



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 12, 2012

Dr. Michael Mugits, Superintendent
Green Island Union Free School District
171 Hudson Avenue
Green Island, NY 12183

Dear Superintendent Mugits:

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: Charles Dedrick

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 Tuesday, May 15, 2012

Updated Tuesday, December 11, 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 : 010701030000

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

010701030000

1.2) School District Name: GREEN ISLAND UFSD

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

GREEN ISLAND UFSD

1.3) School Improvement Grant (SIG) Districts Only

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

(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 17, 2012

Updated Tuesday, December 11, 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	State-approved 3rd party assessment	NWEA Measures of Academic Progress for Primary Grades
1	State-approved 3rd party assessment	NWEA Measures of Academic Progress for Primary Grades
2	State-approved 3rd party assessment	NWEA Measures of Academic Progress, ELA
	ELA	Assessment
3	State assessment	3rd Grade State Assessment

For K-3 ELA: describe the district-adopted expectations for the level of performance required for each HEDI rating category and the process for assigning points to teachers based on SLO results consistent with regulations and assurances in the Comparable Growth Measures subcomponent. Include any district-determined expectations for 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.

SLO's for teachers will utilize a state approved 3rd party vendor (NWEA Measure of Academic Progress), or Green Island developed, pre-assessment and post-assessment, to measure growth across grades K-2. Teachers will be assigned points based on the percentage of learners meeting targeted growth rates set by teachers and their lead evaluator in accordance with the attached HEDI scale. Grade 3 teachers will be assigned points based on the percentage of learners meeting targeted growth rates relative to the state assessments and the HEDI scale. Teachers scores will be based on the degree to which their goals were attained. The pre-assessment will be administered at the beginning of the interval of time defined in the SLO. The SLO will assess the critical learning attributes throughout the duration of the SLO defined time-span. The post-assessment will be administered during the time-interval parameters governed by the SLO. Teachers will be assigned points per the District HEDI criteria.

Highly Effective (18-20 points) = Results are well above state average for similar students (or District goals in the absence of state tests). 90%-100% of the learners achieve or exceed the target determined in the Student Learning Objective.

Effective (9-17 points) Results meet state average for similar students (or District goals in the absence of state tests). 51%-89% of the learners achieve or exceed the target determined in the Student Learning Objective.

Developing (3-8 points) Results are below state average for similar learners (or District goals in the absence of state tests). 36%-50% of the learners achieve or exceed the target determined in the Student Learning Objective.

Ineffective (0-2 points) Results are well below state average for similar learners (or District goals in the absence of state tests) 0%-35% of the learners achieve or exceed the target determined in the Student learning Objective.

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

Results reveal exceptional learning gains relative to District adopted expectations for growth or achievement of learning standards for grade/subject (see attached chart)

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

Results reveal that learning gains meet District adopted expectations for growth or achievement of learning standards for grade/subject (see attached chart)

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

Results reveal that learning gains are below District adopted expectations for growth or achievement of learning standards for grade/subject (see attached chart)

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

Results reveal that learning gains are well-below District adopted expectations for growth or achievement of learning standards for grade/subject (see attached chart)

2.3) Grades K-3 Math

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

Math	Assessment
------	------------

K	State-approved 3rd party assessment	NWEA Measures of Academic Progress for Primary Grades
1	State-approved 3rd party assessment	NWEA Measures of Academic Progress for primary Grades
2	State-approved 3rd party assessment	NWEA Measures of Academic Progress, Math
	Math	Assessment
3	State assessment	3rd Grade State Assessment

For Grades K-3 Math: describe the district-adopted expectations for the level of performance required for each HEDI rating category and the process for assigning points to teachers based on SLO results consistent with regulations and assurances in the Comparable Growth Measures subcomponent. Include any district-determined expectations for 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.

SLO's for teachers will utilize a state approved 3rd party vendor (NWEA Measure of Academic Progress), or Green Island developed, pre-assessment and post-assessment, to measure growth across grades K-2. Teachers will be assigned points based on the percentage of learners meeting targeted growth rates set by teachers and their lead evaluator in accordance with the attached HEDI scale. Grade 3 teachers will be assigned points based on the percentage of learners meeting targeted growth rates relative to the state assessments and the HEDI scale. Teachers scores will be based on the degree to which their goals were attained. The pre-assessment will be administered at the beginning of the interval of time defined in the SLO. The SLO will assess the critical learning attributes throughout the duration of the SLO defined time-span. The post-assessment will be administered during the time-interval parameters governed by the SLO. Teachers will be assigned points per the District HEDI criteria.

Highly Effective (18-20 points) = Results are well above state average for similar students (or District goals in the absence of state tests). 90%-100% of the learners achieve or exceed the target determined in the Student Learning Objective.

Effective (9-17 points) Results meet state average for similar students (or District goals in the absence of state tests). 51%-89% of the learners achieve or exceed the target determined in the Student Learning Objective.

Developing (3-8 points) Results are below state average for similar learners (or District goals in the absence of state tests). 36%-50% of the learners achieve or exceed the target determined in the Student Learning Objective.

Ineffective (0-2 points) Results are well below state average for similar learners (or District goals in the absence of state tests) 0%-35% of the learners achieve or exceed the target determined in the Student learning Objective.

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

Results reveal exceptional learning gains relative to District adopted expectations for growth or achievement of learning standards for grade/subject (see attached chart)

Effective (9 - 17 points) Results meet state average for similar students (or District goals if no state test).	Results reveal that learning gains meet District adopted expectations for growth or achievement of learning standards for grade/subject (see attached chart)
Developing (3 - 8 points) Results are below state average for similar students (or District goals if no state test).	Results reveal that learning gains are below District adopted expectations for growth or achievement of learning standards for grade/subject (see attached chart)
Ineffective (0 - 2 points) Results are well-below state average for similar students (or District goals if no state test).	Results reveal that learning gains are well-below District adopted expectations for growth or achievement of learning standards for grade/subject (see attached chart)

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	Green Island developed 6th Grade Science assessment.
7	District, regional or BOCES-developed assessment	Green Island developed 7th Grade Science assessment.
	Science	Assessment
8	State assessment	8th Grade State Science Assessment

For Grades 6-8 Science: describe the district-adopted expectations for the level of performance required for each HEDI rating category and the process for assigning points to teachers based on SLO results consistent with regulations and assurances in the Comparable Growth Measures subcomponent. Include any district-determined expectations for 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.	<p>SLO's for teachers will utilize baseline data and a Green Island developed, pre-assessment and post-assessment, to measure growth. Teachers will be assigned points based on the percentage of learners meeting targeted growth rates set by teachers and their lead evaluator in accordance with the attached HEDI scale. Teachers scores will be based on the degree to which their goals were attained. The pre-assessment will be administered at the beginning of the interval of time defined in the SLO. The SLO will assess the critical learning attributes throughout the duration of the SLO defined time-span. The post-assessment will be administered during the time-interval parameters governed by the SLO. Teachers will be assigned points per the District HEDI criteria.</p> <p>Highly Effective (18-20 points) = Results are well above state average for similar students (or District goals in the absence of state tests). 90%-100% of the learners achieve or exceed the target determined in the Student Learning Objective.</p> <p>Effective (9-17 points) Results meet state average for similar students (or District goals in the absence of state tests). 51%-89% of the learners achieve or exceed the target determined in the Student Learning Objective.</p> <p>Developing (3-8 points) Results are below state average</p>
---	--

for similar learners (or District goals in the absence of state tests). 36%-50% of the learners achieve or exceed the target determined in the Student Learning Objective. Ineffective (0-2 points) Results are well below state average for similar learners (or District goals in the absence of state tests) 0%-35% of the learners achieve or exceed the target determined in the Student learning Objective.

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

Results reveal exceptional learning gains relative to District adopted expectations for growth or achievement of learning standards for grade/subject (see attached chart)

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

Results reveal that learning gains meet District adopted expectations for growth or achievement of learning standards for grade/subject (see attached chart)

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

Results reveal that learning gains are below District adopted expectations for growth or achievement of learning standards for grade/subject (see attached chart)

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

Results reveal that learning gains are well-below District adopted expectations for growth or achievement of learning standards for grade/subject (see attached chart)

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	Green Island UFSD developed 6th Grade Social Studies Assessments
7	District, regional or BOCES-developed assessment	Green Island UFSD developed 7th Grade Social Studies Assessments
8	District, regional or BOCES-developed assessment	Green Island UFSD developed 8th Grade Social Studies Assessments

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.

SLO's for teachers will utilize baseline data and a Green Island developed, pre-assessment and post-assessment, to measure growth. Teachers will be assigned points based on the percentage of learners meeting targeted growth rates set by teachers and their lead evaluator in accordance with the attached HEDI scale. Teachers scores will be based on the degree to which their goals were attained. The pre-assessment will be administered at the beginning of the interval of time defined in the SLO. The SLO will assess the critical learning attributes throughout the duration of the SLO defined time-span. The post-assessment will be administered during the time-interval parameters governed by the SLO. Teachers will be assigned points per the District HEDI criteria. Highly Effective (18-20 points) = Results are well above

state average for similar students (or District goals in the absence of state tests). 90%-100% of the learners achieve or exceed the target determined in the Student Learning Objective.

Effective (9-17 points) Results meet state average for similar students (or District goals in the absence of state tests). 51%-89% of the learners achieve or exceed the target determined in the Student Learning Objective.

Developing (3-8 points) Results are below state average for similar learners (or District goals in the absence of state tests). 36%-50% of the learners achieve or exceed the target determined in the Student Learning Objective.

Ineffective (0-2 points) Results are well below state average for similar learners (or District goals in the absence of state tests) 0%-35% of the learners achieve or exceed the target determined in the Student learning Objective.

Highly Effective (18 - 20 points) Results are well-above District goals for similar students.	Results reveal exceptional learning gains relative to District adopted expectations for growth or achievement of learning standards for grade/subject (see attached chart)
Effective (9 - 17 points) Results meet District goals for similar students.	Results reveal that learning gains meet District adopted expectations for growth or achievement of learning standards for grade/subject (see attached chart)
Developing (3 - 8 points) Results are below District goals for similar students.	Results reveal that learning gains are below District adopted expectations for growth or achievement of learning standards for grade/subject (see attached chart)
Ineffective (0 - 2 points) Results are well-below District goals for similar students.	Results reveal that learning gains are well-below District adopted expectations for growth or achievement of learning standards for grade/subject (see attached chart)

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	Green Island UFSD developed Global 1 Assessments
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.

SLO's for teachers will utilize baseline data and a Green Island developed, pre-assessment and post-assessment, to measure growth in Global 1. Teachers of Global 2 and American History will utilize a Green Island developed assessment as a pre-assessment, and use the state Regents exams as a post-assessment. Teachers will be assigned points based on the percentage of learners meeting targeted growth rates set by teachers and their lead evaluator in accordance with the attached HEDI scale.

Teachers scores will be based on the degree to which their goals were attained. The pre-assessment will be administered at the beginning of the interval of time defined in the SLO. The SLO will assess the critical learning attributes throughout the duration of the SLO defined time-span. The post-assessment will be administered during the time-interval parameters governed by the SLO. Teachers will be assigned points per the District HEDI criteria.

Highly Effective (18-20 points) = Results are well above state average for similar students (or District goals in the absence of state tests). 90%-100% of the learners achieve or exceed the target determined in the Student Learning Objective.

Effective (9-17 points) Results meet state average for similar students (or District goals in the absence of state tests). 51%-89% of the learners achieve or exceed the target determined in the Student Learning Objective.

Developing (3-8 points) Results are below state average for similar learners (or District goals in the absence of state tests). 36%-50% of the learners achieve or exceed the target determined in the Student Learning Objective.

Ineffective (0-2 points) Results are well below state average for similar learners (or District goals in the absence of state tests) 0%-35% of the learners achieve or exceed the target determined in the Student learning Objective.

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

Results reveal exceptional learning gains relative to District adopted expectations for growth or achievement of learning standards for grade/subject (see attached chart)

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

Results reveal that learning gains meet District adopted expectations for growth or achievement of learning standards for grade/subject (see attached chart)

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

Results reveal that learning gains are below District adopted expectations for growth or achievement of learning standards for grade/subject (see attached chart)

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

Results reveal that learning gains are well-below District adopted expectations for growth or achievement of learning standards for grade/subject (see attached chart)

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.

<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>SLO's for teachers will utilize baseline data and a Green Island developed pre-assessment along with a Regents-assessment serving as a post assessment, to measure growth. Teachers will be assigned points based on the percentage of learners meeting targeted growth rates set by teachers and their lead evaluator in accordance with the attached HEDI scale. Teachers scores will be based on the degree to which their goals were attained. The pre-assessment will be administered at the beginning of the interval of time defined in the SLO. The SLO will assess the critical learning attributes throughout the duration of the SLO defined time-span. The post-assessment will be administered during the time-interval parameters governed by the SLO. Teachers will be assigned points per the District HEDI criteria.</p> <p>Highly Effective (18-20 points) = Results are well above state average for similar students (or District goals in the absence of state tests). 90%-100% of the learners achieve or exceed the target determined in the Student Learning Objective.</p> <p>Effective (9-17 points) Results meet state average for similar students (or District goals in the absence of state tests). 51%-89% of the learners achieve or exceed the target determined in the Student Learning Objective.</p> <p>Developing (3-8 points) Results are below state average for similar learners (or District goals in the absence of state tests). 36%-50% of the learners achieve or exceed the target determined in the Student Learning Objective.</p> <p>Ineffective (0-2 points) Results are well below state average for similar learners (or District goals in the absence of state tests) 0%-35% of the learners achieve or exceed the target determined in the Student learning Objective.</p>
<p>Highly Effective (18 - 20 points) Results are well-above District goals for similar students.</p>	<p>Results reveal exceptional learning gains relative to District adopted expectations for growth or achievement of learning standards for grade/subject (see attached chart)</p>
<p>Effective (9 - 17 points) Results meet District goals for similar students.</p>	<p>Results reveal that learning gains meet District adopted expectations for growth or achievement of learning standards for grade/subject (see attached chart)</p>
<p>Developing (3 - 8 points) Results are below District goals for similar students.</p>	<p>Results reveal that learning gains are below District adopted expectations for growth or achievement of learning standards for grade/subject (see attached chart)</p>

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

Results reveal that learning gains are well-below District adopted expectations for growth or achievement of learning standards for grade/subject (see attached chart)

2.8) High School Math Regents Courses

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

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

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

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

Use this box, if needed, to describe the general process for assigning HEDI categories for these grades/subjects in this subcomponent. If needed, you may upload a table or graphic at 2.11, below.

SLO's for teachers will utilize baseline data and a Green Island developed pre-assessment along with a Regents-assessment serving as a post assessment, to measure growth. Teachers will be assigned points based on the percentage of learners meeting targeted growth rates set by teachers and their lead evaluator in accordance with the attached HEDI scale. Teachers scores will be based on the degree to which their goals were attained. The pre-assessment will be administered at the beginning of the interval of time defined in the SLO. The SLO will assess the critical learning attributes throughout the duration of the SLO defined time-span. The post-assessment will be administered during the time-interval parameters governed by the SLO. Teachers will be assigned points per the District HEDI criteria. Highly Effective (18-20 points) = Results are well above state average for similar students (or District goals in the absence of state tests). 90%-100% of the learners achieve or exceed the target determined in the Student Learning Objective.

Effective (9-17 points) Results meet state average for similar students (or District goals in the absence of state tests). 51%-89% of the learners achieve or exceed the target determined in the Student Learning Objective.
Developing (3-8 points) Results are below state average for similar learners (or District goals in the absence of state tests). 36%-50% of the learners achieve or exceed the target determined in the Student Learning Objective.
Ineffective (0-2 points) Results are well below state average for similar learners (or District goals in the absence of state tests) 0%-35% of the learners achieve or exceed the target determined in the Student learning Objective.

Highly Effective (18 - 20 points) Results are well-above District goals for similar students.	Results reveal exceptional learning gains relative to District adopted expectations for growth or achievement of learning standards for grade/subject (see attached chart)
Effective (9 - 17 points) Results meet District goals for similar students.	Results reveal that learning gains meet District adopted expectations for growth or achievement of learning standards for grade/subject (see attached chart)
Developing (3 - 8 points) Results are below District goals for similar students.	Results reveal that learning gains are below District adopted expectations for growth or achievement of learning standards for grade/subject (see attached chart)
Ineffective (0 - 2 points) Results are well-below District goals for similar students.	Results reveal that learning gains are well-below District adopted expectations for growth or achievement of learning standards for grade/subject (see attached chart)

2.9) High School English Language Arts

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

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

	High School English Courses	Assessment
Grade 9 ELA	District, regional or BOCES-developed assessment	Green Island UFSD developed Grade 9 ELA assessments.
Grade 10 ELA	District, regional or BOCES-developed assessment	Green Island UFSD developed Grade 10 ELA assessments.
Grade 11 ELA	Regents assessment	Grade 11 ELA Regents Exam

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

Use this box, if needed, to describe the general process for assigning HEDI categories for these grades/subjects in this subcomponent. If needed, you may upload a table or graphic at 2.11, below.	SLO's for teachers will utilize baseline data and a Green Island developed pre-assessment and post-assessment in Grades 9 and 10 to measure growth. Grade 11 will use a Green Island developed assessment for the pre-assessment and the Regents exam as a post-assessment. Teachers will be assigned points based on the percentage of learners meeting targeted growth rates set by teachers and their lead evaluator in accordance with the attached HEDI scale. Teachers scores will be based on the degree to which their goals were attained. The pre-assessment will be administered at the beginning of the interval of time defined in the SLO. The SLO will assess the critical learning attributes throughout the duration of the SLO defined time-span. The post-assessment will be administered during the time-interval parameters governed by the SLO. Teachers will be assigned points per the District HEDI criteria. Highly Effective (18-20 points) = Results are well above state average for similar students (or District goals in the absence of state tests). 90%-100% of the learners achieve
---	--

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.

SLO's for teachers will utilize baseline data and a Green Island developed pre-assessment and post-assessment to measure growth in the respective grades/subjects. Teachers will be assigned points based on the percentage of learners meeting targeted growth rates set by teachers and their lead evaluator in accordance with the attached HEDI scale. Teachers scores will be based on the degree to which their goals were attained. The pre-assessment will be administered at the beginning of the interval of time defined in the SLO. The SLO will assess the critical learning attributes throughout the duration of the SLO defined time-span. The post-assessment will be administered during the time-interval parameters governed by the SLO. Teachers will be assigned points per the District HEDI criteria.

Highly Effective (18-20 points) = Results are well above state average for similar students (or District goals in the absence of state tests). 90%-100% of the learners achieve or exceed the target determined in the Student Learning Objective.

Effective (9-17 points) Results meet state average for similar students (or District goals in the absence of state tests). 51%-89% of the learners achieve or exceed the target determined in the Student Learning Objective.

Developing (3-8 points) Results are below state average for similar learners (or District goals in the absence of state tests). 36%-50% of the learners achieve or exceed the target determined in the Student Learning Objective.

Ineffective (0-2 points) Results are well below state average for similar learners (or District goals in the absence of state tests) 0%-35% of the learners achieve or exceed the target determined in the Student learning Objective.

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

Results reveal exceptional learning gains relative to District adopted expectations for growth or achievement of learning standards for grade/subject (see attached chart)

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

Results reveal that learning gains meet District adopted expectations for growth or achievement of learning standards for grade/subject (see attached chart)

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

Results reveal that learning gains are below District adopted expectations for growth or achievement of learning standards for grade/subject (see attached chart)

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

Results reveal that learning gains are well-below District adopted expectations for growth or achievement of learning standards for grade/subject (see attached chart)

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/5364/130620-TXEttx9bQW/GIUFSD HEDI, Teachers without state growth scores_1.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.

None

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 Thursday, May 17, 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	4) State-approved 3rd party assessments	Measures of Academic Progress, ELA
5	4) State-approved 3rd party assessments	Measures of Academic Progress, ELA
6	4) State-approved 3rd party assessments	Measures of Academic Progress, ELA
7	4) State-approved 3rd party assessments	Measures of Academic Progress, ELA

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

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

Use this box, if needed, to describe the general process for assigning HEDI categories for these grades/subjects in this subcomponent. If needed, you may upload a table or graphic at 3.3, below.	For grades 4-8 ELA the teachers will meet with their Lead Evaluator to collaboratively establish performance targets measuring achievement. HEDI ratings will be based on the percent of students who achieve above the targeted measure of achievement established after the pre-test administration. Results will be based on achievement rather than growth, and reflect progress of the learners from the pre-assessment to the post-assessment. (see attached chart)
Highly Effective (14 - 15 points) Results are well above District- or BOCES-adopted expectations for growth or achievement for grade/subject.	Results are well above district goals. 81%-100% of students achieve or exceed the target set for the teacher.
Effective (8- 13 points) Results meet District- or BOCES-adopted expectations for growth or achievement for grade/subject.	Results meet district goals. 51%-80% of students achieve or exceed the target set for the teacher.
Developing (3 - 7 points) Results are below District- or BOCES-adopted expectations for growth or achievement for grade/subject.	Results are below district goals. 32%-50% of students achieve or exceed the target set for the teacher.
Ineffective (0 - 2 points) Results are well below District- or BOCES-adopted expectations for growth or achievement for grade/subject.	Results are well below district goals. 0%-31% of students achieve or exceed the target set for the teacher.

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

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

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

Use this box, if needed, to describe the general process for assigning HEDI categories for these grades/subjects in this subcomponent. If needed, you may upload a table or graphic at 3.3, below.	For 4-8 Math the teachers will meet with their Lead Evaluator to collaboratively establish performance targets measuring achievement. HEDI ratings will be based on the percent of students who achieve above the targeted measure of achievement established after the pre-test administration. Results will be based on achievement rather than growth, and reflect progress of the learners from the pre-assessment to the post-assessment
Highly Effective (14 - 15 points) Results are well above District- or BOCES-adopted expectations for growth or achievement for grade/subject.	Results are well above district goals. 81%-100% of students achieve or exceed the target set for the teacher.
Effective (8- 13 points) Results meet District- or BOCES-adopted expectations for growth or achievement for grade/subject.	Results meet district goals. 51%-80% of students achieve or exceed the target set for the teacher.
Developing (3 - 7 points) Results are below District- or BOCES-adopted expectations for growth or achievement for grade/subject.	Results are below district goals. 32%-50% of students achieve or exceed the target set for the teacher.
Ineffective (0 - 2 points) Results are well below District- or BOCES-adopted expectations for growth or achievement for grade/subject.	Results are well below district goals. 0%-31% of students achieve or exceed the target set for the teacher.

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/5139/130616-rhJdBgDruP/GIUFSD Teacher Growth 15 pt HEDI_1.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	4) State-approved 3rd party assessments	Measures of Academic Progress for Primary Grades
1	4) State-approved 3rd party assessments	Measures of Academic Progress for Primary Grades
2	4) State-approved 3rd party assessments	Measures of Academic Progress ELA
3	4) State-approved 3rd party assessments	Measures of Academic Progress ELA

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

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

Use this box, if needed, to describe the general process for assigning HEDI categories for these grades/subjects in this subcomponent. If needed, you may upload a table or graphic at 3.13, below.	For K-3 ELA the teachers will meet with their Lead Evaluator to collaboratively establish performance targets measuring achievement. HEDI ratings will be based on the percent of students who achieve above the targeted measure of achievement established after the pre-test administration. Results will be based on achievement rather than growth, and reflect progress of the learners from the pre-assessment to the post-assessment.
Highly Effective (18-20 points) Results are well above District- or BOCES-adopted expectations for growth or achievement for grade/subject.	Results are well above district goals. 90%-100% of students achieve or exceed the target set for the teacher.
Effective (9-17 points) Results meet District- or BOCES-adopted expectations for growth or achievement for grade/subject.	Results meet district goals. 51%-89% of students achieve or exceed the target set for the teacher.
Developing (3 - 8 points) Results are below District- or BOCES-adopted expectations for growth or achievement for grade/subject.	Results are below district goals. 36%-50% of students achieve or exceed the target set for the teacher.
Ineffective (0 - 2 points) Results are well below District- or BOCES-adopted expectations for growth or achievement for grade/subject.	Results are well below district goals. 0%-35% of students achieve or exceed the target set for the teacher.

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	4) State-approved 3rd party assessments	Measures of Academic Progress for Primary Grades
1	4) State-approved 3rd party assessments	Measures of Academic Progress for Primary Grades
2	4) State-approved 3rd party assessments	Measures of Academic Progress, Math
3	4) State-approved 3rd party assessments	Measures of Academic Progress, Math

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

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

Use this box, if needed, to describe the general process for assigning HEDI categories for these grades/subjects in this subcomponent. If needed, you may upload a table or graphic at 3.13, below.	For K-3 Math the teachers will meet with their Lead Evaluator to collaboratively establish performance targets measuring achievement. HEDI ratings will be based on the percent of students who achieve above the targeted measure of achievement established after the pre-test administration. Results will be based on achievement rather than growth, and reflect progress of the learners from the pre-assessment to the post-assessment.
Highly Effective (18-20 points) Results are well above District- or BOCES-adopted expectations for growth or achievement for grade/subject.	Results are well above district goals. 90%-100% of students achieve or exceed the target set for the teacher.
Effective (9-17 points) Results meet District- or BOCES-adopted expectations for growth or achievement for grade/subject.	Results meet district goals. 51%-89% of students achieve or exceed the target set for the teacher.
Developing (3 - 8 points) Results are below District -or BOCES-adopted expectations for growth or achievement for grade/subject.	Results are below district goals. 36%-50% of students achieve or exceed the target set for the teacher.
Ineffective (0 - 2 points) Results are well below District- or BOCES-adopted expectations for growth or achievement for grade/subject.	Results are well below district goals. 0%-35% of students achieve or exceed the target set for the teacher.

3.6) Grades 6-8 Science

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

	Locally-Selected Measure from List of Approved Measures	Assessment
6	5) District, regional, or BOCES–developed assessments	Green Island UFSD developed Grade 6 Science assessment
7	5) District, regional, or BOCES–developed assessments	Green Island UFSD developed Grade 7 Science assessment
8	3) Teacher specific achievement or growth score computed locally	Grade 8 State Science Assessment

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

Use this box, if needed, to describe the general process for assigning HEDI categories for these grades/subjects in this subcomponent. If needed, you may upload a table or graphic at 3.13, below.	For grades 6-8 Science the teachers will meet with their Lead Evaluator to collaboratively establish performance targets measuring achievement. HEDI ratings will be based on the percent of students who achieve above the targeted measure of achievement established after the pre-test administration. Results will be based on achievement rather than growth, and reflect progress of the learners from the pre-assessment to the post-assessment.
Highly Effective (18 - 20 points) Results are well above District- or BOCES-adopted expectations for growth or achievement for grade/subject.	Results are well above district goals. 90%-100% of students achieve or exceed the target set for the teacher.

Effective (9 - 17 points) Results meet District- or BOCES-adopted expectations for growth or achievement for grade/subject.	Results meet district goals. 51%-89% of students achieve or exceed the target set for the teacher.
Developing (3 - 8 points) Results are below District- or BOCES-adopted expectations for growth or achievement for grade/subject.	Results are below district goals. 36%-50% of students achieve or exceed the target set for the teacher.
Ineffective (0 - 2 points) Results are well below District- or BOCES-adopted expectations for growth or achievement for grade/subject.	Results are well below district goals. 0%-35% of students achieve or exceed the target set for the teacher.

3.7) Grades 6-8 Social Studies

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

	Locally-Selected Measure from List of Approved Measures	Assessment
6	5) District, regional, or BOCES–developed assessments	Green Island UFSD developed Grade 6 Social Studies assessment
7	5) District, regional, or BOCES–developed assessments	Green Island UFSD developed Grade 7 Social Studies assessment
8	5) District, regional, or BOCES–developed assessments	Green Island UFSD developed Grade 8 Social Studies assessment

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

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

Use this box, if needed, to describe the general process for assigning HEDI categories for these grades/subjects in this subcomponent. If needed, you may upload a table or graphic at 3.13, below.	For grades 6-8 Social Studies the teachers will meet with their Lead Evaluator to collaboratively establish performance targets measuring achievement. HEDI ratings will be based on the percent of students who achieve above the targeted measure of achievement established after the pre-test administration. Results will be based on achievement rather than growth, and reflect progress of the learners from the pre-assessment to the post-assessment.
Highly Effective (18 - 20 points) Results are well above District- or BOCES-adopted expectations for growth or achievement for grade/subject.	Results are well above district goals. 90%-100% of students achieve or exceed the target set for the teacher.
Effective (9 - 17 points) Results meet District- or BOCES-adopted expectations for growth or achievement for grade/subject.	Results meet district goals. 51%-89% of students achieve or exceed the target set for the teacher.
Developing (3 - 8 points) Results are below District- or BOCES-adopted expectations for growth or achievement for grade/subject.	Results are below district goals. 36%-50% of students achieve or exceed the target set for the teacher.

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

Results are well below district goals. 0%-35% of students achieve or exceed the target set for the teacher.

3.8) High School Social Studies

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

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

	Locally-Selected Measure from List of Approved Measures	Assessment
Global 1	5) District, regional, or BOCES–developed assessments	Green Island UFSD developed Global 9 assessment
Global 2	3) Teacher specific achievement or growth score computed locally	Global 10 Regents Exam
American History	3) Teacher specific achievement or growth score computed locally	American History Regents Exam

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

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

Use this box, if needed, to describe the general process for assigning HEDI categories for these grades/subjects in this subcomponent. If needed, you may upload a table or graphic at 3.13, below.

For High School Social Studies the teachers will meet with their Lead Evaluator to collaboratively establish performance targets measuring achievement. HEDI ratings will be based on the percent of students who achieve above the targeted measure of achievement established after the pre-test administration. Results will be based on achievement rather than growth, and reflect progress of the learners from the pre-assessment to the post-assessment.

Highly Effective (18 - 20 points) Results are well above District- or BOCES-adopted expectations for growth or achievement for grade/subject.

Results are well above district goals. 90%-100% of students achieve or exceed the target set for the teacher.

Effective (9 - 17 points) Results meet District- or BOCES-adopted expectations for growth or achievement for grade/subject.

Results meet district goals. 51%-89% of students achieve or exceed the target set for the teacher.

Developing (3 - 8 points) Results are below District- or BOCES-adopted expectations for growth or achievement for grade/subject.

Results are below district goals. 36%-50% of students achieve or exceed the target set for the teacher.

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

Results are well below district goals. 0%-35% of students achieve or exceed the target set for the teacher.

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	3) Teacher specific achievement or growth score computed locally	Living Environment Regents Exam
Earth Science	3) Teacher specific achievement or growth score computed locally	Earth Science Regents Exam
Chemistry	3) Teacher specific achievement or growth score computed locally	Chemistry Regents Exam
Physics	3) Teacher specific achievement or growth score computed locally	Physics Regents Exam

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.	For high school Science the teachers will meet with their Lead Evaluator to collaboratively establish performance targets measuring achievement. HEDI ratings will be based on the percent of students who achieve above the targeted measure of achievement established after the pre-test administration. Results will be based on achievement rather than growth, and reflect progress of the learners from the pre-assessment to the post-assessment.
Highly Effective (18-20 points) Results are well above District- or BOCES-adopted expectations for growth or achievement for grade/subject.	Results are well above district goals. 90%-100% of students achieve or exceed the target set for the teacher.
Developing (3 - 8 points) Results are below District- or BOCES-adopted expectations for growth or achievement for grade/subject.	Results meet district goals. 51%-89% of students achieve or exceed the target set for the teacher.
Effective (9 - 17points) Results meet District- or BOCES-adopted expectations for growth or achievement for grade/subject.	Results are below district goals. 36%-50% of students achieve or exceed the target set for the teacher.
Ineffective (0 - 2 points) Results are well below District- or BOCES-adopted expectations for growth or achievement for grade/subject.	Results are well below district goals. 0%-35% of students achieve or exceed the target set for the teacher.

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	3) Teacher specific achievement or growth score computed locally	Integrated Algebra Regents Exam
Geometry	3) Teacher specific achievement or growth score computed locally	Geometry Regents Exam
Algebra 2	3) Teacher specific achievement or growth score computed locally	Algebra2/Trigonometry Regents Exam

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

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

Use this box, if needed, to describe the general process for assigning HEDI categories for these grades/subjects in this subcomponent. If needed, you may upload a table or graphic at 3.13, below.	For high school Math the teachers will meet with their Lead Evaluator to collaboratively establish performance targets measuring achievement. HEDI ratings will be based on the percent of students who achieve above the targeted measure of achievement established after the pre-test administration. Results will be based on achievement rather than growth, and reflect progress of the learners from the pre-assessment to the post-assessment.
Highly Effective (18 - 20 points) Results are well above District- or BOCES-adopted expectations for growth or achievement for grade/subject.	Results are well above district goals. 90%-100% of students achieve or exceed the target set for the teacher.
Effective (9 - 17 points) Results meet District- or BOCES-adopted expectations for growth or achievement for grade/subject.	Results meet district goals. 51%-89% of students achieve or exceed the target set for the teacher.
Developing (3 - 8 points) Results are below District- or BOCES-adopted expectations for growth or achievement for grade/subject.	Results are below district goals. 36%-50% of students achieve or exceed the target set for the teacher.
Ineffective (0 - 2 points) Results are well below District- or BOCES-adopted expectations for growth or achievement for grade/subject.	Results are well below district goals. 0%-35% of students achieve or exceed the target set for the teacher.

3.11) High School English Language Arts

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

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

	Locally-Selected Measure from List of Approved Measures	Assessment
Grade 9 ELA	5) District, regional, or BOCES–developed assessments	Green Island UFSD developed Grade 9 Assessment
Grade 10 ELA	5) District, regional, or BOCES–developed assessments	Green Island UFSD developed Grade 10 Assessment
Grade 11 ELA	3) Teacher specific achievement or growth score computed locally	ELA Regents Exam

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.	For high school ELA the teachers will meet with their Lead Evaluator to collaboratively establish performance targets measuring achievement. HEDI ratings will be based on the percent of students who achieve above the targeted measure of achievement established after the pre-test administration. Results will be based on achievement rather than growth, and reflect progress of the learners from the pre-assessment to the post-assessment.
Highly Effective (18 - 20 points) Results are well above District- or BOCES-adopted expectations for growth or achievement for grade/subject.	Results are well above district goals. 90%-100% of students achieve or exceed the target set for the teacher.
Effective (9 - 17 points) Results meet District- or BOCES-adopted expectations for growth or achievement for grade/subject.	Results meet district goals. 51%-89% of students achieve or exceed the target set for the teacher.
Developing (3 - 8 points) Results are below District- or BOCES-adopted expectations for growth or achievement for grade/subject.	Results are below district goals. 36%-50% of students achieve or exceed the target set for the teacher.
Ineffective (0 - 2 points) Results are well below District- or BOCES-adopted expectations for growth or achievement for grade/subject.	Results are well below district goals. 0%-35% of students achieve or exceed the target set for the teacher.

3.12) All Other Courses

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

Course(s) or Subject(s)	Locally-Selected Measure from List of Approved Measures	Assessment
Physical Education and Health courses, K-12	5) District/regional/BOCES–developed	Green Island UFSD developed course appropriate assessment in Physical Education and health
Art courses, K-12	6(ii) School wide measure computed locally	State 4-8 ELA

Music courses, K-12	6(ii) School wide measure computed locally	State 4-8 ELA
Business courses, 9-12	5) District/regional/BOCES–developed	Green Island UFSD developed course appropriate assessment in Business
Family and Consumer Science courses 7-12	5) District/regional/BOCES–developed	Green Island UFSD developed course appropriate assessment in Family and Consumer Science
Science Classes, 9-12	5) District/regional/BOCES–developed	Green Island UFSD developed course appropriate assessment in Science
Spanish Classes 7-12	5) District/regional/BOCES–developed	Green Island UFSD developed course appropriate assessment in Spanish
French Classes 7-12	5) District/regional/BOCES–developed	Green Island UFSD developed course appropriate assessment in French

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

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

Use this box, if needed, to describe the general process for assigning HEDI categories for these grades/subjects in this subcomponent. If needed, you may upload a table or graphic at 3.13, below.	HEDI ratings for all other teachers will be based on the percent of students who achieve above the targeted measure of achievement established after the pre-test administration. Results will be based on achievement rather than growth. (see attached chart)
Highly Effective (18 - 20 points) Results are well above District- or BOCES -adopted expectations for growth or achievement for grade/subject.	Results are well above district goals. 90%-100% of students achieve or exceed the target set for the teacher.
Effective (9 - 17 points) Results meet District- or BOCES-adopted expectations for growth or achievement for grade/subject.	Results meet district goals. 51%-89% of students achieve or exceed the target set for the teacher.
Developing (3 - 8 points) Results are below District- or BOCES-adopted expectations for growth or achievement for grade/subject.	Results are below district goals. 36%-50% of students achieve or exceed the target set for the teacher.
Ineffective (0 - 2 points) Results are well below District- or BOCES-adopted expectations for growth or achievement for grade/subject.	Results are well below district goals. 0%-35% of students achieve or exceed the target set for the teacher.

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/5139/130616-y92vNseFa4/GIUFSD teacher local 20 pt HEDI_1.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.

If teachers have more than one locally selected measure, the measures will each earn a score of 0-20 points which the district will weight proportionately based on the number of locally selected measures.

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 Thursday, May 17, 2012

Updated Tuesday, December 11, 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

(No response)

4.2) Points Within Other Measures

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

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

Is the following points assignment applicable to all teachers?

Yes

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

(No response)

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

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

(No response)

4.3) Survey Tools (if applicable)

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

(No response)

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

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

4.4) Assurances

Please check all of the boxes below:

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

4.5) Process for Assigning Points and Determining HEDI Ratings

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

Members of the instructional staff and leadership staff of the Green Island Union Free School District cooperated on developing a process for assigning points and determining HEDI ratings using the teacher practice rubric. Danielson's Enhancing Professional Practice: A Framework for Teaching (2007) will be used by the district as the teacher practice rubric for 40 points, and a structured review of teacher artifacts worth up to 20 points to supplement the teacher practice. The point distribution and resulting HEDI scale can be found in the attached files.

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/5091/130627-eka9yMJ855/GIUFSD Danielson Rubric 40 points and Structured Review 20 points and HEDI scale_2.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.	Teachers who receive a total score of 54-60 will be deemed highly effective, indicating that their overall performance exceeds the NYS Teaching Standards.
Effective: Overall performance and results meet NYS Teaching Standards.	Teachers who receive a total score of 31-53 will be deemed effective, indicating that their overall performance meets the NYS Teaching Standards.
Developing: Overall performance and results need improvement in order to meet NYS Teaching Standards.	Teachers who receive a total score of 22-30 will be deemed developing, indicating that their overall performance does not yet meet the NYS Teaching Standards.
Ineffective: Overall performance and results do not meet NYS Teaching Standards.	Teachers who receive a total score of 0-21 will be deemed ineffective, indicating that their overall performance is furthest from meeting the NYS Teaching Standards.

Provide the ranges for the 60-point scoring bands.

Highly Effective	54-60
Effective	31-53
Developing	22-30
Ineffective	0-21

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	0
4.6) Observations of Probationary Teachers Enter Total	3

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?

- Not Applicable

4.7) Observations of Tenured Teachers

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

By building principals or other trained administrators

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

By trained in-school peer teachers or other trained reviewers

Formal/Long	0
Informal/Short	0

Independent evaluators

Formal/Long	0
Informal/Short	0

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

- In Person

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

- Not Applicable

5. Composite Scoring (Teachers)

Created Thursday, May 17, 2012

Updated Thursday, November 29, 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	54-60
Effective	31-53
Developing	22-30
Ineffective	0-21

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 Thursday, May 17, 2012

Updated Tuesday, December 11, 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/5265/130632-Df0w3Xx5v6/GIUFSD Teacher Improvement Plan.pdf>

6.3) Appeals Process

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

(1) the substance of the annual professional performance review

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

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

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

APPR Appeals Process (Teachers)

1. Only a "Developing" or "Ineffective" rating may be appealed. An appeal to a "Developing" or "Ineffective" rating must be submitted by the professional in writing directly to the Superintendent or his/her designee within fourteen (14) calendar days of receipt of the evaluation and shall set forth the specific basis for the appeal.

2. The appeal, must specify if it is based on a procedural defect in the evaluation process or a substantive disagreement with the conclusion (i.e. developing or ineffective) drawn by the evaluator. The professional shall bear the burden of proof in either type of appeal.

3. An appeal alleging a procedural defect in the evaluation process may include, but is not limited to, (a) a substantial deviation in the required timing of the evaluation, or the required timing of the pre- and post-evaluation meeting between the evaluator and the professional, (b) a material deviation or omission in the processes required in a Teacher Improvement Plan, including the timing of intermediate steps within the TIP, and (c) the accuracy and utilization of student test scores as contained within the procedure, provided they are the basis for the evaluator's conclusion, then that particular evaluation shall not be utilized as the affirmative basis for disciplinary charges against the professional at any future time. However, information of a pedagogical nature may be utilized for improving the professional's performance or for establishing a corrective plan for that professional, including but not limited to an individual Teacher Improvement Plan. In addition, it may be used to respond to or rebut claims made by the professional.

4. An appeal alleging a substantive disagreement with the conclusion (i.e. developing or ineffective) drawn by the evaluator must be based on grounds that include clear and convincing evidence that the evaluator acted in an arbitrary or capricious manner when evaluating the professional. It is not the intent of the parties to question the final determination of the evaluator on pedagogical or subjective grounds and an appeal cannot be based on a disagreement on what was observed by the evaluator, absent clear and convincing evidence that the evaluator was arbitrary or capricious.

5. The parties agree to formulate a three person panel to hear appeals to final evaluation ratings of professionals, and such panel shall not present an inordinate financial burden to either party.

The panel shall consist of one representative chosen by GITA; one representative chosen by the District, and the third member to be mutually chosen by the parties. The 3rd party panel member shall be chosen within five (5) calendar days of the filing of the appeal. Should the parties be unable to agree on the 3rd panel member, then, on the fifth day, one shall be chosen randomly from a list of names (not to exceed 3 each) provided by each of the first two panel members.

The parties further agree that such panel (a) shall hear appeals in a timely manner after the appeal is made, (b) shall issue a decision regarding the appeal within three (3) days after the appeal meeting, and (c) shall make final and binding determinations regarding the appeal based on the totality of information that was presented at the appeal meeting. The panel's final determination shall not be subject to the grievance procedure or challengeable in any other forum.

The parties agree that any appeals based on procedural matters may be determined by a two (2) person panel, a GITA representative and a District representative and only if those two persons cannot agree, will a third panel member be chosen to make a determination of the appeal on the fifth day.

6.4) Training and Certification of Lead Evaluators and Evaluators

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

The Green Island Union Free School District will ensure that all Lead Evaluators (K-12 Principal and Superintendent) are fully trained and highly qualified, as necessary, to complete an individual's performance review. Evaluator training will be conducted by the Capital Region BOCES or by contract with outside trainers. Lead evaluator training will be conducted in accordance with the certification requirements per the Commissioner's regulations. This training has thus far included the following:

1. Race To The Top Summer Training for Lead Evaluators (9 hours) August 29 and 30, 2011, (both principal and superintendent)
2. The Principal as Instructional Leader (3 hours) August 3, 2012 (principal)
3. Danielson Framework for Teacher Training (4 hours) August 30, 2012 (principal and superintendent)

The following training videos have been used to support the skills of the Lead Evaluators:

1. Making Teacher Evaluations Meaningful: Charlotte Danielson (26 minutes 38 seconds) on April 17, 2012 (principal)
2. Assessing Teacher Effectiveness: Charlotte Danielson (51 minutes, 37 seconds) November 15, 2011 (principal) - June 20, 2012 (superintendent)
3. A Framework for Teaching: High School; Charlotte Danielson (31 minutes 25 seconds) May 16, 2012 (superintendent)
4. A Framework for Teaching: Middle School; Charlotte Danielson (35 minutes, 19 seconds) May 16, 2012 (superintendent)

In addition, the Principal and Superintendent have both read the following books attendant to the teacher practice model selected by

the school district:

1. *Teacher Evaluation to Enhance professional Practice*, by Charlotte Danielson and Thomas L. McGreal
2. *Enhancing Professional Practice: A Framework for Teaching*, by Charlotte Danielson

The Green Island UFSD has established a process to ensure that lead evaluators maintain inter-rater reliability over time in accordance with NYSED guidance and protocols recommended in training for lead evaluators. The District expects that these protocols will include measures such as: data analysis and periodic comparisons of assessments, and/or annual calibration sessions across evaluators.

The Superintendent will ensure that lead evaluators will participate in annual training and are recertified on an annual basis. The Capital Region BOCES will be utilized to provide the training and recertification.

6.5) Assurances -- Evaluators

Please check the boxes below:

-
- Checked
-

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

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

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

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

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

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

(7) use of the Statewide Instructional Reporting System

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

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

-
- Checked
-

6.6) Assurances -- Teachers

Please check all of the boxes below:

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

6.7) Assurances -- Data

Please check all of the boxes below:

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

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

Created Thursday, October 11, 2012
Updated Thursday, November 29, 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):

Heatly School K-12
(No response)

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

Please check the boxes below:

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

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

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

State assessments, *required if one exists*

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

List of State-approved 3rd party assessments

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

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

School or Program Type	SLO with Assessment Option	Name of the Assessment
N/A		N/A

Describe the district-adopted expectations for the level of performance required for each HEDI rating category and the process for assigning points to principals based on SLO results, consistent with regulations and assurances in the Comparable Growth Measures subcomponent. Include any district-determined expectations for student performance.

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

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

(No response)

7.4) Special Considerations for Comparable Growth Measures

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

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

None

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 Thursday, October 11, 2012

Updated Wednesday, December 12, 2012

Page 1

Locally-Selected Measures of Student Achievement or Growth

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

- (d) student performance on any or all of the district-wide locally selected measures approved for use in teacher evaluations
- (e) four, five and/or six-year high school graduation and/or dropout rates for principals employed in a school with high school grades
- (f) percentage of students who earn a Regents diploma with advanced designation and/or honors for principals employed in a school with high school grades
- (g) percentage of a cohort of students that achieve specified scores on Regents examinations and/or Department approved alternative examinations (including, but not limited to, Advanced Placement examinations, International Baccalaureate examinations, SAT II, etc.), for principals employed in a school with high school grades (e.g., the percentage of students in the 2009 cohort that scored at least a 3 on an Advanced Placement examination since entry into the ninth grade)
- (h) students' progress toward graduation in the school using strong predictive indicators, including but not limited to 9th and/or 10th grade credit accumulation and/or the percentage of students that pass 9th and/or 10th grade subjects most commonly associated with graduation and/or students' progress in passing the number of required Regents examinations for graduation, for principals employed in a school with high school grades

Grade Configuration	Locally-Selected Measure from List of Approved Measures	Assessment
K-12	(d) measures used by district for teacher evaluation	NWEA Measures of Academic Progress for the Primary Grades for Kdg and 1
K-12	(d) measures used by district for teacher evaluation	New York State Grade 11 English Regents Exam
K-12	(d) measures used by district for teacher evaluation	NWEA Measures of Academic Progress, Grade 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 will conference with the superintendent to examine achievement goals and ensure that all goals are rigorous. Based on the approved goals, and the weighted average of the assessments, the superintendent will review the Green Island UFSD HEDI chart (see attached) with the principal.
Highly Effective (14 - 15 points) Results are well above District- or BOCES-adopted expectations for growth or achievement for grade/subject.	Results of the identified assessments are well above the District adopted expectations for growth or achievement of student learning standards for grade/subject.
Effective (8- 13 points) Results meet District- or BOCES-adopted expectations for growth or achievement for grade/subject.	Results of the identified assessments meet the District adopted expectations for growth or achievement of student learning standards for grade/subject.
Developing (3 - 7 points) Results are below District- or BOCES-adopted expectations for growth or achievement for grade/subject.	Results of the identified assessments are below the District adopted expectations for growth or achievement of student learning standards for grade/subject.

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

Results of the identified assessments are well below the District adopted expectations for growth or achievement of student learning standards for grade/subject.

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

(No response)

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

assets/survey-uploads/5366/193976-qBFVOWF7fC/GIUFSD Principal Growth 15 point rubric scale_2.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
NA		

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

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

(No response)

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

(No response)

8.3) Locally Developed Controls

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

NA

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.

N/A

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 Thursday, October 11, 2012
Updated Thursday, November 29, 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.

There will be two evaluations of the principal (the evaluation instrument is attached below). Each element within the respective domains has been assigned specific point values. The total points accumulated for the two evaluations will be divided by two (2) to produce a final point value that will subsequently be applied to the HEDI scale (attached below) and determine the performance status of the principal regarding the 60 point allocation.

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/5143/193733-pMADJ4gk6R/APPR Rubric, HEDI for Principal Evaluation 2012.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 principal's performance on the Multidimensional Principal Performance Rubric registers a score within the following range: 54-60
Effective: Overall performance and results meet standards.	The principal's performance on the Multidimensional Principal Performance Rubric registers a score within the following range: 31-53
Developing: Overall performance and results need improvement in order to meet standards.	The principal's performance on the Multidimensional Principal Performance Rubric registers a score within the following range: 22-30
Ineffective: Overall performance and results do not meet standards.	The principal's performance on the Multidimensional Principal Performance Rubric registers a score within the following range: 0-21

Please provide the locally-negotiated 60 point scoring bands.

Highly Effective	54-60
Effective	31-53
Developing	22-30
Ineffective	0-21

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

Tenured Principals

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

10. Composite Scoring (Principals)

Created Thursday, October 11, 2012
Updated Thursday, November 29, 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	NA - There are no principals in our district without a state approved score.
Effective	NA
Developing	NA
Ineffective	NA

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 Thursday, October 11, 2012
Updated Thursday, November 29, 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/5276/194229-Df0w3Xx5v6/PIP.pdf](#)

11.3) Appeals Process

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

- (1) the substance of the annual professional performance review
- (2) the school district's or BOCES' adherence to the standards and methodologies required for such reviews, pursuant to Education Law section 3012-c
- (3) the adherence to the regulations of the Commissioner and compliance with any applicable locally negotiated procedures, as well as the school district's or BOCES' issuance and/or implementation of the terms of the teacher or principal improvement plan, as required under Education Law section 3012-c

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

APPR Appeals Process - Principal

1. Only a "Developing" or "Ineffective" rating may be appealed. An appeal to a "Developing" or "Ineffective" rating must be submitted by the professional in writing directly to the Superintendent or his/her designee within fourteen (14) calendar days of receipt of the evaluation and shall set forth the specific basis for the appeal.

2. The appeal, must specify if it is based on a procedural defect in the evaluation process or a substantive disagreement with the conclusion (i.e. developing or ineffective) drawn by the evaluator. The professional shall bear the burden of proof in either type of appeal.

3. An appeal alleging a procedural defect in the evaluation process may include, but is not limited to, (a) a substantial deviation in the required timing of the evaluation, or the required timing of the pre- and post-evaluation meeting between the evaluator and the professional, (b) a material deviation or omission in the processes required in a Teacher Improvement Plan, including the timing of intermediate steps within the TIP, and (c) the accuracy and utilization of student test scores as contained within the procedure, provided they are the basis for the evaluator's conclusion, then that particular evaluation shall not be utilized as the affirmative basis for disciplinary charges against the professional at any future time. However, information of a pedagogical nature may be utilized for improving the professional's performance or for establishing a corrective plan for that professional, including but not limited to an individual Teacher Improvement Plan. In addition, it may be used to respond to or rebut claims made by the professional.

4. An appeal alleging a substantive disagreement with the conclusion (i.e. developing or ineffective) drawn by the evaluator must be based on grounds that include clear and convincing evidence that the evaluator acted in an arbitrary or capricious manner when evaluating the professional. It is not the intent of the parties to question the final determination of the evaluator on pedagogical or subjective grounds and an appeal cannot be based on a disagreement on what was observed by the evaluator, absent clear and convincing evidence that the evaluator was arbitrary or capricious.

5. The parties agree to formulate a three person panel to hear appeals to final evaluation ratings of professionals, and such panel shall not present an inordinate financial burden to either party.

The panel shall consist of one representative chosen by GITA; one representative chosen by the District, and the third member to be mutually chosen by the parties. The 3rd party panel member shall be chosen within five (5) calendar days of the filing of the appeal. Should the parties be unable to agree on the 3rd panel member, then, on the fifth day, one shall be chosen randomly from a list of names (not to exceed 3 each) provided by each of the first two panel members.

The parties further agree that such panel (a) shall hear appeals in a timely manner after the appeal is made, (b) shall issue a decision regarding the appeal within three (3) days after the appeal meeting, and (c) shall make final and binding determinations regarding the appeal based on the totality of information that was presented at the appeal meeting. The panel's final determination shall not be subject to the grievance procedure or challengeable in any other forum,

The parties agree that any appeals based on procedural matters may be determined by a two (2) person panel, a representative for the principal and a District representative and only if those two persons cannot agree, will a third panel member be chosen to make a determination of the appeal on the fifth day.

11.4) Training and Certification of Lead Evaluators and Evaluators

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

The Green Island Union Free School District will comply with all requirements for the training and certification of lead evaluators. This commitment includes both the initial trainings of all evaluators on the nine elements listed in section 30-2.9 of the Rules of the Board of Regents and the ongoing training and support essential to maintain the skill level of the evaluator. Evaluator training will be conducted by the Capital Region BOCES or by contract with outside trainers.

There is only one lead evaluator, the superintendent, so there is no issue with inter-rater reliability.

The superintendent attended the following training sessions offered by the Capital Region BOCES:

1. Principals Series - Principal Evidence/ISLCC Standards (6 hours) August 22, 2012,
2. Principals Series - Principal Rubric Training with MPPR Rubric (6 hours) August 15, 2012

The superintendent read the following book:

1. Assessing Educational leaders: Evaluating performance for Improved Individual and Organizational Results - by Doug Reeves,

The superintendent viewed the following video:

1. Doug Reeves 4, for iEvaluate: August 31, 2012

The District will ensure that the Superintendent, as the single Lead Evaluator, will participate in annual training and will be recertified on an annual basis. The Capital Region BOCES will be utilized to provide the training and recertification.

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 Thursday, May 17, 2012

Updated Tuesday, December 11, 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/5581/130633-3Uqgn5g9Iu/APPR Dated Dec 6.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.

Green Island Union Free School District

Locally Selected Measures for Teachers Who Do Not Have a State Provided Growth Score

HIGHLY EFFECTIVE			EFFECTIVE									DEVELOPING					INEFFECTIVE			
20	19	18	17	16	15	14	13	12	11	10	9	8	7	6	5	4	3	2	1	0
97% - 100%	93% -	90% -	86% -	82% -	77% -	72% -	67% -	63% -	59% -	55% -	51% -	49% -	47% -	44% -	41% -	38% -	36% -	22% -	16% -	0% - 15%
	96%	92%	89%	85%	81%	76%	71%	66%	62%	58%	54%	50%	48%	46%	43%	40%	37%	35%	21%	

CLASSROOM OBSERVATION

Teacher:

School Year:

Position:

Date:

Assignment/Class:

Time:

DOMAIN 1 – Planning and Preparation

<p>Danielson Components</p> <p>“Enhancing Professional Practice, A Framework for Teaching” 2nd Edition (2007)</p>	<p>NYS Teaching Standards</p> <p>Teacher Demonstrates:</p> <p>Standard I: Knowledge of Students and Student Learning</p> <p>Standard II: Knowledge of Content and Instructional Planning</p>			
<p>1A Demonstrating knowledge of content and pedagogy</p>	<p>ELEMENT I.</p> <p>ELEMENT II.1</p> <p>ELEMENT II.</p>			
<p>DANIELSON ELEMENT</p>	<p>LEVEL OF PERFORMANCE</p>			
	<p><input type="checkbox"/> INEFFECTIVE 0</p>	<p><input type="checkbox"/> DEVELOPING .65</p>	<p><input type="checkbox"/> EFFECTIVE .85</p>	<p><input type="checkbox"/> HIGHLY EFFECTIVE 1.0</p>

Knowledge of content and the structure of the discipline	In planning and practice, teacher makes content errors or does not correct errors made by students.	Teacher is familiar with the important concepts in the discipline but may display lack of awareness of how these concepts relate to one another.	Teacher displays solid knowledge of the important concepts in the discipline and how these relate to one another.	Teacher displays extensive knowledge of the important concepts in the discipline and how these relate to both to one another and to the other disciplines.
Knowledge of prerequisite relationships	Teacher's plans and practice display little understanding of prerequisite relationships important to student learning of the content.	Teacher's plans and practice indicate some awareness of prerequisite relationships, although such knowledge may be inaccurate or incomplete.	Teacher's plans and practice reflect accurate understanding of prerequisite relationships among topics and concepts.	Teacher's plans and practices reflect understanding of prerequisite relationships among topics and concepts and a link to necessary cognitive structures by students to ensure understanding.
Knowledge of content-related pedagogy	Teacher displays little or no understanding of the range of pedagogical approaches suitable to student learning of the content.	Teacher's plans and practice reflect a limited range of pedagogical approaches or some approaches that are not suitable to the discipline or to the students.	Teacher's plans and practice reflect familiarity with a wide range of effective pedagogical approaches in the discipline.	Teacher's plans and practice reflect familiarity with a wide range of effective pedagogical approaches in the discipline, anticipating student misconceptions.

--	--	--	--	--	--

TOTAL – CONTENT KNOWLEDGE (3.0 points) _____

Danielson Components		NYS Teaching Standards			
“Enhancing Professional Practice, A Framework for Teaching” 2 nd Edition (2007)		Teacher demonstrates: Standard I: Knowledge of Students and Student Learning			
1B Demonstrating knowledge of students		ELEMENT I.1 ELEMENT I.3 ELEMENT I.4 ELEMENT I ELEMENT I.6			
DANIELSON ELEMENT		LEVEL OF PERFORMANCE			
		<input type="checkbox"/> INEFFECTIVE 0	<input type="checkbox"/> DEVELOPING .65	<input type="checkbox"/> EFFECTIVE .85	<input type="checkbox"/> HIGHLY EFFECTIVE 1.0
Knowledge of child and adolescent development	Teacher displays little or no knowledge of the developmental characteristics of the age group.	Teacher displays partial knowledge of the developmental characteristics of the age group.	Teacher displays accurate understanding of the typical developmental characteristics of the age group, as well as exceptions to the general patterns.	In addition to accurate knowledge of the typical developmental characteristics of the age group and exceptions to the general patterns, teacher displays knowledge of the extent to which individual students	

				follow the general patterns.
Knowledge of the learning process	Teacher sees no value in understanding how students learn and does not seek such information.	Teacher recognizes the value of knowing how students learn, but this knowledge is limited or outdated.	Teacher's knowledge of how students learn is accurate and current. Teacher applies this knowledge to the class as a whole and to groups of students.	Teacher displays extensive and subtle understanding of how students learn and applies this knowledge to individual students.
Knowledge of diversity in students' skills, interest and culture	Teacher displays little or no knowledge of students' skills, interest, and culture.	Teacher recognizes the value of understanding students' skills, interest, and culture.	Teacher recognizes the value of understanding students' skills, interest, and culture and displays this knowledge for groups of students.	Teacher displays understanding of individual students' skills, interest, and culture.
Knowledge of students' special needs	Teacher displays little or no understanding of students' special learning or medical needs or why such knowledge is important.	Teacher displays awareness of the importance of knowing students' special learning or medical needs, but such knowledge may be	Teacher is aware of students' special learning and medical needs.	Teacher possesses information about each student's learning and medical needs, collecting such information from a variety of sources.

		incomplete or inaccurate.		

TOTAL – KNOWLEDGE OF STUDENTS (4.0 points) _____

Danielson Components “Enhancing Professional Practice, A Framework for Teaching” 2nd Edition (2007)	NYS Teaching Standards Teacher demonstrates: Standard II: Knowledge of Content and Instructional Planning Standard III: Effective Instructional Practice
1C Setting instructional outcomes	ELEMENT II.1 ELEMENT II. ELEMENT II.3 ELEMENT II.4 ELEMENT II ELEMENT II.6 ELEMENT III.3
DANIELSON	LEVEL OF PERFORMANCE

ELEMENT	☐ INEFFECTIVE 0	☐ DEVELOPING .65	☐ EFFECTIVE .85	☐ HIGHLY EFFECTIVE 1.0
Value, sequence and alignment	Outcomes represent low expectations for students and lack of rigor. They do not reflect important learning in the discipline or a connection to a sequence of learning.	Outcomes represent moderately high expectations and rigor. Some reflect important learning in the discipline and at least some connection to a sequence of learning.	Most outcomes represent high expectations and rigor and important learning in the discipline. They are connected to a sequence of learning.	All outcomes represent high expectations and rigor and important learning in the discipline. They are connected to a sequence of learning both in the discipline and in related disciplines.
Clarity	Outcomes are either not clear or are stated as activities, not as student learning. Outcomes do not permit viable methods of assessment.	Outcomes are only moderately clear or consist of a combination of outcomes and activities. Some outcomes do not permit viable methods of assessment.	All the instructional outcomes are clear, written in the form of student learning. Most suggest viable methods of assessment.	All the outcomes are clear, written in the form of student learning, and permit viable methods of assessment.
Balance	Outcomes reflect only one type of learning and only one discipline or strand.	Outcomes reflect several types of learning, but teacher has made no attempt at coordination or	Outcomes reflect several different types of learning and opportunities for coordination.	Where appropriate, outcomes reflect several different types of learning and opportunities for both coordination and

		integration.		integration.
Suitability for diverse learners	Outcomes are not suitable for the class or are not based on any assessment of student needs.	Most of the outcomes are suitable for most of the students in the class based on global assessments of student learning.	Most of the outcomes are suitable for all students in the class and are based on evidence of student proficiency. However, the needs of some individual students may not be accommodated.	Outcomes are based on a comprehensive assessment of student learning and take into account the varying needs of individual students or groups.

TOTAL – INSTRUCTIONAL OUTCOMES (4.0 points) _____

Danielson Components “Enhancing Professional Practice, A Framework for Teaching” 2 nd Edition (2007)	NYS Teaching Standards Teacher demonstrates: Standard I: Knowledge of Students and Student Learning Standard II: Knowledge of Content and Instructional Planning Standard III: Effective Instructional Practice
1D Demonstrating knowledge of	ELEMENT I.6

resources		ELEMENT II.6 ELEMENT III.4 ELEMENT III			
DANIELSON ELEMENT	LEVEL OF PERFORMANCE				
	<input type="checkbox"/> INEFFECTIVE 0	<input type="checkbox"/> DEVELOPING .65	<input type="checkbox"/> EFFECTIVE .85	<input type="checkbox"/> HIGHLY EFFECTIVE 1.0	
Resources for students	Teacher is unaware of resources for students available through the school or district.	Teacher displays awareness of resources for students available through the school or district but no knowledge of resources available more broadly.	Teacher displays awareness of resources for student available through the school or district and some familiarity with resources external to the school and on the Internet.	Teacher's knowledge of resources for students is extensive, including those available through the school or district, in the community, and on the Internet.	
	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	

TOTAL – DEMONSTRATING KNOWLEDGE OF RESOURCES (1.0 points) _____

Danielson Components “Enhancing Professional Practice, A Framework for Teaching” 2 nd Edition (2007)	NYS Teaching Standards Teacher demonstrates: Standard I: Knowledge of Students and Student Learning
---	--

1E Designing coherent instruction		ELEMENT I.1 ELEMENT I. ELEMENT I.3 ELEMENT I.4 ELEMENT I ELEMENT I.6			
DANIELSON ELEMENT	LEVEL OF PERFORMANCE				
	<input type="checkbox"/> INEFFECTIVE 0	<input type="checkbox"/> DEVELOPING .65	<input type="checkbox"/> EFFECTIVE .85	<input type="checkbox"/> HIGHLY EFFECTIVE 1.0	
Learning activities	Learning activities are not suitable to students or to instructional outcomes and are not designed to engage students in active intellectual activity.	Only some of the learning activities are suitable to students or to the instructional outcomes. Some represent a moderate cognitive challenge, but with no differentiation for different students.	All learning activities are suitable to students or to the instructional outcomes, and most represent significant cognitive challenge, with some differentiation for different groups of students.	Learning activities are highly suitable to diverse learners and support the instructional outcomes. They are all designed to engage students in high-level cognitive activity and are differentiated, as appropriate, for individual learners.	
Instructional materials and	Materials and resources are not	Some of the materials and resources are	All of the materials and resources are	All of the materials and resources are suitable	

resources	suitable for students and do not support the instructional outcomes or engage students in meaningful learning.	suitable to students, support the instructional outcomes, and engage students in meaningful learning.	suitable to students, support the instructional outcomes, and are designed to engage students in meaningful learning.	to students, support the instructional outcomes, and are designed to engage students in meaningful learning. There is evidence of appropriate use of technology and of student participation in selecting or adapting materials.
Lesson and unit structure	The lesson or unit has no clearly defined structure, or the structure is chaotic. Activities do not follow an organized progression, and time allocations are unrealistic.	The lesson or unit has a recognizable structure, although the structure is not uniformly maintained throughout. Progression of activities is uneven, with most time allocations reasonable.	The lesson or unit has a clearly defined structure around which activities are organized. Progression of activities is even, with reasonable time allocations.	The lesson's or unit's structure is clear and allows for different pathways according to diverse student needs. The progression of activities is highly coherent.

TOTAL – DESIGNING COHERENT INSTRUCTION (3.0 points) _____

Danielson Components	NYS Teaching Standards
-----------------------------	-------------------------------

<p>“Enhancing Professional Practice, A Framework for Teaching” 2nd Edition (2007)</p>	<p>Teacher demonstrates: Standard III: Effective Instructional Practice Standard V: Well Designed Assessment for Student Learning</p>			
<p>1F Designing student assessments</p>	<p>ELEMENT III.6 ELEMENT V.1 ELEMENT V. ELEMENT V.3 ELEMENT V.4 ELEMENT V</p>			
<p>DANIELSON ELEMENT</p>	<p>LEVEL OF PERFORMANCE</p>			
	<p><input type="checkbox"/> INEFFECTIVE 0</p>	<p><input type="checkbox"/> DEVELOPING .65</p>	<p><input type="checkbox"/> EFFECTIVE .85</p>	<p><input type="checkbox"/> HIGHLY EFFECTIVE 1.0</p>
<p>Monitoring student understanding and progress.</p>	<p>Assessment procedures are not congruent with instructional outcomes.</p>	<p>Some of the instructional outcomes are assessed through the proposed approach, but many are not.</p>	<p>All the instructional outcomes are assessed through the approach to assessment; assessment methodologies may have been adapted for groups of students.</p>	<p>Proposed approach to assessment is fully aligned with the instructional outcomes in both content and process. Assessment methodologies have been adapted for individual students, as needed.</p>

Design of formative assessments	Teacher has no plan to incorporate formative assessment in the lesson or unit.	Approach to the use of formative assessment is rudimentary, including only some of the instructional outcomes.	Teacher has a well-developed strategy to using formative assessment and has designed particular approaches to be used.	Approach to using formative assessment is well designed and includes student as well as teacher use of the assessment information.

TOTAL – DESIGNING STUDENT ASSESSMENTS (2.0 points) _____

Danielson Components “Enhancing Professional Practice, A Framework for Teaching” 2 nd Edition (2007)	NYS Teaching Standards Teacher demonstrates: Standard IV: Skill in Creating a Positive Learning Environment
---	--

2A Creating an environment of respect and rapport		ELEMENT IV.1 ELEMENT IV.3		
DANIELSON ELEMENT	LEVEL OF PERFORMANCE			
	<input type="checkbox"/> INEFFECTIVE 0	<input type="checkbox"/> DEVELOPING <input type="checkbox"/> 1.30	<input type="checkbox"/> EFFECTIVE <input type="checkbox"/> 1.70	<input type="checkbox"/> HIGHLY EFFECTIVE <input type="checkbox"/> 2.0
Teacher interaction with students	Teacher interaction with at least some students is negative, demeaning, sarcastic, or inappropriate to the age or culture of the students. Students exhibit disrespect for the teacher.	Teacher-student interactions are generally appropriate but may reflect occasional inconsistencies, favoritism, or disregard for students' cultures. Students exhibit only minimal respect for the teacher.	Teacher-student interactions are friendly and demonstrate general caring and respect. Such interactions are appropriate to the age and cultures of the students. Students exhibit respect for the teacher.	Teacher interactions with students reflect genuine respect and caring for individuals as well as groups of students.
Student interactions with other students	Student interactions are characterized by conflict, sarcasm, or put-downs.	Students do not demonstrate disrespect for one another.	Student interactions are generally polite and respectful.	Students demonstrate genuine caring for one another as individuals.

TOTAL – CREATING AN ENVIRONMENT OF RESPECT AND RAPPORT (4.0 points) _____

<p>Danielson Components</p> <p><i>“Enhancing Professional Practice, A Framework for Teaching”</i></p> <p><i>2nd Edition (2007)</i></p>		<p>NYS Teaching Standards</p> <p>Teacher demonstrates:</p> <p>Standard IV: Skill in Creating a Positive Learning Environment</p>			
<p>2B Establishing a culture for learning</p>		<p>ELEMENT IV</p>			
<p>DANIELSON ELEMENT</p>	<p>LEVEL OF PERFORMANCE</p>				
	<p><input type="checkbox"/> INEFFECTIVE 0</p>	<p><input type="checkbox"/> DEVELOPING 1.30</p>	<p><input type="checkbox"/> EFFECTIVE 1.70</p>	<p><input type="checkbox"/> HIGHLY EFFECTIVE 2.0</p>	
<p>Importance of the content</p>	<p>Teacher or students convey a negative attitude toward the content, suggesting that it is not important or has been mandated by others.</p>	<p>Teacher communicates importance of the work but with little conviction and only minimal apparent buy-in by the students.</p>	<p>Teacher conveys genuine enthusiasm for the content, and students demonstrate consistent commitment to its value.</p>	<p>Students demonstrate through their active participation, curiosity, and taking initiative that they value the importance of the content.</p>	
<p>Expectations for learning and achievement</p>	<p>Instructional outcomes, activities and assignments, and classroom interactions convey low expectations for at least some students.</p>	<p>Instructional outcomes, activities and assignments, and classroom interactions convey only modest expectations for student learning and achievement.</p>	<p>Instructional outcomes, activities and assignments, and classroom interactions convey high expectations for most students.</p>	<p>Instructional outcomes, activities and assignments, and classroom interactions convey high expectations for all students. Students appear to have internalized these</p>	

					expectations.

TOTAL – ESTABLISHING A CULTURE FOR LEARNING (4.0 points) _____

Danielson Components “Enhancing Professional Practice, A Framework for Teaching” 2 nd Edition (2007)		NYS Teaching Standards Teacher demonstrates: Standard IV: Skill in Creating a Positive Learning Environment			
2C Managing classroom procedures		ELEMENT IV.3 ELEMENT IV.4			
DANIELSON ELEMENT	LEVEL OF PERFORMANCE				
	<input type="checkbox"/> INEFFECTIVE 0	<input type="checkbox"/> DEVELOPING 1.30	<input type="checkbox"/> EFFECTIVE 1.70	<input type="checkbox"/> HIGHLY EFFECTIVE 2.0	
Management of instructional groups	Students not working with the teacher are not productively	Some students are productively engaged in learning while unsupervised by the	Students are well organized, and most students are productively engaged	Students are well organized, and students are productively engaged at all times,	

	engaged in learning.	teacher.	in learning while unsupervised by the teacher.	with students assuming responsibility for productivity.
--	----------------------	----------	--	---

Management of transitions	Transitions are chaotic, with much time lost between activities or lesson segments.	Only some transitions are efficient, resulting in some loss of instructional time.	Transitions occur smoothly, with little loss of instructional time.	Transitions are seamless, with students assuming responsibility in ensuring their efficient operation.
Management of materials and supplies	Materials and supplies are handled inefficiently, resulting in significant loss of instructional time.	Routines for handling materials and supplies function moderately well, but with some loss of instructional time.	Routines for handling materials and supplies occur smoothly, with little loss of instructional time.	Routines for handling materials and supplies are seamless, with students assuming some responsibility for smooth operation.
Performance of noninstructional duties	Considerable instructional time is lost in performing noninstructional duties.	Systems for performing noninstructional duties are only fairly efficient, resulting in some loss of instructional time.	Efficient systems for performing noninstructional duties are in place, resulting in minimal loss of instructional time.	Systems for performing noninstructional duties are well established, with students assuming considerable responsibility for efficient operation.

TOTAL – MANAGING CLASSROOM PROCEDURES (8.0 points) _____

Danielson Components	NYS Teaching Standards
-----------------------------	-------------------------------

<p>“Enhancing Professional Practice, A Framework for Teaching” 2nd Edition (2007)</p>		<p>Teacher demonstrates: Standard IV: Skill in Creating a Positive Learning Environment</p>		
<p>2D Managing student behavior</p>		<p>ELEMENT IV.1 ELEMENT IV.3</p>		
<p>DANIELSON ELEMENT</p>	<p>LEVEL OF PERFORMANCE</p>			
	<p><input type="checkbox"/> INEFFECTIVE 0</p>	<p><input type="checkbox"/> DEVELOPING 1.30</p>	<p><input type="checkbox"/> EFFECTIVE 1.70</p>	<p><input type="checkbox"/> HIGHLY EFFECTIVE 2.0</p>
<p>Expectations</p>	<p>No standards of conduct appear to have been established, or students are confused as to what the standards are.</p>	<p>Standards of conduct appear to have been established, and most students seem to understand them.</p>	<p>Standards of conduct are clear to all students.</p>	<p>Standards of conduct are clear to all students and appear to have been developed with student participation.</p>
<p>Monitoring of student behavior</p>	<p>Student behavior is not monitored, and teacher is unaware of what the students are doing.</p>	<p>Teacher is generally aware of student behavior but may miss the activities of some students.</p>	<p>Teacher is alert to student behavior at all times.</p>	<p>Monitoring by teacher is subtle and preventive.</p>
<p>Response to student misbehavior</p>	<p>Teacher does not respond to misbehavior, or the</p>	<p>Teacher attempts to respond to student misbehavior but with</p>	<p>Teacher response to misbehavior is appropriate and</p>	<p>Teacher response to misbehavior is highly effective and sensitive</p>

	response is inconsistent, is overly repressive, or does not respect the student's dignity.	uneven results, or there are no major infractions of the rules.	successful and respects the student's dignity, or student behavior is generally appropriate.	to students' individual needs, or student behavior is entirely appropriate.
	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>

TOTAL – MANAGING STUDENT BEHAVIOR (6.0 points) _____

Danielson Components		NYS Teaching Standards			
“Enhancing Professional Practice, A Framework for Teaching” 2 nd Edition (2007)		Teacher demonstrates: Standard IV: Skill in Creating a Positive Learning Environment			
2E Organizing physical space		ELEMENT IV.4			
DANIELSON ELEMENT	LEVEL OF PERFORMANCE				
	<input type="checkbox"/> INEFFECTIVE 0	<input type="checkbox"/> DEVELOPING 1.30	<input type="checkbox"/> EFFECTIVE 1.70	<input type="checkbox"/> HIGHLY EFFECTIVE 2.0	
Safety and accessibility	The classroom is unsafe, or learning is not accessible to some students.	The classroom is safe, and at least essential learning is accessible to most students.	The classroom is safe, and learning is equally accessible to all students.	The classroom is safe, and students themselves ensure that all learning is equally accessible to all students.	
	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	

Arrangement of furniture and use of physical resources	The furniture arrangement hinders the learning activities, or the teacher makes poor use of physical resources.	Teacher uses physical resources adequately. The furniture may be adjusted for a lesson, but with limited effectiveness.	Teacher uses physical resources skillfully, and the furniture arrangement is a resource for learning activities.	Both teacher and students use physical resources easily and skillfully, and furniture is adjusted to advance their learning.

TOTAL – ORGANIZING PHYSICAL SPACE (4.0 points) _____

Danielson Components “Enhancing Professional Practice, A Framework for Teaching” 2 nd Edition (2007)	NYS Teaching Standards Teacher demonstrates: Standard III: Effective Instructional Practice			
3A Communicating with students	ELEMENT III			
DANIELSON ELEMENT	LEVEL OF PERFORMANCE			
	<input type="checkbox"/> INEFFECTIVE 0	<input type="checkbox"/> DEVELOPING 1.30	<input type="checkbox"/> EFFECTIVE 1.70	<input type="checkbox"/> HIGHLY EFFECTIVE 2.0
Expectations for learning	Teacher’s purpose in a lesson or unit is unclear to students.	Teacher attempts to explain the instructional purpose, with limited success.	Teacher’s purpose for the lesson or unit is clear, including where it is situated within	Teacher makes the purpose of the lesson or unit clear, including where it is situated within broader learning,

			broader learning.	linking that purpose to student interests when possible.
Directions and procedures	Teacher's directions and procedures are confusing to students.	Teacher's directions and procedures are clarified after initial student confusion.	Teacher's directions and procedures are clear to students.	Teacher's directions and procedures are clear to students and anticipate possible students misunderstanding.
Explanations of content	Teacher's explanation of the content is unclear or confusing or uses inappropriate language.	Teacher's explanation of the content is uneven; some is done skillfully, but other portions are difficult to follow.	Teacher's explanation of content is appropriate and connects with students' knowledge and experience.	Teacher's explanation of content is engaging and connects with students' knowledge and experience.
Use of oral and written language	Teacher's spoken language is inaudible, or written language is illegible. Spoken or written language contains errors of grammar or syntax. Vocabulary may be inappropriate, vague, or used incorrectly, leaving students	Teacher's spoken language is audible, and written language is legible. Both are used correctly and conform to standard English. Vocabulary is correct but limited or is not appropriate to the students' ages or backgrounds.	Teacher's spoken and written language is clear and correct and conforms to standard English. Vocabulary is appropriate to the students' ages and interests.	Teacher's spoken and written language is correct and conforms to standard English. It is also expressive, with well-chosen vocabulary that enriches the lesson. Teacher finds opportunities to extend students' vocabularies.

	confused.				
--	-----------	--	--	--	--

TOTAL – COMMUNICATING WITH STUDENTS (8.0 points) _____

Danielson Components “Enhancing Professional Practice, A Framework for Teaching” 2 nd Edition (2007)	NYS Teaching Standards Teacher demonstrates: Standard III: Effective Instructional Practice Standard IV: Skill in Creating a Positive Learning Environment			
3B Using questioning and discussion techniques	ELEMENT III ELEMENT III.4 ELEMENT III ELEMENT IV			
DANIELSON ELEMENT	LEVEL OF PERFORMANCE			
	<input type="checkbox"/> INEFFECTIVE 0	<input type="checkbox"/> DEVELOPING 1.30	<input type="checkbox"/> EFFECTIVE 1.70	<input type="checkbox"/> HIGHLY EFFECTIVE 2.0
Quality of questions	Teacher’s questions are virtually all of poor quality, with low cognitive challenge and	Teacher’s questions are a combination of low and high quality, posed in rapid succession.	Most of the teacher’s questions are of high quality. Adequate time is provided for	Teacher’s questions are of uniformly high quality, with adequate time for students to

	single correct responses, and they are asked in rapid succession.	Only some invite a thoughtful response.	students to respond.	respond. Students formulate many questions.
Discussion techniques	Interaction between teacher and students is predominantly recitation style, with the teacher mediating all questions and answers.	Teacher makes some attempt to engage students in genuine discussion rather than recitation, with uneven results.	Teacher creates a genuine discussion among students, stepping aside when appropriate.	Students assume considerable responsibility for the success of the discussion, initiating topics and making unsolicited contributions.

TOTAL – USING QUESTIONING AND DISCUSSION TECHNIQUES (4.0 points) _____

Danielson Components “Enhancing Professional Practice, A Framework for Teaching” 2 nd Edition (2007)	NYS Teaching Standards Teacher demonstrates: Standard III: Effective Instructional Practice
3C Engaging students in learning	ELEMENT III.1 ELEMENT III.4

		ELEMENT III			
DANIELSON ELEMENT	LEVEL OF PERFORMANCE				
	<input type="checkbox"/> INEFFECTIVE 0	<input type="checkbox"/> DEVELOPING 1.30	<input type="checkbox"/> EFFECTIVE 1.70	<input type="checkbox"/> HIGHLY EFFECTIVE 2.0	
Activities and assignments	Activities and assignments are inappropriate for students' age or background. Students are not mentally engaged in them.	Activities and assignments are appropriate to some students and engage them mentally, but others are not engaged.	Most activities and assignments are appropriate to students, and almost all students are cognitively engaged in exploring content.	All students are cognitively engaged in the activities and assignments in their exploration of content. Students have an opportunity to initiate or adapt activities and projects to enhance their understanding.	
Structure and pacing	The lesson has no clearly defined structure, or the pace of the lesson is too slow or rushed, or both.	The lesson has a recognizable structure, although it is not uniformly maintained throughout the lesson. Pacing of the lesson is inconsistent.	The lesson has a clearly defined structure around which the activities are organized. Pacing of the lesson is generally appropriate.	The lesson's structure is highly coherent, allowing for reflection and closure. Pacing of the lesson is appropriate for all students.	

TOTAL – ENGAGING STUDENTS IN LEARNING (4.0 points) _____

<p align="center">Danielson Components</p> <p align="center">“Enhancing Professional Practice, A Framework for Teaching” 2nd Edition (2007)</p>		<p align="center">NYS Teaching Standards</p> <p>Teacher demonstrates:</p> <p>Standard III: Effective Instructional Practice</p> <p>Standard V: Well Designed Assessment for Student Learning</p>			
<p>3D Using assessment in instruction</p>		<p>ELEMENT III.6</p> <p>ELEMENT V.1</p> <p>ELEMENT V</p> <p>ELEMENT V.3</p> <p>ELEMENT V.4</p> <p>ELEMENT V</p>			
<p align="center">DANIELSON ELEMENT</p>	<p align="center">LEVEL OF PERFORMANCE</p>				
	<p align="center"><input type="checkbox"/> INEFFECTIVE 0</p>	<p align="center"><input type="checkbox"/> DEVELOPING 1.30</p>	<p align="center"><input type="checkbox"/> EFFECTIVE 1.70</p>	<p align="center"><input type="checkbox"/> HIGHLY EFFECTIVE 2.0</p>	
<p>Monitoring of student learning</p>	<p>Teacher does not monitor student learning in the curriculum.</p>	<p>Teacher monitors the progress of the class as a whole but elicits no diagnostic information.</p>	<p>Teacher monitors the progress of groups of students in the curriculum, making limited use of diagnostic prompts to elicit information.</p>	<p>Teacher actively and systematically elicits diagnostic information from individual students regarding their understanding and monitors the progress of individual students.</p>	

Feedback to students	Teacher's feedback to students is of poor quality and not provided in a timely manner.	Teacher's feedback to students is uneven, and its timeliness is inconsistent.	Teacher's feedback to students is timely and of consistently high quality.	Teacher's feedback to students is timely and of consistently high quality, and students make use of the feedback in their learning.

TOTAL – USING ASSESSMENT IN INSTRUCTION (4.0 points) _____

Danielson Components “Enhancing Professional Practice, A Framework for Teaching” 2 nd Edition (2007)	NYS Teaching Standards Teacher demonstrates: Standard I: Knowledge of Students and Student Learning Standard II: Knowledge of Content and Instructional Planning Standard III: Effective Instructional Practice
3E Demonstrating flexibility and responsiveness	ELEMENT I.3 ELEMENT II.6 ELEMENT III.6

DANIELSON ELEMENT	LEVEL OF PERFORMANCE			
	<input type="checkbox"/> INEFFECTIVE 0	<input type="checkbox"/> DEVELOPING 1.30	<input type="checkbox"/> EFFECTIVE 1.70	<input type="checkbox"/> HIGHLY EFFECTIVE 2.0
Lesson adjustment	Teacher adheres rigidly to an instructional plan, even when a change is clearly needed.	Teacher attempts to adjust a lesson when needed, with only partially successful results.	Teacher makes a minor adjustment to a lesson, and the adjustment occurs smoothly.	Teacher successfully makes a major adjustment to a lesson when needed.
Response to students	Teacher ignores or brushes aside students' questions or interests.	Teacher attempts to accommodate students' questions or interests, although the pacing of the lesson is disrupted.	Teacher successfully accommodates students' question or interests.	Teacher seizes a major opportunity to enhance learning, building on student interests or a spontaneous event.
Persistence	When a student has difficulty learning, the teacher either gives up or blames the student or the student's home environment.	Teacher accepts responsibility for the success of all students but has only a limited repertoire of instructional strategies to draw on.	Teacher persists in seeking approaches for students who have difficulty learning, drawing on a broad repertoire of strategies.	Teacher persists in seeking effective approaches for students who need help, using an extensive repertoire of strategies and soliciting additional resources as needed.

TOTAL – DEMONSTRATING FLEXIBILITY AND RESPONSIVENESS (6.0 points) _____

DOMAIN 4: PROFESSIONAL RESPONSIBILITIES

Danielson Components “Enhancing Professional Practice, A Framework for Teaching” 2 nd Edition (2007)		NYS Teaching Standards Teacher demonstrates: Standard VII. Professional Growth			
4A Reflecting on teaching		ELEMENT VII.1			
DANIELSON ELEMENT	LEVEL OF PERFORMANCE				
	<input type="checkbox"/> INEFFECTIVE 0	<input type="checkbox"/> DEVELOPING .65	<input type="checkbox"/> EFFECTIVE .85	<input type="checkbox"/> HIGHLY EFFECTIVE 1.0	
Accuracy	Teacher does not know whether a lesson was effective or achieved its instructional outcomes, or teacher profoundly misjudges the success of a lesson.	Teacher has a generally accurate impression of a lesson’s effectiveness and the extent to which instructional outcomes were met.	Teacher makes an accurate assessment of a lesson’s effectiveness and the extent to which it achieved its instructional outcomes and can cite general references to support the judgment.	Teacher makes a thoughtful and accurate assessment of a lesson’s effectiveness and the extent to which it achieved its instructional outcomes, citing many specific examples from the lesson and weighing the relative strengths of each.	
	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	

Use in future teaching	Teacher has no suggestions for how a lesson could be improved another time the lesson is taught.	Teacher makes general suggestions about how a lesson could be improved another time the lesson is taught.	Teacher makes a few specific suggestions of what could be tried another time the lesson is taught.	Drawing on an extensive repertoire of skills, teacher offers specific alternative actions, complete with the probable success of different courses of action.
	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>

TOTAL – REFLECTING ON TEACHING (2.0 points) _____

TOTAL CLASSROOM OBSERVATION POINTS _____

Evaluation Charts for APPR Conversion of 60 points (Evaluation = 40; Prof Growth = 20)

Non-Tenured Teacher

3 Observations

Total Points – single observation = 71

3 observations = total of 213

Sum of the 3 Observations, divided by 213 = %

Take the % and obtain corresponding number on chart

Multiply by 2 for the 40 Point Scale

Tenured Teacher

2 Observations

Total Points – single Observation = 71

2 Observations = total of 142

Sum of the 2 Observations, divided by 142 = %

Take the % and obtain the corresponding number on the chart

Multiply by 2 for the 40 Point Scale

HIGHLY EFFECTIVE			EFFECTIVE									DEVELOPING					INEFFECTIVE			
20	19	18	17	16	15	14	13	12	11	10	9	8	7	6	5	4	3	2	1	0
97-100	93-96%	90-92%	86-89%	82-85%	77-81%	72-76%	67-71%	63-66%	59-62%	55-58%	51-54%	49-50%	47-48%	44-46%	41-43%	38-40%	36-37%	22-35%	16-21%	0%-15%

Green Island UFSD

Other Teacher Evaluative Measures Rubric

Teacher: _____

Date : _____

Every teacher will choose elements totaling 12 points (either one 8 point value and one 4 point value, or three 4 point values) in addition to the Required Parent Communication Log which comprises 8 of the total 20 points possible. In choosing elements by October 1st of the current school year, a teacher is committing to work on those elements for that school year and understand they will be evaluated on those elements at the end of the year. The teacher will meet with their Lead Evaluator and present attendant artifacts to be examined for those elements chosen by the teacher. The Lead evaluator will assign points on the specified elements from the rubric reflecting the teacher's progress toward goal attainment and assign the total points to the HEDI scale (below). That score will be added on their 40 point observation module to produce their share of the "60% Other Measures for Teachers."

	Criteria					Points
	0	1	2	3	4	
Professional Development Log*	Teacher documents less than 35 PD hours.	Teacher documents 35-40 PD hours.	Teacher documents between 41 and 50 PD hours.	Teacher documents between 51 and 75 PD hours.	Teacher documents more than 75 PD hours.	_____
School Committee or Association Involvement	Teacher is not a member of a school committee.	Teacher is a member of one school committee.	Teacher is a member of 2 committees (on an as needed basis).	Teacher is an active member of 2 or more committees.	Teacher holds a committee leadership role. (ie. Chair, officer)	_____
Online uploads of Grades	Teacher does not upload grades.	Teacher uploads grades only for progress reports and marking period grades.	Teacher uploads grades on a monthly basis.	Teacher uploads grades on a bi-weekly basis.	Teacher uploads grades on a weekly basis.	_____
Extra Class or Duty (uncompensated)	Teacher has not accepted an extra class of duty for any quarter.	Teacher accepts an extra class or Duty for a time equivalent of 1 quarter.	Teacher accepts an extra class or Duty for a time equivalent of 2 quarter.	Teacher accepts an extra class or Duty for a time equivalent of 3 quarter.	Teacher accepts an extra class or Duty for a time equivalent of 4 quarters.	_____
Curriculum Mapping Hours	Teacher did not document any curriculum mapping hours.	Teacher documents 5 hours of curriculum mappings.	Teacher documents 10 hours of curriculum mappings.	Teacher documents 15 hours of curriculum mappings.	Teacher documents 20 hours of curriculum mappings.	_____

Community Activity Log (uncompensated)	Teacher did not document attendance of any school or community related functions. (i.e. Sporting events, concerts, fundraisers, etc.)	Teacher documents 1 to 3 hours of attendance at school related or community functions. (i.e. Sporting events, concerts, fundraisers, etc.)	Teacher documents 4 to 7 hours of attendance at school related or community functions. (i.e. Sporting events, concerts, fundraisers, etc.)	Teacher documents 8 to 11 hours of attendance at school related or community functions. (i.e. Sporting events, concerts, fundraisers, etc.)	Teacher documents 12 or more hours of attendance at school related or community functions. (i.e. Sporting events, concerts, fundraisers, etc.)	_____
Conference attendance** (off hours)	Teacher did not attend conferences or workshops off hours.	Teacher shows proof of 3 hours of attendance at conferences of workshops.	Teacher shows proof 6 hours of attendance at conferences of workshops.	Teacher shows proof of 9 hours of attendance at conferences of workshops.	Teacher shows proof of 12 hours of attendance at conferences of workshops.	_____
Professional Goals and Reflection.	Teacher did not submit a Professional Goal for review and reflection.	Teacher submitted but did not follow district timeline for goals.	Teacher follows district timeline for goals, but fail to complete end of year self reflection.	Teacher follows district timeline for goals. As well as, completes the end of year self reflection.	Teacher follows district timeline for goals. As well as, completes the end of year self reflection with plan for future improvement.	_____
	0	2	4	6	8	
Online Class Communication	Teacher does not use online software to communicate class information.	Teacher utilized online software such as weebly, blackboard, wiki or remind101 on a quarterly basis to communicate class information to students and parents.	Teacher utilized online software such as weebly, blackboard, wiki or remind101 on a monthly basis to communicate class information to students and parents.	Teacher utilized online software such as weebly, blackboard, wiki or remind101 on a bi-weekly basis to communicate class information to students and parents.	Teacher utilized online software such as weebly, blackboard, wiki or remind101 on a weekly basis to communicate class information to students and parents.	_____
Communication with parents (Required of ALL Teachers.)	Teacher does not document contact with parents.	Teacher documents less than 6 contacts per quarter.	Teacher documents between 6 to 9 contacts per quarter.	Teacher documents between 10 to 14 contacts per quarter.	Teacher documents more than 14 contacts per quarter.	_____
				TOTAL =		_____/20

HIGHLY EFFECTIVE			EFFECTIVE									DEVELOPING					INEFFECTIVE			
20	19	18	17	16	15	14	13	12	11	10	9	8	7	6	5	4	3	2	1	0

Total Points: Teacher Rubric (maximum of 40 points) and Teacher Artifacts (maximum of 20 points)

HIGHLY EFFECTIVE			EFFECTIVE									DEVELOPING					INEFFECTIVE			
60	-	54				53	-	31					30	-	22			21	-	0

Green Island UFSD: Teacher Improvement Plan

TIP will be initiated within 10 days of identification of the need for a TIP; Reviewed again by December 15, and again by March 15, with an endpoint no later than May 15.

<u>Areas of Needed Improvement</u>	<u>Tasks/Activities to Support or Document Improvement</u>	<u>Time Frame</u>	<u>Manner of Assessment</u>	<u>Who Responsible</u> <u>(this can be a variety of persons but should also include teacher on improvement plan)</u>

Teacher Signature _____ Date _____

Administrator Signature _____ Date _____

Green Island Union Free School District

Locally Selected Measures for a Principal Who has a State Provided Growth Measure for Their 25 points

Highly Effective		Effective						Developing					Ineffective		
15	14	13	12	11	10	9	8	7	6	5	4	3	2	1	0
98 -100%	81-97%	70- 80%	66 - 69%	62 - 65%	59- 61%	55- 58%	51- 54%	47- 50%	44- 46%	40- 43%	36- 39%	32- 35%	29- 31%	14- 28%	0- 13%

APPR Rubric for Principal Evaluation 2012-2013

60 points – Based on Multidimensional Principal Performance Rubric

	Highly	Effective	Developing	Ineffective
	Effective			

Domain 1:

Shared Vision of Learning:

a. Culture	3.5	3	1.5	0
b. B. Sustainability	3.5	3	1.5	0
c.				

Domain 2:

School Culture and

Instructional Program:

a. Culture	4	3.5	2.5	0
b. Instructional Program	5	4.5	3.5	0
c. Capacity Building	5	4.5	3.5	0
d. Sustainability	4	3.5	2.5	0
e. Strategic Planning Process	4	3.5	2.5	0

Domain 3;

Safe, Efficient, Effective

Learning Environment:

a. Capacity Building	4	3.5	2.5	0
b. Culture	4	3.5	2.5	0
c. Sustainability	4	3.5	2.5	0
d. Instructional program	5	4.5	3.5	0

Domain 4:

Community:

a. Strategic Planning Process: Inquiry	3	1.5	1.25	0
---	---	-----	------	---

b. Culture	2	1.25	1	0
c. Sustainability	2	1.25	1	0

Domain 5:

Integrity, Fairness, Ethics:

a. Sustainability	2.5	2	1.5	0
b. Culture	2.5	2	1.5	0

Domain 6:

Political Social, Economic:

a. Sustainability	1	.9	.75	0
b. Culture	1	.9	.75	0

Total Points (each column) =

Grand Total (all columns added together) =

Scoring Range HE = 54-60 points E = 31-53 points D = 22-30 points I = 0-21 points

Principal Signature _____ Date _____

Superintendent Signature _____ Date _____

The Principal will be evaluated twice each year. The two evaluations will be added together and divided by 2 to arrive at a point total that will then be applied to the HEDI Scale below to determine status of principal:

HIGHLY EFFECTIVE			EFFECTIVE						DEVELOPING						INEFFECTIVE				
54	-	60				31	-	53					22	-	30		0	-	21

Green Island Union Free School District Principal Improvement Plan Process

Upon rating a principal as ineffective or developing, an improvement plan designed to rectify perceived or demonstrated deficiencies must be developed and commenced no later than ten (10) school days after the start of a school year. The superintendent or designee, in conjunction with the principal, must develop an improvement plan that contains:

1. A clear delineation of the deficiencies that resulted in the ineffective or developing assessment.
2. Specific improvement goal/outcome statements.
3. Specific improvement action steps/activities.
4. A reasonable time line for achieving improvement.
5. Required and accessible resources to achieve goal.
6. A formative evaluation process documenting meetings strategically scheduled throughout the year to assess progress. These meetings shall occur at least twice during the year: the first between December 1 and December 15 and the second between March 1 and March 15. A written summary of feedback on progress shall be given within 5 business days of each meeting.
7. A clear manner in which improvement efforts will be assessed, including evidence demonstrating improvement.
8. A formal, final written summative assessment delineating progress made with an opportunity for comments by the principal.

Principal Improvement Plan

Name of Principal _____

School Building _____ Academic Year _____

Deficiency that promulgated the “ineffective” or “developing” performance rating:

Improvement Goal/Outcome:

Action Steps/Activities:

Timeline for completion:

Required and Accessible Resources, including identification of responsibility for provision:

Dates of formative evaluation on progress (lead evaluator and principal initial each date to confirm the meeting):

December:

March:

Other:

Evidence to be provided for Goal Achievement:

Assessment Summary: Superintendent is to attach a narrative summary of improvement progress, including verification of the provision of support and resources as outlined above no later than 10 days after the identified completion date. Such summary shall be signed by the superintendent and principal with the opportunity for the principal to attach comments.

Green Island Union Free School District

Locally Selected Measures for Teachers Who Have State Provided Growth Scores on a Scale of 25 points

Highly Effective		Effective						Developing					Ineffective		
15	14	13	12	11	10	9	8	7	6	5	4	3	2	1	0
98 -100%	81-97%	70- 80%	66 - 69%	62 - 65%	59- 61%	55- 58%	51- 54%	47- 50%	44- 46%	40- 43%	36- 39%	32- 35%	29- 31%	14- 28%	0- 13%

Green Island Union Free School District

Locally Selected Measures for Teachers Who Do Not Have a State Provided Growth Score

HIGHLY EFFECTIVE			EFFECTIVE									DEVELOPING					INEFFECTIVE			
20	19	18	17	16	15	14	13	12	11	10	9	8	7	6	5	4	3	2	1	0
97% - 100%	93% -	90% -	86% -	82% -	77% -	72% -	67% -	63% -	59% -	55% -	51% -	49% -	47% -	44% -	41% -	38% -	36% -	22% -	16% -	0% - 15%
	96%	92%	89%	85%	81%	76%	71%	66%	62%	58%	54%	50%	48%	46%	43%	40%	37%	35%	21%	

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:

Dr. Michael James Mugitt 12-6-12

Teachers Union President Signature: Date:

Jenny Starn 12-6-12

Administrative Union President Signature: Date:

Erin L. Teahan 12-6-12

Board of Education President Signature: Date:

Arick DeCia 12-6-12