



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 10, 2012

Kyle Bower, Superintendent
Hammondsport Central School District
8272 Main Street
Hammondsport, NY 14840

Dear Superintendent Bower:

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: Horst Graefe

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

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

Annual Professional Performance Reviews: 2012-13

Created Thursday, May 03, 2012

Updated Wednesday, October 31, 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 : 572901040000

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

572901040000

1.2) School District Name: HAMMONDSPORT CSD

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

HAMMONDSPORT CSD

1.3) School Improvement Grant (SIG) Districts Only

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

(No response)

1.4) Award Classification

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

(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 Friday, May 04, 2012

Updated Thursday, December 06, 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.	(No response)

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	Northwest Evaluation Association Measures of Academic Progress Assessments for Primary Grades ELA
1	State-approved 3rd party assessment	Northwest Evaluation Association Measures of Academic Progress Assessments for Primary Grades ELA
2	State-approved 3rd party assessment	Northwest Evaluation Association Measures of Academic Progress Assessments for Primary Grades 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.

Hammondsport will be using conditional growth index (CGI) based on the Northwest Evaluation Association Measures of Academic Progress assessment to calculate teacher-level effectiveness ratings for the comparable growth measures in ELA in grades K-2. The conditional growth index captures the contributions educators make to student learning on the NWEA MAP assessments, by comparing actual student growth to the student growth norms. These norms reflect the amount of growth that might be expected from these students based on their grade, subject, and starting RIT score. CGI scores are expressed in standard deviation units, or z-scores, with scores above zero indicating students exceeded the growth norms, whereas scores below zero indicate growth less than the growth norm. CGI scores of zero are indicative of students meeting their growth norms.

To construct an evaluative rating, CGI scores for all students linked to a particular teacher will be averaged, with this average CGI score converted to the four-category HEDI range. The objective is to facilitate valid and fair comparisons of productivity with respect to student outcomes, given that teachers often serve very different student populations. Major modeling and score translation decisions were decided by a Technical Advisory Panel made up of volunteer districts from across the state.

To assign K-2 teachers to HEDI categories, we will assume a normal distribution of teacher effects centered on 13. From this point, we will use the following cut points to assign teachers to categories:

Highly Effective: Greater than or equal to .9 standard deviations above average (13)

Effective: Less than .9 standard deviations above average and greater than or equal to -.9 standard deviations below average

Developing: Less than -.9 standard deviations below average and greater than or equal to -2.1 standard deviations below average

Ineffective: Less than -2.1 standard deviations below average

For Grade 3 ELA an SLO will be developed using prior performance and demographic data related to students who have participated in the 3rd Grade State Assessment in prior years alongside the data associated with the incoming cohort to determine an appropriate SLO target for the upcoming 3rd Grade State Assessment. The principal will have final approval of all SLO targets. Student performance on the 3rd Grade State Assessment as related to the target will be the basis for placing the teacher score in a HEDI rating category.

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

For K-2 within the category of Highly Effective, those teachers who fall at greater than or equal to .9 standard deviations above average, we further divide the distribution to determine specific points. The specific point breakdown, with upper and lower bounds denoted in standard deviation units, is as follows:

APPR Point \geq <
18 0.9 1.1

19 1.1 1.3
20 1.3
Grade 3 Using the NYS ELA Assessment- Points shall be assigned by the percentage of students well above the target goal of 80%. 86-100% of student performance targets met.

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

K-2 Using NWEA MAP Primary-Within the category of Effective, those teachers who fall at less than .9 standard deviations above average and greater than or equal to -.9 standard deviations below average, we further divide the distribution to determine specific points. The specific point breakdown, with upper and lower bounds denoted in standard deviation units, is as follows:

APPR Point \geq <
9 -0.9 -0.7
10 -0.7 -0.5
11 -0.5 -0.3
12 -0.3 -0.1
13 -0.1 0.1
14 0.1 0.3
15 0.3 0.5
16 0.5 0.7
17 0.7 0.9

Grade 3 Using the NYS ELA Assessment-Points shall be assigned by the percentage of students slightly above, at, or slightly below the target goal of 80%. 55%-85% of student performance targets met.

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

K-2 Using NWEA MAP Primary- Within the category of Developing, those teachers who fall at less than -.9 standard deviations below average and greater than or equal to -2.1 standard deviations below average, we further divide the distribution to determine specific points. The specific point breakdown, with upper and lower bounds denoted in standard deviation units, is as follows:

APPR Point \geq <
3 -2.1 -1.9
4 -1.9 -1.7
5 -1.7 -1.5
6 -1.5 -1.3
7 -1.3 -1.1
8 -1.1 -0.9

Grade 3 Using NYS ELA Assessment-Points shall be assigned by the percentage of students achieving below the target goal of 80%. 30%-54% of student performance targets met.

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

K-2 Using NWEA MAP Primary-Within the category of Ineffective, those teachers who fall at less than -2.1 standard deviations below average, we further divide the distribution to determine specific points. The specific point breakdown, with upper and lower bounds denoted in standard deviation units, is as follows:

APPR Point \geq <
0 -2.5
1 -2.5 -2.3
2 -2.3 -2.1

Grade 3 Using NYS ELA Assessment - Points shall be assigned by the percentage of students achieving well below the target goal of 80%. Below 30% of student performance targets met.

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	Northwest Evaluation Association Measures of Academic Progress Assessments for Primary Grades math
1	State-approved 3rd party assessment	Northwest Evaluation Association Measures of Academic Progress Assessments for Primary Grades math
2	State-approved 3rd party assessment	Northwest Evaluation Association Measures of Academic Progress Assessments for Primary Grades 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.

Hammondsport will be using conditional growth index (CGI) based on the Northwest Evaluation Association Measures of Academic Progress assessment to calculate teacher-level effectiveness ratings for the comparable growth measures in Math in grades K-2. The conditional growth index captures the contributions educators make to student learning on the NWEA MAP assessments, by comparing actual student growth to the student growth norms. These norms reflect the amount of growth that might be expected from these students based on their grade, subject, and starting RIT score. CGI scores are expressed in standard deviation units, or z-scores, with scores above zero indicating students exceeded the growth norms, whereas scores below zero indicate growth less than the growth norm. CGI scores of zero are indicative of students meeting their growth norms.

To construct an evaluative rating, CGI scores for all students linked to a particular teacher will be averaged, with this average CGI score converted to the four-category HEDI range. The objective is to facilitate valid and fair comparisons of productivity with respect to student outcomes, given that teachers often serve very different student populations. Major modeling and score translation decisions were decided by a Technical Advisory Panel made up of volunteer districts from across the state.

To assign K-2 teachers to HEDI categories, we will

assume a normal distribution of teacher effects centered on 13. From this point, we will use the following cut points to assign teachers to categories:

Highly Effective: Greater than or equal to .9 standard deviations above average (13)

Effective: Less than .9 standard deviations above average and greater than or equal to -.9 standard deviations below average

Developing: Less than -.9 standard deviations below average and greater than or equal to -2.1 standard deviations below average

Ineffective: Less than -2.1 standard deviations below average

For Grade 3 Math an SLO will be developed using prior performance and demographic data related to students who have participated in the 3rd Grade State Assessment in prior years alongside the data associated with the incoming cohort to determine an appropriate SLO target for the upcoming 3rd Grade State Assessment. The principal will have final approval of all SLO targets. Student performance on the 3rd Grade State Assessment as related to the target will be the basis for placing the teacher score in a HEDI rating category.

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

For K-2 within the category of Highly Effective, those teachers who fall at greater than or equal to .9 standard deviations above average, we further divide the distribution to determine specific points. The specific point breakdown, with upper and lower bounds denoted in standard deviation units, is as follows:

APPR Point \geq <

18 0.9 1.1

19 1.1 1.3

20 1.3

Grade 3 Using the NYS math Assessment- Points shall be assigned by the percentage of students well above the target goal of 80%. 86-100% of student performance targets met.

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

K-2 Using NWEA MAP Primary-Within the category of Effective, those teachers who fall at less than .9 standard deviations above average and greater than or equal to -.9 standard deviations below average, we further divide the distribution to determine specific points. The specific point breakdown, with upper and lower bounds denoted in standard deviation units, is as follows:

APPR Point \geq <

9 -0.9 -0.7

10 -0.7 -0.5

11 -0.5 -0.3

12 -0.3 -0.1

13 -0.1 0.1

14 0.1 0.3

15 0.3 0.5

16 0.5 0.7

17 0.7 0.9

Grade 3 Using the NYS math Assessment-Points shall be assigned by the percentage of students slightly above, at,

or slightly below the target goal of 80%. 55%-85% of student performance targets met.

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

K-2 Using NWEA MAP Primary- Within the category of Developing, those teachers who fall at less than -.9 standard deviations below average and greater than or equal to -2.1 standard deviations below average, we further divide the distribution to determine specific points. The specific point breakdown, with upper and lower bounds denoted in standard deviation units, is as follows:

APPR Point $\geq <$
 3 -2.1 -1.9
 4 -1.9 -1.7
 5 -1.7 -1.5
 6 -1.5 -1.3
 7 -1.3 -1.1
 8 -1.1 -0.9

Grade 3 Using NYS math Assessment-Points shall be assigned by the percentage of students achieving below the target goal of 80%. 30%-54% of student performance targets met.

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

K-2 Using NWEA MAP Primary-Within the category of Ineffective, those teachers who fall at less than -2.1 standard deviations below average, we further divide the distribution to determine specific points. The specific point breakdown, with upper and lower bounds denoted in standard deviation units, is as follows:

APPR Point $\geq <$
 0 -2.5
 1 -2.5 -2.3
 2 -2.3 -2.1

Grade 3 Using NYS math Assessment - Points shall be assigned by the percentage of students achieving well below the target goal of 80%. Below 30% of student performance targets met.

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	Not applicable	Not applicable
7	District, regional or BOCES-developed assessment	Hammondsport District 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.	Teacher will write an SLO that uses differentiated growth targets for all of the students on their roster. Teacher will either give a District approved pre assessment, use previous student performance and demographic data to establish a baseline, or a combination of both. Following a pre assessment, the teacher will then apply the formula of 1/2 the growth to 100 for each individual student in the grade level to establish the initial individual student growth goal. If the individual student goals that result are determined to be too low by the principal, the teacher and principal will develop an SLO also using prior student performance and a review of previous course and demographic data to inform the goal setting. We will then place the target average of 80% of students meeting or exceeding their differentiated growth targets at the 15 point mark and distribute the remaining percentages equally across the HEDI scale. Following the summative assessment, the percent of students reaching their differentiated growth targets will be used to apply the HEDI scale and assign a final teacher score. Final approval of student goals and SLO's is assigned to the appropriate building principal in all cases.
Highly Effective (18 - 20 points) Results are well-above state average for similar students (or District goals if no state test).	Points shall be assigned by the percentage of students well above the target goal of 80%. 86-100% of student performance targets met.
Effective (9 - 17 points) Results meet state average for similar students (or District goals if no state test).	Points shall be assigned by the percentage of students slightly above, at, or slightly below the target goal of 80%. 55%-85% of student performance targets met.
Developing (3 - 8 points) Results are below state average for similar students (or District goals if no state test).	Points shall be assigned by the percentage of students achieving below the target goal of 80%. 30%-54% of student performance targets met.
Ineffective (0 - 2 points) Results are well-below state average for similar students (or District goals if no state test).	Points shall be assigned by the percentage of students achieving well below the target goal of 80%. Below 30% of student performance targets met.

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	Not applicable	Not applicable
7	District, regional or BOCES-developed assessment	Hammondspport District Developed 7th Grade Social Studies Assessment
8	District, regional or BOCES-developed assessment	Hammondspport District Developed 8th grade Social Studies Assessment

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

Use this box, if needed, to describe the general process for assigning HEDI categories for these grades/subjects in	Teacher will write an SLO that uses differentiated growth targets for all of the students on their roster. Teacher will
---	---

this subcomponent. If needed, you may upload a table or graphic at 2.11, below.

either give a District approved pre assessment, use previous student performance and demographic data to establish a baseline, or a combination of both. Following a pre assessment, the teacher will then apply the formula of 1/2 the growth to 100 for each individual student in the grade level to establish the initial individual student growth goal. If the individual student goals that result are determined to be too low by the principal, the teacher and principal will develop an SLO also using prior student performance and a review of previous course and demographic data to inform the goal setting. We will then place the target average of 80% of students meeting or exceeding their differentiated growth targets at the 15 point mark and distribute the remaining percentages equally across the HEDI scale. Following the summative assessment, the percent of students reaching their differentiated growth targets will be used to apply the HEDI scale and assign a final teacher score. Final approval of student goals and SLO's is assigned to the appropriate building principal in all cases.

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

Points shall be assigned by the percentage of students well above the target goal of 80%. 86-100% of student performance targets met.

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

Points shall be assigned by the percentage of students slightly above, at, or slightly below the target goal of 80%. 55%-85% of student performance targets met.

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

Points shall be assigned by the percentage of students achieving below the target goal of 80%. 30%-54% of student performance targets met.

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

Points shall be assigned by the percentage of students achieving well below the target goal of 80%. Below 30% of student performance targets met.

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	Hammondsport District Developed Global I Assessment

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

For High School Social Studies Regents Courses: describe the district-adopted expectations for the level of performance required for each HEDI rating category and the process for assigning points to teachers based on SLO results consistent with regulations and

assurances in the Comparable Growth Measures subcomponent. Include any district-determined expectations for student performance.

<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>Teacher will write an SLO that uses differentiated growth targets for all of the students on their roster. Teacher will either give a District approved pre assessment, use previous student performance and demographic data to establish a baseline, or a combination of both. Following a pre assessment, the teacher will then apply the formula of 1/2 the growth to 100 for each individual student in the grade level to establish the initial individual student growth goal. If the individual student goals that result are determined to be too low by the principal, the teacher and principal will develop an SLO also using prior student performance and a review of previous course and demographic data to inform the goal setting. We will then place the target average of 80% of students meeting or exceeding their differentiated growth targets at the 15 point mark and distribute the remaining percentages equally across the HEDI scale. Following the summative assessment, the percent of students reaching their differentiated growth targets will be used to apply the HEDI scale and assign a final teacher score. Final approval of student goals and SLO's is assigned to the appropriate building principal in all cases.</p>
<p>Highly Effective (18 - 20 points) Results are well-above District goals for similar students.</p>	<p>Points shall be assigned by the percentage of students well above the target goal of 80%. 86-100% of student performance targets met.</p>
<p>Effective (9 - 17 points) Results meet District goals for similar students.</p>	<p>Points shall be assigned by the percentage of students slightly above, at, or slightly below the target goal of 80%. 55%-85% of student performance targets met.</p>
<p>Developing (3 - 8 points) Results are below District goals for similar students.</p>	<p>Points shall be assigned by the percentage of students achieving below the target goal of 80%. 30%-54% of student performance targets met.</p>
<p>Ineffective (0 - 2 points) Results are well-below District goals for similar students.</p>	<p>Points shall be assigned by the percentage of students achieving well below the target goal of 80%. Below 30% of student performance targets met.</p>

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>Teacher will write an SLO that uses differentiated growth targets for all of the students on their roster. Teacher will either give a District approved pre assessment, use previous student performance and demographic data to establish a baseline, or a combination of both. Following a pre assessment, the teacher will then apply the formula of 1/2 the growth to 100 for each individual student in the grade level to establish the initial individual student growth goal. If the individual student goals that result are determined to be too low by the principal, the teacher and principal will develop an SLO also using prior student performance and a review of previous course and demographic data to inform the goal setting. We will then place the target average of 80% of students meeting or exceeding their differentiated growth targets at the 15 point mark and distribute the remaining percentages equally across the HEDI scale. Following the summative assessment, the percent of students reaching their differentiated growth targets will be used to apply the HEDI scale and assign a final teacher score. Final approval of student goals and SLO's is assigned to the appropriate building principal in all cases.</p>
<p>Highly Effective (18 - 20 points) Results are well-above District goals for similar students.</p>	<p>Points shall be assigned by the percentage of students well above the target goal of 80%. 86-100% of student performance targets met.</p>
<p>Effective (9 - 17 points) Results meet District goals for similar students.</p>	<p>Points shall be assigned by the percentage of students slightly above, at, or slightly below the target goal of 80%. 55%-85% of student performance targets met.</p>
<p>Developing (3 - 8 points) Results are below District goals for similar students.</p>	<p>Points shall be assigned by the percentage of students achieving below the target goal of 80%. 30%-54% of student performance targets met.</p>
<p>Ineffective (0 - 2 points) Results are well-below District goals for similar students.</p>	<p>Points shall be assigned by the percentage of students achieving well below the target goal of 80%. Below 30% of student performance targets met.</p>

2.8) High School Math Regents Courses

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

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

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

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

<p>Use this box, if needed, to describe the general process for assigning HEDI categories for these grades/subjects in this subcomponent. If needed, you may upload a table or graphic at 2.11, below.</p>	<p>Teacher will write an SLO that uses differentiated growth targets for all of the students on their roster. Teacher will either give a District approved pre assessment, use previous student performance and demographic data to establish a baseline, or a combination of both. Following a pre assessment, the teacher will then apply the formula of 1/2 the growth to 100 for each individual student in the grade level to establish the initial individual student growth goal. If the individual student goals that result are determined to be too low by the principal, the teacher and principal will develop an SLO also using prior student performance and a review of previous course and demographic data to inform the goal setting. We will then place the target average of 80% of students meeting or exceeding their differentiated growth targets at the 15 point mark and distribute the remaining percentages equally across the HEDI scale. Following the summative assessment, the percent of students reaching their differentiated growth targets will be used to apply the HEDI scale and assign a final teacher score. Final approval of student goals and SLO's is assigned to the appropriate building principal in all cases.</p>
<p>Highly Effective (18 - 20 points) Results are well-above District goals for similar students.</p>	<p>Points shall be assigned by the percentage of students well above the target goal of 80%. 86-100% of student performance targets met.</p>
<p>Effective (9 - 17 points) Results meet District goals for similar students.</p>	<p>Points shall be assigned by the percentage of students slightly above, at, or slightly below the target goal of 80%. 55%-85% of student performance targets met.</p>
<p>Developing (3 - 8 points) Results are below District goals for similar students.</p>	<p>Points shall be assigned by the percentage of students achieving below the target goal of 80%. 30%-54% of student performance targets met.</p>
<p>Ineffective (0 - 2 points) Results are well-below District goals for similar students.</p>	<p>Points shall be assigned by the percentage of students achieving well below the target goal of 80%. Below 30% of student performance targets met.</p>

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	Northwest Evaluation Association Measures of Academic Progress Assessments for Grade 9 ELA
Grade 10 ELA	District, regional or BOCES-developed assessment	Northwest Evaluation Association Measures of Academic Progress Assessments for Grade 10 ELA
Grade 11 ELA	Regents assessment	English Comprehensive Regents Assessment

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

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

Hammondsport will be using conditional growth index (CGI) based on the Northwest Evaluation Association Measures of Academic Progress assessment to calculate teacher-level effectiveness ratings for the comparable growth measures in ELA in grades 9 and 10. The conditional growth index captures the contributions educators make to student learning on the NWEA MAP assessments, by comparing actual student growth to the student growth norms. These norms reflect the amount of growth that might be expected from these students based on their grade, subject, and starting RIT score. CGI scores are expressed in standard deviation units, or z-scores, with scores above zero indicating students exceeded the growth norms, whereas scores below zero indicate growth less than the growth norm. CGI scores of zero are indicative of students meeting their growth norms.

To construct an evaluative rating, CGI scores for all students linked to a particular teacher will be averaged, with this average CGI score converted to the four-category HEDI range. The objective is to facilitate valid and fair comparisons of productivity with respect to student outcomes, given that teachers often serve very different student populations. Major modeling and score translation decisions were decided by a Technical Advisory Panel made up of volunteer districts from across the state.

To assign 9-10 ELA teachers to HEDI categories, we will assume a normal distribution of teacher effects centered on 13. From this point, we will use the following cut points to assign teachers to categories:

Highly Effective: Greater than or equal to .9 standard deviations above average (13)

Effective: Less than .9 standard deviations above average and greater than or equal to -.9 standard deviations below average

Developing: Less than -.9 standard deviations below average and greater than or equal to -2.1 standard deviations below average

Ineffective: Less than -2.1 standard deviations below average

Grade 11 ELA: Teacher will write an SLO that uses differentiated growth targets for all of the students on their roster. Teacher will either give a District approved pre assessment, use previous student performance and demographic data to establish a baseline, or a combination of both. Following a pre assessment, the teacher will then apply the formula of 1/2 the growth to 100 for each individual student in the grade level to establish the initial individual student growth goal. If the individual student goals that result are determined to be too low by the principal, the teacher and principal will develop an SLO also using prior student performance and

a review of previous course and demographic data to inform the goal setting. We will then place the target average of 80% of students meeting or exceeding their differentiated growth targets at the 15 point mark and distribute the remaining percentages equally across the HEDI scale. Following the summative assessment, the percent of students reaching their differentiated growth targets will be used to apply the HEDI scale and assign a final teacher score. Final approval of student goals and SLO's is assigned to the appropriate building principal in all cases.

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

For 9-10 ELA within the category of Highly Effective, those teachers who fall at greater than or equal to .9 standard deviations above average, we further divide the distribution to determine specific points. The specific point breakdown, with upper and lower bounds denoted in standard deviation units, is as follows:

APPR Point \geq <
18 0.9 1.1
19 1.1 1.3
20 1.3

Grade 11 ELA: Points shall be assigned by the percentage of students well above the target goal of 80%. 86-100% of student performance targets met.

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

9-10 ELA Using NWEA MAP Primary-Within the category of Effective, those teachers who fall at less than .9 standard deviations above average and greater than or equal to -.9 standard deviations below average, we further divide the distribution to determine specific points. The specific point breakdown, with upper and lower bounds denoted in standard deviation units, is as follows:

APPR Point \geq <
9 -0.9 -0.7
10 -0.7 -0.5
11 -0.5 -0.3
12 -0.3 -0.1
13 -0.1 0.1
14 0.1 0.3
15 0.3 0.5
16 0.5 0.7
17 0.7 0.9

Grade 11 ELA: Points shall be assigned by the percentage of students slightly above, at, or slightly below the target goal of 80%. 55%-85% of student performance targets met.

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

9-10 ELA Using NWEA MAP Primary- Within the category of Developing, those teachers who fall at less than -.9 standard deviations below average and greater than or equal to -2.1 standard deviations below average, we further divide the distribution to determine specific points. The specific point breakdown, with upper and lower bounds denoted in standard deviation units, is as follows:

APPR Point \geq <

3 -2.1 -1.9

4 -1.9 -1.7

5 -1.7 -1.5

6 -1.5 -1.3

7 -1.3 -1.1

8 -1.1 -0.9

Grade 11 ELA: Points shall be assigned by the percentage of students achieving below the target goal of 80%. 30%-54% of student performance targets met.

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

9-10 ELA Using NWEA MAP Primary-Within the category of Ineffective, those teachers who fall at less than -2.1 standard deviations below average, we further divide the distribution to determine specific points. The specific point breakdown, with upper and lower bounds denoted in standard deviation units, is as follows:

APPR Point \geq <

0 -2.5

1 -2.5 -2.3

2 -2.3 -2.1

Grade 11 ELA: Points shall be assigned by the percentage of students achieving well below the target goal of 80%. Below 30% of student performance targets met.

2.10) All Other Courses

Fill in, as applicable, for all other teachers in additional grades/subjects that have Student Learning Objectives. If you need additional space, duplicate this form and upload (below) as an attachment to your APPR plan. You may combine into one line any groups of teachers for whom the answers in the boxes are the same including, for example, "all other teachers not named above" .

Course(s) or Subject(s)	Option	Assessment
Art	District, Regional or BOCES-developed	Hammondsport developed grade specific Art assessments
Music	District, Regional or BOCES-developed	Hammondsport developed grade specific Music assessments
Physical Education	District, Regional or BOCES-developed	Hammondsport developed grade specific Physical Education local assessment
Library K-6	School/BOCES-wide/group/team results based on State	NYS ELA 3-6
K-2 Special Education	State-approved 3rd party assessment	Northwest Evaluation Association Measures of Academic Progress Assessments for Primary Grades
3-8 Special Education	State Assessment	NYS 3-8 grade ELA/Math Assessments
9-12 Special Education	State Assessment	NYS Course Specific Regents Exams
Health	District, Regional or BOCES-developed	Hammondsport Junior High/Senior High Health locally developed assessment
Technology	District, Regional or BOCES-developed	Hammondsport course specific locally developed assessments

Spanish	District, Regional or BOCES-developed	GST BOCES Regionally developed LOTE assessment-Grade and Level Specific
Accounting	District, Regional or BOCES-developed	Hammondsport locally developed Accounting local assessment
Grades 9-12 Business	District, Regional or BOCES-developed	Hammondsport locally Developed Course Specific Assessments
Economics	District, Regional or BOCES-developed	Hammondsport locally developed Economics local assessment
Participation in Government	District, Regional or BOCES-developed	Hammondsport locally developed Participation in Government local assessment
ACE Statistics	District, Regional or BOCES-developed	Hammondsport locally developed ACE Statistics local assessment
Pre- Calculus	District, Regional or BOCES-developed	Hammondsport locally developed Pre-Calculus local assessment
English 12	District, Regional or BOCES-developed	Hammondsport locally developed 12th grade English local assessment

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

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

For Special Education Grades K-2 Hammondsport will be using conditional growth index (CGI) based on the Northwest Evaluation Association Measures of Academic Progress assessment to calculate teacher-level effectiveness ratings for the comparable growth measures in ELA in grades K-2. The conditional growth index captures the contributions educators make to student learning on the NWEA MAP assessments, by comparing actual student growth to the student growth norms. These norms reflect the amount of growth that might be expected from these students based on their grade, subject, and starting RIT score. CGI scores are expressed in standard deviation units, or z-scores, with scores above zero indicating students exceeded the growth norms, whereas scores below zero indicate growth less than the growth norm. CGI scores of zero are indicative of students meeting their growth norms.

To construct an evaluative rating, CGI scores for all students linked to a particular teacher will be averaged, with this average CGI score converted to the four-category HEDI range. The objective is to facilitate valid and fair comparisons of productivity with respect to student outcomes, given that teachers often serve very different student populations. Major modeling and score translation decisions were decided by a Technical Advisory Panel made up of volunteer districts from across the state.

To assign K-2 teachers to HEDI categories, we will assume a normal distribution of teacher effects centered on 13.

All other grade levels/subjects: Teacher will write an SLO that uses differentiated growth targets for all of the students on their roster. Teacher will either give a District approved pre assessment, use previous student performance and demographic data to establish a baseline, or a combination of both. Following a pre assessment, the teacher will then apply the formula of 1/2 the growth to 100 for each individual student in the grade level to establish the initial individual student growth goal. If the individual student goals that result are determined to be too low by the principal, the teacher and principal will develop an SLO also using prior student performance and a review of previous course and demographic data to inform the goal setting. We will then place the target average of 80% of students meeting or exceeding their differentiated growth targets at the 15 point mark and distribute the remaining percentages equally across the HEDI scale. Following the summative assessment, the percent of students reaching their differentiated growth targets will be used to apply the HEDI scale and assign a final teacher score. Final approval of student goals and SLO's is assigned to the appropriate building principal in all cases.

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

For Special Education K-2: within the category of Highly Effective, those teachers who fall at greater than or equal to .9 standard deviations above average, we further divide the distribution to determine specific points. The specific point breakdown, with upper and lower bounds denoted in standard deviation units, is as follows:

APPR Point $\geq <$
18 0.9 1.1
19 1.1 1.3
20 1.3

All other grade levels/subjects: 86-100% of student performance targets met.

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

For K-2 Special Education: Within the category of Effective, those teachers who fall at less than .9 standard deviations above average and greater than or equal to -.9 standard deviations below average, we further divide the distribution to determine specific points. The specific point breakdown, with upper and lower bounds denoted in standard deviation units, is as follows:

APPR Point $\geq <$
9 -0.9 -0.7
10 -0.7 -0.5
11 -0.5 -0.3
12 -0.3 -0.1
13 -0.1 0.1
14 0.1 0.3
15 0.3 0.5
16 0.5 0.7
17 0.7 0.9

All other grade levels/subjects: 55%-85% of student performance targets met.

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

For K-2 Special Education: Within the category of Developing, those teachers who fall at less than $-.9$ standard deviations below average and greater than or equal to -2.1 standard deviations below average, we further divide the distribution to determine specific points. The specific point breakdown, with upper and lower bounds denoted in standard deviation units, is as follows:

APPR Point $\geq <$
3 -2.1 -1.9
4 -1.9 -1.7
5 -1.7 -1.5
6 -1.5 -1.3
7 -1.3 -1.1
8 -1.1 -0.9

All other grade levels/subjects: 30%-54% of student performance targets met.

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

For K-2 Special Education: Within the category of Ineffective, those teachers who fall at less than -2.1 standard deviations below average, we further divide the distribution to determine specific points. The specific point breakdown, with upper and lower bounds denoted in standard deviation units, is as follows:

APPR Point $\geq <$
0 -2.5
1 -2.5 -2.3
2 -2.3 -2.1

All other grade levels/subjects: Below 30% of student performance targets met.

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/5364/124915-TXEttx9bQW/2.11 HEDI Tables and Charts.doc

2.12) Locally Developed Controls

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

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

(No response)

2.13) Teachers with more than one growth measure

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

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

2.14) Assurances

Please check all of the boxes below:

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

3. Local Measures (Teachers)

Created Friday, May 04, 2012

Updated Thursday, December 06, 2012

Page 1

Locally Selected Measures of Student Achievement or Growth

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

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

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

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

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

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

Growth or achievement measure(s) from these options.

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

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

Measures based on:

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

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

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

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

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

- 6) A school-wide measure of either student growth or achievement based on either:
 - (i) A State-provided student growth score covering all students in the school that took the State assessment in ELA or Math in Grades 4-8; or
 - (ii) A school-wide measure of student growth or achievement computed in a manner determined locally based on a State, State-approved 3rd party, or district, regional or BOCES developed assessment that is rigorous and comparable across classrooms.

3.1) Grades 4-8 ELA

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

	Locally-Selected Measure from List of Approved Measures	Assessment
4	6(ii) School wide measure computed locally	State ELA and Math 3-6 and State Science Grade 4
5	6(ii) School wide measure computed locally	State ELA and Math 3-6 and State Science Grade 4
6	6(ii) School wide measure computed locally	State ELA and Math 3-6 and State Science Grade 4
7	6(ii) School wide measure computed locally	State ELA and Math 7 and 8, State Science Grade 8, and gatekeeper Regents

8	6(ii) School wide measure computed locally	State ELA and Math 7 and 8, State Science Grade 8, and gatekeeper Regents
---	--	---

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.

<p>Use this box, if needed, to describe the general process for assigning HEDI categories for these grades/subjects in this subcomponent. If needed, you may upload a table or graphic at 3.3, below.</p>	<p>Glenn Curtiss Elementary School: School wide goal, K-6 based on the growth in percent of students proficient on all state assessments(3rd-6th grade ELA/math and 4th grade science) in that school building at Hammondspport Central School. A school wide proficiency score will be computed by adding the proficiency percentages for selected state tests and then dividing by the number of state tests taken. All students on the roster will be expected to take the examination and all possible efforts should be made to achieve this. The scale attached in 3.3 will then be used to convert the growth in proficiency into the local measure. This scale will be determined annually and may be further modified if significant adjustments are made at the state level to exam content, format, or scales. Hammondspport Jr/Sr Hlgh: School wide goal for grades 7-12, based on the growth in percent of students proficient on selected state assessments (7th/8th grade ELA/math, 8th grade science, and five core Regents examinations) in that school building at Hammondspport Central School. A school wide proficiency score will be computed by adding the proficiency percentages for selected state tests and then dividing by the number of state tests taken. All students on the roster will be expected to take the examination and all possible efforts should be made to achieve this. The scale attached in 3.3 will then be used to convert the growth in proficiency into the local measure. This scale will be determined annually and may be further modified if significant adjustments are made at the state level to exam content, format, or scales.</p>
<p>Highly Effective (14 - 15 points) Results are well above District- or BOCES-adopted expectations for growth or achievement for grade/subject.</p>	<p>Growth in proficiency of 1.21% or above</p>
<p>Effective (8- 13 points) Results meet District- or BOCES-adopted expectations for growth or achievement for grade/subject.</p>	<p>Growth in proficiency of .71%-1.20%</p>
<p>Developing (3 - 7 points) Results are below District- or BOCES-adopted expectations for growth or achievement for grade/subject.</p>	<p>Growth in proficiency of .21%-.70%</p>
<p>Ineffective (0 - 2 points) Results are well below District- or BOCES-adopted expectations for growth or achievement for grade/subject.</p>	<p>Growth in proficiency of .20% or less</p>

3.2) Grades 4-8 Math

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

	Locally-Selected Measure from List of Approved Measures	Assessment
4	6(ii) School wide measure computed locally	State ELA and Math 3-6 and State Science Grade 4
5	6(ii) School wide measure computed locally	State ELA and Math 3-6 and State Science Grade 4
6	6(ii) School wide measure computed locally	State ELA and Math 3-6 and State Science Grade 4
7	6(ii) School wide measure computed locally	State ELA and Math 7 and 8, State Science Grade 8, and gatekeeper Regents
8	6(ii) School wide measure computed locally	State ELA and Math 7 and 8, State Science Grade 8, and gatekeeper Regents

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.

<p>Use this box, if needed, to describe the general process for assigning HEDI categories for these grades/subjects in this subcomponent. If needed, you may upload a table or graphic at 3.3, below.</p>	<p>Glenn Curtiss Elementary School: School wide goal, K-6 based on the growth in percent of students proficient on all state assessments(3rd-6th grade ELA/math and 4th grade science) in that school building at Hammondspport Central School. A school wide proficiency score will be computed by adding the proficiency percentages for selected state tests and then dividing by the number of state tests taken. All students on the roster will be expected to take the examination and all possible efforts should be made to achieve this. The scale attached in 3.3 will then be used to convert the growth in proficiency into the local measure. This scale will be determined annually and may be further modified if significant adjustments are made at the state level to exam content, format, or scales.</p> <p>Hammondspport Jr/Sr High: School wide goal for grades 7-12, based on the growth in percent of students proficient on selected state assessments (7th/8th grade ELA/math, 8th grade science, and five core Regents examinations) in that school building at Hammondspport Central School. A school wide proficiency score will be computed by adding the proficiency percentages for selected state tests and then dividing by the number of state tests taken. All students on the roster will be expected to take the examination and all possible efforts should be made to achieve this. The scale attached in 3.3 will then be used to convert the growth in proficiency into the local measure. This scale will be determined annually and may be further modified if significant adjustments are made at the state level to exam content, format, or scales.</p>
<p>Highly Effective (14 - 15 points) Results are well above District- or BOCES-adopted expectations for growth or achievement for grade/subject.</p>	<p>Growth in proficiency of 1.21% or above</p>

Effective (8- 13 points) Results meet District- or BOCES-adopted expectations for growth or achievement for grade/subject.	Growth in proficiency of .71%-1.20%
Developing (3 - 7 points) Results are below District- or BOCES-adopted expectations for growth or achievement for grade/subject.	Growth in proficiency of .21%-.70%
Ineffective (0 - 2 points) Results are well below District- or BOCES-adopted expectations for growth or achievement for grade/subject.	Growth in proficiency of .20% or less

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/5139/124916-rhJdBgDruP/3.3 Proficiency HEDI scales_1.doc

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

Growth or achievement measure(s) from these options.

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

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

Measures based on:

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

3.4) Grades K-3 ELA

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

	Locally-Selected Measure from List of Approved Measures	Assessment
K	6(ii) School-wide measure computed locally	State ELA and Math 3-6 and State Science Grade 4
1	6(ii) School-wide measure computed locally	State ELA and Math 3-6 and State Science Grade 4
2	6(ii) School-wide measure computed locally	State ELA and Math 3-6 and State Science Grade 4
3	6(ii) School-wide measure computed locally	State ELA and Math 3-6 and State Science Grade 4

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

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

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.	Glenn Curtiss Elementary School: School wide goal, K-6 based on the growth in percent of students proficient on all state assessments(3rd-6th grade ELA/math and 4th grade science) in that school building at Hammondspport Central School. A school wide proficiency score will be computed by adding the proficiency percentages for
---	--

selected state tests and then dividing by the number of state tests taken. All students on the roster will be expected to take the examination and all possible efforts should be made to achieve this. The scale attached in 3.3 will then be used to convert the growth in proficiency into the local measure. This scale will be determined annually and may be further modified if significant adjustments are made at the state level to exam content, format, or scales.

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

Growth in proficiency of 1.21% or above

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

Growth in proficiency of .71%-1.20%

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

Growth in proficiency of .21%-.70%

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

Growth in proficiency of .20% or less

3.5) Grades K-3 Math

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

	Locally-Selected Measure from List of Approved Measures	Assessment
K	6(ii) School-wide measure computed locally	State ELA and Math 3-6 and State Science Grade 4
1	6(ii) School-wide measure computed locally	State ELA and Math 3-6 and State Science Grade 4
2	6(ii) School-wide measure computed locally	State ELA and Math 3-6 and State Science Grade 4
3	6(ii) School-wide measure computed locally	State ELA and Math 3-6 and State Science Grade 4

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

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

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

Glenn Curtiss Elementary School: School wide goal, K-6 based on the growth in percent of students proficient on all state assessments(3rd-6th grade ELA/math and 4th grade science) in that school building at Hammondspport Central School. A school wide proficiency score will be computed by adding the proficiency percentages for

selected state tests and then dividing by the number of state tests taken. All students on the roster will be expected to take the examination and all possible efforts should be made to achieve this. The scale attached in 3.3 will then be used to convert the growth in proficiency into the local measure. This scale will be determined annually and may be further modified if significant adjustments are made at the state level to exam content, format, or scales.

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

Growth in proficiency of 1.21% or above

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

Growth in proficiency of .71%-1.20%

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

Growth in proficiency of .21%-.70%

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

Growth in proficiency of .20% or less

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	Not applicable	NA
7	6(ii) School wide measure computed locally	State ELA and Math 7 and 8, State Science Grade 8, and gatekeeper Regents
8	6(ii) School wide measure computed locally	State ELA and Math 7 and 8, State Science Grade 8, and gatekeeper Regents

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.

Hammondsport Jr/Sr High: School wide goal for grades 7-12, based on the growth in percent of students proficient on selected state assessments (7th/8th grade ELA/math, 8th grade science, and five core Regents examinations) in that school building at Hammondsport Central School. A school wide proficiency score will be computed by adding the proficiency percentages for selected state tests and then dividing by the number of state tests taken. All students on the roster will be expected to take the examination and all possible efforts should be made to achieve this. The scale attached in 3.3 will then be used to convert the growth in proficiency into the local measure. This scale will be determined annually and may be further modified if significant adjustments are made at the state

	level to exam content, format, or scales.
Highly Effective (18 - 20 points) Results are well above District- or BOCES-adopted expectations for growth or achievement for grade/subject.	Growth in proficiency of 1.21% or above
Effective (9 - 17 points) Results meet District- or BOCES-adopted expectations for growth or achievement for grade/subject.	Growth in proficiency of .71%-1.20%
Developing (3 - 8 points) Results are below District- or BOCES-adopted expectations for growth or achievement for grade/subject.	Growth in proficiency of .21%-.70%
Ineffective (0 - 2 points) Results are well below District- or BOCES-adopted expectations for growth or achievement for grade/subject.	Growth in proficiency of .20% or less

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	Not applicable	NA
7	6(ii) School wide measure computed locally	State ELA and Math 7 and 8, State Science Grade 8, and gatekeeper Regents
8	6(ii) School wide measure computed locally	State ELA and Math 7 and 8, State Science Grade 8, and gatekeeper Regents

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.	Hammondsport Jr/Sr High: School wide goal for grades 7-12, based on the growth in percent of students proficient on selected state assessments (7th/8th grade ELA/math, 8th grade science, and five core Regents examinations) in that school building at Hammondsport Central School. A school wide proficiency score will be computed by adding the proficiency percentages for selected state tests and then dividing by the number of state tests taken. All students on the roster will be expected to take the examination and all possible efforts should be made to achieve this. The scale attached in 3.3 will then be used to convert the growth in proficiency into the local measure. This scale will be determined annually and may be further modified if significant adjustments are made at the state level to exam content, format, or scales.
Highly Effective (18 - 20 points) Results are well above District- or BOCES-adopted expectations for growth or	Growth in proficiency of 1.21% or above

achievement for grade/subject.	
Effective (9 - 17 points) Results meet District- or BOCES-adopted expectations for growth or achievement for grade/subject.	Growth in proficiency of .71%-1.20%
Developing (3 - 8 points) Results are below District- or BOCES-adopted expectations for growth or achievement for grade/subject.	Growth in proficiency of .21%-.70%
Ineffective (0 - 2 points) Results are well below District- or BOCES-adopted expectations for growth or achievement for grade/subject.	Growth in proficiency of .20% or less

3.8) High School Social Studies

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

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

	Locally-Selected Measure from List of Approved Measures	Assessment
Global 1	6(ii) School wide measure computed locally	State ELA and Math 7 and 8, State Science Grade 8, and gatekeeper Regents
Global 2	6(ii) School wide measure computed locally	State ELA and Math 7 and 8, State Science Grade 8, and gatekeeper Regents
American History	6(ii) School wide measure computed locally	State ELA and Math 7 and 8, State Science Grade 8, and gatekeeper Regents

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.	Hammondsport Jr/Sr High: School wide goal for grades 7-12, based on the growth in percent of students proficient on selected state assessments (7th/8th grade ELA/math, 8th grade science, and five core Regents examinations) in that school building at Hammondsport Central School. A school wide proficiency score will be computed by adding the proficiency percentages for selected state tests and then dividing by the number of state tests taken. All students on the roster will be expected to take the examination and all possible efforts should be made to achieve this. The scale attached in 3.3 will then be used to convert the growth in proficiency into the local measure. This scale will be determined annually and may be further modified if significant adjustments are made at the state level to exam content, format, or scales.
---	--

Highly Effective (18 - 20 points) Results are well above District- or BOCES-adopted expectations for growth or achievement for grade/subject.	Growth in proficiency of 1.21% or above
Effective (9 - 17 points) Results meet District- or BOCES-adopted expectations for growth or achievement for grade/subject.	Growth in proficiency of .71%-1.20%
Developing (3 - 8 points) Results are below District- or BOCES-adopted expectations for growth or achievement for grade/subject.	Growth in proficiency of .21%-.70%
Ineffective (0 - 2 points) Results are well below District- or BOCES-adopted expectations for growth or achievement for grade/subject.	Growth in proficiency of .20% or less

3.9) High School Science

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

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

	Locally-Selected Measure from List of Approved Measures	Assessment
Living Environment	6(ii) School wide measure computed locally	State ELA and Math 7 and 8, State Science Grade 8, and gatekeeper Regents
Earth Science	6(ii) School wide measure computed locally	State ELA and Math 7 and 8, State Science Grade 8, and gatekeeper Regents
Chemistry	6(ii) School wide measure computed locally	State ELA and Math 7 and 8, State Science Grade 8, and gatekeeper Regents
Physics	6(ii) School wide measure computed locally	State ELA and Math 7 and 8, State Science Grade 8, and gatekeeper Regents

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.	Hammondsport Jr/Sr High: School wide goal for grades 7-12, based on the growth in percent of students proficient on selected state assessments (7th/8th grade ELA/math, 8th grade science, and five core Regents examinations) in that school building at Hammondsport Central School. A school wide proficiency score will be computed by adding the proficiency percentages for selected state tests and then dividing by the number of state tests taken. All students on the roster will be expected to take the examination and all possible efforts should be made to achieve this. The scale attached in 3.3 will then be used to
---	--

convert the growth in proficiency into the local measure. This scale will be determined annually and may be further modified if significant adjustments are made at the state level to exam content, format, or scales.

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

Growth in proficiency of 1.21% or above

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

Growth in proficiency of .71%-1.20%

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

Growth in proficiency of .21%-.70%

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

Growth in proficiency of .20% or less

3.10) High School Math

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

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

	Locally-Selected Measure from List of Approved Measures	Assessment
Algebra 1	6(ii) School wide measure computed locally	State ELA and Math 7 and 8, State Science Grade 8, and gatekeeper Regents
Geometry	6(ii) School wide measure computed locally	State ELA and Math 7 and 8, State Science Grade 8, and gatekeeper Regents
Algebra 2	6(ii) School wide measure computed locally	State ELA and Math 7 and 8, State Science Grade 8, and gatekeeper Regents

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.

Hammondsport Jr/Sr High: School wide goal for grades 7-12, based on the growth in percent of students proficient on selected state assessments (7th/8th grade ELA/math, 8th grade science, and five core Regents examinations) in that school building at Hammondsport Central School. A school wide proficiency score will be computed by adding the proficiency percentages for selected state tests and then dividing by the number of state tests taken. All students on the roster will be expected to take the

examination and all possible efforts should be made to achieve this. The scale attached in 3.3 will then be used to convert the growth in proficiency into the local measure. This scale will be determined annually and may be further modified if significant adjustments are made at the state level to exam content, format, or scales.

Highly Effective (18 - 20 points) Results are well above District- or BOCES-adopted expectations for growth or achievement for grade/subject.	Growth in proficiency of 1.21% or above
Effective (9 - 17 points) Results meet District- or BOCES-adopted expectations for growth or achievement for grade/subject.	Growth in proficiency of .71%-1.20%
Developing (3 - 8 points) Results are below District- or BOCES-adopted expectations for growth or achievement for grade/subject.	Growth in proficiency of .21%-.70%
Ineffective (0 - 2 points) Results are well below District- or BOCES-adopted expectations for growth or achievement for grade/subject.	Growth in proficiency of .20% or less

3.11) High School English Language Arts

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

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

	Locally-Selected Measure from List of Approved Measures	Assessment
Grade 9 ELA	6(ii) School wide measure computed locally	State ELA and Math 7 and 8, State Science Grade 8, and gatekeeper Regents
Grade 10 ELA	6(ii) School wide measure computed locally	State ELA and Math 7 and 8, State Science Grade 8, and gatekeeper Regents
Grade 11 ELA	6(ii) School wide measure computed locally	State ELA and Math 7 and 8, State Science Grade 8, and gatekeeper Regents

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.	Hammondsport Jr/Sr High: School wide goal for grades 7-12, based on the growth in percent of students proficient on selected state assessments (7th/8th grade ELA/math, 8th grade science, and five core Regents examinations) in that school building at Hammondsport Central School. A school wide proficiency score will be computed by adding the proficiency percentages for selected state tests and
---	--

graphic at 3.13, below.

grade science) in that school building at Hammondspport Central School. A school wide proficiency score will be computed by adding the proficiency percentages for selected state tests and then dividing by the number of state tests taken. All students on the roster will be expected to take the examination and all possible efforts should be made to achieve this. The scale attached in 3.3 will then be used to convert the growth in proficiency into the local measure. This scale will be determined annually and may be further modified if significant adjustments are made at the state level to exam content, format, or scales. Hammondspport Jr/Sr High: School wide goal for grades 7-12, based on the growth in percent of students proficient on selected state assessments (7th/8th grade ELA/math, 8th grade science, and five core Regents examinations) in that school building at Hammondspport Central School. A school wide proficiency score will be computed by adding the proficiency percentages for selected state tests and then dividing by the number of state tests taken. All students on the roster will be expected to take the examination and all possible efforts should be made to achieve this. The scale attached in 3.3 will then be used to convert the growth in proficiency into the local measure. This scale will be determined annually and may be further modified if significant adjustments are made at the state level to exam content, format, or scales.

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

Growth in proficiency of 1.21% or above

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

Growth in proficiency of .71%-1.20%

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

Growth in proficiency of .21%-.70%

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

Growth in proficiency of .20% or less

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/5139/124916-y92vNseFa4/REVISED Schoolwide Growth Measure for Local 20.doc

3.14) Locally Developed Controls

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

The target and points awarded will be comparing the prior year's school wide (K-6 or 7-12) proficiency average on state assessments/five core Regents examinations compared to the school wide (K-6 or 7-12) proficiency average on state assessments/five core Regents examinations for the current year. All students on the rosters for the appropriate classes will be expected to take the assessments/examinations and all possible efforts should be used to achieve this. Only students on our course rosters at the time of the assessment/examination count in the District average and this does not include students at alternative educational settings that do not appear on our teacher's rosters. Students on the teachers rosters best represent those for whom they are directly accountable and over whose performance they have the most control.

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.

No teachers will have more than one locally selected measure. All teachers in each school building will receive the same school wide local measure score, either Elementary K-6 or Jr/Sr High 7-12.

3.16) Assurances

Please check all of the boxes below:

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

4. Other Measures of Effectiveness (Teachers)

Created Friday, May 04, 2012

Updated Thursday, December 06, 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.)

Marzano's Causal Teacher Evaluation Model

(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.

The total of 60 points will be reached by adding 40pts for multiple classroom observations and 20 points for a structured review of artifacts/portfolio. The two components within this section will be added together to get a total composite score with possible points ranging from 0 points to 60 points. Point conversion charts are attached.

The direct observation portion (40pts) will be based on multiple classroom observations and (20pts) on the completion of an artifact collection/portfolio consistent with the standards outlined by the NYS Education Commissioner. Classroom observations will be conducted using the Marzano Art and Science of Teaching Framework and associated rubrics. Each focus element for observation will be directly observed multiple times by the principals through a minimum of two formal observations (one unannounced) and multiple walkthroughs. The average score received for each element throughout the year during formal observations will be added together

and divided by the number of scores gathered for that element. The resulting score of 0-4 will be placed on the HEDI scale and appropriate teacher score assigned. Due to multiple observations, the summative rubric score will likely be a decimal. The summative average of scores received throughout the year will be based on formal observations and conferences. The final composite score will always be a whole number.

The artifact collection/self assessment portfolio will be reviewed by the principal to insure that all other NYS Teaching Standards not assessed through direct observation are measured through the artifact collection/portfolio. A rubric score will be determined for the artifact collection and that scored placed on the HEDI scale and the appropriate teacher score assigned.

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/5091/124908-eka9yMJ855/4.5 Teacher Rubrics and HEDI scale.doc

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.	The scores will be calculated using the points available for each of the focus elements and the structured review of the portfolio and transposed to the HEDI chart attached above. Overall performance and results exceed NYS Teaching Standards. A point total of 52-60 will result in a rating of Highly Effective.
Effective: Overall performance and results meet NYS Teaching Standards.	The scores will be calculated using the points available for each of the focus elements and the structured review of the portfolio and transposed to the HEDI chart attached above. Overall performance and results meet NYS Teaching Standards. A point total of 38-51 will result in a rating of Effective.
Developing: Overall performance and results need improvement in order to meet NYS Teaching Standards.	The scores will be calculated using the points available for each of the focus elements and the structured review of the portfolio and transposed to the HEDI chart attached above. Overall performance and results need improvement in order to meet NYS Teaching Standards. A point total of 30-37 will result in a rating of Developing.
Ineffective: Overall performance and results do not meet NYS Teaching Standards.	The scores will be calculated using the points available for each of the focus elements and the structured review of the portfolio and transposed to the HEDI chart attached above. Overall performance and results do not meet NYS Teaching Standards. A point total of 0-29 will result in a rating of ineffective.

Provide the ranges for the 60-point scoring bands.

Highly Effective	52-60
Effective	38-51
Developing	30-37
Ineffective	0-29

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	4
4.6) Observations of Probationary Teachers Informal/Short	0
4.6) Observations of Probationary Teachers Enter Total	4

By trained in-school peer teachers or other trained reviewers

Formal/Long	0
Informal/Short	0

Independent evaluators

Formal/Long	0
Informal/Short	0

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

-
- In Person
-

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

-
- 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 Friday, May 04, 2012

Updated Wednesday, October 31, 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	52-60
Effective	38-51
Developing	30-37
Ineffective	0-29

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

2012-13 where Value-Added growth measure applies

Growth or Comparable Measures

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

Other Measures of Effectiveness

(60 points)

Overall

Composite Score

Highly Effective

22-25

14-15

Ranges determined locally--see above

91-100

Effective

10-21

8-13

75-90

Developing

3-9

3-7

65-74

Ineffective

0-2

0-2

0-64

6. Additional Requirements - Teachers

Created Friday, May 04, 2012

Updated Thursday, December 06, 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/5265/124917-Df0w3Xx5v6/6.2 Hammondspport Teacher Improvement Plan.doc

6.3) Appeals Process

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

(1) the substance of the annual professional performance review

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

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

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

The entire appeals process will be timely and expeditious. The purpose of the internal APPR appeals process is to foster and nurture growth of the professional staff in order to maintain a highly qualified and effective work force. All tenured and probationary employees who meet the appeal process criteria identified below may use this appeal process. A teacher may not file multiple appeals regarding the same performance review or TIP. All grounds for appeal must be raised within one appeal, provided that the teacher knew or could have reasonably known that ground(s) existed at the time the appeal was initiated, in which instance a further appeal

may be filed but only based upon such previously unknown ground(s).

APPR Subject to Appeal

Any unit member aggrieved by an APPR rating of either “ineffective” or “developing” may challenge that APPR. In accordance with Education Law 3012-C(5), an APPR which is the subject of a pending appeal shall not be sought to be offered in evidence or placed in evidence in any Education Law 3020-A proceeding, or any locally negotiated procedure, until the appeal process is concluded.

Grounds for an Appeal

An appeal may be filed challenging the APPR based upon one or more of the following grounds:

- *The substance of the Annual Professional Performance Review;*
- *The district’s failure to adhere to the standards and methodologies required for the Annual Professional Performance Review, pursuant to Education Law 3012-C and applicable rules and regulations;*
- *The district’s failure to comply with either the applicable regulations of the Commissioner of Education, or locally negotiated procedures;*
- *The district’s failure to issue and/or implement the terms of the Teacher Improvement Plan, where applicable, as required under Education Law 3012-C.*

Notification of the Appeal

In order to be timely, the notification of the APPR appeal shall be filed, in writing, within two calendar weeks after the teacher has received the APPR. Notification of the appeal shall be provided to the appropriate Building Principal.

Decisions on Appeal

Step 1- Within two calendar weeks of receipt of an appeal, the principal will meet with the teacher in an effort to informally resolve the areas of dispute. The teacher, upon request, shall be entitled to an Association representative being present. At this meeting, both the teacher and principal shall present and review any and all additional documents or written documents that are specific to the point(s) of disagreement and/or relevant to the resolution of the appeal. Material not presented at the time of the informal conference shall not be considered in the deliberations related to the resolution of the appeal. The outcome of the informal conference will be made known in writing at the conclusion of the conference. If the teacher is not satisfied with the outcome, he/she may proceed to the second step. The second step shall be initiated by the unit member notifying the Superintendent and HTA President in writing, within three calendar days of the conclusion of the conference.

Step 2- APPR Review Committee. The Committee make up shall be:

- *One tenured administrator, certified to conduct evaluations, appointed by the Superintendent. The administrator appointed shall not be the administrator who authored the evaluation.*
- *Two tenured teachers appointed by the HTA President.*

The committee shall meet within 10 school days and reach its finding by the conclusion of the meeting using the consensus model. If consensus is not reached, the committee shall write up the opposing viewpoints and submit the opposing viewpoints to the supervising administrator, the teacher, the HTA President, and the Superintendent.

Step 3- The Superintendent (or designee) shall render a written decision on the appeal within ten (10) calendar days after the original appeal with supporting documentation, and opposing viewpoints from the APPR Review Committee, are received. The decision shall set forth the reasons and factual basis for each determination on each of the specific issues raised in the appeal. The Superintendent shall have the authority to rescind, modify, or affirm the rating. A new evaluation may also be ordered.

Exclusivity of Section 3012-c Appeal Procedure:

The 3012-C appeal procedure shall constitute the exclusive means for initiating, reviewing and resolving any and all challenges and appeals related to a teacher performance review and/or improvement plan. A teacher may not resort to any other contractual grievance procedures for the resolution of challenges and appeals related to a professional performance review and/or improvement plan, except as otherwise authorized by law.

6.4) Training and Certification of Lead Evaluators and Evaluators

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

1. *The District will certify and re-certify lead evaluators annually as qualified to conduct teacher/principal evaluations under 3012-c.*
2. *The District will provide training to all lead evaluators from a BOCES Certified Network Trainer. Each lead evaluator will be required to attend all trainings and provide documentation of all trainings. The trainings will consist of NYS Teaching and Leadership Standards, Evidence Based Observation Techniques, Application and use of Student Growth and Value Added Models, Application and Use of Site Approved Teacher/Principal Rubrics, Application and Use of Assessment Tools Used, Application and Use of State Approved Locally Developed Measures of Student Achievement, Use of Statewide Instructional Reporting System, the Scoring Methodology Used by the Department and/or your District, Specific Considerations in Evaluating Teachers and Principals of ELL and SWD. Lead evaluators attend approximately 7-10 days (8 hour days) of training by GST BOCES per year.*

3. *Inter-Rater Reliability*

Lead evaluators will maintain inter-rater reliability over time. Evaluators and lead evaluators will be trained through the GST BOCES RTTT Evaluator Training Program in maintaining inter-rater reliability over time. All administrators will go through initial inter-reliability training through GST BOCES along with on going professional development throughout the school year provided by the District.

6.5) Assurances -- Evaluators

Please check the boxes below:

-
- Checked
-

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

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

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

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

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

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

(7) use of the Statewide Instructional Reporting System

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

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

• Checked

6.6) Assurances -- Teachers

Please check all of the boxes below:

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

6.7) Assurances -- Data

Please check all of the boxes below:

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

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

Created Tuesday, July 24, 2012

Updated Thursday, November 08, 2012

Page 1

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

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

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

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

K-6
7-12
(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

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

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

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 Tuesday, July 24, 2012

Updated Thursday, December 06, 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-6	(d) measures used by district for teacher evaluation	State ELA/Math grades 3-6 and State Science grade 4
7-12	(d) measures used by district for teacher evaluation	State ELA and Math grades 7 and 8, State Science grade 8, and gatekeeper Regents

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

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

<p>Use this box, if needed, to describe the process for assigning HEDI categories. If needed, you may upload a table or graphic below.</p>	<p>Glenn Curtiss Elementary School: school wide goal based on the growth in percent of students proficient on all state assessments given in the elementary school building (3rd -6th grade ELA/Math and 4th grade science) at Hammondsport Central School. A school wide proficiency score will be computed by adding the proficiency percentages for selected state tests and then dividing by the number of state tests taken. All students on the roster will be expected to take the examination and all possible efforts should be made to achieve this. The scale attached in 3.3 will then be used to convert the growth in proficiency into the local measure. This scale will be determined annually and may be further modified if significant adjustments are made at the state level to exam content, format, or scales.</p> <p>Hammondsport Jr/Sr. High School: school wide goal based on the growth in percent of students proficient on all state assessments and five core Regents examinations given in the Jr/Sr High School building (7th -8th grade</p>
--	--

ELA/Math, 8th grade science and five core Regents) at Hammondsport Central School. A school wide proficiency score will be computed by adding the proficiency percentages for selected state tests and then dividing by the number of state tests taken. All students on the roster will be expected to take the examination and all possible efforts should be made to achieve this. The scale attached in 3.3 will then be used to convert the growth in proficiency into the local measure. This scale will be determined annually and may be further modified if significant adjustments are made at the state level to exam content, format, or scales.

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

Growth in proficiency of 1.21% or above.

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

Growth in proficiency of .71% -1.20%.

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

Growth in proficiency of .21%-.70%.

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

Growth in proficiency of .2% or less.

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.

(No response)

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
Not applicable		Not applicable

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.	Not applicable
Highly Effective (18 - 20 points) Results are well above District- or BOCES-adopted expectations for growth or achievement for grade/subject.	Not applicable
Effective (9- 17 points) Results meet District- or BOCES-adopted expectations for growth or achievement for grade/subject.	Not applicable
Developing (3 - 8 points) Results are below District- or BOCES-adopted expectations for growth or achievement for grade/subject.	Not applicable
Ineffective (0 - 2 points) Results are well below District- or BOCES-adopted expectations for growth or achievement for grade/subject.	Not applicable

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

(No response)

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

(No response)

8.3) Locally Developed Controls

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

The target and points awarded will be comparing the prior year's school wide proficiency average on state assessments/Regents examinations compared to the school wide proficiency average on state assessments/Regents examination for the current year. All students on the rosters for the appropriate classes will be expected to take the assessments/examinations and all possible efforts should be used to achieve this. Only students on our course rosters at the time of the assessment/examination count in the school wide average and this does not include students at alternative educational settings that do not appear on our teacher's rosters. Students on the teacher's rosters best represent those for whom they are directly accountable and over whose performance they have the most control.

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.

There are no principals with multiple locally selected measures. All principals will receive one local score derived from school wide K-6 or 7-12 state assessment proficiency growth percentage.

8.5) Assurances

Please check all of the boxes below:

8.5) Assurances Assure that the application of locally developed controls will be rigorous, fair, and transparent	Check
---	-------

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

9. Other Measures of Effectiveness (Principals)

Created Tuesday, September 11, 2012
Updated Thursday, December 06, 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.

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

9.4) Sources of Evidence (if applicable)

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

9.4) Sources of Evidence (if applicable) Structured feedback from teachers using a State-approved tool	(No response)
9.4) Sources of Evidence (if applicable) Structured feedback from students using a State-approved tool	(No response)
9.4) Sources of Evidence (if applicable) Structured feedback from families using a State-approved tool	(No response)
9.4) Sources of Evidence (if applicable) School visits by other trained evaluators	(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.

All 60 pts will be assigned based on application of the Marzano Administrator Rubric through multiple building visits, conferences, and walkthroughs during the school year. The averaging of Marzano element scores will result in an average element score between 0 and 4. The number will be converted to a number between 0-60 using the conversion chart that is attached. Final composite will always be a whole number.

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

assets/survey-uploads/5143/175084-pMADJ4gk6R/Revised Marzano Rubric 60 pts.xlsx

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

Highly Effective: Overall performance and results exceed standards.	Overall performance will exceed state standards with a total average conversion score ranging from 59-60 points.
Effective: Overall performance and results meet standards.	Overall performance meets state standards with a total average conversion score ranging from 57-58 points.
Developing: Overall performance and results need improvement in order to meet standards.	Overall performance needs improvement in order to meet standards with a total average conversion score of 50-56 points.
Ineffective: Overall performance and results do not meet standards.	Overall performance do not meet standards with a total average conversion score of 0-49 points.

Please provide the locally-negotiated 60 point scoring bands.

Highly Effective	59-60
Effective	57-58

Developing	50-56
Ineffective	0-49

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 Tuesday, September 11, 2012
Updated Thursday, November 08, 2012

Page 1

Standards for Rating Categories

Growth or Comparable Measures

Locally-selected Measures of growth or achievement

Other Measures of Effectiveness (Teacher and Leader standards)

Highly

Effective

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

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

Overall performance and results exceed ISLLC leadership standards.

Effective

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

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

Overall performance and results meet ISLLC leadership standards.

Developing

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

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

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

Ineffective

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

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

Overall performance and results do not meet ISLLC leadership standards.

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

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

2012-13 where there is no Value-Added measure

Growth or Comparable Measures

Locally-selected Measures of

growth or achievement

Other Measures of Effectiveness

(60 points)

Overall

Composite Score

Highly Effective

18-20

18-20

Ranges determined locally--see below

91-100

Effective

9-17

9-17

75-90

Developing

3-8

3-8

65-74

Ineffective

0-2

0-2

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

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

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

2012-13 where Value-Added growth measure applies

Growth or Comparable Measures

Locally-selected Measures of growth or achievement

Other Measures of Effectiveness

(60 points)

Overall

Composite Score

Highly Effective

22-25

14-15

Ranges determined locally--see above

91-100

Effective

10-21

8-13

75-90

Developing

3-9

3-7

65-74

Ineffective

0-2

0-2

0-64

11. Additional Requirements - Principals

Created Friday, May 04, 2012

Updated Thursday, December 06, 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/5276/124911-Df0w3Xx5v6/11.2 Principal Improvement Plan.doc](#)

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:

Appeal Process:

Appeals of annual performance reviews shall be limited to those performance reviews in which the administrator received the following:

- A composite rating of "ineffective" or "developing"*
- Any administrator may appeal a PIP if the plan was generated as the result of an ineffective or developing composite rating, in*

accordance with the APPR.

The scope of the appeal will be limited to the following subjects:

- The substance of the annual summative evaluation.
- The District's adherence to the standards and methodologies required for such reviews, pursuant to Education law 3012-c.
- The adherence to Commissioner's regulations.
- Compliance with any locally negotiated procedures regarding annual professional growth plan or improvement plans.
- The District's issuance and/or implementation of the terms of the Principal Improvement Plan under Education law 3012-c in connection with an ineffective or developing rating.

Prohibition against more than one appeal: An administrator may not file multiple appeals regarding the same performance review or improvement plan. All grounds for appeal must be raised with specificity within one appeal. Any grounds not raised at the time the appeal is filed shall be deemed null and void.

Burden of proof: Except for procedural appeals for failure to follow timelines, the administrator has the burden of demonstrating a clear and legal right to the relief requested and the burden of establishing the facts upon which petitioner seeks relief.

Arbitration: With the exception of grievances based on failure to follow the procedural steps, the BOCES Superintendent's or his/her designee's decision shall be final and binding and not subject to the grievance procedure.

Timelines:

The appeals process will be timely and expeditious. All timelines shall be adhered to unless extended by mutual agreement. Failure of the petitioner to meet a timeline will nullify the appeal. Failure of the respondent to meet a timeline will allow movement of the appeal to the next level.

Level 1- Evaluator:

Informal- Within 5 school days of a qualifying event as defined in the above sections, the administrator may request a follow-up meeting with the Superintendent to informally discuss any and all related issues.

Formal- Any appeal must be submitted to the Superintendent in writing no later than ten (10) school days from the date when the administrator receives his/her annual performance professional review. If challenging the issuance, implementation or adherence of a principal improvement plan, the appeal must be submitted within ten (10) school days of when the alleged breach of such plan occurred.

When submitting an appeal, a detailed written description of the specific grounds for the appeal as well as the performance review and/or improvement plan being challenged must be provided. Along with the appeal, all supporting documentation must be submitted, or specifically noted if pending.

Within ten (10) school days of receipt of an appeal, the Superintendent must submit a detailed written response to the appeal including all supporting documents, as well as any additional supporting documents or materials relevant to the response.

Any supporting documentation/information not submitted or noted by either party in the Stage 1 appeal shall not be considered at the further steps of the appeal.

Level 2- BOCES Superintendent

Within five (5) school days of the receipt of the Superintendents Level 1 response, if principal is not satisfied with such response, the principal must submit a written appeal to the BOCES Superintendent or his/her designee.

Within thirty (30) school days of the receipt of the written level two (2) response, the BOCES Superintendent or his/her designee will conduct a hearing at which the principal and the Superintendent will be allowed to present oral arguments in support of the appeal and the response, respectively.

Within fifteen (15) school days of the BOCES Superintendent's hearing, the BOCES Superintendent shall issue a written determination to the principal and Superintendent. The determination may be to deny the appeal; to sustain the appeal and grant the remedy sought; or sustain the appeal and modify the remedy.

Records

The entire appeals record will be part of the principal's unit member's permanent folder.

After entering or noting a document into the record at Stage 1 of the appeals process, the District shall maintain copies of all the documents/information for all further stages of the appeals process.

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.

- 1. The District will certify and re-certify lead evaluators annually as qualified to conduct teacher/principal evaluations under 3012-c.*
- 2. The District will provide training to all lead evaluators from a BOCES Certified Network Trainer. Each lead evaluator will be required to attend all trainings and provide documentation of all trainings. The trainings will consist of NYS Teaching and Leadership Standards, Evidence Based Observation Techniques, Application and use of Student Growth and Value Added Models, Application and Use of Site Approved Teacher/Principal Rubrics, Application and Use of Assessment Tools Used, Application and Use of State Approved Locally Developed Measures of Student Achievement, Use of Statewide Instructional Reporting System, the Scoring Methodology Used by the Department and/or your District, Specific Considerations in Evaluating Teachers and Principals of ELL and SWD. Lead evaluators attend approximately 7-10 days (8 hour days) of training by GST BOCES per year.*

3. Inter-Rater Reliability

Lead evaluators will maintain inter-rater reliability over time. Evaluators and lead evaluators will be trained through the GST BOCES RTTT Evaluator Training Program in maintaining inter-rater reliability over time. All administrators will go through initial inter-reliability training through GST BOCES along with on going professional development throughout the school year provided by the District.

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 Friday, May 04, 2012

Updated Monday, December 10, 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/5581/124912-3Uqgn5g9Iu/District Certification form #3.pdf](assets/survey-uploads/5581/124912-3Uqgn5g9Iu/District%20Certification%20form%20#3.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.

HEDI CHARTS

For K-2 ELA/Math and K-2 SPED Conditional Growth Index HEDI Breakdown Charts:

Highly Effective: Greater than or equal to .9 standard deviations above average (13)

Effective: Less than .9 standard deviations above average and greater than or equal to -.9 standard deviations below average

Developing: Less than -.9 standard deviations below average and greater than or equal to -2.1 standard deviations below average

Ineffective: Less than -2.1 standard deviations below average

(Prompt 2) Highly Effective (18-20 points) Results are well above District- or BOCES-adopted expectations for growth or achievement for grade/subject

Within the category of Highly Effective, those teachers who fall at greater than or equal to .9 standard deviations above average, we further divide the distribution to determine specific points. The specific point breakdown, with upper and lower bounds denoted in standard deviation units, is as follows:

APPR Point	≥	<
18	0.9	1.1
19	1.1	1.3
20	1.3	

(Prompt 3) Effective (9- 17 points) Results meet District- or BOCES-adopted expectations for growth or achievement for grade/subject.

Within the category of Effective, those teachers who fall at less than .9 standard deviations above average and greater than or equal to -.9 standard deviations below average, we further divide the distribution to determine specific points. The specific point breakdown, with upper and lower bounds denoted in standard deviation units, is as follows:

APPR Point	≥	<
9	-0.9	-0.7
10	-0.7	-0.5
11	-0.5	-0.3
12	-0.3	-0.1
13	-0.1	0.1
14	0.1	0.3
15	0.3	0.5
16	0.5	0.7
17	0.7	0.9

(Prompt 4) Developing (3 - 8 points) Results are below District- or BOCES-adopted expectations for growth or achievement for grade/subject

Within the category of Developing, those teachers who fall at less than -.9 standard deviations below average and greater than or equal to -2.1 standard deviations below average, we further divide the distribution to determine specific points. The specific point breakdown, with upper and lower bounds denoted in standard deviation units, is as follows:

APPR Point	≥	<
3	-2.1	-1.9
4	-1.9	-1.7
5	-1.7	-1.5
6	-1.5	-1.3
7	-1.3	-1.1
8	-1.1	-0.9

(Prompt 5) Ineffective (0 - 2 points) Results are well below District- or BOCES-adopted expectations for growth or achievement for grade/subject

Within the category of Ineffective, those teachers who fall at less than -2.1 standard deviations below average, we further divide the distribution to determine specific points. The specific point breakdown, with upper and lower bounds denoted in standard deviation units, is as follows:

APPR Point	≥	<
0		-2.5
1	-2.5	-2.3
2	-2.3	-2.1

State Provided Measures of Student Growth: Student Learning Objective As Comparable Growth Measures.

For Courses Administering a Pre Assessment:

2.11 Teachers shall write an SLO for the entire grade level enrollment or individual course. A pre-assessment will be administered and a pre-assessment score recorded on the class list. We will then apply the formula of 1/2 the growth to 100 for each individual student in the grade level/course. A projected goal score will be generated for each individual student in the grade level/course. After the summative assessment is given, enter the student’s score on the class roster. Calculate the total class/course percentage of students that met or exceeded their individual goal. The target average of 80% of students meeting their goal will be placed at 15pts on the 20pt HEDI scale with the remaining percentages distributed equally across the scale.

For Courses Not Administering a Pre Assessment:

2.11 Teachers shall write an SLO for the entire grade level enrollment or individual course. Prior performance and demographic data related to students who have taken the summative assessment/Regents assessment in prior years will be reviewed. Data associated with the incoming cohort will also be reviewed including items such as individual course grades, prior summative assessments and/or State Exams. A projected goal score will be generated for each individual student in the grade level/course. After the summative assessment is given, enter the student’s score on the class roster. Calculate the total class/course percentage of students that met or exceeded their individual goal. The target average of 80% of students meeting their goal will be placed at 15pts on the 20pt HEDI scale with the remaining percentages distributed equally across the 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
95-100%	91-94%	86-90%	84-85%	82-83%	79-81%	76-78%	73-75%	70-72%	66-69%	60-65%	55-59%	53-54%	51-52%	46-50%	41-45%	36-40%	30-35%	21-29%	11-20%	0-10%

Highly Effective

Points shall be assigned by the percentage of the class average achieving well above the target goal set.

Effective

Points shall be assigned by the percentage of the class average achieving slightly above, at, or slightly below the target goal set.

Developing

Points shall be assigned by the percentage of the class average achieving below the target goal set.

Ineffective

Points shall be assigned by the percentage of the class average achieving well below the target goal set.

School Wide K-6 and 7-12 Growth in Proficiency 20pt Local Scale

***Rounding Rules are In effect to the hundredths place on all scales.**

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
+1.4% or more	1.31-1.39%	1.21-1.30%	1.11-1.20%	1.06-1.10%	1.00-1.05%	.95-.99%	.90-.94%	.85-.89%	.80-.84%	.75-.79%	.71-.74%	.66-.70%	.60-.65%	.50-.59%	.41-.49%	.31-.40%	.21-.30%	.11-.20%	.01-.10%	0% or less

School Wide K-6 and 7-12 Growth in Proficiency 15pt Local Scale

** Used for both teachers and principals.

HIGHLY EFFECTIVE		EFFECTIVE						DEVELOPING					INEFFECTIVE		
15	14	13	12	11	10	9	8	7	6	5	4	3	2	1	0
+1.4% or more	1.21-1.39%	1.15-1.20%	1.11-1.14%	1.01-1.10%	.91-1.00%	.81-.90%	.71-.80%	.61-.70%	.51-.60%	.41-.50%	.31-.40%	.21-.30%	.11-.20%	.01-.10%	0% or less

REVISED 10/29/12

Schoolwide Growth Measure for Local 20%

There will be two school wide measures (Elementary K-6 and Jr/Sr High 7-12) based on the increase in proficiency percent average on all state assessments and/or Regents Examinations taken in either building within any given year. An average will be computed based upon the proficiency percentage on each State Assessment or Regents examination divided by the number of examinations multiplied by 100%. All students on the roster will be expected to take the examination and all possible efforts should be made to achieve this.

Growth in proficiency will be measured as follows:

$(\text{current year average}) - (\text{prior year's average}) = \text{growth in proficiency.}$

The scale below will then be used to convert the growth in proficiency into the points for the local measure. This scale will be determined annually and may be further modified if significant adjustments are made at the State level to exam content, format, or scales.

Highly Effective (18-20 points)	Growth in proficiency of 1.21% or above
Effective (9-17 points)	Growth in proficiency of .61%-1.20%
Developing (3-8 points)	Growth in proficiency of .21%-.60%
Ineffective (0-2 points)	Growth in proficiency of .2% or less

7-12 Proficiency Percentage
Proficiency by Five Regents exams and middle level state assessments.

09-10 School Year		10-11 School Year		11-12 School Year		Sample for 12-13	
English	100.00%	English	95.00%	English	91.89%	English	94.50%
Algebra	90.00%	Algebra	100.00%	Algebra	91.48%	Algebra	94.86%
Global	89.00%	Global	95.00%	Global	91.30%	Global	91.30%
US History	88.00%	US History	98.00%	US History	91.89%	US History	94.00%
Earth Science	78.00%	Earth Science	85%	Earth Science	97.5%	Earth Science	92%
ELA 7 th grade	61%	ELA 7 th grade	51%	ELA 7 th grade	35%	ELA 7 th grade	39%
ELA 8 th grade	68%	ELA 8 th grade	64%	ELA 8 th grade	55%	ELA 8 th grade	55%
Math 7 th grade	51%	Math 7 th grade	66%	Math 7 th grade	47%	Math 7 th grade	68%
Math 8 th grade	30%	Math 8 th grade	67%	Math 8 th grade	60%	Math 8 th grade	52%
Science 8 th	91.00%	Science 8 th	97.00%	Science 8 th	93.75%	Science 8th	93.12%
10	746.00	10	818	10	754.81	10	767.78%
Proficiency Avg for 09-10'	74.6%	Proficiency Avg for 10-11'	81.80%	Proficiency Avg for 11-12'	75.48%	Proficiency Avg for 12-13'	76.78%

*Proficiency Levels taken from Hammondsport Jr./Sr. High results by year found at www.nystart.gov.

Avg for 12-13' **76.78%**
Avg for 11-12' **75.48%**
Difference **1.3%**

Highly Effective **19 points**

Assignment of mentor teacher? Yes No

The teacher, principal, mentor(if applicable) and an Association representative (if requested by the teacher) shall meet _____ to assess the effectiveness and appropriateness of the TIP in assisting the teacher to achieve the goals set forth in the TIP. Based on the outcome of this assessment, the TIP will be modified accordingly.

Teacher Signature: _____ Date: _____
Principal Signature: _____ Date: _____
HTA Rep Signature (if requested): _____ Date: _____

**Hammondsport Central School
Teacher Improvement Plan**

Meeting Date: _____
Principal Comments:

Teacher Comments:

Meeting Date: _____
Principal Comments:

Teacher Comments:

Recommendation for Results of TIP

_____ The teacher has met the performance goals identified through the TIP.

_____ The teacher has not met the performance goals.

Next Steps:

Principal Signature: _____ Date: _____

Teacher Signature: _____ Date: _____

*Teachers signature does not constitute agreement but merely signifies that s/he has examined and discussed the materials with the principal.

4.5 Hammondspport Central School Annual Teacher Summative Evaluation

Year: _____

Name: _____

Position : _____

Evaluator: _____

Date: _____

Section I: Rubric

	0	1	2	3	4
<u>District Selected Element</u>	Not Using	Ineffective	Developing	Effective	Highly Effective
Evidence:		Score:			
<u>Teacher Selected Element</u>	Not Using	Ineffective	Developing	Effective	Highly Effective
Evidence:		Score:			
Average Rubric Score:		Score:			

Marzano Rubric Score to Sub-Component Conversion Chart (40 pts)

Ineffective 0-24		Developing 25-29		Effective 30-35		Highly Effective 36-40	
Total Average Rubric Score	Conversion Score for Composite	Total Average Rubric Score	Conversion Score for Composite	Total Average Rubric Score	Conversion Score for Composite	Total Average Rubric Score	Conversion Score for Composite
1.9	24	2.4	29	3.0	35	4	40
1.8	22	2.3	28	2.9	34	3.9	40
1.7	20	2.2	27	2.8	33	3.8	40
1.6	18	2.1	26	2.7	32	3.7	40
1.5	16	2.0	25	2.6	31	3.6	40
1.4	14			2.5	30	3.5	40
1.3	13					3.4	39
1.2	12					3.3	38

1.1	11								3.2	37
1.0	10								3.1	36
.9	9									
.8	8									
.7	7									
.6	6									
.5	5									
.4	4									
.3	3									
.2	2									
.1	1									
0	0									

Section I: Rubric Score Conversion (maximum 40 points)	
---	--

Section II: Self Assessment/Artifact Portfolio Total: (maximum 20 points)

Review of self assessment and teacher created portfolio	
--	--

- Score will be based on rubric evaluation of teacher work.

Section III: State Assessment Total: (maximum 20/25 points)

State Provided Growth Score/Student Learning Objective (SLO)	
---	--

- Score will be based on either State provided score or District SLO.

Section III: Local Assessment Total: (maximum 20/15 points)

Local Assessment (NWEA/Local Assessment)	
---	--

- Score will be based on individual teacher goals/SLOs.

Overall Composite Score: (maximum 100 points)	Level:
--	---------------

Teacher Signature: _____ Date: _____
 Principal Signature: _____ Date: _____

Conversion Chart					
Level	Measures of Student Growth	Local Measures of Student Achievement	Other 60 points		Overall Composite Score
Ineffective	0 - 2	0 - 2	0-29		0-64
Developing	3 - 8	3 - 8	30-37		65-74
Effective	9 - 17	9 - 17	38-51		75-90
Highly Effective	18 - 20	18 - 20	52-60		91-100

Conversion Chart					
Level	Measures of Student Growth	Local Measures of Student Achievement	Other 60 points		Overall Composite Score
Ineffective	0 - 2	0 - 2	0-29		0-64
Developing	3 - 9	3 - 7	30-37		65-74
Effective	10-21	8-13	38-51		75-90
Highly Effective	22-25	14-15	52-60		91-100

Self Assessment/Artifact Portfolio Rubric

CATEGORY	Innovating (4pts)	Applying (3pts)	Developing (2pts)	Beginning (1pt)	Not Using (0pts)
Quality of Portfolio Organization	Portfolio documents are organized into sections with well define visual cues to organization. (e.g. table of contents, section tabs)	Portfolio documents are generally organized into sections and visuals cues.	Documents are sometimes inconsistently organized into sections and visual cues are unclear.	Portfolio is disorganized and just a collection of documents with no visual structure.	No evidence of portfolio.
Variety of Information	All various work samples are clear, concise and convincing samples reflecting competency in the selected teaching attributes.	Clear evidence attained in the variety of documentation, work samples involving the selected teaching attributes.	Limited in the variety of information reflecting on the selected teaching attributes.	Little or no evidence of a variety of work samples reflecting on the selected teaching attributes.	No evidence provided reflecting on the selected teaching attributes.
Thoroughness of Information	Work samples and data are clear, concise and convincing; thoroughly compiled to reflect competency in the selected teaching attributes.	Thoroughly documented, clear evidence of most experiences reflecting competency in the selected teaching attributes.	Limited evidence in the depth of work examples collected.	Little thoroughness in the collection of work samples.	No samples collected.
Depth of Self Reflection	Clear, concise level of self-reflection evident with convincing self-revelation.	Clear, self-reflective data documenting positive professional growth decisions.	Limited self-reflection is evident with personal documentation.	Little self-reflection leading to positive professional growth.	No Self Reflection documented or proven.
Growth in Performance of Attributes of Effective Teaching	Clear, concise evidence of growth in performance of selected attributes of effective teaching through classroom effectiveness, interactions with colleagues, and community involvement.	Clear documentation of growth reflecting competencies in the selected attributes of effective teaching through classroom effectiveness and interactions with colleagues.	Limited positive advancement in documenting competencies in the selected attributes of effective teaching through classroom effectiveness	Little growth in documenting work samples reflecting competencies within the selected attributes of effective teaching	No Growth Documented.

Self Assessment/Artifact Portfolio Rubric Rating Conversion Chart (20 pts)

Total Rubric Score / 5 = _____ Score

Conversion Points= _____

Ineffective : Score 0.1 – 1.0

Score	0.1	0.2	0.3	0.4	0.5	0.6	0.7	0.8	0.9	1.0
Points	1	1	2	2	3	3	3	4	4	4

Developing: Score 1.1 -2.0

Score	1.1	1.2	1.3	1.4	1.5	1.6	1.7	1.8	1.9	2.0
Points	5	5	6	6	7	7	7	8	8	8

Effective 2.1 – 3.0

Score	2.1	2.2	2.3	2.4	2.5	2.6	2.7	2.8	2.9	3.0
Points	9	10	11	12	13	14	15	15	16	16

Highly Effective 3.1 – 4.0

Score	3.1	3.2	3.3	3.4	3.5	3.6	3.7	3.8	3.9	4.0
Points	17	17	18	18	19	19	19	20	20	20

Principal Rubric Score to Sub-Component Conversion Chart

Ineffective 0-49		Developing 50-56		Effective 57-58		Highly Effective 59-60	
Total Average Rubric Score	Conversion Score for Composite	Total Average Rubric Score	Conversion Score for Composite	Total Average Rubric Score	Conversion Score for Composite	Total Average Rubric Score	Conversion Score for Composite
1.958	49	2.458	56	3.208	58	4	60
1.917	48	2.417	56	3.167	58	3.958	60
1.875	47	2.375	55	3.125	58	3.917	60
1.833	46	2.333	55	3.083	58	3.875	60
1.792	45	2.292	54	3.042	58	3.833	60
1.75	44	2.25	54	3	58	3.792	60
1.708	43	2.208	53	2.958	58	3.75	60
1.667	42	2.167	52	2.917	58	3.708	59
1.625	41	2.125	52	2.875	58	3.667	59
1.583	40	2.083	51	2.833	58	3.625	59
1.542	39	2.042	51	2.792	58	3.583	59
1.5	38	2	50	2.75	58	3.542	59
1.458	37			2.958	58	3.5	59
1.417	36			2.917	58	3.458	59
1.375	35			2.875	58	3.417	59
1.333	34			2.708	57	3.375	59
1.292	33			2.667	57	3.333	59
1.25	32			2.625	57	3.292	59
1.208	31			2.583	57	3.25	59
1.167	30			2.542	57		
1.125	29			2.5	57		
1.083	28						
1.042	27						
1	26						
0.958	25						
0.917	24						
0.875	23						
0.833	22						
0.792	21						
0.75	20						
0.708	19						
0.667	18						
0.625	17						
0.583	16						
0.542	15						
0.5	14						
0.458	13						
0.417	12						
0.375	11						
0.333	10						
0.292	9						
0.25	8						
0.208	7						
0.167	6						
0.125	5						
0.083	3.5						
0.042	1.5						
0	0						

11.2 Principal Improvement Plan

Principal Improvement Plan:

The Principal Improvement Plan (PIP) is designed to provide support through communication, discussion and collaboration in the area (s) of significant concern. The Superintendent and administrator will jointly determine the strategies to be taken to overcome the deficiencies, but it is agreed that the primary responsibility for correction of the deficiencies remains with the administrator. The Superintendent and administrator will agree on a mutual time-line to improve any noted deficiencies.

The purpose of the PIP is to:

- improve performance;
- provide targeted, intensive assistance process;
- provide additional support; which may include professional development
- provide information to determine tenure

Referral to PIP:

1. It is agreed that a PIP be developed as early in the school year as reasonable. However, an administrator can be recommended for a PIP component at any time during the year or when the concerns are such that an overall composite score of *ineffective* or *developing score* is calculated on the *Principal Summative Evaluation*. *PIPs as a result of an ineffective or developing rating on the APPR must be completed and initiated no later than 10 days after the beginning of the school year.*

A probationary administrator, who is disciplined, dismissed, not renewed, or denied tenure, based in whole or part upon classroom performance or any other factor measured by the APPR, shall have the right to appeal such action through the APPR Appeals procedure.

2. The Superintendent will notify the administrator in writing describing the areas of concern as they relate to proficiency in demonstrating performance levels as outlined in the Marzano School Leadership Rubric.
3. The Superintendent and administrator will meet to address the concerns, complete PIP worksheet (Appendix E) and begin implementation.
4. The administrator will participate in a year end summative review. The administrator must obtain at least an effective rating on the composite score. If an overall composite score is not at the *effective* or *highly effective* rating, the administrator will continue to have a PIP for the following year.

The administrator must satisfactorily complete the action steps and demonstrate he/she has successfully met the criteria outlined in the PIP

Hammondsport Central School
Principal Improvement Plan
(To be completed jointly by principal and superintendent)

Name _____ Building _____
Academic Year _____

Deficiencies/Areas of Concern:

Improvement Goals/Outcomes:

Action Steps/Activities- Including Timeline for Completion:

Evidence to be Provided for Goal Achievement:

Principal Comments:

Superintendent Comments:

Principal Signature: _____ Date: _____

Superintendent Signature: _____ Date: _____

End of the year review: (check all that apply)

- _____ Principal has successfully met criteria outlined in the TIP.
- _____ Principal has not successfully met criteria outlined in the TIP.
- _____ Principal has received a composite score of effective or better
- _____ Principal has not received a composite score of effective or better.

Principal Signature: _____ Date: _____

Superintendent Signature: _____ Date: _____

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

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

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

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

- Assure that the evaluation system will be used as a significant factor for employment decisions and teacher and principal development
- Assure that the entire APPR plan will be completed for each teacher or principal as soon as practicable, but in no case later than September 1 of the school year next following the school year for which the classroom teacher or building principal's performance is being measured
- Assure that the district or BOCES will provide the teacher's or principal's score and rating on the locally selected measures subcomponent, if available, and on the other measures of teacher and principal effectiveness subcomponent for a teacher's or principal's annual professional performance review, in writing, no later than the last school day of the school year for which the teacher or principal is being measured
- Assure that the APPR plan will be posted on the district's or BOCES' website by September 10 or within 10 days after it is approved by the Commissioner, whichever is later
- Assure that accurate teacher and student data will be provided to the Commissioner in a format and timeline prescribed by the Commissioner
- Assure that the district or BOCES will report the individual subcomponent scores and the total composite effectiveness score for each classroom teacher and building principal in a manner prescribed by the Commissioner
- Certify that the district provides an opportunity for every classroom teacher and building principal to verify the subjects and/or student rosters assigned to them
- Assure that teachers and principals will receive timely and constructive feedback as part of the evaluation process
- Assure that any training course for lead evaluator certification addresses each of the requirements in the regulations, including specific considerations in evaluating teachers and principals of English Language Learners and students with disabilities
- Assure that educators who receive a Developing or Ineffective rating will receive a TIP or PIP plan, in accordance with the regulations, as soon as practicable but in no case later than 10 school days from the opening of classes in the school year following the performance year
- Assure that all evaluators and lead evaluators will be properly trained and that lead evaluators will be certified and recertified as necessary in accordance with the regulations
- Assure that the district or BOCES has appeal procedures that are consistent with the regulations and that they provide for the timely and expeditious resolution of an appeal
- Assure that, for teachers, all NYS Teaching Standards are assessed at least once per year, and, for principals, all Leadership Standards are assessed at least once per year
- Assure that it is possible for a teacher or principal to obtain each point in the scoring ranges, including 0 for each subcomponent and 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: 12/7/12



Teachers Union President Signature: Date:

Karen A. Deek 12/7/12

Administrative Union President Signature: Date:

EM 12/7/12

Board of Education President Signature: Date:

James M. Zimin 12/7/12