



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

December 6, 2012

Michael Chirco, Superintendent
Gorham-Middlesex Central School District
4100 Baldwin Road
Rushville, NY 14544

Dear Superintendent Chirco:

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 Thursday, May 03, 2012

Updated Saturday, December 01, 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 : 430901060000

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

430901060000

1.2) School District Name: GORHAM-MIDDLESEX CSD (MARCUS WHITMAN

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

GORHAM-MIDDLESEX CSD (MARCUS WHITMAN

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):

(No response)

1.5) Assurances

Please check all of the boxes below:

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

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

Re-submission to address deficiencies

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

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

Annual (2012-13)

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

Created Thursday, May 03, 2012

Updated Wednesday, December 05, 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	W-FL BOCES Regionally Developed Kindergarten ELA Assessment
1	District, regional, or BOCES-developed assessment	W-FL BOCES Regionally Developed Grade 1 ELA Assessment
2	District, regional, or BOCES-developed assessment	W-FL BOCES Regionally Developed Grade 2 ELA Assessment

	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.

The targets for Student Learning Objectives are set by the building principal and the teacher based upon preassessment results and other baseline data. Points will be assigned based on 80% of the students in the teacher's SLO achieving growth as defined by the teacher and a building principal. A teacher will be considered mid-to-high range "effective" (HEDI rating with 14 points) if 80% of his/her students reach the SLO target. Points will be assigned depending upon the % of students who exceed or fall short of the target.

Calculation of a SLO score:

After the post-assessment is administered and scored, the percentage of students meeting their target shall be determined according to the following guidelines:

- Student must be included on the teacher's BEDS form to be included in percentage calculation.
- Students must have both a pre- and post-assessment in order to count toward the growth target.
- Where more than one SLO is applicable, each SLO shall be weighted proportionately based on the number of students in each SLO.

Highly Effective (18 - 20 points) Results are well-above state average for similar students (or District goals if no state test).

86 -100% of students will meet or exceed their growth target.

Effective (9 - 17 points) Results meet state average for similar students (or District goals if no state test).

65-85 % of students will meet or exceed their growth target.

Developing (3 - 8 points) Results are below state average for similar students (or District goals if no state test).

40-64 % of students will meet or exceed their growth target.

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

0-39% of students will meet or exceed their growth target.

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	W-FL Boces Regionally Developed Math Assessment for Grade K
1	District, regional, or BOCES-developed assessment	W-FL Boces Regionally Developed Math Assessment for Grade 1
2	District, regional, or BOCES-developed assessment	W-FL BOCES Regionally Developed Math Assessment for Grade 2
	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.

<p>Use this box, if needed, to describe the general process for assigning HEDI categories for these grades/subjects in this subcomponent. If needed, you may upload a table or graphic at 2.11, below.</p>	<p>The targets for Student Learning Objectives are set by the building principal and the teacher based upon preassessment results and other baseline data. Points will be assigned based on 80% of the students in the teacher's SLO achieving growth as defined by the teacher and a building principal. A teacher will be considered mid-to-high range "effective" (HEDI rating with 14 points) if 80% of his/her students reach the SLO target. Points will be assigned depending upon the % of students who exceed or fall short of the target.</p> <p>Calculation of a SLO score After the post-assessment is administered and scored, the percentage of students meeting their target shall be determined according to the following guidelines:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Student must be included on the teacher's BEDS form to be included in percentage calculation. • Students must have both a pre- and post-assessment in order to count toward the growth target. • Where more than one SLO is applicable, each SLO shall be weighted proportionately based on the number of students in each SLO.
<p>Highly Effective (18 - 20 points) Results are well-above state average for similar students (or District goals if no state test).</p>	<p>86 -100% of students will meet or exceed their growth target.</p>
<p>Effective (9 - 17 points) Results meet state average for similar students (or District goals if no state test).</p>	<p>65-85 % of students will meet or exceed their growth target.</p>
<p>Developing (3 - 8 points) Results are below state average for similar students (or District goals if no state test).</p>	<p>40-64 % of students will meet or exceed their growth target.</p>
<p>Ineffective (0 - 2 points) Results are well-below state average for similar students (or District goals if no state test).</p>	<p>0-39% of students will meet or exceed their growth target.</p>

2.4) Grades 6-8 Science

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

	Science	Assessment
6	District, regional or BOCES-developed assessment	W-FL BOCES Regionally Developed Assessment for Science Grade 6
7	District, regional or BOCES-developed assessment	W-FL BOCES Regionally Developed Science Assessment for Grade 7
	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.

<p>Use this box, if needed, to describe the general process for assigning HEDI categories for these grades/subjects in this subcomponent. If needed, you may upload a table or graphic at 2.11, below.</p>	<p>The targets for Student Learning Objectives are set by the building principal and the teacher based upon preassessment results and other baseline data. Points will be assigned based on 80% of the students in the teacher's SLO achieving growth as defined by the teacher and a building principal. A teacher will be considered mid-to-high range "effective" (HEDI rating with 14 points) if 80% of his/her students reach the SLO target. Points will be assigned depending upon the % of students who exceed or fall short of the target.</p> <p>Calculation of a SLO score After the post-assessment is administered and scored, the percentage of students meeting their target shall be determined according to the following guidelines:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Student must be included on the teacher's BEDS form to be included in percentage calculation. • Students must have both a pre- and post-assessment in order to count toward the growth target. • Where more than one SLO is applicable, each SLO shall be weighted proportionately based on the number of students in each SLO.
<p>Highly Effective (18 - 20 points) Results are well-above state average for similar students (or District goals if no state test).</p>	<p>86 -100% of students will meet or exceed their growth target.</p>
<p>Effective (9 - 17 points) Results meet state average for similar students (or District goals if no state test).</p>	<p>65-85 % of students will meet or exceed their growth target.</p>
<p>Developing (3 - 8 points) Results are below state average for similar students (or District goals if no state test).</p>	<p>40-64 % of students will meet or exceed their growth target.</p>
<p>Ineffective (0 - 2 points) Results are well-below state average for similar students (or District goals if no state test).</p>	<p>0-39% of students will meet or exceed their growth target.</p>

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	W-FL BOCES Regionally Developed Social Studies Assessment for Grade 6
7	District, regional or BOCES-developed assessment	W-FL BOCES Regionally Developed Social Studies Assessment for Grade 7
8	District, regional or BOCES-developed assessment	W-FL BOCES Regionally Developed Social Studies Assessment for Grade 8

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.

The targets for Student Learning Objectives are set by the building principal and the teacher based upon preassessment results and other baseline data. Points will be assigned based on 80% of the students in the teacher's SLO achieving growth as defined by the teacher and a building principal. A teacher will be considered mid-to-high range "effective" (HEDI rating with 14 points) if 80% of his/her students reach the SLO target. Points will be assigned depending upon the % of students who exceed or fall short of the target.

Calculation of a SLO score

After the post-assessment is administered and scored, the percentage of students meeting their target shall be determined according to the following guidelines:

- Student must be included on the teacher's BEDS form to be included in percentage calculation.
- Students must have both a pre- and post-assessment in order to count toward the growth target.
- Where more than one SLO is applicable, each SLO shall be weighted proportionately based on the number of students in each SLO.

Highly Effective (18 - 20 points) Results are well-above District goals for similar students.

86 -100% of students will meet or exceed their growth target.

Effective (9 - 17 points) Results meet District goals for similar students.

65-85 % of students will meet or exceed their growth target.

Developing (3 - 8 points) Results are below District goals for similar students.

40-64 % of students will meet or exceed their growth target.

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

0-39% of students will meet or exceed their growth target.

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	W-FL BOCES Regionally 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.

The targets for Student Learning Objectives are set by the building principal and the teacher based upon preassessment results and other baseline data. Points will be assigned based on 80% of the students in the teacher's SLO achieving growth as defined by the teacher and a building principal. A teacher will be considered mid-to-high range "effective" (HEDI rating with 14 points) if 80% of his/her students reach the SLO target. Points will be assigned depending upon the % of students who exceed or fall short of the target.

Calculation of a SLO score

After the post-assessment is administered and scored, the percentage of students meeting their target shall be determined according to the following guidelines:

- Student must be included on the teacher's BEDS form to be included in percentage calculation.
- Students must have both a pre- and post-assessment in order to count toward the growth target.
- Where more than one SLO is applicable, each SLO shall be weighted proportionately based on the number of students in each SLO.

Highly Effective (18 - 20 points) Results are well-above District goals for similar students.

86 -100% of students will meet or exceed their growth target.

Effective (9 - 17 points) Results meet District goals for similar students.

65-85 % of students will meet or exceed their growth target.

Developing (3 - 8 points) Results are below District goals for similar students.

40-64 % of students will meet or exceed their growth target.

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

0-39% of students will meet or exceed their growth target.

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

The targets for Student Learning Objectives are set by the building principal and the teacher based upon preassessment results and other baseline data. Points will

<p>graphic at 2.11, below.</p>	<p>be assigned based on 80% of the students in the teacher's SLO achieving growth as defined by the teacher and a building principal. A teacher will be considered mid-to-high range "effective" (HEDI rating with 14 points) if 80% of his/her students reach the SLO target. Points will be assigned depending upon the % of students who exceed or fall short of the target.</p> <p>Calculation of a SLO score</p> <p>After the post-assessment is administered and scored, the percentage of students meeting their target shall be determined according to the following guidelines:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Student must be included on the teacher's BEDS form to be included in percentage calculation. • Students must have both a pre- and post-assessment in order to count toward the growth target. • Where more than one SLO is applicable, each SLO shall be weighted proportionately based on the number of students in each SLO.
<p>Highly Effective (18 - 20 points) Results are well-above District goals for similar students.</p>	<p>86 -100% of students will meet or exceed their growth target.</p>
<p>Effective (9 - 17 points) Results meet District goals for similar students.</p>	<p>65-85 % of students will meet or exceed their growth target.</p>
<p>Developing (3 - 8 points) Results are below District goals for similar students.</p>	<p>40-64 % of students will meet or exceed their growth target.</p>
<p>Ineffective (0 - 2 points) Results are well-below District goals for similar students.</p>	<p>0-39% of students will meet or exceed their growth target.</p>

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.

<p>Use this box, if needed, to describe the general process for assigning HEDI categories for these grades/subjects in this subcomponent. If needed, you may upload a table or graphic at 2.11, below.</p>	<p>The targets for Student Learning Objectives are set by the building principal and the teacher based upon preassessment results and other baseline data. Points will be assigned based on 80% of the students in the teacher's SLO achieving growth as defined by the teacher and a building principal. A teacher will be considered mid-to-high range "effective" (HEDI rating with 14 points) if</p>
--	--

80% of his/her students reach the SLO target. Points will be assigned depending upon the % of students who exceed or fall short of the target.
 Calculation of a SLO score
 After the post-assessment is administered and scored, the percentage of students meeting their target shall be determined according to the following guidelines:

- Student must be included on the teacher's BEDS form to be included in percentage calculation.
- Students must have both a pre- and post-assessment in order to count toward the growth target.
- Where more than one SLO is applicable, each SLO shall be weighted proportionately based on the number of students in each SLO.

Highly Effective (18 - 20 points) Results are well-above District goals for similar students.	86 -100% of students will meet or exceed their growth target.
Effective (9 - 17 points) Results meet District goals for similar students.	65-85 % of students will meet or exceed their growth target.
Developing (3 - 8 points) Results are below District goals for similar students.	40-64 % of students will meet or exceed their growth target.
Ineffective (0 - 2 points) Results are well-below District goals for similar students.	0-39% of students will meet or exceed their growth target.

2.9) High School English Language Arts

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

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

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

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.

The targets for Student Learning Objectives are set by the building principal and the teacher based upon preassessment results and other baseline data. Points will be assigned based on 80% of the students in the teacher's SLO achieving growth as defined by the teacher and a building principal. A teacher will be considered mid-to-high range "effective" (HEDI rating with 14 points) if 80% of his/her students reach the SLO target. Points will be assigned depending upon the % of students who exceed or fall short of the target.

Calculation of a SLO score
 After the post-assessment is administered and scored, the percentage of students meeting their target shall be determined according to the following guidelines:

- Student must be included on the teacher's BEDS form to be included in percentage calculation.
- Students must have both a pre- and post-assessment in order to count toward the growth target.
- Where more than one SLO is applicable, each SLO shall be weighted proportionately based on the number of students in each SLO.

Highly Effective (18 - 20 points) Results are well-above District goals for similar students.	86 -100% of students will meet or exceed their growth target.
Effective (9 - 17 points) Results meet District goals for similar students.	65-85 % of students will meet or exceed their growth target.
Developing (3 - 8 points) Results are below District goals for similar students.	40-64 % of students will meet or exceed their growth target.
Ineffective (0 - 2 points) Results are well-below District goals for similar students.	0-39% of students will meet or exceed their growth target.

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
Reading 3-5	State Assessment	ELA State Assessment Grade 3-5
Reading 6-8	State Assessment	ELA State Assessment Grade 6-8
Special Education 3-5	State Assessment	ELA/math State Assessment Grade 3-5
Special Education 6-8	State Assessment	ELA/math State Assessment Grade 6-8
Speech 3-5	State Assessment	ELA State Assessment Grade 3-5
Speech 6-8	State Assessment	ELA State Assessment Grade 6-8
Grades K-2 All Other Courses	District, Regional or BOCES-developed	W-FL BOCES Regionally developed grade and subject specific assessment
Grades 3-5 All Other Subjects	District, Regional or BOCES-developed	W-FL BOCES Regionally developed grade and subject specific assessment
Grades 6-8 All Other Subjects	District, Regional or BOCES-developed	W-FL BOCES Regionally developed grade and subject specific assessment
Grades 9-12 All Other Subjects	District, Regional or BOCES-developed	W-FL BOCES Regionally developed grade and subject specific assessment
Special Education 9-12	State Assessment	Grade and subject specific Regents examination

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.

The targets for Student Learning Objectives are set by the building principal and the teacher based upon preassessment results and other baseline data. Points will be assigned based on 80% of the students in the teacher's SLO achieving growth as defined by the teacher and a building principal. A teacher will be considered mid-to-high range "effective" (HEDI rating with 14 points) if 80% of his/her students reach the SLO target. Points will be assigned depending upon the % of students who exceed or fall short of the target.

Calculation of a SLO score

After the post-assessment is administered and scored, the percentage of students meeting their target shall be determined according to the following guidelines:

- Student must be included on the teacher's BEDS form to be included in percentage calculation.
- Students must have both a pre- and post-assessment in order to count toward the growth target.
- Where more than one SLO is applicable, each SLO shall be weighted proportionately based on the number of students in each SLO.

Highly Effective (18 - 20 points) Results are well-above District goals for similar students.

86 -100% of students will meet or exceed their growth target.

Effective (9 - 17 points) Results meet District goals for similar students.

65-85 % of students will meet or exceed their growth target.

Developing (3 - 8 points) Results are below District goals for similar students.

40-64 % of students will meet or exceed their growth target.

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

0-39% of students will meet or exceed their growth target.

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/5364/124587-TXEttx9bQW/Teachers SLO Nov 2.docx

2.12) Locally Developed Controls

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

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

No locally developed controls.

2.13) Teachers with more than one growth measure

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

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

2.14) Assurances

Please check all of the boxes below:

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

3. Local Measures (Teachers)

Created Monday, June 25, 2012

Updated Thursday, December 06, 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/Math grades 3- 5, and State Science grade 4
5	6(ii) School wide measure computed locally	State ELA/Math grades 3- 5, and State Science grade 4

6	6(ii) School wide measure computed locally	State ELA/Math grades 6-8, and State Science grade 8
7	6(ii) School wide measure computed locally	State ELA/Math grades 6-8, and State Science grade 8
8	6(ii) School wide measure computed locally	State ELA/Math grades 6-8, and State Science grade 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.	All teachers in the Intermediate School (Grades 3, 4 and 5) will receive the same score calculated using this formula: 0.333 (average percentage of students scoring at levels 3 and 4 on the State ELA assessment in grades 3,4 and 5) + 0.333 (average percentage of students scoring at levels 3 and 4 on the state math assessment in grades 3,4 and 5) + 0.333 (percentage of students scoring at levels 3 and 4 on the science assessment in grade 4). The resulting percentage is then converted to points using the chart uploaded in section 3.3. All teachers in the Middle School (Grades 6, 7 and 8) will receive the same score calculated using this formula: 0.333 (average percentage of students scoring at levels 3 and 4 on the state ELA assessment in grades 6, 7 and 8) + 0.333 (average percentage of students scoring at levels 3 and 4 on the state math assessment in grades 6, 7 and 8) + 0.333 (average percentage of students scoring at levels 3 and 4 on the state science assessment in grade 8). The resulting percentage is then converted to points using the chart uploaded in section 3.3.
Highly Effective (14 - 15 points) Results are well above District- or BOCES-adopted expectations for growth or achievement for grade/subject.	63-100 percent--See table attached at section 3.3
Effective (8- 13 points) Results meet District- or BOCES-adopted expectations for growth or achievement for grade/subject.	51-62 percent--See table attached at section 3.3
Developing (3 - 7 points) Results are below District- or BOCES-adopted expectations for growth or achievement for grade/subject.	31-50 percent--See table attached at section 3.3
Ineffective (0 - 2 points) Results are well below District- or BOCES-adopted expectations for growth or achievement for grade/subject.	0-30 percent--See table attached at section 3.3

3.2) Grades 4-8 Math

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

	Locally-Selected Measure from List of Approved Measures	Assessment
4	6(ii) School wide measure computed locally	State ELA/Math grades 3- 5, and State Science grade 4
5	6(ii) School wide measure computed locally	State ELA/Math grades 3- 5, and State Science grade 4
6	6(ii) School wide measure computed locally	State ELA/Math grades 6-8, and State Science grade 8
7	6(ii) School wide measure computed locally	State ELA/Math grades 6-8, and State Science grade 8
8	6(ii) School wide measure computed locally	State ELA/Math grades 6-8, and State Science grade 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.	<p>All teachers in the Intermediate School (Grades 3, 4 and 5) will receive the same score calculated using this formula: 0.333 (average percentage of students scoring at levels 3 and 4 on the State ELA assessment in grades 3,4 and 5) + 0.333(average percentage of students scoring at levels 3 and 4 on the state math assessment in grades 3,4 and 5) + 0.333 (percentage of students scoring at levels 3 and 4 on the science assessment in grade 4). The resulting percentage is then converted to points using the chart uploaded in section 3.3.</p> <p>All teachers in the Middle School (Grades 6, 7 and 8) will receive the same score calculated using this formula: 0.333 (average percentage of students scoring at levels 3 and 4 on the state ELA assessment in grades 6, 7 and 8) + 0.333 (average percentage of students scoring at levels 3 and 4 on the state math assessment in grades 6, 7 and 8) + 0.333 (average percentage of students scoring at levels 3 and 4 on the state science assessment in grade 8). The resulting percentage is then converted to points using the chart uploaded in section 3.3.</p>
Highly Effective (14 - 15 points) Results are well above District- or BOCES-adopted expectations for growth or achievement for grade/subject.	63-100 percent--See table attached at section 3.3
Effective (8- 13 points) Results meet District- or BOCES-adopted expectations for growth or achievement for grade/subject.	51-62 percent--See table attached at section 3.3
Developing (3 - 7 points) Results are below District- or BOCES-adopted expectations for growth or achievement for grade/subject.	31-50 percent--See table attached at section 3.3
Ineffective (0 - 2 points) Results are well below District- or BOCES-adopted expectations for growth or achievement for grade/subject.	0-30 percent--See table attached at section 3.3

3.3) HEDI Tables or Graphics

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

assets/survey-uploads/5139/145519-rhJdBgDruP/0-15 Teachers 3-8.docx

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

Growth or achievement measure(s) from these options.

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

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

Measures based on:

- 1) The change in percentage of a teacher's students who achieve a specific level of performance as determined locally, on such assessments/examinations compared to those students' level of performance on such assessments/examinations in the previous school year (e.g., a three percentage point increase in students earning the proficient level (three) or better performance level on the 7th grade math State assessment compared to those same students' performance levels on the 6th grade math State assessment, or an increase in the percentage of a teacher's students earning the advanced performance level (four) on the 4th grade ELA or math State assessments compared to those students' performance levels on the 3rd grade ELA or math State assessments)
- 2) Teacher specific growth score computed by the Department based on the percent of the teacher's students earning a State determined level of growth. The methodology to translate such growth into the State-established sub-component scoring ranges shall be determined locally
- 3) Teacher specific achievement or growth score computed in a manner determined locally based on a measure of student performance on the State assessments, Regents examinations and/or Department approved alternative examinations other than the measure described in 1) or 2), above
- 4) Student growth or achievement computed in a manner determined locally based on a State-approved 3rd party assessment
- 5) Student growth or achievement computed in a manner determined locally based on a district, regional or BOCES-developed assessment that is rigorous and comparable across classrooms
- 6) A school-wide measure of either student growth or achievement based on either:

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

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

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

3.4) Grades K-3 ELA

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

	Locally-Selected Measure from List of Approved Measures	Assessment
K	6(ii) School-wide measure computed locally	Gorham-Middlesex locally developed Literacy assessments for grades K, 1 and 2.
1	6(ii) School-wide measure computed locally	Gorham-Middlesex locally developed Literacy assessments for grades K, 1 and 2.
2	6(ii) School-wide measure computed locally	Gorham-Middlesex locally developed Literacy assessments for grades K, 1 and 2.
3	6(ii) School-wide measure computed locally	State ELA/Math grades 3- 5, and State Science grade 4

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.

<p>Use this box, if needed, to describe the general process for assigning HEDI categories for these grades/subjects in this subcomponent. If needed, you may upload a table or graphic at 3.13, below.</p>	<p>All teachers in the Primary School (Grades K, 1 and 2) will receive the same score calculated by totaling the percentage of students reading at or above the grade level benchmark for grades K, 1 and 2 on the last reading assessment of the school year. The benchmarks are: Grade K- Independent Level 4, Grade 1- Independent Level 18, and Grade 2- Independent Level 28. This total is then divided by three to compute a school-wide average. The resulting percentage is then converted to points using the chart uploaded in section 3.13.</p> <p>All teachers in the Intermediate School (Grades 3, 4 and 5) will receive the same score calculated using this formula: 0.333 (average percentage of students scoring at levels 3 and 4 on the State ELA assessment in grades 3,4 and 5) + 0.333(average percentage of students scoring at levels 3 and 4 on the state math assessment in grades 3,4 and 5) + 0.333 (percentage of students scoring at levels 3 and 4 on the science assessment in grade 4). The</p>
--	--

	resulting percentage is then converted to points using the chart uploaded in section 3.13.
Highly Effective (18-20 points) Results are well above District- or BOCES-adopted expectations for growth or achievement for grade/subject.	66-100 percent for grades K-2 and 60-100 percent for grades 3-5. See table attached at section 3.13
Effective (9-17 points) Results meet District- or BOCES-adopted expectations for growth or achievement for grade/subject.	41-65 percent for grades K-2 and 41-59 percent for grades 3-5. See table attached at section 3.13
Developing (3 - 8 points) Results are below District- or BOCES-adopted expectations for growth or achievement for grade/subject.	25-40 percent--See table attached at section 3.13
Ineffective (0 - 2 points) Results are well below District- or BOCES-adopted expectations for growth or achievement for grade/subject.	0-24 percent--See table attached at section 3.13

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	Gorham-Middlesex CSD locally developed Literacy assessments for grades K, 1 and 2.
1	6(ii) School-wide measure computed locally	Gorham-Middlesex CSD locally developed Literacy assessments for grades K, 1 and 2.
2	6(ii) School-wide measure computed locally	Gorham-Middlesex CSD locally developed Literacy assessments for grades K, 1 and 2.
3	6(ii) School-wide measure computed locally	State ELA/Math grades 3- 5, and State Science grade 4

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.	<p>All teachers in the Primary School (Grades K, 1 and 2) will receive the same score calculated by totaling the percentage of students reading at or above the grade level benchmark for grades K, 1 and 2 on the last reading assessment of the school year. The benchmarks are: Grade K- Independent Level 4, Grade 1- Independent Level 18, and Grade 2- Independent Level 28. This total is then divided by three to compute a school-wide average. The resulting percentage is then converted to points using the chart uploaded in section 3.13.</p> <p>All teachers in the Intermediate School (Grades 3, 4 and 5) will receive the same score calculated using this formula: 0.333 (average percentage of students scoring at</p>
---	--

	levels 3 and 4 on the State ELA assessment in grades 3,4 and 5) + 0.333(average percentage of students scoring at levels 3 and 4 on the state math assessment in grades 3,4 and 5) + 0.333 (percentage of students scoring at levels 3 and 4 on the science assessment in grade 4). The resulting percentage is then converted to points using the chart uploaded in section 3.13.
Highly Effective (18-20 points) Results are well above District- or BOCES-adopted expectations for growth or achievement for grade/subject.	66-100 percent for grades K-2 and 60-100 percent for grades 3-5. See table attached at section 3.13
Effective (9-17 points) Results meet District- or BOCES-adopted expectations for growth or achievement for grade/subject.	41-65 percent for grades K-2 and 41-59 percent for grades 3-5. See table attached at section 3.13
Developing (3 - 8 points) Results are below District -or BOCES-adopted expectations for growth or achievement for grade/subject.	25-40 percent--See table attached at section 3.13
Ineffective (0 - 2 points) Results are well below District- or BOCES-adopted expectations for growth or achievement for grade/subject.	0-24 percent--See table attached at section 3.13

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/Math grades 6-8, and State Science grade 8
7	6(ii) School wide measure computed locally	State ELA/Math grades 6-8, and State Science grade 8
8	6(ii) School wide measure computed locally	State ELA/Math grades 6-8, and State Science grade 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.	All teachers in the Middle School (Grades 6, 7 and 8) will receive the same score calculated using this formula: 0.333 (average percentage of students scoring at levels 3 and 4 on the state ELA assessment in grades 6, 7 and 8) + 0.333 (average percentage of students scoring at levels 3 and 4 on the state math assessment in grades 6, 7 and 8) + 0.333 (average percentage of students scoring at levels 3 and 4 on the state science assessment in grade 8). The resulting percentage is then converted to points using the chart uploaded in section 3.13.
Highly Effective (18 - 20 points) Results are well above District- or BOCES-adopted expectations for growth or achievement for grade/subject.	66-100 percent--See table attached at section 3.13

Effective (9 - 17 points) Results meet District- or BOCES-adopted expectations for growth or achievement for grade/subject.	41-65 percent--See table attached at section 3.13
Developing (3 - 8 points) Results are below District- or BOCES-adopted expectations for growth or achievement for grade/subject.	25-40 percent--See table attached at section 3.13
Ineffective (0 - 2 points) Results are well below District- or BOCES-adopted expectations for growth or achievement for grade/subject.	0-24 percent--See table attached at section 3.13

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/Math grades 6-8, and State Science grade 8
7	6(ii) School wide measure computed locally	State ELA/Math grades 6-8, and State Science grade 8
8	6(ii) School wide measure computed locally	State ELA/Math grades 6-8, and State Science grade 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.	All teachers in the Middle School (Grades 6, 7 and 8) will receive the same score calculated using this formula: 0.333 (average percentage of students scoring at levels 3 and 4 on the state ELA assessment in grades 6, 7 and 8) + 0.333 (average percentage of students scoring at levels 3 and 4 on the state math assessment in grades 6, 7 and 8) + 0.333 (average percentage of students scoring at levels 3 and 4 on the state science assessment in grade 8). The resulting percentage is then converted to points using the chart uploaded in section 3.13.
Highly Effective (18 - 20 points) Results are well above District- or BOCES-adopted expectations for growth or achievement for grade/subject.	66-100 percent--See table attached at section 3.13
Effective (9 - 17 points) Results meet District- or BOCES-adopted expectations for growth or achievement for grade/subject.	41-65 percent--See table attached at section 3.13
Developing (3 - 8 points) Results are below District- or BOCES-adopted expectations for growth or achievement for grade/subject.	25-40 percent--See table attached at section 3.13

Ineffective (0 - 2 points) Results are well below District- or BOCES-adopted expectations for growth or achievement for grade/subject. 0-24 percent--See table attached at section 3.13

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	Regents examinations (Living environment, Integrated Algebra, Global History, US History, Comprehensive English)
Global 2	6(ii) School wide measure computed locally	Regents examinations (Living environment, Integrated Algebra, Global History, US History, Comprehensive English)
American History	6(ii) School wide measure computed locally	Regents examinations (Living environment, Integrated Algebra, Global History, US History, Comprehensive English)

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

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

Use this box, if needed, to describe the general process for assigning HEDI categories for these grades/subjects in this subcomponent. If needed, you may upload a table or graphic at 3.13, below.	All teachers in the High School (Grades 9, 10, 11 and 12) will receive the same score calculated using this formula: 0.20 (the percentage of students scoring 65-100 on the Integrated Algebra Regents examination) + 0.20 (the percentage of students scoring 65-100 on the Living Environment Regents examination) + 0.20 (the percentage of students scoring 65-100 on the Global History Regents examination) + 0.20 (the percentage of students scoring 65-100 on the US History Regents examination) + 0.20 (the percentage of students scoring 65-100 on the Comprehensive English Regents examination) The resulting percentage is then converted to points using the chart uploaded in section 3.13.
Highly Effective (18 - 20 points) Results are well above District- or BOCES-adopted expectations for growth or achievement for grade/subject.	90-100 percent--See table attached at section 3.13
Effective (9 - 17 points) Results meet District- or BOCES-adopted expectations for growth or achievement for grade/subject.	53-89 percent--See table attached at section 3.13
Developing (3 - 8 points) Results are below District- or BOCES-adopted expectations for growth or achievement for grade/subject.	41-52 percent--See table attached at section 3.13

Ineffective (0 - 2 points) Results are well below District- or BOCES-adopted expectations for growth or achievement for grade/subject. 0-40 percent--See table attached at section 3.13

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	Regents examinations (Living environment, Integrated Algebra, Global History, US History, Comprehensive English)
Earth Science	6(ii) School wide measure computed locally	Regents examinations (Living environment, Integrated Algebra, Global History, US History, Comprehensive English)
Chemistry	6(ii) School wide measure computed locally	Regents examinations (Living environment, Integrated Algebra, Global History, US History, Comprehensive English)
Physics	6(ii) School wide measure computed locally	Regents examinations (Living environment, Integrated Algebra, Global History, US History, Comprehensive English)

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

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

Use this box, if needed, to describe the general process for assigning HEDI categories for these grades/subjects in this subcomponent. If needed, you may upload a table or graphic at 3.13, below.	All teachers in the High School (Grades 9, 10, 11 and 12) will receive the same score calculated using this formula: 0.20 (the percentage of students scoring 65-100 on the Integrated Algebra Regents examination) + 0.20 (the percentage of students scoring 65-100 on the Living Environment Regents examination) + 0.20 (the percentage of students scoring 65-100 on the Global History Regents examination) + 0.20 (the percentage of students scoring 65-100 on the US History Regents examination) + 0.20 (the percentage of students scoring 65-100 on the Comprehensive English Regents examination) The resulting percentage is then converted to points using the chart uploaded in section 3.13.
Highly Effective (18-20 points) Results are well above District- or BOCES-adopted expectations for growth or achievement for grade/subject.	90-100 percent--See table attached at section 3.13
Developing (3 - 8 points) Results are below District- or BOCES-adopted expectations for growth or achievement for grade/subject.	53-89 percent--See table attached at section 3.13

Effective (9 - 17points) Results meet District- or BOCES-adopted expectations for growth or achievement for grade/subject.	41-52. percent--See table attached at section 3.13
Ineffective (0 - 2 points) Results are well below District- or BOCES-adopted expectations for growth or achievement for grade/subject.	0-40 percent--See table attached at section 3.13

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	Regents examinations (Living environment, Integrated Algebra, Global History, US History, Comprehensive English)
Geometry	6(ii) School wide measure computed locally	Regents examinations (Living environment, Integrated Algebra, Global History, US History, Comprehensive English)
Algebra 2	6(ii) School wide measure computed locally	Regents examinations (Living environment, Integrated Algebra, Global History, US History, Comprehensive English)

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

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

Use this box, if needed, to describe the general process for assigning HEDI categories for these grades/subjects in this subcomponent. If needed, you may upload a table or graphic at 3.13, below.	All teachers in the High School (Grades 9, 10, 11 and 12) will receive the same score calculated using this formula: 0.20 (the percentage of students scoring 65-100 on the Integrated Algebra Regents examination) + 0.20 (the percentage of students scoring 65-100 on the Living Environment Regents examination) + 0.20 (the percentage of students scoring 65-100 on the Global History Regents examination) + 0.20 (the percentage of students scoring 65-100 on the US History Regents examination) + 0.20 (the percentage of students scoring 65-100 on the Comprehensive English Regents examination) The resulting percentage is then converted to points using the chart uploaded in section 3.13.
Highly Effective (18 - 20 points) Results are well above District- or BOCES-adopted expectations for growth or achievement for grade/subject.	90-100 percent--See table attached at section 3.13
Effective (9 - 17 points) Results meet District- or BOCES-adopted expectations for growth or achievement for grade/subject.	53-89 percent--See table attached at section 3.13

Developing (3 - 8 points) Results are below District- or BOCES-adopted expectations for growth or achievement for grade/subject.	41-52 percent--See table attached at section 3.13
Ineffective (0 - 2 points) Results are well below District- or BOCES-adopted expectations for growth or achievement for grade/subject.	0-40 percent--See table attached at section 3.13

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	Regents examinations (Living environment, Integrated Algebra, Global History, US History, Comprehensive English)
Grade 10 ELA	6(ii) School wide measure computed locally	Regents examinations (Living environment, Integrated Algebra, Global History, US History, Comprehensive English)
Grade 11 ELA	6(ii) School wide measure computed locally	Regents examinations (Living environment, Integrated Algebra, Global History, US History, Comprehensive English)

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

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

Use this box, if needed, to describe the general process for assigning HEDI categories for these grades/subjects in this subcomponent. If needed, you may upload a table or graphic at 3.13, below.	All teachers in the High School (Grades 9, 10, 11 and 12) will receive the same score calculated using this formula: 0.20 (the percentage of students scoring 65-100 on the Integrated Algebra Regents examination) + 0.20 (the percentage of students scoring 65-100 on the Living Environment Regents examination) + 0.20 (the percentage of students scoring 65-100 on the Global History Regents examination) + 0.20 (the percentage of students scoring 65-100 on the US History Regents examination) + 0.20 (the percentage of students scoring 65-100 on the Comprehensive English Regents examination) The resulting percentage is then converted to points using the chart uploaded in section 3.13.
Highly Effective (18 - 20 points) Results are well above District- or BOCES-adopted expectations for growth or achievement for grade/subject.	90-100 percent--See table attached at section 3.13
Effective (9 - 17 points) Results meet District- or BOCES-adopted expectations for growth or achievement for grade/subject.	53-89 percent--See table attached at section 3.13

formula: 0.333 (average percentage of students scoring at levels 3 and 4 on the State ELA assessment in grades 3,4 and 5) + 0.333(average percentage of students scoring at levels 3 and 4 on the state math assessment in grades 3,4 and 5) + 0.333 (percentage of students scoring at levels 3 and 4 on the science assessment in grade 4). The resulting percentage is then converted to points using the chart uploaded in section 3.13.

All teachers in the Middle School (Grades 6, 7 and 8) will receive the same score calculated using this formula: 0.333 (average percentage of students scoring at levels 3 and 4 on the state ELA assessment in grades 6, 7 and 8) + 0.333 (average percentage of students scoring at levels 3 and 4 on the state math assessment in grades 6, 7 and 8) + 0.333 (average percentage of students scoring at levels 3 and 4 on the state science assessment in grade 8). The resulting percentage is then converted to points using the chart uploaded in section 3.13.

All teachers in the High School (Grades 9, 10, 11 and 12) will receive the same score calculated using this formula: 0.20 (the percentage of students scoring 65-100 on the Integrated Algebra Regents examination) + 0.20 (the percentage of students scoring 65-100 on the Living Environment Regents examination) + 0.20 (the percentage of students scoring 65-100 on the Global History Regents examination) + 0.20 (the percentage of students scoring 65-100 on the US History Regents examination) + 0.20 (the percentage of students scoring 65-100 on the Comprehensive English Regents examination) The resulting percentage is then converted to points using the chart uploaded in section 3.13.

Highly Effective (18 - 20 points) Results are well above District- or BOCES -adopted expectations for growth or achievement for grade/subject.	66-100 percent grades K-2, 60-100 percent grades 3-5, 66-100 percent grades 6-8, 90-100 percent grades 9-12 --See table attached at section 3.13
Effective (9 - 17 points) Results meet District- or BOCES-adopted expectations for growth or achievement for grade/subject.	41-59 percent grades K-2, 41-59 percent grades 3-5, 41-65 percent grades 6-8, 53-89 percent grades 9-12 --See table attached at section 3.13
Developing (3 - 8 points) Results are below District- or BOCES-adopted expectations for growth or achievement for grade/subject.	25-40 percent grades K-2, 25-40 percent grades 3-5, 25-40 percent grades 6-8, 41-52 percent grades 9-12 --See table attached at section 3.13
Ineffective (0 - 2 points) Results are well below District- or BOCES-adopted expectations for growth or achievement for grade/subject.	0-24 percent grades K-2, 0-24 percent grades 3-5, 0-24 percent grades 6-8, 0-40 percent grades 9-12 --See table attached at section 3.13

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

(No response)

3.13) HEDI Tables or Graphics

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

and upload that file here.

assets/survey-uploads/5139/145519-y92vNseFa4/Locally Determined 0-20 R.docx

3.14) Locally Developed Controls

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

None

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.

A single score for all teachers in a building will be assigned as described above. Two teachers will have two locally selected measures because they work in two schools with different grade level configurations. The scores from each school will be weighted equally. The Elementary Art teacher will receive a score from the K-2 and 3-5 buildings. The two scores will be added together and divided by two to determine her score. Similarly, the 6-12 Library Media Specialist will receive a score from both the middle and high school that will be added together and divided by two.

3.16) Assurances

Please check all of the boxes below:

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

4. Other Measures of Effectiveness (Teachers)

Created Tuesday, September 25, 2012

Updated Wednesday, December 05, 2012

Page 1

4.1) Teacher Practice Rubric

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

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

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

Danielson's Framework for Teaching (2011 Revised Edition)

(No response)

4.2) Points Within Other Measures

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

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

Is the following points assignment applicable to all teachers?

Yes

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

(No response)

Multiple (at least two) classroom observations by principal or other trained administrator, at least one of which must be unannounced [at least 31 points]	60
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	0

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

(No response)

4.3) Survey Tools (if applicable)

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

(No response)

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

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

4.4) Assurances

Please check all of the boxes below:

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

4.5) Process for Assigning Points and Determining HEDI Ratings

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

Classroom observations will account for all 60 points, and each component of the Danielson 2011 rubric will be rated for each observation. Each of the 22 components will be rated from 1 to 4. The rankings will then be added together and divided by 22 to arrive at an average overall rubric score between 1.0 and 4.0. The scores from each observation will be averaged together to arrive at a single average observation score. This will be converted to a point score between 0 and 60 using the table attached. We understand that 0-60 rubric score must be a whole number.

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/5091/181717-eka9yMJ855/0-60 Rubric Conversion Chart.docx

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.	Overall score on the components of the Danielson 2011 rubric will be between 3.5 and 4.0, considered to be at the distinguished level.
Effective: Overall performance and results meet NYS Teaching Standards.	Overall score on the components of the Danielson 2011 rubric will be between 2.5 and 3.4, considered to be at the proficient level.
Developing: Overall performance and results need improvement in order to meet NYS Teaching Standards.	Overall score on the components of the Danielson 2011 rubric will be between 1.5 and 2.4, considered to be at the basic level.
Ineffective: Overall performance and results do not meet NYS Teaching Standards.	Overall score on the components of the Danielson 2011 rubric will be between 1.0 and 1.4, considered to be at the unsatisfactory level.

Provide the ranges for the 60-point scoring bands.

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

4.6) Observations of Probationary Teachers

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

By building principals or other trained administrators

4.6) Observations of Probationary Teachers Formal/Long	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	0
4.7) Observations of Tenured Teachers Informal/Short	2
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?

- Not Applicable

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

- In Person

5. Composite Scoring (Teachers)

Created Tuesday, September 25, 2012

Updated Saturday, December 01, 2012

Page 1

Standards for Rating Categories

Growth or Comparable Measures

Locally-selected Measures of growth or achievement

Other Measures of Effectiveness (Teacher and Leader standards)

Highly

Effective

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

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

Overall performance and results exceed NYS Teaching Standards.

Effective

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

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

Overall performance and results meet NYS Teaching Standards.

Developing

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

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

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

Ineffective

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

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

Overall performance and results do not meet NYS Teaching Standards.

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

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

2012-13 where there is no Value-Added measure

Growth or Comparable Measures

Locally-selected Measures of

growth or achievement

Other Measures of Effectiveness

(60 points)

Overall

Composite Score

Highly Effective

18-20

18-20

Ranges determined locally--see below

91-100

Effective

9-17

9-17

75-90

Developing

3-8

3-8

65-74

Ineffective

0-2

0-2

0-64

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

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

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

2012-13 where Value-Added growth measure applies

Growth or Comparable Measures

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

Other Measures of Effectiveness

(60 points)

Overall

Composite Score

Highly Effective

22-25

14-15

Ranges determined locally--see above

91-100

Effective

10-21

8-13

75-90

Developing

3-9

3-7

65-74

Ineffective

0-2

0-2

0-64

6. Additional Requirements - Teachers

Created Tuesday, September 25, 2012

Updated Saturday, December 01, 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/5265/181935-Df0w3Xx5v6/Teacher Improvement Plan Forms.docx](#)

6.3) Appeals Process

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

(1) the substance of the annual professional performance review

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

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

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

APPR APPEALS PROCEDURE

The following procedures are the exclusive means for initiating, reviewing and resolving any and all appeals related to a tenured teacher's Annual Professional Performance Review (APPR) composite score/overall HEDI rating Probationary teachers may not appeal their overall composite score/HEDI rating.

APPR Subject to Appeals Process

- (1) Only a tenured teacher who receives a rating of “Ineffective” or “Developing” may appeal his or her performance review. Any teacher that receives a rating of “Effective” or “Highly Effective” cannot appeal, however, has the right to submit a written professional response to his/her APPR, unless or until a time comes when the rating is used for any other purpose than evaluative, in which case the appeals procedure shall be re-negotiated.*
 - (2) A non-tenured teacher may not file an appeal except for procedural issues. The appeals process will be the same for probationary and tenured teachers.*
 - (3) A teacher may appeal only the substance of his or her performance review, the school district’s adherence to standards and methodologies required for such reviews, adherence to applicable regulations of the Commissioner of Education, and the teacher’s overall composite score/HEDI rating in his/her Annual Professional Performance Review plan.*
 - (4) A teacher may not file multiple appeals regarding the same performance review. All grounds for appealing a particular performance review must be raised within the same appeal. Any grounds not raised at the time the appeal is filed shall be deemed waived.*
 - (5) A teacher initiating the appeal must submit a detailed description of the precise point(s) of disagreement over his or her performance review, along with any and all additional documents or written materials that he or she believes are relevant to the resolution of the appeal, and an explanation of relief requested to the Superintendent, with a copy to the MWTA President. The appeal must be submitted in writing on the appropriate Appeals Form (see Appendix K). E-mail or other electronic submissions are not permitted. Any additional information not submitted at the time the appeal is filed shall not be considered in the deliberations related to the resolution of the appeal.*
 - (6) Appeals concerning a teacher’s performance review must be received in the office of the Superintendent of Schools no later than fifteen (15) school days after he/she receives his/her overall APPR composite score. The failure to submit an appeal to the Superintendent of Schools within this time frame shall result in a waiver of the teacher’s right to appeal that performance review.*
 - (7) STEP 1 – Meeting with the Principal/Supervising Administrator--
Within ten (10) school days of receiving the teacher’s appeal the principal (or supervising administrator) who compiled the appeal shall have a meeting with the teacher. A MWTA representative and another administrator may attend this meeting per the teacher’s or administrator’s request.*
 - (8) Under this appeals process the teacher is expected to provide an explanation of the relief requested. The teacher is required to provide facts and evidence upon which he/she seeks relief.*
 - (9) The principal, having met with the teacher and Association representative, if applicable, will consider the documentary materials and the conversation, and will render a written decision to the Superintendent, Teacher and the MWTA President within ten (10) school days. A principal may choose to maintain the initial performance review, or may modify the overall composite score/HEDI rating performance review based upon the discussion with the teacher and the documentary materials provided by the teacher.*
 - (10) STEP 2--Once the principal’s decision is rendered, the teacher may choose to move the appeal on to the District Professional Practice Review Team within ten (10) school days after the date of the Principal’s decision to the Superintendent. The team will be comprised of four members:
 - Three members of the Marcus Whitman Teachers’ Association appointed by the Association President;
 - Two administrators appointed by the Superintendent.*
- The committee members will be appointed for each appeal. No administrator can hear an appeal of an evaluation s/he has completed. Another administrator will be assigned to the Team in such cases. No teacher can serve on the Team to examine an appeal of his or her own evaluation. The Association will assign another member to serve in such circumstances.*
- (11) The District Professional Practice Review Team will schedule a meeting to examine the documentary evidence of the appeal within ten (10) school days of receipt of an appeal. Upon the request of the teacher or the Review Team, the teacher will make a presentation to the Review Team for its consideration. The committee will make a decision within ten (10) school days of meeting to consider the appeal. The decision must set forth the reasons and factual basis for each determination on each of the specific issues raised in the appeal. The Review Team shall have the authority to recommend that the teacher’s APPR composite score or rating be modified or affirmed. The review team will send its recommendations to the Superintendent for his/her final decision.*
 - (12) Once a recommendation(s) is received, the superintendent will render a decision on the Review Team’s recommendation within ten (10) school days. The decision must set forth the reasons and factual basis for each determination on each of the specific issues*

raised in the appeal. The Superintendent shall have the authority to modify, or affirm the rating and composite score of the teacher's APPR. All appeals end with the superintendent's decision. A teacher cannot file another appeal for the same evaluation.

(13) If the appeal is fully or partially sustained, the original performance review shall be revised accordingly. The revised performance review may not be reviewed or appealed under this procedure. If the appeal is rejected, the original APPR and Composite Score shall remain unchanged.

The teacher's failure to comply with the requirements of this Appeals Procedure shall result in a denial of the appeal. If the Appeal's Procedure is violated it shall be grounds for a contractual grievance.

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: Only fully certified District-employed administrators (building principals, Director of Health and Physical Education (for health PE teachers) and Director of Pupil Personnel Services (for Special Education teachers) may evaluate teachers.

Any administrator who participates in the evaluation of teachers for the purpose of determining an APPR rating shall attend monthly training sessions provided by the Network Team and/or Wayne-Finger lakes BOCES staff developers. Treaining session length will vary between 1 and 6.5 hours depending upon topic and activities. Traning topics include the Common Core State Standards, Data Driven Instruction, the process of creating Student Learning Objectives and other topics provided to Network Teams in Albany. Methods employed include video and webinars, lecture, artifact evaluation, discussions and simulations including role playing, and observations of video recorded lessons.

All lead evaluators must be initially trained and certified in Danielson 2011/Teachscape. Training lasts between 15 and 20 hours, and the two certification tests take approximately 6 hours. This training is the primary vehicle for delivering training to ensure interrater reliability. Evaluators will recertify through Teachscape every two years (2012, 2014, 2016 . . .)

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	Checked
---	---------

teacher/student linkage data necessary to comply with regulations, in a format and timeline prescribed by the Commissioner.

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, September 26, 2012

Updated Wednesday, December 05, 2012

Page 1

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

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

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

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

3-5
6-8
9-12
(No response)
(No response)
(No response)
(No response)

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

Please check the boxes below:

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

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

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

State assessments, *required if one exists*

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

List of State-approved 3rd party assessments

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

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

School or Program Type	SLO with Assessment Option	Name of the Assessment
K-2	District, regional, or BOCES-developed	Wayne-Finger Lakes regionally developed ELA and math assessments for grades K, 1 and 2.

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.	Principals will be setting individual growth targets based upon preassessments and other baseline data. HEDI score will be based on the percentage of students meeting or exceeding growth targets.
Highly Effective (18 - 20 points) Results are well above state average for similar students (or District goals if no state test).	86 to 100 percent of students meet growth targets
Effective (9 - 17 points) Results meet state average for similar students (or District goals if no state test).	65 to 85 percent of students meet growth targets
Developing (3 - 8 points) Results are below state average for similar students (or District goals if no state test).	40 to 64 percent of students meet growth targets
Ineffective (0 - 2 points) Results are well below state average for similar students (or District goals if no state test).	0 to 39 percent of students meet growth targets.

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/5365/182211-lha0DogRNw/Principals SLO Nov 2.docx

7.4) Special Considerations for Comparable Growth Measures

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

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

(No response)

7.5) Principals with More Than One Growth Measure

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

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

7.6) Assurances -- Comparable Growth Measures

Please check all of the boxes below:

7.6) Assurances -- Comparable Growth Measures Assure the application of locally developed controls will be rigorous, fair, and transparent and only those used for State Growth will be used for Comparable Growth Measures.	Checked
7.6) Assurances -- Comparable Growth Measures Assure that use of locally developed controls will not have a disparate impact on underrepresented students in accordance with applicable civil rights laws.	Checked
7.6) Assurances -- Comparable Growth Measures Assure that procedures for ensuring data accuracy and integrity are being utilized.	Checked
7.6) Assurances -- Comparable Growth Measures Assure that district will develop SLOs according to the rules established by NYSED for principal SLOs: 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 Monday, September 24, 2012
Updated Wednesday, December 05, 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
3-5	(d) measures used by district for teacher evaluation	State math and ELA assessments for grades 3 to 5 and the state science assessment for grade 4
6-8	(d) measures used by district for teacher evaluation	State math and ELA assessments for grades 6 to 8 and the state science assessment for grade 8
9-12	(d) measures used by district for teacher evaluation	Regents examinations in Living Environment, Integrated Algebra, Global History, US History and Comprehensive English

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.

<p>Use this box, if needed, to describe the process for assigning HEDI categories. If needed, you may upload a table or graphic below.</p>	<p>The principal of the Intermediate School (Grades 3, 4 and 5) will receive a score calculated using this formula: 0.333 (average percentage of students scoring at levels 3 and 4 on the State ELA assessment in grades 3, 4 and 5) + 0.333 (average percentage of students scoring at levels 3 and 4 on the state math assessment in grades 3, 4 and 5) + 0.333 (percentage of students scoring at levels 3 and 4 on the science assessment in grade 4). The resulting percentage is then converted to points using the chart uploaded below.</p> <p>The principal of the Middle School (Grades 6, 7 and 8) will receive a score calculated using this formula: 0.333 (average percentage of students scoring at levels 3 and 4 on the state ELA assessment in grades 6, 7 and 8) + 0.333 (average percentage of students scoring at levels 3</p>
--	--

and 4 on the state math assessment in grades 6, 7 and 8) + 0.333 (average percentage of students scoring at levels 3 and 4 on the state science assessment in grade 8). The resulting percentage is then converted to points using the chart uploaded below.

The principal of the High School (Grades 9, 10, 11 and 12) will receive a score calculated using this formula: 0.20 (the percentage of students scoring 65-100 on the Integrated Algebra Regents examination) + 0.20 (the percentage of students scoring 65-100 on the Living Environment Regents examination) + 0.20 (the percentage of students scoring 65-100 on the Global History Regents examination) + 0.20 (the percentage of students scoring 65-100 on the US History Regents examination) + 0.20 (the percentage of students scoring 65-100 on the Comprehensive English Regents examination) The resulting percentage is then converted to points using the chart uploaded below.

Highly Effective (14 - 15 points) Results are well above District- or BOCES-adopted expectations for growth or achievement for grade/subject.

For the principal of a 3-5 building the percentages ranges between 63 and 100; for the principal of a 6-8 building the percentages range from 63 to 100; for the principal of a 9-12 building the percentages range between 85 and 100

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

For the principal of a 3-5 building the percentages ranges between 51 and 62; for the principal of a 6-8 building the percentages range from 51 to 62; for the principal of a 9-12 building the percentages range between 55 and 84

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

For the principal of a 3-5 building the percentages ranges between 31 and 50; for the principal of a 6-8 building the percentages range from 31 to 50; for the principal of a 9-12 building the percentages range between 31 and 54

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

For the principal of a 3-5 building the percentages ranges between 0 and 30; for the principal of a 6-8 building the percentages range from 0 to 30; for the principal of a 9-12 building the percentages range between 0 and 30

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/5366/181293-qBFVOWF7fC/0-15 principals.docx

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

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

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

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

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

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

Grade Configuration	Locally-Selected Measure from List of Approved Measures	Assessment
K-2	(d) measures used by district for teacher evaluation	Gorham-Middlesex CSD developed literacy assessment for grades K, 1 and 2

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

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

Use this box, if needed, to describe the process for assigning HEDI categories. If needed, you may upload a table or graphic below.	The principal of the Primary School (Grades K, 1 and 2) will receive a score calculated by totaling the percentage of students reading at or above the grade level benchmark for grades K, 1 and 2 on the last reading assessment of the school year. The benchmarks are: K- Independent Level 4, grade 1- Independent Level 18 and grade 2- Independent Level 28. This total is then divided by three to compute a school-wide average. The resulting percentage is then converted to points using the chart uploaded below.
Highly Effective (18 - 20 points) Results are well above District- or BOCES-adopted expectations for growth or achievement for grade/subject.	The percentage of students reading at or above grade level benchmark is between 66 and 100.
Effective (9- 17 points) Results meet District- or BOCES-adopted expectations for growth or achievement for grade/subject.	The percentage of students reading at or above grade level benchmark is between 41 and 65.
Developing (3 - 8 points) Results are below District- or BOCES-adopted expectations for growth or achievement for grade/subject.	The percentage of students reading at or above grade level benchmark is between 25 and 40.
Ineffective (0 - 2 points) Results are well below District- or BOCES-adopted expectations for growth or achievement for grade/subject.	The percentage of students reading at or above grade level benchmark is between 0 and 24.

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

(No response)

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

assets/survey-uploads/5366/181293-T8MIGWUVm1/0-20 Principal K-2.docx

8.3) Locally Developed Controls

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

(No response)

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.

None

8.5) Assurances

Please check all of the boxes below:

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

9. Other Measures of Effectiveness (Principals)

Created Wednesday, September 26, 2012

Updated Wednesday, December 05, 2012

Page 1

9.1) Principal Practice Rubric

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

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

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.

The Multidimensional Principal Performance Rubric contains 6 Domains plus one additional domain that include a total of 22 components. Each component will be rated from one to four and then the rating for each component will be added together and the sum divided by 22 to arrive at an average rubric rating between 1 and 4. The average rating will then be converted using the table provided below. We understand that the rubric score must be a whole number.

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/5143/182221-pMADJ4gk6R/Principal 0-60 Rubric Conversion Chart_1.docx](#)

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.	The overall rubric average score will be between 3.5 and 4.
Effective: Overall performance and results meet standards.	The overall rubric average score will be between 2.5 and 3.4.
Developing: Overall performance and results need improvement in order to meet standards.	The overall rubric average score will be between 1.5 and 2.4.
Ineffective: Overall performance and results do not meet standards.	The overall rubric average score will be between 1 and 1.4.

Please provide the locally-negotiated 60 point scoring bands.

Highly Effective	59-60
Effective	57-58
Developing	50-56

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	3
By trained administrator	0
By trained independent evaluator	0
Enter Total	3

Tenured Principals

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

10. Composite Scoring (Principals)

Created Wednesday, September 26, 2012

Updated Saturday, December 01, 2012

Page 1

Standards for Rating Categories

Growth or Comparable Measures

Locally-selected Measures of

growth or achievement

Other Measures of Effectiveness

(Teacher and Leader standards)

Highly

Effective

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

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

Overall performance and results exceed ISLLC leadership standards.

Effective

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

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

Overall performance and results meet ISLLC leadership standards.

Developing

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

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

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

Ineffective

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

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

Overall performance and results do not meet ISLLC leadership standards.

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

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

2012-13 where there is no Value-Added measure

Growth or Comparable Measures

Locally-selected Measures of

growth or achievement

Other Measures of Effectiveness

(60 points)

Overall

Composite Score

Highly Effective

18-20

18-20

Ranges determined locally--see below

91-100

Effective

9-17

9-17

75-90

Developing

3-8

3-8

65-74

Ineffective

0-2

0-2

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

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

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

2012-13 where Value-Added growth measure applies

Growth or Comparable Measures

Locally-selected Measures of growth or achievement

Other Measures of Effectiveness

(60 points)

Overall

Composite Score

Highly Effective

22-25

14-15

Ranges determined locally--see above

91-100

Effective

10-21

8-13

75-90

Developing

3-9

3-7

65-74

Ineffective

0-2

0-2

0-64

11. Additional Requirements - Principals

Created Wednesday, September 26, 2012

Updated Saturday, December 01, 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/5276/182354-Df0w3Xx5v6/Principal Improvement Plan.docx](assets/survey-uploads/5276/182354-Df0w3Xx5v6/Principal%20Improvement%20Plan.docx)

11.3) Appeals Process

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

(1) the substance of the annual professional performance review

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

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

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

Appeals Process

The following procedures are the exclusive means for initiating, reviewing and resolving any and all challenges and appeals related to a tenured administrator's Annual Professional Performance Review (APPR). Probationary administrators may only appeal procedural issues.

The grievance and/or arbitration procedures in any negotiated agreement shall not be used to appeal or review a tenured

administrator's annual professional performance review. To the extent that a conflict exists between a negotiated agreement and this procedure, the terms and conditions of this procedure shall prevail and be applied.

This procedure shall be in effect until any appeal of an administrator's evaluation for the 2012-13 school year is completed or until the parties reach agreement on an amended plan. The parties agree that the process and scoring methods will be assessed at the end of the 2012-13 school year and revised as necessary for the next year. Any and all changes to the agreement will adhere to the requirements of Education Law 3012-c. After that the procedure will remain in effect until the next contract negotiations or until the requirement to have such a procedure under Education Law §3012-c is repealed by law, regulation or a valid ruling by a court or administrative agency with jurisdiction.

- (1) Only administrators who receive a rating of "Ineffective" or "Developing" may appeal his or her performance review. Any administrators that receive a rating of "Effective" or "Highly Effective" cannot appeal, however, have the right to submit a written professional response to their APPR.
- (2) A administrator may appeal only the substance of his or her performance review, the school district's adherence to standards and methodologies required for such reviews, adherence to applicable regulations of the Commissioner of Education, and compliance with the procedures for the conduct of performance reviews set forth in the Annual Professional Performance Review plan.
- (3) An administrator may not file multiple appeals regarding the same performance review. All grounds for appealing a particular performance review must be raised within the same appeal. Any grounds not raised at the time the appeal is filed shall be deemed waived.
- (4) Appeals concerning a administrator's performance review must be received in the office of the Superintendent of Schools no later than 10 school days after he/she receives his/her APPR composite score. The failure to submit an appeal to the Superintendent of Schools within this time frame shall result in a waiver of the administrator's right to appeal that performance review.
- (5) Probationary administrators can only pursue procedural appeals using the same procedures available to tenured administrators. Tenured administrators can pursue procedural and/or substantive appeals. Process appeals and substantive appeals by tenured administrators shall be heard by a WFL BOCES designee. The WFL BOCES designee will be assigned to review and render a decision on the appeal within 30 calendar days of the filing of an appeal. The designee will be collaboratively agreed upon by Superintendent and MWAA President (or MWAA Designee).
- (6) A administrator wishing to initiate an appeal must submit a detailed description of the precise point(s) of disagreement over his or her performance review, along with any and all additional documents or written materials that he or she believes are relevant to the resolution of the appeal, to the Superintendent, with a copy to the MWAA President (or MWAA Designee). The appeal must be submitted in writing. E-mail or other electronic submissions are not permitted. Any additional information not submitted at the time the appeal is filed shall not be considered in the deliberations related to the resolution of the appeal.
- (7) Under this appeals process the administrator is expected to provide an explanation of relief requested. The administrator is required to provide facts and evidence upon which he/she seeks relief. All materials will be delivered to the WFL BOCES designee within 10 calendar days of selection by the district and MWAA.
- (8) The WFL BOCES designee, shall consider the evidence, perform any investigation, and render a written decision to the Superintendent, Administrator and the MWAA President (or MWAA Designee) within 30 calendar days of the receipt of the appeal documents.
- (9) The decision of the WFL BOCES designee shall be final and an appeal shall be deemed completed upon the issuance of that decision. The decision of the WFL BOCES designee shall not be subject to any further appeal. The designee will be collaboratively agreed upon by Superintendent and MWAA President (or MWAA Designee).
- (10) If the appeal is sustained, the original performance review shall be revised accordingly. The revised performance review may not be reviewed or appealed under this procedure. If the appeal is rejected, the original APPR and Composite Score shall remain unchanged.
- (11) At such time that the Annual Professional Performance Review will be used for supplemental compensation, the District and MWAA will negotiate specific details.

The administrator's failure to comply with the requirements of this Appeals Procedure shall result in a denial of the appeal.

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.

Lead evaluators in the district responsible for observing and evaluating administrators will be certified annually. They must successfully complete training sessions provided by the Network Team Equivalent and staff developers from Wayne-Finger Lakes BOCES. This training consists of monthly meetings facilitated by the Districts Network Team representative. The training also consists of each lead evaluator participating in collegial study of the Multidimensional Principal Performance Rubric with lead evaluators from seven other districts in BOCES. This training is focused on gathering evidence and using it to assess the components of the rubric. This includes 20 hours of meetings and "rating sessions" to examine evidence being gathered by each participant.

Lead evaluators will attend a full-day training session with Giselle Martin-Kniep that includes an exploration of the rationale behind the MPPR as well as the application of current research about goal setting for principals.

Approximately 22 hours of study leading to recertification will be provided through W-FL BOCES annually.

The issue of interrater reliability does not exist, because the superintendent is the only administrator responsible for evaluating principals.

11.5) Assurances -- Evaluators

Please check the boxes below:

-
- Checked
-

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

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

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

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

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

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

(7) use of the Statewide Instructional Reporting System

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

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

-
- Checked
-

11.6) Assurances -- Principals

Please check all of the boxes below:

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

11.7) Assurances -- Data

Please check all of the boxes below:

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

12. Joint Certification of APPR Plan

Created Wednesday, September 26, 2012

Updated Thursday, December 06, 2012

Page 1

12.1) Upload the Joint Certification of the APPR Plan

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

[assets/survey-uploads/5581/182346-3Uqgn5g9Iu/district certification form.pdf](assets/survey-uploads/5581/182346-3Uqgn5g9Iu/district%20certification%20form.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.

APPENDIX I – SLO Conversion Chart

Points will be assigned based on 80% of the students in the teacher’s SLO achieving growth as defined by the teacher and a building principal. A teacher will be considered mid-to-high range “effective” (HEDI rating with 14 points) if 80% of his/her students reach the SLO target. Points will be assigned depending upon the % of students who exceed or fall short of the target.

HIGHLY EFFECTIVE 86%+ of students meet target 18-20 points			EFFECTIVE 65-85% of students meet target 9-17 points									DEVELOPING 40-64% of students meet target 3-8 points					INEFFECTIVE 0-39% of students meet target 0-2 points			
20	19	18	17	16	15	<u>14</u>	13	12	11	10	9	8	7	6	5	4	3	2	1	0
95-100%	91-94%	86-90%	85%	83-84%	81-82%	<u>79-80%</u>	77-78%	74-76%	70-73%	67-69%	65-66%	60-64%	55-59%	50-54%	46-49%	42-45%	40-41%	26-39%	15-25%	0-14%

Upon implementation of a Value-Added Model by New York State, this chart will be used for Locally-selected Measure (0-15) for teachers with State Provided Growth Score only.

Each Building's Local Measures subcomponent score is converted into a 0-15 score using the appropriate chart.

Intermediate Building All teachers 3-5	
Ineffective	
0	0-11%
1	12-20
2	21-30
Developing	
3	31-35
4	36-40
5	41-45
6	46-48
7	49-50
Effective	
8	51-52
9	53-54
10	55-56
11	57-58
12	59-60
13	61-62
Highly Effective	
14	63-80
15	81-100

Middle School All teachers 6-8	
Ineffective	
0	0-11%
1	12-20
2	21-30
Developing	
3	31-35
4	36-40
5	41-45
6	46-48
7	49-50
Effective	
8	51-52
9	53-54
10	55-56
11	57-58
12	59-60
13	61-62
Highly Effective	
14	63-80
15	81-100

APPENDIX G—Locally Determined Measures 0-20 Conversion Chart

For current use for all teachers

Each Building's Local Measures subcomponent score is converted into a 0-20 score using the appropriate chart.

Primary Building All teachers K-2	Intermediate Building All teachers 3-5	Middle School All teachers 6-8	High School All teachers 9-12
Ineffective	Ineffective	Ineffective	Ineffective
0-16% 0	0-16% 0	0-16% 0	0-20% 0
17-19 1	17-19 1	17-19 1	21-30 1
20-24 2	20-24 2	20-24 2	31-40 2
Developing	Developing	Developing	Developing
25-26 3	25-26 3	25-26 3	41-42 3
27-29 4	27-29 4	27-29 4	43-44 4
30-31 5	30-31 5	30-31 5	45-46 5
32-34 6	32-34 6	32-34 6	47-48 6
35-38 7	35-38 7	35-38 7	49-50 7
Effective	Effective	Effective	Effective
39-40 8	39-40 8	39-40 8	51-52 8
41-42 9	41-42 9	41-42 9	53-54 9
43-44 10	43-44 10	43-44 10	55-57 10
45-46 11	45-46 11	45-46 11	58-59 11
47-48 12	47-48 12	47-48 12	60-64 12
49-50 13	49-50 13	49-50 13	65-70 13
51-54 14	51-52 14	51-54 14	71-75 14
55-58 15	53-54 15	55-58 15	76-80 15
59-61 16	55-56 16	59-61 16	81-84 16
62-65 17	57-59 17	62-65 17	85-89 17
Highly Effective	Highly Effective	Highly Effective	Highly Effective
66-75 18	60-69 18	66-75 18	90-95 18
76-85 19	70-85 19	76-85 19	96-97 19
86-100 20	86-100 20	86-100 20	98-100 20

Upon implementation of a Value-Added Model by New York State, this chart will be used for Locally-selected Measure (0-15) for principals with State Provided Growth Score only.

Each Building's Local Measures subcomponent score is converted into a 0-15 score using the appropriate chart.

Intermediate Building All teachers 3-5	Middle School All teachers 6-8	High School All teachers 9-12
Ineffective	Ineffective	Ineffective
0 0-11%	0 0-11%	0 0-11%
1 12-20	1 12-20	1 12-20
2 21-30	2 21-30	2 21-30
Developing	Developing	Developing
3 31-35	3 31-35	3 31-35
4 36-40	4 36-40	4 36-40
5 41-45	5 41-45	5 41-45
6 46-48	6 46-48	6 46-50
7 49-50	7 49-50	7 51-54
Effective	Effective	Effective
8 51-52	8 51-52	8 55-59
9 53-54	9 53-54	9 60-64
10 55-56	10 55-56	10 65-69
11 57-58	11 57-58	11 70-74
12 59-60	12 59-60	12 75-79
13 61-62	13 61-62	13 80-84
Highly Effective	Highly Effective	Highly Effective
14 63-80	14 63-80	14 85-95
15 81-100	15 81-100	15 96-100

0-20 Conversion Chart

For current use for K-2 principal

Primary Building Principal K-2	
Ineffective	
0-16%	0
17-19	1
20-24	2
Developing	
25-26	3
27-29	4
30-31	5
32-34	6
35-38	7
39-40	8
Effective	
41-42	9
43-44	10
45-46	11
47-48	12
49-50	13
51-54	14
55-58	15
59-61	16
62-65	17
Highly Effective	
66-75	18
76-85	19
86-100	20

APPENDIX F -- Teacher Practice 0-60 Scoring Conversion Chart using Danielson Frameworks for Teaching 2011 Rubric

HEDI Rating	Overall rubric average score	60 point distribution for composite
Ineffective	1-1.4	0-49
Developing	1.5-2.4	50-56
Effective	2.5-3.4	57-58
Highly Effective	3.5-4	59-60

Rubric Score to Sub-Component Conversion Chart

The following chart will be used to convert a teacher’s 1-4 score on the Danielson rubric into the 0-60 points for the teacher effectiveness component of the evaluation. When calculating the composite score for teachers, simple rounding rules will apply (any number containing a decimal from 0.50 up will be rounded up to the next whole number).

Total Average Rubric Score	Category	Conversion Score for Composite
Ineffective 0-49		
1.000		0
1.008		1
1.017		2
1.025		3
1.033		4
1.042		5
1.050		6
1.058		7
1.067		8
1.075		9
1.083		10
1.092		11
1.100		12
1.108		13
1.115		14
1.123		15
1.131		16
1.138		17
1.146		18
1.154		19
1.162		20
1.169		21
1.177		22
1.185		23
1.192		24
1.200		25
1.208		26
1.217		27
1.225		28

1.233		29
1.242		30
1.250		31
1.258		32
1.267		33
1.275		34
1.283		35
1.292		36
1.300		37
1.308		38
1.317		39
1.325		40
1.333		41
1.342		42
1.350		43
1.358		44
1.367		45
1.375		46
1.383		47
1.392		48
1.400		49
Developing 50-56		
1.5		50
1.6		50.7
1.7		51.4
1.8		52.1
1.9		52.8
2		53.5
2.1		54.2
2.2		54.9
2.3		55.6
2.4		56.3
Effective 57-58		
2.5		57
2.6		57.2
2.7		57.4
2.8		57.6
2.9		57.8
3		58
3.1		58.2
3.2		58.4
3.3		58.6
3.4		58.8
Highly Effective 59-60		
3.5		59
3.6		59.3
3.7		59.5
3.8		59.8
3.9		60
4		60.25 (round to 60)

If the Commissioner of Education changes the scoring bands, the District and Association will negotiate a new scoring system if the current system will no longer work with the new bands.

APPENDIX L

Awareness Phase Plan/Awareness Phase Review

Marcus Whitman Central School District

Name: _____ Grade/Subject: _____

Administrator: _____ **Date:** _____

Awareness Phase Plan/Awareness Phase Review

Marcus Whitman Central School District

Name: _____ Grade/Subject: _____

Administrator: _____ Date: _____

Awareness Phase Plan

Specific statement of problem(s) related to the components of the Frameworks for Teaching Rubric:

Goals (measurable, action-oriented, realistic, time-bound):

Time frame: _____

Administrator Signature

Date

I have discussed the contents of this document with the administrator and have been provided the opportunity to respond in writing.

Teacher Signature

Date

Written response attached: Yes No

Awareness Phase Review

Date: _____

Administrator's recommendations:

Teacher Comments:

Administrator Signature

Date

I have discussed the contents of this document with the administrator and have been provided the opportunity to respond in writing.

Teacher Signature

Date

Awareness Phase Plan

Specific statement of problem(s) related to the components of the Frameworks for Teaching Rubric:

Goals (measurable, action-oriented, realistic, time-bound):

Time frame: _____

Administrator Signature

Date

I have discussed the contents of this document with the administrator and have been provided the opportunity to respond in writing.

Teacher Signature

Date

Written response attached: Yes No

Awareness Phase Review

Date: _____

Administrator's recommendations:

Teacher Comments:

Administrator Signature

Date

I have discussed the contents of this document with the administrator and have been provided the opportunity to respond in writing.

Teacher Signature

Date

APPENDIX M

Professional Assistance Plan

Marcus Whitman Central School District

____ Collaborative Assistance Plan

____ Directed Assistance Plan

Name: _____ Discipline/Grade: _____

Professional Assistance Plan

Marcus Whitman Central School District

____ Collaborative Assistance Plan

____ Directed Assistance Plan

Name: _____ Discipline/Grade: _____

Administrator: _____ Date: _____

Specific Statement of Problem(s) related to the Components of the Frameworks for Teaching Rubric:

Goals (measurable, action-oriented, realistic, time-bound):

Strategies/Resources/Indicators of Progress

Review Dates:

Administrator Signature

Date

I have discussed the contents of this document with the administrator and have been provided the opportunity to respond in writing.

Teacher Signature

Date

Written response attached: Yes No

Administrator: _____ Date: _____

Specific Statement of Problem(s) related to the Components of the Frameworks for Teaching Rubric:

Goals (measurable, action-oriented, realistic, time-bound):

Strategies/Resources/Indicators of Progress

Review Dates:

Administrator Signature

Date

I have discussed the contents of this document with the administrator and have been provided the opportunity to respond in writing.

Teacher Signature

Date

Written response attached: Yes No

PROFESSIONAL ASSISTANCE PLAN

Meeting Summary/Evaluation Summary Report

___ Collaborative Assistance Plan

___ Directed Assistance Plan

Name: _____ Administrator: _____

Which meeting: ___ First ___ Second ___ Third ___ Fourth ___ Fifth

Goal(s) addressed:

Strategies implemented:

Resources/Support Utilized to Date:

Administrator Comments/Recommendations:

Teacher Comments:

Next meeting date: _____

Administrator Signature

Date

I have discussed the contents of this document with the administrator and have been provided the opportunity to respond in writing.

Teacher Signature

Date

SLO Conversion Chart

Points will be assigned based on 80% of the students in the principal’s SLO achieving growth as defined by the superintendent and building principal. A principal will be considered mid-to-high range “effective” (HEDI rating with 14 points) if 80% of the students reach the SLO target. Points will be assigned depending upon the % of students who exceed or fall short of the target.

Example: Eighty (80%) of the students will demonstrate growth of one grade level (determined by the teacher and principal) on the regionally developed assessments. (Underlined portions are determined by superintendent and principal annually after pre-assessment given.)

HIGHLY EFFECTIVE 86%+ of students meet target 18-20 points			EFFECTIVE 65-85% of students meet target 9-17 points									DEVELOPING 40-64% of students meet target 3-8 points					INEFFECTIVE 0-39% of students meet target 0-2 points			
20	19	18	17	16	15	<u>14</u>	13	12	11	10	9	8	7	6	5	4	3	2	1	0
95-100%	91-94%	86-90%	85%	83-84%	81-82%	<u>79-80%</u>	77-78%	74-76%	70-73%	67-69%	65-66%	60-64%	55-59%	50-54%	46-49%	42-45%	40-41%	26-39%	15-25%	0-14%

Principal Practice 0-60 Scoring Conversion Chart using Multidimensional Principal Performance Rubric

HEDI Rating	Overall rubric average score	60 point distribution for composite
Ineffective	1-1.4	0-49
Developing	1.5-2.4	50-56
Effective	2.5-3.4	57-58
Highly Effective	3.5-4	59-60

Rubric Score to Sub-Component Conversion Chart

The following chart will be used to convert a principal’s 1-4 score on the MPP rubric into the 0-60 points for the principal effectiveness component of the evaluation. We understand that the rubric score must be a whole number. When calculating the composite score for principals, standard rounding rules will apply (any number containing a decimal from 0.50 up will be rounded up to the next whole number).

Total Average Rubric Score	Category	Conversion Score for Composite
Ineffective 0-49		
1.000		0
1.008		1
1.017		2
1.025		3
1.033		4
1.042		5
1.050		6
1.058		7
1.067		8
1.075		9
1.083		10
1.092		11
1.100		12
1.108		13
1.115		14
1.123		15
1.131		16
1.138		17
1.146		18
1.154		19
1.162		20
1.169		21
1.177		22
1.185		23
1.192		24
1.200		25
1.208		26
1.217		27

1.225		28
1.233		29
1.242		30
1.250		31
1.258		32
1.267		33
1.275		34
1.283		35
1.292		36
1.300		37
1.308		38
1.317		39
1.325		40
1.333		41
1.342		42
1.350		43
1.358		44
1.367		45
1.375		46
1.383		47
1.392		48
1.400		49
Developing 50-56		
1.5		50
1.6		50.7
1.7		51.4
1.8		52.1
1.9		52.8
2		53.5
2.1		54.2
2.2		54.9
2.3		55.6
2.4		56.3
Effective 57-58		
2.5		57
2.6		57.2
2.7		57.4
2.8		57.6
2.9		57.8
3		58
3.1		58.2
3.2		58.4
3.3		58.6
3.4		58.8
Highly Effective 59-60		
3.5		59
3.6		59.3
3.7		59.5
3.8		59.8
3.9		60
4		60.25 (round to 60)

If the Commissioner of Education changes the scoring bands, the District and Association will negotiate a new scoring system if the current system will no longer work with the new bands.

Principal Improvement Plan

PURPOSE:

- To enable a principal the opportunity to seek assistance in any of the components of the Multidimensional Principal Performance Rubric (MPPR);
- To provide a more structured process for a principal who earns a composite score on an annual evaluation that indicates that the principal is “Ineffective” or “Developing.” The administrator scoring as Ineffective or Developing will enter the improvement plan at either the Collaborative or Directed Assistance phase.
- To provide due process for disciplinary action.

THREE PHASES:

- Awareness Phase
- Collaborative Assistance Phase
- Directed Assistance Phase

AWARENESS PHASE

1. A concern is identified by the superintendent or principal.
2. The superintendent and principal meet to collaborate and attempt to resolve the concern in an agreed-upon time frame. (*Attachment J—Awareness Phase Plan/Awareness Phase Review*)
3. At the conclusion of the Awareness Phase, the superintendent will review the progress and will make one of the following recommendations:
 - The principal has adequately corrected the concern.
 - In the event the concern is not resolved, the principal is placed into either the collaborative or directed assistance phase. At this point, the principal will be advised by the superintendent to discuss the situation with the Marcus Whitman Administrators Association or designated representative. The principal or the administrator may request other representation in all subsequent meetings regarding the concern.

COLLABORATIVE ASSISTANCE PHASE

1. Review the recommendations from the Awareness Phase.
2. A specific plan will be developed which includes:
 - Growth-promoting goals that are specific, measurable, action oriented, realistic, and time bound;
 - Strategies for resolution of the concern;
 - Timelines;
 - Indicators of progress;
 - Resources and support needed. (*Attachment K—Professional Assistance Plan*)

3. The superintendent and administrator set up a specific time to review what progress has been made. (*Attachment L—Professional Assistance Plan Meeting Summary/Evaluation Summary Report will be used with each meeting held for reviewing progress.*)
4. One of the following recommendations will be made upon reviewing the teacher’s progress (*Attachment L*):
 - The concern is resolved and the PIP is ended.
 - The principal remains in the Collaborative Assistance Phase with revised goals and timelines. OR
 - The concern is not resolved, and the principal is moved into the Directed Assistance Phase.

NOTE:

To protect the principal who is working to improve his or her work, data obtained during the Awareness or Collaborative Assistance Phase may not be used in further action against the principal. An exception would be an event or additional information concerning a blatant violation of a specific policy or rule that initiates an immediate move from the Awareness Phase or the Collaborative Assistance Phase into the Directed Assistance Phase.

DIRECTED ASSISTANCE PHASE

1. The principal may be placed in the Directed Assistance Phase because of, but not limited to:
 - Not achieving the “Effective” or “Highly Effective” level on specific components of the MPPR after being in the Collaborative Assistance Phase;
 - Insubordination;
 - Specific policy or rule violation(s).
2. The Directed Assistance Phase begins with a meeting between the superintendent, principal, and Marcus Whitman Administrators Association President or designated representative. Other resource people may be involved.
3. The superintendent will identify in writing the specific components of the MPPR, rule or policy in violation. The principal will be given an opportunity to respond. Following the discussion, the superintendent will indicate the next steps to be taken, such as:
 - A specific remedial plan with timeline (*Attachment K; progress will be reviewed using Attachment L*);
 - Requirement of specific training in or outside of the school, or evaluation by a professional;
 - Placement of the principal on paid administrative leave;
 - Recommendation for further corrective action by the Board of Education, following New York State Education Law.
4. The Directed Assistance Phase only addresses ongoing performance concerns not corrected by the principal under either the Awareness Phase or the Collaborative Assistance Phase. The Directed Assistance Phase is not intended as a restriction on the district’s right to take appropriate disciplinary action for principal misconduct without prior resort to either the Awareness Phase or the Collaborative Assistance Phase.

Awareness Phase Plan/Awareness Phase Review
Marcus Whitman Central School District

Principal: _____ Grade/Subject: _____

Superintendent: _____ Date: _____

Awareness Phase Plan

Specific statement of problem(s) related to the Multidimensional Principal performance Rubric:

Goals (measurable, action-oriented, realistic, time-bound):

Time frame: _____

Superintendent's Signature

Date

I have discussed the contents of this document with the administrator and have been provided the opportunity to respond in writing.

Principal's Signature

Date

Written response attached: Yes No

Awareness Phase Review

Date: _____

Superintendent's recommendations:

Principal Comments:

Superintendent's Signature

Date

I have discussed the contents of this document with the administrator and have been provided the opportunity to respond in writing.

Principal Signature

Date

Professional Assistance Plan

Marcus Whitman Central School District

____ Collaborative Assistance Plan

____ Directed Assistance Plan

Principal: _____

Discipline/Grade: _____

Superintendent: _____

Date: _____

Specific Statement of Problem(s) related to the Multidimensional Principal Performance Rubric; act(s) of insubordination; or specific rule or policy violation:

Goals (measurable, action-oriented, realistic, time-bound):

Strategies/Resources/Indicators of Progress

Review Dates:

Administrator Signature

Date

I have discussed the contents of this document with the administrator and have been provided the opportunity to respond in writing.

Teacher Signature

Date

Written response attached: Yes No

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

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

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

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

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

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

Signatures, dates

Superintendent Signature: Date:

Whitney Chiles *12-6-12*

Teachers Union President Signature: Date:

Nicole J Green *12-6-12*

Administrative Union President Signature: Date:

Susan M. Hissel *12-6-12*

Board of Education President Signature: Date:

Mary M Evans *12-6-12*