



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

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

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

March 25, 2014

Revised

John Lorentz, Superintendent
Farmingdale Union Free School District
50 Van Cott Avenue
Farmingdale, NY 11735

Dear Superintendent Lorentz

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

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

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

Thank you again for your hard work.

Sincerely,


John B. King, Jr.
Commissioner

Attachment

c: Dr. Thomas L. Rogers

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 Friday, February 28, 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 : 280522030000

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

280522030000

1.2) School District Name: FARMINGDALE UFSD

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

FARMINGDALE UFSD

1.3) Assurances

Please check all of the boxes below:

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

1.3) Assurances | Assure that it is understood that this district/BOCES' APPR plan will be posted in its entirety on the NYSED website following approval Checked

1.4) Submission Status

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

Submission of material changes to an approved APPR plan

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

Created Tuesday, April 30, 2013

Updated Wednesday, March 19, 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 in addition where there is no state-provided measure. Teachers with 50 – 100% of students covered by State-provided growth measures will receive a growth score from the State for the full Growth subcomponent score of their evaluation. Teachers with 0 – 49% of students covered by State-provided growth measures must have SLOs for the Growth subcomponent of their evaluation and one SLO must use the State-provided measure if applicable for any courses. (See guidance for more detail on teachers with State-provided measures AND SLOs.)

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

2.1) Assurances

Please check the boxes below:

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

STUDENT LEARNING OBJECTIVES AS COMPARABLE GROWTH MEASURES (20 points)

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

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

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

If no State assessment or Regents exam exists:

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

District, regional or BOCES-developed assessments provided that it is rigorous and comparable across classrooms
For other grades/subjects: district-determined assessments from options below may be used as evidence of student learning within the SLO:

State assessments, *required if one exists*

List of State-approved 3rd party assessments

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

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

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

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

2.2) Grades K-3 ELA

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

| | ELA | Assessment |
|---|-------------------------------------|------------|
| K | State-approved 3rd party assessment | Aimsweb |
| 1 | State-approved 3rd party assessment | Aimsweb |
| 2 | State-approved 3rd party assessment | Aimsweb |

| | 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. | HEDI Scores are based on the percentage of students meeting classwide growth target set by the district using pre assessment data along with additional baseline data. see chart in task 2.11 |
| Highly Effective (18 - 20 points) Results are well-above state average for similar students (or District goals if no state test). | see chart in task 2.11 |
| Effective (9 - 17 points) Results meet state average for similar students (or District goals if no state test). | see chart in task 2.11 |
| Developing (3 - 8 points) Results are below state average for similar students (or District goals if no state test). | see chart in task 2.11 |
| Ineffective (0 - 2 points) Results are well-below state average for similar students (or District goals if no state test). | see chart in task 2.11 |

2.3) Grades K-3 Math

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

| | Math | Assessment |
|---|-------------------------------------|------------|
| K | State-approved 3rd party assessment | Aimsweb |
| 1 | State-approved 3rd party assessment | Aimsweb |
| 2 | State-approved 3rd party assessment | Aimsweb |

| | 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. | HEDI Scores are based on the percentage of students meeting classwide growth target set by the district using pre assessment data along with additional baseline data see Task 2.11 |
| Highly Effective (18 - 20 points) Results are well-above state average for similar students (or District goals if no state test). | see chart in task 2.11 |
| Effective (9 - 17 points) Results meet state average for similar students (or District goals if no state test). | see chart in task 2.11 |
| Developing (3 - 8 points) Results are below state average for similar students (or District goals if no state test). | see chart in task 2.11 |
| Ineffective (0 - 2 points) Results are well-below state average for similar students (or District goals if no state test). | see chart in task 2.11 |

2.4) Grades 6-8 Science

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

| | Science | Assessment |
|---|--|--|
| 6 | District, regional or BOCES-developed assessment | Farmingdale Developed 6th grade Science Assessment |
| 7 | District, regional or BOCES-developed assessment | Farmingdale 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. | HEDI Scores are based on the percentage of students meeting classwide growth target set by the district using pre assessment data along with additional baseline data see chart in task 2.11 |
| Highly Effective (18 - 20 points) Results are well-above state average for similar students (or District goals if no state test). | see chart in task 2.11 |
| Effective (9 - 17 points) Results meet state average for similar students (or District goals if no state test). | see chart in task 2.11 |
| Developing (3 - 8 points) Results are below state average for similar students (or District goals if no state test). | see chart in task 2.11 |
| Ineffective (0 - 2 points) Results are well-below state average for similar students (or District goals if no state test). | see chart in task 2.11 |

2.5) Grades 6-8 Social Studies

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

| | Social Studies | Assessment |
|---|--|---|
| 6 | District, regional or BOCES-developed assessment | Farmingdale Developed 6th grade Social Studies Assessment |
| 7 | District, regional or BOCES-developed assessment | Farmingdale Developed 7th grade Social Studies Assessment |
| 8 | District, regional or BOCES-developed assessment | Farmingdale 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. | HEDI Scores are based on the percentage of students meeting classwide growth target set by the district using pre assessment data along with additional baseline data See chart in task 2.11. |
| Highly Effective (18 - 20 points) Results are well-above District goals for similar students. | see chart in task 2.11 |
| Effective (9 - 17 points) Results meet District goals for similar students. | see chart in task 2.11 |
| Developing (3 - 8 points) Results are below District goals for similar students. | see chart in task 2.11 |
| Ineffective (0 - 2 points) Results are well-below District goals for similar students. | see chart in task 2.11 |

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 | Farmingdale UFSD Developed Global 1 Assessment |

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

For High School Social Studies Regents Courses: describe the district-adopted expectations for the level of performance required for each HEDI rating category and the process for assigning points to teachers based on SLO results consistent with regulations and assurances in the Comparable Growth Measures subcomponent. Include any district-determined expectations for 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. | HEDI Scores are based on the percentage of students meeting classwide growth target set by the district using assessment data along with additional baseline data see chart in task 2.11. |
| Highly Effective (18 - 20 points) Results are well-above District goals for similar students. | see chart in task 2.11 |
| Effective (9 - 17 points) Results meet District goals for similar students. | see chart in task 2.11 |
| Developing (3 - 8 points) Results are below District goals for similar students. | see chart in task 2.11 |
| Ineffective (0 - 2 points) Results are well-below District goals for similar students. | see chart in task 2.11 |

2.7) High School Science Regents Courses

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

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

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

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

assessments listed for this Task.

| | |
|---|---|
| Use this box, if needed, to describe the general process for assigning HEDI categories for these grades/subjects in this subcomponent. If needed, you may upload a table or graphic at 2.11, below. | HEDI Scores are based on the percentage of students meeting classwide growth target set by the district using assessment data along with additional baseline data see chart in task 2.11. |
| Highly Effective (18 - 20 points) Results are well-above District goals for similar students. | see chart in task 2.11 |
| Effective (9 - 17 points) Results meet District goals for similar students. | see chart in task 2.11 |
| Developing (3 - 8 points) Results are below District goals for similar students. | see chart in task 2.11 |
| Ineffective (0 - 2 points) Results are well-below District goals for similar students. | see chart in task 2.11 |

2.8) High School Math Regents Courses

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

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

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

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

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

| | |
|---|--|
| Use this box, if needed, to describe the general process for assigning HEDI categories for these grades/subjects in this subcomponent. If needed, you may upload a table or graphic at 2.11, below. | HEDI Scores are based on the percentage of students meeting classwide growth target set by the district using assessment data along with additional baseline data see chart in task 2.11. For Algebra 1, students in common core courses will take both the Integrated and Common Core Algebra Regents and teachers will use the higher of the two scores. |
| Highly Effective (18 - 20 points) Results are well-above District goals for similar students. | see chart in task 2.11 |
| Effective (9 - 17 points) Results meet District goals for similar students. | see chart in task 2.11 |
| Developing (3 - 8 points) Results are below District goals for similar students. | see chart in task 2.11 |

Ineffective (0 - 2 points) Results are well-below District goals for similar students. see chart in task 2.11

2.9) High School English Language Arts

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

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

| | High School English Courses | Assessment |
|--------------|--|--|
| Grade 9 ELA | District, regional or BOCES-developed assessment | Farmingdale District developed 9th gr. ELA Writing Assessment |
| Grade 10 ELA | District, regional or BOCES-developed assessment | Farmingdale District developed 10th gr. ELA Writing Assessment |
| Grade 11 ELA | Regents assessment | NY Comprehensive ELA Regents |

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, the Common Core English Regents, or both and how the HEDI process will be adjusted accordingly.

| | |
|---|---|
| Use this box, if needed, to describe the general process for assigning HEDI categories for these grades/subjects in this subcomponent. If needed, you may upload a table or graphic at 2.11, below. | HEDI Scores are based on the percentage of students meeting classwide growth target set by the district using pre assessment data along with additional baseline data see chart in task 2.11. |
| Highly Effective (18 - 20 points) Results are well-above District goals for similar students. | see chart in task 2.11 |
| Effective (9 - 17 points) Results meet District goals for similar students. | see chart in task 2.11 |
| Developing (3 - 8 points) Results are below District goals for similar students. | see chart in task 2.11 |
| Ineffective (0 - 2 points) Results are well-below District goals for similar students. | see chart in task 2.11 |

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 |
|-------------------------|---------------------------------------|---|
| All other Courses | District, Regional or BOCES-developed | Farmingdale UFSD developed course specific 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. | HEDI Scores are based on the percentage of students meeting classwide growth target set by the district using pre assessment data along with additional baseline data. see chart in task 2.11 |
| Highly Effective (18 - 20 points) Results are well-above District goals for similar students. | see chart in task 2.11 |
| Effective (9 - 17 points) Results meet District goals for similar students. | see chart in task 2.11 |
| Developing (3 - 8 points) Results are below District goals for similar students. | see chart in task 2.11 |
| Ineffective (0 - 2 points) Results are well-below District goals for similar students. | see chart in task 2.11 |

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

(No response)

2.11) HEDI Tables or Graphics

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

assets/survey-uploads/12186/1033072-TXEttx9bQW/Farmingdale Table for 15% 20% APPR 1314- 3-18-14.xlsx

2.12) Locally Developed Controls

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

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

No controls used.

2.13) Teachers with more than one growth measure

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

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

2.14) Assurances

Please check all of the boxes below:

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

3. Local Measures (Teachers)

Created Tuesday, April 30, 2013

Updated Thursday, March 20, 2014

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 | 5) District, regional, or BOCES–developed assessments | Farmingdale developed 4th Grade Reading benchmark assessment |
| 5 | 5) District, regional, or BOCES–developed assessments | Farmingdale developed 5th Grade Reading benchmark assessment |
| 6 | 5) District, regional, or BOCES–developed assessments | Farmingdale developed 6th Grade ELA Final Exam |

| | | |
|---|---|--|
| 7 | 5) District, regional, or BOCES–developed assessments | Farmingdale developed 7th Grade ELA Final Exam |
| 8 | 5) District, regional, or BOCES–developed assessments | Farmingdale developed 8th Grade ELA Final Exam |

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. | HEDI Scores are based on the percentage of students meeting classwide achievement scores set by the district using pre assessment baseline data. see 3.3 upload |
| Highly Effective (14 - 15 points) Results are well above District- or BOCES-adopted expectations for growth or achievement for grade/subject. | See chart in task 3.3 |
| Effective (8- 13 points) Results meet District- or BOCES-adopted expectations for growth or achievement for grade/subject. | See chart in task 3.3 |
| Developing (3 - 7 points) Results are below District- or BOCES-adopted expectations for growth or achievement for grade/subject. | See chart in task 3.3 |
| Ineffective (0 - 2 points) Results are well below District- or BOCES-adopted expectations for growth or achievement for grade/subject. | See chart in task 3.3 |

3.2) Grades 4-8 Math

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

| | Locally-Selected Measure from List of Approved Measures | Assessment |
|---|---|---|
| 4 | 4) State-approved 3rd party assessments | NWEA MAP Math |
| 5 | 4) State-approved 3rd party assessments | NWEA MAP Math |
| 6 | 5) District, regional, or BOCES–developed assessments | Farmingdale developed 6th Grade Local math assessment |
| 7 | 5) District, regional, or BOCES–developed assessments | Farmingdale developed 7th Grade Local math assessment |
| 8 | 5) District, regional, or BOCES–developed assessments | Farmingdale developed 8th Grade Local math assessment |

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

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

| | |
|--|---|
| Use this box, if needed, to describe the general process for assigning HEDI categories for these grades/subjects in this subcomponent. If needed, you may upload a table or graphic at 3.3, below. | HEDI Scores are based on the percentage of students meeting classwide achievement scores set by the district using pre assessment baseline data. see 3.3 upload |
| Highly Effective (14 - 15 points) Results are well above District- or BOCES-adopted expectations for growth or achievement for grade/subject. | See chart in task 3.3 |
| Effective (8- 13 points) Results meet District- or BOCES-adopted expectations for growth or achievement for grade/subject. | See chart in task 3.3 |
| Developing (3 - 7 points) Results are below District- or BOCES-adopted expectations for growth or achievement for grade/subject. | See chart in task 3.3 |
| Ineffective (0 - 2 points) Results are well below District- or BOCES-adopted expectations for growth or achievement for grade/subject. | See chart in task 3.3 |

3.3) HEDI Tables or Graphics

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

assets/survey-uploads/12149/1033073-rhJdBgDruP/Farmingdale Table for 15% 20% APPR 1314- 3-11-14.xlsx

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

Growth or achievement measure(s) from these options.

One or more of the following types of local measures of student growth or achievement may be used for the evaluation of teachers. The options in the drop-down menus below are abbreviated from the following list:

Measures based on:

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

3.4) Grades K-3 ELA

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

| | Locally-Selected Measure from List of Approved Measures | Assessment |
|---|---|---|
| K | 5) District, regional, or BOCES-developed assessments | Farmingdale developed Kgn Reading benchmark |
| 1 | 5) District, regional, or BOCES-developed assessments | Farmingdale developed 1st Grade Reading benchmark |
| 2 | 5) District, regional, or BOCES-developed assessments | Farmingdale developed 2nd Grade Reading benchmark |
| 3 | 5) District, regional, or BOCES-developed assessments | Farmingdale developed 3rd Grade Reading benchmark |

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. | HEDI Scores are based on the percentage of students meeting classwide growth target set by the district using pre assessment baseline data. |
| Highly Effective (18-20 points) Results are well above District- or BOCES-adopted expectations for growth or achievement for grade/subject. | see upload in Task 3.13 |
| Effective (9-17 points) Results meet District- or BOCES-adopted expectations for growth or achievement for grade/subject. | see upload in Task 3.13 |
| Developing (3 - 8 points) Results are below District- or BOCES-adopted expectations for growth or achievement for grade/subject. | see upload in Task 3.13 |
| Ineffective (0 - 2 points) Results are well below District- or BOCES-adopted expectations for growth or achievement for grade/subject. | see upload in Task 3.13 |

3.5) Grades K-3 Math

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

| | Locally-Selected Measure from List of Approved Measures | Assessment |
|---|---|---|
| K | 5) District, regional, or BOCES–developed assessments | Farmingdale developed Kgn Local math assessment |
| 1 | 5) District, regional, or BOCES–developed assessments | Farmingdale developed 1st Grade Local math assessment |
| 2 | 5) District, regional, or BOCES–developed assessments | Farmingdale developed 2nd Grade Local math assessment |
| 3 | 5) District, regional, or BOCES–developed assessments | Farmingdale developed 3rd Grade Local math assessment |

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

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

| | |
|---|--|
| Use this box, if needed, to describe the general process for assigning HEDI categories for these grades/subjects in this subcomponent. If needed, you may upload a table or graphic at 3.13, below. | HEDI Scores are based on the percentage of students meeting classwide achievement target set by the district using pre assessment baseline data. |
| Highly Effective (18-20 points) Results are well above District- or BOCES-adopted expectations for growth or achievement for grade/subject. | see upload in Task 3.13 |
| Effective (9-17 points) Results meet District- or BOCES-adopted expectations for growth or achievement for grade/subject. | see upload in Task 3.13 |

| | |
|--|-------------------------|
| Developing (3 - 8 points) Results are below District -or BOCES-adopted expectations for growth or achievement for grade/subject. | see upload in Task 3.13 |
| Ineffective (0 - 2 points) Results are well below District- or BOCES-adopted expectations for growth or achievement for grade/subject. | see upload in Task 3.13 |

3.6) Grades 6-8 Science

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

| | Locally-Selected Measure from List of Approved Measures | Assessment |
|---|---|--|
| 6 | 6(ii) School wide measure computed locally | Measures of Academic Progress in ELA and Math |
| 7 | 6(ii) School wide measure computed locally | Measures of Academic Progress in ELA and Math |
| 8 | 5) District, regional, or BOCES–developed assessments | Farmingdale developed 8th Grade Local science assessment |

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

| | |
|---|---|
| Use this box, if needed, to describe the general process for assigning HEDI categories for these grades/subjects in this subcomponent. If needed, you may upload a table or graphic at 3.13, below. | HEDI Scores are based on the percentage of students meeting classwide achievement target set by the district using pre assessment baseline data. Where school-wide measures are used, HEDI points will be assigned based on the percentage of students at the grade level will meet or exceed the target. For grades 6 & 7 a HEDI score will be generated for both Math and ELA and the two scores will be averaged together. Normal rounding rules will apply. |
|---|---|

| | |
|---|--------------------------|
| Highly Effective (18 - 20 points) Results are well above District- or BOCES-adopted expectations for growth or achievement for grade/subject. | see upload in Task 3.13. |
| Effective (9 - 17 points) Results meet District- or BOCES-adopted expectations for growth or achievement for grade/subject. | see upload in Task 3.13 |
| Developing (3 - 8 points) Results are below District- or BOCES-adopted expectations for growth or achievement for grade/subject. | see upload in Task 3.13 |
| Ineffective (0 - 2 points) Results are well below District- or BOCES-adopted expectations for growth or achievement for grade/subject. | see upload in Task 3.13 |

3.7) Grades 6-8 Social Studies

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

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

| | | |
|---|---|---|
| 6 | 6(ii) School wide measure computed locally | Measures of Academic Progress in ELA |
| 7 | 6(ii) School wide measure computed locally | Measures of Academic Progress in ELA |
| 8 | 5) District, regional, or BOCES–developed assessments | Farmingdale developed 8th grade Local social studies assesment. |

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. | HEDI Scores are based on the percentage of students meeting classwide achievement target set by the district using pre assessment baseline data. Where school-wide measures are used, HEDI points will be assigned based on the percentage of students at the grade level who meet or exceed the target. |
| Highly Effective (18 - 20 points) Results are well above District- or BOCES-adopted expectations for growth or achievement for grade/subject. | see upload in Task 3.13 |
| Effective (9 - 17 points) Results meet District- or BOCES-adopted expectations for growth or achievement for grade/subject. | see upload in Task 3.13 |
| Developing (3 - 8 points) Results are below District- or BOCES-adopted expectations for growth or achievement for grade/subject. | see upload in Task 3.13 |
| Ineffective (0 - 2 points) Results are well below District- or BOCES-adopted expectations for growth or achievement for grade/subject. | see upload in Task 3.13 |

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 | 5) District, regional, or BOCES–developed assessments | Farmingdale developed Local Global 1 assessment |
| Global 2 | 5) District, regional, or BOCES–developed assessments | Farmingdale developed Local Global 2 assessment |
| American History | 5) District, regional, or BOCES–developed assessments | Farmingdale developed Local American History assessment |

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

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

| | |
|---|--|
| Use this box, if needed, to describe the general process for assigning HEDI categories for these grades/subjects in this subcomponent. If needed, you may upload a table or graphic at 3.13, below. | HEDI Scores are based on the percentage of students meeting classwide achievement target set by the district using pre assessment baseline data. |
| Highly Effective (18 - 20 points) Results are well above District- or BOCES-adopted expectations for growth or achievement for grade/subject. | see upload in Task 3.13 |
| Effective (9 - 17 points) Results meet District- or BOCES-adopted expectations for growth or achievement for grade/subject. | see upload in Task 3.13 |
| Developing (3 - 8 points) Results are below District- or BOCES-adopted expectations for growth or achievement for grade/subject. | see upload in Task 3.13 |
| Ineffective (0 - 2 points) Results are well below District- or BOCES-adopted expectations for growth or achievement for grade/subject. | see upload in Task 3.13 |

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 | 5) District, regional, or BOCES–developed assessments | Farmingdale developed Local Living Environment assessment |
| Earth Science | 5) District, regional, or BOCES–developed assessments | Farmingdale developed Local Earth Science assessment |
| Chemistry | 5) District, regional, or BOCES–developed assessments | Farmingdale developed Local Chemistry assessment |
| Physics | 5) District, regional, or BOCES–developed assessments | Farmingdale developed Local Physics assessment |

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

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

assurances listed to the left of each box.

| | |
|---|--|
| Use this box, if needed, to describe the general process for assigning HEDI categories for these grades/subjects in this subcomponent. If needed, you may upload a table or graphic at 3.13, below. | HEDI Scores are based on the percentage of students meeting classwide achievement target set by the district using pre assessment baseline data. |
| Highly Effective (18-20 points) Results are well above District- or BOCES-adopted expectations for growth or achievement for grade/subject. | see upload in Task 3.13 |
| Developing (3 - 8 points) Results are below District- or BOCES-adopted expectations for growth or achievement for grade/subject. | see upload in Task 3.13 |
| Effective (9 - 17points) Results meet District- or BOCES-adopted expectations for growth or achievement for grade/subject. | see upload in Task 3.13 |
| Ineffective (0 - 2 points) Results are well below District- or BOCES-adopted expectations for growth or achievement for grade/subject. | see upload in Task 3.13 |

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 | 5) District, regional, or BOCES–developed assessments | Farmingdale developed Local Algebra 1 assessment |
| Geometry | 5) District, regional, or BOCES–developed assessments | Farmingdale developed Local Geometry assessment |
| Algebra 2 | 5) District, regional, or BOCES–developed assessments | Farmingdale developed Local Algebra 2 assessment |

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

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

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

| | |
|--|--|
| Use this box, if needed, to describe the general process for assigning HEDI categories for these grades/subjects in this | HEDI Scores are based on the percentage of students meeting classwide achievement target set by the district using pre |
|--|--|

| | |
|---|---------------------------|
| subcomponent. If needed, you may upload a table or graphic at 3.13, below. | assessment baseline data. |
| Highly Effective (18 - 20 points) Results are well above District- or BOCES-adopted expectations for growth or achievement for grade/subject. | see upload in Task 3.13 |
| Effective (9 - 17 points) Results meet District- or BOCES-adopted expectations for growth or achievement for grade/subject. | see upload in Task 3.13 |
| Developing (3 - 8 points) Results are below District- or BOCES-adopted expectations for growth or achievement for grade/subject. | see upload in Task 3.13 |
| Ineffective (0 - 2 points) Results are well below District- or BOCES-adopted expectations for growth or achievement for grade/subject. | see upload in Task 3.13 |

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 | 5) District, regional, or BOCES–developed assessments | Farmingdale developed Local Grade 9 ELA assessment |
| Grade 10 ELA | 5) District, regional, or BOCES–developed assessments | Farmingdale developed Local Grade10 ELA assessment |
| Grade 11 ELA | 5) District, regional, or BOCES–developed assessments | Farmingdale developed Local Grade11 ELA assessment |

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

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

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

| | |
|---|--|
| Use this box, if needed, to describe the general process for assigning HEDI categories for these grades/subjects in this subcomponent. If needed, you may upload a table or graphic at 3.13, below. | HEDI Scores are based on the percentage of students meeting classwide achievement target set by the district using pre assessment baseline data. |
| Highly Effective (18 - 20 points) Results are well above District- or BOCES-adopted expectations for growth or | see upload in Task 3.13 |

| | |
|--|--------------------------|
| achievement for grade/subject. | |
| Effective (9 - 17 points) Results meet District- or BOCES-adopted expectations for growth or achievement for grade/subject. | see upload in Task 3.13. |
| Developing (3 - 8 points) Results are below District- or BOCES-adopted expectations for growth or achievement for grade/subject. | see upload in Task 3.13 |
| Ineffective (0 - 2 points) Results are well below District- or BOCES-adopted expectations for growth or achievement for grade/subject. | see upload in Task 3.13 |

3.12) All Other Courses

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

| Course(s) or Subject(s) | Locally-Selected Measure from List of Approved Measures | Assessment |
|---|---|---|
| All other High School courses | 6(ii) School wide measure computed locally | Farmingdale UFSD developed grade-level ELA writing assessment |
| All other Middle School Courses | 6(ii) School wide measure computed locally | Measures of Academic Progress for ELA |
| Life Skills, Resource Room, Study Skills, grade 6 | 6(ii) School wide measure computed locally | Measures of Academic Progress ELA and 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. | HEDI Scores are based on the grade level percentage of students meeting classwide achievement target set by the district using pre assessment baseline data. |
| Highly Effective (18 - 20 points) Results are well above District- or BOCES -adopted expectations for growth or achievement for grade/subject. | see upload in Task 3.13 |
| Effective (9 - 17 points) Results meet District- or BOCES-adopted expectations for growth or achievement for grade/subject. | see upload in Task 3.13 |
| Developing (3 - 8 points) Results are below District- or BOCES-adopted expectations for growth or achievement for grade/subject. | see upload in Task 3.13 |
| Ineffective (0 - 2 points) Results are well below District- or BOCES-adopted expectations for growth or achievement for grade/subject. | see upload in Task 3.13 |

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

(No response)

3.13) HEDI Tables or Graphics

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

assets/survey-uploads/12149/1033073-y92vNseFa4/Chart for 20% SLO and Local 3-4-14.xlsx

3.14) Locally Developed Controls

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

no controls used

3.15) Teachers with More Than One Locally Selected Measure

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

The District will establish a ratio for the identified teacher based upon the total number of student test scores in each locally-selected measure. All K-5 classroom teachers will have locally-selected measures for ELA and Math. Secondary teachers having more than one measure will have an equal number of locally-selected measures that will be calculated the same way. 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 | Checked |

3.16) Assurances | Assure that all locally-selected measures for a teacher are different than any measures used for the State assessment or other comparable measures subcomponent. Checked

4. Other Measures of Effectiveness (Teachers)

Created Tuesday, April 30, 2013

Updated Wednesday, March 12, 2014

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 | Danielson's Framework for Teaching (2011 Revised 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 |

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

(No response)

4.3) Survey Tools (if applicable)

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

(No response)

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

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

4.4) Assurances

Please check all of the boxes below:

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

4.5) Process for Assigning Points and Determining HEDI Ratings

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

Each domain will be scored from 1-4 based on the evidence observed and/or collected by the evaluator. Over the course of the school year, evaluators will collect evidence for all of the components of the rubric observed and the final score for each domain will be based on all of that evidence. Domains scored will be averaged together to result in an overall rubric score from 1-4. the rubric score will then be converted to a score from 0-60 using the attached conversion chart. The rubric score listed on the chart is the minimum score necessary to achieve corresponding HEDI point value. We understand the composite score must be reported in whole numbers. Normal

rounding rules will apply, but will not result in a teacher moving from one HEDI category to another.

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/12179/1033074-eka9yMJ855/5.1 Table 4 Other Measures conversion chart 13-14- updated 2-21-14.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. | Teachers earning 3.5 through 4.0 points. |
| Effective: Overall performance and results meet NYS Teaching Standards. | Teachers earning 2.5 through 3.4 points. |
| Developing: Overall performance and results need improvement in order to meet NYS Teaching Standards. | Teachers earning 1.5 through 2.4 points. |
| Ineffective: Overall performance and results do not meet NYS Teaching Standards. | Teachers earning 1 through 1.4 points. |

Provide the ranges for the 60-point scoring bands.

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

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 | 5 |
| Informal/Short | 0 |
| Enter Total | 5 |

By trained in-school peer teachers or other trained reviewers

| | |
|----------------|---|
| Formal/Long | 0 |
| Informal/Short | 0 |

Independent evaluators

| | |
|----------------|---|
| Formal/Long | 0 |
| Informal/Short | 0 |

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

-
- In Person
-

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

-
- In Person
-

4.7) Observations of Tenured Teachers

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

By building principals or other trained administrators

| | |
|----------------|---|
| Formal/Long | 2 |
| Informal/Short | 0 |
| Total | 2 |

By trained in-school peer teachers or other trained reviewers

| | |
|----------------|---|
| Formal/Long | 0 |
| Informal/Short | 0 |

Independent evaluators

| | |
|----------------|---|
| Formal/Long | 0 |
| Informal/Short | 0 |

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

-
- In Person
-

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

-
- In Person
-

5. Composite Scoring (Teachers)

Created Tuesday, April 30, 2013

Updated Friday, February 21, 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 | 60-59 |
| Effective | 58-57 |
| Developing | 56-50 |
| Ineffective | 49-0 |

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 Tuesday, March 04, 2014

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/5265/146587-Df0w3Xx5v6/Farmingdale TIP.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:

The parties will continue to meet to discuss observations, evaluations and teacher improvement plan procedures as required by Education Law Section 3012(c). The resolution of the issues discussed by the parties shall be in writing, be placed within the collective

bargaining agreement, and this writing shall constitute compliance with the requirements of Education Law Section 3012(c).

Notwithstanding the above, the parties agree that effective July 1, 2011 and thereafter, as to the appeals procedure referred to in Education Law Section 3012(c), the following constitute compliance with the statute:

1. Appeals shall be limited to those evaluations which have resulted in a rating of Ineffective or Developing.
2. Within five school days of the receipt of an annual evaluation providing a rating as set forth in Subparagraph (1) above, a teacher may appeal the annual evaluation to the Superintendent of Schools or his/her designee. All appeals will follow this time frame. The appeal shall be in writing and shall articulate in detail the basis of the appeal. Appeals shall be limited to:
 - a. The substance of the annual professional performance review;
 - b. The school district's adherence to the standards and methodologies required for such reviews pursuant to Section 3012(c) of the Education Law;
 - c. The school district's adherence to the Regulations of the Commissioner and compliance with any applicable locally negotiated procedures;
 - d. The school district's issuance and/or implementation of the terms of the teacher's improvement plan;
3. Any issue not raised in the written appeal shall be deemed waived; and
4. Notwithstanding item (3) above, procedural issues shall be subject to this contract's grievance procedure.
5. Within five school days of receipt of the appeal, the Superintendent of Schools or his/her designee shall schedule a meeting with the teacher appealing their respective evaluation, should the teacher request such a meeting in the written appeal. Within five school days of receipt of the written appeal or the meeting with the teacher, whichever is later, the Superintendent or his/her designee shall render a written determination with respect thereto.
6. The determination of the Superintendent of Schools or his/her designee as to the substance of the evaluation shall not be grievable, arbitrable, nor reviewable in any other forum. However, nothing shall prevent a teacher from challenging the substance of an evaluation within the context of a proceeding pursuant to Education Law Section 3020-a.
7. The time frames referred to herein may be extended by mutual agreement of the parties. All appeals will be performed in a timely and expeditious manner.

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.

The district will certify that all administrators that evaluate teachers have received appropriate training in accordance with the NTI Institutes established by NYSED which include the following:

New York State Teaching Standards and related elements

Evidence-based observation techniques

Use of student growth models

Use of an approved rubric

Use of district tools that will include the Individual Professional Growth Plan and the portfolio for non-tenured teachers

Use of locally selected student performance measures in teacher evaluation

Use of the Statewide Instructional Performance System

scoring methods

Consideration in evaluating teachers of ELL students and students with disabilities

inter-rater reliability

Two turn-key trainers attended all NTI 2011- 2012 Sessions held in Albany

These District-approved training sessions have been delivered by the turn-key trainers during 10 training sessions throughout the 2011-12 school year with special sessions scheduled for new administrators. In addition to the 10 sessions, mock evaluations were staged, group critiques were held and administrative shadowing during observations and post-observation conferences.

On an annual basis, administrators will have facilitated opportunities to calibrate their ratings against the rubric and video lessons.

Re-certification will occur periodically in accordance with law and regulation. For new evaluators and lead evaluators training will address the same elements with a minimum of two days per year.

6.5) Assurances -- Evaluators

Please check the boxes below:

-
- Checked
-

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

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

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

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

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

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

(7) use of the Statewide Instructional Reporting System

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

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

-
- 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 Friday, February 21, 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):

| |
|------|
| K-5 |
| 6-8 |
| 9-12 |
| |
| |
| |

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.

| School or Program Type | SLO with Assessment Option | Name of the Assessment |
|------------------------|----------------------------|------------------------|
| n/a | | n/a |
| n/a | | n/a |
| n/a | | n/a |

Describe the district-adopted expectations for the level of performance required for each HEDI rating category and the process for assigning points to principals based on SLO results, consistent with regulations and assurances in the Comparable Growth Measures subcomponent. Include any district-determined expectations for student performance. 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. | n/a |
| Highly Effective (18 - 20 points) Results are well above state average for similar students (or District goals if no state test). | n/a |
| Effective (9 - 17 points) Results meet state average for similar students (or District goals if no state test). | n/a |
| Developing (3 - 8 points) Results are below state average for similar students (or District goals if no state test). | n/a |
| Ineffective (0 - 2 points) Results are well below state average for similar students (or District goals if no state test). | n/a |

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

(No response)

7.4) Special Considerations for Comparable Growth Measures

Describe any adjustments, controls, or other special considerations that will be used in 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.

n/a

7.5) Principals with More Than One Growth Measure

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

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

7.6) Assurances -- Comparable Growth Measures

Please check all of the boxes below:

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

8. Local Measures (Principals)

Created Tuesday, April 30, 2013

Updated Wednesday, March 19, 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).

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-5 | (d) measures used by district for teacher evaluation | Farmingdale developed grade specific local assessments for ELA and Math |
| 6-8 | (d) measures used by district for teacher evaluation | Farmingdale developed local assessments by grade level and/or course |
| 9-12 | (d) measures used by district for teacher evaluation | Farmingdale developed local assessments by grade level and/or course |

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. | HEDI Scores are based on the percentage of students meeting achievement target set by the district using pre assessment baseline data for all district-developed assessment administered in the building. See charts in task 8.1. |
| Highly Effective (14 - 15 points) Results are well above District- or BOCES-adopted expectations for growth or achievement for grade/subject. | See charts in task 8.1. |
| Effective (8- 13 points) Results meet District- or BOCES-adopted expectations for growth or achievement for grade/subject. | See charts in task 8.1. |
| Developing (3 - 7 points) Results are below District- or BOCES-adopted expectations for growth or achievement for grade/subject. | See charts in task 8.1. |
| Ineffective (0 - 2 points) Results are well below District- or BOCES-adopted expectations for growth or achievement for | See charts in task 8.1. |

grade/subject.

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/12190/1033078-qBFVOWF7fC/Farmingdale Table for 15% 20% APPR 1314- 3-11-14.xlsx

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

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

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

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

- (a) student achievement levels on State assessments in ELA and/or Math in Grades 4-8 (e.g., percentage of students in the school whose performance levels on State assessments are proficient or advanced)*
- (b) student growth or achievement on State assessments in ELA and/or Math in Grades 4-8 for students in each specific performance level (e.g., Level 1, Level 2)*
- (c) student growth or achievement on State assessments in ELA and/or Math in Grades 4-8 for students with disabilities and English Language Learners in Grades 4-8*
- (d) student performance on any or all of the district-wide locally selected measures approved for use in teacher evaluations*
- (e) four, five and/or six-year high school graduation and/or dropout rates for principals employed in a school with high school grades*
- (f) percentage of students who earn a Regents diploma with advanced designation and/or honors for principals employed in a school with high school grades*
- (g) percentage of a cohort of students that achieve specified scores on Regents examinations and/or Department approved alternative examinations (including, but not limited to, Advanced Placement examinations, International Baccalaureate examinations, SAT II, etc.), for principals employed in a school with high school grades (e.g., the percentage of students in the 2009 cohort that scored at least a 3 on an Advanced Placement examination since entry into the ninth grade)*
- (h) students' progress toward graduation in the school using strong predictive indicators, including but not limited to 9th and/or 10th grade credit accumulation and/or the percentage of students that pass 9th and/or 10th grade subjects most commonly associated with graduation and/or students' progress in passing the number of required Regents examinations for graduation, for principals employed in a school with high school grades*
- (i) student learning objectives (only allowable for principals in programs/buildings without a Value-Added measure for the State Growth subcomponent). Used with one of the following assessments: State, State-approved 3rd party, or a District, regional, or BOCES-developed assessment that is rigorous and comparable across classrooms*

Districts or BOCES that intend to use a district, regional, or BOCES-developed assessment must include the name, grade, and

subject of the assessment. For example, a regionally-developed 7th grade Social Studies assessment would be written as follows: [INSERT SPECIFIC NAME OF REGION]-developed 7th grade Social Studies assessment.

| Grade Configuration | Locally-Selected Measure from List of Approved Measures | Assessment |
|---------------------|---|------------|
|---------------------|---|------------|

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. | N/A |
| Highly Effective (18 - 20 points) Results are well above District- or BOCES-adopted expectations for growth or achievement for grade/subject. | N/A |
| Effective (9- 17 points) Results meet District- or BOCES-adopted expectations for growth or achievement for grade/subject. | N/A |
| Developing (3 - 8 points) Results are below District- or BOCES-adopted expectations for growth or achievement for grade/subject. | N/A |
| Ineffective (0 - 2 points) Results are well below District- or BOCES-adopted expectations for growth or achievement for grade/subject. | N/A |

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 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.

No controls used.

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.

If principals have more than one locally selected measure, the measures will each earn a score from 0-20 points (0-15 when value added is implemented) which will be weighted proportionately based on the number of students measured. Normal rounding rules apply.

8.5) Assurances

Please check all of the boxes below:

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

9. Other Measures of Effectiveness (Principals)

Created Tuesday, April 30, 2013

Updated Thursday, March 20, 2014

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 | Multidimensional Principal Performance 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] | 36 |
|---|----|

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. 24

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. | Checked |
| 9.3) Assurances -- Goals Assure that any other goals, if applicable, shall address quantifiable and verifiable improvements in academic results or the school's learning environment (e.g. student or teacher attendance). | Checked |

9.4) Sources of Evidence (if applicable)

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

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

9.5) Survey Tool(s) (if applicable)

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

(No response)

Note: When the State-approved survey list is 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.

36 points are achieved via equal distribution of value to the components of each domain in the Multidimensional Rubric. Points will be assigned based upon the evidence collected by the evaluator during observations of the principal during school visits, faculty meetings, PTA meetings and other events. The final scores for each component are based on all of the evidence collected and observed over the course of the year. The balance (24 points) are based upon the achievement of goals developed with the evaluator and a structured review of artifacts. See attached Table 5.

Ineffective = 0-16%, Developing = 17%-43%,

Effective = 44%-95%, Highly Effective 96%-100%. Normal rounding rules will apply but will not result in a principal moving between HEIDI rating categories.

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/12205/1033079-pMADJ4gk6R/Farmingdale Table 5 Principals Process for Assigning Points 3-18-14.xlsx

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

| | |
|---|--|
| Highly Effective: Overall performance and results exceed standards. | 58-60 as determined by each component of the domain. |
| Effective: Overall performance and results meet standards. | 30-57 as determined by each component of the domain. |

| | |
|--|--|
| Developing: Overall performance and results need improvement in order to meet standards. | 10-29 as determined by each component of the domain. |
| Ineffective: Overall performance and results do not meet standards. | 0-9 as determined by each component of the domain. |

Please provide the locally-negotiated 60 point scoring bands.

| | |
|------------------|-------|
| Highly Effective | 58-60 |
| Effective | 30-57 |
| Developing | 10-29 |
| Ineffective | 0-9 |

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 | 10 |
| By trained administrator | 5 |
| By trained independent evaluator | 0 |
| Enter Total | 15 |

Tenured Principals

| | |
|----------------------------------|----|
| By supervisor | 5 |
| By trained administrator | 5 |
| By trained independent evaluator | 0 |
| Enter Total | 10 |

10. Composite Scoring (Principals)

Created Tuesday, April 30, 2013

Updated Friday, February 21, 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 | 58-60 |
| Effective | 30-57 |
| Developing | 10-29 |
| Ineffective | 0-9 |

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 Tuesday, March 18, 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/5276/146623-Df0w3Xx5v6/Farmingdale PIP.docx](#)

11.3) Appeals Process

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

(1) the substance of the annual professional performance review

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

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

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

ANNUAL PROFESSIONAL PERFORMANCE REVIEW APPEALS PROCEDURE

1. The District's Annual Professional Performance Review Plan and procedures as related to District Administrators is attached hereto as Schedule "A" and expressly incorporated herein pursuant to, and in compliance with, Section 3012 (c) of the Education Law.

2. Appeals Procedure:

The parties agree that as to the appeals procedure referred to in Education Law Section 3012 (c), the following constitutes compliance with the statute:

a. Appeals shall be limited to those evaluations which have resulted in a rating of Ineffective or Developing.

b. Within five (5) school days of the receipt of an annual evaluation providing a rating as set forth in Subparagraph (a) above, an administrator may appeal the annual evaluation to the Superintendent of Schools or his/her designee. All appeals follow the same time frame. The appeal shall be in writing and shall articulate in detail the basis of the appeal. Appeals shall be limited to:

1. The substance of the annual professional performance review;

2. The school district's adherence to the standards and methodologies required for such reviews pursuant to Section 3012 (c) of the Education Law;

3. The school district's adherence to the Regulations of the Commissioner and compliance with any applicable locally negotiated procedures;

4. The school district's issuance and/or implementation of the terms of the administrator's improvement plan;

Any issue not raised in the written appeal shall be deemed waived; and

Notwithstanding the above, procedural issues shall be subject to this contract's grievance procedure.

c. Within five (5) school days of receipt of the appeal, the Superintendent of Schools or his/her designee shall render a written determination with respect thereto.

d. The determination of the Superintendent of Schools or his/her designee as to the substance of the evaluation shall not be grievable, arbitrable, nor reviewable in any other forum. However, nothing contained herein shall prevent an Administrator from challenging the substance of an evaluation within the context of a proceeding pursuant to Education Law 3020-a.

e. The time frames referred to herein may be extended by mutual agreement of the parties. All appeals will conclude in a timely and expeditious manner.

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 district will certify that all central office administrators that evaluate principals have received training in accordance with the NTI Institutes established by NYSED which include the following:

ISLLC Standards and related elements

Evidence-based observation techniques

Use of student growth models

Use of an approved rubric

Use of district tools that will include the Individual Professional Growth Plan

Use of locally selected student performance measures for principals

Use of the Statewide Instructional Performance System

Scoring methods

Specific considerations in evaluating principals of ELL's and SWD's

Inter-rater reliability

Two turn-key trainers attended all NTI 2011- 2012 Sessions held in Albany

These District-approved training sessions have been delivered by the turn-key trainers training sessions throughout the 2011-12 school year. On an annual basis, administrators will have facilitated opportunities to calibrate their ratings against the rubric. Re-certification will occur periodically in accordance with law and regulation. New evaluators and lead evaluators will receive a minimum of 2 days of initial training. This training will be equivalent to that listed above.

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

11.6) Assurances -- Principals

Please check all of the boxes below:

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

11.7) Assurances -- Data

Please check all of the boxes below:

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

12. Joint Certification of APPR Plan

Created Tuesday, April 30, 2013

Updated Monday, March 24, 2014

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/12158/1033082-3Uqgn5g9Iu/APPR Joint Certification 3-24-14.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.

Farmingdale

15%

| Rating | HEDI Points | Percent Students Achieving Target | HEDI scores and Target Range | | |
|------------------|-------------|-----------------------------------|------------------------------|----|------|
| | | | | to | |
| Ineffective | 0 | 0% | 0% | to | 7% |
| | 1 | 8% | 8% | to | 15% |
| | 2 | 16% | 16% | to | 23% |
| Developing | 3 | 24% | 24% | to | 32% |
| | 4 | 33% | 33% | to | 40% |
| | 5 | 41% | 41% | to | 48% |
| | 6 | 49% | 49% | to | 56% |
| | 7 | 57% | 57% | to | 64% |
| Effective | 8 | 65% | 65% | to | 69% |
| | 9 | 70% | 70% | to | 74% |
| | 10 | 75% | 75% | to | 79% |
| | 11 | 80% | 80% | to | 84% |
| | 12 | 85% | 85% | to | 89% |
| | 13 | 90% | 90% | to | 94% |
| Highly Effective | 14 | 95% | 95% | to | 97% |
| | 15 | 100% | 98% | to | 100% |

Farmingdale

20%

| | HEDI Points | SLO/Local Target or Percent Meeting Target | HEDI Scores and Target Range | |
|-------------|-------------|--|------------------------------|--------|
| Ineffective | 0 | 0.00% | 0 to | 4.18% |
| | 1 | 4.19% | 4.19% to | 8.36% |
| | 2 | 8.37% | 8.37% to | 12.55% |
| Developing | 3 | 12.56% | 12.56% to | 16.73% |
| | 4 | 16.74% | 16.74% to | 20.92% |
| | 5 | 20.93% | 20.93% to | 25.10% |
| | 6 | 25.11% | 25.11% to | 29.29% |
| | 7 | 29.30% | 29.30% to | 33.47% |
| | 8 | 33.48% | 33.48% to | 37.66% |
| Effective | 9 | 37.67% | 37.67% to | 43.32% |
| | 10 | 43.33% | 43.33% to | 48.99% |
| | 11 | 49.00% | 49.00% to | 54.66% |
| | 12 | 54.67% | 54.67% to | 60.32% |
| | 13 | 60.33% | 60.33% to | 65.99% |
| | 14 | 66.00% | 66.00% to | 71.66% |
| | 15 | 71.67% | 71.67% to | 77.32% |

| | | | | |
|-------------------------|-----------|----------------|------------------|----------------|
| | 16 | 77.33% | 77.33% to | 82.99% |
| | 17 | 83.00% | 83.00% to | 88.66% |
| Highly Effective | 18 | 88.67% | 88.67% to | 94.32% |
| | 19 | 94.33% | 94.33% to | 97.16% |
| | 20 | 100.00% | 97.17% to | 100.00% |

Farmingdale

Local - 15%

| | | Percent Students Achieving Target | HEDI scores and Target Range | | |
|------------------|-------------|-----------------------------------|------------------------------|----|------|
| Rating | HEDI Points | | | | |
| Ineffective | 0 | 0% | 0% | to | 7% |
| | 1 | 8% | 8% | to | 15% |
| | 2 | 16% | 16% | to | 23% |
| Developing | 3 | 24% | 24% | to | 32% |
| | 4 | 33% | 33% | to | 40% |
| | 5 | 41% | 41% | to | 48% |
| | 6 | 49% | 49% | to | 56% |
| | 7 | 57% | 57% | to | 64% |
| Effective | 8 | 65% | 65% | to | 69% |
| | 9 | 70% | 70% | to | 74% |
| | 10 | 75% | 75% | to | 79% |
| | 11 | 80% | 80% | to | 84% |
| | 12 | 85% | 85% | to | 89% |
| | 13 | 90% | 90% | to | 94% |
| Highly Effective | 14 | 95% | 95% | to | 97% |
| | 15 | 100% | 98% | to | 100% |

Farmingdale

Local - 20%

| | HEDI Points | SLO/Local Target or Percent Meeting Target | HEDI Scores and Target Range | |
|-------------|-------------|--|------------------------------|--------|
| Ineffective | 0 | 0.00% | 0 to | 4.18% |
| | 1 | 4.19% | 4.19% to | 8.36% |
| | 2 | 8.37% | 8.37% to | 12.55% |
| Developing | 3 | 12.56% | 12.56% to | 16.73% |
| | 4 | 16.74% | 16.74% to | 20.92% |
| | 5 | 20.93% | 20.93% to | 25.10% |
| | 6 | 25.11% | 25.11% to | 29.29% |
| | 7 | 29.30% | 29.30% to | 33.47% |
| | 8 | 33.48% | 33.48% to | 37.66% |
| Effective | 9 | 37.67% | 37.67% to | 43.32% |
| | 10 | 43.33% | 43.33% to | 48.99% |
| | 11 | 49.00% | 49.00% to | 54.66% |
| | 12 | 54.67% | 54.67% to | 60.32% |
| | 13 | 60.33% | 60.33% to | 65.99% |
| | 14 | 66.00% | 66.00% to | 71.66% |
| | 15 | 71.67% | 71.67% to | 77.32% |

| | | | | |
|-------------------------|-----------|----------------|------------------|----------------|
| | 16 | 77.33% | 77.33% to | 82.99% |
| | 17 | 83.00% | 83.00% to | 88.66% |
| Highly Effective | 18 | 88.67% | 88.67% to | 94.32% |
| | 19 | 94.33% | 94.33% to | 97.16% |
| | 20 | 100.00% | 97.17% to | 100.00% |

| 20% | HEDI Points | SLO/Local Target or Percent Meeting Target | HEDI Scores and Target Range | |
|------------------|-------------|--|------------------------------|---------|
| | Ineffective | 0 | 0.00% | 0 to |
| 1 | | 4.19% | 4.19% to | 8.36% |
| 2 | | 8.37% | 8.37% to | 12.55% |
| Developing | 3 | 12.56% | 12.56% to | 16.73% |
| | 4 | 16.74% | 16.74% to | 20.92% |
| | 5 | 20.93% | 20.93% to | 25.10% |
| | 6 | 25.11% | 25.11% to | 29.29% |
| | 7 | 29.30% | 29.30% to | 33.47% |
| | 8 | 33.48% | 33.48% to | 37.66% |
| Effective | 9 | 37.67% | 37.67% to | 43.32% |
| | 10 | 43.33% | 43.33% to | 48.99% |
| | 11 | 49.00% | 49.00% to | 54.66% |
| | 12 | 54.67% | 54.67% to | 60.32% |
| | 13 | 60.33% | 60.33% to | 65.99% |
| | 14 | 66.00% | 66.00% to | 71.66% |
| | 15 | 71.67% | 71.67% to | 77.32% |
| | 16 | 77.33% | 77.33% to | 82.99% |
| | 17 | 83.00% | 83.00% to | 88.66% |
| Highly Effective | 18 | 88.67% | 88.67% to | 94.32% |
| | 19 | 94.33% | 94.33% to | 97.16% |
| | 20 | 100.00% | 97.17% to | 100.00% |

5.1 Table 4 Other Measures Rubric Score to Sub-Component Conversion Chart

| Total Average Rubric Score | Category | Conversion score for composite |
|----------------------------|----------|--------------------------------|
| Ineffective 0-49 | | |
| 1.000 | | 0 |
| 1.008 | | 1 |
| 1.017 | | 2 |
| 1.025 | | 3 |
| 1.033 | | 4 |
| 1.042 | | 5 |
| 1.050 | | 6 |
| 1.058 | | 7 |
| 1.067 | | 8 |
| 1.075 | | 9 |
| 1.083 | | 10 |
| 1.092 | | 11 |
| 1.100 | | 12 |
| 1.108 | | 13 |
| 1.115 | | 14 |
| 1.123 | | 15 |
| 1.131 | | 16 |
| 1.138 | | 17 |
| 1.146 | | 18 |
| 1.154 | | 19 |
| 1.162 | | 20 |
| 1.169 | | 21 |
| 1.177 | | 22 |
| 1.185 | | 23 |
| 1.192 | | 24 |
| 1.200 | | 25 |
| 1.208 | | 26 |
| 1.217 | | 27 |
| 1.225 | | 28 |
| 1.233 | | 29 |
| 1.242 | | 30 |
| 1.250 | | 31 |
| 1.258 | | 32 |
| 1.267 | | 33 |
| 1.275 | | 34 |
| 1.283 | | 35 |
| 1.292 | | 36 |
| 1.300 | | 37 |
| 1.308 | | 38 |
| 1.317 | | 39 |
| 1.325 | | 40 |
| 1.333 | | 41 |
| 1.342 | | 42 |
| 1.350 | | 43 |
| 1.358 | | 44 |
| 1.367 | | 45 |
| 1.375 | | 46 |

| | | |
|-------------------------------|--|---------------------|
| 1.383 | | 47 |
| 1.392 | | 48 |
| 1.400 | | 49 |
| Developing 50-56 | | |
| 1.5 | | 50 |
| 1.6 | | 50.7 |
| 1.7 | | 51.4 |
| 1.8 | | 52.1 |
| 1.9 | | 52.8 |
| 2 | | 53.5 |
| 2.1 | | 54.2 |
| 2.2 | | 54.9 |
| 2.3 | | 55.6 |
| 2.4 | | 56.3 |
| Effective 57-58 | | |
| 2.5 | | 57 |
| 2.6 | | 57.2 |
| 2.7 | | 57.4 |
| 2.8 | | 57.6 |
| 2.9 | | 57.8 |
| 3 | | 58 |
| 3.1 | | 58.2 |
| 3.2 | | 58.4 |
| 3.3 | | 58.6 |
| 3.4 | | 58.8 |
| Highly Effective 59-60 | | |
| 3.5 | | 59 |
| 3.6 | | 59.3 |
| 3.7 | | 59.5 |
| 3.8 | | 59.8 |
| 3.9 | | 60 |
| 4 | | 60.25 (round to 60) |

FARMINGDALE SCHOOLS TEACHER IMPROVEMENT PLAN (TIP)

The purpose of the Teacher Improvement Plan (TIP) is to provide organizational support and assistance to teachers who are not meeting the State and District's professional performance standards. All teachers who are rated ineffective or developing on their annual summative evaluation will be placed on a Teacher Improvement Plan. Additionally, individual teachers who may be having difficulty in meeting the New York State Teaching Standards during the school year may be placed on a TIP. While the District has a responsibility to remove teachers who consistently perform below expectations, a major goal of a Teacher Improvement Plan is to provide teachers who may be experiencing some difficulties with a clear understanding of the specific concerns, and a focused, structured opportunity to become effective. Under the new APPR regulations, more teachers may be placed on improvement plans; this should be seen as an opportunity to improve teaching skills and not as a prelude to dismissal.

The TIP shall be developed by the district in consultation with the teacher, the FFT President or designee, and the Assistant Superintendent for Instruction or his or her designee. It is designed to help a teacher to perform at an effective level. Each TIP will specify the following:

- identification of specific behaviors to be changed related to the District and/or New York State Teaching Standards, with a precise statement of expected outcomes
- a timeline for accomplishing change including the frequency and nature of required observations
- actions that the teacher will take in order to make the desired changes
- specific supports that are available to the teacher, including people, materials, or professional development opportunities
- monitoring/evaluation methods

Teachers are placed on improvement plans as a result of a failure to demonstrate effective teaching performance. Concerns may arise in one or multiple areas of teaching practice. Except in the case of sudden egregious problems, the District will provide several levels of feedback and opportunities for remediation prior to placing a teacher on a Teacher Improvement Plan. Depending on the nature of the performance problem, the feedback may be verbal, written or both. In all cases, administrative feedback will describe the area in which the teacher is not meeting the standard, cite examples, and indicate what changes are required in order to meet New York State Teaching Standards. Informal intervention may lead to resolution of the problem.

Teacher Improvement Plan

(Based upon the NYS APPR Regulation and common local district practices)

Date: _____

Developed by : _____

Teacher

Administrator

Other

Identification of specific behaviors to be changed and a statement of expected outcomes related to the Farmingdale Teaching Performance Rubrics:

Timeline for accomplishing change:

Actions that the teacher agrees to take, in order to achieve the targeted outcomes:

Specific description of multiple supports that will be available to the teacher, which may include, for instance:

- Mentor, PDP, Department Chair, Administrator
- Workshops, courses, observation schedule, peer visitations

How progress in the change effort will be monitored and evaluated:

Signatures of teacher, union representative, and the administrator indicate agreement to the above plan.

Teacher: _____

Date: _____

Asst. Superintendent for
Instruction or designee

Date: _____

FFT President or designee _____

Date: _____

Farmingdale

Local - 15%

| | | Percent Students Achieving Target | HEDI scores and Target Range | | |
|------------------|-------------|-----------------------------------|------------------------------|----|------|
| Rating | HEDI Points | | | | |
| Ineffective | 0 | 0% | 0% | to | 7% |
| | 1 | 8% | 8% | to | 15% |
| | 2 | 16% | 16% | to | 23% |
| Developing | 3 | 24% | 24% | to | 32% |
| | 4 | 33% | 33% | to | 40% |
| | 5 | 41% | 41% | to | 48% |
| | 6 | 49% | 49% | to | 56% |
| | 7 | 57% | 57% | to | 64% |
| Effective | 8 | 65% | 65% | to | 69% |
| | 9 | 70% | 70% | to | 74% |
| | 10 | 75% | 75% | to | 79% |
| | 11 | 80% | 80% | to | 84% |
| | 12 | 85% | 85% | to | 89% |
| | 13 | 90% | 90% | to | 94% |
| Highly Effective | 14 | 95% | 95% | to | 97% |
| | 15 | 100% | 98% | to | 100% |

Farmingdale

Local - 20%

| | HEDI Points | SLO/Local Target or Percent Meeting Target | HEDI Scores and Target Range | |
|-------------|-------------|--|------------------------------|--------|
| Ineffective | 0 | 0.00% | 0 to | 4.18% |
| | 1 | 4.19% | 4.19% to | 8.36% |
| | 2 | 8.37% | 8.37% to | 12.55% |
| Developing | 3 | 12.56% | 12.56% to | 16.73% |
| | 4 | 16.74% | 16.74% to | 20.92% |
| | 5 | 20.93% | 20.93% to | 25.10% |
| | 6 | 25.11% | 25.11% to | 29.29% |
| | 7 | 29.30% | 29.30% to | 33.47% |
| | 8 | 33.48% | 33.48% to | 37.66% |
| Effective | 9 | 37.67% | 37.67% to | 43.32% |
| | 10 | 43.33% | 43.33% to | 48.99% |
| | 11 | 49.00% | 49.00% to | 54.66% |
| | 12 | 54.67% | 54.67% to | 60.32% |
| | 13 | 60.33% | 60.33% to | 65.99% |
| | 14 | 66.00% | 66.00% to | 71.66% |
| | 15 | 71.67% | 71.67% to | 77.32% |

| | | | | |
|-------------------------|-----------|----------------|------------------|----------------|
| | 16 | 77.33% | 77.33% to | 82.99% |
| | 17 | 83.00% | 83.00% to | 88.66% |
| Highly Effective | 18 | 88.67% | 88.67% to | 94.32% |
| | 19 | 94.33% | 94.33% to | 97.16% |
| | 20 | 100.00% | 97.17% to | 100.00% |

| | | RUBRIC VALUE |
|--|--|--------------|
| DOMAIN I - SHARED VISION OF LEARNING | | |
| CULTURE | | 0-3.0 |
| SUSTAINABILITY | | 0-3.0 |
| TOTAL | | 0-6.0 |
| DOMAIN II - SCHOOL CULTURE AND INSTRUCTIONAL PROGRAM | | |
| CULTURE | | 0-1.2 |
| INSTRUCTIONAL PROGRAM | | 0-1.2 |
| CAPACITY BUILDING | | 0-1.2 |
| SUSTAINABILITY | | 0-1.2 |
| STRATEGIC PLANNING PROCESS | | 0-1.2 |
| TOTAL | | 0-6.0 |
| DOMAIN III- SAFE, EFFICIENT, EFFECTIVE LEARNING ENVIRONMENT | | |
| CAPACITY BUILDING | | 0-1.5 |
| CULTURE | | 0-1.5 |
| SUSTAINABILITY | | 0-1.5 |
| INSTRUCTIONAL PROGRAM | | 0-1.5 |
| TOTAL | | 0-6.0 |
| DOMAIN IV- COMMUNITY | | |
| STRATEGIC PLANNING | | 0-2.0 |
| CULTURE | | 0-2.0 |
| SUSTAINABILITY | | 0-2.0 |
| TOTAL | | 0-6.0 |
| DOMAIN V- INTEGRITY, FAIRNESS, | | |
| ETHICS | | 0-3.0 |
| SUSTAINABILITY | | 0-3.0 |
| CULTURE | | 0-6.0 |
| TOTAL | | |
| DOMAIN VI-POLITICAL SOCIAL, ECONOMICS | | |
| LEGAL, AND CULTURAL CONTEXT | | |
| SUSTAINABILITY | | 0-3.0 |
| CULTURE | | 0-3.0 |
| TOTAL | | 0-6.0 |
| GOALS | | 0-12 |
| ARTIFACTS | | 0-12 |

FARMINGDALE SCHOOLS IMPROVEMENT PLAN

The purpose of the Principal and Administrator Improvement Plan is to provide organizational support and assistance to those principals and administrators who are not meeting the State and District's professional performance standards. All administrators who are rated ineffective or developing on their annual summative evaluation will be placed on an Improvement Plan. Additionally, individual principals and administrators who may be having difficulty in meeting the New York Standards during the school year may be placed on an Improvement Plan. **While the district has a responsibility to remove administrators who consistently perform below expectation, a major goal of an Improvement Plan is to provide administrators who may be experiencing some difficulties with a clear understanding of the specific concerns, and a focused, structured opportunity to become effective.** Under the new APPR regulations, more principals and administrators may be placed on improvement plans; this should be seen as an opportunity to improve skills and not as a prelude to dismissal.

The IP shall be developed by the district in consultation with the administrator, the FAAS President or designee, and the Superintendent of Schools or his or her designee. It is designed to help an administrator to perform at an effective level. Each IP will specify the following:

- identification of specific behaviors to be changed related to the District and/or New York State Standards, with a precise statement of expected outcomes
- a timeline for accomplishing change
- actions that the administrator will take in order to make the desired changes
- specific supports that are available to the administrator, including people, materials, or professional development opportunities
- monitoring/evaluation methods

Administrators are placed on improvement plans as a result of a failure to demonstrate effective performance. Concerns may arise in one or multiple areas of practice. Except in the case of sudden egregious problems, the District will provide several levels of feedback and opportunities for remediation prior to placing a principal or administrator on an Improvement Plan.

Depending on the nature of the performance problem, the feedback may be verbal, written or both. In all cases, feedback will describe the area in which the administrator is not meeting the standard, cite examples, and indicate what changes are required in order to meet New York State and District Standards. Informal intervention may lead to resolution of the problem.

Improvement Plan

Date: _____

Developed for: _____
Principal/Administrator

Identification of specific behaviors to be changed and a statement of expected outcomes related to the Performance Rubric:

Actions that the administrator agrees to take, in order to achieve the targeted outcomes:

Timeline for accomplishing change:

Specific description of multiple supports that will be available to the administrator, which may include, for instance:

- Mentor, PDP, Other Administrators
- Workshops, courses, observation and peer consultation

How progress in the change effort will be monitored and evaluated:

Signatures of administrator, union representative, and the Superintendent indicate agreement to the above plan.

Principal/
Administrator: _____
Date: _____

Superintendent of
Schools or designee _____
Date: _____

FAAS President or
designee _____
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 TIP or PIP plan, in accordance with the regulations, as soon as practicable but in no case later than 10 school days from the opening of classes in the school year following the performance year
- Assure that all evaluators and lead evaluators will be properly trained and that lead evaluators will be certified and recertified as necessary in accordance with the regulations
- Assure that the district or BOCES has appeal procedures that are consistent with the regulations and that they provide for the timely and expeditious resolution of an appeal
- Assure that, for teachers, all NYS Teaching Standards are assessed at least once per year, and, for principals, all Leadership Standards are assessed at least once per year
- Assure that it is possible for a teacher or principal to obtain each point in the scoring ranges, including 0 for each subcomponent and that the APPR Plan describes the process for assigning points for each subcomponent
- Assure that locally-selected measures are rigorous and comparable across all classrooms (for teachers, the same locally-selected measure is used across a subject and/or grade level; for principals, the same locally-selected measure must be used for all principals in the same or similar program or grade configuration)
- Assure that, if more than one type of locally-selected measure is used for different groups of teachers within a grade/subject, the measures are comparable based on the Standards of Educational and Psychological Testing
- Assure that, if more than one type of locally-selected measure is used for principals in the same or similar grade configuration or program, the measures are comparable based on the Standards of Educational and Psychological Testing
- Assure that the process for assigning points for all subcomponents and the composite scores will use the narrative HEDI descriptions described in the regulations to effectively differentiate educators' performance in ways that improve student learning and instruction
- Assure that district or BOCES will develop SLOs according to the rules and/or guidance established by SED and that past academic performance and / or baseline academic data of students is taken into account when developing an SLO
- Assure that Student Growth/Value Added Measure will be used where applicable
- Assure that any material changes to this APPR Plan will be submitted to the Commissioner for approval as soon as practicable and/or in a timeframe prescribed by the Commissioner
- Assure that this APPR Plan applies to all classroom teachers and building principals as defined in the regulation and SED guidance
- Assure that the district or BOCES will provide the Department with any information necessary to conduct annual monitoring pursuant to the regulations
- If this APPR Plan is being submitted subsequent to July 1, 2013, assure that this was the result of unresolved collective bargaining negotiations

Signatures, dates

Superintendent Signature: Date:

John Lewis 3/24/14

Teachers Union President Signature: Date:

Clare M Zatorski 3/24/14

Administrative Union President Signature: Date:

Alan de Zure 3/24/14

Board of Education President Signature: Date:

[Signature] 3/24/14