivity with respect to student outcomes, given that teachers often serve very different student populations. The Fallsburg Central School District’s analyses will be conducted by the Value-Added Research Center on NWEA’s Measures of Academic Progress assessment. Major modeling decisions were decided by a Technical Advisory Panel made up of volunteer districts from across the state. For a more detailed description of the value-added model used, please see 3.13. To assign teachers to HEDI categories, we will assume a normal distribution of teacher effects centered on 13. A zero (0) on the conversion chart represents the expected level of growth based on state norms. From this point, we will use the following cut points to assign teachers to categories: Highly Effective: Greater than or equal to .9 standard deviations above average Effective: Less than .9 standard deviations above average and greater than or equal to -.9 standard deviations below average Developing: Less than -.9 standard deviations below average and greater than or equal to -2.1 standard deviations below average Ineffective: Less than -2.1 standard deviations below average
Highly Effective (18-20 points) Results are well above District- or BOCES-adopted expectations for growth or achievement for grade/subject.	Within the category of Highly Effective, those teachers who fall at greater than or equal to .9 standard deviations above average, we further divide the distribution to determine specific points.

Effective (9-17 points) Results meet District- or BOCES-adopted expectations for growth or achievement for grade/subject.	Within the category of Effective, those teachers who fall at less than .9 standard deviations above average and greater than or equal to -.9 standard deviations below average, we further divide the distribution to determine specific points.
Developing (3 - 8 points) Results are below District -or BOCES-adopted expectations for growth or achievement for grade/subject.	Within the category of Developing, those teachers who fall at less than -.9 standard deviations below average and greater than or equal to -2.1 standard deviations below average, we further divide the distribution to determine specific points.
Ineffective (0 - 2 points) Results are well below District- or BOCES-adopted expectations for growth or achievement for grade/subject.	Within the category of Ineffective, those teachers who fall at less than -2.1 standard deviations below average, we further divide the distribution to determine specific points.

3.6) Grades 6-8 Science

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

	Locally-Selected Measure from List of Approved Measures	Assessment
6	Not applicable	6th Grade is Common Branch
7	7) Student Learning Objectives	Fallsburg Central School District-Developed 7th Grade Science Assessment
8	7) Student Learning Objectives	NYS 8th Grade Science Exam

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

Use this box, if needed, to describe the general process for assigning HEDI categories for these grades/subjects in this subcomponent. If needed, you may upload a table or graphic at 3.13, below.	Every fall, the principal and teacher will review prior-year and pre-assessment data, to identify areas where improved student achievement is needed. The teacher and principal shall collaborate and make a determination on whether to use an overall achievement target or growth SLO for this subcomponent. The teacher and principal, consistent with 3012-c regulations, may utilize a growth SLO so long as it is not used in the same manner as it was for the growth subcomponent. Option I: Using pre-assessment or prior-year data, teachers, in collaboration with their principal, will set achievement targets for students. HEDI points will be awarded based on the percent of students meeting or exceeding the achievement target. Option II: Using pre-assessment or prior-year data, teachers in collaboration with principals will set class-wide growth targets for student subgroups. The subgroup(s) measured shall be determined through discussions between the teacher(s) and principal(s). HEDI points will be awarded based on the percent of students meeting or exceeding the growth target. All teachers in the same grade/subject area shall all use the same measure for the local subcomponent. Regardless of the option selected, measures will be rigorous and comparable across classrooms. The HEDI table attached to 3.13 illustrates how teachers may receive 0–20 scores in this subcomponent.

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 students attaining growth targets or achievement targets of NYS Science Standards for each grade/subject. 85% or more of a teacher's students would meet this expectation to be considered highly-effective.
Effective (9 - 17 points) Results meet District- or BOCES-adopted expectations for growth or achievement for grade/subject.	Results meet District expectations for students attaining growth targets or achievement targets of NYS Science Standards for each grade/subject. 60%–84% of a teacher's students would meet this expectation to be considered effective.
Developing (3 - 8 points) Results are below District- or BOCES-adopted expectations for growth or achievement for grade/subject.	Results do not meet District expectations for students attaining growth targets or achievement targets of NYS Science Standards for each grade/subject. 25%–59% of a teacher's students would meet this expectation to be considered developing.
Ineffective (0 - 2 points) Results are well below District- or BOCES-adopted expectations for growth or achievement for grade/subject.	Results are far below District expectations for students attaining growth targets or achievement targets of NYS Science Standards for each grade/subject. 24% or fewer of a teacher's students would meet this expectation to be considered ineffective.

3.7) Grades 6-8 Social Studies

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

	Locally-Selected Measure from List of Approved Measures	Assessment
6	Not applicable	Not applicable
7	7) Student Learning Objectives	Fallsburg Central School District-Developed 7th Grade Social Studies Assessment
8	7) Student Learning Objectives	Fallsburg Central School District-Developed 8th Grade Social Studies Assessment

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

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

Use this box, if needed, to describe the general process for assigning HEDI categories for these grades/subjects in this subcomponent. If needed, you may upload a table or graphic at 3.13, below.	Every fall, the principal and teacher will review prior-year and pre-assessment data, to identify areas where improved student achievement is needed. The teacher and principal shall collaborate and make a determination on whether to use an overall achievement target or growth SLO for this subcomponent. The teacher and principal, consistent with 3012-c regulations, may utilize a growth SLO so long as it is not used in the same manner as it was for the growth subcomponent. Option I: Using pre-assessment or prior-year data, teachers, in collaboration with their principal, will set achievement targets for students. HEDI points will be awarded based on the percent of students meeting or exceeding the achievement target. Option II: Using pre-assessment or prior-year data, teachers in collaboration with principals will set class-wide growth targets

	for student subgroups. The subgroup(s) measured shall be determined through discussions between the teacher(s) and principal(s). HEDI points will be awarded based on the percent of students meeting or exceeding the growth target. All teachers in the same grade/subject area shall all use the same measure for the local subcomponent. Regardless of the option selected, measures will be rigorous and comparable across classrooms. The HEDI table attached to 3.13 illustrates how teachers may receive 0–20 scores in this subcomponent.
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 students attaining growth targets or achievement targets of NYS Social Studies Standards for each grade/subject. 85% or more of a teacher's students would meet this expectation to be considered highly-effective.
Effective (9 - 17 points) Results meet District- or BOCES-adopted expectations for growth or achievement for grade/subject.	Results meet District expectations for students attaining growth targets or achievement targets of NYS Social Studies Standards for each grade/subject. 60%–84% of a teacher's students would meet this expectation to be considered effective.
Developing (3 - 8 points) Results are below District- or BOCES-adopted expectations for growth or achievement for grade/subject.	Results do not meet District expectations for students attaining growth targets or achievement targets of NYS Social Studies Standards for each grade/subject. 25%–59% of a teacher's students would meet this expectation to be considered developing.
Ineffective (0 - 2 points) Results are well below District- or BOCES-adopted expectations for growth or achievement for grade/subject.	Results are far below District expectations for students attaining growth targets or achievement targets of NYS Social Studies Standards for each grade/subject. 24% or fewer of a teacher's students would meet this expectation to be considered ineffective.

3.8) High School Social Studies

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

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

	Locally-Selected Measure from List of Approved Measures	Assessment
Global 1	7) Student Learning Objectives	Fallsburg Central School District-Developed 9th Grade Global Studies Assessment
Global 2	7) Student Learning Objectives	NYS Global History Regents Exam
American History	7) Student Learning Objectives	NYS US History Regents Exam

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

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

Use this box, if needed, to describe the general process for assigning HEDI categories for these grades/subjects in this subcomponent. If needed, you may upload a table or graphic at 3.13, below.	Every fall, the principal and teacher will review prior-year and pre-assessment data, to identify areas where improved student achievement is needed. The teacher and principal shall collaborate and make a determination on whether to use an overall achievement target or growth SLO for this subcomponent. The teacher and principal, consistent with 3012-c regulations, may utilize a growth SLO so long as it is not used in the same manner as it was for the growth subcomponent. Option I: Using pre-assessment or prior-year data, teachers, in collaboration with their principal, will set achievement targets for students. HEDI points will be awarded based on the percent of students meeting or exceeding the achievement target. Option II: Using pre-assessment or prior-year data, teachers in collaboration with principals will set class-wide growth targets for student subgroups. The subgroup(s) measured shall be determined through discussions between the teacher(s) and principal(s). HEDI points will be awarded based on the percent of students meeting or exceeding the growth target. All teachers in the same grade/subject area shall all use the same measure for the local subcomponent. Regardless of the option selected, measures will be rigorous and comparable across classrooms. The HEDI table attached to 3.13 illustrates how teachers may receive 0–20 scores in this subcomponent.
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 students attaining growth targets or achievement targets of NYS Social Studies Standards for each grade/subject. 85% or more of a teacher's students would meet this expectation to be considered highly-effective.
Effective (9 - 17 points) Results meet District- or BOCES-adopted expectations for growth or achievement for grade/subject.	Results meet District expectations for students attaining growth targets or achievement targets of NYS Social Studies Standards for each grade/subject. 60%–84% of a teacher's students would meet this expectation to be considered effective.
Developing (3 - 8 points) Results are below District- or BOCES-adopted expectations for growth or achievement for grade/subject.	Results do not meet District expectations for students attaining growth targets or achievement targets of NYS Social Studies Standards for each grade/subject. 25%–59% of a teacher's students would meet this expectation to be considered developing.
Ineffective (0 - 2 points) Results are well below District- or BOCES-adopted expectations for growth or achievement for grade/subject.	Results are far below District expectations for students attaining growth targets or achievement targets of NYS Social Studies Standards for each grade/subject. 24% or fewer of a teacher's students would meet this expectation to be considered ineffective.

3.9) High School Science

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

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

	Locally-Selected Measure from List of Approved Measures	Assessment
Living Environment	7) Student Learning Objectives	NYS Living Environment Regents Exam

Earth Science	7) Student Learning Objectives	NYS Earth Science Regents Exam
Chemistry	7) Student Learning Objectives	NYS Chemistry Regents Exam
Physics	Not applicable	Not applicable

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.	Every fall, the principal and teacher will review prior-year and pre-assessment data, to identify areas where improved student achievement is needed. The teacher and principal shall collaborate and make a determination on whether to use an overall achievement target or growth SLO for this subcomponent. The teacher and principal, consistent with 3012-c regulations, may utilize a growth SLO so long as it is not used in the same manner as it was for the growth subcomponent. Option I: Using pre-assessment or prior-year data, teachers, in collaboration with their principal, will set achievement targets for students. HEDI points will be awarded based on the percent of students meeting or exceeding the achievement target. Option II: Using pre-assessment or prior-year data, teachers in collaboration with principals will set class-wide growth targets for student subgroups. The subgroup(s) measured shall be determined through discussions between the teacher(s) and principal(s). HEDI points will be awarded based on the percent of students meeting or exceeding the growth target. All teachers in the same grade/subject area shall all use the same measure for the local subcomponent. Regardless of the option selected, measures will be rigorous and comparable across classrooms. The HEDI table attached to 3.13 illustrates how teachers may receive 0–20 scores in this subcomponent.
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 students attaining growth targets or achievement targets of NYS Science Standards for each grade/subject. 85% or more of a teacher's students would meet this expectation to be considered highly-effective.
Developing (3 - 8 points) Results are below District- or BOCES-adopted expectations for growth or achievement for grade/subject.	Results do not meet District expectations for students attaining growth targets or achievement targets of NYS Science Standards for each grade/subject. 25%–59% of a teacher's students would meet this expectation to be considered developing.
Effective (9 - 17points) Results meet District- or BOCES-adopted expectations for growth or achievement for grade/subject.	Results meet District expectations for students attaining growth targets or achievement targets of NYS Science Standards for each grade/subject. 60%–84% of a teacher's students would meet this expectation to be considered effective.
Ineffective (0 - 2 points) Results are well below District- or BOCES-adopted expectations for growth or achievement for grade/subject.	Results are far below District expectations for students attaining growth targets or achievement targets of NYS Science Standards for each grade/subject. 24% or fewer of a teacher's students would meet this expectation to be considered

ineffective.

3.10) High School Math

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

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

	Locally-Selected Measure from List of Approved Measures	Assessment
Algebra 1	7) Student Learning Objectives	Measures of Academic Progress (Math)
Geometry	7) Student Learning Objectives	Measures of Academic Progress (Math)
Algebra 2	7) Student Learning Objectives	NYS Algebra 2/Trigonometry Regents Exam

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

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

NOTE: As applicable, for Algebra 1 and Geometry, please specify whether your district will be offering the 2005 Learning Standards version of the assessment in addition to the Common Core version, or just the latter, and how the HEDI process will be adjusted accordingly.

Use this box, if needed, to describe the general process for assigning HEDI categories for these grades/subjects in this subcomponent. If needed, you may upload a table or graphic at 3.13, below.	Every fall, the principal and teacher will review prior-year and pre-assessment data, to identify areas where improved student achievement is needed. The teacher and principal shall collaborate and make a determination on whether to use an overall achievement target or growth SLO for this subcomponent. The teacher and principal, consistent with 3012-c regulations, may utilize a growth SLO so long as it is not used in the same manner as it was for the growth subcomponent. Option I: Using pre-assessment or prior-year data, teachers, in collaboration with their principal, will set achievement targets for students. HEDI points will be awarded based on the percent of students meeting or exceeding the achievement target. Option II: Using pre-assessment or prior-year data, teachers in collaboration with principals will set class-wide growth targets for student subgroups. The subgroup(s) measured shall be determined through discussions between the teacher(s) and principal(s). HEDI points will be awarded based on the percent of students meeting or exceeding the growth target. All teachers in the same grade/subject area shall all use the same measure for the local subcomponent. Regardless of the option selected, measures will be rigorous and comparable across classrooms. The HEDI table attached to 3.13 illustrates how teachers may receive 0–20 scores in this subcomponent.
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 students attaining growth targets or achievement targets of NYS Common Core State Standards for math. 85% or more of a

	teacher's students would meet this expectation to be considered highly-effective.
Effective (9 - 17 points) Results meet District- or BOCES-adopted expectations for growth or achievement for grade/subject.	Results meet District expectations for students attaining growth targets or achievement targets of NYS Common Core State Standards for math. 60%–84% of a teacher's students would meet this expectation to be considered effective.
Developing (3 - 8 points) Results are below District- or BOCES-adopted expectations for growth or achievement for grade/subject.	Results do not meet District expectations for students attaining growth targets or achievement targets of NYS Common Core State Standards for math. 25%–59% of a teacher's students would meet this expectation to be considered developing.
Ineffective (0 - 2 points) Results are well below District- or BOCES-adopted expectations for growth or achievement for grade/subject.	Results are far below District expectations for students attaining growth targets or achievement targets of NYS Common Core State Standards for math. 24% or fewer of a teacher's students would meet this expectation to be considered ineffective.

3.11) High School English Language Arts

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

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

	Locally-Selected Measure from List of Approved Measures	Assessment
Grade 9 ELA	4) State-approved 3rd party assessments	Measures of Academic Progress (ELA)
Grade 10 ELA	4) State-approved 3rd party assessments	Measures of Academic Progress (ELA)
Grade 11 ELA	7) Student Learning Objectives	NYS Comprehensive and Common Core English Grade 11 Regents

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

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

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

Use this box, if needed, to describe the general process for assigning HEDI categories for these grades/subjects in this subcomponent. If needed, you may upload a table or graphic at 3.13, below.	For grades 9 and 10 ELA, the Fallsburg Central School District will be using value-added measures based on the NWEA Measures of Academic Progress assessments to calculate teacher-level effectiveness ratings for the locally selected measures of student growth in ELA in grades 9–10. The term “value-added” refers to the contributions educators and schools make to student outcomes, such as performance on standardized assessments. Value-added models provide a way to measure this contribution separately from factors that influence student outcomes, but over which a teacher or school has no control. They do this by statistically controlling for factors such as students’ socioeconomic status and projecting how students will perform on assessments based on actual outcomes from similar students in the state. This allows the model to produce estimates of productivity – value-added indicators – under the

counterfactual assumption that all schools serve the same group of students. This facilitates apples-to-apples teacher comparisons, rather than apples-to-oranges comparisons. The objective is to facilitate valid and fair comparisons of productivity with respect to student outcomes, given that teachers often serve very different student populations. The Fallsburg Central School District's analyses will be conducted by the Value-Added Research Center on NWEA's Measures of Academic Progress assessments. Major modeling decisions were decided by a Technical Advisory Panel made up of volunteer districts from across the state. For a more detailed description of the value-added model used, please see 3.13.

To assign teachers to HEDI categories, we will assume a normal distribution of teacher effects centered on 13. A zero (0) on the conversion chart represents the expected level of growth based on state norms. From this point, we will use the following cut points to assign teachers to categories:

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

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

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

Ineffective: Less than -2.1 standard deviations below average

For grade 11 ELA, every fall, the principal and teacher will review prior-year and pre-assessment data, to identify areas where improved student achievement is needed. The teacher and principal shall collaborate and make a determination on whether to use an overall achievement target or growth SLO for this subcomponent. The teacher and principal, consistent with 3012-c regulations, may utilize a growth SLO so long as it is not used in the same manner as it was for the growth subcomponent.
Option I: Using pre-assessment or prior-year data, teachers, in collaboration with their principal, will set achievement targets for students. HEDI points will be awarded based on the percent of students meeting or exceeding the achievement target.
Option II: Using pre-assessment or prior-year data, teachers in collaboration with principals will set class-wide growth targets for student subgroups. The subgroup(s) measured shall be determined through discussions between the teacher(s) and principal(s). HEDI points will be awarded based on the percent of students meeting or exceeding the growth target.

All teachers in the same grade/subject area shall all use the same measure for the local subcomponent. Regardless of the option selected, measures will be rigorous and comparable across classrooms.

The HEDI table attached to 3.13 illustrates how teachers may receive 0–20 scores in this subcomponent.

Students in Common Core courses will take both NYS English Regents. The District will use the higher of the two scores for

	APPR purposes.
Highly Effective (18 - 20 points) Results are well above District- or BOCES-adopted expectations for growth or achievement for grade/subject.	For grades 9–10 ELA, within the category of Highly Effective, those teachers who fall at greater than or equal to .9 standard deviations above average, we further divide the distribution to determine specific points. For grade 11 ELA, results are well-above District expectations for students attaining growth targets or achievement targets of NYS Common Core State Standards for each grade/subject. 85% or more of a teacher's students would meet this expectation to be considered highly-effective.
Effective (9 - 17 points) Results meet District- or BOCES-adopted expectations for growth or achievement for grade/subject.	For grades 9–10 ELA, within the category of Effective, those teachers who fall at less than .9 standard deviations above average and greater than or equal to -.9 standard deviations below average, we further divide the distribution to determine specific points. For grade 11 ELA, results meet District expectations for students attaining growth targets or achievement targets of NYS Common Core State Standards for each grade/subject. 60%–84% of a teacher's students would meet this expectation to be considered effective.
Developing (3 - 8 points) Results are below District- or BOCES-adopted expectations for growth or achievement for grade/subject.	For grades 9–10 ELA, within the category of Developing, those teachers who fall at less than -.9 standard deviations below average and greater than or equal to -2.1 standard deviations below average, we further divide the distribution to determine specific points. For grade 11 ELA, results do not meet District expectations for students attaining growth targets or achievement targets of NYS Common Core State Standards for each grade/subject. 25%–59% of a teacher's students would meet this expectation to be considered developing.
Ineffective (0 - 2 points) Results are well below District- or BOCES-adopted expectations for growth or achievement for grade/subject.	For grades 9–10 ELA, within the category of Ineffective, those teachers who fall at less than -2.1 standard deviations below average, we further divide the distribution to determine specific points. For grade 11 ELA, results are far below District expectations for students attaining growth targets or achievement targets of NYS Common Core State Standards for each grade/subject. 24% or fewer of a teacher's students would meet this expectation to be considered ineffective.

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. Please note that no APPR plan shall be approved by the Commissioner for use in the 2014-2015 school year or thereafter that provides for the administration of traditional standardized assessments for use with students in kindergarten through grade two for APPR purposes (see: http://www.engageny.org/resource/guidance-on-the-approved-regulatory-amendments-to-appr-to-help-reduce-local-testing).

Please also note that, for students using 3d party assessments in this Task, drop-down option #4 applies to grades 3 and above and drop-down option #8 applies to grades K-2.

Course(s) or Subject(s)	Locally-Selected Measure from List of Approved Measures	Assessment

	ESL, 3–12	4) Grades 3 and up: State-approved 3rd party	Measures of Academic Progress (ELA
	Music, KG–8	7) Student Learning Objectives	Fallsburg Central School District-Developed Music Grade-specific Assessments
	Art, KG–12	7) Student Learning Objectives	Fallsburg Central School District-Developed Art Grade-specific Assessments
	Band, 5–12	7) Student Learning Objectives	Fallsburg Central School District-Developed Music Grade-specific Performance Assessments
	Chorus, 7–12	7) Student Learning Objectives	Fallsburg Central School District-Developed Music Grade-specific Performance Assessments
	Technology, KG–12	7) Student Learning Objectives	Fallsburg Central School District-Developed Technology Grade-specific Assessments
	Library, KG–6	7) Student Learning Objectives	Fallsburg Central School District-Developed Elementary Library Grade-specific Assessment
	Business Math, 9–12	7) Student Learning Objectives	Fallsburg Central School District-Developed Business Math Assessments
	Home & Careers, 7–8	7) Student Learning Objectives	Fallsburg Central School District-Developed Home & Careers Grade-specific Assessments
	Reading, 3–8	4) Grades 3 and up: State-approved 3rd party	Measures of Academic Progress (ELA)
	PreBiology	7) Student Learning Objectives	Fallsburg Central School District-Developed PreBiology Assessments
	Physical Education, KG–12	7) Student Learning Objectives	Fallsburg Central School District-Developed Physical Education Grade-specific Assessments
	Health, 7–12	7) Student Learning Objectives	Fallsburg Central School District-Developed Health Grade-specific Assessment
	Economics	7) Student Learning Objectives	Fallsburg Central School District-Developed Economics Assessment
	Spanish, 7–12	7) Student Learning Objectives	Fallsburg Central School District-Developed Spanish Grade-specific Assessments
	ELA, 12th grade	7) Student Learning Objectives	Fallsburg Central School District-Developed ELA Assessments
	Participation in Government	7) Student Learning Objectives	Fallsburg Central School District-Developed Participation in Government Assessment
	ESL, KG–1	8) Grades K-2: 3rd party non-“traditional standardized” assessment that meets NYSED guidance requirements	Measures for Academic Progress for Primary Grades (ELA)
	Reading, KG–1	8) Grades K-2: 3rd party non-“traditional standardized” assessment that meets NYSED guidance requirements	Measures for Academic Progress for Primary Grades (ELA)
	Accounting, 9–12	7) Student Learning Objectives	Fallsburg Central School District-Developed Accounting Assessment

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

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

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.	For some of the assignments listed in 3.12, the Fallsburg Central School District will be using value-added measures based on the NWEA Measures of Academic Progress and Measures of Academic Progress for Primary Grades assessments to calculate teacher-level effectiveness ratings for the locally selected measures of student growth in ELA or math in the specified subject areas. The term “value-added” refers to the contributions educators and schools make to student outcomes, such as performance on standardized assessments. Value-added models provide a way to measure this contribution separately from factors that influence student outcomes, but over which a teacher or school has no control. They do this by statistically controlling for factors such as students’ socioeconomic status and projecting how students will perform on assessments based on actual outcomes from similar students in the state. This allows the model to produce estimates of productivity – value-added indicators – under the counterfactual assumption that all schools serve the same group of students. This facilitates apples-to-apples teacher comparisons, rather than apples-to-oranges comparisons. The objective is to facilitate valid and fair comparisons of productivity with respect to student outcomes, given that teachers often serve very different student populations. The Fallsburg Central School District’s analyses will be conducted by the Value-Added Research Center on NWEA’s Measures of Academic Progress assessments. Major modeling decisions were decided by a Technical Advisory Panel made up of volunteer districts from across the state. For a more detailed description of the value-added model used, please see 3.13. To assign teachers to HEDI categories, we will assume a normal distribution of teacher effects centered on 13. A zero (0) on the conversion chart represents the expected level of growth based on state norms. From this point, we will use the following cut points to assign teachers to categories: Highly Effective: Greater than or equal to .9 standard deviations above average Effective: Less than .9 standard deviations above average and greater than or equal to -.9 standard deviations below average Developing: Less than -.9 standard deviations below average and greater than or equal to -2.1 standard deviations below average Ineffective: Less than -2.1 standard deviations below average For all other assignments listed in 3.12, Every fall, the principal and teacher will review prior-year and pre-assessment data, to identify areas where improved student achievement is needed. The teacher and principal shall collaborate and make a determination on whether to use an overall achievement target or growth SLO for this subcomponent. The teacher and principal, consistent with 3012-c regulations, may utilize a growth SLO so long as it is not used in the same manner as it was for the growth subcomponent.

	Option I: Using pre-assessment or prior-year data, teachers, in collaboration with their principal, will set achievement targets for students. HEDI points will be awarded based on the percent of students meeting or exceeding the achievement target. Option II: Using pre-assessment or prior-year data, teachers in collaboration with principals will set class-wide growth targets for student subgroups. The subgroup(s) measured shall be determined through discussions between the teacher(s) and principal(s). HEDI points will be awarded based on the percent of students meeting or exceeding the growth target. All teachers in the same grade/subject area shall all use the same measure for the local subcomponent. Regardless of the option selected, measures will be rigorous and comparable across classrooms. The HEDI table attached to 3.13 illustrates how teachers may receive 0–20 scores in this subcomponent.
Highly Effective (18 - 20 points) Results are well above District- or BOCES -adopted expectations for growth or achievement for grade/subject.	For assignments listed in 3.12 with Measures of Academic Progress and Measures for Academic Progress for Primary Grades, within the category of Highly Effective, those teachers who fall at greater than or equal to .9 standard deviations above average, we further divide the distribution to determine specific points. For all other assignments listed in 3.12, results are well-above District expectations for students attaining growth targets or achievement targets of NYS Standards for each grade/subject. 85% or more of a teacher's students would meet this expectation to be considered highly-effective.
Effective (9 - 17 points) Results meet District- or BOCES-adopted expectations for growth or achievement for grade/subject.	For assignments listed in 3.12 with Measures of Academic Progress and Measures for Academic Progress for Primary Grades, within the category of Effective, those teachers who fall at less than .9 standard deviations above average and greater than or equal to -.9 standard deviations below average, we further divide the distribution to determine specific points. For all other assignments listed in 3.12, results meet District expectations for students attaining growth targets or achievement targets of NYS Standards for each grade/subject. 60%–84% of a teacher's students would meet this expectation to be considered effective.
Developing (3 - 8 points) Results are below District- or BOCES-adopted expectations for growth or achievement for grade/subject.	For assignments listed in 3.12 with Measures of Academic Progress and Measures for Academic Progress for Primary Grades, within the category of Developing, those teachers who fall at less than -.9 standard deviations below average and greater than or equal to -2.1 standard deviations below average, we further divide the distribution to determine specific points. For all other assignments listed in 3.12, results do not meet District expectations for students attaining growth targets or achievement targets of NYS Standards for each grade/subject. 25%–59% of a teacher's students would meet this expectation to be considered developing.
Ineffective (0 - 2 points) Results are well below District- or BOCES-adopted expectations for growth or achievement for grade/subject.	For assignments listed in 3.12 with Measures of Academic Progress and Measures for Academic Progress for Primary Grades, within the category of Ineffective, those teachers who fall at less than -2.1 standard deviations below average, we

further divide the distribution to determine specific points.

For all other assignments listed in 3.12, results are far below District expectations for students attaining growth targets or achievement targets of NYS Standards for each grade/subject. 24% or fewer of a teacher's students would meet this expectation to be considered ineffective.

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/12149/890944-Rp0Ol6pk1T/3.12 NYSED APPR Portal submission ESL Math and Reading--Fallsburg CSD Oct 2014.pdf

3.13) HEDI Tables or Graphics

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

assets/survey-uploads/12149/890944-y92vNseFa4/3.13 NYSED APPR Portal submission HEDI Tables--Fallsburg CSD Oct 2014.pdf

3.14) Locally Developed Controls

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

This is not applicable.

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.

For classroom teachers with multiple measures, each measure will receive a 0–20 or 0–15 score. The District will weigh each score proportionately based upon the number of students within each measure to result in a single HEDI score for that teacher.

Normal rounding rules will apply.

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
3.16) Assurances | Assure that the amount of time devoted to traditional standardized assessments that are not specifically required by state or federal law for each classroom or program within a grade level does not exceed, in the aggregate, one percent of the minimum in required annual instructional hours for the grade.	Checked
3.16) Assurances | Assure that, as applicable, any third party assessment that is administered to students in kindergarten, first, or second grade, and being used for APPR purposes, is consistent with the State's APPR Assessment Guidance and is not a traditional standardized assessment.	Checked

4. Other Measures of Effectiveness (Teachers)

Created Tuesday, April 30, 2013
Updated Friday, January 30, 2015

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.)

4.1) Teacher Practice Rubric | Rubric	Marshall's Teacher Evaluation Rubric (2014 Edition)

Second Rubric, if applicable	(No response)

4.2) Points Within Other Measures

State the number of points (if any) that will be assigned to each of the following measures, making sure that the points total 60. If you are not using a particular measure, enter 0. This APPR form only provides one space for assigning points within other measures for teachers. If your district/BOCES prefers to assign points differently for different groups of teachers, enter the points assignment for one group of teachers below. For the other group(s) of teachers, fill out copies of this form and upload as an attachment for review. Is the following points assignment applicable to all teachers?

Yes

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

(No response)

Multiple (at least two) classroom observations by principal or other trained administrator, at least one of which must be unannounced [at least 31 points]	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, label accordingly, and combine them into a single file, and upload as an attachment for review. Click here for a downloadable copy of Form 4.2. (MS Word)

(No response)

4.3) Survey Tools (if applicable)

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

(No response)

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

[SurveyTools.0] Tripod Early Elementary Student Perception Survey K-2	(No response)
[SurveyTools.1] Tripod Elementary Student Perception Survey 3-5	(No response)
[SurveyTools.2] Tripod Secondary Student Perception Survey	(No response)
[SurveyTools.3] District Variance	(No response)
[SurveyTools.4] My Student Survey, LLC's Survey of Teacher Practice (STeP) survey for use in grades 3-12	(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.

Evaluators will gather and rate information taken from classroom observations (6 unannounced walk-throughs) and structured evidence (unit plans, lesson plans, and teacher portfolio) to inform ratings on Marshall's Teacher Evaluation Rubric. Every NYS Teaching Standard will be evaluated and measured through classroom observations and evidence collection. The attached "Calculating the Score of Professional Practice 60%" document shows how every standard is accounted for.

On the Marshall Rubric every subcomponent within each domain will be scored. All of the points awarded in the multiple measures of effectiveness score (60 points) will come directly from the observation process and the collaborative review of the evidence provided to the evaluator and by the teacher during their APPR meeting. At the close of each observation, the teacher shall meet with his/her lead evaluator to discuss the evidence gathered. This evidence will be added to Marshall's "Four Square" document for post-observation comments. Each teacher shall receive a minimum of 6 official mini-observations.

Once all observations and post-observation conferences have been held, the teacher and lead evaluator will meet to discuss the

evidence gathered through the observation process and score each sub-component found on the rubric. The following process will be used to calculate the number of points awarded for each domain:
Highly Effective indicators will receive 4 points
Effective indicators will receive 3 points
Improvement Necessary indicators (Developing) will receive 2 points
Does Not Meet Standard indicators (Ineffective) will receive 1 point

Each domain will receive a score based on the total number of points divided by the number of subcomponents within each domain (10). The six domain scores will be averaged to determine the overall rating. The distribution of the 60 points will be determined using the “Fallsburg CSD Teacher Conversion Scale for Multiple Measures (0–60).” The score for each subcomponent will be assigned holistically based on all evidence collected and observed over the course of the school year.

While "ineffectives" are scored at a one (1), if a teacher received a "Total Average Rubric Score" of 1.000, he/she would receive a "0" out of 60. In the conversion chart, the ineffective rating was expanded to allow all of the available 60 points to be attainable, pursuant to NYSED regulations. Each category conversion was calculated based upon the possible number of rubric scores and the number of subcomponent points within each category.

Evaluators may elect not to score the following standard indicators (Marshall Teacher Evaluation Rubric, 2014), if they felt the indicator was not applicable to the lessons observed: Domain E.f : “Homework.”

The overall composite score shall be reported in whole-numbers. The rubric scores are the minimum scores necessary to obtain the corresponding HEDI points. In the event that a HEDI score ends in a decimal, normal rounding rules will apply. However, in no event will a teacher's HEDI rating category change as a result of rounding.

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/12179/890945-eka9yMJ855/FTA APPR--Calculating Score of Professional Practice 60%--Oct 2014.pdf

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.	To obtain a Highly Effective rating, results will be well-above District expectations for overall performance and exceed NYS Teaching Standards. The teacher has earned a rating of 59 to 60 points for achieving an average rubric score of 3.5 to 4.0 as measured across the six domains of the Marshall Teacher Evaluation rubric.
Effective: Overall performance and results meet NYS Teaching Standards.	To obtain an Effective rating, results will meet District expectations for overall performance and NYS Teaching Standards. The teacher has earned a rating of 57 to 58 points for achieving an average rubric score of 2.5 to 3.4 as measured across the six domains of the Marshall Teacher Evaluation rubric.
Developing: Overall performance and results need improvement in order to meet NYS Teaching Standards.	To obtain a Developing rating, results will not meet District expectations for overall performance and NYS Teaching Standards. The teacher has earned a rating of 50 to 56 points for achieving an average rubric score of 1.5 to 2.4 as measured across the six domains of the Marshall Teacher Evaluation rubric.
Ineffective: Overall performance and results do not meet NYS Teaching Standards.	To obtain an Ineffective rating, results will fall far below District expectations for overall performance and NYS Teaching Standards. The teacher has earned a rating of 0 to 49 points for achieving an average rubric score of 1.0 to 1.4 as measured across the six domains of the Marshall Teacher Evaluation rubric.

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

Formal/Long	0
Informal/Short	6
Enter Total	6

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?

- Not Applicable

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

Formal/Long	0

Informal/Short	6
Total	6

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?

- Not Applicable

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

- In Person

5. Composite Scoring (Teachers)

Created Tuesday, April 30, 2013
Updated Wednesday, October 22, 2014

Page 1

Standards for Rating Categories

Growth or Comparable Measures

Locally-selected Measures of growth or achievement

Other Measures of Effectiveness (Teacher and Leader standards)

Highly Effective

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

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

Overall performance and results exceed NYS Teaching Standards.

Effective

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

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

Overall performance and results meet NYS Teaching Standards.

Developing

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

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

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

Ineffective

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

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

Overall performance and results do not meet NYS Teaching Standards.

The Commissioner shall review the specific scoring ranges for each of the rating categories annually before the start of each school year and shall recommend any changes to the Board of Regents for consideration.

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

Where there is no Value-Added measure

	Growth or Comparable Measures	Locally-selected Measures of growth or achievement	Other Measures of Effectiveness (60 points)	Overall Composite Score
Highly Effective	18-20	18-20	Ranges determined locally--see below	91-100
Effective	9-17	9-17		75-90
Developing	3-8	3-8		65-74
Ineffective	0-2	0-2		0-64

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

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

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

Where Value-Added growth measure applies
Growth or Comparable Measures
Locally-selected Measures of
growth or achievement
Other Measures of Effectiveness
(60 points)

Overall
Composite Score

Highly Effective
22-25
14-15
Ranges determined locally--see above
91-100

Effective
10-21
8-13
75-90

Developing
3-9
3-7
65-74

Ineffective
0-2
0-2
0-64

6. Additional Requirements - Teachers

Created Tuesday, April 30, 2013
Updated Friday, February 13, 2015

Page 1

6.1) Assurances -- Improvement Plans

Please check the boxes below:

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

6.2) Attachment: Teacher Improvement Plan Forms

As a required attachment to this APPR plan, upload the TIP forms that are used in the school district or BOCES. All TIP plans must include: 1) identification of needed areas of improvement, 2) a timeline for achieving improvement, 3) the manner in which the improvement will be assessed, and, where appropriate, 4) differentiated activities to support a teacher's improvement in those areas. For a list of supported file types, go to the Resources folder (above) and click Technical Tips. Please be sure to update a document with a form layout, with fillable spaces and not just a narrative.

assets/survey-uploads/5265/256153-Df0w3Xx5v6/Fallsburg CSD APPR TIP Template--2012–13.pdf

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:

(A) APPEALS OF INEFFECTIVE AND DEVELOPING RATINGS ONLY
Appeals of annual professional performance reviews are limited to teachers who receive a composite rating of ineffective or developing. Probationary teachers may not appeal their APPRs beyond the Superintendent’s level (section (G).4, below). All appeals will be handled in a timely and expeditious manner.

(B) WHAT MAY BE CHALLENGED IN AN APPEAL
Appeal procedures are limited to the following subjects:
(1) The substance of the annual professional performance review;
(2) The District's adherence to the standards and methodologies required for such reviews, pursuant to Education Law §3012-c;
(3) The adherence to the Commissioner's regulations, as applicable to such reviews;
(4) Compliance with any applicable locally negotiated procedures applicable to annual professional performance reviews or improvement plans; and
(5) The District's issuance and/or implementation of the terms of the teacher improvement plan under Education Law §3012-c.

(C) PROHIBITION AGAINST MORE THAN ONE APPEAL
A teacher may not file multiple appeals regarding the same performance review or teacher improvement plan. All grounds for appeal must be raised with specificity within one appeal. Any grounds not raised at the time the appeal is filed shall be deemed waived.

(D) BURDEN OF PROOF
The appealing teacher has the burden of demonstrating a clear legal right to the relief requested and the burden of establishing the facts upon which petitioner seeks relief.

(E) TIMEFRAME FOR FILING APPEAL
All appeals must be submitted in writing no later than 10 business days of the date when the teacher receives his or her composite APPR rating. The failure to file an appeal within these timeframes shall be deemed a waiver of the right to appeal and the appeal shall be deemed abandoned.

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

(F) TIMEFRAME FOR DISTRICT RESPONSE
Within 10 business days of receipt of an appeal, the District evaluator(s) who issued the performance review or are responsible for either the issuance and/or implementation of the terms of the teacher's improvement plan must submit a detailed written response to the appeal.

The response must include any and all additional documents or written materials specific to the point(s) of disagreement in the response and are relevant to the resolution of the appeal. Any such information that is not submitted at the time the response is filed shall not be considered in the deliberations related to the resolution of the appeal.

The teacher initiating the appeal shall receive a copy of the response and any and all additional information submitted with the response as soon as practicable but in no case later than one day after the response is filed.

Should the appealing teacher seek to continue the appeal, he or she must notify, in writing, his or her intent to do so with the APPR Appeals Committee no later than five (5) business days of receiving the evaluator's written response. The failure to file this notification within this timeframe shall deem the appeal abandoned.

(G) DECISION-MAKER ON APPEAL
1. There shall be an ad hoc APPR Appeals Committee consisting of four members:
a. Two certified, full-time administrators, certified as lead evaluators, appointed by the Superintendent. Neither administrator appointed shall be the lead evaluator of the appealing teacher.
b. Two tenured teachers appointed by the President of the Association or his/her designee.
2. The Committee will convene within five (5) business days of receipt of the appealing teacher's written request to continue the appeal.
a. The Committee will evaluate the merits of the appeal based solely on review of written documentation.
b. Each committee member will author a finding on the appeal, based upon the evidence submitted. This finding will contain citations of the evidence that support the committee member's decision.
c. Should a majority of the committee rule in favor of the appeal, the appeal will be granted.
d. A single written determination shall be prepared and issued. This determination shall be provided to the appealing teacher, evaluating administrator (and/or the person responsible for issuing or implementing the terms of an improvement plan), FTA president, and the Superintendent of Schools within twenty (20) business days after the initial Committee meeting.

3. Should the appealing teacher disagree with the Committee's determination, he or she may continue the appeal with the Superintendent of Schools. To do so, the appealing teacher must submit his or her intent to continue the appeal in writing to the Superintendent, no later than five (5) business days after receipt of the Committee's determination.

4. A decision shall be rendered by the Superintendent of Schools and provided to the appealing teacher, in writing, no later than five (5) business days of receiving the appealing teacher's written intent to continue the appeal.

a. A copy of the Superintendent's decision shall also be provided to the evaluator and/or the person responsible for issuing or implementing the terms of an improvement plan.
b. This decision shall be final.

(H) EXCLUSIVITY OF SECTION 3012-C APPEAL PROCEDURE
The 3012-c appeal procedure shall constitute the exclusive means for initiating, reviewing and resolving any and all challenges and appeals related to a teacher performance review and/or improvement plan. A teacher may not resort to any other contractual grievance procedures for the resolution of challenges and appeals related to a professional performance review and/or improvement plan, except as otherwise authorized by law.

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

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

Fallsburg CSD will ensure that all evaluators/lead evaluators are properly trained and certified to complete an individual's APPR using the Marshall Teacher Evaluation Rubrics (2014). Initial Lead Evaluator training will be conducted by facilitators familiar with the New York State Education Department model certification process incorporating the regulations that were enacted to implement Education Law 3012-c. Certification training shall include a one-hour online course covering the required NYS nine criteria as listed below. The second part of the training will include a 4 hour in-class evidence collection session, which includes inter-rater reliability. Participants will need to complete their evidence collection independently (minimum of 1-2 hours) in order to submit final evidence collection observation.

This training will include the following requirements for lead evaluators/ evaluators:
(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
(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 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

Evaluators and lead evaluators will be re-certified every three years. Re-certification training will be the same as the training described above.

The Fallsburg CSD Administrative Council will meet monthly to maintain inter-rater reliability over time. These meetings ensure and enhance
inter-rater reliability by having evaluators compare sample evidence gathered and their evaluation techniques using the rubric, coming to agreement as to best practices in scoring the rubric. Training is also provided by district administration on the use of My Learning Plan's OASYS, the electronic platform for the Marshall Rubric and other APPR forms.

The Superintendent or Board of Education will certify (and re-certify) all evaluators and lead evaluators.

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 Tuesday, April 30, 2013
Updated Wednesday, October 22, 2014

Page 1

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

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

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

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

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

PK-6
7-12

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

Please check the boxes below:

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

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

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

If any grade/course in the building has a State-provided growth measure AND the principal must have SLOs because fewer than 30% of students in the building are covered, then the SLOs will begin first with the SGP/VA results.
Additional SLOs will then be set based on grades/subjects with State assessments, where applicable.
If additional SLOs are necessary, principals must begin with the grade(s)/courses(s) that have the largest number of students using school-wide student results from one of the following assessment options: State-approved 3rd party or district/regional/BOCES-developed assessments that are rigorous and comparable across classrooms.

State assessments, required if one exists
District, regional, or BOCES-developed assessments that are rigorous and comparable across classrooms
List of State-approved 3rd party assessments

First, list the grade configuration of the school or program the SLO applies to. Then, using the drop-down boxes below, please select the type of assessment that will be used for SLOs for the school/program listed. Finally, name the specific assessment listing the full name of the assessment. Districts or BOCES that intend to use a district, regional, or BOCES-developed assessment must include the name, grade, and subject of the assessment in the following format: "[Name of your District/Region/BOCES] developed [Grade] [Subject] Assessment." For example, a BOCES-developed 7th grade Social Studies assessment would be written as follows: "GVEP-Developed Grade 7 Social Studies Assessment." For State-approved 3rd party assessments, please include the name of the assessment exactly as it appears in RED on the State-approved list. For State assessments or Regents examinations, please indicate as such in the assessment name.

Please note that no APPR plan shall be approved by the Commissioner for use in the 2014-2015 school year or thereafter that provides for the administration of traditional standardized assessments for use with students in kindergarten through grade two for APPR purposes (see:
http://www.engageny.org/resource/guidance-on-the-approved-regulatory-amendments-to-appr-to-help-reduce-local-testing).

Please also note that, for students using 3d party assessments in this Task, the 2nd drop-down option applies to grades 3 and above and the 4th drop-down option applies to grades K-2.

	School or Program Type	SLO with Assessment Option	Name of the Assessment
	Not applicable		

Describe the district-adopted expectations for the level of performance required for each HEDI rating category and the process for assigning points to principals based on SLO results, consistent with regulations and assurances in the Comparable Growth Measures subcomponent. Include any district-determined expectations for student performance. Please describe the process your district is using to measure student growth on the assessments listed for this Task. If applicable, please also include a description of the process for combining the State-provided growth score with the SLO(s) for this Task.

Use this box, if needed, to describe the process for assigning HEDI categories in this subcomponent. If needed, you may upload a table or graphic below.	Not applicable
Highly Effective (18 - 20 points) Results are well above state average for similar students (or District goals if no state test).	Not applicable
Effective (9 - 17 points) Results meet state average for similar students (or District goals if no state test).	Not applicable
Developing (3 - 8 points) Results are below state average for similar students (or District goals if no state test).	Not applicable

Ineffective (0 - 2 points) Results are well below state average for similar students (or District goals if no state test).	Not applicable

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

Note: The only allowable controls or adjustments for Comparable Growth Measures are the following: prior student achievement results, students with disabilities, English language learners, and students in poverty.

(No response)

7.5) Principals with More Than One Growth Measure

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

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

7.6) Assurances -- Comparable Growth Measures

Please check all of the boxes below:

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

7.6) Assurances -- Comparable Growth Measures | Assure that the amount of time devoted to traditional standardized assessments that are not specifically required by state or federal law for each classroom or program within a grade level does not exceed, in the aggregate, one percent of the minimum required annual instructional hours for the grade.	Checked
7.6) Assurances -- Comparable Growth Measures | Assure that, as applicable, any third party assessment that is administered to students in kindergarten, first, or second grade, and being used for APPR purposes, is consistent with the State's APPR Assessment Guidance and is not a traditional standardized assessment.	Checked

8. Local Measures (Principals)

Created Tuesday, April 30, 2013
Updated Friday, December 12, 2014

Page 1

Locally-Selected Measures of Student Achievement or Growth

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

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

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

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

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

Also note: no APPR plan shall be approved by the Commissioner for use in the 2014-2015 school year or thereafter that provides for the administration of traditional standardized assessments for use with students in kindergarten through grade two for APPR purposes (see: http://www.engageny.org/resource/guidance-on-the-approved-regulatory-amendments-to-appr-to-help-reduce-local-testing).

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

	Grade Configuration/Program	Locally-Selected Measure from List of Approved Measures	Assessment
	K–6	(d) measures used by district for teacher evaluation	NWEA's Measures of Academic Progress (ELA and math) and Measures for Academic Progress for Primary Grades (ELA and math) in grades K–6
	7–12	(d) measures used by district for teacher evaluation	NWEA's Measures of Academic Progress (ELA and math) in grades 7–11

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.	The Fallsburg Central School District will establish HEDI categories based on percentages of students who attain their growth targets in NWEA Measures of Academic Progress assessments to calculate principal effectiveness ratings for the locally selected measures of student growth in ELA and math. The principals and superintendent for will establish individual student growth targets based on the fall MAP (ELA and math) and MAP for Primary Grades (ELA & math). Targets will be approved by the superintendent. Based on the building-wide percent of students attaining their growth targets on the spring assessments, principals will be assigned a score based on the District's HEDI scale.
Highly Effective (14 - 15 points) Results are well above District- or BOCES-adopted expectations for growth or achievement for grade/subject.	See uploaded scales in 8.1.
Effective (8- 13 points) Results meet District- or BOCES-adopted expectations for growth or achievement for grade/subject.	See uploaded scales in 8.1.

Developing (3 - 7 points) Results are below District- or BOCES-adopted expectations for growth or achievement for grade/subject.	See uploaded scales in 8.1.
Ineffective (0 - 2 points) Results are well below District- or BOCES-adopted expectations for growth or achievement for grade/subject.	See uploaded scales in 8.1.

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

(No response)

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

assets/survey-uploads/12190/890949-qBFVOWF7fC/Fallsburg CSD HEDI Scales for NWEA MAP--2013–14_4.pdf

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

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

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

Also note: no APPR plan shall be approved by the Commissioner for use in the 2014-2015 school year or thereafter that provides for the administration of traditional standardized assessments for use with students in kindergarten through grade two for APPR purposes (see: http://www.engageny.org/resource/guidance-on-the-approved-regulatory-amendments-to-appr-to-help-reduce-local-testing).

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
	Not applicable		

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.	Not applicable
Highly Effective (18 - 20 points) Results are well above District- or BOCES-adopted expectations for growth or achievement for grade/subject.	Not applicable
Effective (9- 17 points) Results meet District- or BOCES-adopted expectations for growth or achievement for grade/subject.	Not applicable
Developing (3 - 8 points) Results are below District- or BOCES-adopted expectations for growth or achievement for grade/subject.	Not applicable
Ineffective (0 - 2 points) Results are well below District- or BOCES-adopted expectations for growth or achievement for grade/subject.	Not applicable

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

(No response)

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

(No response)

8.3) Locally Developed Controls

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

Not applicable

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.

Not applicable.

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
8.5) Assurances | Assure that the amount of time devoted to traditional standardized assessments that are not specifically required by state or federal law for each classroom or program within a grade level does not exceed, in the aggregate, one percent of the minimum required annual instructional hours for the grade.	Check
8.5) Assurances | Assure that, as applicable, any third party assessment that is administered to students in kindergarten, first, or second grade, and being used for APPR purposes, is consistent with the State's APPR Assessment Guidance and is not a traditional standardized assessment.	Check

9. Other Measures of Effectiveness (Principals)

Created Tuesday, April 30, 2013
Updated Wednesday, January 14, 2015

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.

9.1) Principal Practice Rubric | Rubric	Marshall's Principal Evaluation Rubric

Second rubric (if applicable)	(No response)

9.2) Points Within Other Measures

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

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

Is the following point assignment for all principals?

Yes

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

(No response)

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

Broad assessment of principal leadership and management actions based on the practice rubric by the supervisor, a trained administrator or a trained independent evaluator. This must incorporate multiple school visits by supervisor, trained administrator, or trained independent evaluator, at least one of which must be from a supervisor, and at least one of which must be unannounced. [At least 31 points]	60
Any remaining points shall be assigned based on results of one or more ambitious and measurable goals set collaboratively with principals and their superintendents or district superintendents.	0

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

downloadable copy of Form 9.2. (MS Word)

(No response)

9.3) Assurances -- Goals

Please check the boxes below if assigning any points to "ambitious and measurable goals":

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

9.4) Sources of Evidence (if applicable)

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

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

9.5) Survey Tool(s) (if applicable)

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

(No response)

Note: When the State-approved survey list is updated, this list will be updated within the drop-down menu of approved survey tools.

Principal Evaluation Tripod School Perception Survey for Teachers	(No response)
K12 Insight Student Survey (Grades 3-5) for Principal Evaluation in New York	(No response)
K12 Insight Student Survey (Grades 6-12) for Principal Evaluation in New York	(No response)
K12 Insight Parent Survey for Principal Evaluation in New York	(No response)
K12 Insight Teacher/Staff Survey for Principal Evaluation in New York	(No response)
District variance	(No response)
Principal Evaluation Tripod School Perception Survey (Combined Parent Survey)	(No response)
Principal Evaluation Tripod School Perception Survey (Combined Student Surveys)	(No response)
NYC School Survey-2012 Parent Survey	(No response)
NYC School Survey-2012 Student Survey	(No response)

NYC School Survey-2012 Teacher Survey	(No response)

9.6) Assurances

Please check all of the boxes below:

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

9.7) Process for Assigning Points and Determining HEDI Ratings

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

Lead evaluators of principals will regularly monitor and collect evidence from school principals, and code them according to the domains of the ISLLC standards and Marshall rubric. Principals will receive a mid-term formative benchmark, using the Marshall rubric, where they will receive a tentative rating for the school year until that point (e.g., January). Principals, with the lead evaluator, will receive an annual review at the end of the school year.

Using the Marshall rubric for principal evaluation, the superintendent will identify each of the the areas and criteria, circle or highlight this performance indicator, and record all scores on the summary sheet with the overall comments. The final score for each domain will be assigned based on all of the evidence collected and observed over the course of the school year.

Principals will have 60% of their APPR derived from their scores on these rubrics. Each domain contains 10 criteria, with each criteria rated on a four-point scale (highly effective, effective, improvement necessary, and does not meet standards). Principals will be annually assessed on every criteria of each domain. Scoring is as follows:
Highly effective: 4 points
Effective: 3 points
Improvement necessary: 2 point
Does not meet standards: 1 points

From these scores, overall domain scores (ODS) will be developed by averaging the scores of all criteria in a given domain. A mean ODS (MODS) will then be found by averaging the ODS of all six (6) domains. All averages will be rounded to the nearest hundredth.

To determine the principal's score, out of 60 points (maximum), the MODS will be applied to the attached "FAA conversion chart" (0–60). This converted score will then be applied to the following HEDI rating scale, consistent with §3012-c regulations. While "ineffectives" are scored at a one (1), if a principal received a "Total Average Rubric Score" of 1.000 (see p. 1 of the "FAA conversion chart" attachment), he/she would receive a "0" out of 60.

The overall composite score shall be reported in whole-numbers. The rubric scores are the minimum scores necessary to obtain the corresponding HEDI points. In the event that a HEDI score ends in a decimal, normal rounding rules will apply. However, in no event will a principal's HEDI rating category change as a result of rounding.

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

assets/survey-uploads/5143/247969-pMADJ4gk6R/FAA conversion chart--Dec 2012.pdf

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.	Professional practice at the Highly Effective level is reserved for truly outstanding leadership as described by the very demanding criteria set forth at this level in Marshall's Principal Evaluation Rubric. This level is that of a master administrator whose practices exceed effective standards.
Effective: Overall performance and results meet standards.	Professional practice at the Effective level demonstrates a thorough knowledge and application of all aspects of building administration. Principals at this level thoroughly understand academic content, curriculum, supervision of students and staff.
Developing: Overall performance and results need improvement in order to meet standards.	Professional practice at the Developing level demonstrates a moderate understanding and application of the necessary supervisory skills outlined in Marshall's Principal Evaluation Rubric. This reflects a rudimentary implementation of school administration and supervisory skills.
Ineffective: Overall performance and results do not meet standards.	Professional practice at the Ineffective level does not demonstrate an understanding or application of the underlying concepts of school administration and supervision. This level of practice is unsatisfactory and inefficient. It is detrimental to a professional learning environment.

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	1
By trained administrator	1
By trained independent evaluator	0
Enter Total	2

Tenured Principals

By supervisor	1
By trained administrator	1
By trained independent evaluator	0
Enter Total	2

10. Composite Scoring (Principals)

Created Tuesday, April 30, 2013
Updated Wednesday, October 22, 2014

Page 1

Standards for Rating Categories

Growth or Comparable Measures

Locally-selected Measures of growth or achievement

Other Measures of Effectiveness (Teacher and Leader standards)

Highly Effective

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

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

Overall performance and results exceed ISLLC leadership standards.

Effective

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

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

Overall performance and results meet ISLLC leadership standards.

Developing

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

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

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

Ineffective

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

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

Overall performance and results do not meet ISLLC leadership standards.

The Commissioner shall review the specific scoring ranges for each of the rating categories annually before the start of each school year and shall recommend any changes to the Board of Regents for consideration.

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

Where there is no Value-Added measure

	Growth or Comparable Measures	Locally-selected Measures of growth or achievement	Other Measures of Effectiveness (60 points)	Overall Composite Score
Highly Effective	18-20	18-20	Ranges determined locally--see below	91-100
Effective	9-17	9-17		75-90
Developing	3-8	3-8		65-74
Ineffective	0-2	0-2		0-64

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

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

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

Where Value-Added growth measure applies
Growth or Comparable Measures
Locally-selected Measures of
growth or achievement
Other Measures of Effectiveness
(60 points)

Overall
Composite Score

Highly Effective
22-25
14-15
Ranges determined locally--see above
91-100

Effective
10-21
8-13
75-90

Developing
3-9
3-7
65-74

Ineffective
0-2
0-2
0-64

11. Additional Requirements - Principals

Created Tuesday, April 30, 2013
Updated Wednesday, October 22, 2014

Page 1

11.1) Assurances -- Improvement Plans

Please check the boxes below.

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

11.2) Attachment: Principal Improvement Plan Forms

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

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

assets/survey-uploads/5276/247986-Df0w3Xx5v6/Fallsburg CSD APPR AIP Template--2012–13.pdf

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:

(A) APPEALS OF INEFFECTIVE AND DEVELOPING RATINGS ONLY
Appeals of annual professional performance reviews are limited to tenured principals who receive a composite rating of ineffective or developing. Probationary principals may not appeal their APPRs. All appeals will be handled in a timely and expeditious manner.

(B) WHAT MAY BE CHALLENGED IN AN APPEAL

Appeal procedures are limited to the following subjects:
(1) The substance of the annual professional performance review;
(2) The District's adherence to the standards and methodologies required for such reviews, pursuant to Education Law §3012-c;
(2) The adherence to the Commissioner's regulations, as applicable to such reviews;
(3) Compliance with any applicable locally negotiated procedures applicable to annual professional performance reviews or improvement plans; and
(4) The District's issuance and/or implementation of the terms of the administrator improvement plan under Education Law §3012-c.

(C) PROHIBITION AGAINST MORE THAN ONE APPEAL
A principal may not file multiple appeals regarding the same performance review or administrator improvement plan. All grounds for appeal must be raised with specificity within one appeal. Any grounds not raised at the time the appeal is filed shall be deemed waived.

(D) BURDEN OF PROOF
The appealing principal has the burden of demonstrating a clear legal right to the relief requested and the burden of establishing the facts upon which petitioner seeks relief.

(E) TIMEFRAME FOR FILING APPEAL
All appeals must be submitted in writing no later than 10 business days of the date when the principal receives his or her composite APPR rating. The composite rating will be issued to the principal by September 1. This appeal must be submitted to the lead evaluator of the APPR. The failure to file an appeal within these timeframes shall be deemed a waiver of the right to appeal and the appeal shall be deemed abandoned.

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

(F) TIMEFRAME FOR DISTRICT RESPONSE
(1) Tier I Appeal
Within 10 business days of receipt of an appeal, the District lead evaluator who issued the APPR or is responsible for either the issuance and/or implementation of the terms of the administrator's improvement plan must submit a detailed written response to the appeal.

The response must include any and all additional documents or written materials specific to the point(s) of disagreement in the response and are relevant to the resolution of the appeal. Any such information that is not submitted at the time the response is filed shall not be considered in the deliberations related to the resolution of the appeal.

The principal initiating the appeal shall receive a copy of the response and any and all additional information submitted with the response as soon as practicable but in no case later than one day after the response is filed.

Should the appealing principal seek to continue the appeal, he or she must notify, in writing, his or her intent to do so with the Superintendent of Schools no later than five (5) business days of receiving the lead evaluator's written response. The failure to file this notification within this timeframe shall deem the appeal abandoned.

(2) Tier II Appeal
Within three business days of receipt of the principal's written request to continue the appeal (after Tier I), the Superintendent shall notify the Sullivan County BOCES District Superintendent of the request. The BOCES Superintendent, or his/her designee, shall review all materials provided by the principal and the District, as it relates to the principal's APPR. The BOCES Superintendent, or his/her designee, shall provide the District and principal with a determination no later than ten (10) school days after he/she received notice of the appeal's continuance (from the Fallsburg Superintendent).

A copy of the SC BOCES Superintendent's decision shall also be provided to the lead evaluator and/or the person responsible for issuing or implementing the terms of an improvement plan.

The SC BOCES District Superintendent will:
a. Uphold the principal's appeal
b. Uphold the principal's appeal, with exceptions and modifications, or
c. Deny the appeal

In the event the SC BOCES Superintendent upholds the principal's appeal, that determination shall be final, pending the review and acceptance by the Fallsburg CSD Superintendent. The Fallsburg CSD Superintendent's review, at this stage, will be for the sole purpose of ensuring that the appeals processes in Tier I and Tier II were followed, as detailed above.

Should the SC BOCES Superintendent deny the appeal and the appealing principal seeks to continue the appeal, he/she must submit, in writing, a request to do so with the Fallsburg CSD Superintendent of Schools no later than five (5) school days after receipt of the BOCES Superintendent's determination.

(3) Tier III Appeal
A decision shall be rendered by the Superintendent of Schools and provided to the appealing principal, in writing, no later than five (5) business days of receiving the appealing principal's written intent to continue the appeal (after Tier II).

A copy of the Superintendent's decision shall also be provided to the lead evaluator and/or the person responsible for issuing or implementing the terms of an improvement plan. This decision shall be final.

(H) EXCLUSIVITY OF SECTION 3012-C APPEAL PROCEDURE
The 3012-c appeal procedure shall constitute the exclusive means for initiating, reviewing and resolving any and all challenges and appeals related to a principal's performance review and/or improvement plan. A principal may not resort to any other contractual grievance procedures for the resolution of challenges and appeals related to a professional performance review and/or improvement plan, except as otherwise authorized by law.

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

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

The Fallsburg Central School District has provided its lead evaluators of principals extensive professional development on the ISLLC Standards, Marshall's Principal Evaluation Rubrics, and NYSED's 3012c regulations. Some of these workshops included the following:

a. VAL-ED ISLLC Standards Training (October 2011, Albany, NY; 2 days)
b. Marshall Principal Evaluation Rubrics Training (June 2012, Goshen, NY; December 2012, Albany, NY; 2 days)
c. Various leadership debriefings, trainings, and meetings throughout 2011–12 and 2012–13 at Sullivan County BOCES
d. Various leadership debriefings, trainings, and meetings throughout 2011–12 and 2012–13 at the New York State Council of School Superintendents' (NYSCOSS) leadership institutes (Fall and Winter; 4 days/year)
e. NWEA-Value Added Research Council Advisory Committee meetings (4 days, from May 2012–December 2012) to review usage of value-added results of the Measures of Academic Progress

The District's lead evaluators regularly review and discuss the components of the 60-20-20 and 60-25-15 principal APPR model. The District will annually require lead evaluators to submit evidence that they have completed all required training, per NYSED guidance and regulations, to be certified, or re-certified, as lead evaluators by the Fallsburg Board of Education. The District's lead evaluators will be annually certified by the Fallsburg Central School District Board of Education. All new evaluators will receive training that addresses the nine elements found in 30-2.9b in the Regents rules. New evaluators will receive approximately 10 hours of training.

The District ensures inter-rater reliability by holding monthly reviews, among evaluators, of evidence collected from its principals; scoring the evidence based on the Kim Marshall Principal Evaluation Rubric; and reviewing their results. Fallsburg evaluators will also seek regular follow-up training, as needed, with Kim Marshall regarding the use and application of his Rubric.

11.5) Assurances -- Evaluators

Please check the boxes below:

- Checked

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

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

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

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

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

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

(7) use of the Statewide Instructional Reporting System

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

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

- Checked

11.6) Assurances -- Principals

Please check all of the boxes below:

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

11.7) Assurances -- Data

Please check all of the boxes below:

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

12. Joint Certification of APPR Plan

Created Tuesday, November 25, 2014
Updated Friday, February 20, 2015

Page 1

12.1)Upload the Joint Certification of the APPR Plan

Please obtain the required signatures, create a PDF file, and upload your joint certification of the APPR Plan using this form: APPR District Certification Form. Please note that Review Room timestamps each revision and signatures cannot be dated earlier than the last revision.

assets/survey-uploads/12158/2061693-3Uqgn5g9Iu/Fallsburg CSD APPR signed certification--Feb 2015.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.

Form 2.10) All Other Courses

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

	Course(s) or Subject(s)	Option	Assessment
	Math AIS, grades KG–1	○ State Assessment √ 3rd party non-traditional standardized assessment that meets NYSED guidance requirements ○ District, Regional or BOCES-developed ○ School/BOCES-wide/group/team results based on State	Measures of Academic Progress for Primary Grades (math)
	Math AIS, 2nd grade	○ State Assessment √ 3rd party non-traditional standardized assessment that meets NYSED guidance requirements ○ District, Regional or BOCES-developed ○ School/BOCES-wide/group/team results based on State	Measures of Academic Progress (Math)
	Math AIS, 3rd grade	√ State Assessment ○ State-approved 3rd party assessment ○ District, Regional or BOCES-developed ○ School/BOCES-wide/group/team results based on State	NYS 3rd Grade NYS Math Assessment
		○ State Assessment ○ State-approved 3rd party assessment ○ District, Regional or BOCES-developed ○ School/BOCES-wide/group/team results based	

		on State	

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

Use this box, if needed, to describe the general process for assigning HEDI categories for these grades/subjects in this subcomponent. If needed, you may upload a table or graphic at 2.11.	Principal and teacher will examine fall or spring (prior year) benchmark data to set targets for student growth. Measures of Academic Progress (2nd grade) and Measures of Academic Progress for Primary Grades (KG–1) establish individual student fall-to-spring growth targets in ELA and math. Teachers will be expected to create individual or growth targets for students based on spring (prior year) or fall benchmark/pre-assessment results in their related subject area. The principal will be approving the targets set by teachers in his or her building. The HEDI table attached to 2.11 illustrates how teachers may receive 0–20 scores in this subcomponent.
Highly Effective (18 - 20 points) Results are well-above District goals for similar students.	Results are well-above District expectations for students attaining growth targets set by Measures of Academic Progress (2nd grade); Measures of Academic Progress for Primary Grades (K–1); or teachers and principals based on a review of spring (prior year) or fall (i.e., beginning of the year) benchmarks of NYS standards for each particular content area. 85% or more of a teacher's students would meet their growth targets to be considered highly-effective.
Effective (9 - 17 points) Results meet District goals for similar students.	Results meet District expectations for students attaining growth targets set by Measures of Academic Progress (2nd grade); Measures of Academic Progress for Primary Grades (K–1); or teachers and principals based on a review of spring (prior year) or fall (i.e., beginning of the year) benchmarks of NYS standards for each particular content area. a. For teachers of reading and math AIS in grades K–

	3: 50%–84% of a teacher's students would meet their growth targets to be considered effective. b. For all other teachers listed in 2.10: 60%–84% of a teacher's students would meet their growth targets to be considered effective.
Developing (3 - 8 points) Results are below District goals for similar students.	Results do not meet District expectations for students attaining growth targets set by Measures of Academic Progress (2nd grade); Measures of Academic Progress for Primary Grades (K–1); or teachers and principals based on a review of spring (prior year) or fall (i.e., beginning of the year) benchmarks of NYS standards for each particular content area. a. For teachers of reading and math AIS in grades K–3: 20%–49% of a teacher's students would meet their growth targets to be considered developing. b. For all other teachers listed in 2.10: 25%–59% of a teacher's students would meet their growth targets to be considered developing.
Ineffective (0 - 2 points) Results are well-below District goals for similar students.	Results are far below District expectations for students attaining growth targets set by Measures of Academic Progress (2nd grade); Measures of Academic Progress for Primary Grades (K–1); or teachers and principals based on a review of spring (prior year) or fall (i.e., beginning of the year) benchmarks of NYS standards for each particular content area. a. For teachers of reading and math AIS in grades K–3: 19% or fewer of a teacher's students would meet their growth targets to be considered ineffective. b. For all other teachers listed in 2.10: 24% or fewer of a teacher's students would meet their growth targets to be considered ineffective.

Fallsburg CSD HEDI Scales for Student Learning Objectives: Measures of Academic Progress

**These bands represent the aggregate percentage of Fallsburg CSD students, KG–11, that attain their growth targets in reading and/or mathematics (MAP and MAP for Primary Grades).*

Highly Effective			Effective									Developing						Ineffective		
20	19	18	17	16	15	14	13	12	11	10	9	8	7	6	5	4	3	2	1	0
90 or higher	88–89	85–87	82–84	79–81	75–78	71–74	66–70	62–65	58–61	54–57	50–53	45–49	40–44	35–39	30–34	25–29	20–24	10–19	1–9	0

Fallsburg CSD HEDI Scales for Student Learning Objectives: 3rd Grade NYS Assessments

Highly Effective			Effective									Developing						Ineffective		
20	19	18	17	16	15	14	13	12	11	10	9	8	7	6	5	4	3	2	1	0
89 or higher	87–88	85–86	83–84	81–82	79–80	75–78	70–74	65–69	60–64	55–59	50–54	45–49	40–44	35–39	30–34	25–29	20–24	11–19	1–10	0

Fallsburg CSD HEDI Scales for Student Learning Objectives: Regents, NYSESLAT, and 8th Grade NYS Science Exams

Highly Effective			Effective									Developing						Ineffective		
20	19	18	17	16	15	14	13	12	11	10	9	8	7	6	5	4	3	2	1	0
95 or higher	90–94	85–89	83–84	81–82	78–80	75–77	72–74	69–71	66–68	63–65	60–62	54–59	48–53	42–47	36–41	30–35	25–29	12–24	1–11	0

Fallsburg CSD HEDI Scales for Student Learning Objectives: District Developed Assessment

Highly Effective			Effective									Developing						Ineffective		
20	19	18	17	16	15	14	13	12	11	10	9	8	7	6	5	4	3	2	1	0
95 or higher	90–94	85–89	83–84	81–82	78–80	75–77	72–74	69–71	66–68	63–65	60–62	54–59	48–53	42–47	36–41	30–35	25–29	12–24	1–11	0

Fallsburg Central School District HEDI Tables (3.3)
For 0–15 scores for grades 4–8, ELA & Math

APPR Point	≥	<
0		-3.0
1	-3.0	-2.7
2	-2.7	-2.4
3	-2.4	-2.1
4	-2.1	-1.8
5	-1.8	-1.5
6	-1.5	-1.2
7	-1.2	-0.9
8	-0.9	-0.6
9	-0.6	-0.3
10	-0.3	0.0
11	0.0	0.3
12	0.3	0.6
13	0.6	0.9
14	0.9	1.2
15	1.2	

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. Please note that no APPR plan shall be approved by the Commissioner for use in the 2014-2015 school year or thereafter that provides for the administration of traditional standardized assessments for use with students in kindergarten through grade two for APPR purposes (see: http://www.engageny.org/resource/guidance-on-the-approved-regulatory-amendments-to-appr-to-help-reduce-local-testing).

Please also note that, for students using 3d party assessments in this Task, drop-down option #4 applies to grades 3 and above and drop-down option #8 applies to grades K-2.

	Course(s) or Subject(s)	Locally-Selected Measure from List of Approved Measures	Assessment
	Math AIS, K–1	○ 1) Change in % of student performance level on State ○ 2) Teacher specific growth computed by NYSED ○ 3) Teacher specific achievement/growth score computed locally ○ 4) Grades 3 and up: State-approved 3rd party ○ 5) District/regional/BOCES–developed ○ 6(i) School-wide measure based on State-provided measure ○ 6(ii) School wide measure computed locally ○ 7) Student Learning Objectives √ 8) Grades K-2: 3rd party non-"traditional standardized" assessment that meets NYSED guidance requirements	Measures of Academic Progress for Primary Grades (Math)
	Math AIS, 2nd grade	○ 1) Change in % of student performance level on State ○ 2) Teacher specific growth computed by NYSED ○ 3) Teacher specific achievement/growth score computed locally	Measures of Academic Progress for Primary Grades (Math)

		○ 4) Grades 3 and up: State-approved 3rd party ○ 5) District/regional/BOCES–developed ○ 6(i) School-wide measure based on State-provided measure ○ 6(ii) School wide measure computed locally ○ 7) Student Learning Objectives √ 8) Grades K-2: 3rd party non-“traditional standardized” assessment that meets NYSED guidance requirements	
	Math AIS, 3–8	○ 1) Change in % of student performance level on State ○ 2) Teacher specific growth computed by NYSED ○ 3) Teacher specific achievement/growth score computed locally √ 4) Grades 3 and up: State-approved 3rd party ○ 5) District/regional/BOCES–developed ○ 6(i) School-wide measure based on State-provided measure ○ 6(ii) School wide measure computed locally ○ 7) Student Learning Objectives ○ 8) Grades K-2: 3rd party non-“traditional standardized” assessment that meets NYSED guidance requirements	Measures of Academic Progress (Math)

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

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

Use this box, if needed, to describe the general process for assigning HEDI categories for these grades/subjects in this subcomponent. If needed, you may upload a table or graphic at 3.13, below.	The Fallsburg Central School District will be using value-added measures based on the NWEA Measures of Academic Progress assessments—Measures for Academic Progress (Primary Grades) for KG–1—to calculate teacher-level effectiveness ratings for the locally selected measures of student growth in math in grades K-3 (Measures for Academic Progress, Primary Grades for KG–1). The term "value-added" refers to the contributions educators and schools make to student outcomes, such as performance on standardized assessments. Value-added models provide a way to measure this contribution separately from factors that influence student outcomes, but over which a teacher or school has no control. They do this by statistically controlling for factors such as students' socioeconomic status and projecting how students will perform on assessments based on actual outcomes from similar students in the state. This allows the model to produce estimates of productivity – value-added indicators – under the counterfactual assumption that all schools serve the same group of students. This facilitates apples-to-apples teacher comparisons, rather than apples-to-oranges comparisons. The objective is to facilitate valid and fair comparisons of productivity with respect to student outcomes, given that teachers often serve very different student populations. The Fallsburg Central School District's analyses will be conducted by the Value-Added Research Center on NWEA's Measures of Academic Progress assessment. Major modeling decisions were decided by a Technical Advisory Panel made up of volunteer districts from across the state. For a more detailed description of the value-added model used, please see 3.13. To assign teachers to HEDI categories, we will assume a normal distribution of teacher effects centered on 13. From this point, we will use the following cut points to assign teachers to categories: Highly Effective: Greater than or equal to .9 standard deviations above average (13) Effective: Less than .9 standard deviations above average and greater than or equal to -.9 standard deviations below average Developing: Less than -.9 standard deviations below average and greater than or equal to -2.1 standard deviations below average Ineffective: Less than -2.1 standard deviations below average
Highly Effective (18 - 20 points) Results are well above District- or BOCES - adopted expectations for growth or achievement for	Within the category of Highly Effective, those teachers who fall at greater than or equal to .9 standard deviations above average, we further divide the distribution to determine specific points.

grade/subject.	
Effective (9- 17 points) Results meet District- or BOCES-adopted expectations for growth or achievement for grade/subject.	Within the category of Effective, those teachers who fall at less than .9 standard deviations above average and greater than or equal to -.9 standard deviations below average, we further divide the distribution to determine specific points.
Developing (3 - 8 points) Results are below District- or BOCES-adopted expectations for growth or achievement for grade/subject.	Within the category of Developing, those teachers who fall at less than -.9 standard deviations below average and greater than or equal to -2.1 standard deviations below average, we further divide the distribution to determine specific points.
Ineffective (0 - 2 points) Results are well below District- or BOCES-adopted expectations for growth or achievement for grade/subject.	Within the category of Ineffective, those teachers who fall at less than -2.1 standard deviations below average, we further divide the distribution to determine specific points.

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. Please note that no APPR plan shall be approved by the Commissioner for use in the 2014-2015 school year or thereafter that provides for the administration of traditional standardized assessments for use with students in kindergarten through grade two for APPR purposes (see: http://www.engageny.org/resource/guidance-on-the-approved-regulatory-amendments-to-appr-to-help-reduce-local-testing).

Please also note that, for students using 3d party assessments in this Task, drop-down option #4 applies to grades 3 and above and drop-down option #8 applies to grades K-2.

	Course(s) or Subject(s)	Locally-Selected Measure from List of Approved Measures	Assessment
	ESL, 2nd grade	○ 1) Change in % of student performance level on State ○ 2) Teacher specific growth computed by NYSED ○ 3) Teacher specific achievement/growth score computed locally ○ 4) Grades 3 and up: State-approved 3rd party ○ 5) District/regional/BOCES–developed ○ 6(i) School-wide measure based on State-provided measure ○ 6(ii) School wide measure computed locally ○ 7) Student Learning Objectives √ 8) Grades K-2: 3rd party non-"traditional standardized" assessment that meets NYSED guidance requirements	Measures of Academic Progress for Primary Grades (ELA)
	Reading, 2nd grade	○ 1) Change in % of student performance level on State ○ 2) Teacher specific growth computed by NYSED ○ 3) Teacher specific achievement/growth score computed locally	Measures of Academic Progress for Primary Grades (ELA)

		○ 4) Grades 3 and up: State-approved 3rd party ○ 5) District/regional/BOCES–developed ○ 6(i) School-wide measure based on State-provided measure ○ 6(ii) School wide measure computed locally ○ 7) Student Learning Objectives √ 8) Grades K-2: 3rd party non-“traditional standardized” assessment that meets NYSED guidance requirements	
		○ 1) Change in % of student performance level on State ○ 2) Teacher specific growth computed by NYSED ○ 3) Teacher specific achievement/growth score computed locally ○ 4) Grades 3 and up: State-approved 3rd party ○ 5) District/regional/BOCES–developed ○ 6(i) School-wide measure based on State-provided measure ○ 6(ii) School wide measure computed locally ○ 7) Student Learning Objectives ○ 8) Grades K-2: 3rd party non-“traditional standardized” assessment that meets NYSED guidance requirements	

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.	The Fallsburg Central School District will be using value-added measures based on the NWEA Measures of Academic Progress assessments—Measures for Academic Progress (Primary Grades) for KG–1—to calculate teacher-level effectiveness ratings for the locally selected measures of student growth in math in grades K-3 (Measures for Academic Progress, Primary Grades for KG–1). The term "value-added" refers to the contributions educators and schools make to student outcomes, such as performance on standardized assessments. Value-added models provide a way to measure this contribution separately from factors that influence student outcomes, but over which a teacher or school has no control. They do this by statistically controlling for factors such as students' socioeconomic status and projecting how students will perform on assessments based on actual outcomes from similar students in the state. This allows the model to produce estimates of productivity – value-added indicators – under the counterfactual assumption that all schools serve the same group of students. This facilitates apples-to-apples teacher comparisons, rather than apples-to-oranges comparisons. The objective is to facilitate valid and fair comparisons of productivity with respect to student outcomes, given that teachers often serve very different student populations. The Fallsburg Central School District's analyses will be conducted by the Value-Added Research Center on NWEA's Measures of Academic Progress assessment. Major modeling decisions were decided by a Technical Advisory Panel made up of volunteer districts from across the state. For a more detailed description of the value-added model used, please see 3.13. To assign teachers to HEDI categories, we will assume a normal distribution of teacher effects centered on 13. From this point, we will use the following cut points to assign teachers to categories: Highly Effective: Greater than or equal to .9 standard deviations above average (13) Effective: Less than .9 standard deviations above average and greater than or equal to -.9 standard deviations below average Developing: Less than -.9 standard deviations below average and greater than or equal to -2.1 standard deviations below average Ineffective: Less than -2.1 standard deviations below average
Highly Effective (18 - 20 points) Results are well above District- or BOCES - adopted expectations for growth or achievement for	Within the category of Highly Effective, those teachers who fall at greater than or equal to .9 standard deviations above average, we further divide the distribution to determine specific points.

grade/subject.	
Effective (9- 17 points) Results meet District- or BOCES-adopted expectations for growth or achievement for grade/subject.	Within the category of Effective, those teachers who fall at less than .9 standard deviations above average and greater than or equal to -.9 standard deviations below average, we further divide the distribution to determine specific points.
Developing (3 - 8 points) Results are below District- or BOCES-adopted expectations for growth or achievement for grade/subject.	Within the category of Developing, those teachers who fall at less than -.9 standard deviations below average and greater than or equal to -2.1 standard deviations below average, we further divide the distribution to determine specific points.
Ineffective (0 - 2 points) Results are well below District- or BOCES-adopted expectations for growth or achievement for grade/subject.	Within the category of Ineffective, those teachers who fall at less than -2.1 standard deviations below average, we further divide the distribution to determine specific points.

Fallsburg CSD SLO HEDI Table for Grades K-3 ELA (3.4)
Using NWEA/Value-Added Research Council *z*-Scores

APPR Point	≥	<
0		-2.5
1	-2.5	-2.3
2	-2.3	-2.1
3	-2.1	-1.9
4	-1.9	-1.7
5	-1.7	-1.5
6	-1.5	-1.3
7	-1.3	-1.1
8	-1.1	-0.9
9	-0.9	-0.7
10	-0.7	-0.5
11	-0.5	-0.3
12	-0.3	-0.1
13	-0.1	0.1
14	0.1	0.3
15	0.3	0.5
16	0.5	0.7
17	0.7	0.9
18	0.9	1.1
19	1.1	1.3
20	1.3	

Fallsburg CSD SLO HEDI Table for Grades K-3 Math (3.5)
Using NWEA/Value-Added Research Council *z*-Scores

APPR Point	≥	<
0		-2.5
1	-2.5	-2.3
2	-2.3	-2.1
3	-2.1	-1.9
4	-1.9	-1.7
5	-1.7	-1.5
6	-1.5	-1.3
7	-1.3	-1.1
8	-1.1	-0.9
9	-0.9	-0.7
10	-0.7	-0.5
11	-0.5	-0.3
12	-0.3	-0.1
13	-0.1	0.1
14	0.1	0.3
15	0.3	0.5
16	0.5	0.7
17	0.7	0.9
18	0.9	1.1
19	1.1	1.3
20	1.3	

Fallsburg CSD SLO HEDI Table for Grades 6–8 Science (3.6)

Fallsburg CSD HEDI Scales for Student Learning Objectives: Science 8th Grade NYS Exam and District Developed Assessments

Highly Effective			Effective									Developing						Ineffective		
20	19	18	17	16	15	14	13	12	11	10	9	8	7	6	5	4	3	2	1	0
95 or higher	90–94	85–89	83–84	81–82	78–80	75–77	72–74	69–71	66–68	63–65	60–62	54–59	48–53	42–47	36–41	30–35	25–29	12–24	1–11	0

Fallsburg CSD SLO HEDI Table for Grades 6–8 Social Studies (3.7)

Fallsburg CSD HEDI Scales for Student Learning Objectives: Social Studies District Developed Assessments

Highly Effective			Effective									Developing						Ineffective		
20	19	18	17	16	15	14	13	12	11	10	9	8	7	6	5	4	3	2	1	0
95 or higher	90–94	85–89	83–84	81–82	78–80	75–77	72–74	69–71	66–68	63–65	60–62	54–59	48–53	42–47	36–41	30–35	25–29	12–24	1–11	0

Fallsburg CSD SLO HEDI Table for High School Social Studies (3.8)

Fallsburg CSD HEDI Scales for Student Learning Objectives: Social Studies Regents and District Developed Assessments

Highly Effective			Effective									Developing						Ineffective		
20	19	18	17	16	15	14	13	12	11	10	9	8	7	6	5	4	3	2	1	0
95 or higher	90–94	85–89	83–84	81–82	78–80	75–77	72–74	69–71	66–68	63–65	60–62	54–59	48–53	42–47	36–41	30–35	25–29	12–24	1–11	0

Fallsburg CSD SLO HEDI Table for High School Science (3.9)

Fallsburg CSD HEDI Scales for Student Learning Objectives: Science Regents

Highly Effective			Effective									Developing						Ineffective		
20	19	18	17	16	15	14	13	12	11	10	9	8	7	6	5	4	3	2	1	0
95 or higher	90–94	85–89	83–84	81–82	78–80	75–77	72–74	69–71	66–68	63–65	60–62	54–59	48–53	42–47	36–41	30–35	25–29	12–24	1–11	0

Fallsburg CSD SLO HEDI Table for High School Math (3.10)

Fallsburg CSD HEDI Scales for Student Learning Objectives: Math Regents and MAP Math Strands

Highly Effective			Effective									Developing						Ineffective		
20	19	18	17	16	15	14	13	12	11	10	9	8	7	6	5	4	3	2	1	0
95 or higher	90–94	85–89	83–84	81–82	78–80	75–77	72–74	69–71	66–68	63–65	60–62	54–59	48–53	42–47	36–41	30–35	25–29	12–24	1–11	0

Fallsburg CSD SLO HEDI Table for Grades 9–10 ELA (3.11)
Using NWEA/Value-Added Research Council *z*-Scores

APPR Point	≥	<
0		-2.5
1	-2.5	-2.3
2	-2.3	-2.1
3	-2.1	-1.9
4	-1.9	-1.7
5	-1.7	-1.5
6	-1.5	-1.3
7	-1.3	-1.1
8	-1.1	-0.9
9	-0.9	-0.7
10	-0.7	-0.5
11	-0.5	-0.3
12	-0.3	-0.1
13	-0.1	0.1
14	0.1	0.3
15	0.3	0.5
16	0.5	0.7
17	0.7	0.9
18	0.9	1.1
19	1.1	1.3
20	1.3	

Fallsburg CSD SLO HEDI Table for Grades 11 ELA (3.11)

Fallsburg CSD HEDI Scales for Student Learning Objectives: 11th Grade ELA Regents																				
Highly Effective			***Effective***									***Developing***						***Ineffective***		
20	19	18	17	16	15	14	13	12	11	10	9	8	7	6	5	4	3	2	1	0
≥ 95	90–94	85–89	83–84	81–82	78–80	75–77	72–74	69–71	66–68	63–65	60–62	54–59	48–53	42–47	36–41	30–35	25–29	12–24	1–11	0

Fallsburg CSD SLO HEDI Table for 3.12 Assignments using MAP and MAP for Primary Grades (NWEA/Value-Added Research Council *z*-Scores)

APPR Point	≥	<
0		-2.5
1	-2.5	-2.3
2	-2.3	-2.1
3	-2.1	-1.9
4	-1.9	-1.7
5	-1.7	-1.5
6	-1.5	-1.3
7	-1.3	-1.1
8	-1.1	-0.9
9	-0.9	-0.7
10	-0.7	-0.5
11	-0.5	-0.3
12	-0.3	-0.1
13	-0.1	0.1
14	0.1	0.3
15	0.3	0.5
16	0.5	0.7
17	0.7	0.9
18	0.9	1.1
19	1.1	1.3
20	1.3	

Fallsburg CSD HEDI Scales for Student Learning Objectives: District Developed Assessment

Highly Effective			Effective									Developing						Ineffective		
20	19	18	17	16	15	14	13	12	11	10	9	8	7	6	5	4	3	2	1	0
95 or higher	90–94	85–89	83–84	81–82	78–80	75–77	72–74	69–71	66–68	63–65	60–62	54–59	48–53	42–47	36–41	30–35	25–29	12–24	1–11	0

Rubric Score to Sub-Component Conversion Chart

Fallsburg CSD Teacher Conversion Scale for Multiple Measures (0–60)

Total Average Rubric Score	Category	Conversion score for composite
Ineffective 0-49		
1.000		0
1.008		1
1.017		2
1.025		3
1.033		4
1.042		5
1.050		6
1.058		7
1.067		8
1.075		9
1.083		10
1.092		11
1.100		12
1.108		13
1.115		14
1.123		15
1.131		16
1.138		17
1.146		18
1.154		19
1.162		20
1.169		21
1.177		22
1.185		23
1.192		24
1.200		25
1.208		26
1.217		27
1.225		28
1.233		29
1.242		30
1.250		31
1.258		32
1.267		33
1.275		34
1.283		35
1.292		36
1.300		37
1.308		38
1.317		39
1.325		40

Rubric Score to Sub-Component Conversion Chart

Total Average Rubric Score	Category	Conversion score for composite
1.333		41
1.342		42
1.350		43
1.358		44
1.367		45
1.375		46
1.383		47
1.392		48
1.400		49
Developing 50-56		
1.5		50
1.6		50.7
1.7		51.4
1.8		52.1
1.9		52.8
2		53.5
2.1		54.2
2.2		54.9
2.3		55.6
2.4		56.3
Effective 57-58		
2.5		57
2.6		57.2
2.7		57.4
2.8		57.6
2.9		57.8
3		58
3.1		58.2
3.2		58.4
3.3		58.6
3.4		58.8
Highly Effective 59-60		
3.5		59
3.6		59.3
3.7		59.5
3.8		59.8
3.9		60
4		60.25 (round to 60)

Teacher Improvement Plan
Fallsburg Central School District

Staff Member: **Date:**
Assignment: **Academic Year:**
Evaluator:

Area/Skills in Need of Improvement	*Strategies for Success*	*Evidence of Improvement*	*Date(s) of Implementation*	*Follow-up Review*

Administrator's comments:

Teacher's Signature **Date**

Evaluator's Signature **Date**

Fallsburg CSD HEDI Scales:
Measures of Academic Progress (0–20)

**These bands represent the aggregate percentage of Fallsburg CSD students, in their respective K–6 or 7–12 buildings, that attain their growth targets in reading and/or mathematics (MAP and MAP for Primary Grades).*

Highly Effective			Effective									Developing						Ineffective		
20	19	18	17	16	15	14	13	12	11	10	9	8	7	6	5	4	3	2	1	0
90 or higher	88–89	85–87	82–84	79–81	75–78	71–74	66–70	62–65	58–61	54–57	50–53	45–49	40–44	35–39	30–34	25–29	20–24	10–19	1–9	0

Fallsburg CSD HEDI Scales:
Measures of Academic Progress (0–15)

**These bands represent the aggregate percentage of Fallsburg CSD students, in their respective K–6 or 7–12 buildings, that attain their growth targets in reading and/or mathematics (MAP and MAP for Primary Grades).*

Highly Effective		Effective						Developing					Ineffective		
15	14	13	12	11	10	9	8	7	6	5	4	3	2	1	0
90 or higher	85–89	80–84	74–79	68–73	62–67	56–61	50–55	44–49	38–43	32–37	26–31	20–25	19–11	10–1	0

Fallsburg CSD Principal Conversion Scale for Multiple Measures (0–60)

Total Average Rubric Score	Category	Conversion score for composite
Ineffective 0-49		
1.000		0
1.008		1
1.017		2
1.025		3
1.033		4
1.042		5
1.050		6
1.058		7
1.067		8
1.075		9
1.083		10
1.092		11
1.100		12
1.108		13
1.115		14
1.123		15
1.131		16
1.138		17
1.146		18
1.154		19
1.162		20
1.169		21
1.177		22
1.185		23
1.192		24
1.200		25
1.208		26
1.217		27
1.225		28
1.233		29
1.242		30
1.250		31
1.258		32
1.267		33
1.275		34
1.283		35
1.292		36
1.300		37
1.308		38
1.317		39
1.325		40

Rubric Score to Sub-Component Conversion Chart

Total Average Rubric Score	Category	Conversion score for composite
1.333		41
1.342		42
1.350		43
1.358		44
1.367		45
1.375		46
1.383		47
1.392		48
1.400		49
Developing 50-56		
1.5		50
1.6		50.7
1.7		51.4
1.8		52.1
1.9		52.8
2		53.5
2.1		54.2
2.2		54.9
2.3		55.6
2.4		56.3
Effective 57-58		
2.5		57
2.6		57.2
2.7		57.4
2.8		57.6
2.9		57.8
3		58
3.1		58.2
3.2		58.4
3.3		58.6
3.4		58.8
Highly Effective 59-60		
3.5		59
3.6		59.3
3.7		59.5
3.8		59.8
3.9		60
4		60.25 (round to 60)

Administrator Improvement Plan
Fallsburg Central School District

Administrator: **Date:**
Assignment: **Academic Year:**
Evaluator:

Area/Skills in Need of Improvement	*Strategies for Success*	*Evidence of Improvement*	*Date(s) of Implementation*	*Follow-up Review*

Evaluator's comments:

Administrator's Signature **Date**

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

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

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

- Assure that the evaluation system will be used as a significant factor for employment decisions and teacher and principal development
- Assure that the entire APPR Plan will be completed for each teacher or principal as soon as practicable, but in no case later than September 1 of the school year next following the school year for which the classroom teacher or building principal's performance is being measured
- Assure that the district or BOCES will provide the teacher's or principal's score and rating on the locally selected measures subcomponent, if available, and on the other measures of teacher and principal effectiveness subcomponent for a teacher's or principal's annual professional performance review, in writing, no later than the last school day of the school year for which the teacher or principal is being measured
- Assure that the APPR Plan will be posted on the district's or BOCES' website by September 10 or within 10 days after it is approved by the Commissioner, whichever is later
- Assure that accurate teacher and student data will be provided to the Commissioner in a format and timeline prescribed by the Commissioner
- Assure that the district or BOCES will report the individual subcomponent scores and the total composite effectiveness score for each classroom teacher and building principal in a manner prescribed by the Commissioner
- Certify that the district provides an opportunity for every classroom teacher and building principal to verify the subjects and/or student rosters assigned to them
- Assure that teachers and principals will receive timely and constructive feedback as part of the evaluation process
- Assure that any training course for lead evaluator certification addresses each of the requirements in the regulations, including specific considerations in evaluating teachers and principals of English Language Learners and students with disabilities
  Assure that educators who receive a Developing or Ineffective rating will receive a Teacher Improvement Plan (TIP) or Principal Improvement Plan (PIP), in accordance with all applicable statutes and 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 all applicable statutes and regulations
- Assure that the district or BOCES has appeal procedures that are consistent with the statute and 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 statute, regulations 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
- Assure that any third party assessment that is administered for use to students in kindergarten, first, or second grade, and being used for APPR purposes, is consistent with the State's APPR Assessment Guidance and is not a traditional standardized assessment.

Signatures, dates

Superintendent Signature: Date:

2/17/15

Teachers Union President Signature: Date:

2/17/15

Administrative Union President Signature: Date:

2/17/15

Board of Education President Signature: Date:

2/18/15

For APPR plans submitted to the Commissioner on or after March 2, 2014 for use in the 2014-15 school year and thereafter the school district or BOCES also makes the following specific assurance with respect to their APPR plan:

Pursuant to Section 30-2.3(a)(4) of the Rules of the Board of Regents, the Superintendent, District Superintendent or Chancellor attests that for the 2014-15 school year and thereafter the amount of time devoted to traditional standardized assessments that are not specifically required by state or federal law for each classroom or program within a grade level does not exceed, in the aggregate, one percent of the minimum in required annual instructional hours for the grade; and the amount of time devoted to test preparation using traditional standardized assessments under standardized testing conditions for each classroom or program within a grade level does not exceed, in the aggregate, two percent of the minimum required annual instructional hours for the grade. Time devoted to teacher administered classroom quizzes or exams, portfolio reviews, performance assessments, formative assessments, and diagnostic assessments is not included in this calculation. Additionally, these calculations do not supersede the requirements of a section of the 504 plan of a qualified student with a disability or federal law relating to English language learners or the individualized education program (IEP) of a student with a disability.

Superintendent / District Superintendent / Chancellor Signature: Date:

2/17/15