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

January 4, 2013

Tim Hayes, Superintendent
Geneseo Central School District
4050 Avon Road
Geneseo, NY 14454

Dear Superintendent Hayes:

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: Michael Glover

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

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

Annual Professional Performance Reviews: 2012-13

Created Wednesday, May 16, 2012
Updated Thursday, December 27, 2012

1

Disclaimers

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

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

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

1. SCHOOL DISTRICT INFORMATION

1.1) School District's BEDS Number : 240401040000

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

240401040000

1.2) School District Name: GENESEO CSD

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

GENESEO CSD

1.3) School Improvement Grant (SIG) Districts Only

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

(No response)

1.4) Award Classification

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

- Virtual AP Incentive Program (NYSED)

1.5) Assurances

Please check all of the boxes below:

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

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

Re-submission to address deficiencies

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

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

Annual (2012-13)

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

Created Tuesday, October 09, 2012
Updated Friday, December 28, 2012

Page 1

STATE-PROVIDED MEASURES OF STUDENT GROWTH

(25 points with an approved value-added measure)

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

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

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

2.1) Assurances

Please check the boxes below:

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

STUDENT LEARNING OBJECTIVES AS COMPARABLE GROWTH MEASURES (20 points)

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

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

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

If no State assessment or Regents exam exists:

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

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

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

State assessments, *required if one exists*

List of State-approved 3rd party assessments

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

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

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

2.2) Grades K-3 ELA

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

	ELA	Assessment
K	District, regional, or BOCES-developed assessment	Geneseo Central School District ELA Assessment for Kindergarten
1	District, regional, or BOCES-developed assessment	Geneseo Central School District ELA Assessment for First Grade
2	District, regional, or BOCES-developed assessment	Geneseo Central School District ELA Assessment for Second Grade

	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.	Using data results from district developed pre-assessments, growth targets will be established by teachers of record for individual students. Based on the percentage of students who achieve their growth target goals, teachers will be assigned a score of 0-20 and will be identified as highly effective, effective, developing or ineffective according to the Geneseo Central School District HEDI scoring rubric.
Highly Effective (18 - 20 points) Results are well-above state average for similar students (or District goals if no state test).	Teachers will be rated as highly effective when 88-100% of their students achieve their growth target scores.
Effective (9 - 17 points) Results meet state average for similar students (or District goals if no state test).	Teachers will be rated as effective when 75-87% of their students achieve their growth target scores.
Developing (3 - 8 points) Results are below state average for similar students (or District goals if no state test).	Teachers will be rated as developing when 65-74% of their students achieve their growth target scores.
Ineffective (0 - 2 points) Results are well-below state average for similar students (or District goals if no state test).	Teachers will be rated as ineffective when 64% or less of their students achieve their growth target 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	District, regional, or BOCES-developed assessment	Geneseo Central School District Math Assessment for Kindergarten
1	District, regional, or BOCES-developed assessment	Geneseo Central School District Math Assessment for First Grade
2	District, regional, or BOCES-developed assessment	Geneseo Central School District Math Assessment for Second Grade

	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.	Using data results from district developed pre-assessments, growth targets will be established by teachers of record for individual students. Based on the percentage of students who achieve their growth target goals, teachers will be assigned a score of 0-20 and will be identified as highly effective, effective, developing or ineffective according to the Geneseo Central School District HEDI scoring rubric.
Highly Effective (18 - 20 points) Results are well-above state average for similar students (or District goals if no state test).	Teachers will be rated as highly effective when 88-100% of their students achieve their growth target scores.

Effective (9 - 17 points) Results meet state average for similar students (or District goals if no state test).	Teachers will be rated as effective when 75-87% of their students achieve their growth target scores.
Developing (3 - 8 points) Results are below state average for similar students (or District goals if no state test).	Teachers will be rated as developing when 65-74% of their students achieve their growth target scores.
Ineffective (0 - 2 points) Results are well-below state average for similar students (or District goals if no state test).	Teachers will be rated as ineffective when 64% or less of their students achieve their growth target 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	GVEP-developed Science Grade 6 Assessment
7	District, regional or BOCES-developed assessment	GVEP-developed Science Grade 7 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.	Using data results from regionally developed pre-assessments, growth targets will be established by teachers of record for individual students. Based on the percentage of students who achieve their growth target goals, teachers will be assigned a score of 0-20 and will be identified as highly effective, effective, developing or ineffective according to the Geneseo Central School District HEDI scoring rubric.
Highly Effective (18 - 20 points) Results are well-above state average for similar students (or District goals if no state test).	Teachers will be rated as highly effective when 88-100% of their students achieve their growth target scores.
Effective (9 - 17 points) Results meet state average for similar students (or District goals if no state test).	Teachers will be rated as effective when 75-87% of their students achieve their growth target scores.
Developing (3 - 8 points) Results are below state average for similar students (or District goals if no state test).	Teachers will be rated as developing when 65-74% of their students achieve their growth target scores.
Ineffective (0 - 2 points) Results are well-below state average for similar students (or District goals if no state test).	Teachers will be rated as ineffective when 64% or less of their students achieve their growth target 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	GVEP-developed Social Studies Grade 6 Assessment
7	District, regional or BOCES-developed assessment	GVEP-developed Social Studies Grade 7 Assessment
8	District, regional or BOCES-developed assessment	GVEP-developed Social Studies Grade 8 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.	Using data results from regionally developed pre-assessments, growth targets will be established by teachers of record for individual students. Based on the percentage of students who achieve their growth target goals, teachers will be assigned a score of 0-20 and will be identified as highly effective, effective, developing or ineffective according to the Geneseo Central School District HEDI scoring rubric.
Highly Effective (18 - 20 points) Results are well-above District goals for similar students.	Teachers will be rated as highly effective when 88-100% of their students achieve their growth target scores.
Effective (9 - 17 points) Results meet District goals for similar students.	Teachers will be rated as effective when 75-87% of their students achieve their growth target scores.
Developing (3 - 8 points) Results are below District goals for similar students.	Teachers will be rated as developing when 65-74% of their students achieve their growth target scores.
Ineffective (0 - 2 points) Results are well-below District goals for similar students.	Teachers will be rated as ineffective when 64% or less of their students achieve their growth target 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	GVEP-developed Global 1 Assessment

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

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

Use this box, if needed, to describe the general process for assigning HEDI categories for these grades/subjects in this subcomponent. If needed, you may upload a table or graphic at 2.11, below.	Using data results from regionally developed pre-assessments, growth targets will be established by teachers of record for individual students. Based on the percentage of students who achieve their growth target goals, teachers will be assigned a score of 0-20 and will be identified as highly effective, effective, developing or ineffective according to the Geneseo Central School District HEDI scoring rubric.
Highly Effective (18 - 20 points) Results are well-above District goals for similar students.	Teachers will be rated as highly effective when 88-100% of their students achieve their growth target scores.
Effective (9 - 17 points) Results meet District goals for similar students.	Teachers will be rated as effective when 75-87% of their students achieve their growth target scores.
Developing (3 - 8 points) Results are below District goals for similar students.	Teachers will be rated as developing when 65-74% of their students achieve their growth target scores.
Ineffective (0 - 2 points) Results are well-below District goals for similar students.	Teachers will be rated as ineffective when 64% or less of their students achieve their growth target 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.	Using data results from regionally developed pre-assessments, growth targets will be established by teachers of record for individual students. Based on the percentage of students who achieve their growth target goals, teachers will be assigned a score of 0-20 and will be identified as highly effective, effective, developing or ineffective according to the Geneseo Central School District HEDI scoring rubric.
Highly Effective (18 - 20 points) Results are well-above District goals for similar students.	Teachers will be rated as highly effective when 88-100% of their students achieve their growth target scores.
Effective (9 - 17 points) Results meet District goals for similar students.	Teachers will be rated as effective when 75-87% of their students achieve their growth target scores.
Developing (3 - 8 points) Results are below District goals for similar students.	Teachers will be rated as developing when 65-74% of their students achieve their growth target scores.

Ineffective (0 - 2 points) Results are well-below District goals for similar students.	Teachers will be rated as ineffective when 64% or less of their students achieve their growth target 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.	Using data results from regionally developed pre-assessments, growth targets will be established by teachers of record for individual students. Based on the percentage of students who achieve their growth target goals, teachers will be assigned a score of 0-20 and will be identified as highly effective, effective, developing or ineffective according to the Geneseo Central School District HEDI scoring rubric.
Highly Effective (18 - 20 points) Results are well-above District goals for similar students.	Teachers will be rated as highly effective when 88-100% of their students achieve their growth target scores.
Effective (9 - 17 points) Results meet District goals for similar students.	Teachers will be rated as effective when 75-87% of their students achieve their growth target scores.
Developing (3 - 8 points) Results are below District goals for similar students.	Teachers will be rated as developing when 65-74% of their students achieve their growth target scores.
Ineffective (0 - 2 points) Results are well-below District goals for similar students.	Teachers will be rated as ineffective when 64% or less of their students achieve their growth target 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	GVEP-developed ELA 9 Assessment
Grade 10 ELA	District, regional or BOCES-developed assessment	GVEP-developed ELA 10 Assessment

Grade 11 ELA	Regents assessment	Regents ELA Assessment

For High School English Language Arts: describe the district-adopted expectations for the level of performance required for each HEDI rating category and the process for assigning points to teachers based on SLO results consistent with regulations and assurances in the Comparable Growth Measures subcomponent. Include any district-determined expectations for 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.	Using data results from regionally developed pre-assessments, growth targets will be established by teachers of record for individual students. Based on the percentage of students who achieve their growth target goals, teachers will be assigned a score of 0-20 and will be identified as highly effective, effective, developing or ineffective according to the Geneseo Central School District HEDI scoring rubric.
Highly Effective (18 - 20 points) Results are well-above District goals for similar students.	Teachers will be rated as highly effective when 88-100% of their students achieve their growth target scores.
Effective (9 - 17 points) Results meet District goals for similar students.	Teachers will be rated as effective when 75-87% of their students achieve their growth target scores.
Developing (3 - 8 points) Results are below District goals for similar students.	Teachers will be rated as developing when 65-74% of their students achieve their growth target scores.
Ineffective (0 - 2 points) Results are well-below District goals for similar students.	Teachers will be rated as ineffective when 64% or less of their students achieve their growth target 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
Anatomy	District, Regional or BOCES-developed	Geneseo CSD-developed Anatomy pre-assessment and summative assessment
Non-Regents Geometry/Algebra 1B	District, Regional or BOCES-developed	Geneseo CSD-developed Non-Regents Geometry/Algebra 1Bpre-assessment and summative assessment
Spanish 2	District, Regional or BOCES-developed	GVEP-developed Spanish 2 Assessment
French 7	District, Regional or BOCES-developed	GVEP-developed French 7 Assessment
Spanish 8	District, Regional or BOCES-developed	GVEP, Monroe1, Monroe 2-developed Spanish 8 Assessment
Economics	District, Regional or BOCES-developed	Geneseo CSD-developed Economics pre-assessment and summative assessment
Studio Art	District, Regional or BOCES-developed	GVEP-developed Studio Art Assessment
Technology 8	District, Regional or BOCES-developed	GVEP-developed Technology 8 Assessment
Physical Education K-12	District, Regional or BOCES-developed	GVEP-developed Physical Education Grade Specific Assessments

	Middle School Home and Careers	District, Regional or BOCES-developed	GVEP-developed Grade Specific Middle School Home and Careers Assessment
	Computer Applications	District, Regional or BOCES-developed	GVEP-developed Computer Applications Assessment
	Social Studies 5	District, Regional or BOCES-developed	Geneseo CSD-developed Social Studies 5 pre-assessment and summative assessment
	Science 4	State Assessment	Grade 4 State Science Assessment
	ESOL 1/2	State Assessment	NYSESLAT
	Elementary Art	District, Regional or BOCES-developed	GVEP-developed Grade Specific Elemenatry Art Assessment
	Elementary Music	District, Regional or BOCES-developed	GVEP-developed Grade Specific Elementary Music Assessment
	Middle School General Music	District, Regional or BOCES-developed	GVEP-developed Grade Specific Middle School Music 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.	Using data results from regionally developed pre-assessments, growth targets will be established by teachers of record for individual students. Based on the percentage of students who achieve their growth target goals, teachers will be assigned a score of 0-20 and will be identified as highly effective, effective, developing or ineffective according to the Geneseo Central School District HEDI scoring rubric.
Highly Effective (18 - 20 points) Results are well-above District goals for similar students.	Teachers will be rated as highly effective when 88-100% of their students achieve their growth target scores.
Effective (9 - 17 points) Results meet District goals for similar students.	Teachers will be rated as effective when 75-87% of their students achieve their growth target scores.
Developing (3 - 8 points) Results are below District goals for similar students.	Teachers will be rated as developing when 65-74% of their students achieve their growth target scores.
Ineffective (0 - 2 points) Results are well-below District goals for similar students.	Teachers will be rated as ineffective when 64% or less of their students achieve their growth target 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/5364/192080-TXEtxx9bQW/SLO-Template HEDI Scale GCSD Final.docx

2.12) Locally Developed Controls

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

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

(No response)

2.13) Teachers with more than one growth measure

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

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

2.14) Assurances

Please check all of the boxes below:

2.14) Assurances | Assure the application of locally developed controls will be rigorous, fair, and transparent and only those used for State Growth will be used for Comparable Growth Measures.	Checked
2.14) Assurances | Assure that use of locally developed controls will not have a disparate impact on underrepresented students in accordance with applicable civil rights laws.	Checked
2.14) Assurances | Assure that enrolled students in accordance with teacher of record policies are included and may not be excluded.	Checked
2.14) Assurances | Assure that procedures for ensuring data accuracy and integrity are being utilized.	Checked
2.14) Assurances | Assure that district will develop SLOs according to the rules established by SED (see: 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 Tuesday, October 09, 2012
Updated Monday, December 31, 2012

Page 1

Locally Selected Measures of Student Achievement or Growth

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

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

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

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

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

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

Growth or achievement measure(s) from these options.

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

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

Measures based on:

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

3.1) Grades 4-8 ELA

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

	Locally-Selected Measure from List of Approved Measures	Assessment
4	6(ii) School wide measure computed locally	State ELA and Math Assessment for Grades 3-5
5	6(ii) School wide measure computed locally	State ELA and Math Assessment for Grades 3-5

6	6(ii) School wide measure computed locally	State ELA and Math Assessment for Grades 6-8
7	6(ii) School wide measure computed locally	State ELA and Math Assessment for Grades 6-8
8	6(ii) School wide measure computed locally	State ELA and Math Assessment for Grades 6-8

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.	For elementary teachers at Geneseo Central in grades 4 and 5 we will be using the prior three years average standard score performance of Geneseo Elementary students in grades 3 through 5 on the New York State grades 3 through 5 Math and English Language Arts Assessments to establish a baseline of achievement for the students in the Geneseo Central Elementary School for the HEDI Scoring Rubric. Teacher performance will be based on the performance of students in 2013 on the New York State grades 3 through 5 Math and English Language Arts Assessments. The average combined standard performance score for the prior three years is 670. The 2013 scores will be used to determine the teacher performance rating for this subcomponent. For middle school teachers at Geneseo Central in grades 6-8 we will be using the prior three years average standard score performance of Geneseo Middle School students in grades 6 through 8 on the New York State grades 6 through 8 Math and English Language Arts Assessments to establish a baseline of achievement for students in the Geneseo Middle School for the HEDI Scoring Rubric. Teacher performance will be based on the performance of students in 2013 on the New York State Math and English Language Arts Assessments. The average combined standard performance score for the prior three years is 668. The 2013 scores will be used to determine the teacher performance rating for this subcomponent.
Highly Effective (14 - 15 points) Results are well above District- or BOCES-adopted expectations for growth or achievement for grade/subject.	Elementary teachers in grades 4 and 5 will be rated as highly effective if the 2013 average standard score is 675 or higher. Middle school teachers in grades 6-8 will be rated as highly effective if the 2013 average standard score is 673 or higher.
Effective (8- 13 points) Results meet District- or BOCES-adopted expectations for growth or achievement for grade/subject.	Elementary teachers will be rated as effective if the 2013 average standard score is 666 to 674. Middle school teachers will be rated as effective if the 2013 average standard score is 664 to 672.

Developing (3 - 7 points) Results are below District- or BOCES-adopted expectations for growth or achievement for grade/subject.	Elementary teachers will be rated as developing if the 2013 average standard score is 660 to 665. Middle school teachers will be rated as developing if the 2013 average standard score is between 658 and 663.
Ineffective (0 - 2 points) Results are well below District- or BOCES-adopted expectations for growth or achievement for grade/subject.	Elementary teachers will be rated as ineffective if the 2013 average standard score is 659 or lower. Middle school teachers will be rated as ineffective if the 2013 average standard score is 657 or lower.

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	6(ii) School wide measure computed locally	State ELA and Math Assessment for Grades 3-5
5	6(ii) School wide measure computed locally	State ELA and Math Assessment for Grades 3-5
6	6(ii) School wide measure computed locally	State ELA and Math Assessment for Grades 6-8
7	6(ii) School wide measure computed locally	State ELA and Math Assessment for Grades 6-8
8	6(ii) School wide measure computed locally	State ELA and Math Assessment for Grades 6-8

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.	For elementary teachers at Geneseo Central in grades 4 and 5 we will be using the prior three years average standard score performance of Geneseo Elementary students in grades 3 through 5 on the New York State grades 3 through 5 Math and English Language Arts Assessments to establish a baseline of achievement for the students in the Geneseo Central Elementary School. Teacher performance will be based on the performance of students in 2013 on the New York State grades 3 through 5 Math and English Language Arts Assessments. The average combined standard performance score for the prior three years is 670. The 2013 scores will be used to determine the teacher performance rating for this subcomponent. For middle school teachers at Geneseo Central in grades 6-8 we will be using the prior three years average standard score performance of Geneseo Middle School

	students in grades 6 through 8 on the New York State grades 6 through 8 Math and English Language Arts Assessments to establish a baseline of achievement for students in the Geneseo Middle School for the HEDI Scoring Rubric. Teacher performance will be based on the performance of students in 2013 on the New York State Math and English Language Arts Assessments. The average combined standard performance score for the prior three years is 668. The 2013 scores will be used to determine the teacher performance rating for this subcomponent.
Highly Effective (14 - 15 points) Results are well above District- or BOCES-adopted expectations for growth or achievement for grade/subject.	Elementary teachers in grades 4 and 5 will be rated as highly effective if the 2013 average standard score is 675 or higher. Middle school teachers in grades 6-8 will be rated as highly effective if the 2013 average standard score is 673 or higher.
Effective (8- 13 points) Results meet District- or BOCES-adopted expectations for growth or achievement for grade/subject.	Elementary teachers will be rated as effective if the 2013 average standard score is 666 to 674. Middle school teachers will be rated as effective if the 2013 average standard score is 664 to 672.
Developing (3 - 7 points) Results are below District- or BOCES-adopted expectations for growth or achievement for grade/subject.	Elementary teachers will be rated as developing if the 2013 average standard score is 660 to 665. Middle school teachers will be rated as developing if the 2013 average standard score is between 658 and 663.
Ineffective (0 - 2 points) Results are well below District- or BOCES-adopted expectations for growth or achievement for grade/subject.	Elementary teachers will be rated as ineffective if the 2013 average standard score is 659 or lower. Middle school teachers will be rated as ineffective if the 2013 average standard score is 657 or lower.

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/5139/192279-rhJdBgDruP/Local Achievement Measures for Teachers - 15 point rubrics [resubmit2].pdf

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	6(ii) School-wide measure computed locally	State ELA and Math Assessment for Grades 3-5
1	6(ii) School-wide measure computed locally	State ELA and Math Assessment for Grades 3-5
2	6(ii) School-wide measure computed locally	State ELA and Math Assessment for Grades 3-5

3	6(ii) School-wide measure computed locally	State ELA and Math Assessment for Grades 3-5

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.	For elementary teachers at Geneseo Central in grades K through 3 we will be using the prior three years average standard score performance of Geneseo Elementary students in grades 3 through 5 on the New York State grades 3 through 5 Math and English Language Arts Assessments to establish a baseline of achievement for the students in the Geneseo Central Elementary School for the HEDI Scoring Rubric. Teacher performance will be based on the performance of students in 2013 on the New York State grades 3 through 5 Math and English Language Arts Assessments. The average combined standard performance score for the prior three years is 670. The 2013 scores will be used to determine the teacher performance rating for this subcomponent.
Highly Effective (18-20 points) Results are well above District- or BOCES-adopted expectations for growth or achievement for grade/subject.	Teachers will be rated as highly effective if the 2013 average standard score is 675 or higher on the New York State grades 3 through 5 Math and English Language Arts Assessments.
Effective (9-17 points) Results meet District- or BOCES-adopted expectations for growth or achievement for grade/subject.	Teachers will be rated as effective if the 2013 average standard score is 666 to 674 on the New York State grades 3 through 5 Math and English Language Arts Assessments.
Developing (3 - 8 points) Results are below District- or BOCES-adopted expectations for growth or achievement for grade/subject.	Teachers will be rated as developing if the 2013 average standard score is 660 to 665 on the New York State grades 3 through 5 Math and English Language Arts Assessments.
Ineffective (0 - 2 points) Results are well below District- or BOCES-adopted expectations for growth or achievement for grade/subject.	Teachers will be rated as ineffective if the 2013 average standard score is 659 or lower on the New York State grades 3 through 5 Math and English Language Arts Assessments.

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	6(ii) School-wide measure computed locally	State ELA and Math Assessment for Grades 3-5
1	6(ii) School-wide measure computed locally	State ELA and Math Assessment for Grades 3-5

2	6(ii) School-wide measure computed locally	State ELA and Math Assessment for Grades 3-5
3	6(ii) School-wide measure computed locally	State ELA and Math Assessment for Grades 3-5

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.	For elementary teachers at Geneseo Central in grades 4 and 5 we will be using the prior three years average standard score performance of Geneseo Elementary students in grades 3 through 5 on the New York State grades 3 through 5 Math and English Language Arts Assessments to establish a baseline of achievement for the students in the Geneseo Central Elementary School for the HEDI Scoring Rubric. Teacher performance will be based on the performance of students in 2013 on the New York State grades 3 through 5 Math and English Language Arts Assessments. The average combined standard performance score for the prior three years is 670. The 2013 scores will be used to determine the teacher performance rating for this subcomponent.
Highly Effective (18-20 points) Results are well above District- or BOCES-adopted expectations for growth or achievement for grade/subject.	Teachers will be rated as highly effective if the 2013 average standard score is 675 or higher on the New York State grades 3 through 5 Math and English Language Arts Assessments.
Effective (9-17 points) Results meet District- or BOCES-adopted expectations for growth or achievement for grade/subject.	Teachers will be rated as effective if the 2013 average standard score is 666 to 674 on the New York State grades 3 through 5 Math and English Language Arts Assessments.
Developing (3 - 8 points) Results are below District -or BOCES-adopted expectations for growth or achievement for grade/subject.	Teachers will be rated as developing if the 2013 average standard score is 660 to 665 on the New York State grades 3 through 5 Math and English Language Arts Assessments.
Ineffective (0 - 2 points) Results are well below District- or BOCES-adopted expectations for growth or achievement for grade/subject.	Teachers will be rated as ineffective if the 2013 average standard score is 659 or lower on the New York State grades 3 through 5 Math and English Language Arts Assessments.

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	6(ii) School wide measure computed locally	State ELA and Math Assessment for Grades 6-8

7	6(ii) School wide measure computed locally	State ELA and Math Assessment for Grades 6-8
8	6(ii) School wide measure computed locally	State ELA and Math Assessment for Grades 6-8

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.	For middle school teachers at Geneseo Central in grades 6-8 we will be using the prior three years average standard score performance of Geneseo Middle School students in grades 6 through 8 on the New York State grades 6 through 8 Math and English Language Arts Assessments to establish a baseline of achievement for students in the Geneseo Middle School for the HEDI Scoring Rubric. Teacher performance will be based on the performance of students in 2013 on the New York State Math and English Language Arts Assessments. The average combined standard performance score for the prior three years is 668. The 2013 scores will be used to determine the teacher performance rating for this subcomponent.
Highly Effective (18 - 20 points) Results are well above District- or BOCES-adopted expectations for growth or achievement for grade/subject.	Teachers will be rated as highly effective if the 2013 average standard score is 673 or higher on the New York State grades 6 through 8 Math and English Language Arts Assessment.
Effective (9 - 17 points) Results meet District- or BOCES-adopted expectations for growth or achievement for grade/subject.	Teachers will be rated as effective if the 2013 average standard score is 664 to 672 on the New York State grades 6 through 8 Math and English Language Arts Assessment.
Developing (3 - 8 points) Results are below District- or BOCES-adopted expectations for growth or achievement for grade/subject.	Teachers will be rated as developing if the 2013 average standard score is 658 to 663 on the New York State grades 6 through 8 Math and English Language Arts Assessment.
Ineffective (0 - 2 points) Results are well below District- or BOCES-adopted expectations for growth or achievement for grade/subject.	Teachers will be rated as ineffective if the 2013 average standard score is 657 or lower on the New York State grades 6 through 8 Math and English Language Arts Assessment.

3.7) Grades 6-8 Social Studies

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

	Locally-Selected Measure from List of Approved Measures	Assessment
6	6(ii) School wide measure computed locally	State ELA and Math Assessment for Grades 6-8
7	6(ii) School wide measure computed locally	State ELA and Math Assessment for Grades 6-8
8	6(ii) School wide measure computed locally	State ELA and Math Assessment for Grades 6-8

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.	For middle school teachers at Geneseo Central in grades 6-8 we will be using the prior three years average standard score performance of Geneseo Middle School students in grades 6 through 8 on the New York State grades 6 through 8 Math and English Language Arts Assessments to establish a baseline of achievement for students in the Geneseo Middle School for the HEDI Scoring Rubric. Teacher performance will be based on the performance of students in 2013 on the New York State Math and English Language Arts Assessments. The average combined standard performance score for the prior three years is 668. The 2013 scores will be used to determine the teacher performance rating for this subcomponent.
Highly Effective (18 - 20 points) Results are well above District- or BOCES-adopted expectations for growth or achievement for grade/subject.	Teachers will be rated as highly effective if the 2013 average standard score is 673 or higher on the New York State grades 6 through 8 Math and English Language Arts Assessment.
Effective (9 - 17 points) Results meet District- or BOCES-adopted expectations for growth or achievement for grade/subject.	Teachers will be rated as effective if the 2013 average standard score is 664 to 672 on the New York State grades 6 through 8 Math and English Language Arts Assessment.
Developing (3 - 8 points) Results are below District- or BOCES-adopted expectations for growth or achievement for grade/subject.	Teachers will be rated as developing if the 2013 average standard score is 658 to 663 on the New York State grades 6 through 8 Math and English Language Arts Assessment.
Ineffective (0 - 2 points) Results are well below District- or BOCES-adopted expectations for growth or achievement for grade/subject.	Teachers will be rated as ineffective if the 2013 average standard score is 657 or lower on the New York State grades 6 through 8 Math and English Language Arts Assessment.

3.8) High School Social Studies

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

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

	Locally-Selected Measure from List of Approved Measures	Assessment
Global 1	6(ii) School wide measure computed locally	State Regents Exams in Global Studies, ELA, Living Environment, Algebra 1 and US History and Government
Global 2	6(ii) School wide measure computed locally	State Regents Exams in Global Studies, ELA, Living Environment, Algebra 1 and US History and Government

American History	6(ii) School wide measure computed locally	State Regents Exams in Global Studies, ELA, Living Environment, Algebra 1 and US History and Government

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.	The measure for local achievement shall be the average Regents exam scores for the five Regents Exams required for a Regents Diploma. These exams are Integrated Algebra, Global Studies, United States History, Living Environment and English Language Arts. The average scores for the 2009-2010, 2010-2011 and 2011-2012 school years were utilized to establish the baseline for the HEDI Scoring Rubric. The average score for all exams over the three year period is 85.9. The 2013 average on the five Regents Exams will be used to determine the teacher performance rating for this subcomponent.
Highly Effective (18 - 20 points) Results are well above District- or BOCES-adopted expectations for growth or achievement for grade/subject.	Teachers will be rated as highly effective if the 2013 average score for the five Regents Exams is 86.2 or higher.
Effective (9 - 17 points) Results meet District- or BOCES-adopted expectations for growth or achievement for grade/subject.	Teachers will be rated as effective if the 2013 average score for the five Regents Exams is 85.3 to 86.1.
Developing (3 - 8 points) Results are below District- or BOCES-adopted expectations for growth or achievement for grade/subject.	Teachers will be rated as developing if the 2013 average score for the five Regents Exams is 84.7 to 85.2.
Ineffective (0 - 2 points) Results are well below District- or BOCES-adopted expectations for growth or achievement for grade/subject.	Teachers will be rated as ineffective if the 2013 average score for the five Regents Exams is 84.6 or lower.

3.9) High School Science

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

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

	Locally-Selected Measure from List of Approved Measures	Assessment
Living Environment	6(ii) School wide measure computed locally	State Regents Exams in Global Studies, ELA, Living Environment, Algebra 1 and US History and Government
Earth Science	6(ii) School wide measure computed locally	State Regents Exams in Global Studies, ELA, Living Environment, Algebra 1 and US History and Government
Chemistry	6(ii) School wide measure computed locally	State Regents Exams in Global Studies, ELA, Living Environment, Algebra 1 and US History and Government

Physics	6(ii) School wide measure computed locally	State Regents Exams in Global Studies, ELA, Living Environment, Algebra 1 and US History and Government

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

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

Use this box, if needed, to describe the general process for assigning HEDI categories for these grades/subjects in this subcomponent. If needed, you may upload a table or graphic at 3.13, below.	The measure for local achievement shall be the average Regents exam scores for the five Regents Exams required for a Regents Diploma. These exams are Integrated Algebra, Global Studies, United States History, Living Environment and English Language Arts. The average scores for the 2009-2010, 2010-2011 and 2011-2012 school years were utilized to establish the baseline for the HEDI Scoring Rubric. The average score for all exams over the three year period is 85.9. The 2013 average on the five Regents Exams will be used to determine the teacher performance rating for this subcomponent.
Highly Effective (18-20 points) Results are well above District- or BOCES-adopted expectations for growth or achievement for grade/subject.	Teachers will be rated as highly effective if the 2013 average score for the five Regents Exams is 86.2 or higher.
Developing (3 - 8 points) Results are below District- or BOCES-adopted expectations for growth or achievement for grade/subject.	Teachers will be rated as effective if the 2013 average score for the five Regents Exams is 85.3 to 86.1.
Effective (9 - 17points) Results meet District- or BOCES-adopted expectations for growth or achievement for grade/subject.	Teachers will be rated as developing if the 2013 average score for the five Regents Exams is 84.7 to85.2.
Ineffective (0 - 2 points) Results are well below District- or BOCES-adopted expectations for growth or achievement for grade/subject.	Teachers will be rated as ineffective if the 2013 average score for the five Regents Exams is 84.6 or lower.

3.10) High School Math

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

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

	Locally-Selected Measure from List of Approved Measures	Assessment
Algebra 1	6(ii) School wide measure computed locally	State Regents Exams in Global Studies, ELA, Living Environment, Algebra 1 and US History and Government
Geometry	6(ii) School wide measure computed locally	State Regents Exams in Global Studies, ELA, Living Environment, Algebra 1 and US History and Government
Algebra 2	6(ii) School wide measure computed locally	State Regents Exams in Global Studies, ELA, Living Environment, Algebra 1 and US History and Government

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.	The measure for local achievement shall be the average Regents exam scores for the five Regents Exams required for a Regents Diploma. These exams are Integrated Algebra, Global Studies, United States History, Living Environment and English Language Arts. The average scores for the 2009-2010, 2010-2011 and 2011-2012 school years were utilized to establish the baseline for the HEDI Scoring Rubric. The average score for all exams over the three year period is 85.9. The 2013 average on the five Regents Exams will be used to determine the teacher performance rating for this subcomponent.
Highly Effective (18 - 20 points) Results are well above District- or BOCES-adopted expectations for growth or achievement for grade/subject.	Teachers will be rated as highly effective if the 2013 average score for the five Regents Exams is 86.2 or higher.
Effective (9 - 17 points) Results meet District- or BOCES-adopted expectations for growth or achievement for grade/subject.	Teachers will be rated as effective if the 2013 average score for the five Regents Exams is 85.3 to 86.1.
Developing (3 - 8 points) Results are below District- or BOCES-adopted expectations for growth or achievement for grade/subject.	Teachers will be rated as developing if the 2013 average score for the five Regents Exams is 84.7 to 85.2.
Ineffective (0 - 2 points) Results are well below District- or BOCES-adopted expectations for growth or achievement for grade/subject.	Teachers will be rated as ineffective if the 2013 average score for the five Regents Exams is 84.6 or lower.

3.11) High School English Language Arts

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

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

	Locally-Selected Measure from List of Approved Measures	Assessment
Grade 9 ELA	6(ii) School wide measure computed locally	State Regents Exams in Global Studies, ELA, Living Environment, Algebra 1 and US History and Government
Grade 10 ELA	6(ii) School wide measure computed locally	State Regents Exams in Global Studies, ELA, Living Environment, Algebra 1 and US History and Government
Grade 11 ELA	6(ii) School wide measure computed locally	State Regents Exams in Global Studies, ELA, Living Environment, Algebra 1 and US History and Government

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.	The measure for local achievement shall be the average Regents exam scores for the five Regents Exams required for a Regents Diploma. These exams are Integrated Algebra, Global Studies, United States History, Living Environment and English Language Arts. The average scores for the 2009-2010, 2010-2011 and 2011-2012 school years were utilized to establish the baseline for the HEDI Scoring Rubric. The average score for all exams over the three year period is 85.9. The 2013 average on the five Regents Exams will be used to determine the teacher performance rating for this subcomponent.
Highly Effective (18 - 20 points) Results are well above District- or BOCES-adopted expectations for growth or achievement for grade/subject.	Teachers will be rated as highly effective if the 2013 average score for the five Regents Exams is 86.2 or higher.
Effective (9 - 17 points) Results meet District- or BOCES-adopted expectations for growth or achievement for grade/subject.	Teachers will be rated as effective if the 2013 average score for the five Regents Exams is 85.3 to 86.1.
Developing (3 - 8 points) Results are below District- or BOCES-adopted expectations for growth or achievement for grade/subject.	Teachers will be rated as developing if the 2013 average score for the five Regents Exams is 84.7 to 85.2.
Ineffective (0 - 2 points) Results are well below District- or BOCES-adopted expectations for growth or achievement for grade/subject.	Teachers will be rated as ineffective if the 2013 average score for the five Regents Exams is 84.6 or lower.

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
	For all other courses in grades K-5	6(ii) School wide measure computed locally	State ELA and Math Assessment for Grades 3-5
	For all other courses in grades 6-8	6(ii) School wide measure computed locally	State ELA and Math Assessment for Grades 6-8
	For all other courses in grades 9-12	6(ii) School wide measure computed locally	State Regents Exams in Global Studies, ELA, Living Environment, Algebra 1 and US History and Government

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

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

Use this box, if needed, to describe the general process for assigning HEDI categories for these grades/subjects in this subcomponent. If needed, you may upload a table or graphic at 3.13, below.	For all other courses in grades K-5, we will be using the prior three years average standard score performance of Geneseo Elementary students in grades 3 through 5 on the New York State grades 3 through 5 Math and English Language Arts Assessments to establish a baseline of achievement for the students in the Geneseo Central Elementary School for the HEDI Scoring Rubric. Teacher performance will be based on the performance of students in 2013 on the New York State grades 3 through 5 Math and English Language Arts Assessments. The average combined standard performance score for the prior three years is 670. The 2013 scores will be used to determine the teacher performance rating for this subcomponent. For all other middle school courses at Geneseo Central in grades 6-8 we will be using the prior three years average standard score performance of Geneseo Middle School students in grades 6 through 8 on the New York State grades 6 through 8 Math and English Language Arts Assessments to establish a baseline of achievement for students in the Geneseo Middle School for the HEDI Scoring Rubric. Teacher performance will be based on the performance of students in 2013 on the New York State Math and English Language Arts Assessments. The average combined standard performance score for the prior three years is 668. The 2013 scores will be used to determine the teacher performance rating for this subcomponent. For all other high school courses in grades 9-12 the measure for local achievement shall be the average Regents exam scores for the five Regents Exams required for a Regents Diploma. These exams are Integrated Algebra, Global Studies, United States History, Living Environment and English Language Arts. The average scores for the 2009-2010, 2010-2011 and 2011-2012 school years were utilized to establish the baseline for the HEDI Scoring Rubric. The average score for all exams over the three year period is 85.9. The 2013 average on the five Regents Exams will be used to determine the teacher performance rating for this subcomponent.
Highly Effective (18 - 20 points) Results are well above District- or BOCES -adopted expectations for growth or achievement for grade/subject.	Teachers in grades K-5 will be rated as highly effective if the 2013 average standard score is 675 or higher on the New York State grades 3 through 5 Math and English Language Arts Assessments. Teachers in grades 6-8 will be rated as highly effective if the 2013 average standard score is 673 or higher on the

	New York State grades 6 through 8 Math and English Language Arts Assessment. Teachers in grades 9-12 will be rated as highly effective if the 2013 average score for the five Regents Exams is 86.2 or higher.
Effective (9 - 17 points) Results meet District- or BOCES-adopted expectations for growth or achievement for grade/subject.	Teachers in grades K-5 will be rated as effective if the 2013 average standard score is 666 to 674 on the New York State grades 3 through 5 Math and English Language Arts Assessments. Teachers in grades 6-8 will be rated as effective if the 2013 average standard score is 664 to 672 on the New York State grades 6 through 8 Math and English Language Arts Assessment. Teachers in grades 9-12 will be rated as effective if the 2013 average score for the five Regents Exams is 85.3 to 86.1.
Developing (3 - 8 points) Results are below District- or BOCES-adopted expectations for growth or achievement for grade/subject.	Teachers in grades K-5 will be rated as developing if the 2013 average standard score is 660 to 665 on the New York State grades 3 through 5 Math and English Language Arts Assessments. Teachers in grades 6-8 will be rated as developing if the 2013 average standard score is 658 to 663 on the New York State grades 6 through 8 Math and English Language Arts Assessment. Teachers in grades 9-12 will be rated as developing if the 2013 average score for the five Regents Exams is 84.7 to 85.2.
Ineffective (0 - 2 points) Results are well below District- or BOCES-adopted expectations for growth or achievement for grade/subject.	Teachers in grades K-5 will be rated as ineffective if the 2013 average standard score is 659 or lower on the New York State grades 3 through 5 Math and English Language Arts Assessments. Teachers in grades 6-8 will be rated as ineffective if the 2013 average standard score is 657 or lower on the New York State grades 6 through 8 Math and English Language Arts Assessment. Teachers in grades 9-12 will be rated as ineffective if the 2013 average score for the five Regents Exams is 84.6 or lower.

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

assets/survey-uploads/5139/192279-Rp0Ol6pk1T/Form3_12_AllOtherCourses[1] Geneseo Central School District.docx

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/5139/192279-y92vNseFa4/Local Achievement Measures for Teachers - 20 point rubrics [resubmit2].pdf

3.14) Locally Developed Controls

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

(No response)

3.15) Teachers with More Than One Locally Selected Measure

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

Local measures are based on building scores. Each teacher is assigned to the elementary, middle or high school. Therefore, no multiple selected measures will be utilized.

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 Friday, November 02, 2012
Updated Thursday, January 03, 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

(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]	39
One or more observation(s) by trained independent evaluators	(No response)
Observations by trained in-school peer teachers	(No response)
Feedback from students using State-approved survey tool	(No response)
Feedback from parents/caregivers using State-approved survey tool	(No response)
Structured reviews of lesson plans, student portfolios and other teacher artifacts	21

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.

The "Framework for Teaching" was selected as the basis for our Annual Professional Performance Review process because it is researched-based and provides a clearly defined framework to help teachers improve their instruction. More specifically, the framework:

1. Enhances professional practice by seeking to identify principles of effective practice and classroom organization. Such principles maximize student learning and promote student engagement.

2. Provides a common vocabulary for discussions regarding professional excellence in teaching.

3. Provides clear expectations, via the rubrics, about what constitutes proficient and distinguished teaching and serves as a guide for teachers striving to attain mastery teaching status.

4. The Framework for Teaching, with its 4 domains and 22 specific components, is designed to:
● Provide every unit member, via the rubrics, valuable feedback to guide their planning for effective professional practice.
● Provide evaluators, via Domains 2 and 3, clear guidelines to assess the components of effective practice that are directly observable in the instructional setting.
● Provide unit members and evaluators, via Domain 1, Protocol for Pre-Observation Conference, and Protocol for Post-Observation Conference as vehicles for meaningful discussion on instructional/professional skills not directly observable in the classroom.
● Provides unit members and evaluators, via Domain 4, a vehicle for identifying Professional Responsibilities that are aligned with the Summative Review component of unit member observations.

PROFESSIONAL COMPETENCY DOMAINS
From Charlotte Danielson's
Enhancing Professional Practice: A Framework for Teaching

DOMAIN 1: Planning and Preparation (how a teacher designs instruction)
1a. Demonstrating Knowledge of Content and Pedagogy
1b. Demonstrating Knowledge of Students
1c. Selecting Instructional Goals
1d. Demonstrating Knowledge of Resources
1e. Designing Coherent Instruction
1f. Assessing Student Learning

DOMAIN 2: The Classroom Environment (the interactions that occur in the classroom)
2a. Creating an Environment of Respect and Rapport
2b. Establishing a Culture for Learning
2c. Managing Classroom Procedures
2d. Managing Student Behavior
2e. Organizing Physical Space

DOMAIN 3: Instruction (the heart of teaching---the actual engagement of students in content)
3a. Communicating Clearly and Accurately
3b. Using Questioning and Discussion Techniques
3c. Engaging Students in Learning
3d. Providing Feedback to Students
3e. Demonstrating Flexibility and Responsiveness

DOMAIN 4: Professional Responsibilities (the roles outside of those in the classroom)
4a. Reflecting on Teaching
4b. Maintaining Accurate Records
4c. Communicating with Families
4d. Contributing to the School and District
4e. Growing and Developing Professionally
4f. Showing Professionalism

Points for Domains 1, 2, and 3 are assigned during the observation process. Every classroom observation is scored utilizing the Teacher Observation Form. The Teacher Observation Form uses a 39 point scale. Every observation is rated utilizing the 39 point scale. Depending on the type of observation (Formal (announced) or unannounced) the 39 point score is converted to a score out of 26 points for Formal (announced) observations or a score out of 13 points for unannounced observations. For untenured teachers, the three formal observations are averaged to determine the score for formal (long) observations. Tenured teachers have a single formal observation which determines the formal observation score. Unannounced observations are assigned a value of 13 points. Every teacher has one informal observation. The total score for all observations equals 39 points. [The Teacher Observation Form and the conversion chart for formal (announced) and unannounced observations are contained in the attached Teacher Observation and Summative Processes and Documents - 60 points [resubmit] document.]

Points for Domain 4, Professional Responsibilities, are assigned during the summative review meeting between the evaluator and teacher. The Summative Review Form for Teachers is utilized to rate Professional Responsibilities for each teacher. Professional Responsibilites are assigned a value of 21 points. Artifacts which demonstrate competency in the elements of professional responsibility are reviewed by the evaluator during the summative conference.

The observation score out of 39 points and the professional responsibilities score out of 21 points are added together to determine the overall score out of 60 points for each teacher in the area of "other measures." The total score out of 60 points is utilized to determine the HEDI rating for a teacher in this subcomponent.

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/5091/215502-eka9yMJ855/Teacher Observation and Summative Processes and Documents - 60 points [resubmit2].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.	Individuals at this level are master educators and make a contribution to the field, both in and outside their school. Their work space operates at a qualitatively different level, consisting of a community of learners, with students highly motivated and engaged and assuming considerable responsibility for their own learning. The Distinguished level is the level that all teachers should strive to attain; however, circumstances may create obstacles for consistent performance at this high level.
Effective: Overall performance and results meet NYS Teaching Standards.	The individual clearly understands the concepts underlying the component and implements it well. Most experienced, capable individuals will regard themselves and be regarded by others as performing at this level. “Teachers performing at the Proficient level have mastered the work of teaching while working to improve their practice.”
Developing: Overall performance and results need improvement in order to meet NYS Teaching Standards.	The individual appears to understand the concepts underlying the component and attempts to implement its elements. But implementation is sporadic, intermittent, or otherwise not entirely successful. Additional reading, discussion, visiting work spaces of other individuals, and experience (particularly supported by a mentor) will enable the individual to become more proficient in this area. For supervision or evaluation, this level is minimally competent-improvement is likely with experience, and little or no actual harm is done to students. A component area observed or described as “Basic” does not meet District Standards and intervention is likely.
Ineffective: Overall performance and results do not meet NYS Teaching Standards.	The individual does not yet appear to understand the concepts underlying the component. Working on the fundamental practices associated with the elements will enable the individual to grow and develop in this area. A component area observed or described as “Unsatisfactory” does not meet District Standards. This level may represent teaching, “that is below the licensing standard of ‘do no harm’”, and it is likely that the District will intervene.

Provide the ranges for the 60-point scoring bands.

Highly Effective	51-60
Effective	35-50
Developing	25-34
Ineffective	0-24

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	3
4.6) Observations of Probationary Teachers | Informal/Short	1
4.6) Observations of Probationary Teachers | Enter Total	4

By trained in-school peer teachers or other trained reviewers

Formal/Long	0
Informal/Short	0

Independent evaluators

Formal/Long	0
Informal/Short	0

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

- In Person

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

- In Person

4.7) Observations of Tenured Teachers

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

By building principals or other trained administrators

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

By trained in-school peer teachers or other trained reviewers

Formal/Long	0
Informal/Short	0

Independent evaluators

Formal/Long	0
Informal/Short	0

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

- In Person

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

- In Person

5. Composite Scoring (Teachers)

Created Friday, November 02, 2012

Page 1

Standards for Rating Categories

Growth or Comparable Measures

Locally-selected Measures of

growth or achievement

Other Measures of Effectiveness

(Teacher and Leader standards)

Highly

Effective

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

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

Overall performance and results exceed NYS Teaching Standards.

Effective

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

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

Overall performance and results meet NYS Teaching Standards.

Developing

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

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

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

Ineffective

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

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

Overall performance and results do not meet NYS Teaching Standards.

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

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

2012-13 where there is no Value-Added measure

Growth or Comparable Measures

Locally-selected Measures of

growth or achievement

Other Measures of Effectiveness

(60 points)

Overall

Composite Score

Highly Effective

18-20

18-20

Ranges determined locally--see below

91-100

Effective

9-17

9-17

75-90

Developing

3-8

3-8

65-74

Ineffective

0-2

0-2

0-64

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

Highly Effective	51-60
Effective	35-50
Developing	25-34
Ineffective	0-24

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 Friday, November 02, 2012
Updated Friday, December 28, 2012

Page 1

6.1) Assurances -- Improvement Plans

Please check the boxes below:

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

6.2) Attachment: Teacher Improvement Plan Forms

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

assets/survey-uploads/5265/215605-Df0w3Xx5v6/TEACHER IMPROVEMENT PLAN 2012.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:

APPEALS OF INEFFECTIVE AND DEVELOPING RATINGS ONLY
Appeals of annual professional performance reviews should be limited to those who receive composite ratings of ineffective or developing only.

WHAT MAY BE CHALLENGED IN AN APPEAL

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

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

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

TIMEFRAME FOR FILING APPEAL
All appeals must be submitted in writing no later than 15 calendar days of the date when the teacher receives his or her composite APPR rating. The failure to file an appeal within these timeframes shall be deemed a waiver of the right to appeal and the appeal shall be deemed abandoned.

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

TIMEFRAME FOR DISTRICT RESPONSE
Within 15 calendar days of receipt of an appeal, the school district staff member(s) who issued the performance review or are responsible for either the issuance and/or implementation of the terms of the teacher's or principal's improvement plan must submit a detailed written response to the appeal.

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

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

DECISION-MAKER ON APPEAL
A decision shall be rendered by the superintendent of schools. The superintendent may seek counsel on an appeal from the Genesee Valley Education Partnership District Superintendent. In all cases, final decisions shall be determined by the Geneseo Central School District Superintendent of Schools.

DECISION
A written decision on the merits of the appeal shall be rendered no later than 30 calendar days from the date upon which the teacher filed his or her appeal. The appeal shall be based on a written record, comprised of the teacher's appeal papers and any documentary evidence accompanying the appeal, as well as the response to the appeal and additional documentary evidence submitted with such response papers. Such decision shall be final.

The decision shall set forth the reasons and factual basis for each determination on each of the specific issues raised in the teacher's appeal. If the appeal is sustained, the reviewer may set aside a rating if it has been affected by substantial error or defect, modify a rating if it is affected by substantial error or defect or order a new evaluation if procedures have been violated. A copy of the decision shall be provided to the teacher and the evaluator or the person responsible for either issuing or implementing the terms of an improvement plan, if that person is different.

EXCLUSIVITY OF SECTION 3012-C APPEAL PROCEDURE
The 3012-c appeal procedure shall constitute the exclusive means for initiating, reviewing and resolving any and all challenges and

appeals related to a teacher performance review and/or improvement plan. A teacher may not resort to any other contractual grievance procedures for the resolution of challenges and appeals related to a professional performance review and/or improvement plan, except as otherwise authorized by law.

6.4) Training 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.

Evaluators will be trained in the nine elements defined by New York State teaching standards by attending training offered by the Genesee Valley Educational Partnership, Monroe 1 or Monroe 2 BOCES. All training consists of 10 sessions that are included in 6 to 10 days of training. In addition, evaluators will work collaboratively in weekly administrative team meetings to review and analyze lessons, evidence-based post-observation documents and evidence of professional responsibilities according to the Danielson model. Professional summer work will include evaluator review and training to insure inter-rater reliability and commonality of practice. Lead evaluators and evaluators will utilize authentic evidence gathered during actual teacher observations, review video of lessons and best practice, and will discuss and review the elements of Danielson as they reflect on the New York State teaching standards.

All documentation of training and development activities will be kept on file in the District Office. Upon completion of training, the superintendent will recommend to the Board of Education individuals who are able to conduct evaluations.

Recertification will occur yearly after individuals have participated in the ongoing professional development activities and the summer training.

6.5) Assurances -- Evaluators

Please check the boxes below:

- Checked

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

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

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

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

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

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

(7) use of the Statewide Instructional Reporting System

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

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

- Checked

6.6) Assurances -- Teachers

Please check all of the boxes below:

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

6.7) Assurances -- Data

Please check all of the boxes below:

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

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

Created Wednesday, November 07, 2012

Page 1

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

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

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

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

K-5
6-12
(No response)
(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

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.	No Principals will have comparable growth measures.
Highly Effective (18 - 20 points) Results are well above state average for similar students (or District goals if no state test).	No Principals will have comparable growth measures.
Effective (9 - 17 points) Results meet state average for similar students (or District goals if no state test).	No Principals will have comparable growth measures.
Developing (3 - 8 points) Results are below state average for similar students (or District goals if no state test).	No Principals will have comparable growth measures.
Ineffective (0 - 2 points) Results are well below state average for similar students (or District goals if no state test).	No Principals will have comparable growth measures.

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

(No response)

7.4) Special Considerations for Comparable Growth Measures

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

Note: The only allowable controls or adjustments for Comparable Growth Measures are those used in State Growth measures, which

include: prior student achievement results, students with disabilities, English language learners, students in poverty, and, in the future, any other student-, classroom-, and school-level characteristics approved by the Board of Regents.

No special considerations are needed.

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, November 07, 2012
Updated Monday, December 31, 2012

Page 1

Locally-Selected Measures of Student Achievement or Growth

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

Grade Configuration	Locally-Selected Measure from List of Approved Measures	Assessment
K-5	(d) measures used by district for teacher evaluation	New York State Assessments in English Language Arts and Math for grades 3-5.
6-12	(d) measures used by district for teacher evaluation	New York State Assessments in English Language Arts and Math for grades 6-8 and the Regents Exams in Global Studies, American History, Living Environment, Integrated Algebra and English Language Arts.

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

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

Use this box, if needed, to describe the process for assigning HEDI categories. If needed, you may upload a table or graphic below.	For the elementary principal at Geneseo Central, we have used the prior three years average standard score performance of Geneseo Elementary students on the New York State grades 3 through 5 Math and English Language Arts Assessments to establish a baseline of performance for students in the Geneseo Elementary School. The average combined performance score for the three years is 670. The three year performance scores were utilized to determine the HEDI rubric being utilized to score this subcomponent. Principal performance will be based on the performance of students on the 2013 grades 3 through 5 New York State Math and English Language Arts Assessments. The average standard score for students on the 2013 New York State Math and English Language Arts Assessments will be compared to the three year average to determine the HEDI rating for this subcomponent.

	For the middle school/high school principal at Geneseo Central we will use a combined score that includes a comparison of 2013 student performance to the prior three years average performance of Geneseo Middle School students on the New York State grades 6 through 8 Math and English Language Arts Assessments and the prior three years average performance of Geneseo High School students on the New York State Regents Exams in Global Studies, American History, Living Environment, Integrated Algebra and English Language Arts. The average combined performance score on the middle level assessments for the three years is 668. The average combined score for the five Regents Exams is 85.9. The three year performance scores were utilized to determine the HEDI rubric being utilized to score this subcomponent. Principal performance will be based on the performance of students in 2013 on the gades 6 through 8 New York State Math and English Language Arts Assessments and the 2013 New York State Regents Exams in Global Studies, American History, Living Environment, Integrated Algebra and English Language Arts. The overall subcomponent rating for the middle school/high school principal will be an average of the two HEDI scores.
Highly Effective (14 - 15 points) Results are well above District- or BOCES-adopted expectations for growth or achievement for grade/subject.	The elementary principal will be rated as highly effective if the 2013 average standard score for students on the 2013 grades 3 through 5 New York State Math and English Language Arts Assessments is 675 or higher. The middle school/high school principal will be rated as highly effective if the 2013 average standard score on the New York State grades 6 through 8 Math and English Language Arts Assessments is 673 or higher and the 2013 average score for the 2013 New York State Regents Exams in Global Studies, American History, Living Environment, Integrated Algebra and English Language Arts is 86.2 or higher.
Effective (8- 13 points) Results meet District- or BOCES-adopted expectations for growth or achievement for grade/subject.	The elementary principal will be rated as effective if the 2013 average standard score for students on the 2013 grades 3 through 5 New York State Math and English Language Arts Assessments is 666 to 674. The middle school/high school principal will be rated as effective if the 2013 average standard score on the New York State grades 6 through 8 Math and English Language Arts Assessments is 664 to 672 and the 2013 average score for the 2013 New York State Regents Exams in Global Studies, American History, Living Environment, Integrated Algebra and English Language Arts is 85.3 to 86.1.
Developing (3 - 7 points) Results are below District- or BOCES-adopted expectations for growth or achievement for grade/subject.	The elementary principal will be rated as developing if the 2013 average standard score for students on the 2013 grades 3 through 5 New York State Math and English Language Arts Assessments is 660 to 665. The middle school/high school principal will be rated as developing if the 2013 average standard score on the New York State grades 6 through 8 Math and English Language Arts Assessments is 658 to 663 and the 2013 average score for the 2013 New York State Regents Exams in Global Studies, American History, Living Environment, Integrated Algebra and English Language Arts is 84.7 to 85.2.

Ineffective (0 - 2 points) Results are well below District- or BOCES-adopted expectations for growth or achievement for grade/subject.	The elementary principal will be rated as ineffective if the 2013 average standard score for students on the 2013 grades 3 through 5 New York State Math and English Language Arts Assessments is 659 or lower. The middle school/high school principal will be rated as ineffective if the 2013 average standard score on the New York State grades 6 through 8 Math and English Language Arts Assessments is 657 or lower and the 2013 average score for the 2013 New York State Regents Exams in Global Studies, American History, Living Environment, Integrated Algebra and English Language Arts is 84.6 or lower.

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/5366/221912-qBFVOWF7fC/Local Achievement Measures for Principals - 15 point rubrics [resubmit2].pdf

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

with high school grades

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

Use this box, if needed, to describe the process for assigning HEDI categories. If needed, you may upload a table or graphic below.	No Geneseo Central School District principal will require a 20 point local achievement score.
Highly Effective (18 - 20 points) Results are well above District- or BOCES-adopted expectations for growth or achievement for grade/subject.	No Geneseo Central School District principal will require a 20 point local achievement score.
Effective (9- 17 points) Results meet District- or BOCES-adopted expectations for growth or achievement for grade/subject.	No Geneseo Central School District principal will require a 20 point local achievement score.
Developing (3 - 8 points) Results are below District- or BOCES-adopted expectations for growth or achievement for grade/subject.	No Geneseo Central School District principal will require a 20 point local achievement score.
Ineffective (0 - 2 points) Results are well below District- or BOCES-adopted expectations for growth or achievement for grade/subject.	No Geneseo Central School District principal will require a 20 point local achievement score.

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.

No locally developed controls will be utilized.

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.

For the Middle School/High School Principal, the HEDI score for the middle school assessments and the HEDI score for the Regents Exams will be averaged to determine an overall score.

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 Friday, November 09, 2012
Updated Thursday, January 03, 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]	60
Any remaining points shall be assigned based on results of one or more ambitious and measurable goals set collaboratively with principals and their superintendents or district superintendents.	0

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

(No response)

9.3) Assurances -- Goals

Please check the boxes below (if applicable):

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

9.4) Sources of Evidence (if applicable)

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

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

9.5) Survey Tool(s) (if applicable)

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

(No response)

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

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

9.6) Assurances

Please check all of the boxes below:

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

9.7) Process for Assigning Points and Determining HEDI Ratings

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

Each principal will receive an "Other Measures of Effectiveness Score" out of 60 possible points based on The LCI Multidimensional Principal Performance Rubric. The Superintendent will make a minimum of two visits to the principal's school and will collect evidence on the rubric domains throughout the year. Each of the six domains carries a ten point value. The total score for each of the domains is added to determine the overall score out of 60 possible points for the Other Measures subcomponent.

Using the rubric, the superintendent will circle the descriptor for each item that best matches the principal's performance. Using a holistic approach, a HEDI rating and point value shall then be determined for each domain (out of 10 possible points) and then added together to achieve an overall score (out of 60 possible points) based on the rubric. Points will be assigned as indicated below.

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/5143/225065-pMADJ4gk6R/Principal Rubrics for Other Measures Subcomponent [resubmit2].pdf

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

Highly Effective: Overall performance and results exceed standards.	Overall performance and results exceed standards. Based on the District's goals and priorities, the principals' overall performance and results exceeds the level of performance expected as assessed by the LCI Multidimensional rubric.
Effective: Overall performance and results meet standards.	Overall performance and results meet standards. Based on the District's goals and priorities, the principals' overall performance and results meets the level of performance expected as assessed by the LCI Multidimensional rubric.
Developing: Overall performance and results need improvement in order to meet standards.	Overall performance and results need improvement in order to meet standards. Based on the District's goals and priorities, the principals' overall performance and results needs improvement in order to meet the level of performance

	expected as assessed by the LCI Multidimensional rubric.
Ineffective: Overall performance and results do not meet standards.	Overall performance and results do not meet standards. Based on the District's goals and priorities, the principals' overall performance and results does not meet the level of performance expected as assessed by the LCI Multidimensional rubric.

Please provide the locally-negotiated 60 point scoring bands.

Highly Effective	51-60
Effective	35-50
Developing	25-34
Ineffective	0-24

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

Tenured Principals

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

10. Composite Scoring (Principals)

Created Friday, November 09, 2012

Page 1

Standards for Rating Categories

Growth or Comparable Measures

Locally-selected Measures of

growth or achievement

Other Measures of Effectiveness

(Teacher and Leader standards)

Highly

Effective

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

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

Overall performance and results exceed ISLLC leadership standards.

Effective

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

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

Overall performance and results meet ISLLC leadership standards.

Developing

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

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

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

Ineffective

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

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

Overall performance and results do not meet ISLLC leadership standards.

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

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

2012-13 where there is no Value-Added measure

Growth or Comparable Measures

Locally-selected Measures of

growth or achievement

Other Measures of Effectiveness

(60 points)

Overall

Composite Score

Highly Effective

18-20

18-20

Ranges determined locally--see below

91-100

Effective

9-17

9-17

75-90

Developing

3-8

3-8

65-74

Ineffective

0-2

0-2

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	51-60
Effective	35-50
Developing	24-34
Ineffective	0-24

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 Friday, November 09, 2012
Updated Friday, December 28, 2012

Page 1

11.1) Assurances -- Improvement Plans

Please check the boxes below.

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

11.2) Attachment: Principal Improvement Plan Forms

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

assets/survey-uploads/5276/225090-Df0w3Xx5v6/PIP Form[1].pdf

11.3) Appeals Process

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

(1) the substance of the annual professional performance review

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

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

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

APPEALS OF INEFFECTIVE AND DEVELOPING RATINGS ONLY
Appeals of annual professional performance reviews should be limited to those who receive composite ratings of ineffective or developing only.

WHAT MAY BE CHALLENGED IN AN APPEAL
Appeal procedures are limited to the following subjects:

(1) The substance of the annual professional performance review;
(2) The school district's or board of cooperative educational services' adherence to the standards and methodologies required for such reviews, pursuant to Education Law §3012-c;
(2) The adherence to the Commissioner's regulations, as applicable to such reviews;
(3) Compliance with any applicable locally negotiated procedures applicable to annual professional performance reviews or improvement plans; and
(4) The school district's or board of cooperative educational services' issuance and/or implementation of the terms of the principal or principal improvement plan under Education Law §3012-c.

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

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

TIMEFRAME FOR FILING APPEAL
All appeals must be submitted in writing no later than 15 calendar days of the date when the principal receives his or her composite APPR rating. The failure to file an appeal within these timeframes shall be deemed a waiver of the right to appeal and the appeal shall be deemed abandoned.

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

TIMEFRAME FOR DISTRICT RESPONSE
Within 15 calendar days of receipt of an appeal, the school district staff member(s) who issued the performance review or are responsible for either the issuance and/or implementation of the terms of the principal's or principal's improvement plan must submit a detailed written response to the appeal.

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

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

DECISION-MAKER ON APPEAL
A decision shall be rendered by the Genesee Valley Education Partnership District Superintendent.

DECISION
A written decision on the merits of the appeal shall be rendered no later than 30 calendar days from the date upon which the principal filed his or her appeal. The appeal shall be based on a written record, comprised of the principal's appeal papers and any documentary evidence accompanying the appeal, as well as the response to the appeal and additional documentary evidence submitted with such response papers. Such decision shall be final.

The decision shall set forth the reasons and factual basis for each determination on each of the specific issues raised in the principal's appeal. If the appeal is sustained, the reviewer may set aside a rating if it has been affected by substantial error or defect, modify a rating if it is affected by substantial error or defect or order a new evaluation if procedures have been violated. A copy of the decision shall be provided to the principal and the evaluator or the person responsible for either issuing or implementing the terms of an improvement plan, if that person is different.

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

plan, except as otherwise authorized by law.

11.4) Training 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 ensure that all lead evaluators/evaluators are properly trained and certified to complete an individual's APPR. Evaluator training will be conducted by certified Genesee Valley BOCES Network Team personnel. Evaluator training will occur regionally and will replicate the recommended State Education Department ("SED") model certification process incorporating the Regulations that were enacted to implement Education Law §3012-c. Evaluators will attend this BOCES training throughout the year at a duration as offered by Genesee Valley BOCES. This training will include the following Requirements for Lead Evaluators/Evaluators:
• New York State Teaching Standards and ISSLC Standards;
• Evidence-based observation;
• Application and use of Student Growth Percentile and Value Added Growth Model data;
• Application and use of the State-approved teacher or principal practice rubrics;
• Application and use of any assessment tools used to evaluate teachers and principals;
• Application and use of State-approved locally selected measures of student achievement;
• Use of Statewide Instructional Reporting System;
• Scoring methodology used to evaluate teachers and principals; and
• Specific considerations in evaluating teachers and principals of English language learners ("ELLS") and students with disabilities.
The District will work with the Genesee Valley BOCES Network Team to ensure that lead evaluators maintain inter-rater reliability over time and that they are re-certified on an annual basis.

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 Monday, October 29, 2012
Updated Thursday, January 03, 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/5581/210605-3Uqgn5g9Iu/Assurances Final [resubmit].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.

Geneseo Central School District Student Learning Objective Template

Teacher Name:_____ **School Year:**_____

Grade Level/Subject:_____ **Administrator:**_____

All SLOs MUST include the following basic components:	
Population	*These are the students assigned to the course section(s) in this SLO - all students who are assigned to the course section(s) must be included in the SLO. (Full class rosters of all students must be provided for all included course sections.)*
Learning Content	*What is being taught over the instructional period covered? Common Core/National/State standards? Will this goal apply to all standards applicable to a course or just to specific priority standards?*
Interval of Instructional Time	*What is the instructional period covered (if not a year, rationale for semester/quarter/etc)?*
Evidence	*What specific assessment(s) will be used to measure this goal? The assessment must align to the learning content of the course.*

Baseline	*What is the starting level of students' knowledge of the learning content at the beginning of the instructional period?*
Target(s)	*What is the expected outcome (target) of students' level of knowledge of the learning content at the end of the instructional period?*
HEDI Scoring	*How will evaluators determine what range of student performance "meets" the goal (effective) versus "well-below" (ineffective), "below" (developing), and "well-above" (highly effective)?*
Rationale	*Describe the reasoning behind the choices regarding learning content, evidence, and target and how they will be used together to prepare students for future growth and development in subsequent grades/courses, as well as college and career readiness.*

HIGHLY EFFECTIVE			EFFECTIVE									DEVELOPING						INEFFECTIVE		
20	19	18	17	16	15	14	**13**	12	11	10	9	8	7	6	5	4	3	2	1	0
97-100	93-96	88-92	87	86	84-85	82-83	81	79-80	77-78	76	75	74	73	72	71	68-70	65-67	55-64	50-54	<50

Teacher Signature:_____ Date:_____

Administrator Signature:_____ Date:_____

4-5 Local Achievement Measure for Teachers of ELA and Math

The measure for local achievement shall be the 2013 average standard score for the 2013 grades 3-5 New York State Assessments in Math and English Language Arts. The average standard scores for the grades 3-5 New York State Assessments in Math and English Language Arts in the 2009-2010, 2010-2011 and 2011-2012 school years were utilized to establish the baseline for the HEDI Scoring Rubric.

HEDI Scoring

How will evaluators determine what range of student performance "meets" the goal (effective) versus "well-below" (ineffective), "below" (developing), and "well-above" (highly effective)?

HIGHLY EFFECTIVE		EFFECTIVE						DEVELOPING					INEFFECTIVE		
15	14	13	**12**	11	10	9	8	7	6	5	4	3	2	1	0
677 and above	675 676	673 674	671 672	670	669	667 668	665 666	664	663	662	661	660	659	658	657 and below

Rationale

All k-5 teachers play a critical role in the establishment of numeracy and literacy skills for all students. The 3-5 New York State Assessments provide a meaningful measure of the overall achievement for students in the Geneseo Central Elementary School.

Target(s)	*6-8 Local Achievement Measure for ELA and Math Teachers* *The measure for local achievement shall be the 2013 average standard score for the 2013 grades 6-8 New York State Assessments in Math and English Language Arts. The average standard scores for the grades 6-8 New York State Assessments in Math and English Language Arts in 2009-2010, 2010-2011 and 2011-2012 school years were utilized to establish the baseline for the HEDI Scoring Rubric.*
HEDI Scoring	*How will evaluators determine what range of student performance "meets" the goal (effective) versus "well-below" (ineffective), "below" (developing), and "well-above" (highly effective)?*

HIGHLY EFFECTIVE		EFFECTIVE						DEVELOPING					INEFFECTIVE		
15	14	13	**12**	11	10	9	8	7	6	5	4	3	2	1	0
674 and above	673	671 672	669 670	668	666 667	665	664	663	662	660 661	659	658	657	656	655 and below

Rationale	*All 6-8 teachers play a critical role in the establishment of numeracy and literacy skills for all students. The 6-8 New York State Assessments provide a meaningful measure of the overall achievement for students in the Geneseo Central Elementary School.*

Form 3.12) All Other Courses

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

	Course(s) or Subject(s)	Locally-Selected Measure from List of Approved Measures	Assessment
	All other courses in grades K-5	◉ 1) Change in % of student performance level on State ○ 2) Teacher specific growth computed by NYSED ○ 3) Teacher specific achievement/growth score computed locally ○ 4) State-approved 3rd party ○ 5) District/regional/BOCES–developed ○ 6(i) School-wide measure based on State-provided measure ○ 6(ii) School wide measure computed locally ○ 7) Student Learning Objectives	New York State Assessments in Math and English Language Arts grades 3-5.
	All other courses in grades 6-8	◉ 1) Change in % of student performance level on State ○ 2) Teacher specific growth computed by NYSED ○ 3) Teacher specific achievement/growth score computed locally ○ 4) State-approved 3rd party ○ 5) District/regional/BOCES–developed ○ 6(i) School-wide measure based on State-provided measure ○ 6(ii) School wide measure computed locally ○ 7) Student Learning Objectives	New York State Assessments in Math and English Language Arts grades 3-5.
		○ 1) Change in % of student performance level on State	

		○ 2) Teacher specific growth computed by NYSED ○ 3) Teacher specific achievement/growth score computed locally ○ 4) State-approved 3rd party ○ 5) District/regional/BOCES–developed ○ 6(i) School-wide measure based on State-provided measure ○ 6(ii) School wide measure computed locally ○ 7) Student Learning Objectives	

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.	
Highly Effective (14 - 15 points) Results are well above District- or BOCES - adopted expectations for growth or achievement for grade/subject.	
Effective (8- 13 points) Results meet District- or BOCES-adopted expectations for growth or achievement for grade/subject.	
Developing (3 - 7 points) Results are below District- or BOCES-adopted expectations for growth or achievement for grade/subject.	
Ineffective (0 - 2 points) Results are well below District- or BOCES-adopted expectations for growth or achievement for grade/subject.	

K-5 Local Achievement Measure

The measure for local achievement shall be the 2013 average standard score for the 2013 grades 3-5 New York State Assessments in Math and English Language Arts. The average standard scores for the grades 3-5 New York State Assessments in Math and English Language Arts in the 2009-2010, 2010-2011 and 2011-2012 school years were utilized to establish the baseline for the HEDI Scoring Rubric.

HEDI Scoring

How will evaluators determine what range of student performance "meets" the goal (effective) versus "well-below" (ineffective), "below" (developing), and "well-above" (highly effective)?

HIGHLY EFFECTIVE			EFFECTIVE									DEVELOPING						INEFFECTIVE		
20	19	18	17	16	15	14	**13**	12	11	10	9	8	7	6	5	4	3	2	1	0
677 and above	676	675	674	673	672	671	670	669	668	667	666	665	664	663	662	661	660	659	658	657 and below

Rationale

All k-5 teachers play a critical role in the establishment of numeracy and literacy skills for all students. The 3-5 New York State Assessments provide a meaningful measure of the overall achievement for students in the Geneseo Central Elementary School.

Target(s)	*6-8 Local Achievement Measure* *The measure for local achievement shall be the 2013 average standard score for the 2013 grades 6-8 New York State Assessments in Math and English Language Arts. The average standard scores for the grades 6-8 New York State Assessments in Math and English Language Arts in 2009-2010, 2010-2011 and 2011-2012 school years were utilized to establish the baseline for the HEDI Scoring Rubric.*
HEDI Scoring	*How will evaluators determine what range of student performance "meets" the goal (effective) versus "well-below" (ineffective), "below" (developing), and "well-above" (highly effective)?*

HIGHLY EFFECTIVE			EFFECTIVE									DEVELOPING						INEFFECTIVE		
20	19	18	17	16	15	14	**13**	12	11	10	9	8	7	6	5	4	3	2	1	0
675 and above	674	673	672	671	670	669	668	667	666	665	664	663	662	661	660	659	658	657	656	655 and below

Rationale	*All 6-8 teachers play a critical role in the establishment of numeracy and literacy skills for all students. The 6-8 New York State Assessments provide a meaningful measure of the overall achievement for students in the Geneseo Central Elementary School.*

Target(s)	*9-12 Local Achievement Measure for All Subjects* *The measure for local achievement shall be the 2013 average Regents exam scores for the five 2013 Regents Exams required for a Regents Diploma. These exams are Integrated Algebra, Global Studies, United States History, Living Environment and English Language Arts. The average scores for the Regents Exams required for a Regents Diploma in 2009-2010, 2010-2011 and 2011-2012 school years were utilized to establish the baseline for the HEDI Scoring Rubric.*
HEDI Scoring	*How will evaluators determine what range of student performance "meets" the goal (effective) versus "well-below" (ineffective), "below" (developing), and "well-above" (highly effective)?*

HIGHLY EFFECTIVE			EFFECTIVE									DEVELOPING						INEFFECTIVE		
20	19	18	17	16	15	14	**13**	12	11	10	9	8	7	6	5	4	3	2	1	0
86.4 and above	86.3	86.2	86.1	86	85.9	85.8	85.7	85.6	85.5	85.4	85.3	85.2	85.1	85	84.9	84.8	84.7	84.6	84.5	84.4 and below

Rationale	*All 9-12 teachers play a vital role in students successfully achieving the graduation requirements. The five Regents Exams being utilized to determine the Local Achievement Measure are the most frequently utilized by students to graduate from Geneseo High School with a Regents Diploma.*

Teacher Name
Observed by: Adminstrator Name

Date: Period: -- Observation Type/Number: Unannounced/1/2/3

Charlotte Danielson's *Enhancing Professional Practice: A Framework for Teaching* (2nd ed. Alexandria, VA. Association for Supervision and Curriculum Development, 2007) is the resource used to guide conversations about teaching and learning. "The Framework" is the supporting document that is used for determining expectations for observations and professional responsibilities.

Details:

Domain 1: Planning and Preparation (9 points)

0- Unsatisfactory/Ineffective; .5- Basic/Developing; 1- Proficient/Effective; 1.5- Distinguished/Highly Effective, Not Observed (for unannounced observations only)

1a: Demonstrating knowledge of content and pedagogy	
1b: Demonstrating knowledge of students	
1c: Setting instructional outcomes	
1d: Demonstrating knowledge of resources	
1e: Designing coherent instruction	
1f: Designing student assessments	

Comments on Domain 1:

Domain 2: The Classroom Environment (15 points)

0- Unsatisfactory/Ineffective; 1- Basic/Developing; 2- Proficient/Effective; 3- Distinguished/Highly Effective, Not Observed (for unannounced observations only)

2a: Creating an environment of respect and rapport	
2b: Establishing a culture for learning	
2c: Managing classroom procedures	
2d: Managing student behavior	
2e: Organizing physical space	

Comments on Domain 2: .

Domain 3: Instruction (15 points)

0- Unsatisfactory/Ineffective; 1- Basic/Developing; 2- Proficient/Effective; 3- Distinguished/Highly Effective, Not Observed (for unannounced observations only)

3a: Communicating with students	
3b: Using questioning and discussion techniques	
3c: Engaging students in learning	
3d: Using assessments in instruction	
3e: Demonstrating flexibility and responsiveness	

Comments on Domain 3:
Additional Comments:

Total Score: 0.0 **Unit Member Comments:**

(for Unannounced Observations)

Interpreting the Score:

0-9	Ineffective
10-19	Developing
20-29	Effective
30-39	Highly Effective

Any component area observed or described as "Unsatisfactory/Ineffective" or "Basic/Developing" does not meet District Standards and may lead to one or all of the following: Non-Tenured Teacher Improvement Plan (NTIP), a recommendation for discontinuation of employment, and/or a non-recommendation for tenure.

TEACHER'S SIGNATURE:

_____

DATE: _____

Meeting Requested?
Circle Y N

SUPERVISOR'S SIGNATURE:

_____

DATE: _____

SUPERINTENDENT'S SIGNATURE:

_____

DATE: _____

Annual Professional Performance Review
Summative Review Form
2011-2012

<u>Summative Review</u>: 21 Points Possible

Evaluator: _____

Notes/Examples of Artifacts:

		Unsatisfactory/ Ineffective (0 pts.)	Basic/ Developing (1 pt.)	Proficient/ Effective (2 pts.)	Distinguished/ Highly Effective (3 pts.)
1	Reflecting on Teaching p.92				
2	Maintaining Accurate Records, p. 97				
3	Communicating with Families, p. 100				
4	Participating in a Professional Community p. 99 and p. 103				
5	Growing and Developing Professionally (Enhancement of Content Knowledge and Pedagogical Skill), p.105				
6	Showing Professionalism, p.106				
7	Other Areas of Domain IV				

UNIT MEMBER'S SIGNATURE:_____ **DATE:** _____

SUPERVISOR'S SIGNATURE:_____ **DATE:** _____

SUPERINTENDENT'S **DATE:** _____

SIGNATURE:_____

Annual Professional Performance Review
Overall Composite/Cumulative Evaluation Form

Staff Member Name: _____ Date: _____

I. Other Measures of Effectiveness:

Unannounced and Announced Classroom Observations (if applicable)**: 39 points Possible**

Unannounced Classroom Observation: _____ Observer: _____
_____

Formal Classroom Observation #1: _____ Observer: _____
_____

Formal Classroom Observation #2: _____ Observer: _____
_____

Formal Classroom Observation #3: _____ Observer: _____
_____

Unannounced Observation: _____
_____/13 points
Average of Three Formal Classroom Observations: _____
_____/26 points
or
Formal Observation Score: _____
_____/26 points

Summative Review: **21 Points Possible**
Total Summative Review: _____
_____/21 points

II. Student Growth Measures: 40 Points Possible

Locally Selected Assessment Student Learning Objective (SLO): 20 Points _____
_____

NYS Assessment Student Growth Score: (if applicable): 20 Points _____
_____

Comparable Measure Student Growth: 20 Points _____
_____

(for areas where there is no NYS Assessment)

Cumulative Evaluation: 100 Points Possible

Overall Composite Score: _____

_____/**100**

Overall Composite Score Total(s)	Rating
91-100	**Distinguished/Highly Effective**
75-90	**Proficient/Effective**
65-74	**Basic/Developing**
64-Below	**Unsatisfactory/Ineffective**

An Overall Composite Score Total rated as "Unsatisfactory/Ineffective" or "Basic/Developing" does not meet District Standards and may lead to one or all of the following: Non-Tenured Teacher Improvement Plan (NTIP), a recommendation for discontinuation of employment, and/or a non-recommendation for tenure.

_____ _____

(Signature of Unit Member) (Signature of Administrator)

_____

(Signature of Superintendent)

Geneseo Central School District
Teacher Observation Conversion Rubric

	Ineffective	Developing	Effective	Highly Effective
Total Observation Score (39 possible points)	**0-9**	**10-19**	**20-29**	**30-39**
Announced Formal Observation Score (26 possible points)	**0-6.6**	**6.7-13.2**	**13.3-19.9**	**20-26**
Unannounced Observation Score (13 possible points)	**0-3.3**	**3.4-6.6**	**6.7-9.9**	**10-13**

Note – All observations scores are determined by utilizing the Geneseo Central Teacher Observation Form. Once a score out of 39 points is determined, the score is converted to an Announced or Unannounced Score utilizing the Conversion Rubric.

Rubric Conversion Chart

39 Point Rubric	26 Point Rubric	13 Point Rubric
1	0.66	0.33
2	1.32	0.66
3	1.98	0.99
4	2.64	1.32
5	3.3	1.65
6	3.96	1.98
7	4.62	2.31
8	5.28	2.64
9	5.94	2.97
10	6.6	3.3
11	7.26	3.63
12	7.92	3.96
13	8.58	4.29
14	9.24	4.62
15	9.9	4.95
16	10.56	5.28
17	11.22	5.61
18	11.88	5.94
19	12.54	6.27
20	13.2	6.6
21	13.86	6.93
22	14.52	7.26
23	15.18	7.59
24	15.84	7.92
25	16.5	8.25
26	17.16	8.58
27	17.82	8.91
28	18.48	9.24
29	19.14	9.57
30	19.8	9.9
31	20.46	10.23
32	21.12	10.56
33	21.78	10.89
34	22.44	11.22
35	23.1	11.55
36	23.76	11.88
37	24.42	12.21
38	25.08	12.54
39	25.74	12.87

TEACHER IMPROVEMENT PLAN (TIP)
Purpose-Procedures-Points to Consider

For those staff members who are , and whose Overall Composite/Cumulative Evaluation is rated ***as below district standards (Unsatisfactory/Ineffective or Basic/Developing)***, a Teacher Improvement Plan (TIP) shall be developed by the district in consultation with the Staff Member (Commissioner's Regulation 100.2 - Subdivision (0) #4). ***References to the Annual Professional Performance Review (APPR) may be found under Observation/Evaluation headings in Geneseo Faculty Association Contract.***

Purposes:

1. To demonstrate the commitment of the Geneseo Central School District to the ongoing growth and development of all Staff.
2. To improve the performance of staff members who have been identified by their administrator(s) as needing assistance in meeting acceptable criteria for the Geneseo APPR.
3. To implement a process that is positive and that should assist in professional growth for the staff.

Procedures:

1. When an Administrator's *informal observation*, *formal* observation and/or summative evaluation of any Staff Member indicates an area of on-going concern with their performance, the Administrator(s) will inform the Superintendent of the need to provide a Teacher Improvement Plan (TIP). The Superintendent will notify the Geneseo Faculty Association of the concern.
2. This recommendation to the Superintendent for the Teacher Improvement Plan must be supplemented by copies of the APPR Formal Observation(s), *notes or descriptions of information gleaned from informal observations*, the APPR Personnel Improvement Plan, *and the* Administrative Checklist.
3. The Superintendent will review these documents. If the Administrator's recommendation for a Teacher Improvement Plan is approved by the Superintendent, an individual improvement plan will be developed with the Staff Member and the Administrator. This written plan will focus on specific areas identified. Data collection or assistance will be designed by the Administrator with the input of the individual staff member.
4. The Administrator will review the plan with the Superintendent.
5. Strict confidentiality will be maintained throughout the duration of the plan.

Points to Consider:

1. Timelines regarding the formal observation process for should occur according to building-level and district procedures. These are separate from the NTIP.
2. Timelines regarding the GFA Contract with the Geneseo Central School District must be adhered to in addition to timelines created during the development of the NTIP.
3. Strategies to be included on the Teacher Improvement Plan (TIP) may be varied in accordance with the specific area(s) in need of improvement. The list below is not all-inclusive of possible improvement plan strategies, but may serve as a guide for developing the NTIP.
4. The duration of the NTIP should be relatively brief. Clear starting and ending dates should be established during the planning phase.

Possible Strategies for Improvement

Additional Formal Observations	Verbal discussion with unit member
Submission of lesson plans	Required professional readings
Informal classroom observations	Required attendance at workshops or conferences
Administrative memos	Additional consultation with mentor
Unit Member Consultant (Peer Tutoring)	Conversation With GFA Representative(s)
Planning sessions with a colleague	Classroom visitations and reflection

There are three documents included in the TIP Process:

- **APPR TIP Purpose-Procedures-Points to Consider**
- **APPR TIP Plan**
- **APPR TIP Administrative Checklist**

Adapted From: Charlotte Danielson's *Enhancing Professional Practice: A Framework for Teaching, 2nd Ed. (2007)*
Geneseo Central School APPR Committee – 04/10

ADMINISTRATIVE CHECKLIST

Staff Member Name: _____ Date: _____

I. Observations		Sign-off		
A. Required Formal Observations:	Date	Unit Member	Administrator	GFA Rep.
• Observation # _____				
• Observation # _____				
• Observation # _____				
B. Summative Review				
II. Teacher Improvement Plan (TIP):				
A. Administrator Informs Superintendent of need for Non-Tenured Personnel Improvement Plan				
B. Superintendent Notifies GFA Representative(s) of need for Personnel Improvement Plan				
C. Staff Member & Administrator Develop the Personnel Improvement Plan				
D. Administrator & Superintendent Review the Personnel Improvement Plan				
E. Interventions For Improvement (Refer to GCSD APPR Booklet for possible strategies to be used)				
List Strategies Below:				
F. Successful Completion Of Personnel Improvement Plan _____Yes _____No				
• Release Staff Member From Personnel Improvement Plan				

Staff Member Signature: _____ Completion Date: _____

Administrator Signature: _____ Completion Date: _____

GFA Representative Signature: _____ Completion Date: _____

Superintendent Signature: _____ Completion Date: _____

There are three documents included in the NTIP Process:

- **APPR TIP Purpose-Procedures-Points to Consider**
- **APPR TIP Plan**
- **APPR TIP Administrative Checklist**

Adapted From: Charlotte Danielson's *Enhancing Professional Practice: A Framework for Teaching, 2nd Ed. (2007)*
Geneseo Central School APPR Committee – 04/10

TEACHER IMPROVEMENT PLAN FORM (TIP)

NAME: _____ GRADE LEVEL: _____

Initiation Date: _____ Planned Completion Date: _____

DOMAIN AREA(S) IDENTIFIED FOR IMPROVEMENT

Domain Name		Applicable	Not Applicable
I	Planning and Preparation		
II	Classroom Environment		
III	Instruction		
IV	Professional Responsibilities		

Domain Area	Strategies for Improvement (Refer to the GCSD APPR Booklet for possible strategies to be included in NTIP)	Due Date	Completion Date

REVIEWED ON: _____
Date(s)

PROGRESS SUMMARY: _____

_____

RECOMMENDED ACTION: _____

_____

STAFF MEMBER COMMENTS: _____

_____

Successful Completion – Teacher Improvement Plan ☐ Yes ☐ No

Staff Member:_____ Completion Date: _____

GFA Representative: _____ Completion Date: _____

Administrator's Signature: _____ Completion Date: _____

Superintendent Signature: _____ Completion Date: _____

There are three documents included in the NTIP Process:

- **APPR TIP Purpose-Procedures-Points to Consider**
- **APPR TIP Plan**
- **APPR TIP Administrative Checklist**

Adapted From: Charlotte Danielson's *Enhancing Professional Practice: A Framework for Teaching, 2nd Ed. (2007)*
Geneseo Central School APPR Committee – 04/10

Local Achievement Measure for Elementary Principal

For the elementary principal at Geneseo Central, we have used the prior three years average standard score performance of Geneseo Elementary students on the New York State grades 3 through 5 Math and English Language Arts Assessments to establish a baseline of performance for students in the Geneseo Elementary School. The average combined performance score for the three years is 670. The three year performance scores were utilized to determine the HEDI rubric being utilized to score this subcomponent. Principal performance will be based on the performance of students on the 2013 grades 3 through 5 New York State Math and English Language Arts Assessments. The average standard score for students on the 2013 New York State Math and English Language Arts Assessments will be compared to the three year average to determine the HEDI rating for this subcomponent.

HEDI Scoring

How will evaluators determine what range of student performance "meets" the goal (effective) versus "well-below" (ineffective), "below" (developing), and "well-above" (highly effective)?

HIGHLY EFFECTIVE		EFFECTIVE						DEVELOPING					INEFFECTIVE		
15	14	13	**12**	11	10	9	8	7	6	5	4	3	2	1	0
677 and above	675 676	673 674	671 672	670	669	667 668	665 666	664	663	662	661	660	659	658	657 and below

Rationale	*The elementary principal plays a critical role in the establishment of numeracy and literacy skills for all students. The 3-5 New York State Assessments provide a meaningful measure of the overall achievement for students in the Geneseo Central Elementary School.*

Target(s)	*6-8 Local Achievement Measure for MS/HS Principal* For the middle school/high school principal at Geneseo Central will use a combined score that includes a comparison of 2013 student performance to the prior three years average performance of Geneseo Middle School students on the New York State grades 6 through 8 Math and English Language Arts Assessments and the prior three years average performance of Geneseo High School students on the New York State Regents Exams in Global Studies, American History, Living Environment, Integrated Algebra and English Language Arts. The average combined performance score on the middle level assessments for the three years is 668. The three year performance scores were utilized to determine the HEDI rubric being utilized to score this subcomponent. Principal performance will be based on the performance of students in 2013 on the grades 6 through 8 New York State Math and English Language Arts Assessments as compared to the three year average.
HEDI Scoring	*How will evaluators determine what range of student performance "meets" the goal (effective) versus "well-below" (ineffective), "below" (developing), and "well-above" (highly effective)?*

HIGHLY EFFECTIVE		EFFECTIVE						DEVELOPING					INEFFECTIVE		
15	14	13	12	11	10	9	8	7	6	5	4	3	2	1	0
674 and above	673	671 672	669 670	668	666 667	665	664	663	662	660 661	659	658	657	656	655 and below

Rationale	*All 6-8 principal plays a critical role in the establishment of numeracy and literacy skills for all students. The 6-8 New York State Assessments provide a meaningful measure of the overall achievement for students in the Geneseo Central Middle School.*

Target(s)	*9-12 Local Achievement Measure for MS/HS Principal* For the middle school/high school principal at Geneseo Central will use a combined score that includes a comparison of 2013 student performance to the prior three years average performance of Geneseo Middle School students on the New York State grades 6 through 8 Math and English Language Arts Assessments and the prior three years average performance of Geneseo High School students on the New York State Regents Exams in Global Studies, American History, Living Environment, Integrated Algebra and English Language Arts. The average combined score for the five Regents Exams is 85.9. The three year performance scores were utilized to determine the HEDI rubric being utilized to score this subcomponent. Principal performance will be based on the performance of Geneseo High School students on the 2013 New York State Regents Exams in Global Studies, American History, Living Environment, Integrated Algebra and English Language Arts. The overall subcomponent rating for the middle school/high school principal will be an average of the two HEDI scores. The 2013 average score will be compared to the prior three year average to determine the score for this subcomponent.
HEDI Scoring	*How will evaluators determine what range of student performance "meets" the goal (effective) versus "well-below" (ineffective), "below" (developing), and "well-above" (highly effective)?*

HIGHLY EFFECTIVE		EFFECTIVE						DEVELOPING					INEFFECTIVE		
15	14	13	12	11	10	**9**	8	7	6	5	4	3	2	1	0
86.3 and higher	86.2	86.1	86	85.8 - 85.9	85.6 - 85.7	85.4	85.3	85.2	85.1	84.9 - 85.0	84.8	84.7	84.6	84.5	84.4 and lower

Rationale	*The MS/HS Principal plays a vital role in students successfully achieving the graduation requirements. The five Regents Exams being utilized to determine the Local Achievement Measure are the most frequently utilized by students to graduate from Geneseo High School with a Regents Diploma.*

Geneseo Central School District
Scoring Rubric for Other Measures for Principals

This scoring rubric is to be used in conjunction with the LCI Multidimensional Principal Performance Rubric to determine the score for the Other Measures component of the overall principal performance score.

DOMAIN	**Ineffective (0-4.0)**	**Developing (4.1-5.7)**	**Effective (5.8-8.4)**	**Highly Effective (8.5-10)**	
1 – Shared Vision of Learning					
2 – School Culture and Instructional Program					
3 – Safe, Efficient, Effective Learning Environment					
4 – Community					
5 – Integrity, Fairness, Ethics					
6 – Political, Social, Economic, Legal and Cultural Context					
Totals:					**Total Score:**

Final Rating for Other Measures:

_____Highly Effective (51-60)

_____Effective (35-50)

_____Developing (25-34)

_____Ineffective (0-24)

Multidimensional Principal Performance Rubric

Domain 1 – Shared Vision of Learning

An education leader promotes the success of every student by facilitating the development, articulation, implementation, and stewardship of a vision of learning that is shared and supported by all stakeholders.

	Ineffective 0-4	Developing 4.1-5.7	Effective 5.7-8.4	Highly Effective 8.5-10
Culture[1] *(attitudes, knowledge, behaviors and beliefs that characterize the school environment and are shared by its stakeholders)*	claims to have a vision and mission for the school, but keeps it private	identifies the school's vision and mission, and makes them public	**collaborates** with key stakeholders in the school **to develop and implement a shared vision and mission for learning**	engages stakeholders representing all roles and perspectives in the school in the development, monitoring and refinement of a shared vision[2] and mission for learning
	school vision and mission are unrelated to the district vision and mission	school vision and mission are created in isolation of the district's vision and mission and aligned as an afterthought	school vision and mission aligns with the vision and mission of the district	school vision and mission intentionally align with the vision and mission of the district and contribute to the improvement of learning district wide
	disregards the need to use the school's vision and mission to guide goals, plans and actions	refers to the school vision and mission as a document unconnected to programs, policies or practices	explicitly links the school's vision and mission to programs and policies	uses the school's vision and mission as a compass to inform reflective practice, goal-setting, and decision-making
Sustainability *(a focus on continuance and meaning beyond the present moment, contextualizing today's successes and improvements as the legacy of the future)*	assumes that the school's improvement is either an event or the responsibility of a single individual	provides selected staff with opportunities to discuss school improvement efforts	has a process and structure in place for organizational improvement and uses it to assess the school	uses and regularly evaluates strategic processes and structures to **promote the school's continuous and sustainable improvement**

[1] In the electronic version, Culture is hyperlinked to an input PowerPoint.
[2] In the electronic version, shared vision is hyperlinked to an annotated shared visioning activity.

© 2011 Learner-Centered Initiatives, Ltd and Communities for Learning: Leading lasting change®

Multidimensional Principal Performance Rubric

Domain 2 – School Culture and Instructional Program

An education leader promotes the success of every student by advocating, nurturing, and sustaining a school culture and instructional program conducive to student learning and staff professional growth.

	Ineffective 0-4	Developing 4.1-5.7	Effective 5.8-8.4	Highly Effective 8.5-10
Culture *(attitudes, knowledge, behaviors and beliefs that characterize the school environment and are shared by its stakeholders)*	acknowledges the need for communication and collaboration	considers proposals for collaborative structures and projects	supports various teaming opportunities, common planning and inquiry time, and visitations within the organization to increase learning and improve practice	establishes different ways of accessing staff expertise and work by promoting activities such as lab sites, peer coaching, mentoring, collegial inquiry, etc. as an embedded part of practice
	provides selected individuals with basic information about various collaborative teaching, learning and work-related concepts or practices to several individuals	encourages selected staff to expand their understanding of particular practices that support collaboration such as collaborative planning, co-facilitation or integrated curriculum design	develops a culture of collaboration, trust, learning, and high expectations by encouraging staff to work together on key projects (e.g., induction processes, program design, integrated curriculum, or other individual or organizational projects)	**nurtures and sustains a culture of collaboration, trust, learning, and high expectations** by providing structured opportunities for cross role groups to design and implement innovative approaches to improving learning, work and practice
	creates a learning environment that relies on teacher-controlled classroom activities, rote learning, student compliance and learning opportunities that are disconnected from students' experiences, needs or cultures	creates a learning environment in which students are passive recipients in learning opportunities that are only peripherally connected to their experiences or cultures	**creates a personalized and motivating learning environment for students** in which they are involved in meaningful and relevant learning opportunities that they recognize as connected to their experiences, needs and cultures	engages stakeholders (e.g., students, staff, parents) in developing and sustaining a learning environment that actively involves students in meaningful,[3] relevant learning that is clearly connected to their experiences, culture and futures, and require them to construct meaning of concepts or processes in deductive or inductive ways

[3] In the electronic version, *meaningful* will hyperlink to an activity on engagement and meaningfulness

© 2011 Learner-Centered Initiatives, Ltd and Communities for Learning: Leading lasting change®

Multidimensional Principal Performance Rubric

Domain 2 (cont.)

	Ineffective 0-4	Developing 4.1-5.7	Effective 5.8-8.4	Highly Effective 8.5-10
Instructional Program *(design and delivery of high quality curriculum that produces clear evidence of learning)*	promotes a curricular program that provides students with limited, surface or cursory exposure to a topic, concept or skill set and establishes or defines meaning for students, focusing on the recall of isolated concepts, skills and/or facts	establishes a curricular program focused primarily on recall, comprehension and factual knowledge acquisition that enables students to develop a basic understanding of a topic and/or process and includes few, if any, opportunities for them to construct meaning	**creates a comprehensive, rigorous, and coherent curricular program** that address all levels of thinking, enables students to develop knowledge and skills related to a concept, problem, or issue, and supports their construction of meaning during the most important lessons and tasks	engages students and teachers in designing and revising a learner-centered curricular program that integrates basic and higher levels of thinking throughout and provides opportunities for students to emulate professionals and construct meaning as they engage in a thorough exploration of a concept, problem, issue, or question
	maintains a hands off approach to instruction	provides mixed messages related to expectations for instructional methodology and own understanding of "best practices"	**supervises instruction** and makes explicit the expectation that teachers remain current in research-based, best practices and incorporate them into their own work	supervises instruction on an ongoing basis, and engages in collegial opportunities for learning, action research and/or inquiry related to best practices in teaching and learning
	initiates actions that interrupt instructional time and distract from learning (e.g., meetings, announcements, unplanned assemblies, phone calls to teachers in classrooms, etc.)	allows actions that disrupt instructional time and distract from learning (e.g. meetings, announcements, unplanned assemblies, phone calls to teachers in classrooms, etc.)	**maximizes time spent on quality instruction** by protecting it from interruptions and inefficient scheduling, minimizing disruption to instructional time	involves diverse stakeholders in uncovering issues that challenge time spent on quality instruction and in innovative approaches to dealing with them

© 2011 Learner-Centered Initiatives, Ltd and Communities for Learning: Leading lasting change®

Multidimensional Principal Performance Rubric

Domain 2 (cont.)

	Ineffective 0-4	Developing 4.1-5.7	Effective 5.8-8.4	Highly Effective 8.5-10
Capacity Building *(developing potential and tapping existing internal expertise to promote learning and improve practice)*	assumes titled leaders are able to handle administrative responsibilities and teachers to be able to instruct students	invests in activities that promote the development of a select group of leaders	**develops the instructional and leadership capacity of staff**	develops and taps the instructional and leadership capacity of all stakeholders in the school organization to assume a variety of formal and informal leadership roles in the school
	is unaware of effective and appropriate technologies available	provides the necessary hardware and software, and establishes the expectation that teachers will integrate technology into student learning experiences	**promotes the use of the most effective and appropriate technologies to support teaching and learning** and ensures that necessary resources are available	engages varied perspectives in determining how to best integrate the use of the most effective and appropriate technologies into teaching, learning and the daily workings of the school organization
Sustainability[4] *(a focus on continuance and meaning beyond the present moment, contextualizing today's successes and improvements as the legacy of the future)*	uses "accountability" to justify a system that links student achievement with accolades and blame	assessment and accountability systems, though in place, are misaligned so that it is difficult to see how data from one explicitly relates to or informs the other	**develops assessment and accountability systems to monitor student progress,** uncover patterns and trends, and provide a way to contextualize current student strengths and needs inside a history that connects changes in teaching and learning to student achievement.	facilitates regular use of easily accessible assessment and accountability systems that enable students, teachers, and parents to monitor student progress, teacher learning, uncover patterns and trends, and provides a way to contextualize student achievement, both inside history and projected into the future.

[4] In the electronic version, *Sustainability* will hyperlink to a PowerPoint providing input on Sustainability.

© 2011 Learner-Centered Initiatives, Ltd and Communities for Learning: Leading lasting change®

Multidimensional Principal Performance Rubric

Domain 2 (cont.)

	Ineffective 0-4	Developing 4.1-5.7	Effective 5.8-8.4	Highly Effective 8.5-10
Strategic Planning Process: **monitoring/inquiry** *(the implementation and stewardship of goals, decisions and actions)*	judges the merit of the instructional program based on what is used by others	evaluates the impact of the instructional program based on results of standardized assessments	gathers input from staff and surveys students as well as formal assessment data as part of process to **monitor and evaluate the impact of the instructional program**	provides time and the expectation for students and staff to participate in multiple cycles of field testing, feedback and revision of the instructional program in order to monitor and evaluate its impact and make necessary refinements to support continuous improvement

© 2011 Learner-Centered Initiatives, Ltd and Communities for Learning: Leading lasting change®

Multidimensional Principal Performance Rubric

Domain 3 – Safe, Efficient, Effective Learning Environment

An education leader promotes the success of every student by ensuring management of the organization, operation, and resources for a safe, efficient, and effective learning environment.

	Ineffective 0-4	Developing 4.1-5.7	Effective 5.8-8.4	Highly Effective 8.5-10
Capacity Building *(developing potential and tapping existing internal expertise to promote learning and improve practice)*	obtains and uses human, fiscal and technological resources based on available funds or last year's budget instead of need	obtains human, fiscal and technological resources and allocates them without an apparent plan	**obtains, allocates, aligns, and efficiently utilizes human, fiscal, and technological resources**	considers vision and solicits input from various stakeholders in determining, obtaining, allocating and utilizing necessary human, fiscal and technological resources, aligning them with present and future needs
	considers self as the sole leader of the organization while allocating limited responsibilities for unwanted tasks to others	shares "leadership" by providing others with limited responsibilities for tasks and functions but no decision making ability	**develops the capacity for distributed leadership** by providing interested individuals with opportunities and support for to assuming leadership responsibilities and roles	embeds distributed leadership into all levels of the organization by enabling administrative, teacher, student and parent leaders to assume leadership roles and co-creates a process by which today's leaders identify, support and promote the leaders of tomorrow
Culture *(attitudes, knowledge, behaviors and beliefs that characterize the school environment and are shared by its stakeholders)*	speaks to the importance of school safety, but is inconsistent in creating and implementing specific plans to ensure it	establishes rules and related consequences designed to keep students safe, but relies on inconsistent procedures	**promotes and protects the welfare and safety of students and staff**	engages multiple, diverse groups of stakeholders in defining, promoting and protecting the welfare and safety of students and staff, within and beyond school walls

© 2011 Learner-Centered Initiatives, Ltd and Communities for Learning: Leading lasting change®

Multidimensional Principal Performance Rubric

Domain 3 (cont.)

	Ineffective 0 - 4	Developing 4.1-5.7	Effective 5.8 - 8.4	Highly Effective 8.5 - 10
Sustainability *(a focus on continuance and meaning beyond the present moment, contextualizing today's successes and improvements as the legacy of the future)*	avoids engaging with management or operations systems	**monitors and evaluates the management and operational systems**	monitors, evaluates and revises management and operational systems	establishes processes for the ongoing evaluation, monitoring and revision of management and operational systems, ensuring their continuous, sustainable improvement
Instructional Program *(design and delivery of high quality curriculum that produces clear evidence of learning)*	allocates time as required to comply with regulations and mandates	schedules time outside of the typical school day for teachers to support instruction and learning	**ensures teacher and organizational time is focused to support quality instruction and student learning**	engages groups of students and teachers in determining how to best allocate and manage time to support ongoing and sustainable improvements in quality instructional practices and student learning

© 2011 Learner-Centered Initiatives, Ltd and Communities for Learning: Leading lasting change®

Multidimensional Principal Performance Rubric

Domain 4 - Community

An education leader promotes the success of every student by collaborating with faculty and community members, responding to diverse community interests and needs, and mobilizing community resources.

	Ineffective 0-4	Developing 4.1-5.7	Effective 5.8-8.4	Highly Effective 8.5-10
Strategic Planning Process: Inquiry *(gather and analyze data to monitor effects of actions and decisions on goal attainment and enable mid-course adjustments as needed to better enable success)*	makes decisions about whether or not to change the educational environment based on own impressions and beliefs	**collects and analyzes data and information pertinent to the educational environment**	collects and analyzes data and information pertinent to the educational environment, and uses it to make related improvements	engages in ongoing collection and analysis of data on the educational environment and information from diverse stakeholders to ensure continuous improvement
Culture *(attitudes, knowledge, behaviors and beliefs that characterize the school environment and are shared by its stakeholders)*	considers the community as separate from the school	provides isolated opportunities for including the community in a school activity or for engaging students in community outreach or service projects	**promotes understanding, appreciation, and use of the community's diverse cultural, social, and intellectual resources** through diverse activities	engages students, educators, parents, and community partners in employing a range of mechanisms and technology to identify and tap the community's diverse cultural, social and intellectual resources, promote their widespread appreciation, and connect them to desired improvements in teaching and learning
Sustainability *(a focus on continuance and meaning beyond the present moment, contextualizing today's successes and improvements as the legacy of the future)*	identifies lack of family and caregiver involvement as a key explanation for lack of achievement	takes actions intended to increase family and caregiver support for the school	**builds and sustains positive relationships with families and caregivers**	builds sustainable, positive relationships with families and caregivers and enables them to take on significant roles in ongoing improvement efforts

© 2011 Learner-Centered Initiatives, Ltd and Communities for Learning: Leading lasting change®

Multidimensional Principal Performance Rubric

Domain 5 – Integrity, Fairness, Ethics

An education leader promotes the success of every student by acting with integrity, fairness, and in an ethical manner.

	Ineffective 0 - 4	Developing 4.1-5.7	Effective 5.8-8.4	Highly Effective 8.5-10
Sustainability *(a focus on continuance and meaning beyond the present moment, contextualizing today's successes and improvements as the legacy of the future)*	associates "accountability" with threats and blame for students' academic and social difficulties	focuses on accountability for academic and social success of students whose test results threaten the school's standing	**ensures a system of accountability for every student's academic and social success**	enables an approach to "accountability" that upholds high ethical standards and inspires stakeholders (educators, parents, students and community partners) to own and be responsible for every student's academic and social success
	makes decisions based on self-interest and is caught off guard by consequences of decisions and responds by denying, becoming defensive or ignoring them.	makes decisions and takes actions without considering consequences, dealing with them if and when they occur	**considers and evaluates the potential moral and legal consequences of decision-making**	engages the diverse perspectives of various stakeholders in using multiple sources of data to explore potential intended and unintended moral, legal and ethical consequences of decisions and actions that support the greater good
	blames mandates for decisions or actions that challenge the integrity or ethics of the school or its various stakeholders	assumes responsibility for decisions and actions related to mandates	assumes responsibility for thoughtfully considering and upholding mandates so that the school can successfully tread the line between compliance and moral and ethical responsibility	promotes resiliency by involving stakeholders in considering how to negotiate and uphold mandates in ways that preserve the integrity of the school's learning and work and align with its ethical and moral beliefs

© 2011 Learner-Centered Initiatives, Ltd and Communities for Learning: Leading lasting change®

Multidimensional Principal Performance Rubric

Domain 5 (cont.)

	Ineffective 0-4	Developing 4.1-5.7	Effective 5.8-8.4	Highly Effective 8.5-10
Culture *(attitudes, knowledge, behaviors and beliefs that characterize the school environment and are shared by its stakeholders)*	mourns the lack of the self-awareness, reflective practice transparency and ethical behavior in others	proclaims the importance of self-awareness, reflective practice transparency and ethical behavior and seeks it in others	**models principles of self-awareness, reflective practice, transparency, and ethical behavior**	engages stakeholders in identifying and describing exemplars of self and cultural awareness, reflective practice, transparency and ethical behavior from within and outside the school, and determining how to replicate them
	pays lip service to values related to democracy, equity and diversity	holds others accountable for upholding the values of democracy, equity and diversity	**safeguards the values of democracy, equity, and diversity**	provides opportunities for all stakeholder groups to define, embrace and embody the values of democracy, equity, and diversity
	implements strategies that group and label students with specific needs, isolating them from the mainstream	asserts that individual student needs should inform all aspects of schooling, but has difficulty putting these beliefs into action	**promotes social justice and ensures that individual student needs inform all aspects of schooling**	creates processes that embed social justice into the fabric of the school, seamlessly integrating the needs of individuals with improvement initiatives, actions and decisions

© 2011 Learner-Centered Initiatives, Ltd and Communities for Learning: Leading lasting change®

Multidimensional Principal Performance Rubric

Domain 6 – Political, Social, Economic, Legal and Cultural Context

An education leader promotes the success of every student by understanding, responding to, and influencing the political, social, economic, legal, and cultural context.

	Ineffective 0-4	Developing 4.1-5.7	Effective 5.8-8.4	Highly Effective 8.5-10
Sustainability *(a focus on continuance and meaning beyond the present moment, contextualizing today's successes and improvements as the legacy of the future)*	appears unaware of decisions affecting student learning made outside of own school or district	reacts to district, state and national decisions affecting student learning	**acts to influence local, district, state, and national decisions affecting student learning,** within and beyond their own school and district	engages the entire school community and all of its stakeholders in collaborating to make proactive and positive change in local, district, state and national decisions affecting the improvement of teaching and learning
	waits to be told how to respond to emerging trends or initiatives	continues to rely on the same leadership strategies, in the face of emerging trends and initiatives, or copies others who they view as leaders in the field	**assesses, analyzes, and anticipates emerging trends and initiatives in order to adapt leadership strategies**	draws upon the perspectives, expertise and leadership of various stakeholders in responding proactively to emerging challenges to the shared vision, ensuring the resilience of the school, its growth, learning and improvements
Culture *(attitudes, knowledge, behaviors and beliefs that characterize the school environment and are shared by its stakeholders)*	advocates for self and own interests	advocates for selected causes	**advocates for children, families, and caregivers**	guided by the school vision, enables self, children, families and caregivers to successfully and appropriately advocate for themselves and one another

© 2011 Learner-Centered Initiatives, Ltd and Communities for Learning: Leading lasting change®

Multidimensional Principal Performance Rubric

Other: Goal Setting and Attainment

	Ineffective 0-4	Developing 4.1-5.7	Effective 5.8-8.4	Highly Effective 8.5-10
Uncovering Goals • Align • Define	"does" goal setting in order to be in compliance with mandates or regulations	completes goal setting activities to satisfy external expectations and assumptions about the connection between principal practice and student learning	engages in the goal setting process as part of own professional improvement as related to improving student learning	embraces the goal setting process as part of ongoing work to improve learning by decreasing the distance between the school's current reality and the vision
	operates from own opinion and perceptions without attending to vision and data	considers data gathered about teacher practice, academic results and/or school learning environment in isolation of the school and district vision	works with the superintendent to consider the school and district vision and student learning needs, as well as information gathered about teacher practice, academic results and/or the school learning environment	engages a cross role group, including the superintendent, teachers and other administrators, to triangulate the school and district vision with data depicting the current reality of student learning, teacher practice, academic results and/or the school learning environment
	extracts goals from own interests	establishes goals that focus on improving teacher practice, and academic results and/or school learning environment	creates goals that connect changes in principal practice to the improvement of teacher practice, academic results, and/or school learning environment in order to improve student learning	generates goals that maximize on the principal's role in improving teacher practice, academic results, and/or school learning environment in the service of improving learning
	goals are isolated action steps, unaligned to a goal that can actually be worked toward	goals are broad, general, aspirational statements that are too big to be assessed	goals are stated in ways that allow progress toward them to be assessed	goals are expressed in statements that are both actionable and measurable

© 2011 Learner-Centered Initiatives, Ltd and Communities for Learning: Leading lasting change®

Multidimensional Principal Performance Rubric

	Ineffective 0-4	Developing 4.1-5.7	Effective 5.8-8.4	Highly Effective 8.5-10
Strategic Planning[5] • Prioritize • Strategize	considers goals in no special order	prioritizes goals based on own interests	prioritizes goals by considering what can be gained by pursuing each	prioritizes goals by considering the potential benefits and unintended consequences of pursuing certain goals vis-a-vis others
	changes commitment to goals as new ones emerge	relies on own perspective to assert the importance and alignment of identified goals	uses superintendent's perspective to test own assumptions about goals to see if they are truly connected to the school/district vision and needs	uses the perspectives of others to test own assumptions about the goals articulated and to see if they are truly connected to the school/district vision and needs
	lists generic strategies that could apply to a variety of goals	lists strategies that will be used to accomplish goals identified	articulates strategies supporting actions, and reasons for selecting them	articulates strategies supporting actions and also for overcoming obstacles to the plan, with rationale for selecting them that includes anticipated results, implementation intentions[6] related to each, and evidence of strategy's impact.
	states the benefits of attaining the goal(s)	describes, in general terms, what successful goal attainment will look like and accomplish	identifies anticipated specific measures of success for each goal	describes the evidence that, when collected and annotated, will support that attending to these goals actually decreases the distance between current reality and the vision

[5] In this electronic version, *Strategic Planning* will hyperlink to a scaffolded, strategic planning worksheet.
[6] In the electronic version, *implementation intentions* will be a hyperlinked definition with examples.

© 2011 Learner-Centered Initiatives, Ltd and Communities for Learning: Leading lasting change®

Multidimensional Principal Performance Rubric

	Ineffective 0-4	Developing 4.1-5.7	Effective 5.8-8.4	Highly Effective 8.5-10
Taking Action • Mobilize • Monitor • Refine	refers in general to working toward goals, but is unable to articulate related steps or strategies	identifies a series of individual actions for each goal without specifying whether the goals are long or short term	creates an action plan that delineates steps and strategies for all goals, regardless of whether they are short or long term	designs an action plan that clearly differentiates between short and long term goals and their associated steps and strategies
	speaks about taking actions, but has trouble committing and getting started	implements the action plan quietly and privately	implements the action plan publically, and invites others to use it as a model for goal setting that they can do as well	shares and implements the action plan publically, and uses it as an opportunity to build a culture of inquiry by inspiring others to engage in their own goal setting to improve learning
	changes goals to better match what is currently happening or uses what is happening to rationalize giving up	adjusts goals and actions based on instinct and self-perceptions	monitors and refines goals and/or action steps, based on formative assessment of evidence collected	seeks multiple, diverse perspectives to review evidence collected and contribute to own questions about process, actions, strategies and progress, to support revisions to the action plan

© 2011 Learner-Centered Initiatives, Ltd and Communities for Learning: Leading lasting change®

Multidimensional Principal Performance Rubric

	Ineffective 0-4 pts	Developing 4.1-5.7 pts	Effective 5.8-8.4 pts	Highly Effective 8.5-10 pts
Evaluating Attainment • Document o Insights o Accomplishments o New questions o Implications for moving forward • Next steps	documentation is a beginning and end event and focuses on restating actions taken and noting obstacles to goal achievement	sporadically documents thinking related to key moments, obstacles or achievements	periodically documents own thinking and reactions to the progress made obstacles encountered, and insights or questions that arise	throughout the implementation of the action plan, systematically documents and reflects upon emerging insights, questions, perceived accomplishments, obstacles encountered, and unintended consequences
	categorically claims goal attainment or uses failure to meet goals set as evidence that the goal setting process does not work	evaluates goals and goal attainment based on own impressions of what success should have looked like and what was actually achieved	evaluates goals and goal attainment by assessing "evidence of success," establishing the degree to which the goal has been achieved, and determining next steps towards attaining the school vision	taps the perspectives of those who supported the initial data analysis to help evaluate goal attainment and related impact on learning by assessing "evidence of success," establishing the degree to which the goal has been achieved, and determining next steps in attaining the school vision and improving learning
	dismisses the possibility of using goals to define next steps	considers new goals based on success in achieving current goals, adjusting them to match perceived ability of the school to actually improve	determines next steps and future actions to improve student learning, teacher practice, academic results and/or the school learning environment in light how successful the recent work was in making improvements	engages stakeholders[7] in planning, future goals, actions and next steps to improve student learning, teacher practice, academic results and/or the school learning environment based on how much closer the school and district are to the vision

[7] In the electronic version, stakeholders would be a hyperlink to a definition and stakeholder identification activity.

© 2011 Learner-Centered Initiatives, Ltd and Communities for Learning: Leading lasting change®

GENESEO CENTRAL SCHOOL DISTRICT PRINCIPAL IMPROVEMENT PLAN (PIP)

Background: Section 30-2.10 of the Commissioner's regulations requires that any Principal rated as Developing or Ineffective through an APPR conducted under Section 3012-c of the Education Law shall receive a Principal Improvement Plan (PIP). PIPs shall be developed by the Principal's supervisor but only after discussion with the affected Principal. Union representation shall be afforded upon the Principal's request. A PIP is not a disciplinary action. The issuance and/or implementation of the terms of a PIP shall not be grievable under the collective bargaining agreement between the District and the Principals' Association, but shall instead be subject to the APRP Appeals procedure. Insufficient Principal implementation of this PIP may affect subsequent evaluations, including the scoring of Standard VI of the Principal evaluation rubric.

Principal Name: _____ Tenure Area(s): _____
Status: ☐ 1st Year Probationary ☐ 2nd Year Probationary ☐ 3rd Year Probationary ☐ Tenured ☐ Other
Evaluator Name: _____ Evaluator Position: _____
Final Evaluation Date:_____ for the _____ school year, resulting in a HEDI rating of _____.

Directions for PIP Development: The Principal completes the following chart after discussion with the affected Principal and union representative, if any. Use additional pages if needed. Implementation of this plan will commence by _____[1].

Area(s) Needing Improvement	Timeline for Achieving Improvement	Principal Responsibilities (if any) and Timeframes:	Supervisor Contributions (if any) and Timeframes:	The Manner(s) by which Improvement will be Assessed

Directions for PIP Follow up: The supervisor, Principal and Union Representative (upon the Principal's request) will hold a PIP-Update meeting on _____ to discuss the status of implementing this PIP, the degree of improvement in the identified "Area(s) Needing Improvement," and updating this PIP if appropriate.

_____
Principal's Signature, Dated: _____

_____
Supervisor's Signature, Dated: _____

_____
Principals' Assoc. Pres., Dated: _____

[1] Implementation of the PIP must commence within 10 school days after class begins for the next school year.

UPDATED PRINCIPAL IMPROVEMENT PLAN (PIP)

Background: This Updated PIP is a modification of a PIP dated _____ and is based on a PIP-Update meeting held on _____. Updated PIPs are considered PIPS. Accordingly, Updated PIPs shall be developed by the Principal's supervisor but only after discussion with the affected Principal. Union representation shall be afforded upon the Principal's request. An Updated PIP is not a disciplinary action. The issuance and/or implementation of the terms of an Updated PIP shall not be grievable under the collective bargaining agreement between the District and the Principals' Association, but shall instead be subject to the APRP Appeals procedure. Insufficient Principal implementation of this Updated PIP may affect subsequent evaluations, including the scoring of Standard VI of the Principal evaluation rubric.

Principal Name: _____ Tenure Area(s): _____
Status: ☐ 1st Year Probationary ☐ 2nd Year Probationary ☐ 3rd Year Probationary ☐ Tenured ☐ Other
Evaluator Name: _____ Evaluator Position: _____
Final Evaluation Date:_____ for the _____ school year, resulting in a HEDI rating of _____.

Directions for Updated PIP Development: The Principal completes the following chart after discussion with the affected Principal and union representative, if any. Use additional pages if needed. Implementation of this Updated PIP will commence by _____.

Area(s) Needing Improvement	Timeline for Achieving Improvement	Principal Responsibilities (if any) and Timeframes:	Supervisor Contributions (if any) and Timeframes:	The Manner(s) by which Improvement will be Assessed

Directions for Updated PIP Follow up: The supervisor, Principal and Union Representative (upon the Principal's request) may but are not required to meet to discuss this Updated PIP. Check One: ☐ No update meeting is scheduled at this time. ☐ An update meeting will be held on _____ to discuss the status of implementing this Updated PIP, the degree of improvement in the identified "Area(s) Needing Improvement," and modifying this Updated PIP if appropriate.

_____
Principal's Signature, Dated: _____

_____
Supevisor's Signature, Dated: _____

_____
Principals' Assoc. Pres., Dated: _____

Admin1/SMM/BOCES/MAHONEY(5.31.12)

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:

1/3/2013

Teachers Union President Signature: Date:

Glenda Van Rey 1-3-13

Administrative Union President Signature: Date:

1/3/2013

Board of Education President Signature: Date:

Stephen P. Muskell