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

August 20, 2013

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 for the 2012-2013 school year. As a reminder, we are relying on the information you provided on your APPR form, including the certifications and assurances that are part of your approved APPR. If any material changes are made to your approved APPR plan, your district/BOCES must submit such material changes to us for approval. Please see the attached notes for further information.

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

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

Thank you again for your hard work.

Sincerely,

John B. King, Jr.
Commissioner

Attachment

c: Dr. Thomas L. Rogers

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

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

Annual Professional Performance Reviews: 2012-13

Created Monday, May 21, 2012
Updated Thursday, June 20, 2013

1

Disclaimers

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

The Department will not review any attachments other than those required in the online form. Any additional attachments supplied by the school district or BOCES are for informational purposes only for the teachers and principals reviewed under this APPR plan. Statements and/or materials in such additional attachments have not been approved and/or endorsed by the Department. However, the Department 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) School Improvement Grant (SIG) Districts Only

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

Not applicable

1.4) Award Classification

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

(No response)

1.5) Assurances

Please check all of the boxes below:

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

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

Submission of material changes to an approved APPR plan

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

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

Multi-year, please specify the years:: 2012-2014

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

Created Monday, May 21, 2012
Updated Wednesday, July 31, 2013

Page 1

STATE-PROVIDED MEASURES OF STUDENT GROWTH

(25 points with an approved value-added measure)

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

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

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

2.1) Assurances

Please check the boxes below:

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

STUDENT LEARNING OBJECTIVES AS COMPARABLE GROWTH MEASURES (20 points)

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

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

State assessments (or Regents or Regent equivalents), *required if one exists*
If no State assessment or Regents exam exists:

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

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

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

State assessments, *required if one exists*

List of State-approved 3rd party assessments

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

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

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

2.2) Grades K-3 ELA

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

	ELA	Assessment
K	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 student performance.

Use this box, if needed, to describe the general process for assigning HEDI categories for these grades/subjects in this subcomponent. If needed, you may upload a table or graphic at 2.11, below.	HEDI Scores are based on the percentage of students meeting classwide growth target set by the district using pre assessment baseline data as compared to the summative assesement. see table 1.

Highly Effective (18 - 20 points) Results are well-above state average for similar students (or District goals if no state test).	94.29% through 100% of the students meeting target growth scores
Effective (9 - 17 points) Results meet state average for similar students (or District goals if no state test).	68.57% through 94.28% of the students meeting target growth scores
Developing (3 - 8 points) Results are below state average for similar students (or District goals if no state test).	22.86% through 68.56% of the students meeting target growth scores
Ineffective (0 - 2 points) Results are well-below state average for similar students (or District goals if no state test).	0% through 22.85% of the students meeting target growth scores

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 student performance.

Use this box, if needed, to describe the general process for assigning HEDI categories for these grades/subjects in this subcomponent. If needed, you may upload a table or graphic at 2.11, below.	HEDI Scores are based on the percentage of students meeting classwide growth target set by the district using pre assessment baseline data as compared to the summative assessment. see table 1.
Highly Effective (18 - 20 points) Results are well-above state average for similar students (or District goals if no state test).	94.29% through 100% of the students meeting target growth scores
Effective (9 - 17 points) Results meet state average for similar students (or District goals if no state test).	68.57% through 94.28% of the students meeting target growth scores
Developing (3 - 8 points) Results are below state average for similar students (or District goals if no state test).	22.86% through 68.56% of the students meeting target growth scores
Ineffective (0 - 2 points) Results are well-below state average for similar students (or District goals if no state test).	0% through 22.85% of the students meeting target growth scores

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 District developed 6th gr. Science assessment

7	District, regional or BOCES-developed assessment	Farmingdale District developed 7th gr. 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 student performance.

Use this box, if needed, to describe the general process for assigning HEDI categories for these grades/subjects in this subcomponent. If needed, you may upload a table or graphic at 2.11, below.	HEDI Scores are based on the percentage of students meeting classwide growth target set by the district using pre assessment baseline data as compared to the summative assessement. see table 1.
Highly Effective (18 - 20 points) Results are well-above state average for similar students (or District goals if no state test).	94.29% through 100% of the students meeting target growth scores
Effective (9 - 17 points) Results meet state average for similar students (or District goals if no state test).	68.57% through 94.28% of the students meeting target growth scores
Developing (3 - 8 points) Results are below state average for similar students (or District goals if no state test).	22.86% through 68.56% of the students meeting target growth scores
Ineffective (0 - 2 points) Results are well-below state average for similar students (or District goals if no state test).	0% through 22.85% of the students meeting target growth scores

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 District developed 6 grade Social Studies assessment
7	District, regional or BOCES-developed assessment	Farmingdale District developed 7th gr. Social Studies assessment
8	District, regional or BOCES-developed assessment	Farmingdale District developed 8th gr. Social Studies assessment

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

Use this box, if needed, to describe the general process for assigning HEDI categories for these grades/subjects in this subcomponent. If needed, you may upload a table or graphic at 2.11, below.	HEDI Scores are based on the percentage of students meeting classwide growth target set by the district using pre assessment baseline data as compared to the summative assessment. see table 1.
Highly Effective (18 - 20 points) Results are well-above District goals for similar students.	94.29% through 100% of the students meeting target growth scores
Effective (9 - 17 points) Results meet District goals for similar students.	68.57% through 94.28% of the students meeting target growth scores

Developing (3 - 8 points) Results are below District goals for similar students.	22.86% through 68.56% of the students meeting target growth scores
Ineffective (0 - 2 points) Results are well-below District goals for similar students.	0% through 22.85% of the students meeting target growth scores

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	Global 1 Farmingdale District Developed Final Exam

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

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

Use this box, if needed, to describe the general process for assigning HEDI categories for these grades/subjects in this subcomponent. If needed, you may upload a table or graphic at 2.11, below.	HEDI Scores are based on the percentage of students meeting classwide growth target set by the district using pre assessment baseline data as compared to the summative assessment. see table 1.
Highly Effective (18 - 20 points) Results are well-above District goals for similar students.	94.29% through 100% of the students meeting target growth scores
Effective (9 - 17 points) Results meet District goals for similar students.	68.57% through 94.28% of the students meeting target growth scores
Developing (3 - 8 points) Results are below District goals for similar students.	22.86% through 68.56% of the students meeting target growth scores
Ineffective (0 - 2 points) Results are well-below District goals for similar students.	0% through 22.85% of the students meeting target growth scores

2.7) High School Science Regents Courses

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

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

	Science Regents Courses	Assessment

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

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

Use this box, if needed, to describe the general process for assigning HEDI categories for these grades/subjects in this subcomponent. If needed, you may upload a table or graphic at 2.11, below.	HEDI Scores are based on the percentage of students meeting classwide growth target set by the district using pre assessment baseline data as compared to the summative assessement. see table 1.
Highly Effective (18 - 20 points) Results are well-above District goals for similar students.	94.29% through 100% of the students meeting target growth scores
Effective (9 - 17 points) Results meet District goals for similar students.	68.57% through 94.28% of the students meeting target growth scores
Developing (3 - 8 points) Results are below District goals for similar students.	22.86% through 68.56% of the students meeting target growth scores
Ineffective (0 - 2 points) Results are well-below District goals for similar students.	0% through 22.85% of the students meeting target growth scores

2.8) High School Math Regents Courses

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

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

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

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

Use this box, if needed, to describe the general process for assigning HEDI categories for these grades/subjects in this subcomponent. If needed, you may upload a table or graphic at 2.11, below.	HEDI Scores are based on the percentage of students meeting classwide growth target set by the district using pre assessment baseline data as compared to the summative assessement. see table 1.
Highly Effective (18 - 20 points) Results are well-above District goals for similar students.	94.29% through 100% of the students meeting target growth scores
Effective (9 - 17 points) Results meet District goals for similar students.	68.57% through 94.28% of the students meeting target growth scores

Developing (3 - 8 points) Results are below District goals for similar students.	22.86% through 68.56% of the students meeting target growth scores
Ineffective (0 - 2 points) Results are well-below District goals for similar students.	0% through 22.85% of the students meeting target growth scores

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	NYS Comprehensive English Regents Exam

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

Use this box, if needed, to describe the general process for assigning HEDI categories for these grades/subjects in this subcomponent. If needed, you may upload a table or graphic at 2.11, below.	HEDI Scores are based on the percentage of students meeting classwide growth target set by the district using pre assessment baseline data as compared to the summative assessment. see table 1.
Highly Effective (18 - 20 points) Results are well-above District goals for similar students.	94.29% through 100% of the students meeting target growth scores
Effective (9 - 17 points) Results meet District goals for similar students.	68.57% through 94.28% of the students meeting target growth scores
Developing (3 - 8 points) Results are below District goals for similar students.	22.86% through 68.56% of the students meeting target growth scores
Ineffective (0 - 2 points) Results are well-below District goals for similar students.	0% through 22.85% of the students meeting target growth scores

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 devloped grade/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 student performance.

Use this box, if needed, to describe the general process for assigning HEDI categories for these grades/subjects in this subcomponent. If needed, you may upload a table or graphic at 2.11, below.	HEDI Scores are based on the percentage of students meeting classwide growth target set by the district using pre assessment baseline data as compared to the summative assessment. see table 1.
Highly Effective (18 - 20 points) Results are well-above District goals for similar students.	94.29% through 100% of the students meeting target growth scores
Effective (9 - 17 points) Results meet District goals for similar students.	68.57% through 94.28% of the students meeting target growth scores
Developing (3 - 8 points) Results are below District goals for similar students.	22.86% through 68.56% of the students meeting target growth scores
Ineffective (0 - 2 points) Results are well-below District goals for similar students.	0% through 22.85% of the students meeting target growth scores

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

(No response)

2.11) HEDI Tables or Graphics

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

assets/survey-uploads/5364/131640-TXEtxx9bQW/Farmingdale Table 1 SLOand Local 20 total points_1.xlsx

2.12) Locally Developed Controls

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

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

The district will use pre-assessments and/or diagnostic assessments as a baseline to set growth targets for students. The agregate student growth percentage will result in a HEDI rating for the teacher. No other adjustments, controls or special considerations will be made.

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

3. Local Measures (Teachers)

Created Monday, May 21, 2012
Updated Thursday, August 01, 2013

Page 1

Locally Selected Measures of Student Achievement or Growth

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

Measures based on:

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

3.1) Grades 4-8 ELA

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

	Locally-Selected Measure from List of Approved Measures	Assessment
4	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 Writing benchmark assessment
7	5) District, regional, or BOCES–developed assessments	Farmingdale developed 7th Grade Writing benchmark assessment
8	5) District, regional, or BOCES–developed assessments	Farmingdale developed 8th Grade Writing benchmark assessment

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 growth target set by the district using pre assessment baseline data. see table 2.
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 assessment that will be used for the locally-selected measure for the grade/subject listed. Then name the specific assessment, listing the full name of the assessment.

	Locally-Selected Measure from List of Approved Measures	Assessment
4	5) District, regional, or BOCES–developed assessments	Farmingdale developed 4th Grade Local math assessment
5	5) District, regional, or BOCES–developed assessments	Farmingdale developed 5th Grade Local math assessment
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 growth target set by the district using pre assessment baseline data. see table 2.
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/5139/131648-rhJdBgDruP/Farmingdale Table 2 Local 15pts and Table 3 Local 20 pts_1.xlsx

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

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

Measures based on:

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

3.4) Grades K-3 ELA

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

	Locally-Selected Measure from List of Approved Measures	Assessment
K	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. see table 3.

Highly Effective (18-20 points) Results are well above District- or BOCES-adopted expectations for growth or achievement for grade/subject.	94.29% through 100% of students meeting growth target.
Effective (9-17 points) Results meet District- or BOCES-adopted expectations for growth or achievement for grade/subject.	68.57% through 94.28% of students meeting growth target.
Developing (3 - 8 points) Results are below District- or BOCES-adopted expectations for growth or achievement for grade/subject.	22.86% through 68.56% of students meeting growth target.
Ineffective (0 - 2 points) Results are well below District- or BOCES-adopted expectations for growth or achievement for grade/subject.	0% through 22.85% of students meeting growth target.

3.5) Grades K-3 Math

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

	Locally-Selected Measure from List of Approved Measures	Assessment
K	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 growth target set by the district using pre assessment baseline data. see table 3.
Highly Effective (18-20 points) Results are well above District- or BOCES-adopted expectations for growth or achievement for grade/subject.	94.29% through 100% of students meeting growth target.
Effective (9-17 points) Results meet District- or BOCES-adopted expectations for growth or achievement for grade/subject.	68.57% through 94.28% of students meeting growth target.
Developing (3 - 8 points) Results are below District -or BOCES-adopted expectations for growth or achievement for grade/subject.	22.86% through 68.56% of students meeting growth target.

Ineffective (0 - 2 points) Results are well below District- or BOCES-adopted expectations for growth or achievement for grade/subject.	0% through 22.85% of students meeting growth target.

3.6) Grades 6-8 Science

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

	Locally-Selected Measure from List of Approved Measures	Assessment
6	5) District, regional, or BOCES–developed assessments	Farmingdale developed 6th Grade Local science assessment
7	5) District, regional, or BOCES–developed assessments	Farmingdale developed 7th Grade Local science assessment
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 growth target set by the district using pre assessment baseline data. see table 3.
Highly Effective (18 - 20 points) Results are well above District- or BOCES-adopted expectations for growth or achievement for grade/subject.	94.29% through 100% of students meeting growth target.
Effective (9 - 17 points) Results meet District- or BOCES-adopted expectations for growth or achievement for grade/subject.	68.57% through 94.28% of students meeting growth target.
Developing (3 - 8 points) Results are below District- or BOCES-adopted expectations for growth or achievement for grade/subject.	22.86% through 68.56% of students meeting growth target.
Ineffective (0 - 2 points) Results are well below District- or BOCES-adopted expectations for growth or achievement for grade/subject.	0% through 22.85% of students meeting growth target.

3.7) Grades 6-8 Social Studies

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

	Locally-Selected Measure from List of Approved Measures	Assessment
6	5) District, regional, or BOCES–developed assessments	Farmingdale developed 6th Grade Local social studies assessment
7	5) District, regional, or BOCES–developed assessments	Farmingdale developed 7th Grade Local social studies assessment

8	5) District, regional, or BOCES–developed assessments	Farmingdale developed 8th Grade Local social studies assessment

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

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

Use this box, if needed, to describe the general process for assigning HEDI categories for these grades/subjects in this subcomponent. If needed, you may upload a table or graphic at 3.13, below.	HEDI Scores are based on the percentage of students meeting classwide growth target set by the district using pre assessment baseline data. see table 3.
Highly Effective (18 - 20 points) Results are well above District- or BOCES-adopted expectations for growth or achievement for grade/subject.	94.29% through 100% of students meeting growth target.
Effective (9 - 17 points) Results meet District- or BOCES-adopted expectations for growth or achievement for grade/subject.	68.57% through 94.28% of students meeting growth target.
Developing (3 - 8 points) Results are below District- or BOCES-adopted expectations for growth or achievement for grade/subject.	22.86% through 68.56% of students meeting growth target.
Ineffective (0 - 2 points) Results are well below District- or BOCES-adopted expectations for growth or achievement for grade/subject.	0% through 22.85% of students meeting growth target.

3.8) High School Social Studies

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

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

	Locally-Selected Measure from List of Approved Measures	Assessment
Global 1	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 growth target set by the district using pre assessment baseline data. see table 3.
Highly Effective (18 - 20 points) Results are well above District- or BOCES-adopted expectations for growth or achievement for grade/subject.	94.29% through 100% of students meeting growth target.
Effective (9 - 17 points) Results meet District- or BOCES-adopted expectations for growth or achievement for grade/subject.	68.57% through 94.28% of students meeting growth target.
Developing (3 - 8 points) Results are below District- or BOCES-adopted expectations for growth or achievement for grade/subject.	22.86% through 68.56% of students meeting growth target.
Ineffective (0 - 2 points) Results are well below District- or BOCES-adopted expectations for growth or achievement for grade/subject.	0% through 22.85% of students meeting growth target.

3.9) High School Science

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

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

	Locally-Selected Measure from List of Approved Measures	Assessment
Living Environment	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	HEDI Scores are based on the percentage of students meeting classwide growth target set by the district using pre assessment

subcomponent. If needed, you may upload a table or graphic at 3.13, below.	baseline data. see table 3.
Highly Effective (18-20 points) Results are well above District- or BOCES-adopted expectations for growth or achievement for grade/subject.	94.29% through 100% of students meeting growth target.
Developing (3 - 8 points) Results are below District- or BOCES-adopted expectations for growth or achievement for grade/subject.	68.57% through 94.28% of students meeting growth target.
Effective (9 - 17points) Results meet District- or BOCES-adopted expectations for growth or achievement for grade/subject.	22.86% through 68.56% of students meeting growth target.
Ineffective (0 - 2 points) Results are well below District- or BOCES-adopted expectations for growth or achievement for grade/subject.	0% through 22.85% of students meeting growth target.

3.10) High School Math

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

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

	Locally-Selected Measure from List of Approved Measures	Assessment
Algebra 1	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.

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. see table 3.
Highly Effective (18 - 20 points) Results are well above District- or BOCES-adopted expectations for growth or achievement for grade/subject.	94.29% through 100% of students meeting growth target
Effective (9 - 17 points) Results meet District- or BOCES-adopted expectations for growth or achievement for grade/subject.	68.57% through 94.28% of students meeting growth target

Developing (3 - 8 points) Results are below District- or BOCES-adopted expectations for growth or achievement for grade/subject.	22.86% through 68.56% of students meeting growth target.
Ineffective (0 - 2 points) Results are well below District- or BOCES-adopted expectations for growth or achievement for grade/subject.	0% through 22.85% of students meeting growth target.

3.11) High School English Language Arts

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

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

	Locally-Selected Measure from List of Approved Measures	Assessment
Grade 9 ELA	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.

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. see table 3.
Highly Effective (18 - 20 points) Results are well above District- or BOCES-adopted expectations for growth or achievement for grade/subject.	94.29% through 100% of students meeting growth target
Effective (9 - 17 points) Results meet District- or BOCES-adopted expectations for growth or achievement for grade/subject.	68.57% through 94.28% of students meeting growth target
Developing (3 - 8 points) Results are below District- or BOCES-adopted expectations for growth or achievement for grade/subject.	22.86% through 68.56% of students meeting growth target.
Ineffective (0 - 2 points) Results are well below District- or BOCES-adopted expectations for growth or achievement for grade/subject.	0% through 22.85% of students meeting growth target.

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 courses	5) District/regional/BOCES–developed	Farmingdale developed local grade/course specific

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 percentage of students meeting classwide growth target set by the district using pre assessment baseline data. see table 3.
Highly Effective (18 - 20 points) Results are well above District- or BOCES -adopted expectations for growth or achievement for grade/subject.	94.29% through 100% of students meeting growth target
Effective (9 - 17 points) Results meet District- or BOCES-adopted expectations for growth or achievement for grade/subject.	68.57% through 94.28% of students meeting growth target
Developing (3 - 8 points) Results are below District- or BOCES-adopted expectations for growth or achievement for grade/subject.	22.86% through 68.56% of students meeting growth target.
Ineffective (0 - 2 points) Results are well below District- or BOCES-adopted expectations for growth or achievement for grade/subject.	0% through 22.85% of students meeting growth target.

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

(No response)

3.13) HEDI Tables or Graphics

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

and upload that file here.

assets/survey-uploads/5139/131648-y92vNseFa4/Farmingdale Table 1 SLOand Local 20 total points.xlsx

3.14) Locally Developed Controls

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

The district will use pre-assessments and/or diagnostic assessments as a baseline to set growth targets for students. The agregate student growth percentage will result in a HEDI rating for the teacher. No other adjustments, controls or special considerations will be made.

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 SLO will have an equal number of locally-selected measures that will be calculated the same way.

3.16) Assurances

Please check all of the boxes below:

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

4. Other Measures of Effectiveness (Teachers)

Created Tuesday, June 26, 2012
Updated Wednesday, July 31, 2013

Page 1

4.1) Teacher Practice Rubric

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

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

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

Danielson's Framework for Teaching (2011 Revised Edition)

(No response)

4.2) Points Within Other Measures

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

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

Is the following points assignment applicable to all teachers?

Yes

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

(No response)

Multiple (at least two) classroom observations by principal or other trained administrator, at least one of which must be unannounced [at least 31 points]	40
One or more observation(s) by trained independent evaluators	0
Observations by trained in-school peer teachers	0
Feedback from students using State-approved survey tool	0
Feedback from parents/caregivers using State-approved survey tool	0
Structured reviews of lesson plans, student portfolios and other teacher artifacts	20

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

(No response)

4.3) Survey Tools (if applicable)

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

(No response)

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

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

4.4) Assurances

Please check all of the boxes below:

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

4.5) Process for Assigning Points and Determining HEDI Ratings

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

Each domain will be scored from 1-4 based on the evidence observed and or collected by the evaluator. Domains scored will be averaged together to result in an overall rubric score from 1-4. The rubric score will then be converted to score from 0-60 using the attached conversation chart. The rubric score listed on the chart is the minimum score necessary to achieve corresponding HEIDI point value. We understand the composite score must be reported in whole numbers. In no way will rounding rules result in a teacher moving from one scoring band to the next.

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

assets/survey-uploads/5091/146035-eka9yMJ855/APPR Revision Table 4.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

4.6) Observations of Probationary Teachers | Formal/Long	5
4.6) Observations of Probationary Teachers | Informal/Short	0
4.6) Observations of Probationary Teachers | 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

4.7) Observations of Tenured Teachers | Formal/Long	2
4.7) Observations of Tenured Teachers | Informal/Short	0
4.7) Observations of Tenured Teachers | Total	2

By trained in-school peer teachers or other trained reviewers

Formal/Long	0
Informal/Short	0

Independent evaluators

Formal/Long	0
Informal/Short	0

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

- In Person

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

- In Person

5. Composite Scoring (Teachers)

Created Monday, May 21, 2012
Updated Thursday, June 20, 2013

Page 1

Standards for Rating Categories

Growth or Comparable Measures

Locally-selected Measures of growth or achievement

Other Measures of Effectiveness (Teacher and Leader standards)

Highly Effective

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

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

Overall performance and results exceed NYS Teaching Standards.

Effective

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

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

Overall performance and results meet NYS Teaching Standards.

Developing

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

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

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

Ineffective

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

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

Overall performance and results do not meet NYS Teaching Standards.

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

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

2012-13 where there is no Value-Added measure

Growth or Comparable Measures

Locally-selected Measures of growth or achievement

Other Measures of Effectiveness (60 points)

Overall Composite Score

Highly Effective

18-20

18-20

Ranges determined locally--see below

91-100

Effective

9-17

9-17

75-90

Developing

3-8

3-8

65-74

Ineffective

0-2

0-2

0-64

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

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

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

2012-13 where Value-Added growth measure applies

Growth or Comparable Measures

Locally-selected Measures of growth or achievement

Other Measures of Effectiveness (60 points)

Overall Composite Score

Highly Effective

22-25

14-15

Ranges determined locally--see above

91-100

Effective

10-21

8-13

75-90

Developing

3-9

3-7

65-74

Ineffective

0-2

0-2

0-64

6. Additional Requirements - Teachers

Created Wednesday, June 27, 2012
Updated Thursday, June 20, 2013

Page 1

6.1) Assurances -- Improvement Plans

Please check the boxes below:

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

6.2) Attachment: Teacher Improvement Plan Forms

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

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. 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. In compliance with the timely and expeditious requirments of Education Law 3012-C

6.4) Training and Certification of Lead Evaluators and Evaluators

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

The district will certify that all adminstrators 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 admistrative 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.

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 Friday, June 01, 2012
Updated Thursday, September 13, 2012

Page 1

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

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

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

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

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

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

Please check the boxes below:

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

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

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

State assessments, *required if one exists*

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

List of State-approved 3rd party assessments

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

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

School or Program Type	SLO with Assessment Option	Name of the Assessment
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.

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

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

(No response)

7.4) Special Considerations for Comparable Growth Measures

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

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

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://usny.nysed.gov/rttt/teachers-leaders/slo/home.html.	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 Wednesday, June 27, 2012
Updated Thursday, August 01, 2013

Page 1

Locally-Selected Measures of Student Achievement or Growth

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

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

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

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

In the table below, list all of the grade configurations used in your district or BOCES (e.g., K-5, 6-8, 9-12). Then for each grade configuration, select a local measure from the menu.
Note: Districts and BOCES may select one or more types of growth or achievement measures for each grade configuration. If you are using more than one type of local measure for the evaluation of principals in a given grade configuration, list that grade configuration multiple times. If more space is needed, duplicate this portion of the form and upload additional pages (below) as an attachment.

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

	Grade Configuration	Locally-Selected Measure from List of Approved Measures	Assessment
	K-5	(d) measures used by district for teacher evaluation	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 classwide growth target set by the district using pre assessment baseline data. see table 3.
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 grade/subject.	See charts in task 8.1.

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

(No response)

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

assets/survey-uploads/5366/146599-qBFVOWF7fC/Farmingdale Table 2 Local 15pts and Table 3 Local 20 pts_1.xlsx

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

In the table below, list all of the grade configurations used in your district or BOCES (e.g., K-5, 6-8, 9-12). Then for each grade configuration, select a local measure from the menu.
Note: Districts and BOCES may select one or more types of growth or achievement measures for each grade configuration. If you are using more than one type of local measure for the evaluation of principals in a given grade configuration, list that grade configuration multiple times. If more space is needed, duplicate this portion of the form and upload additional pages (below) as an attachment.

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

(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
	N/A		N/A

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

The district will use pre-assessments and/or diagnostic assessments as a baseline to set growth targets for students. The agregate student growth percentage will result in a HEDI rating for the principal. No other adjustments, controls or special considerations will be made.

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 prinicpals have more than one locally selected measure, the measures will each earn a score from 0-20 points which will be weighted proportionately based on the number of students measured.

8.5) Assurances

Please check all of the boxes below:

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

9. Other Measures of Effectiveness (Principals)

Created Wednesday, June 27, 2012
Updated Thursday, August 01, 2013

Page 1

9.1) Principal Practice Rubric

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

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

Multidimensional Principal Performance Rubric

(No response)

9.2) Points Within Other Measures

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

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

Is the following points assignment for all principals?

Yes

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

(No response)

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

Broad assessment of principal leadership and management actions based on the practice rubric by the supervisor, a trained administrator or a trained independent evaluator. This must incorporate multiple school visits by supervisor, trained administrator, or trained independent evaluator, at least one of which must be from a supervisor, and at least one of which must be unannounced. [At least 31 points]	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, combine them into a single file, and upload as an attachment for review. Click here for a downloadable copy of Form 9.2. (MS Word)

(No response)

9.3) Assurances -- Goals

Please check the boxes below (if applicable):

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

9.4) Sources of Evidence (if applicable)

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

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

9.5) Survey Tool(s) (if applicable)

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

(No response)

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

Principal Evaluation Tripod School Perception Survey for Teachers	(No response)
K12 Insight Student Survey (Grades 3-5) for Principal Evaluation in New York	(No response)
K12 Insight Student Survey (Grades 6-12) for Principal Evaluation in New York	(No response)
K12 Insight Parent Survey for Principal Evaluation in New York	(No response)
K12 Insight Teacher/Staff Survey for Principal Evaluation in New York	(No response)
District variance	(No response)
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 balance (24 points) are based upon the achievement of goals developed with the evaluator. See attached Table 5. Points are awarded for domains, goals, artifacts such that, Highly effective = 100%, Effective = 95%, Developing = 48%, Ineffective = 0%, of points alloted on uploaded chart. Normal rounding rules will apply but in no case will rounding move a principal from one band to the next.

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

assets/survey-uploads/5143/146598-pMADJ4gk6R/Farmingdale Table 5 Principals Process for Assigning Points.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 Wednesday, June 27, 2012
Updated Thursday, September 13, 2012

Page 1

Standards for Rating Categories

Growth or Comparable Measures

Locally-selected Measures of

growth or achievement

Other Measures of Effectiveness

(Teacher and Leader standards)

Highly

Effective

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

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

Overall performance and results exceed ISLLC leadership standards.

Effective

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

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

Overall performance and results meet ISLLC leadership standards.

Developing

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

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

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

Ineffective

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

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

Overall performance and results do not meet ISLLC leadership standards.

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

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

2012-13 where there is no Value-Added measure

Growth or Comparable Measures

Locally-selected Measures of

growth or achievement

Other Measures of Effectiveness

(60 points)

Overall

Composite Score

Highly Effective

18-20

18-20

Ranges determined locally--see below

91-100

Effective

9-17

9-17

75-90

Developing

3-8

3-8

65-74

Ineffective

0-2

0-2

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

2012-13 where Value-Added growth measure applies

Growth or Comparable Measures

Locally-selected Measures of

growth or achievement

Other Measures of Effectiveness

(60 points)

Overall

Composite Score

Highly Effective

22-25

14-15

Ranges determined locally--see above

91-100

Effective

10-21

8-13

75-90

Developing

3-9

3-7

65-74

Ineffective

0-2

0-2

0-64

11. Additional Requirements - Principals

Created Wednesday, June 27, 2012
Updated Thursday, June 20, 2013

Page 1

11.1) Assurances -- Improvement Plans

Please check the boxes below.

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

11.2) Attachment: Principal Improvement Plan Forms

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

assets/survey-uploads/5276/146623-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. 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;

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

6. Notwithstanding item (5) 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 in compliance with the timely and expeditious requirements of Education Law 3012-C.

11.4) Training and Certification of Lead Evaluators and Evaluators

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

The 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
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.

11.5) Assurances -- Evaluators

Please check the boxes below:

- Checked

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

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

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

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

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

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

(7) use of the Statewide Instructional Reporting System

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

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

- Checked

11.6) Assurances -- Principals

Please check all of the boxes below:

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

11.7) Assurances -- Data

Please check all of the boxes below:

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

12. Joint Certification of APPR Plan

Created Wednesday, June 27, 2012
Updated Tuesday, August 20, 2013

Page 1

12.1)Upload the Joint Certification of the APPR Plan

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

assets/survey-uploads/5581/146624-3Uqgn5g9Iu/APPR Joint Certification 8-19-13.pdf

File types supported for uploads

PDF (preferred)

Microsoft Office (.doc, .ppt, .xls)

Microsoft Office 2007: Supported but not recommended (.docx, .pptx, .xlsx)

Open Office (.odt, .ott)

Images (.jpg, .gif)

Other Formats (.html, .xhtml, .txt, .rtf, .latex)

Please note that .docx, .pptx, and .xlsx formats are not entirely supported.

Please save your file types as .doc, .ppt or .xls respectively before uploading.

Table 1: HEDI SLO and LOCAL 20 total points

	HEDI Points	SLO Target and Percent Mastery Achieved	HEDI scores and Mastery Range		
Ineffective	0	0.00%	0.00%	to	7.61%
	1	7.62%	7.62%	to	15.23%
	2	15.24%	15.24%	to	22.85%
Developing	3	22.86%	22.86%	to	30.47%
	4	30.48%	30.48%	to	38.09%
	5	38.10%	38.10%	to	45.70%
	6	45.71%	45.71%	to	53.32%
	7	53.33%	53.33%	to	60.94%
	8	60.95%	60.95%	to	68.56%
Effective	9	68.57%	68.57%	to	71.42%
	10	71.43%	71.43%	to	74.28%
	11	74.29%	74.29%	to	77.13%
	12	77.14%	77.14%	to	79.99%
	13*	**80.00%**	80.00%	to	82.85%
	14	82.86%	82.86%	to	85.70%
	15	85.71%	85.71%	to	88.56%
	16	88.57%	88.57%	to	91.42%
	17	91.43%	91.43%	to	94.28%
Highly Effective	18	94.29%	94.29%	to	97.13%
	19	97.14%	97.14%	to	98.56%
	20	100.00%	98.57%	to	100.00%

***This row defines the target score selected for this SLO.**

HEDI bands are defined by the midpoint of the "Effective" band (score of 13) established as the SLO "Target."

Each HEDI point in the "Effective" and "Highly Effective" bands, above and below a score of 13, represents 1/7 of the difference between 100% and the SLO Target score. (Exception: The upper range for a score of 19 is defined as half the distance between a score at HEDI 19 and 100%)

Each HEDI point in the "Ineffective" and "Developing" bands represents one ninth of the difference between the lowest "Effective" score (HEDI score of nine (9) and zero (0).

HEDI Translation Template for SLO Scores Counting as 20% of Composi

Enter HEDI Anchor Point (range 9-17) and anticipated SLO Target Percent (as a percent) in the green boxes.

The chart below will automatically change to reflect the entries.

HEDI Anchor Point - 9 to 17	**13**
SLO Target Percent - as %	**80%**

Note: The point values and ranges on the HEDI point scale(from zero to 20) are determined by SED regulations.

	HEDI Points	SLO Target or Percent Mastery Achieved	HEDI scores and Mastery Range		
Ineffective	0	0%	0%	to	7%
	1	8%	8%	to	14%
	2	15%	15%	to	22%
Developing	3	23%	23%	to	29%
	4	30%	30%	to	37%
	5	38%	38%	to	45%
	6	46%	46%	to	52%
	7	53%	53%	to	60%
	8	61%	61%	to	68%
Effective	9	69%	69%	to	70%
	10	71%	71%	to	73%
	11	74%	74%	to	76%
	12	77%	77%	to	79%
	13	80%	80%	to	82%
	14	83%	83%	to	85%
	15	86%	86%	to	88%
	16	89%	89%	to	90%
	17	91%	91%	to	93%
Highly Effective	18	94%	94%	to	96%
	19	97%	97%	to	98%
	20	100%	99%	to	100%

This tem
SLO to a
target r
(from 9

HEDI sc
are defi
Point se
there ar
the "Hig
of the di

HEDI sc
are defi
Each ste
level 9.

For a giv
useful t
Point ar

See oth

ite

HEDI Calculator

HEDI Calculator	Number of students	SLO Target or Percent Mastery Selected	Percent Mastery Achieved	HEDI score	HEDI Points Awarded
SLO 1	30	90%	92	14	**5.7**
SLO 2	21	65%	70	14	**4.0**
SLO 3	23	80%	78	12	**3.7**
SLO 4					**0.0**
SLO 5					**0.0**
SLO 6					**0.0**
Total	**74**				**13.4**

Calculated values are printed in red.

nplate translates a percent mastery achieved on an a HEDI score. Each translation is based on the equired for that SLO and the HEDI Anchor Point to 17) selected.

ores in the "Highly Effective" and "Effective" ranges ned by the number of steps between the Anchor lected and 100%. For example, at Anchor Point 15, e five equal steps to 100%. Thus, all steps in the ghly Effective" and "Effective" ranges represent 1/5 iference between the Anchor Point and 100%.

cores in the "Developing" and "Ineffective" ranges ned by the nine scores (0 to 8) in these ranges. ep is diminished by 1/9th of the score cited for HEDI

ven Anchor Point, only certain targets will result in ranslation templates. Always check the Anchor nd target combination before using this template.

er tab for 15 pt variable calculator.

Table 3: HEDI LOCAL 20 total points

	HEDI Points	Local Target and Percent Mastery Achieved	HEDI scores and Mastery Range
Ineffective	0	0.00%	0.00% to 7.61%
	1	7.62%	7.62% to 15.23%
	2	15.24%	15.24% to 22.85%
Developing	3	22.86%	22.86% to 30.47%
	4	30.48%	30.48% to 38.09%
	5	38.10%	38.10% to 45.70%
	6	45.71%	45.71% to 53.32%
	7	53.33%	53.33% to 60.94%
	8	60.95%	60.95% to 68.56%
Effective	9	68.57%	68.57% to 71.42%
	10	71.43%	71.43% to 74.28%
	11	74.29%	74.29% to 77.13%
	12	77.14%	77.14% to 79.99%
	13*	**80.00%**	80.00% to 82.85%
	14	82.86%	82.86% to 85.70%
	15	85.71%	85.71% to 88.56%
	16	88.57%	88.57% to 91.42%
	17	91.43%	91.43% to 94.28%
Highly Effective	18	94.29%	94.29% to 97.13%
	19	97.14%	97.14% to 98.56%
	20	100.00%	98.57% to 100.00%

HEDI bands are defined by the midpoint of the "Effective" band (score of 13) established as the Local "Target."

Each HEDI point in the "Effective" and "Highly Effective" bands, above and below a score of 13, represents 1/7 of the difference between 100% and the Local Target score. (Exception: The upper range for a score of 19 is defined as half the distance between a score at HEDI 19 and 100%)

Each HEDI point in the "Ineffective" and "Developing" bands represents one ninth of the difference between the lowest "Effective" score (HEDI score of nine (9) and zero (0).

***This row defines the target score selected for the Local assessment.**

Table 1: HEDI SLO and LOCAL 20 total points

	HEDI Points	SLO Target and Percent Mastery Achieved	HEDI scores and Mastery Range		
Ineffective	0	0.00%	0.00%	to	7.61%
	1	7.62%	7.62%	to	15.23%
	2	15.24%	15.24%	to	22.85%
Developing	3	22.86%	22.86%	to	30.47%
	4	30.48%	30.48%	to	38.09%
	5	38.10%	38.10%	to	45.70%
	6	45.71%	45.71%	to	53.32%
	7	53.33%	53.33%	to	60.94%
	8	60.95%	60.95%	to	68.56%
Effective	9	68.57%	68.57%	to	71.42%
	10	71.43%	71.43%	to	74.28%
	11	74.29%	74.29%	to	77.13%
	12	77.14%	77.14%	to	79.99%
	13*	**80.00%**	80.00%	to	82.85%
	14	82.86%	82.86%	to	85.70%
	15	85.71%	85.71%	to	88.56%
	16	88.57%	88.57%	to	91.42%
	17	91.43%	91.43%	to	94.28%
Highly Effective	18	94.29%	94.29%	to	97.13%
	19	97.14%	97.14%	to	98.56%
	20	100.00%	98.57%	to	100.00%

***This row defines the target score selected for this SLO.**

HEDI bands are defined by the midpoint of the "Effective" band (score of 13) established as the SLO "Target."

Each HEDI point in the "Effective" and "Highly Effective" bands, above and below a score of 13, represents 1/7 of the difference between 100% and the SLO Target score. (Exception: The upper range for a score of 19 is defined as half the distance between a score at HEDI 19 and 100%)

Each HEDI point in the "Ineffective" and "Developing" bands represents one ninth of the difference between the lowest "Effective" score (HEDI score of nine (9) and zero (0).

Revision* Table 4

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)

HEDI Translation Template for SLO Scores Counting as 20% of Composite

Enter HEDI Anchor Point (range 9-17) and anticipated SLO Target Percent (as a percent) in the green boxes.

The chart below will automatically change to reflect the entries.

HEDI Anchor Point - 9 to 17	**13**
SLO Target Percent - as %	**80%**

Note: The point values and ranges on the HEDI point scale(from zero to 20) are determined by SED regulations.

	HEDI Points	SLO Target or Percent Mastery Achieved	HEDI scores and Mastery Range		
Ineffective	0	0%	0%	to	7%
	1	8%	8%	to	14%
	2	15%	15%	to	22%
Developing	3	23%	23%	to	29%
	4	30%	30%	to	37%
	5	38%	38%	to	45%
	6	46%	46%	to	52%
	7	53%	53%	to	60%
	8	61%	61%	to	68%
Effective	9	69%	69%	to	70%
	10	71%	71%	to	73%
	11	74%	74%	to	76%
	12	77%	77%	to	79%
	13	80%	80%	to	82%
	14	83%	83%	to	85%
	15	86%	86%	to	88%
	16	89%	89%	to	90%
	17	91%	91%	to	93%
Highly Effective	18	94%	94%	to	96%
	19	97%	97%	to	98%
	20	100%	99%	to	100%

HEDI Calculator

HEDI Calculator	Number of students	SLO Target or Percent Mastery Selected	Percent Mastery Achieved	HEDI score	HEDI Points Awarded
SLO 1	30	90%	92	14	**5.7**
SLO 2	21	65%	70	14	**4.0**
SLO 3	23	80%	78	12	**3.7**
SLO 4					**0.0**
SLO 5					**0.0**
SLO 6					**0.0**
Total	**74**				**13.4**

Calculated values are printed in red.

This template translates a percent mastery achieved on an SLO to a HEDI score. Each translation is based on the target required for that SLO and the HEDI Anchor Point (from 9 to 17) selected.

HEDI scores in the "Highly Effective" and "Effective" ranges are defined by the number of steps between the Anchor Point selected and 100%. For example, at Anchor Point 15, there are five equal steps to 100%. Thus, all steps in the the "Highly Effective" and "Effective" ranges represent 1/5 of the diference between the Anchor Point and 100%.

HEDI scores in the "Developing" and "Ineffective" ranges are defined by the nine scores (0 to 8) in these ranges. Each step is diminished by 1/9th of the score cited for HEDI level 9.

For a given Anchor Point, only certain targets will result in useful translation templates. Always check the Anchor Point and target combination before using this template.

See other tab for 15 pt variable calculator.

Table 2: HEDI Template for Local Scores Counting as 15% of Composite

HEDI Anchor Point - 8 to 13	11
Target Percent - as %	80%

Note: The point values and ranges on the HEDI point scale(from zero

	HEDI Points	Percent Mastery Achieved	HEDI scores and Mastery Range		
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%

This template translates a percent mastery achieved into a HEDI score. Each translation is based on the target required and the HEDI Anchor Point selected.

HEDI scores in the "Highly Effective" and "Effective" ranges are defined by the number of steps between the Anchor Point selected and 100%. For example, at Anchor Point 11, there are four equal steps to 100%. Thus, all steps in the the "Highly Effective" and "Effective" ranges represent 1/4 of the diference between the Anchor Point and 100%.

HEDI scores in the "Developing" and "Ineffective" ranges are defined by the eight scores (0 to 7) in these ranges. Each step is diminished by 1/8th of the score cited for HEDI level 9.

Table 3: HEDI LOCAL 20 total points

	HEDI Points	Local Target and Percent Mastery Achieved	HEDI scores and Mastery Range
Ineffective	0	0.00%	0.00% to 7.61%
	1	7.62%	7.62% to 15.23%
	2	15.24%	15.24% to 22.85%
Developing	3	22.86%	22.86% to 30.47%
	4	30.48%	30.48% to 38.09%
	5	38.10%	38.10% to 45.70%
	6	45.71%	45.71% to 53.32%
	7	53.33%	53.33% to 60.94%
	8	60.95%	60.95% to 68.56%
Effective	9	68.57%	68.57% to 71.42%
	10	71.43%	71.43% to 74.28%
	11	74.29%	74.29% to 77.13%
	12	77.14%	77.14% to 79.99%
	13*	**80.00%**	80.00% to 82.85%
	14	82.86%	82.86% to 85.70%
	15	85.71%	85.71% to 88.56%
	16	88.57%	88.57% to 91.42%
	17	91.43%	91.43% to 94.28%
Highly Effective	18	94.29%	94.29% to 97.13%
	19	97.14%	97.14% to 98.56%
	20	100.00%	98.57% to 100.00%

***This row defines the target score selected for the Local assessment.**

HEDI bands are defined by the midpoint of the "Effective" band (score of 13) established as the Local "Target."

Each HEDI point in the "Effective" and "Highly Effective" bands, above and below a score of 13, represents 1/7 of the difference between 100% and the Local Target score. (Exception: The upper range for a score of 19 is defined as half the distance between a score at HEDI 19 and 100%)

Each HEDI point in the "Ineffective" and "Developing" bands represents one ninth of the difference between the lowest "Effective" score (HEDI score of nine (9) and zero (0).

		RUBRIC VALUE
HIGHLY EFFECTIVE		5.8-6.0
EFFECTIVE		3.0-5.7
DEVELOPING		1.0-2.9
INEFFECTIVE		0-1.9
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:	_____	Superintendent of Schools or designee	_____
Date:	_____	Date:	_____

FAAS President or designee _____
Date: _____

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: _____

TEN BROECK ACADEMY & FRANKLINVILLE CENTRAL SCHOOL

31 NORTH MAIN STREET ♦ FRANKLINVILLE, NEW YORK 14737
FAX: (716) 676-8041

Principal Improvement Plan

Upon rating a principal as ineffective or developing, an improvement plan designed to rectify perceived or demonstrated deficiencies must be developed and commenced not after than ten (10) days after the start of a school year. The Superintendent or designee, in conjunction with the principal and possible a colleague of choice must develop an improvement plan that contains:

Deficiencies:

Goals and outcomes:

Action steps and activities:

Resources:

If more than one (1) deficiency, please duplicate the above information for each deficiency on a separate sheet of paper.

TEN BROECK ACADEMY & FRANKLINVILLE CENTRAL SCHOOL

31 NORTH MAIN STREET ♦ FRANKLINVILLE, NEW YORK 14737
FAX: (716) 676-8041

Evaluation Process

Meetings will be strategically scheduled throughout the year to assess progress, documenting a formative evaluation process. These meeting shall occur at least twice during the year, the first meeting shall be between December 1st and December 15th; and the second meeting between March 1st and March 15th. A written summary of feedback on progress shall be given within five (5) business days of each meeting.

First Meeting

Summary of feedback and improvement efforts:

Evidence:

Principal signature: _____ Date: _____

Superintendent signature: _____ Date: _____

Second Meeting

Summary of feedback and improvement efforts:

Evidence:

Principal signature: _____ Date: _____

Superintendent signature: _____ Date: _____

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

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

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

The school district or BOCES and its collective bargaining agent(s), where applicable, also 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 the that the APPR Plan describes the process for assigning points for each subcomponent
- Assure that locally-selected measures are rigorous and comparable across all classrooms (for teachers, the same locally-selected measure is used across a subject and/or grade level; for principals, the same locally-selected measure must be used for all principals in the same or similar program or grade configuration)

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

Signatures, dates

Superintendent Signature: Date:

8/19/13

Teachers Union President Signature: Date:

8/19/13

Administrative Union President Signature: Date:

8/19/13

Board of Education President Signature: Date:

8/19/13