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

November 15, 2013

Revised

Andrew Cook, Superintendent
Hartford Central School District
4704 State Route 149
Hartford, New York 12838

Dear Superintendent Cook:

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. 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: James P. Dexter

NOTE:
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

Created Tuesday, April 30, 2013
Updated Monday, September 09, 2013

1

Disclaimers

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

The Department will not review any attachments other than those required in the online form. Any additional attachments supplied by the school district or BOCES are for informational purposes only for the teachers and principals reviewed under this APPR plan. Statements and/or materials in such additional attachments have not been approved and/or endorsed by the Department. However, the Department considers void any other signed agreements between and among parties in any form that prevent, conflict, or interfere with full implementation of the APPR Plan approved by the Department. The Department also 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 : 641001040000

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

641001040000

1.2) School District Name: HARTFORD CSD

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

HARTFORD CSD

1.3) Assurances

Please check all of the boxes below:

1.3) 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
1.3) 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

1.3) 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

1.4) Submission Status

For BOCES or charter schools that did not have an approved APPR plan for the 2012-13 school year only, is this a first-time submission, a re-submission, or a submission of material changes to an approved APPR plan? For districts, BOCES or charter schools that did have an approved APPR plan for the 2012-13 school year, this must be listed as a submission of material changes to the approved APPR plan.

Submission of material changes to an approved APPR plan

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

Created Tuesday, April 30, 2013
Updated Thursday, November 07, 2013

Page 1

STATE-PROVIDED MEASURES OF STUDENT GROWTH

(25 points with an approved value-added measure)

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

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

Please note that if the Board of Regents does not approve a value-added measure for these grades/subjects, 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.	Checked

STUDENT LEARNING OBJECTIVES AS COMPARABLE GROWTH MEASURES (20 points)

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

For core subjects: grades 6-8 Science and Social Studies, high school English Language Arts, Math, Science, and Social Studies courses associated in 2010-11 with Regents exams or, in the future, with other State assessments, the following must be used as the evidence of student learning within the SLO:
State assessments (or Regents or Regent equivalents), *required if one exists*
If no State assessment or Regents exam exists:
District-determined assessments from list of State-approved 3rd party assessments; or

District, regional or BOCES-developed assessments provided that it is rigorous and comparable across classrooms
For other grades/subjects: district-determined assessments from options below may be used as evidence of student learning within the SLO:
State assessments, *required if one exists*
List of State-approved 3rd party assessments
District, regional, or BOCES-developed assessments provided that it is rigorous and comparable across classrooms
School- or BOCES-wide, group or team results based on State assessments
Please note: If your district or BOCES does not have grade/subject-specific teachers for one or more of the rows in questions 2.2 through 2.9, choose "Not applicable" from the drop-down box and type N/A in the assessment box. This would be appropriate if, for example, common branch teachers also teach 6th grade science and/or social studies and therefore would have State-provided growth measures, not SLOs; the district or BOCES does not have certain grades; the district does not offer a specific subject; etc.

Districts or BOCES that intend to use a district, regional, or BOCES-developed assessment must include the name, grade, and subject of the assessment in the following format: "[Name of your District/Region/BOCES] developed [Grade] [Subject] Assessment." For example, a BOCES-developed 7th grade Social Studies assessment would be written as follows: "GVEP-Developed Grade 7 Social Studies Assessment."

2.2) Grades K-3 ELA

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

	ELA	Assessment
K	District, regional, or BOCES-developed assessment	WSWHE BOCES Developed Grade K ELA Assessment
1	District, regional, or BOCES-developed assessment	WSWHE BOCES Developed Grade 1 ELA Assessment
2	District, regional, or BOCES-developed assessment	WSWHE BOCES Developed Grade 2 ELA Assessment

	ELA	Assessment
3	State assessment	3rd Grade State Assessment

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

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.	All information is contained in the document uploaded at 2.11
Highly Effective (18 - 20 points) Results are well-above state average for similar students (or District goals if no state test).	85 - 100% of students reached their summative target
Effective (9 - 17 points) Results meet state average for similar students (or District goals if no state test).	65 - 84% of students reached their summative target
Developing (3 - 8 points) Results are below state average for similar students (or District goals if no state test).	46 - 64% of students reached their summative target
Ineffective (0 - 2 points) Results are well-below state average for similar students (or District goals if no state test).	0 - 45% of students reached their summative target

2.3) Grades K-3 Math

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

	Math	Assessment
K	District, regional, or BOCES-developed assessment	WSWHE BOCES Developed Grade K Math Assessment
1	District, regional, or BOCES-developed assessment	WSWHE BOCES Developed Grade 1 Math Assessment
2	District, regional, or BOCES-developed assessment	WSWHE BOCES Developed Grade 2 Math Assessment

	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 measuring student growth on the assessments listed for this Task.

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.	All information is contained in the document uploaded at 2.11
Highly Effective (18 - 20 points) Results are well-above state average for similar students (or District goals if no state test).	85 - 100% of students reached their summative target
Effective (9 - 17 points) Results meet state average for similar students (or District goals if no state test).	65 - 84% of students reached their summative target
Developing (3 - 8 points) Results are below state average for similar students (or District goals if no state test).	46 - 64% of students reached their summative target
Ineffective (0 - 2 points) Results are well-below state average for similar students (or District goals if no state test).	0 - 45% of students reached their summative target

2.4) Grades 6-8 Science

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

	Science	Assessment
6	District, regional or BOCES-developed assessment	WSWHE BOCES developed grade 6 Science Assessment
7	District, regional or BOCES-developed assessment	WSWHE BOCES developed grade 7 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 measuring student growth on the assessments listed for this Task.

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.	All information is contained in the document uploaded at 2.11
Highly Effective (18 - 20 points) Results are well-above state average for similar students (or District goals if no state test).	85 - 100% of students reached their summative target
Effective (9 - 17 points) Results meet state average for similar students (or District goals if no state test).	65 - 84% of students reached their summative target
Developing (3 - 8 points) Results are below state average for similar students (or District goals if no state test).	46 - 64% of students reached their summative target
Ineffective (0 - 2 points) Results are well-below state average for similar students (or District goals if no state test).	0 - 45% of students reached their summative target

2.5) Grades 6-8 Social Studies

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

	Social Studies	Assessment
6	District, regional or BOCES-developed assessment	Hartford CSD developed grade 6 Social Studies Assessment
7	District, regional or BOCES-developed assessment	Hartford CSD developed grade 7 Social Studies Assessment
8	District, regional or BOCES-developed assessment	Hartford CSD developed grade 8 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 measuring student growth on the assessments listed for this Task.

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.	All information is contained in the document uploaded at 2.11
Highly Effective (18 - 20 points) Results are well-above District goals for similar students.	85 - 100% of students reached their summative target
Effective (9 - 17 points) Results meet District goals for similar students.	65 - 84% of students reached their summative target
Developing (3 - 8 points) Results are below District goals for similar students.	46 - 64% of students reached their summative target
Ineffective (0 - 2 points) Results are well-below District goals for similar students.	0 - 45% of students reached their summative target

2.6) High School Social Studies Regents Courses

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

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

		Assessment
Global 1	District, regional, or BOCES-developed assessment	Hartford CSD developed Global Studies 1 Assessment

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

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

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.	All information is contained in the document uploaded at 2.11
Highly Effective (18 - 20 points) Results are well-above District goals for similar students.	85 - 100% of students reached their summative target
Effective (9 - 17 points) Results meet District goals for similar students.	65 - 84% of students reached their summative target
Developing (3 - 8 points) Results are below District goals for similar students.	46 - 64% of students reached their summative target
Ineffective (0 - 2 points) Results are well-below District goals for similar students.	0 - 45% of students reached their summative target

2.7) High School Science Regents Courses

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

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

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

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

assessments listed for this Task.

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.	All information is contained in the document uploaded at 2.11
Highly Effective (18 - 20 points) Results are well-above District goals for similar students.	85 - 100% of students reached their summative target
Effective (9 - 17 points) Results meet District goals for similar students.	65 - 84% of students reached their summative target
Developing (3 - 8 points) Results are below District goals for similar students.	46 - 64% of students reached their summative target
Ineffective (0 - 2 points) Results are well-below District goals for similar students.	0 - 45% of students reached their summative target

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 measuring student growth on the assessments listed for this Task.

NOTE: For Algebra 1, please specify whether your district will be offering the Integrated Algebra Regents, the Common Core Algebra Regents, or both and how the HEDI process will be adjusted accordingly.

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.	All information is contained in the document uploaded at 2.11 The District will be administering both the NYS Integrated Algebra Regents and the NYS Common Core Algebra Regents. All students who take Common Core instruction will be taking the NYS Common Core Algebra Regents exam, while all other students who elect, or are required to sit the NYS Integrated Algebra Regents, will be taking the NYS Integrated Algebra exam. If a student elects to take both exams, the district will be using the students' highest score.
Highly Effective (18 - 20 points) Results are well-above District goals for similar students.	85 - 100% of students reached their summative target
Effective (9 - 17 points) Results meet District goals for similar students.	65 - 84% of students reached their summative target

Developing (3 - 8 points) Results are below District goals for similar students.	46 - 64% of students reached their summative target
Ineffective (0 - 2 points) Results are well-below District goals for similar students.	0 - 45% of students reached their summative target

2.9) High School English Language Arts

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

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

	High School English Courses	Assessment
Grade 9 ELA	District, regional or BOCES-developed assessment	WSWHE BOCES developed grade 9 ELA Assessment
Grade 10 ELA	District, regional or BOCES-developed assessment	WSWHE BOCES developed grade 10 ELA Assessment
Grade 11 ELA	Regents assessment	New York State Comprehensive ELA Regents Exam

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

NOTE: For Grade 11 ELA, please specify whether your district will be offering the Comprehensive English Regents, the Common Core English Regents, or both and how the HEDI process will be adjusted accordingly.

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.	All information is contained in the document uploaded at 2.11
Highly Effective (18 - 20 points) Results are well-above District goals for similar students.	85 - 100% of students reached their summative target
Effective (9 - 17 points) Results meet District goals for similar students.	65 - 84% of students reached their summative target
Developing (3 - 8 points) Results are below District goals for similar students.	46 - 64% of students reached their summative target
Ineffective (0 - 2 points) Results are well-below District goals for similar students.	0 - 45% of students reached their summative target

2.10) All Other Courses

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

Course(s) or Subject(s)	Option	Assessment

	Elementary Physical Education	District, Regional or BOCES-developed	WSWHE BOCES Developed Elementary Physical Education Assessment; grade specific
	Elementary Art	District, Regional or BOCES-developed	WSWHE BOCES Developed Elementary Art Assessment; grade specific
	Middle School Health	District, Regional or BOCES-developed	Hartford CSD developed Middle School Health Assessment
	LOTE Courses	District, Regional or BOCES-developed	Hartford CSD Developed LOTE Grade and Subject Specific Assessments
	Instructional Music	District, Regional or BOCES-developed	WSWHE BOCES Developed Instructional Music Assessment
	Chorus	District, Regional or BOCES-developed	WSWHE BOCES Developed Choral Assessment
	Keyboarding	District, Regional or BOCES-developed	Hartford CSD Developed Keyboarding Assessment
	Career Exploration	District, Regional or BOCES-developed	Hartford CSD developed Career Exploration Assessment
	Economics	District, Regional or BOCES-developed	Hartford CSD developed Economics Assessment
	Participation in Government	District, Regional or BOCES-developed	Hartford CSD developed Participation in Government Assessment
	Agricultural Science Courses	District, Regional or BOCES-developed	Hartford CSD Developed Agricultural Science Assessments
	Middle School Physical Education	District, Regional or BOCES-developed	WSWHE BOCES Developed Middle School Physical Education Assessment
	High School Physical Education	District, Regional or BOCES-developed	WSWHE BOCES Developed High School Physical Education Assessment
	All Other Teachers/Courses Not Specifically Identified Above	District, Regional or BOCES-developed	Hartford CSD Developed Course Specific Assessments

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 measuring student growth on the assessments listed for this Task.

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.	All information is contained in the document uploaded at 2.11
Highly Effective (18 - 20 points) Results are well-above District goals for similar students.	85 - 100% of students reached their summative target
Effective (9 - 17 points) Results meet District goals for similar students.	65 - 84% of students reached their summative target
Developing (3 - 8 points) Results are below District goals for similar students.	46 - 64% of students reached their summative target
Ineffective (0 - 2 points) Results are well-below District goals for similar students.	0 - 45% of students reached their summative target

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

(No response)

2.11) HEDI Tables or Graphics

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

assets/survey-uploads/12186/567492-TXEtxx9bQW/Growth Using Comparable Measure1_2.docx

2.12) Locally Developed Controls

Describe any adjustments, controls, or other special considerations that will be used assigning points to a teacher's score for this subcomponent, 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 the following: student prior academic history, students with disabilities, English language learners, and students in poverty.

(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://www.engageny.org/resource/student-learning-objectives-guidance-document).	Checked
2.14) Assurances | Assure that past academic performance and/or baseline academic data of students will be taken into account when developing an SLO.	Checked
2.14) Assurances | Assure that the process for assigning points for SLOs for the Growth Subcomponent will use the narrative HEDI descriptions described in the regulations to effectively differentiate educators in ways that improve student learning and instruction.	Checked

2.14) Assurances | Assure that it is possible for an educator to earn each point, including 0, for SLOs in the Growth subcomponent scoring range.	Checked
2.14) Assurances | Assure that processes are in place to monitor SLOs to ensure rigor and comparability across classrooms.	Checked

3. Local Measures (Teachers)

Created Tuesday, April 30, 2013
Updated Thursday, November 07, 2013

Page 1

Locally Selected Measures of Student Achievement or Growth

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

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

Locally selected measures for common branch teachers: This form calls for locally selected measures in both ELA and math in grades typically served by common branch teachers. Districts may select local measures for common branch teachers that involve subjects other than ELA and math. Whatever local measure is selected for common branch teachers, please enter it under ELA and/or math and describe the assessment used, including the subject. Use N/A for other lines in that grade level that are served by common branch teachers. Describe the HEDI criteria for the measure in the same section where you identified the locally selected measure and assessment. Additionally, please provide a brief explanation in the HEDI general description box of why you have listed the grade/course as “Not Applicable” (e.g., district/BOCES does not offer this grade/subject; common branch teacher).

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 in the following format: “[Name of your District/Region/BOCES] developed [Grade] [Subject] Assessment.” For example, a BOCES-developed 7th grade Social Studies assessment would be written as follows: “GVEP-Developed Grade 7 Social Studies Assessment.”

NOTE: If your district/BOCES is using the same assessment for both the State growth and other comparable measures subcomponent and the locally-selected measures subcomponent, be sure that a *different* measure of student performance is being used with the assessment (e.g., achievement rather than growth; growth measured in a different manner).

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 measure that will be used as the locally-selected measure of student achievement. Then name the specific assessment that will be used with the locally-selected measure, listing the full name of the assessment.

	Locally-Selected Measure from List of Approved Measures	Assessment
4	4) State-approved 3rd party assessments	Measures of Academic Progress (ELA)
5	4) State-approved 3rd party assessments	Measures of Academic Progress (ELA)
6	5) District, regional, or BOCES–developed assessments	Hartford CSD developed grade 6 ELA assessment
7	5) District, regional, or BOCES–developed assessments	Hartford CSD developed grade 7 ELA assessment

8	5) District, regional, or BOCES–developed assessments	Hartford CSD developed grade 8 ELA assessment

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

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

Use this box, if needed, to describe the general process for assigning HEDI categories for these grades/subjects in this subcomponent. If needed, you may upload a table or graphic at 3.3, below.	All information is contained in the document uploaded at 3.3
Highly Effective (14 - 15 points) Results are well above District- or BOCES-adopted expectations for growth or achievement for grade/subject.	85 – 100% of students reached the score of 65 or a Level 3.
Effective (8- 13 points) Results meet District- or BOCES-adopted expectations for growth or achievement for grade/subject.	65 – 84% of students reached the score of 65 or a Level 3.
Developing (3 - 7 points) Results are below District- or BOCES-adopted expectations for growth or achievement for grade/subject.	46 - 64% of students reached the score of 65 or a Level 3.
Ineffective (0 - 2 points) Results are well below District- or BOCES-adopted expectations for growth or achievement for grade/subject.	0 – 45% of students reached the score of 65 or a Level 3.

3.2) Grades 4-8 Math

Using the drop-down boxes below, select the measure that will be used as the locally-selected measure of student achievement. Then name the specific assessment that will be used with the locally-selected measure, listing the full name of the assessment.

	Locally-Selected Measure from List of Approved Measures	Assessment
4	4) State-approved 3rd party assessments	Measures of Academic Progress (Math)
5	4) State-approved 3rd party assessments	Measures of Academic Progress (Math)
6	5) District, regional, or BOCES–developed assessments	Hartford CSD developed grade 6 Math assessment
7	5) District, regional, or BOCES–developed assessments	Hartford CSD developed grade 7 Math assessment
8	5) District, regional, or BOCES–developed assessments	Hartford CSD developed grade 8 Math assessment

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

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

Use this box, if needed, to describe the general process for assigning HEDI categories for these grades/subjects in this subcomponent. If needed, you may upload a table or graphic at 3.3, below.	All information is contained in the document uploaded at 3.3
Highly Effective (14 - 15 points) Results are well above District- or BOCES-adopted expectations for growth or achievement for grade/subject.	85 – 100% of students reached the score of 65 or a Level 3.
Effective (8- 13 points) Results meet District- or BOCES-adopted expectations for growth or achievement for grade/subject.	65 – 84% of students reached the score of 65 or a Level 3.
Developing (3 - 7 points) Results are below District- or BOCES-adopted expectations for growth or achievement for grade/subject.	46 - 64% of students reached the score of 65 or a Level 3.
Ineffective (0 - 2 points) Results are well below District- or BOCES-adopted expectations for growth or achievement for grade/subject.	0 – 45% of students reached the score of 65 or a Level 3.

3.3) HEDI Tables or Graphics

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

assets/survey-uploads/12149/567493-rhJdBgDruP/17878122-Locally Selected Measure Value with a value added and without.docx

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

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

Measures based on:

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

3.4) Grades K-3 ELA

Using the drop-down boxes below, select the measure that will be used as the locally-selected measure of student achievement. Then name the specific assessment that will be used with the locally-selected measure, listing the full name of the assessment.

	Locally-Selected Measure from List of Approved Measures	Assessment
K	4) State-approved 3rd party assessments	Measures of Academic Progress (Primary Grades)
1	5) District, regional, or BOCES–developed assessments	WSWHE BOCES Developed Grade 1 ELA Assessment
2	4) State-approved 3rd party assessments	Measures of Academic Progress (Primary Grades)
3	4) State-approved 3rd party assessments	Measures of Academic Progress (ELA)

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

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

Use this box, if needed, to describe the general process for assigning HEDI categories for these grades/subjects in this subcomponent. If needed, you may upload a table or graphic at 3.13, below.	All information is contained in the document uploaded at 3.13
Highly Effective (18-20 points) Results are well above District- or BOCES-adopted expectations for growth or achievement for grade/subject.	85 – 100% of students reached the score of 65 or a Level 3.
Effective (9-17 points) Results meet District- or BOCES-adopted expectations for growth or achievement for grade/subject.	65 – 84% of students reached the score of 65 or a Level 3.

Developing (3 - 8 points) Results are below District- or BOCES-adopted expectations for growth or achievement for grade/subject.	46 - 64% of students reached the score of 65 or a Level 3.
Ineffective (0 - 2 points) Results are well below District- or BOCES-adopted expectations for growth or achievement for grade/subject.	0 – 45% of students reached the score of 65 or a Level 3.

3.5) Grades K-3 Math

Using the drop-down boxes below, select the measure that will be used as the locally-selected measure of student achievement. Then name the specific assessment that will be used with the locally-selected measure, listing the full name of the assessment.

	Locally-Selected Measure from List of Approved Measures	Assessment
K	4) State-approved 3rd party assessments	Measures of Academic Progress (Primary Grades)
1	5) District, regional, or BOCES–developed assessments	WSWHE BOCES Developed Grade 1 Math Assessment
2	4) State-approved 3rd party assessments	Measures of Academic Progress (Primary Grades)
3	4) State-approved 3rd party assessments	Measures of Academic Progress (Math)

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

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

Use this box, if needed, to describe the general process for assigning HEDI categories for these grades/subjects in this subcomponent. If needed, you may upload a table or graphic at 3.13, below.	All information is contained in the document uploaded at 3.13
Highly Effective (18-20 points) Results are well above District- or BOCES-adopted expectations for growth or achievement for grade/subject.	85 – 100% of students reached the score of 65 or a Level 3.
Effective (9-17 points) Results meet District- or BOCES-adopted expectations for growth or achievement for grade/subject.	65 – 84% of students reached the score of 65 or a Level 3.
Developing (3 - 8 points) Results are below District -or BOCES-adopted expectations for growth or achievement for grade/subject.	46 - 64% of students reached the score of 65 or a Level 3.
Ineffective (0 - 2 points) Results are well below District- or BOCES-adopted expectations for growth or achievement for grade/subject.	0 – 45% of students reached the score of 65 or a Level 3.

3.6) Grades 6-8 Science

Using the drop-down boxes below, select the measure that will be used as the locally-selected measure of student achievement. Then name the specific assessment that will be used with the locally-selected measure, listing the full name of the assessment.

	Locally-Selected Measure from List of Approved Measures	Assessment
6	5) District, regional, or BOCES–developed assessments	Hartford CSD Developed Grade 6 Science Assessment
7	5) District, regional, or BOCES–developed assessments	Hartford CSD Developed Grade 7 Science Assessment
8	5) District, regional, or BOCES–developed assessments	Hartford CSD developed grade 8 Science assessment

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

Use this box, if needed, to describe the general process for assigning HEDI categories for these grades/subjects in this subcomponent. If needed, you may upload a table or graphic at 3.13, below.	All information is contained in the document uploaded at 3.13
Highly Effective (18 - 20 points) Results are well above District- or BOCES-adopted expectations for growth or achievement for grade/subject.	85 – 100% of students reached the score of 65 or a Level 3.
Effective (9 - 17 points) Results meet District- or BOCES-adopted expectations for growth or achievement for grade/subject.	65 – 84% of students reached the score of 65 or a Level 3.
Developing (3 - 8 points) Results are below District- or BOCES-adopted expectations for growth or achievement for grade/subject.	46 - 64% of students reached the score of 65 or a Level 3.
Ineffective (0 - 2 points) Results are well below District- or BOCES-adopted expectations for growth or achievement for grade/subject.	0 – 45% of students reached the score of 65 or a Level 3.

3.7) Grades 6-8 Social Studies

Using the drop-down boxes below, select the measure that will be used as the locally-selected measure of student achievement. Then name the specific assessment that will be used with the locally-selected measure, listing the full name of the assessment.

	Locally-Selected Measure from List of Approved Measures	Assessment
6	5) District, regional, or BOCES–developed assessments	Hartford CSD developed grade 6 Social Studies Assessment
7	5) District, regional, or BOCES–developed assessments	Hartford CSD developed grade Grade 7 Social Studies Assessment
8	5) District, regional, or BOCES–developed assessments	Hartford CSD developed grade Grade 8 Social Studies Assessment

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

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

Use this box, if needed, to describe the general process for assigning HEDI categories for these grades/subjects in this subcomponent. If needed, you may upload a table or graphic at 3.13, below.	All information is contained in the document uploaded at 3.13
Highly Effective (18 - 20 points) Results are well above District- or BOCES-adopted expectations for growth or achievement for grade/subject.	85 – 100% of students reached the score of 65 or a Level 3.
Effective (9 - 17 points) Results meet District- or BOCES-adopted expectations for growth or achievement for grade/subject.	65 – 84%of students reached the score of 65 or a Level 3.
Developing (3 - 8 points) Results are below District- or BOCES-adopted expectations for growth or achievement for grade/subject.	46-64% of students reached the score of 65 or a Level 3.
Ineffective (0 - 2 points) Results are well below District- or BOCES-adopted expectations for growth or achievement for grade/subject.	0 – 45% of students reached the score of 65 or a Level 3.

3.8) High School Social Studies

Using the drop-down boxes below, select the measure that will be used as the locally-selected measure of student achievement. Then name the specific assessment that will be used with the locally-selected measure, listing the full name of the assessment.

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

	Locally-Selected Measure from List of Approved Measures	Assessment
Global 1	5) District, regional, or BOCES–developed assessments	Hartford CSD developed grade Global 1 Assessment
Global 2	3) Teacher specific achievement or growth score computed locally	New York State Global History and Geography Regents Exam
American History	3) Teacher specific achievement or growth score computed locally	New York State United States History and Government Regents Exam

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

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

Use this box, if needed, to describe the general process for assigning HEDI categories for these grades/subjects in this subcomponent. If needed, you may upload a table or graphic at 3.13, below.	All information is contained in the document uploaded at 3.13
Highly Effective (18 - 20 points) Results are well above District- or BOCES-adopted expectations for growth or achievement for grade/subject.	85 – 100% of students reached the score of 65 or a Level 3.
Effective (9 - 17 points) Results meet District- or BOCES-adopted expectations for growth or achievement for grade/subject.	65– 84% of students reached the score of 65 or a Level 3.
Developing (3 - 8 points) Results are below District- or BOCES-adopted expectations for growth or achievement for grade/subject.	46-64% of students reached the score of 65 or a Level 3.
Ineffective (0 - 2 points) Results are well below District- or BOCES-adopted expectations for growth or achievement for grade/subject.	0 – 45% of students reached the score of 65 or a Level 3.

3.9) High School Science

Using the drop-down boxes below, select the measure that will be used as the locally-selected measure of student achievement. Then name the specific assessment that will be used with the locally-selected measure, listing the full name of the assessment.

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

	Locally-Selected Measure from List of Approved Measures	Assessment
Living Environment	3) Teacher specific achievement or growth score computed locally	New York State Living Environment Regents Exam
Earth Science	3) Teacher specific achievement or growth score computed locally	New York State Earth Science Regents Exam
Chemistry	3) Teacher specific achievement or growth score computed locally	New York State Chemistry Regents Exam
Physics	3) Teacher specific achievement or growth score computed locally	New York State Physics Regents Exam

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

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

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

Highly Effective (18-20 points) Results are well above District- or BOCES-adopted expectations for growth or achievement for grade/subject.	85 – 100% of students reached the score of 65 or a Level 3.
Developing (3 - 8 points) Results are below District- or BOCES-adopted expectations for growth or achievement for grade/subject.	65– 84% of students reached the score of 65 or a Level 3.
Effective (9 - 17points) Results meet District- or BOCES-adopted expectations for growth or achievement for grade/subject.	46-64% of students reached the score of 65 or a Level 3.
Ineffective (0 - 2 points) Results are well below District- or BOCES-adopted expectations for growth or achievement for grade/subject.	0 – 45% of students reached the score of 65 or a Level 3.

3.10) High School Math

Using the drop-down boxes below, select the measure that will be used as the locally-selected measure of student achievement. Then name the specific assessment that will be used with the locally-selected measure, listing the full name of the assessment.

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

	Locally-Selected Measure from List of Approved Measures	Assessment
Algebra 1	3) Teacher specific achievement or growth score computed locally	New York State Common Core Algebra Regents Exam and the New York State Integrate Algebra Regents Exam
Geometry	3) Teacher specific achievement or growth score computed locally	New York State Geometry Regents Exam
Algebra 2	3) Teacher specific achievement or growth score computed locally	New York State Algebra 2 Regents Exam

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

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

NOTE: As applicable, please specify whether your district will be offering the Integrated Algebra Regents, the Common Core Algebra Regents, or both and how the HEDI process will be adjusted accordingly.

Use this box, if needed, to describe the general process for assigning HEDI categories for these grades/subjects in this subcomponent. If needed, you may upload a table or graphic at 3.13, below.	All information is contained in the document uploaded at 3.13 For Algebra 1: those students who take common core instruction, they will take both exams (the New York State Common Core Algebra Exam and the New York State Integrate

	Algebra Exam); their higher score will be used
Highly Effective (18 - 20 points) Results are well above District- or BOCES-adopted expectations for growth or achievement for grade/subject.	85 – 100% of students reached the score of 65 or a Level 3.
Effective (9 - 17 points) Results meet District- or BOCES-adopted expectations for growth or achievement for grade/subject.	65– 84% of students reached the score of 65 or a Level 3.
Developing (3 - 8 points) Results are below District- or BOCES-adopted expectations for growth or achievement for grade/subject.	46-64% of students reached the score of 65 or a Level 3.
Ineffective (0 - 2 points) Results are well below District- or BOCES-adopted expectations for growth or achievement for grade/subject.	0 – 45%of students reached the score of 65 or a Level 3.

3.11) High School English Language Arts

Using the drop-down boxes below, select the measure that will be used as the locally-selected measure of student achievement. Then name the specific assessment that will be used with the locally-selected measure, listing the full name of the assessment.

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

	Locally-Selected Measure from List of Approved Measures	Assessment
Grade 9 ELA	5) District, regional, or BOCES–developed assessments	WSWHE BOCES developed grade Grade 9 ELA Assessment
Grade 10 ELA	5) District, regional, or BOCES–developed assessments	WSWHE BOCES developed grade Grade 10 ELA Assessment
Grade 11 ELA	3) Teacher specific achievement or growth score computed locally	New York State Comprehensive ELA 11 Regents Exam

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

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

NOTE: As applicable, please specify whether your district will be offering the Comprehensive English Regents, the Common Core English Regents, or both and how the HEDI process will be adjusted accordingly.

Use this box, if needed, to describe the general process for assigning HEDI categories for these grades/subjects in this subcomponent. If needed, you may upload a table or graphic at 3.13, below.	All information is contained in the document uploaded at 3.13
Highly Effective (18 - 20 points) Results are well above District- or BOCES-adopted expectations for growth or achievement for grade/subject.	85 – 100% of students reached the score of 65 or a Level 3.

Effective (9 - 17 points) Results meet District- or BOCES-adopted expectations for growth or achievement for grade/subject.	65 – 84%of students reached the score of 65 or a Level 3.
Developing (3 - 8 points) Results are below District- or BOCES-adopted expectations for growth or achievement for grade/subject.	46 - 64% of students reached the score of 65 or a Level 3.
Ineffective (0 - 2 points) Results are well below District- or BOCES-adopted expectations for growth or achievement for grade/subject.	0 – 45% of students reached the score of 65 or a Level 3.

3.12) All Other Courses

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

Course(s) or Subject(s)	Locally-Selected Measure from List of Approved Measures	Assessment
Elementary Physical Education	5) District/regional/BOCES–developed	WSWHE BOCES Regionally Developed Elementary Physical Education Assessment; grade specific
Elementary Art	5) District/regional/BOCES–developed	WSWHE BOCES Regionally Developed Grade Elementary Art Assessment; grade specific
Middle School Health	5) District/regional/BOCES–developed	Hartford CSD developed grade Middle School Health Assessment
LOTE Courses	5) District/regional/BOCES–developed	Hartford CSD developed grade and subject Specific LOTE Assessments
Instructional Music	5) District/regional/BOCES–developed	WSWHE BOCES Regionally Developed Instructional Music Assessment
Chorus	5) District/regional/BOCES–developed	WSWHE BOCES Regionally Developed Grade Choral Music Assessment
Keyboarding	5) District/regional/BOCES–developed	Hartford CSD developed grade Keyboarding Assessment
Career Exploration	5) District/regional/BOCES–developed	Hartford CSD developed gradeCareer Exploration Assessment
Economics	5) District/regional/BOCES–developed	Hartford CSD developed Economics Assessment
Participation in Government	5) District/regional/BOCES–developed	Hartford CSD developed Participation in Government Assessment

	Ag. Science Courses	5) District/regional/BOCES–developed	Hartford CSD developed Ag. Science Assessments
	Middle School Physical Education	5) District/regional/BOCES–developed	WSWHE BOCES Regionally Developed Grade Middle School Physical Education Assessment
	High School Physical Education	5) District/regional/BOCES–developed	WSWHE BOCES Regionally Developed Grade High School Physical Education Assessment
	All Other Teachers/Courses Not Specifically Identified Above	5) District/regional/BOCES–developed	Hartford CSD Developed Course Specific Assessments

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

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

Use this box, if needed, to describe the general process for assigning HEDI categories for these grades/subjects in this subcomponent. If needed, you may upload a table or graphic at 3.13, below.	All information is contained in the document uploaded at 3.13
Highly Effective (18 - 20 points) Results are well above District- or BOCES -adopted expectations for growth or achievement for grade/subject.	85 – 100% of students reached the score of 65 or a Level 3.
Effective (9 - 17 points) Results meet District- or BOCES-adopted expectations for growth or achievement for grade/subject.	65 – 84% of students reached the score of 65 or a Level 3.
Developing (3 - 8 points) Results are below District- or BOCES-adopted expectations for growth or achievement for grade/subject.	46-64% of students reached the score of 65 or a Level 3.
Ineffective (0 - 2 points) Results are well below District- or BOCES-adopted expectations for growth or achievement for grade/subject.	0 – 45% of students reached the score of 65 or a Level 3.

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/12149/567493-y92vNseFa4/17878122-Locally Selected Measure Value with a value added and without.docx

3.14) Locally Developed Controls

Describe any adjustments, controls, or other special considerations that will be used in assigning points to a teacher's score for this subcomponent, the rationale for including such factors, and the processes that will be used to mitigate potentially problematic incentives associated with the controls or adjustments.

(No response)

3.15) Teachers with More Than One Locally Selected Measure

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

Any teacher who has more than one locally selected measure will have a composite score that utilizes a pro-rated HEDI scores determined by weighting the specific student populations within the multiple courses. For example: if a teacher has two SLOs with student populations of 55 and 45, respectively. The teacher's composite score will be 55% from the class of 55 students and 45% from the class of 45 students.

3.16) Assurances

Please check all of the boxes below:

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

4. Other Measures of Effectiveness (Teachers)

Created Tuesday, April 30, 2013
Updated Wednesday, November 13, 2013

Page 1

4.1) Teacher Practice Rubric

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

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

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

Danielson's Framework for Teaching

(No response)

4.2) Points Within Other Measures

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

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

Is the following points assignment applicable to all teachers?

Yes

If you checked "no" above, fill in the group of teachers covered by the points assignment indicated immediately below (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]	35
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	25

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, label accordingly, and 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 60 points will be divided into three categories:
Formal Observation(s) - 30 points
Walk-through Observation - 5 points (See attached document below which explains the walk-through point distribution)
Evidence Binder - 25 points

Domains 1 - 3 will be focused on during the formal observation and be proportioned to 10 points for each Domain with each sub-component within the domain weighted equally. (See attached document)
Domain 4 will be assessed using a year-long evidence binder that will be valued at 25 points with each sub-component weighted equally. (see attached document)

All observed components will be scored.

The point totals for each observation and the evidence binder will be added together to result in a HEDI score from 0 to 60.

Standard rounding rules will apply to entire process. Rounding will not result in movement between HEDI bands.

For probationary teachers, their two formal observation scores will be averaged together to generate a single score 0-30.

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/12179/567494-eka9yMJ855/17878178-Walk-through and rubric scoring sheet_1.docx

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

Highly Effective: Overall performance and results exceed NYS Teaching Standards.	Teachers who have a composite score between 55 and 60 points, supported with collected evidence will be considered "Highly Effective."
Effective: Overall performance and results meet NYS Teaching Standards.	Teachers who have a composite score between 35 and 54 points, supported with collected evidence will be considered "Effective."
Developing: Overall performance and results need improvement in order to meet NYS Teaching Standards.	Teachers who have a composite score between 11 and 34 points, supported with collected evidence will be considered "Developing."
Ineffective: Overall performance and results do not meet NYS Teaching Standards.	Teachers who have a composite score between 0 and 10 points, supported with collected evidence will be considered "Ineffective."

Provide the ranges for the 60-point scoring bands.

Highly Effective	55 - 60
Effective	35 - 54
Developing	11 - 34
Ineffective	0 - 10

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	2

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

By trained in-school peer teachers or other trained reviewers

Formal/Long	0
Informal/Short	0

Independent evaluators

Formal/Long	0
Informal/Short	0

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

- In Person

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

- In Person

4.7) Observations of Tenured Teachers

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

By building principals or other trained administrators

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

By trained in-school peer teachers or other trained reviewers

Formal/Long	0
Informal/Short	0

Independent evaluators

Formal/Long	0

Informal/Short	0

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

- In Person

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

- In Person

5. Composite Scoring (Teachers)

Created Tuesday, April 30, 2013
Updated Monday, September 30, 2013

Page 1

Standards for Rating Categories

Growth or Comparable Measures

Locally-selected Measures of growth or achievement

Other Measures of Effectiveness (Teacher and Leader standards)

Highly Effective

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

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

Overall performance and results exceed NYS Teaching Standards.

Effective

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

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

Overall performance and results meet NYS Teaching Standards.

Developing

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

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

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

Ineffective

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

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

Overall performance and results do not meet NYS Teaching Standards.

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 scoring ranges for educators for whom there is no approved Value-Added measure of student growth will be:

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	55 - 60
Effective	35 - 54
Developing	11 - 34
Ineffective	0 - 10

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

Where Value-Added growth measure applies
Growth or Comparable Measures
Locally-selected Measures of growth or achievement
Other Measures of Effectiveness (60 points)

Overall Composite Score
Highly Effective
22-25
14-15
Ranges determined locally--see above

91-100
Effective
10-21
8-13
75-90
Developing
3-9
3-7
65-74
Ineffective
0-2
0-2
0-64

6. Additional Requirements - Teachers

Created Tuesday, April 30, 2013
Updated Thursday, November 07, 2013

Page 1

6.1) Assurances -- Improvement Plans

Please check the boxes below:

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

6.2) Attachment: Teacher Improvement Plan Forms

As a required attachment to this APPR plan, upload the TIP forms that are used in the school district or BOCES. All TIP plans must include: 1) identification of needed areas of improvement, 2) a timeline for achieving improvement, 3) the manner in which the improvement will be assessed, and, where appropriate, 4) differentiated activities to support a teacher's improvement in those areas. For a list of supported file types, go to the Resources folder (above) and click Technical Tips. Please be sure to update a document with a form layout, with fillable spaces and not just a narrative.

assets/survey-uploads/5265/153292-Df0w3Xx5v6/TIP Form.docx

6.3) Appeals Process

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

(1) the substance of the annual professional performance review

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

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

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

To the extent that a teacher wishes to issue an appeal, the following appeals procedure is established.

1. Appeals will be limited to the following situations:

a. A teacher completing the first year of a three-year probationary appointment may appeal only an Ineffective APPR composite rating;

b. Any other teacher may appeal only a Developing or Ineffective APPR composite rating;

c. Any teacher may appeal the implementation of an improvement plan if and only if the plan was generated as the result of a Developing or Ineffective composite rating, in accordance with Section 2, e, below.

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

a. The substance of the individual's annual professional performance review;

b. The District's adherence to the standards and methodologies required for such reviews, pursuant to Education Law 3012-c;

c. The adherence to the Commissioner's regulations, as applicable to such reviews;

d. Compliance with any applicable locally negotiated procedures regarding annual professional performance reviews or improvement plans, as limited by Section I, above; or,

e. The District's issuance and/or implementation of the terms of the teacher improvement plan under Education Law 3012-c in connection with a Developing or Ineffective rating.

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

4. In an appeal, the teacher has the burden of demonstrating a right to the relief requested and the burden of establishing the facts upon which petitioner seeks relief.

5. The following timelines will be strictly adhered to unless extended by mutual agreement but at no point will extend beyond 60 days (the 60 day period is for the entire review process). 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
a. (Informal) Following a qualifying event, as defined in Sections I and II, above, the teacher shall be encouraged and shall be entitled to schedule a follow up meeting to informally discuss with the evaluator any and all related issues.

b. (Formal) Any appeal must be submitted to the evaluator in writing no later than ten (10) school days of the date when the teacher receives his/her annual professional performance review. If a teacher is challenging the issuance or implementation of a teacher improvement plan, the appeal must be submitted in writing within ten (10) school days of issuance or of the time when the teacher knew or should have known of an alleged implementation breach of such plan.

c. When filing an appeal, the teacher must submit a detailed written description of the specific grounds for the appeal as well as the performance review and/or improvement plan being challenged. Along with the appeal, all supporting documentation must be submitted, or specifically noted if pending. Any grounds for appeal or any supporting documentation/information not submitted or noted at the time the appeal is filed shall not be considered.

d. Within ten (10) school days of receipt of an appeal, the evaluator responsible for the issue(s) being appealed must submit a detailed written response to the appeal. Along with the response, all supporting documentation must be submitted, or specifically noted if pending, as well as any additional documents or materials relevant to the response. Any supporting documentation/ information not submitted or noted at the time the response is issued shall not be considered in the deliberations related to the resolution of the appeal. The teacher initiating the appeal, and the Faculty Association President, shall receive copies of the response and any and all additional information submitted with the response. The response of the evaluator will be the determination of the Level 1 appeal.

Level 2 – Appeals Committee

a. Within five (5) school days of receipt of the Level 1 determination, if a teacher is not satisfied with such determination he/she must submit the appeal to a bipartisan panel comprised of one (1) teacher representative designated by the Association president, one (1) administrative representative (an evaluator that was not the original evaluator) designated by the Superintendent of schools and one (1) teacher representative selected jointly by the Superintendent and Association president. If the district and association cannot agree on the jointly selected teacher representative, both parties agree to select a third representative from the WSWHE BOCES. The panel will be provided the entire appeals record; however, any information identifying the appellant or the appellant's district, evaluator will be

redacted prior to receipt by the panel. Further, the anonymity of the panel members will be protected to the extent possible throughout this procedure.

b. Within ten (10) school days of receipt of the Teacher's appeal, the panel will jointly conduct a paper review and deliberation of the matter, and will issue a written recommendation for resolution to the Faculty Association President and the Superintendent of Schools. The recommendation may be to deny the appeal, to sustain the appeal and grant the remedy sought, or to sustain the appeal and modify the remedy; further, reasoning for the recommendation, as well as dissenting opinions, if any, will be included with the recommendation. This panel's decision will be final and binding for all appeals on developing ratings if the panel's decision is unanimous. In cases where the panel cannot reach a unanimous decision on an appeal of a developing rating, the Superintendent will make the final determination as described in Level 3. The panel will submit their findings on appeals of ineffective teaching or T.I.P.'s as a recommendation only to the Superintendent. The panel's recommendation is not considered binding upon the Superintendent in these appeals.

c. The Association and District will work together to provide the training necessary to meet all New York State qualifications and criteria for prospective panel members. The District will provide time for the appeals committee to meet within the contractual day.

Level 3 – Superintendent

a. Within five (5) school days of receipt of the Level 2 recommendation for resolution, the Superintendent of Schools or designee will give due consideration to the panel's recommendation and will issue a final and binding decision, in writing, to the appellant, to the Faculty Association, and to the panel members. Whether the appeal is denied, sustained, or modified, such decision will set forth the reasons and factual basis for each determination on each of the specific grounds raised in the appeal. If the appeal is sustained, the Superintendent or designee may set aside or modify a rating or improvement plan or order a new evaluation or improvement plan if procedures have been violated.

6. The entire appeals record will be part of the teacher's APPR.

7. This appeals procedure constitutes the exclusive means for initiating, reviewing, and resolving any and all appeals within the scope of Sections 1 and 2 above. A teacher may not resort to any other contractual grievance procedure for the resolution of these appeals, except as otherwise authorized by law.

6.4) Training of Lead Evaluators and Evaluators and Certification of Lead Evaluators

Describe the process for training lead evaluators and evaluators. Your description must include 1) the process for training lead evaluators and evaluators, 2) the process for the certification and re-certification of lead evaluators, 3) the process for ensuring inter-rater reliability, 4) the nature (content) and the duration (how many hours, days) of such training.

All District evaluators will be New York State certified building and/or district level administrators who have also received training from the WSWHE BOCES Network Team (a minimum of 4 days) for all required components as identified by SED including:
Lead Evaluators of Teachers Part 1: Participants will explore the Danielson Framework for Teaching and evidence-based observation techniques.
Lead Evaluators of Teachers Part 2: Participants will reexamine the idea of an evidence-based evaluation system through the identification of criteria for quality student learning objectives; exploring various methods of target setting; and ways of establishing HEDI rating scales.
Lead Evaluators of Teachers Part 3: Participants will reexamine the idea of an evidence-based evaluation system through the identification of criteria for quality student learning objectives; exploring various methods of target setting; and ways of establishing HEDI rating scales
Lead Evaluators of Teachers Part 4: This workshop will be a continuation of the Year 1 Sequence of Lead Evaluator of Teachers. Participants will reflect upon the beginning phases of implementation of evidence-based observation while planning strategic moves for the future. This will include work around dedicating time to the process of observing, coaching, and monitoring teacher practice within their schools. A continued focus will be around the valid and reliable use of teacher practice rubrics.

The District will ensure inter-rater reliability through the WSWHE BOCES Network Team Inter-rater Reliability Training workshop and through continued joint observations, meetings, and reflections.
All copies of training attendance and participation shall be maintained in personnel files. Lead Evaluators will be required take any refresher/update workshops offered through the WSWHE BOCES and must be re-certified every three years.

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, April 30, 2013
Updated Monday, September 09, 2013

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.

Please list the grade configurations of the school(s)/program(s) in your district/BOCES where it is expected that 30-100% of a principal's students are taking assessments with a State-provided growth or value-added measure, (e.g., K-5, PK-6, 6-8, 6-12, 9-12, etc.).

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

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

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

Please check the boxes below:

7.2) Assurances -- State-Provided Measures of Student Growth | Assure that the value-added growth score(s) 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	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 assessments 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. The district must select the type of assessment that will be used with the SLO from the options below.

If any grade/course in the building has a State-provided growth measure AND the principal must have SLOs because fewer than 30% of students in the building are covered, then the SLOs will begin first with the SGP/VA results.
Additional SLOs will then be set based on grades/subjects with State assessments, where applicable.
If additional SLOs are necessary, principals must begin with the grade(s)/courses(s) that have the largest number of students using school-wide student results from one of the following assessment options: State-approved 3rd party or district/regional/BOCES-developed assessments that are rigorous and comparable across classrooms.
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 grade configuration of the school or program the SLO applies to. Then, using the drop-down boxes below, please select the type of 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 in the following format: "[Name of your District/Region/BOCES] developed [Grade] [Subject] Assessment." For example, a BOCES-developed 7th grade Social Studies assessment would be written as follows: "GVEP-Developed Grade 7 Social Studies Assessment." For State-approved 3rd party assessments, please include the name of the assessment exactly as it appears in RED on the State-approved list. For State assessments or Regents examinations, please indicate as such in the assessment name.

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. Please describe the process your district is using to measure student growth on the assessments listed for this Task. If applicable, please also include a description of the process for combining the State-provided growth score with the SLO(s) for this Task.

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

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

(No response)

7.4) Special Considerations for Comparable Growth Measures

Describe any adjustments, controls, or other special considerations that will be used in assigning points to a principal's score for this subcomponent, 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 the following: prior student achievement results, students with disabilities, English language learners, and students in poverty.

(No response)

7.5) Principals with More Than One Growth Measure

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

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

7.6) Assurances -- Comparable Growth Measures

Please check all of the boxes below:

7.6) Assurances -- Comparable Growth Measures | Assure the application of locally developed controls will be rigorous, fair, and transparent and only those used for State Growth will be used for Comparable Growth Measures.	Checked
7.6) Assurances -- Comparable Growth Measures | Assure that use of locally developed controls will not have a disparate impact on underrepresented students in accordance with applicable civil rights laws.	Checked
7.6) Assurances -- Comparable Growth Measures | Assure that procedures for ensuring data accuracy and integrity are being utilized.	Checked
7.6) Assurances -- Comparable Growth Measures | Assure that district will develop SLOs according to the rules established by NYSED for principal SLOs: http://www.engageny.org/resource/student-learning-objectives-guidance-document.	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, April 30, 2013
Updated Wednesday, November 13, 2013

Page 1

Locally-Selected Measures of Student Achievement or Growth

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

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

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

Districts or BOCES that intend to use a district, regional, or BOCES-developed assessment must include the name, grade, and subject of the assessment in the following format: "[Name of your District/Region/BOCES] developed [Grade] [Subject] Assessment." For example, a BOCES-developed 7th grade Social Studies assessment would be written as follows: "GVEP-Developed Grade 7 Social Studies Assessment."

Also note: if your district/BOCES is using the same assessment for both the State growth or other comparable measures subcomponent and the locally-selected measures subcomponents, be sure that a *different* measure of student performance is being used with the assessment (e.g., achievement rather than growth; growth measured in a different manner).

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

In the table below, please list the grade configurations of the school(s)/program(s) in your district/BOCES where it is expected that 30-100% of a principal's students are taking assessments with a State-provided growth or value-added measure (e.g., K-5, 6-8, 9-12). Then for each grade configuration, select a measure of growoth or achievement from the drop-down menu. As a reminder, the grade configurations/programs listed in Task 8.1 should be the same as those listed in Task 7.1.
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/Program	Locally-Selected Measure from List of Approved Measures	Assessment
	K-5	(d) measures used by district for teacher evaluation	All WSWHE BOCES and Hartford CSD Developed K-5 Assessments
	6-12	(g) % achieving specific level on Regents or alternatives	All Administered High School Regents Exams During the June testing period

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.	All information is contained in the document uploaded at 8.1 The K-5 Principal, in collaboration with the Superintendent, will establish achievement targets, based on the student's prior academic history. From the percentage of students meeting or exceeding the achievement target, a corresponding 0-20 (a 0-15 once value added model is implemented) a HEDI score will result. The cohort for 6-12 is all students who are taking all administered High School Regents exams during the current year. The District will be offering the New York State Common Core Algebra Regents and the New York State Integrated Algebra Regents as well as the New York State Comprehensive ELA Regents and the New York State Common Core English Regents. For those students who are in common core instruction and take both exams, the highest score will be used.

	To determine the overall proficiency percent on the Regents examinations, the district will take the number of students who sat a Regents exam in June and divide that number by the number of students who reached proficiency (a score of 65 or 55 for those students who have the safety-net option per their I.E.P.s).
Highly Effective (14 - 15 points) Results are well above District- or BOCES-adopted expectations for growth or achievement for grade/subject.	85 – 100% of students who took a summative assessment reached the score of 65 or 55 for those students who have the safety-net option per their I.E.P.s or a Level 3.
Effective (8- 13 points) Results meet District- or BOCES-adopted expectations for growth or achievement for grade/subject.	65 - 84% of students who took a summative assessment reached the score of 65 or 55 for those students who have the safety-net option per their I.E.P.s a Level 3.
Developing (3 - 7 points) Results are below District- or BOCES-adopted expectations for growth or achievement for grade/subject.	46 - 64% of students who took a summative assessment reached the score of 65 or 55 for those students who have the safety-net option per their I.E.P.s a Level 3.
Ineffective (0 - 2 points) Results are well below District- or BOCES-adopted expectations for growth or achievement for grade/subject.	0 – 45% of students who took a summative assessment reached the score of 65 or 55 for those students who have the safety-net option per their I.E.P.s a Level 3.

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)

assets/survey-uploads/12190/567498-8o9AH60arN/Locally Selected Measure for Principals with and without a value add.docx

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/programs used in your district or BOCES in which the district/BOCES expects that fewer than 30% of students will receive a State-provided growth score (e.g., K-2, K-3, CTE). Then for each grade configuration, select a measure from the drop-down menu. As a reminder, the grade configurations/programs listed in Task 8.2 should be the same as those listed in Task 7.3.
Note: Districts and BOCES may select one or more types of growth or achievement measures for each grade configuration. If you are using more than one type of local measure for the evaluation of principals in a given grade configuration, list that grade configuration multiple times. If more space is needed, duplicate this portion of the form and upload additional pages (below) as an attachment.

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

(a) student achievement levels on State assessments in ELA and/or Math in Grades 4-8 (e.g., percentage of students in the school whose performance levels on State assessments are proficient or advanced)
(b) student growth or achievement on State assessments in ELA and/or Math in Grades 4-8 for students in each specific performance level (e.g., Level 1, Level 2)
(c) student growth or achievement on State assessments in ELA and/or Math in Grades 4-8 for students with disabilities and English Language Learners in Grades 4-8
(d) student performance on any or all of the district-wide locally selected measures approved for use in teacher evaluations
(e) four, five and/or six-year high school graduation and/or dropout rates for principals employed in a school with high school grades

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

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

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

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

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

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

Use this box, if needed, to describe the process for assigning HEDI categories. If needed, you may upload a table or graphic below.	N/A
Highly Effective (18 - 20 points) Results are well above District- or BOCES-adopted expectations for growth or achievement for grade/subject.	N/A
Effective (9- 17 points) Results meet District- or BOCES-adopted expectations for growth or achievement for grade/subject.	N/A
Developing (3 - 8 points) Results are below District- or BOCES-adopted expectations for growth or achievement for grade/subject.	N/A
Ineffective (0 - 2 points) Results are well below District- or BOCES-adopted expectations for growth or achievement for grade/subject.	N/A

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

(No response)

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

(No response)

8.3) Locally Developed Controls

Describe any adjustments, controls, or other special considerations that will be used in assigning points to a teacher's score for this subcomponent, the rationale for including such factors, and the processes that will be used to mitigate potentially problematic incentives associated with the controls or adjustments.

(No response)

8.4) Principals with More Than One Locally Selected Measure

Describe the district's process for combining multiple locally selected measures where applicable for principals, each scored from 0-15 or 0-20 points as applicable, into a single subcomponent HEDI category and score.

N/A

8.5) Assurances

Please check all of the boxes below:

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

9. Other Measures of Effectiveness (Principals)

Created Tuesday, April 30, 2013
Updated Tuesday, November 05, 2013

Page 1

9.1) Principal Practice Rubric

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

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

Multidimensional Principal Performance Rubric

(No response)

9.2) Points Within Other Measures

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

Some districts may prefer to assign points differently for different groups of principals. This APPR form only provides one space for assigning points within other measures for principals. If your district/BOCES prefers to assign points differently for different groups of principals, enter the point 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 point 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, label accordingly, 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 assigning any points to "ambitious and measurable goals":

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

9.4) Sources of Evidence (if applicable)

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

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

9.5) Survey Tool(s) (if applicable)

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

(No response)

Note: When the State-approved survey list is updated, this list will be updated within the drop-down menu of approved survey tools.

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

District variance	(No response)
Principal Evaluation Tripod School Perception Survey (Combined Parent Survey)	(No response)
Principal Evaluation Tripod School Perception Survey (Combined Student Surveys)	(No response)
NYC School Survey-2012 Parent Survey	(No response)
NYC School Survey-2012 Student Survey	(No response)
NYC School Survey-2012 Teacher Survey	(No response)

9.6) Assurances

Please check all of the boxes below:

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

9.7) Process for Assigning Points and Determining HEDI Ratings

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

Points will be assigned based on a scale of 1-4 for each rubric sub-component. Rubric scores from the multiple visits will then be averaged together to determine the final rubric score which will then be converted to a 0-60 HEDI.

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/12205/567499-pMADJ4gk6R/2935635-Principals HEDI Rubric - Observation_1.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.	Rubric rating of 3.6 - 4
Effective: Overall performance and results meet standards.	Rubric rating of 2.5 - 3.5
Developing: Overall performance and results need improvement in order to meet standards.	Rubric rating of 1.5 - 2.4
Ineffective: Overall performance and results do not meet standards.	Rubric rating of 1 - 1.4

Please provide the locally-negotiated 60 point scoring bands.

Highly Effective	55 - 60
Effective	31 - 54
Developing	11 - 30
Ineffective	0 - 10

9.8) School Visits

Enter the minimum number of school visits that will be done by each of the following evaluators, making sure that the number of visits "by supervisor" is at least 1 and the total number of visits is at least 2, for both probationary and tenured principals. If your APPR plan does not include visits by a trained administrator or independent evaluator, enter 0 in those boxes.

Probationary Principals

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

Tenured Principals

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

10. Composite Scoring (Principals)

Created Tuesday, April 30, 2013
Updated Monday, September 30, 2013

Page 1

Standards for Rating Categories

Growth or Comparable Measures

Locally-selected Measures of growth or achievement

Other Measures of Effectiveness (Teacher and Leader standards)

Highly Effective

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

Results are well above District- or BOCES- adopted expectations for 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.

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 scoring ranges for principals for whom there is no approved Value-Added measure of student growth will be:

Where there is no Value-Added measure

Growth or Comparable Measures
Locally-selected Measures of growth or achievement
Other Measures of Effectiveness (60 points)

Overall Composite Score
Highly Effective
18-20
18-20
Ranges determined locally--see below
91-100
Effective
9-17
9-17
75-90
Developing
3-8
3-8
65-74
Ineffective
0-2
0-2
0-64

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

Highly Effective	55 - 60
Effective	31 - 54
Developing	11 - 30
Ineffective	0 - 10

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

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 Tuesday, April 30, 2013
Updated Thursday, November 07, 2013

Page 1

11.1) Assurances -- Improvement Plans

Please check the boxes below.

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

11.2) Attachment: Principal Improvement Plan Forms

As a required attachment to this APPR plan, upload the PIP forms that are used in the school district or BOCES. All PIP plans must include: 1) identification of needed areas of improvement, 2) a timeline for achieving improvement, 3) the manner in which the improvement will be assessed, and, where appropriate, 4) differentiated activities to support a principal's improvement in those areas.

For a list of supported file types, go to the Resources folder (above) and click Technical Tips. Please be sure to update a document with a form layout, with fillable spaces and not just a narrative.

assets/survey-uploads/5276/155886-Df0w3Xx5v6/APPENDIX E- PIP.docx

11.3) Appeals Process

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

(1) the substance of the annual professional performance review

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

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

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

A principal may only appeal those grounds enumerated in Education Law 3012-c.
Within 5 business days of the receipt of the APPR document, a principal may request in writing, the Superintendent to issue any and all documentation and written material upon which the composite APPR score was based. The Superintendent will provide such documents within 5 school days of the request. After receiving the documentation, the Principal will have 5 school days to issue an appeal. An appeals panel will convene for a hearing within 10 school days of the request for a hearing. Following the hearing, the appeals panel will have five school days to render a decision. If the Appeals Panel fails to reach a consensus each panel member must submit to the Board of Education within 24-hours a brief explaining their recommendation. The Board of Education will convene within 5 business days upon receipt of the documents and determine if the appeal will be upheld. A final decision will be rendered no later than 60 days of the original appeal.

A Principal may only appeal an ineffective or developing rating.

11.4) Training of Lead Evaluators and Evaluators and Certification of Lead Evaluators

Describe the process for training lead evaluators and evaluators. Your description must include 1) the process for training lead evaluators and evaluators, 2) the process for the certification and re-certification of lead evaluators, 3) the process for ensuring inter-rater reliability, 4) the nature (content) and the duration (how many hours, days) of such training.

Principal evaluators will be certified by New York State as a School District Leader of School District Administrator and will also be required to be trained by the members of the WSWHE BOCES network team on all SED required training components including:
Lead Evaluators of Principals Part 1: In this full day session, superintendents and their assistants will explore the State's new principal evaluation system as defined in section 3012-c of Education Law and section 100.2 (o) of the Commissioner's Regulations. Tools include the ISSLC Standards, New York State-approved principal rubrics, evidence-based evaluation and analysis, protocols, and strategies for managing complex change.
Lead Evaluators of Principals Part 2: Participants will examine the steps outlined by NYS in regards to the creating of Student Learning Objectives (SLOs). Time will be spent exploring the approved rubrics for use in the principal evaluation system through the lens of the instructional shifts and data-driven instruction. Additionally, protocols for building observations and site visits will be shared and practices with lead evaluators.
Lead Evaluators of Principals Part 3: Participants will reexamine the idea of an evidence-based evaluation system through the identification of criteria for quality goal setting; exploring various methods of target setting; and ways of establishing HEDI rating scales.

All Lead Evaluators and evaluators for Principals will be required to attend a WSWHE BOCES Network Team Training on Inter-rater Reliability and will periodically meet and evaluate the submitted evaluations to ensure consistency.
The required trainings will be at a minimum of three full days. Lead Evaluators will be required to attend any additional refresher/updated workshops and will have to be re-certified every three years.
All documentation of all the completed workshops/training seminars will be included in the evaluator's personnel file.

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 Tuesday, April 30, 2013
Updated Wednesday, November 13, 2013

Page 1

12.1)Upload the Joint Certification of the APPR Plan

Please obtain the required signatures, create a PDF file, and upload your joint certification of the APPR Plan using this form: APPR District Certification Form. Please note that Review Room timestamps each revision and signatures cannot be dated earlier than the last revision.

assets/survey-uploads/12158/567502-3Uqgn5g9Iu/APPR District Certification Form - try 4.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.

Growth Using Comparable Measures

Universal Target: 75% of students will meet or exceed their individualized summative target.

All students will be given a pre-assessment at the beginning of the course and a summative assessment at the conclusion of the course. The results of the two exams will be compared to see if the students met the District determined summative (i.e. growth) targets using the table listed below.

For those courses ending in a state assessment that provides a 1-4 performance level (i.e. Grade 3 ELA), teachers, in collaboration with their building principal, will develop individual student growth targets based on established baseline data. The growth number will be based on the percent of students meeting, or exceeding, their individual growth targets and will be given a corresponding 0-20 HEDI number.

Pre-Assessment Score Range	Summative Target
0 – 15	25 or higher
16 – 29	40 or higher
30 – 45	55 or higher
46 – 64	65 or higher
65 – 75	70 or higher
76 – 84	80 or higher
85 – 90	85 or higher
91 – 100	90 or higher

HEDI Scoring

Highly Effective (18 – 20 Points)	Effective (9 – 17 Points)	Developing (3 – 8 Points)	Ineffective (0 – 2 Points)
85 – 100% of students reached their summative target 18 Points – 85-90% 19 Points – 91-96% 20 Points – 97-100%	65 – 84% of students reached their summative target 9 Points – 65-66% 10 Points – 67-68% 11 Points – 69-70% 12 Points – 71-72% 13 Points – 73-74% 14 Points – 75-76% 15 Points – 77-78% 16 Points – 79-81% 17 Points – 82-84%	46 - 64% of students reached their summative target 3 Points – 46 - 48% 4 Points – 49 - 51% 5 Points – 52 - 53% 6 Points – 54 - 56% 7 Points – 57 - 60% 8 Points – 61 - 64%	0 – 45% of students reached their summative target 0 Points – 0-30% 1 Point – 31-40% 2 Points – 41-45%

Locally-Selected Measures of Achievement With An Approved Value-Added Measure (15 Points)

Local Target: 75% of all students will reach the level of proficient (as defined as a level 3 or 4 or 65 or higher) on the summative assessment.

HEDI Scoring

Highly Effective (14 - 15 Points)	Effective (8 - 13 Points)	Developing (3 - 7 Points)	Ineffective (0 – 2 Points)
85 – 100% of students reached their summative target 14 Points – 85 – 93% 15 Points – 94 – 100%	65 – 84% of students reached their summative target 8 Points – 65 - 69% 9 Points – 70 – 73% 10 Points – 74 – 75% 11 Points – 76 – 79% 12 Points – 80 – 81% 13 Points – 82 – 84%	46 - 64% of students reached their summative target 3 Points – 46 – 50% 4 Points – 51 – 55% 5 Points – 56 – 60% 6 Points – 61 – 62% 7 Points – 63 – 64%	0 – 45% of students reached their summative target 0 Points – 0-30% 1 Point – 31-40% 2 Points – 41-45%

Locally-Selected Measures of Achievement Without An Approved Value-Added Measure (20 Points)

Highly Effective (18 – 20 Points)	Effective (9 – 17 Points)	Developing (3 – 8 Points)	Ineffective (0 – 2 Points)
85 – 100% of students reached their summative target 18 Points – 85-90% 19 Points – 91-96% 20 Points – 97-100%	65 – 84% of students reached their summative target 9 Points – 65-66% 10 Points – 67-68% 11 Points – 69-70% 12 Points – 71-72% 13 Points – 73-74% 14 Points – 75-76% 15 Points – 77-78% 16 Points – 79-81% 17 Points – 82-84%	46 - 64% of students reached their summative target 3 Points – 46 - 48% 4 Points – 49 - 51% 5 Points – 52 - 53% 6 Points – 54 - 56% 7 Points – 57 - 60% 8 Points – 61 - 64%	0 – 45% of students reached their summative target 0 Points – 0-30% 1 Point – 31-40% 2 Points – 41-45%

Locally-Selected Measures of Achievement With An Approved Value-Added Measure (15 Points)

Local Target: 75% of all students will reach the level of proficient (as defined as a level 3 or 4 or 65 or higher) on the summative assessment.

HEDI Scoring

Highly Effective (14 - 15 Points)	Effective (8 - 13 Points)	Developing (3 - 7 Points)	Ineffective (0 – 2 Points)
85 – 100% of students reached their summative target 14 Points – 85 – 93% 15 Points – 94 – 100%	65 – 84% of students reached their summative target 8 Points – 65 - 69% 9 Points – 70 – 73% 10 Points – 74 – 75% 11 Points – 76 – 79% 12 Points – 80 – 81% 13 Points – 82 – 84%	46 - 64% of students reached their summative target 3 Points – 46 – 50% 4 Points – 51 – 55% 5 Points – 56 – 60% 6 Points – 61 – 62% 7 Points – 63 – 64%	0 – 45% of students reached their summative target 0 Points – 0-30% 1 Point – 31-40% 2 Points – 41-45%

Locally-Selected Measures of Achievement Without An Approved Value-Added Measure (20 Points)

Highly Effective (18 – 20 Points)	Effective (9 – 17 Points)	Developing (3 – 8 Points)	Ineffective (0 – 2 Points)
85 – 100% of students reached their summative target 18 Points – 85-90% 19 Points – 91-96% 20 Points – 97-100%	65 – 84% of students reached their summative target 9 Points – 65-66% 10 Points – 67-68% 11 Points – 69-70% 12 Points – 71-72% 13 Points – 73-74% 14 Points – 75-76% 15 Points – 77-78% 16 Points – 79-81% 17 Points – 82-84%	46 - 64% of students reached their summative target 3 Points – 46 - 48% 4 Points – 49 - 51% 5 Points – 52 - 53% 6 Points – 54 - 56% 7 Points – 57 - 60% 8 Points – 61 - 64%	0 – 45% of students reached their summative target 0 Points – 0-30% 1 Point – 31-40% 2 Points – 41-45%

Hartford Central School District
Classroom Walk-Through Observation Form

Educator: Observer:

Date: Class: Period/Time:

Key

Evident = the category is observable at the proficient (effective) and/or distinguished (highly effective) level according to the Danielson 2007 rubric

Somewhat Evident = the category is observable at the basic (developing) level according to the Danielson 2007 rubric

Not Evident = the category is not observable or at the unsatisfactory (ineffective) level according to the Danielson 2007 rubric

Category	Highly Effective (1 Point)	Effective (.85 Point)	Developing (.5 Points)	Ineffective (0 Points)	Evidence
The teacher has created an environment of respect and rapport (2a)					
The teacher has established a culture for learning (2b)					
The teacher does a good job of managing classroom procedures (2c)					
The teacher clearly communicates with the students (3a)					
The teacher engages the students in the learning process (3c)					

Total Points:

***Rounding Rules:** Point totals will be rounded following the traditional rounding rules:

.1 - .4 will be rounded down

.5 - .9 will be rounded up.

Assurance: Rounding will not result in movement between HEDI bands.

Summary of Walk-through:

Observer's Signature **Date** **Teacher's Signature**

C: Teacher, Personnel File (Superintendent), and Building Principal

RUBRIC SCORING SHEET

Domain 1

Sub-component	Highly Effective	Effective	Developing	Ineffective
A	1.67	1.2	1	0
B	1.67	1.2	1	0
C	1.67	1.2	1	0
D	1.67	1.2	1	0
E	1.67	1.2	1	0
F	1.67	1.2	1	0

Domain 2

Sub-component	Highly Effective	Effective	Developing	Ineffective
A	2	1.5	1	0
B	2	1.5	1	0
C	2	1.5	1	0
D	2	1.5	1	0
E	2	1.5	1	0

Domain 3

Sub-component	Highly Effective	Effective	Developing	Ineffective
A	2	1.5	1	0
B	2	1.5	1	0
C	2	1.5	1	0
D	2	1.5	1	0
E	2	1.5	1	0

Domain 4

Sub-component	Highly Effective	Effective	Developing	Ineffective
A	4.16	3.5	2	0
B	4.16	3.5	2	0
C	4.16	3.5	2	0
D	4.16	3.5	2	0
E	4.16	3.5	2	0
F	4.16	3.5	2	0

Hartford Central School District
Teacher Improvement Form (T.I.P.)

_____	_____	_____
Teacher	Evaluator(s)	Effective Date of TIP
_____	_____	_____
Subject/Grade Level	Score Breakdown	Composite Score
_____	_____	_____
Date(s):Preconference	Observation(s)	Post-Conference

Standards Chosen for Further Development	Action(s) to be Taken	Administrator's Responsibilities	Teacher's Responsibilities	Timeline for Progress	Indicators of Success	Improvements Made and Documented

Evaluator's Signature: _____ Date: _____

Teacher's Signature: _____ Date: _____

Representative/Witness Signature: _____ Date: _____

Or Teacher's Signature
Waiving Representation: _____ Date: _____

APPENDIX A

Locally-Selected Measures of Achievement For Principals With An Approved Value-Added Measure (15 Points)

Local Target: 75% of all students will reach the level of proficient (a level 3 or 4 or a score of 65) on the summative assessment.

HEDI Scoring

Highly Effective (14 - 15 Points)	Effective (8 - 13 Points)	Developing (3 - 7 Points)	Ineffective (0 – 2 Points)
85 – 100% of students reached their summative target 14 Points – 85 – 93% 15 Points – 94 – 100%	65 – 84% of students reached their summative target 8 Points – 65 - 69% 9 Points – 70 – 73% 10 Points – 74 – 75% 11 Points – 76 – 79% 12 Points – 80 – 81% 13 Points – 82 – 84%	46 - 64% of students reached their summative target 3 Points – 46 – 50% 4 Points – 51 – 55% 5 Points – 56 – 60% 6 Points – 61 – 62% 7 Points – 63 – 64%	0 – 45% of students reached their summative target 0 Points – 0-30% 1 Point – 31-40% 2 Points – 41-45%

Locally-Selected Measures of Achievement For Principals Without An Approved Value-Added Measure (20 Points)

Highly Effective (18 – 20 Points)	Effective (9 – 17 Points)	Developing (3 – 8 Points)	Ineffective (0 – 2 Points)
85 – 100% of students reached their summative target 18 Points – 85-90% 19 Points – 91-96% 20 Points – 97-100%	65 – 84% of students reached their summative target 9 Points – 65-66% 10 Points – 67-68% 11 Points – 69-70% 12 Points – 71-72% 13 Points – 73-74% 14 Points – 75-76% 15 Points – 77-78% 16 Points – 79-81% 17 Points – 82-84%	46 - 64% of students reached their summative target 3 Points – 46 - 48% 4 Points – 49 - 51% 5 Points – 52 - 53% 6 Points – 54 - 56% 7 Points – 57 - 60% 8 Points – 61 - 64%	0 – 45% of students reached their summative target 0 Points – 0-30% 1 Point – 31-40% 2 Points – 41-45%

APPENDIX B

Hartford Central School
Building Principal's HEDI Coversion Table

Average Rubric Score	Hartford Conversion Score
4	60.0
3.9	58.0
3.8	57.0
3.7	56.0
3.6	55.0
3.5	54.0
3.4	51.0
3.3	49.0
3.2	47.5
3.1	44.5
3	42.5
2.9	41.0
2.8	39.0
2.7	37.0
2.6	35.0
2.5	31.0
2.4	30.0
2.3	27.0
2.2	25.0
2.1	23.5
2	22.5
1.9	19.0
1.8	17.0
1.7	15.0
1.6	13.0
1.5	11.0
1.4	10.0
1.3	7.5
1.2	5.0
1.1	3.5
1	0.0

Key		
	Highly Effective	55 - 60 Points
	Effective	31 - 54 Points
	Developing	11 - 30 Points
	Ineffective	0 - 10 Points

Rounding Rules: Point totals will be rounded to the nearest whole number using the traditional rounding rules:
.5 - .9 will be rounded up
.1 - .4 will be rounded down

Assurance: In no case shall rounding cause a principal's score to move from one HEDI scoring band to another.

APPENDIX E

Principal Improvement Plan

Principal:_____ School Year: _____

Building Assignment: _____ Date Plan Was Developed: _____

This form is a tool communicating the expectations and recommendations for improvement. The plan will be collaboratively developed by the Principal and the Superintendent.

Areas of Improvement	Manner To Be Assessed	Differentiated Activities, Support and Resources to be Provided	Expected Date of Completion	Date(s) Plan Assessed	Accomplishments in Each Area of Improvement	Further Development Needed	Outcome

_____ _____ _____

Principal Date Superintendent

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 certify that this APPR plan is the district's or BOCES' complete APPR plan and that such plan will be fully implemented by the school district or BOCES; that there are no collective bargaining agreements, memoranda of understanding or any other agreements in any form that prevent, conflict or interfere with full implementation of the APPR Plan; and that no material changes will be made to the plan through collective bargaining or otherwise except with the approval of the Commissioner in accordance with Subpart 30-2 of the Rules of the Board of Regents.

The school district and its collective bargaining agent(s), where applicable, also acknowledge that if approval of this APPR plan is rejected or rescinded for any reason, any State aid increases received as a result of the Commissioner's approval of this APPR plan will be returned or forfeited to the State pursuant to Chapter 57 of the Laws of 2012 and/or 2013, as applicable.

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, 2013, assure that this was the result of unresolved collective bargaining negotiations

Signatures, dates

Superintendent Signature: Date:

11/13/2013

Teachers Union President Signature: Date:

11/13/2013

Administrative Union President Signature: Date:

11/13/2013

Board of Education President Signature: Date:

11/13/2013