THE STATE EDUCATION DEPARTMENT / THE UNIVERSITY OF THE STATE OF NEW YORK

Commissioner of Education
President of the University of the State of New York
89 Washington Ave., Room 111
Albany, New York 12234

E-mail: commissioner@mail.nysed.gov
Twitter:@JohnKingNYSED
Tel: (518) 474-5844
Fax: (518) 473-4909

December 6, 2012

Dr. Debra Jackson, Superintendent
Highland Falls Central School District
P.O. Box 287
Highland Falls, NY 10928

Dear Superintendent Jackson:

Congratulations. I am pleased to inform you that your multi-year (2012-2013 and thereafter) 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: John C. Pennoyer

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

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

Annual Professional Performance Reviews: 2012-13

Created Friday, May 11, 2012
Updated Wednesday, October 10, 2012

1

Disclaimers

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

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

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

1. SCHOOL DISTRICT INFORMATION

1.1) School District's BEDS Number : 440901040000

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

440901040000

1.2) School District Name: HIGHLAND FALLS CSD

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

HIGHLAND FALLS CSD

1.3) School Improvement Grant (SIG) Districts Only

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

(No response)

1.4) Award Classification

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

(No response)

1.5) Assurances

Please check all of the boxes below:

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

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

Re-submission to address deficiencies

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

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

2012 - 2013 and thereafter

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

Created Monday, June 25, 2012
Updated Wednesday, October 10, 2012

Page 1

STATE-PROVIDED MEASURES OF STUDENT GROWTH

(25 points with an approved value-added measure)

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

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

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

2.1) Assurances

Please check the boxes below:

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

STUDENT LEARNING OBJECTIVES AS COMPARABLE GROWTH MEASURES (20 points)

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

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

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

If no State assessment or Regents exam exists:

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

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

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

State assessments, *required if one exists*

List of State-approved 3rd party assessments

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

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

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

2.2) Grades K-3 ELA

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

	ELA	Assessment
K	State-approved 3rd party assessment	Measures of Academic Progress (Primary Grades)
1	State-approved 3rd party assessment	Measures of Academic Progress (Primary Grades)
2	State-approved 3rd party assessment	Measures of Academic Progress (Primary Grades)

	ELA	Assessment
3	State assessment	3rd Grade State Assessment

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

Use this box, if needed, to describe the general process for assigning HEDI categories for these grades/subjects in this	The expected differentiated student growth measure for each student will be used to determine each teacher's HEDI points.

subcomponent. If needed, you may upload a table or graphic at 2.11, below.	80% of the students must achieve their expected growth for the teacher to achieve the 9 points.
Highly Effective (18 - 20 points) Results are well-above state average for similar students (or District goals if no state test).	20 = 95-100% 19 = 92-94.9% 18 = 90-91.9%
Effective (9 - 17 points) Results meet state average for similar students (or District goals if no state test).	17 = 88-89.9% 16 = 87-87.9% 15 = 86-86.9% 14 = 85-85.9% 13 = 84-84.9% 12 = 83-83.9% 11 = 82-82.9% 10 = 81-81.9% 9 = 80%
Developing (3 - 8 points) Results are below state average for similar students (or District goals if no state test).	8 = 75-79.9% 7 = 70-74.9% 6 = 65-69.9% 5 = 60-64.9% 4 = 55-59.9% 3 = 50-54.9%
Ineffective (0 - 2 points) Results are well-below state average for similar students (or District goals if no state test).	2 = 30-49.9% 1 = 15.29.9% 0 = 0-14.9%

2.3) Grades K-3 Math

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

	Math	Assessment
K	State-approved 3rd party assessment	Measures of Academic Progress (Primary Grades)
1	State-approved 3rd party assessment	Measures of Academic Progress (Primary Grades)
2	State-approved 3rd party assessment	Measures of Academic Progress (Primary Grades)

	Math	Assessment
3	State assessment	3rd Grade State Assessment

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

Use this box, if needed, to describe the general process for assigning HEDI categories for these grades/subjects in this subcomponent. If needed, you may upload a table or graphic at 2.11, below.	The expected differentiated student growth measure for each student will be used to determine each teacher's HEDI points. 80% of the students must achieve their expected growth for the teacher to achieve the 9 points.
Highly Effective (18 - 20 points) Results are well-above state average for similar students (or District goals if no state test).	20 = 95-100% 19 = 92-94.9% 18 = 90-91.9%
Effective (9 - 17 points) Results meet state average for similar students (or District goals if no state test).	17 = 88-89.9% 16 = 87-87.9%

	15 = 86-86.9% 14 = 85-85.9% 13 = 84-84.9% 12 = 83-83.9% 11 = 82-82.9% 10 = 81-81.9% 9 = 80%
Developing (3 - 8 points) Results are below state average for similar students (or District goals if no state test).	8 = 75-79.9% 7 = 70-74.9% 6 = 65-69.9% 5 = 60-64.9% 4 = 55-59.9% 3 = 50-54.9%
Ineffective (0 - 2 points) Results are well-below state average for similar students (or District goals if no state test).	2 = 30-49.9% 1 = 15.29.9% 0 = 0-14.9%

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	State-approved 3rd party assessment	Measures of Academic Progress (Science)
7	State-approved 3rd party assessment	Measures of Academic Progress (Science)

	Science	Assessment
8	State assessment	8th Grade State Science Assessment

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

Use this box, if needed, to describe the general process for assigning HEDI categories for these grades/subjects in this subcomponent. If needed, you may upload a table or graphic at 2.11, below.	The expected differentiated student growth measure for each student will be used to determine each teacher's HEDI points. 80% of the students must achieve their expected growth for the teacher to achieve the 9 points.
Highly Effective (18 - 20 points) Results are well-above state average for similar students (or District goals if no state test).	20 = 95-100% 19 = 92-94.9% 18 = 90-91.9%
Effective (9 - 17 points) Results meet state average for similar students (or District goals if no state test).	17 = 88-89.9% 16 = 87-87.9% 15 = 86-86.9% 14 = 85-85.9% 13 = 84-84.9% 12 = 83-83.9% 11 = 82-82.9% 10 = 81-81.9% 9 = 80%
Developing (3 - 8 points) Results are below state average for similar students (or District goals if no state test).	8 = 75-79.9% 7 = 70-74.9%

	6 = 65-69.9% 5 = 60-64.9% 4 = 55-59.9% 3 = 50-54.9%
Ineffective (0 - 2 points) Results are well-below state average for similar students (or District goals if no state test).	2 = 30-49.9% 1 = 15.29.9% 0 = 0-14.9%

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	State-approved 3rd party assessment	Measures of Academic Progress (ELA)
7	State-approved 3rd party assessment	Measures of Academic Progress (ELA)
8	State-approved 3rd party assessment	Measures of Academic Progress (ELA)

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

Use this box, if needed, to describe the general process for assigning HEDI categories for these grades/subjects in this subcomponent. If needed, you may upload a table or graphic at 2.11, below.	The expected differentiated student growth measure for each student will be used to determine each teacher's HEDI points. 80% of the students must achieve their expected growth for the teacher to achieve the 9 points.
Highly Effective (18 - 20 points) Results are well-above District goals for similar students.	20 = 95-100% 19 = 92-94.9% 18 = 90-91.9%
Effective (9 - 17 points) Results meet District goals for similar students.	17 = 88-89.9% 16 = 87-87.9% 15 = 86-86.9% 14 = 85-85.9% 13 = 84-84.9% 12 = 83-83.9% 11 = 82-82.9% 10 = 81-81.9% 9 = 80%
Developing (3 - 8 points) Results are below District goals for similar students.	8 = 75-79.9% 7 = 70-74.9% 6 = 65-69.9% 5 = 60-64.9% 4 = 55-59.9% 3 = 50-54.9%
Ineffective (0 - 2 points) Results are well-below District goals for similar students.	2 = 30-49.9% 1 = 15.29.9% 0 = 0-14.9%

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	District Developed Global 1 Assessment based on the WrAP

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

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

Use this box, if needed, to describe the general process for assigning HEDI categories for these grades/subjects in this subcomponent. If needed, you may upload a table or graphic at 2.11, below.	The expected differentiated student growth measure for each student will be used to determine each teacher's HEDI points. 80% of the students must achieve their expected growth for the teacher to achieve the 9 points.
Highly Effective (18 - 20 points) Results are well-above District goals for similar students.	20 = 95-100% 19 = 92-94.9% 18 = 90-91.9%
Effective (9 - 17 points) Results meet District goals for similar students.	17 = 88-89.9% 16 = 87-87.9% 15 = 86-86.9% 14 = 85-85.9% 13 = 84-84.9% 12 = 83-83.9% 11 = 82-82.9% 10 = 81-81.9% 9 = 80%
Developing (3 - 8 points) Results are below District goals for similar students.	8 = 75-79.9% 7 = 70-74.9% 6 = 65-69.9% 5 = 60-64.9% 4 = 55-59.9% 3 = 50-54.9%
Ineffective (0 - 2 points) Results are well-below District goals for similar students.	2 = 30-49.9% 1 = 15.29.9% 0 = 0-14.9%

2.7) High School Science Regents Courses

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

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

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

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

Use this box, if needed, to describe the general process for assigning HEDI categories for these grades/subjects in this subcomponent. If needed, you may upload a table or graphic at 2.11, below.	The expected differentiated student growth measure for each student will be used to determine each teacher's HEDI points. 80% of the students must achieve their expected growth for the teacher to achieve the 9 points.
Highly Effective (18 - 20 points) Results are well-above District goals for similar students.	20 = 95-100% 19 = 92-94.9% 18 = 90-91.9%
Effective (9 - 17 points) Results meet District goals for similar students.	17 = 88-89.9% 16 = 87-87.9% 15 = 86-86.9% 14 = 85-85.9% 13 = 84-84.9% 12 = 83-83.9% 11 = 82-82.9% 10 = 81-81.9% 9 = 80%
Developing (3 - 8 points) Results are below District goals for similar students.	8 = 75-79.9% 7 = 70-74.9% 6 = 65-69.9% 5 = 60-64.9% 4 = 55-59.9% 3 = 50-54.9%
Ineffective (0 - 2 points) Results are well-below District goals for similar students.	2 = 30-49.9% 1 = 15.29.9% 0 = 0-14.9%

2.8) High School Math Regents Courses

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

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

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

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

Use this box, if needed, to describe the general process for assigning HEDI categories for these grades/subjects in this subcomponent. If needed, you may upload a table or graphic at 2.11, below.	The expected differentiated student growth measure for each student will be used to determine each teacher's HEDI points. 80% of the students must achieve their expected growth for the teacher to achieve the 9 points.
Highly Effective (18 - 20 points) Results are well-above District goals for similar students.	20 = 95-100% 19 = 92-94.9% 18 = 90-91.9%
Effective (9 - 17 points) Results meet District goals for similar students.	17 = 88-89.9% 16 = 87-87.9% 15 = 86-86.9% 14 = 85-85.9% 13 = 84-84.9% 12 = 83-83.9% 11 = 82-82.9% 10 = 81-81.9% 9 = 80%
Developing (3 - 8 points) Results are below District goals for similar students.	8 = 75-79.9% 7 = 70-74.9% 6 = 65-69.9% 5 = 60-64.9% 4 = 55-59.9% 3 = 50-54.9%
Ineffective (0 - 2 points) Results are well-below District goals for similar students.	2 = 30-49.9% 1 = 15.29.9% 0 = 0-14.9%

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	District Developed English 9 Assessment based on the WrAP
Grade 10 ELA	District, regional or BOCES-developed assessment	District Developed English 10 Assessment based on the WrAP
Grade 11 ELA	Regents assessment	Regents Assessment

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

Use this box, if needed, to describe the general process for assigning HEDI categories for these grades/subjects in this	The expected differentiated student growth measure for each student will be used to determine each teacher's HEDI points.

subcomponent. If needed, you may upload a table or graphic at 2.11, below.	80% of the students must achieve their expected growth for the teacher to achieve the 9 points.
Highly Effective (18 - 20 points) Results are well-above District goals for similar students.	20 = 95-100% 19 = 92-94.9% 18 = 90-91.9%
Effective (9 - 17 points) Results meet District goals for similar students.	17 = 88-89.9% 16 = 87-87.9% 15 = 86-86.9% 14 = 85-85.9% 13 = 84-84.9% 12 = 83-83.9% 11 = 82-82.9% 10 = 81-81.9% 9 = 80%
Developing (3 - 8 points) Results are below District goals for similar students.	8 = 75-79.9% 7 = 70-74.9% 6 = 65-69.9% 5 = 60-64.9% 4 = 55-59.9% 3 = 50-54.9%
Ineffective (0 - 2 points) Results are well-below District goals for similar students.	2 = 30-49.9% 1 = 15.29.9% 0 = 0-14.9%

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
	English 12	District, Regional or BOCES-developed	District Developed English 12 Assessment based on the WrAP
	SUPA English	District, Regional or BOCES-developed	Regional Developed College Level English Assessment based on the SUPA Assessment
	SUPA Economics	District, Regional or BOCES-developed	Regional Developed College Level Economics Assessment based on the SUPA Assessment
	Economics 12	District, Regional or BOCES-developed	District Developed Economics 12 Assessment based on the WrAP
	AP Calculus	State-approved 3rd party assessment	AP Program (Calculus) Assessment
	Calculus	State-approved 3rd party assessment	AP Program (Calculus) Assessment
	Math Applications	State-approved 3rd party assessment	Measures of Academic Progress (Mathematics)
	Pre Calculus	State-approved 3rd party assessment	Measures of Academic Progress (Mathematics)
	Environmental Science	State-approved 3rd party assessment	AP Program (Environmental Science) Assessment
	Spanish 1	District, Regional or BOCES-developed	BOCES Developed Checkpoint A Foreign Language Proficiency Exam

Spanish 2	District, Regional or BOCES-developed	BOCES Developed Checkpoint B Foreign Language Comprehensive Exam
Spanish 3	District, Regional or BOCES-developed	BOCES Developed Checkpoint B Foreign Language Comprehensive Exam
Chinese 1	District, Regional or BOCES-developed	BOCES Developed Checkpoint A Foreign Language Proficiency Exam
Chinese 2	District, Regional or BOCES-developed	BOCES Developed Checkpoint B Foreign Language Comprehensive Exam
Chinese 3	District, Regional or BOCES-developed	BOCES Developed Checkpoint B Foreign Language Comprehensive Exam
Studio Art	District, Regional or BOCES-developed	BOCES Developed (Onondaga-Cortland-Madison BOCES) Studio Art 9 Assessment
Drawing and Painting	District, Regional or BOCES-developed	District Developed Assessment based on the WrAP
Three Dimensional Design	District, Regional or BOCES-developed	District Developed Assessment based on the WrAP
Data Processing Design	District, Regional or BOCES-developed	District Developed Assessment based on the WrAP
Grade 8 Art	District, Regional or BOCES-developed	District Developed Assessment based on the WrAP

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

Use this box, if needed, to describe the general process for assigning HEDI categories for these grades/subjects in this subcomponent. If needed, you may upload a table or graphic at 2.11, below.	The expected differentiated student growth measure for each student will be used to determine each teacher's HEDI points. 80% of the students must achieve their expected growth for the teacher to achieve the 9 points.
Highly Effective (18 - 20 points) Results are well-above District goals for similar students.	20 = 95-100% 19 = 92-94.9% 18 = 90-91.9%
Effective (9 - 17 points) Results meet District goals for similar students.	17 = 88-89.9% 16 = 87-87.9% 15 = 86-86.9% 14 = 85-85.9% 13 = 84-84.9% 12 = 83-83.9% 11 = 82-82.9% 10 = 81-81.9% 9 = 80%
Developing (3 - 8 points) Results are below District goals for similar students.	8 = 75-79.9% 7 = 70-74.9% 6 = 65-69.9% 5 = 60-64.9% 4 = 55-59.9% 3 = 50-54.9%
Ineffective (0 - 2 points) Results are well-below District goals for similar students.	2 = 30-49.9% 1 = 15.29.9% 0 = 0-14.9%

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)

assets/survey-uploads/5364/145410-avH4IQNZMh/Form 2_10_All Other Courses edited.doc

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.

(No response)

2.12) Locally Developed Controls

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

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

We will not have locally developed controls as we will implement "differentiated growth targets by student" to allow us to include all students in our assessments for data driven instruction.

2.13) Teachers with more than one growth measure

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

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

2.14) Assurances

Please check all of the boxes below:

2.14) Assurances | Assure the application of locally developed controls will be rigorous, fair, and transparent and only those used for State Growth will be used for Comparable Growth Measures.	Checked
2.14) Assurances | Assure that use of locally developed controls will not have a disparate impact on underrepresented students in accordance with applicable civil rights laws.	Checked
2.14) Assurances | Assure that enrolled students in accordance with teacher of record policies are included and may not be excluded.	Checked
2.14) Assurances | Assure that procedures for ensuring data accuracy and integrity are being utilized.	Checked
2.14) Assurances | Assure that district will develop SLOs according to the rules established by SED (see: http://usny.nysed.gov/rttt/teachers-leaders/slo/home.html).	Checked

2.14) Assurances | Assure that past academic performance and/or baseline academic data of students will be taken into account when developing an SLO.	Checked
2.14) Assurances | Assure that the process for assigning points for SLOs for the Growth Subcomponent will use the narrative HEDI descriptions described in the regulations to effectively differentiate educators in ways that improve student learning and instruction.	Checked
2.14) Assurances | Assure that it is possible for an educator to earn each point, including 0, for SLOs in the Growth subcomponent scoring range.	Checked
2.14) Assurances | Assure that processes are in place to monitor SLOs to ensure rigor and comparability across classrooms.	Checked

3. Local Measures (Teachers)

Created Wednesday, May 23, 2012
Updated Tuesday, October 16, 2012

Page 1

Locally Selected Measures of Student Achievement or Growth

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

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

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

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

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

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

Growth or achievement measure(s) from these options.

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

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

Measures based on:

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

3.1) Grades 4-8 ELA

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

	Locally-Selected Measure from List of Approved Measures	Assessment
4	4) State-approved 3rd party assessments	Measures of Academic Progress (ELA)
5	4) State-approved 3rd party assessments	Measures of Academic Progress (ELA)
6	4) State-approved 3rd party assessments	Measures of Academic Progress (ELA)
7	4) State-approved 3rd party assessments	Measures of Academic Progress (ELA)
8	4) State-approved 3rd party assessments	Measures of Academic Progress (ELA)

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

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

Use this box, if needed, to describe the general process for assigning HEDI categories for these grades/subjects in this subcomponent. If needed, you may upload a table or graphic at 3.3, below.	We administer, to every student, the "Measures of Academic Progress (ELA)" assessment and each student receives an expected student achievement goal. This data provides a comparison of projected achievement as compared to actual achievement for each individual student. The pre-assessment will be given in September and the summative will be given in March. MAP provides a “RIT” proficiency level (student’s overall scale score on the test) which can be described as comparing a student’s position to predefined performance standards. The RIT proficiency level in March will measure the extent to which individual students met, missed, or exceeded their expected achievement projections after instruction. Every teacher will receive a score based on their student roster that will be used to determine the teacher's HEDI points. 79.9% of the students must achieve their expected achievement for the teacher to achieve 13 points.
Highly Effective (14 - 15 points) Results are well above District- or BOCES-adopted expectations for growth or achievement for grade/subject.	15 = 90% - 100% 14 = 80%- 89.9%
Effective (8- 13 points) Results meet District- or BOCES-adopted expectations for growth or achievement for grade/subject.	13 = 70-79.9% 12 = 64- 69.9% 11 = 61-63.9% 10 =58-60.9% 9 =57-57.9% 8 =55-56.9%
Developing (3 - 7 points) Results are below District- or BOCES-adopted expectations for growth or achievement for grade/subject.	7 = 49-53.9% 6 = 44-48.9% 5 = 39-43.9% 4 =34-38.9% 3 = 30-33.9%
Ineffective (0 - 2 points) Results are well below District- or BOCES-adopted expectations for growth or achievement for grade/subject.	2 = 29-29.9% 1 = 25-28.9% 0 = 0-24.9%

3.2) Grades 4-8 Math

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

	Locally-Selected Measure from List of Approved Measures	Assessment
4	4) State-approved 3rd party assessments	Measures of Academic Progress (Math)
5	4) State-approved 3rd party assessments	Measures of Academic Progress (Math)
6	4) State-approved 3rd party assessments	Measures of Academic Progress (Math)
7	4) State-approved 3rd party assessments	Measures of Academic Progress (Math)
8	4) State-approved 3rd party assessments	Measures of Academic Progress (Math)

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

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

Use this box, if needed, to describe the general process for assigning HEDI categories for these grades/subjects in this subcomponent. If needed, you may upload a table or graphic at 3.3, below.	We administer, to every student, the "Measures of Academic Progress (Mathematics)" assessment and each student receives an expected student achievement goal. This data provides a comparison of projected achievement as compared to actual achievement for each individual student. The pre-assessment will be given in September and the summative will be given in March. MAP provides a “RIT” proficiency level (student’s overall scale score on the test) which can be described as comparing a student’s position to predefined performance standards. The RIT proficiency level in March will measure the extent to which individual students met, missed, or exceeded their expected achievement projections after instruction. Every teacher will receive a score based on their student roster that will be used to determine the teacher's HEDI points. 79.9% of the students must achieve their expected achievement for the teacher to achieve 13 points.
Highly Effective (14 - 15 points) Results are well above District- or BOCES-adopted expectations for growth or achievement for grade/subject.	15 = 90% - 100% 14 = 80%- 89.9%
Effective (8- 13 points) Results meet District- or BOCES-adopted expectations for growth or achievement for grade/subject.	13 = 70-79.9% 12 = 64- 69.9% 11 = 61-63.9% 10 =58-60.9% 9 =57-57.9% 8 =55-56.9%
Developing (3 - 7 points) Results are below District- or BOCES-adopted expectations for growth or achievement for grade/subject.	7 = 49-53.9% 6 = 44-48.9% 5 = 39-43.9% 4 =34-38.9% 3 = 30-33.9%
Ineffective (0 - 2 points) Results are well below District- or BOCES-adopted expectations for growth or achievement for grade/subject.	2 = 29-29.9% 1 = 25-28.9% 0 = 0-24.9%

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.

(No response)

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

Growth or achievement measure(s) from these options.

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

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

Measures based on:

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

3.4) Grades K-3 ELA

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

	Locally-Selected Measure from List of Approved Measures	Assessment
K	4) State-approved 3rd party assessments	Measures of Academic Progress (ELA)
1	4) State-approved 3rd party assessments	Measures of Academic Progress (ELA)
2	4) State-approved 3rd party assessments	Measures of Academic Progress (ELA)
3	4) State-approved 3rd party assessments	Measures of Academic Progress (ELA)

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

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

Use this box, if needed, to describe the general process for assigning HEDI categories for these grades/subjects in this subcomponent. If needed, you may upload a table or graphic at 3.13, below.	We administer, to every student, the "Measures of Academic Progress (ELA)" assessment and each student receives an expected student achievement goal. This data provides a comparison of projected achievement as compared to actual achievement for each individual student. The pre-assessment will be given in September and the summative will be given in March. MAP provides a “RIT” proficiency level (student’s overall scale score on the test) which can be described as comparing a student’s position to predefined performance standards. The RIT proficiency level in March will measure the extent to which individual students met, missed, or exceeded their expected achievement projections after instruction. Every teacher will receive a score based on their student roster that will be used to determine the teacher's HEDI points. 79.9% of the students must achieve their expected achievement for the teacher to achieve 17 points.
Highly Effective (18-20 points) Results are well above District- or BOCES-adopted expectations for growth or achievement for grade/subject.	20 = 90-100% 19 = 85-89.9% 18 = 80-84.9%
Effective (9-17 points) Results meet District- or BOCES-adopted expectations for growth or achievement for grade/subject.	17 = 79-79.9% 16 = 76-78.9% 15 = 73-75.9% 14 = 70-72.9% 13 = 67-69.9% 12 = 64-66.9% 11 = 61-63.9% 10 = 58-60.9% 9 = 55-57.9%
Developing (3 - 8 points) Results are below District- or BOCES-adopted expectations for growth or achievement for grade/subject.	8 = 54-54.9% 7 = 49-53.9% 6 = 44-48.9% 5 = 39-43.9% 4 = 34-38.9% 3 = 30-33.9%

Ineffective (0 - 2 points) Results are well below District- or BOCES-adopted expectations for growth or achievement for grade/subject.	2 = 29-29.9% 1 = 25.28.9% 0 = 0-24.9%

3.5) Grades K-3 Math

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

	Locally-Selected Measure from List of Approved Measures	Assessment
K	4) State-approved 3rd party assessments	Measures of Academic Progress (Math)
1	4) State-approved 3rd party assessments	Measures of Academic Progress (Math)
2	4) State-approved 3rd party assessments	Measures of Academic Progress (Math)
3	4) State-approved 3rd party assessments	Measures of Academic Progress (Math)

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

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

Use this box, if needed, to describe the general process for assigning HEDI categories for these grades/subjects in this subcomponent. If needed, you may upload a table or graphic at 3.13, below.	We administer, to every student, the "Measures of Academic Progress (Mathematics)" assessment and each student receives an expected student achievement goal. This data provides a comparison of projected achievement as compared to actual achievement for each individual student. The pre-assessment will be given in September and the summative will be given in March. MAP provides a “RIT” proficiency level (student’s overall scale score on the test) which can be described as comparing a student’s position to predefined performance standards. The RIT proficiency level in March will measure the extent to which individual students met, missed, or exceeded their expected achievement projections after instruction. Every teacher will receive a score based on their student roster that will be used to determine the teacher's HEDI points. 79.9% of the students must achieve their expected achievement for the teacher to achieve 17 points.
Highly Effective (18-20 points) Results are well above District- or BOCES-adopted expectations for growth or achievement for grade/subject.	20 = 90-100% 19 = 85-89.9% 18 = 80-84.9%
Effective (9-17 points) Results meet District- or BOCES-adopted expectations for growth or achievement for grade/subject.	17 = 79-79.9% 16 = 76-78.9% 15 = 73-75.9% 14 = 70-72.9% 13 = 67-69.9% 12 = 64-66.9% 11 = 61-63.9% 10 = 58-60.9% 9 = 55-57.9%

Developing (3 - 8 points) Results are below District -or BOCES-adopted expectations for growth or achievement for grade/subject.	8 = 54-54.9% 7 = 49-53.9% 6 = 44-48.9% 5 = 39-43.9% 4 = 34-38.9% 3 = 30-33.9%
Ineffective (0 - 2 points) Results are well below District- or BOCES-adopted expectations for growth or achievement for grade/subject.	2 = 29-29.9% 1 = 25.28.9% 0 = 0-24.9%

3.6) Grades 6-8 Science

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

	Locally-Selected Measure from List of Approved Measures	Assessment
6	4) State-approved 3rd party assessments	Measures of Academic Progress (Science)
7	4) State-approved 3rd party assessments	Measures of Academic Progress (Science)
8	4) State-approved 3rd party assessments	Measures of Academic Progress (Science)

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.	We administer, to every student, the "Measures of Academic Progress (Science)" assessment and each student receives an expected student achievement goal. This data provides a comparison of projected achievement as compared to actual achievement for each individual student. The pre-assessment will be given in September and the summative will be given in March. MAP provides a “RIT” proficiency level (student’s overall scale score on the test) which can be described as comparing a student’s position to predefined performance standards. The RIT proficiency level in March will measure the extent to which individual students met, missed, or exceeded their expected achievement projections after instruction. Every teacher will receive a score based on their student roster that will be used to determine the teacher's HEDI points. 79.9% of the students must achieve their expected achievement for the teacher to achieve 17 points.
Highly Effective (18 - 20 points) Results are well above District- or BOCES-adopted expectations for growth or achievement for grade/subject.	20 = 90-100% 19 = 85-89.9% 18 = 80-84.9%
Effective (9 - 17 points) Results meet District- or BOCES-adopted expectations for growth or achievement for grade/subject.	17 = 79-79.9% 16 = 76-78.9% 15 = 73-75.9% 14 = 70-72.9% 13 = 67-69.9% 12 = 64-66.9% 11 = 61-63.9% 10 = 58-60.9% 9 = 55-57.9%

Developing (3 - 8 points) Results are below District- or BOCES-adopted expectations for growth or achievement for grade/subject.	8 = 54-54.9% 7 = 49-53.9% 6 = 44-48.9% 5 = 39-43.9% 4 = 34-38.9% 3 = 30-33.9%
Ineffective (0 - 2 points) Results are well below District- or BOCES-adopted expectations for growth or achievement for grade/subject.	2 = 29-29.9% 1 = 25.28.9% 0 = 0-24.9%

3.7) Grades 6-8 Social Studies

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

	Locally-Selected Measure from List of Approved Measures	Assessment
6	4) State-approved 3rd party assessments	Measures of Academic Progress (ELA)
7	4) State-approved 3rd party assessments	Measures of Academic Progress (ELA)
8	4) State-approved 3rd party assessments	Measures of Academic Progress (ELA)

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.	We administer, to every student, the "Measures of Academic Progress (ELA)" assessment and each student receives an expected student achievement goal. This data provides a comparison of projected achievement as compared to actual achievement for each individual student. The pre-assessment will be given in September and the summative will be given in March. MAP provides a “RIT” proficiency level (student’s overall scale score on the test) which can be described as comparing a student’s position to predefined performance standards. The RIT proficiency level in March will measure the extent to which individual students met, missed, or exceeded their expected achievement projections after instruction. Every teacher will receive a score based on their student roster that will be used to determine the teacher's HEDI points. 79.9% of the students must achieve their expected achievement for the teacher to achieve 17 points.
Highly Effective (18 - 20 points) Results are well above District- or BOCES-adopted expectations for growth or achievement for grade/subject.	20 = 90-100% 19 = 85-89.9% 18 = 80-84.9%
Effective (9 - 17 points) Results meet District- or BOCES-adopted expectations for growth or achievement for grade/subject.	17 = 79-79.9% 16 = 76-78.9% 15 = 73-75.9% 14 = 70-72.9% 13 = 67-69.9% 12 = 64-66.9%

	11 = 61-63.9% 10 = 58-60.9% 9 = 55-57.9%
Developing (3 - 8 points) Results are below District- or BOCES-adopted expectations for growth or achievement for grade/subject.	8 = 54-54.9% 7 = 49-53.9% 6 = 44-48.9% 5 = 39-43.9% 4 = 34-38.9% 3 = 30-33.9%
Ineffective (0 - 2 points) Results are well below District- or BOCES-adopted expectations for growth or achievement for grade/subject.	2 = 29-29.9% 1 = 25.28.9% 0 = 0-24.9%

3.8) High School Social Studies

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

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

	Locally-Selected Measure from List of Approved Measures	Assessment
Global 1	4) State-approved 3rd party assessments	Measures of Academic Progress (ELA)
Global 2	4) State-approved 3rd party assessments	Measures of Academic Progress (ELA)
American History	4) State-approved 3rd party assessments	Measures of Academic Progress (ELA)

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.	We administer, to every student, the "Measures of Academic Progress (ELA)" assessment and each student receives an expected student achievement goal. This data provides a comparison of projected achievement as compared to actual achievement for each individual student. The pre-assessment will be given in September and the summative will be given in March. MAP provides a “RIT” proficiency level (student’s overall scale score on the test) which can be described as comparing a student’s position to predefined performance standards. The RIT proficiency level in March will measure the extent to which individual students met, missed, or exceeded their expected achievement projections after instruction. Every teacher will receive a score based on their student roster that will be used to determine the teacher's HEDI points. 79.9% of the students must achieve their expected achievement for the teacher to achieve 17 points.

Highly Effective (18 - 20 points) Results are well above District- or BOCES-adopted expectations for growth or achievement for grade/subject.	20 = 90-100% 19 = 85-89.9% 18 = 80-84.9%
Effective (9 - 17 points) Results meet District- or BOCES-adopted expectations for growth or achievement for grade/subject.	17 = 79-79.9% 16 = 76-78.9% 15 = 73-75.9% 14 = 70-72.9% 13 = 67-69.9% 12 = 64-66.9% 11 = 61-63.9% 10 = 58-60.9% 9 = 55-57.9%
Developing (3 - 8 points) Results are below District- or BOCES-adopted expectations for growth or achievement for grade/subject.	8 = 54-54.9% 7 = 49-53.9% 6 = 44-48.9% 5 = 39-43.9% 4 = 34-38.9% 3 = 30-33.9%
Ineffective (0 - 2 points) Results are well below District- or BOCES-adopted expectations for growth or achievement for grade/subject.	2 = 29-29.9% 1 = 25.28.9% 0 = 0-24.9%

3.9) High School Science

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

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

	Locally-Selected Measure from List of Approved Measures	Assessment
Living Environment	4) State-approved 3rd party assessments	Measures of Academic Progress (Science)
Earth Science	4) State-approved 3rd party assessments	Measures of Academic Progress (Science)
Chemistry	4) State-approved 3rd party assessments	Measures of Academic Progress (Science)
Physics	4) State-approved 3rd party assessments	Measures of Academic Progress (Science)

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.	We administer, to every student, the "Measures of Academic Progress (ELA)" assessment and each student receives an expected student achievement goal. This data provides a comparison of projected achievement as compared to actual achievement for each individual student. The pre-assessment will be given in September and the summative will be given in

	March. MAP provides a “RIT” proficiency level (student’s overall scale score on the test) which can be described as comparing a student’s position to predefined performance standards. The RIT proficiency level in March will measure the extent to which individual students met, missed, or exceeded their expected achievement projections after instruction. Every teacher will receive a score based on their student roster that will be used to determine the teacher's HEDI points. 79.9% of the students must achieve their expected achievement for the teacher to achieve 17 points.
Highly Effective (18-20 points) Results are well above District- or BOCES-adopted expectations for growth or achievement for grade/subject.	20 = 90-100% 19 = 85-89.9% 18 = 80-84.9%
Developing (3 - 8 points) Results are below District- or BOCES-adopted expectations for growth or achievement for grade/subject.	17 = 79-79.9% 16 = 76-78.9% 15 = 73-75.9% 14 = 70-72.9% 13 = 67-69.9% 12 = 64-66.9% 11 = 61-63.9% 10 = 58-60.9% 9 = 55-57.9%
Effective (9 - 17points) Results meet District- or BOCES-adopted expectations for growth or achievement for grade/subject.	8 = 54-54.9% 7 = 49-53.9% 6 = 44-48.9% 5 = 39-43.9% 4 = 34-38.9% 3 = 30-33.9%
Ineffective (0 - 2 points) Results are well below District- or BOCES-adopted expectations for growth or achievement for grade/subject.	2 = 29-29.9% 1 = 25.28.9% 0 = 0-24.9%

3.10) High School Math

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

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

	Locally-Selected Measure from List of Approved Measures	Assessment
Algebra 1	4) State-approved 3rd party assessments	Measures of Academic Progress (Mathematics)
Geometry	4) State-approved 3rd party assessments	Measures of Academic Progress (Mathematics)
Algebra 2	4) State-approved 3rd party assessments	Measures of Academic Progress (Mathematics)

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

Note: when completing the HEDI boxes below, it is not acceptable to just repeat the text descriptions from the regulations and/or

assurances listed to the left of each box.

Use this box, if needed, to describe the general process for assigning HEDI categories for these grades/subjects in this subcomponent. If needed, you may upload a table or graphic at 3.13, below.	We administer, to every student, the "Measures of Academic Progress (Mathematics)" assessment and each student receives an expected student achievement goal. This data provides a comparison of projected achievement as compared to actual achievement for each individual student. The pre-assessment will be given in September and the summative will be given in March. MAP provides a “RIT” proficiency level (student’s overall scale score on the test) which can be described as comparing a student’s position to predefined performance standards. The RIT proficiency level in March will measure the extent to which individual students met, missed, or exceeded their expected achievement projections after instruction. Every teacher will receive a score based on their student roster that will be used to determine the teacher's HEDI points. 79.9% of the students must achieve their expected achievement for the teacher to achieve 17 points.
Highly Effective (18 - 20 points) Results are well above District- or BOCES-adopted expectations for growth or achievement for grade/subject.	20 = 90-100% 19 = 85-89.9% 18 = 80-84.9%
Effective (9 - 17 points) Results meet District- or BOCES-adopted expectations for growth or achievement for grade/subject.	17 = 79-79.9% 16 = 76-78.9% 15 = 73-75.9% 14 = 70-72.9% 13 = 67-69.9% 12 = 64-66.9% 11 = 61-63.9% 10 = 58-60.9% 9 = 55-57.9%
Developing (3 - 8 points) Results are below District- or BOCES-adopted expectations for growth or achievement for grade/subject.	8 = 54-54.9% 7 = 49-53.9% 6 = 44-48.9% 5 = 39-43.9% 4 = 34-38.9% 3 = 30-33.9%
Ineffective (0 - 2 points) Results are well below District- or BOCES-adopted expectations for growth or achievement for grade/subject.	2 = 29-29.9% 1 = 25.28.9% 0 = 0-24.9%

3.11) High School English Language Arts

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

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

	Locally-Selected Measure from List of Approved Measures	Assessment
Grade 9 ELA	4) State-approved 3rd party assessments	Measures of Academic Progress (ELA)
Grade 10 ELA	4) State-approved 3rd party assessments	Measures of Academic Progress (ELA)
Grade 11 ELA	4) State-approved 3rd party assessments	Measures of Academic Progress (ELA)

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

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

Use this box, if needed, to describe the general process for assigning HEDI categories for these grades/subjects in this subcomponent. If needed, you may upload a table or graphic at 3.13, below.	We administer, to every student, the "Measures of Academic Progress (ELA)" assessment and each student receives an expected student achievement goal. This data provides a comparison of projected achievement as compared to actual achievement for each individual student. The pre-assessment will be given in September and the summative will be given in March. MAP provides a “RIT” proficiency level (student’s overall scale score on the test) which can be described as comparing a student’s position to predefined performance standards. The RIT proficiency level in March will measure the extent to which individual students met, missed, or exceeded their expected achievement projections after instruction. Every teacher will receive a score based on their student roster that will be used to determine the teacher's HEDI points. 79.9% of the students must achieve their expected achievement for the teacher to achieve 17 points.
Highly Effective (18 - 20 points) Results are well above District- or BOCES-adopted expectations for growth or achievement for grade/subject.	20 = 90-100% 19 = 85-89.9% 18 = 80-84.9%
Effective (9 - 17 points) Results meet District- or BOCES-adopted expectations for growth or achievement for grade/subject.	17 = 79-79.9% 16 = 76-78.9% 15 = 73-75.9% 14 = 70-72.9% 13 = 67-69.9% 12 = 64-66.9% 11 = 61-63.9% 10 = 58-60.9% 9 = 55-57.9%
Developing (3 - 8 points) Results are below District- or BOCES-adopted expectations for growth or achievement for grade/subject.	8 = 54-54.9% 7 = 49-53.9% 6 = 44-48.9% 5 = 39-43.9% 4 = 34-38.9% 3 = 30-33.9%
Ineffective (0 - 2 points) Results are well below District- or BOCES-adopted expectations for growth or achievement for grade/subject.	2 = 29-29.9% 1 = 25.28.9% 0 = 0-24.9%

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
English 12	5) District/regional/BOCES–developed	District Developed Assessment based on the WrAP

	SUPA English	5) District/regional/BOCES–developed	District Developed Assessment based on the WrAP
	SUPA Economics	5) District/regional/BOCES–developed	District Developed Assessment based on the WrAP
	Economics 12	5) District/regional/BOCES–developed	District Developed Assessment based on the WrAP
	AP Calculus	5) District/regional/BOCES–developed	District Developed Assessment based on the WrAP
	Calculus	5) District/regional/BOCES–developed	District Developed Assessment based on the WrAP
	Math Applications	5) District/regional/BOCES–developed	District Developed Assessment based on the WrAP
	Pre Calculus	4) State-approved 3rd party	Measures of Academic Progress (Mathematics)
	Environmental Science	5) District/regional/BOCES–developed	District Developed Assessment based on the WrAP
	Spanish 1, 2, 3,	4) State-approved 3rd party	Measures of Academic Progress (ELA)
	Chinese 1, 2, 3,	4) State-approved 3rd party	Measures of Academic Progress (ELA)
	Art	4) State-approved 3rd party	Measures of Academic Progress (ELA)
	Music	4) State-approved 3rd party	Measures of Academic Progress (ELA)
	Physical Education	4) State-approved 3rd party	Measures of Academic Progress (ELA)
	Health	4) State-approved 3rd party	Measures of Academic Progress (ELA)
	English Language Learner 1,2,3	4) State-approved 3rd party	Measures of Academic Progress (ELA)
	Speech	4) State-approved 3rd party	Measures of Academic Progress (ELA)

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

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

assets/survey-uploads/5139/132633-Rp0Ol6pk1T/Form 2_10_All Other Courses edited.doc

3.13) HEDI Tables or Graphics

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

assets/survey-uploads/5139/132633-y92vNseFa4/HEDI chart for other courses based on student achievement_Revised.Octdocx.pdf

3.14) Locally Developed Controls

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

There will not be any adjustments needed.

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.

For those teachers with multiple SLOs, we will weight the SLOs based upon the percentage of students belonging to the teacher of record that each SLO covers proportionately the students assigned to the teacher.

3.16) Assurances

Please check all of the boxes below:

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

4. Other Measures of Effectiveness (Teachers)

Created Friday, June 29, 2012
Updated Wednesday, October 10, 2012

Page 1

4.1) Teacher Practice Rubric

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

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

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

Danielson's Framework for Teaching (2011 Revised Edition)

Not Applicable

4.2) Points Within Other Measures

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

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

Is the following points assignment applicable to all teachers?

Yes

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

(No response)

Multiple (at least two) classroom observations by principal or other trained administrator, at least one of which must be unannounced [at least 31 points]	32
One or more observation(s) by trained independent evaluators	(No response)
Observations by trained in-school peer teachers	(No response)
Feedback from students using State-approved survey tool	(No response)
Feedback from parents/caregivers using State-approved survey tool	(No response)
Structured reviews of lesson plans, student portfolios and other teacher artifacts	28

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

(No response)

4.3) Survey Tools (if applicable)

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

(No response)

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

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

4.4) Assurances

Please check all of the boxes below:

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

4.5) Process for Assigning Points and Determining HEDI Ratings

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

All 60 points are assigned to the Danielson 2011 rubric for the summative evaluation. The table for assigning the points is in the file below. The categories within the domains are weighted based on the importance of the critical attributes within each component. Critical attributes are specific observable teacher and/or student behaviors or actions that are evidence of a teacher's performance relative to a particular Component.

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

assets/survey-uploads/5091/147254-eka9yMJ855/Final Local 60 Points Allocation.pdf

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

Highly Effective: Overall performance and results exceed NYS Teaching Standards.	The Educator exceeds expectations with distinction. This is the highest possible performance rating for an educator who consistently exceeds expectations by having students achieve at a rigorous level and which is above expected growth. The educator is performing at “expert” status which is highly expected to support student achievement.
Effective: Overall performance and results meet NYS Teaching Standards.	The Educator meets or may exceed expectations. This rating is given to educators who are fully successful in meeting all of the performance expectations/goals for their students. These educators are able to achieve research based practices and high standards for student success.
Developing: Overall performance and results need improvement in order to meet NYS Teaching Standards.	The Educator is approaching expectations. This rating is given to educators who sometimes perform at an acceptable level but are not always consistent and may need support to meet expectations. These individuals may be novice educators who are working to become experienced educators.
Ineffective: Overall performance and results do not meet NYS Teaching Standards.	The Educator does not meet expectations. This rating is given to educators who fail to achieve key performance expectations/goals and therefore cannot demonstrate an acceptable level of proficiency.

Provide the ranges for the 60-point scoring bands.

Highly Effective	Point Range of 59-60 Points
Effective	Point Range of 56-58 Points
Developing	Point Range of 44-55 Points
Ineffective	Point Range of 0-43 Points

4.6) Observations of Probationary Teachers

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

By building principals or other trained administrators

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

By trained in-school peer teachers or other trained reviewers

Formal/Long	0
Informal/Short	0

Independent evaluators

Formal/Long	0
Informal/Short	0

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

- In Person

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

- In Person

4.7) Observations of Tenured Teachers

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

By building principals or other trained administrators

4.7) Observations of Tenured Teachers | Formal/Long	2
4.7) Observations of Tenured Teachers | Informal/Short	1
4.7) Observations of Tenured Teachers | 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 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 Monday, June 04, 2012
Updated Monday, December 03, 2012

Page 1

Standards for Rating Categories

Growth or Comparable Measures

Locally-selected Measures of

growth or achievement

Other Measures of Effectiveness

(Teacher and Leader standards)

Highly

Effective

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

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

Overall performance and results exceed NYS Teaching Standards.

Effective

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

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

Overall performance and results meet NYS Teaching Standards.

Developing

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

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

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

Ineffective

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

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

Overall performance and results do not meet NYS Teaching Standards.

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

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

2012-13 where there is no Value-Added measure

Growth or Comparable Measures

Locally-selected Measures of

growth or achievement

Other Measures of Effectiveness

(60 points)

Overall

Composite Score

Highly Effective

18-20

18-20

Ranges determined locally--see below

91-100

Effective

9-17

9-17

75-90

Developing

3-8

3-8

65-74

Ineffective

0-2

0-2

0-64

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

Highly Effective	59 - 60
Effective	56 - 58
Developing	44 - 55
Ineffective	0 - 43

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

2012-13 where Value-Added growth measure applies

Growth or Comparable Measures

Locally-selected Measures of

growth or achievement

Other Measures of Effectiveness

(60 points)

Overall

Composite Score

Highly Effective

22-25

14-15

Ranges determined locally--see above

91-100

Effective

10-21

8-13

75-90

Developing

3-9

3-7

65-74

Ineffective

0-2

0-2

0-64

6. Additional Requirements - Teachers

Created Monday, June 04, 2012
Updated Wednesday, October 10, 2012

Page 1

6.1) Assurances -- Improvement Plans

Please check the boxes below:

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

6.2) Attachment: Teacher Improvement Plan Forms

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

assets/survey-uploads/5265/138766-Df0w3Xx5v6/HFFMCSD Teacher Improvement Plan with form included.pdf

6.3) Appeals Process

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

(1) the substance of the annual professional performance review

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

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

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

1. HFFMCSD Appeals Process:

A. A teacher who receives an ineffective rating on their APPR shall be entitled to appeal their annual APPR rating, based upon a paper submission to the Superintendent of Schools or the Superintendent's administrative designee, who shall be trained in accordance with the requirements of the statute and regulations and also possesses either an SDA or SDL Certification; provided,

however, in the event that the Superintendent or the Superintendent's administrative designee served as an evaluator or lead evaluator he or she shall not hear the appeal.

B. The appeal must be brought in writing, specifying the area(s) of concern, but limited to those matters that may be appealed as prescribed in Section 3012-c of the Education Law. Further, a teacher who is placed on a Teacher Improvement Plan ("TIP") shall have a corresponding right to appeal concerns regarding the TIP in accordance with the requirements set forth in Section 3012-c of the Education Law.

C. An appeal of an APPR evaluation or a TIP must be commenced within fourteen business days of the presentation of the final document to the teacher or else the right to appeal shall be deemed waived in all regards; provided, however, that in the case of a TIP appeal, there shall be a second fourteen business day period for a TIP appeal following the end date of the TIP and the failure to appeal a TIP within fourteen business days following its end date shall be deemed a waiver of the right to do so.

D. The Superintendent or the Superintendent's administrative designee shall respond to the appeal with a written answer granting the appeal and directing further administrative action, or denying the appeal, within fourteen business days of the receipt of the appeal. The Superintendent or the Superintendent's administrative designee shall review the evidence underlying the observations of the teacher along with all other evidence submitted by the teacher prior to rendering a decision. So long as the decision is made within the timeframe set forth in this paragraph, the decision of the Superintendent or the Superintendent's administrative designee shall be final and binding in all regards and shall not be subject to review at arbitration, before any administrative agency or in any court of law.

E. 1. Notwithstanding the above, in the event that a tenured teacher has received two consecutive ineffective APPR evaluation ratings, the appeal shall be to an arbitrator selected on a rotating basis from the following list, based on order and reasonable timeframe of availability: Bonnie Siber-Weinstock, Ira Lobel, Jeffrey Selchick, Margaret Leibowitz, Sheila Cole and Howard Edelman, who shall make a final and binding decision upon the appeal of the APPR evaluation and/or the TIP. The documentation to be furnished to the arbitrator on behalf of the tenured teacher and by the District shall be exchanged between the tenured teacher and the administration on an immediate basis at the time of submission to the arbitrator. In the event that either party has a question regarding the authenticity of such documentation, the same shall be presented in writing in a timely and expedited manner to the arbitrator and copied to the other party for the arbitrator's review and consideration. The Arbitrator shall review the evidence underlying the observations of the teacher along with all other evidence submitted by the teacher prior to rendering a decision in no case will the APPR process not be timely and expedited.

In the event that the district then proceeds to a probable cause finding under Section 3020-a of the Education Law, and determines to conduct such a hearing, the arbitrator who ruled upon the appeal shall be jointly selected by the teacher and the district to be the Section 3020-a hearing officer. Notwithstanding the aforementioned language, nothing herein shall be construed as limiting the right of the employee to challenge said evaluation in any proceeding brought pursuant to Education Law §3020-a, so long as the identical issue wasn't resolved in the appeal or clearly should have been presented in the appeal but was not. It is expected that the cost of said hearing shall be paid for in accordance with the provision of the Education Law; provided, however, in the event that SED will not pay for the costs of the hearing, that expense shall be borne by the District and the proceedings shall be in the nature of a disciplinary arbitration and not a statutory hearing under section 3020-a of the Education Law. During the pendency of a disciplinary arbitration the pay rights of the teacher shall be the same as those afforded to teachers who are subject to statutory proceedings under Section 3020-a of the Education Law.

2. In order to take advantage of the procedure outlined in E(1) above, the tenured teacher must consent, following consultation with an Association representative, to the use of an arbitrator from the arbitration panel set forth in paragraph E(1) above, should the district proceed to find probable cause under Section 3020-a of the Education Law. If the tenured teacher is unwilling to do so, the appeal shall be heard by the Superintendent or the Superintendent's administrative designee. In such event, the Section 3020-a hearing officer's review of the evaluations that have been subject to the appeals process shall be de novo to the maximum extent permitted by law.
F. In accordance with the terms of Education Law Section 3012-c, the District will not use an evaluation or rating received by a unit member who has a right to appeal his/her APPR rating as the basis for disciplinary charges against the member unless and until the appeals process has been concluded and the decision maker has sustained the Evaluator's rating.

6.4) Training and Certification of Lead Evaluators and Evaluators

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

All HFFMCSD Lead Evaluators (principals), have been trained in the required nine elements:
1. NYS Teaching Standards and performance indicators
2. Evidence-based observation techniques grounded in research;

3. Application and use of the student growth percentile model and the value-added growth model;
4. Application and use of the Danielson 2011 rubric for use in evaluations and to observe a teacher's practice; (see below)
5. Application and use of evidence as instructional practice and teaching and assessment using the NYS Common Core Standards
6. Application and use of the NWEA MAP assessments, included local formative and summative data analysis;
7. Use of the Statewide Instructional Reporting System;
8. Scoring methodology to evaluate a teacher including how scores are generated for each sub-component 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 overall rating and their subcomponent ratings; and
9. Specific considerations in evaluating teachers of English language learners and students with disabilities.

All HFFMCSD teacher observers have been and will continue to be trained using the "Observer On-line Training for Danielson 2011 Framework for Teaching". This training includes, but is not limited to online professional development modules that prepare observers to deliver accurate and reliable evaluations of classroom teaching.

The training includes: How to effectively conduct observations using the classroom observation domains of the Danielson 2011 Teaching Evaluation Framework and includes Bias-awareness training to minimize the effects of observer bias and Scoring Practice. It prepares observers for real-world classroom observations by allowing them to practice their observation skills using master-scored classroom videos.

The HFFMCSD evaluators have and will continue to view the online videos of real classrooms, scored the videos using the rubric and have received feedback through the process of comparing his or her scores with the master scores assigned by the program. In addition they will be assessed using the Framework for Teaching—Proficiency Test which is a rigorous assessment that uses innovative video-based items to assess the ability of observers to accurately evaluate teaching practice using Charlotte Danielson 2011 rubric.

By implementing the Framework for Teaching Proficiency Test we will increase confidence that observers will be able to assess teaching performance with accuracy and consistency.

Additionally we have a consultant working with our evaluators to coach them in maintaining consistency and reliability. This consultant is a trained teacher evaluator and in-addition to coaching and training, she will continually conduct inter-rater reliability assessments throughout each year. By working with the consultant and the online training we will continue our training and monitor the inter-rater reliability each year.

The Observer On-line Training includes the Framework for Teaching—Observer Training, Scoring Practice, and Proficiency Test which is a minimum of 25 hours of training for initial evaluators and 8 hours for re-certification of trained evaluators. Additionally, there is a two day training required on the use of documentation and other evidence; including looking at student work, data analysis, note taking and feedback strategies. One day is required for re certification of evaluators.

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 Friday, June 29, 2012
Updated Wednesday, October 10, 2012

Page 1

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

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

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

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

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

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

Please check the boxes below:

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

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

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

State assessments, *required if one exists*

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

List of State-approved 3rd party assessments

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

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

School or Program Type	SLO with Assessment Option	Name of the Assessment
K-2	State-approved 3rd party assessment	Measures of Academic Progress (ELA and Mathematics)

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

Use this box, if needed, to describe the process for assigning HEDI categories in this subcomponent. If needed, you may upload a table or graphic below.	The expected student growth measure each student in Reading and Mathematics will be used to determine the K-2 principal's HEDI points. 80% of the students must achieve their expected growth for the K-2 principal to achieve the 9 points.
Highly Effective (18 - 20 points) Results are well above state average for similar students (or District goals if no state test).	20 = 95-100% 19 = 92-94.9% 18 = 90-91.9%
Effective (9 - 17 points) Results meet state average for similar students (or District goals if no state test).	17 = 88-89.9% 16 = 87-87.9% 15 = 86-86.9% 14 = 85-85.9% 13 = 84-84.9% 12 = 83-83.9% 11 = 82-82.9% 10 = 81-81.9% 9 = 80%
Developing (3 - 8 points) Results are below state average for similar students (or District goals if no state test).	8 = 75-79.9% 7 = 70-74.9% 6 = 65-69.9%
Ineffective (0 - 2 points) Results are well below state average for similar students (or District goals if no state test).	2 = 30-49.9% 1 = 15.29.9% 0 = 0-14.9%

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

(No response)

7.4) Special Considerations for Comparable Growth Measures

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

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

(No response)

7.5) Principals with More Than One Growth Measure

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

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

7.6) Assurances -- Comparable Growth Measures

Please check all of the boxes below:

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

8. Local Measures (Principals)

Created Wednesday, May 23, 2012
Updated Tuesday, October 16, 2012

Page 1

Locally-Selected Measures of Student Achievement or Growth

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

	Grade Configuration	Locally-Selected Measure from List of Approved Measures	Assessment
	3-8	(d) measures used by district for teacher evaluation	Measures of Academic Progress (ELA and Mathematics)
	9-12	(d) measures used by district for teacher evaluation	Measures of Academic Progress (ELA and Mathematics)

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.	We administer, to every student, the "Measures of Academic Progress" assessment and each student receives an expected student achievement goal. This data provides a comparison of projected achievement as compared to actual achievement for each individual student. The pre-assessment will be given in September and the summative will be given in the spring. The RIT proficiency level from the MAP in spring will measure the extent to which individual students met, missed, or exceeded their expected achievement projections after instruction. The student roster for the principal's school will be used to determine the principal's HEDI points. The mean ELA and Mathematics scores for each student will be calculated. 70% of the students must achieve their expected achievement for the principal to achieve 13 points.
Highly Effective (14 - 15 points) Results are well above District- or BOCES-adopted expectations for growth or achievement for grade/subject.	15=90-100% 14=80-89.9%

Effective (8- 13 points) Results meet District- or BOCES-adopted expectations for growth or achievement for grade/subject.	13 =70-79.9% 12 = 64-69.9% 11 = 61-63.9% 10 = 58-60.9% 9 =57-57.9% 8 =55-56.9%
Developing (3 - 7 points) Results are below District- or BOCES-adopted expectations for growth or achievement for grade/subject.	7 = 49-53.9% 6 = 44-48.9% 5 = 39-43.9% 4 = 34-38.9% 3 = 30-33.9%
Ineffective (0 - 2 points) Results are well below District- or BOCES-adopted expectations for growth or achievement for grade/subject.	2 = 29-29.9% 1 = 25-28.9% 0 = 0-24.9%

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

(No response)

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

(No response)

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

	Grade Configuration	Locally-Selected Measure from List of Approved Measures	Assessment
	K-2	(d) measures used by district for teacher evaluation	Measures of Academic Progress (ELA and Mathematics)

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.	We administer, to every student, the "Measures of Academic Progress" assessment and each student receives an expected student achievement goal. This data provides a comparison of projected achievement as compared to actual achievement for each individual student. The pre-assessment will be given in September and the summative will be given in the spring. The RIT proficiency level from the MAP in spring will measure the extent to which individual students met, missed, or exceeded their expected achievement projections after instruction. The student roster for the principal's school will be used to determine the principal's HEDI points. The mean ELA and Mathematics

	scores for each student will be calculated. 88% of the students must achieve their expected achievement for the principal to achieve 17 points.
Highly Effective (18 - 20 points) Results are well above District- or BOCES-adopted expectations for growth or achievement for grade/subject.	20 = 95-100% 19 = 92-94.9% 18 = 90-91.9%
Effective (9- 17 points) Results meet District- or BOCES-adopted expectations for growth or achievement for grade/subject.	17 = 88-89.9% 16 = 87-87.9% 15 = 86-86.9% 14 = 85-85.9% 13 = 84-84.9% 12 = 83-83.9% 11 = 82-82.9% 10 = 81-81.9% 9 = 80%
Developing (3 - 8 points) Results are below District- or BOCES-adopted expectations for growth or achievement for grade/subject.	8 = 75-79.9% 7 = 70-74.9% 6 = 65-69.9% 5 = 60-64.9% 4 = 55-59.9% 3 = 50-54.9%
Ineffective (0 - 2 points) Results are well below District- or BOCES-adopted expectations for growth or achievement for grade/subject.	2 = 30-49.9% 1 = 15.29.9% 0 = 0-14.9%

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

(No response)

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

(No response)

8.3) Locally Developed Controls

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

(No 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.

(No response)

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 Monday, July 02, 2012
Updated Friday, November 30, 2012

Page 1

9.1) Principal Practice Rubric

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

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

Vanderbilt Assessment of Leadership in Education (VAL-ED)

(No response)

9.2) Points Within Other Measures

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

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

Is the following points assignment for all principals?

Yes

If you checked "no" above, fill in the group of principals covered:

(No response)

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

Broad assessment of principal leadership and management actions based on the practice rubric by the supervisor, a trained administrator or a trained independent evaluator. This must incorporate multiple school visits by supervisor, trained administrator, or trained independent evaluator, at least one of which must be from a supervisor, and at least one of which must be unannounced. [At least 31 points]	60
Any remaining points shall be assigned based on results of one or more ambitious and measurable goals set collaboratively with principals and their superintendents or district superintendents.	0

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

(No response)

9.3) Assurances -- Goals

Please check the boxes below (if applicable):

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

9.4) Sources of Evidence (if applicable)

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

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

9.5) Survey Tool(s) (if applicable)

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

(No response)

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

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

9.6) Assurances

Please check all of the boxes below:

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

9.7) Process for Assigning Points and Determining HEDI Ratings

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

Val-Ed provides a summary of the principal's effectiveness for the school year. This summary uses, as sources of evidence, input from teachers, the principal, and the supervisor to provide a total score across all respondents. The results are set against a set of performance standards which are BB (Below Basic) or Ineffective, B (Basic) or Developing, P (Proficient) or Effective, D (Distinguished) or Highly Effective. Each principal will receive their overall effectiveness mean score and the core component scores that are based on the ISLLC standards. Mathematically the building principal's Mean Val-Ed Score when multiplied by 14 will provide the building principal's Local 60 rating. For example see the chart below. This procedure for assigning points assures that each building principal is able to earn all points, 0-60.
The Vanderbilt Assessment of Leadership in Education or VAL-ED is designed to provide a summary of effectiveness of a principal's learning centered leadership behaviors during the current school year. Effective learning-centered leadership is at the intersection of the two dimensions: core components created through key processes. The conceptual framework for VAL-ED is based on a review of the learning-centered leadership research literature and alignment to the Interstate School Leaders Licensure Consortium (ISLLC) standards. Every item in the Principal, Supervisor, and Teacher Response forms represents a cross-section of one core component and one key process based on evidence of their performance in supporting increased student achievement.

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

assets/survey-uploads/5143/148033-pMADJ4gk6R/The Princial Process for HEDI Ratings_1.pdf

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

Highly Effective: Overall performance and results exceed standards.	A highly effective principal exhibits learning-centered leadership behaviors at levels of effectiveness that are virtually certain to influence teachers positively and result in strong value-added to student achievement and social learning for all students. Specifically: The highly effective principal has planned and established goals for self, team, and the school exemplifying rigorous student academic and social learning. Ensuring there is ambitious academic content provided to all

	students in all content areas. Ensuring there are effective instructional practices that maximize student academic and social learning. Additionally there are integrated communities of professional practice in the service of student academic and social learning. Establishing a healthy school environment in which student learning is the central focus. Ensuring linkages to family and/or other people and institutions in the community that advance academic and social learning. Holding self and others responsible for realizing high standards of performance for student academic and social learning and promotes individual and collective responsibility among the professional staff and students.
Effective: Overall performance and results meet standards.	A effective principal exhibits learning-centered leadership behaviors at levels of effectiveness that are likely to influence teachers positively and result in acceptable value-added to student achievement and social learning for all students.
Developing: Overall performance and results need improvement in order to meet standards.	A principal at the developing level of proficiency exhibits learning-centered leadership behaviors at levels of effectiveness that are likely to influence teachers positively and that result in acceptable value-added to student achievement and social learning for some sub-groups of students, but not all.
Ineffective: Overall performance and results do not meet standards.	A principal at the ineffective level of proficiency exhibits learning-centered leadership behaviors at levels of effectiveness that are unlikely to influence teachers positively nor result in acceptable value-added to student achievement and social learning for students.

Please provide the locally-negotiated 60 point scoring bands.

Highly Effective	56-60
Effective	50.5-55.9
Developing	46-50.49
Ineffective	0-45.99

9.8) School Visits

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

Probationary Principals

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

Tenured Principals

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

10. Composite Scoring (Principals)

Created Monday, July 02, 2012
Updated Friday, November 30, 2012

Page 1

Standards for Rating Categories

Growth or Comparable Measures

Locally-selected Measures of

growth or achievement

Other Measures of Effectiveness

(Teacher and Leader standards)

Highly

Effective

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

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

Overall performance and results exceed ISLLC leadership standards.

Effective

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

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

Overall performance and results meet ISLLC leadership standards.

Developing

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

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

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

Ineffective

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

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

Overall performance and results do not meet ISLLC leadership standards.

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

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

2012-13 where there is no Value-Added measure

Growth or Comparable Measures

Locally-selected Measures of

growth or achievement

Other Measures of Effectiveness

(60 points)

Overall

Composite Score

Highly Effective

18-20

18-20

Ranges determined locally--see below

91-100

Effective

9-17

9-17

75-90

Developing

3-8

3-8

65-74

Ineffective

0-2

0-2

0-64

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

Highly Effective	56-60
Effective	50.5-55.9
Developing	46-50.49
Ineffective	0-45.99

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

2012-13 where Value-Added growth measure applies

Growth or Comparable Measures

Locally-selected Measures of

growth or achievement

Other Measures of Effectiveness

(60 points)

Overall

Composite Score

Highly Effective

22-25

14-15

Ranges determined locally--see above

91-100

Effective

10-21

8-13

75-90

Developing

3-9

3-7

65-74

Ineffective

0-2

0-2

0-64

11. Additional Requirements - Principals

Created Monday, July 02, 2012
Updated Wednesday, October 10, 2012

Page 1

11.1) Assurances -- Improvement Plans

Please check the boxes below.

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

11.2) Attachment: Principal Improvement Plan Forms

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

assets/survey-uploads/5276/148055-Df0w3Xx5v6/Appendix G_1.pdf

11.3) Appeals Process

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

(1) the substance of the annual professional performance review

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

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

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

Appeals Process:

A. A principal who receives an ineffective rating on his/her APPR shall be entitled to appeal his/her annual APPR rating, based upon a paper submission to the Central Office administrative designee of the Superintendent of Schools, and a APPR consultant designated by the supervisor, both who shall be trained in accordance with the requirements of statute and regulations and also possesses an appropriate administrative Certification.

B. The appeal must be brought in writing, specifying the area(s) of concern, but limited to those matters that may be appealed as prescribed in Section 3012-c of the Education Law. Further, a principal who is placed on a Principal Improvement Plan ("PIP") shall have a corresponding right to appeal concerns regarding the PIP in accordance with the requirements set forth in Section 3012-c of the Education Law.

C. An appeal of an evaluation or a PIP must be commenced within fourteen calendar days of the presentation of the document to the principal or else the right to appeal shall be deemed waived in all regards. In the case of a PIP appeal, there shall be a second fourteen calendar day period for a PIP appeal following the end date of the PIP, and in the event that an appeal is not timely filed by the fourteenth calendar day following the end date of the PIP, the right to such an appeal shall be deemed waived in all regards.

D. The Superintendent's administrative designee shall respond to the appeal with a written answer granting the appeal and directing further administrative action or deny the appeal in timely and expedited manner. Such decision shall be made within fourteen calendar days of the receipt of the appeal. In the event that the principal is unsatisfied with the result of the appeal, a further appeal may be taken to the Superintendent of Schools fourteen calendar days of receipt of the Superintendent's designee's decision upon the appeal.

E. The Superintendent shall make his or her decision in writing regarding the further appeal within fourteen calendar days of receipt of that appeal. The decision of the Superintendent, so long as the decision is made within the timeframe set forth in this paragraph, shall be final and binding in all regards and shall not be subject to review at arbitration, before any administrative agency or in any court of law.

F. 1. Notwithstanding the above, in the event that a tenured principal has received two consecutive ineffective APPR evaluation ratings, the second tier appeal shall be to an arbitrator selected on a rotating basis from the following list, based on order and reasonable timeframe of availability: Bonnie Siber-Weinstock, Ira Lobel, and Jeffrey Selchick, who shall make a final and binding decision upon the appeal of the APPR evaluation and/or the principal improvement plan. In the event that the district then proceeds to a probable cause finding under Section 3020-a of the Education Law, and determines to conduct such a hearing, the arbitrator who ruled upon the appeal shall be jointly selected by the principal and the district to be the Section 3020-a hearing officer. Notwithstanding the aforementioned language, nothing herein shall be construed as limiting the right of the employee to challenge said evaluation in any proceeding brought pursuant to Education Law §3020-a, so long as the identical issue wasn't resolved in the second tier appeal or clearly should have been presented in the second tier appeal but was not. It is expected that the cost of said hearing shall be paid for in accordance with the provision of the Education Law; provided, however, in the event that SED will not pay for the costs of the hearing, that expense shall be borne by the District and the proceedings shall be in the nature of a disciplinary arbitration and not a statutory hearing under section 3020-a of the Education Law. During the pendency of a disciplinary arbitration the pay rights of the tenured building principal shall be the same as those afforded to building principals who are subject to statutory proceedings under Section 3020-a of the Education Law.

2. In order to take advantage of the procedure outlined in F(1) above, the tenured principal must consent to the use of the arbitration panel should the district proceed to find probable cause under Section 3020-a of the Education Law. If the tenured principal is unwilling to do so, the second tier appeal shall be heard by the Superintendent of Schools in a manner consistent to the APPR regulations and shall be timely and expedited.

11.4) Training and Certification of Lead Evaluators and Evaluators

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

The Lead evaluator, the Superintendent, has been and will continue to be trained in the required nine elements:
1. NYS Teaching Standards and performance indicators;
2. Evidence-based observation techniques grounded in research;
3. Application and use of the student growth percentile model and the value-added growth model;
4. Application and use of the Danielson 2011 rubric for use in evaluations and to observe a teacher's practice; (see below) and the VAL-ED leadership rubric;
5. Application and use of the district's formative and summative assessments, including, but not limited to the WrAP, disaggregation of data, and data analysis;
6. Application and use of the NWEA MAP assessments
7. Use of the Statewide Instructional Reporting System;
8. Scoring methodology to evaluate a teacher and principal, 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 principals' overall rating and their subcomponent ratings; and
9. Specific considerations in evaluating teachers of English language learners and students with disabilities.

There is a single Lead Evaluator of Principals - therefore inter-rater reliability is insured.

Initial training for the Lead Evaluator to reach the required level of training is 35 hours. of training. The Superintendent will continue to take part in training provided by NYSED, and will turnkey the training to the staff and principals. This continuous training by the Superintendent will re-certify her as the lead evaluator and a minimum of 18 hours will be set aside yearly for re-certification.

11.5) Assurances -- Evaluators

Please check the boxes below:

- Checked

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

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

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

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

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

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

(7) use of the Statewide Instructional Reporting System

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

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

- Checked

11.6) Assurances -- Principals

Please check all of the boxes below:

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

11.7) Assurances -- Data

Please check all of the boxes below:

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

12. Joint Certification of APPR Plan

Created Wednesday, May 23, 2012
Updated Tuesday, October 16, 2012

Page 1

12.1)Upload the Joint Certification of the APPR Plan

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

assets/survey-uploads/5581/132637-3Uqgn5g9Iu/HFFMCSD District Certification form-rev..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.

(Form 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
	HS Band	○ State Assessment ○ State-approved 3rd party assessment ◉ District, Regional or BOCES-developed ○ School/BOCES-wide/group/team results based on State	Regional Assessment based on the NYSSMA Rubric
	HS Chorus	○ State Assessment ○ State-approved 3rd party assessment ◉ District, Regional or BOCES-developed ○ School/BOCES-wide/group/team results based on State	Regional Assessment based on the NYSSMA Rubric
	8th Grade Chorus	○ State Assessment ○ State-approved 3rd party assessment ◉ District, Regional or BOCES-developed ○ School/BOCES-wide/group/team results based on State	Regional Assessment based on the NYSSMA Rubric
	8th Grade Band	○ State Assessment ○ State-approved 3rd party assessment	Regional Assessment based on the NYSSMA Rubric

		District, Regional or BOCES-developed ○ School/BOCES-wide/group/team results based on State	
	Health Education	○ State Assessment ○ State-approved 3rd party assessment ● District, Regional or BOCES-developed ○ School/BOCES-wide/group/team results based on State	BOCES Developed Assessment based on the National Health Education Standards and WrAP Assessment
	HS Physical Education	○ State Assessment ○ State-approved 3rd party assessment ● District, Regional or BOCES-developed ○ School/BOCES-wide/group/team results based on State	District Developed Assessment based on the National Physical Education Assessment: Fitness Gram and WrAP Assessment
	Middle Level Physical Education	○ State Assessment ○ State-approved 3rd party assessment ● District, Regional or BOCES-developed ○ School/BOCES-wide/group/team results based on State	District Developed Assessment based on the National Physical Education Assessment: Fitness Gram and WrAP Assessment
	Elementary Physical Education	○ State Assessment ○ State-approved 3rd party assessment ● District, Regional or BOCES-developed ○ School/BOCES-wide/group/team results based on State	District Developed Assessment based on the National Physical Education Assessment: Fitness Gram and WrAP Assessment

	Elementary Art	○ State Assessment ○ State-approved 3rd party assessment ● District, Regional or BOCES-developed ○ School/BOCES-wide/group/team results based on State	Regional Assessment based on the Art grade 7 Assessment on Engageny
	Middle School Art	○ State Assessment ○ State-approved 3rd party assessment ● District, Regional or BOCES-developed ○ School/BOCES-wide/group/team results based on State	Regional Assessment based on the Art grade 7 Assessment on Engageny
	Elementary Music	○ State Assessment ○ State-approved 3rd party assessment ● District, Regional or BOCES-developed ○ School/BOCES-wide/group/team results based on State	District Developed Assessment based on the Rhythmic Notation Assessment
	Speech	○ State Assessment ● State-approved 3rd party assessment ○ District, Regional or BOCES-developed ○ School/BOCES-wide/group/team results based on State	Measure of Academic Progress (ELA)
	English Language Learners	● State Assessment ○ State-approved 3rd party assessment	NYSESLAT

	Level 1,2,3,	District, Regional or BOCES-developed School/BOCES-wide/group/team results based on State	

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

Use this box, if needed, to describe the general process for assigning HEDI categories for these grades/subjects in this subcomponent. If needed, you may upload a table or graphic at 2.11.	The expected differentiated student growth measure for each student will be used to determine each teacher's HEDI points. 80% of the students must achieve their expected growth for the teacher to achieve the 9 points.
Highly Effective (18 - 20 points) Results are well-above District goals for similar students.	20 = 95-100% 19 = 92-94.9% 18 = 90-91.9%
Effective (9 - 17 points) Results meet District goals for similar students.	17 = 88-89.9% 16 = 87-87.9% 15 = 86-86.9% 14 = 85-85.9% 13 = 84-84.9% 12 = 83-83.9% 11 = 82-82.9% 10 = 81-81.9% 9 = 80%
Developing (3 - 8 points) Results are below District goals for similar	8 = 75-79.9%

students.	7 = 70-74.9% 6 = 65-69.9% 5 = 60-64.9% 4 = 55-59.9% 3 = 50-54.9%
Ineffective (0 - 2 points) Results are well-below District goals for similar students.	2 = 30-49.9% 1 = 15.29.9% 0 = 0-14.9%

(Form 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
	HS Band	○ State Assessment ○ State-approved 3rd party assessment ◉ District, Regional or BOCES-developed ○ School/BOCES-wide/group/team results based on State	Regional Assessment based on the NYSSMA Rubric
	HS Chorus	○ State Assessment ○ State-approved 3rd party assessment ◉ District, Regional or BOCES-developed ○ School/BOCES-wide/group/team results based on State	Regional Assessment based on the NYSSMA Rubric
	8th Grade Chorus	○ State Assessment ○ State-approved 3rd party assessment ◉ District, Regional or BOCES-developed ○ School/BOCES-wide/group/team results based on State	Regional Assessment based on the NYSSMA Rubric
	8th Grade Band	○ State Assessment ○ State-approved 3rd party assessment	Regional Assessment based on the NYSSMA Rubric

		District, Regional or BOCES-developed ○ School/BOCES-wide/group/team results based on State	
	Health Education	○ State Assessment ○ State-approved 3rd party assessment ● District, Regional or BOCES-developed ○ School/BOCES-wide/group/team results based on State	BOCES Developed Assessment based on the National Health Education Standards and WrAP Assessment
	HS Physical Education	○ State Assessment ○ State-approved 3rd party assessment ● District, Regional or BOCES-developed ○ School/BOCES-wide/group/team results based on State	District Developed Assessment based on the National Physical Education Assessment: Fitness Gram and WrAP Assessment
	Middle Level Physical Education	○ State Assessment ○ State-approved 3rd party assessment ● District, Regional or BOCES-developed ○ School/BOCES-wide/group/team results based on State	District Developed Assessment based on the National Physical Education Assessment: Fitness Gram and WrAP Assessment
	Elementary Physical Education	○ State Assessment ○ State-approved 3rd party assessment ● District, Regional or BOCES-developed ○ School/BOCES-wide/group/team results based on State	District Developed Assessment based on the National Physical Education Assessment: Fitness Gram and WrAP Assessment

	Elementary Art	○ State Assessment ○ State-approved 3rd party assessment ● District, Regional or BOCES-developed ○ School/BOCES-wide/group/team results based on State	Regional Assessment based on the Art grade 7 Assessment on Engageny
	Middle School Art	○ State Assessment ○ State-approved 3rd party assessment ● District, Regional or BOCES-developed ○ School/BOCES-wide/group/team results based on State	Regional Assessment based on the Art grade 7 Assessment on Engageny
	Elementary Music	○ State Assessment ○ State-approved 3rd party assessment ● District, Regional or BOCES-developed ○ School/BOCES-wide/group/team results based on State	District Developed Assessment based on the Rhythmic Notation Assessment
	Speech	○ State Assessment ● State-approved 3rd party assessment ○ District, Regional or BOCES-developed ○ School/BOCES-wide/group/team results based on State	Measure of Academic Progress (ELA)
	English Language Learners	● State Assessment ○ State-approved 3rd party assessment	NYSESLAT

	Level 1,2,3,	District, Regional or BOCES-developed School/BOCES-wide/group/team results based on State	

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

Use this box, if needed, to describe the general process for assigning HEDI categories for these grades/subjects in this subcomponent. If needed, you may upload a table or graphic at 2.11.	The expected differentiated student growth measure for each student will be used to determine each teacher's HEDI points. 80% of the students must achieve their expected growth for the teacher to achieve the 9 points.
Highly Effective (18 - 20 points) Results are well-above District goals for similar students.	20 = 95-100% 19 = 92-94.9% 18 = 90-91.9%
Effective (9 - 17 points) Results meet District goals for similar students.	17 = 88-89.9% 16 = 87-87.9% 15 = 86-86.9% 14 = 85-85.9% 13 = 84-84.9% 12 = 83-83.9% 11 = 82-82.9% 10 = 81-81.9% 9 = 80%
Developing (3 - 8 points) Results are below District goals for similar	8 = 75-79.9%

students.	7 = 70-74.9% 6 = 65-69.9% 5 = 60-64.9% 4 = 55-59.9% 3 = 50-54.9%
Ineffective (0 - 2 points) Results are well-below District goals for similar students.	2 = 30-49.9% 1 = 15.29.9% 0 = 0-14.9%

This chart is for "other courses" grades K-11 using the "State Approved 3rd Party Assessment" – (Pre-Calculus; Spanish 1,2,3; Chinese 1,2,3; Art; Music; Physical Education; Health; English Language Learner 1,2,3; Speech)*

We administer, to every student, the "Measures of Academic Progress" assessment and each student receives an expected student achievement goal. This data provides a comparison of projected achievement as compared to actual achievement for each individual student. The pre-assessment will be given in September and the summative will be given in the spring. MAP provides a "RIT" proficiency level (student's overall scale score on the test) which can be described as comparing a student's position to predefined performance standards. This score, in the spring, will measure the extent to which individual students met, missed, or exceeded their expected achievement projections after instruction. Every teacher will receive a score based on their student roster that will be used to determine the teacher's HEDI points. **79.9% of the students must achieve their expected achievement for the teacher to achieve 17 points.**

Highly Effective (18 - 20 points) Results are well above District expectations for achievement for grade/subject.	20 = 90-100% 19 = 85-89.9% 18 = 80-84.9%
Effective (9 - 17 points) Results meet District expectations for achievement for grade/subject.	17 = 79-79.9% 16 = 76-78.9% 15 = 73-75.9% 14 = 70-72.9% 13 = 67-69.9% 12 = 64-66.9% 11 = 61-63.9% 10 = 58-60.9% 9 = 55-57.9%
Developing (3 - 8 points) Results are below District expectations for achievement for grade/subject.	8 = 54-54.9% 7 = 49-53.9% 6 = 44-48.9% 5 = 39-43.9% 4 = 34-38.9% 3 = 30-33.9%
Ineffective (0 - 2 points) Results are well below District expectations for achievement for grade/subject.	2 = 29-29.9% 1 = 25.28.9% 0 = 0-24.9%

*see next chart for 12th grade assessments based on the WrAP

This chart is for "other courses" using the district developed writing assessment based on the WrAP –(Grade 12 courses as listed: English 12; SUPA English; SUPA Economics; Economics 12; AP Calculus; Calculus; Mathematics Applications; Environmental Science)

We administer, to every student grades 4-12, a district writing assessment centered on the importance of College and Career Readiness in writing achievement. Student writing is evaluated on a rubric based on the WrAP assessment. Each student will receive a Total Raw Score based on the rubric. The grade 12 summative assessment will be given in the winter semester. In this assessment a student is expected to incorporate higher-order skills to produce writing intended to demonstrate college and career readiness.

Every teacher will receive a score based on their student roster that will be used to determine the teacher's HEDI points. **80% of the students must score achieve a Total Raw Score of 20 for the teacher to achieve 9 points.**

Highly Effective (18 - 20 points) Results are well above District expectations for achievement for grade/subject.	20 = 95-100% 19 = 92-94.9% 18 = 90-91.9%
Effective (9 - 17 points) Results meet District expectations for achievement for grade/subject.	17 = 88-89.9% 16 = 87-87.9% 15 = 86-86.9% 14 = 85-85.9% 13 = 84-84.9% 12 = 83-83.9% 11 = 82-82.9% 10 = 81-81.9% 9 = 80%
Developing (3 - 8 points) Results are below District expectations for achievement for grade/subject.	8 = 75-79.9% 7 = 70-74.9% 6 = 65-69.9% 5 = 60-64.9% 4 = 55-59.9% 3 = 50-54.9%
Ineffective (0 - 2 points) Results are well below District expectations for achievement for grade/subject.	2 = 30-49.9% 1 = 5-29.9% 0 = 0-14

HFFMCSD Local 60 Point Allocation

Danielson 2011 Revised Framework for Teaching	Total Point Value
1. PLANNING & PREPARATION: 18 Points	
1a: Demonstrating Knowledge of Content and Pedagogy.	4
1b: Demonstrating Knowledge of Students.	2
1c: Setting Instructional Outcomes.	4
1d: Demonstrating Knowledge of Resources.	2
1e: Designing Coherent Instruction.	3
1f: Designing Student Assessments.	3
2. THE CLASSROOM ENVIRONMENT: 14 Points	
2a: Creating an Environment of Respect and Rapport.	4
2b: Establishing A Culture for Learning.	3
2c: Managing Classroom Procedures.	3
2d: Managing Student Behavior.	2
2e: Organizing Physical Space.	2
3. INSTRUCTION: 18 Points	
3a. Communicating with Students.	4
3b. Using Questioning and Discussion Techniques.	3
3c. Engaging Students in Learning.	4
3d. Using Assessment in Instruction.	3
3e. Demonstrating Flexibility & Responsiveness.	4
4. PROFESSIONAL RESPONSIBILITIES: 10 Points	
4a. Reflecting on Teaching.	3
4b. Maintaining Accurate Records.	2
4c. Communicating with Families.	2
4d. Participating in a Professional Community.	1
4e. Growing and Developing Professionally.	1
4f. Showing Professionalism.	1
Total Possible Points:	**60**

Val-Ed provides a summary of the principal's effectiveness for the school year. This summary uses, as sources of evidence, input from teachers, the principal, and the supervisor to provide a total score across all respondents. The results are set against a set of performance standards which are BB (Below Basic) or Ineffective, B (Basic) or Developing, P (Proficient) or Effective, D (Distinguished) or Highly Effective. Each principal will receive their overall effectiveness mean score and the core component scores that are based on the ISLLC standards. Mathematically the building principal's Mean Val-Ed Score when multiplied by 14 will provide the building principal's Local 60 rating. For example see the chart below. This procedure for assigning points assures that each building principal is able to earn all points, 0-60.

The Vanderbilt Assessment of Leadership in Education or VAL-ED is designed to provide a summary of effectiveness of a principal's learning centered leadership behaviors during the current school year. Effective learning-centered leadership is at the intersection of the two dimensions: core components created through key processes. The conceptual framework for VAL-ED is based on a review of the learning-centered leadership research literature and alignment to the Interstate School Leaders Licensure Consortium (ISLLC) standards. Every item in the Principal, Supervisor, and Teacher Response forms represents a cross-section of one core component and one key process based on evidence of their performance in supporting increased student achievement.

The summative evaluation will include possible total points of 60, all based upon the Val-Ed Instrument's total effectiveness score.

The HEDI Bands for the Local 60 points have been apportioned in the following manner:

HEDI	Proficiency level (conversion from Val-Ed Framework)	Mean Cut Scores Val-ED	Mean Cut Score Val-ED	Principal Score X14 for points
Ineffective (I)	Below Basic (BB)	0	3.28	0-45.99
Developing (D)	Basic (B)	3.29	3.59	46-50.49
Effective (E)	Proficient (P)	3.60	3.99	50.5-55.9
Highly Effective(H)	Distinguished (D)	4.00	5.00	56-60

Process for assigning Points for the Local 60 Component:

Each building principal's Mean Val-Ed Score will be multiplied by 14 to arrive at the building principal's Local 60 rating. This procedure for assigning points assures that each building principal is able to earn all points, 0-60.

Appendix G:

Narrative Description of Contents of Plan

Principal Improvement Plan (PIP)

Purpose: To help principals focus on area(s) in which they need intensive support to improve their practice.

Processes: An improvement plan is developed when the principal's APPR composite score is within the ineffective or developing range. The purpose of the improvement plan is to identify specific deficiencies in performance and foster growth through professional development and targeted support. In the event that one or more areas are evaluated as ineffective but the composite APPR score is effective or higher the principal will not receive a formal PIP but will receive a recommendation for areas of improvement to develop a PDP.

Timeline: The TIP shall be provided as soon as practicable, but in no case later than ten (10) school days after the opening of classes for the school year; provided, however, notwithstanding any Education Law provisions to the contrary, in the event that the District does not receive the State data on students' assessments by the first day of the school year, and therefore, no composite APPR rating exists for a teacher, the TIP shall be implemented as soon as practicable after the unit member's receipt of a composite "developing" or "ineffective" APPR rating.

Improvement Plan Conference: The supervisor and the principal are required to meet to develop a plan for improvement. The development of the form may take more than one meeting and sufficient time needs to be provided to ensure that the plan is comprehensive and well detailed. The supervisor has final sign-off on the content and duration of the PIP.

If the principal received a rating of "ineffective" he/she has the opportunity for an internal peer mentor or an independent outside mentor mutually agreed upon between the District and Association. The principal may select a mentor, with the approval of the Superintendent and the principal's bargaining unit President. The mentor and the principal will collaborate biweekly during the first quarter. All dealings between the mentor and the principal will be confidential.

Improvement Plan designed by the principal must include the following:

1. Identification of specific deficiencies and recommended area(s) of growth;
2. Measurable goals for improving the deficiencies to acceptable levels;
3. Specific professional development or strategies to accomplish the goals;
4. Specific resources necessary to implement the plan, including but not limited to, opportunities for the principal to work with highly effective principals or central office staff; (*If the principal received a rating of "ineffective" he/she has the opportunity for an internal peer mentor or an independent outside mentor mutually agreed upon between*

the District and Association. The principal may select a mentor, with the approval of the Superintendent and the principal's bargaining unit President. The mentor and the principal will collaborate biweekly during the first quarter. All dealings between the mentor and the principal will be confidential);

5. A timeline for the plan, including intermediate checkpoints to determine progress and provide feedback and coaching. The PIP for a probationary principal shall be three (3) to five (5) months in duration, as determined by the district. The length of a PIP shall not be less than five (5) months in duration for a tenured principal as determined by the district.
6. Procedures for determining acceptable improvement.

Principals are accountable for the implementation and completion of the plan and should meet with their evaluator regarding progress. Upon completion of the plan, the principal and their supervisor shall sign the improvement form, documenting completion of the plan.

The manner of assessment of improvement that shall be in the nature of direct observation, review of materials (where applicable), review of behaviors (where applicable), attention to educational directives (where applicable), and student progress based upon the measure as determined by the state and locally under this APPR (where applicable).

Appendix H:

Peer Mentor for Principal Rated Developing or Ineffective (Optional for Consideration)

The principal when receiving a rating of "developing" must be offered the opportunity for a peer mentor chosen from the principal's bargaining unit. If the principal received a rating of "ineffective" he/she must be offered the opportunity for an internal peer mentor or an independent outside mentor mutually agreed upon between the District and Association. The principal may select a mentor, with the approval of the Superintendent and the principal's bargaining unit President. The mentor and the principal will collaborate biweekly during the first quarter. All dealings between the mentor and the principal will be confidential.

After the first quarter of principal/mentor collaboration, the Superintendent will assess the effectiveness of the intervention and the level of improvement, by no later than December 15th. Based on that assessment, the PIP may be adjusted appropriately and meetings between the Superintendent, Mentor and Principal will continue on a monthly basis during the second quarter. The mentor must provide to the Superintendent, with a copy simultaneously sent to the Principal, a written mid-year progress report no later than January 1st. In the event a mentoring is provided, then the mentor must provide, in writing, an end of the year evaluation to the Superintendent, with a copy simultaneously sent to the Principal, by no later than May 15th. The Superintendent must provide the Principal with his/her end of the year evaluation no later than June 15th. The culmination of the PIP will be communicated in writing to the principal. If at the end of the year the PIP goals are met or the administrator is rated "effective" the PIP will terminate. Both parties will sign the PIP at the end of the school year.

Appendix I:

Principal Improvement Plan Template

Principal Name: _____ School Year: _____
Building: _____

Date of Improvement and Remediation Conference: _____

The PIP should be in place no later than ten days after the start of the academic school year in September. An initial conference shall be held at the beginning of the school year where the PIP is discussed, signed and dated at the beginning of its implementation.

Section 1: Problem Statement – Provide a specific statement of the problem(s) or area(s) in need of improvement.

Specific Statement of Problem and/or Area(s) in Need of Improvement

Section 2: Desired Level of Performance – List specific measurable goals to improve performance. Indicate what will be measured for each goal.

List Specific Goals to Be Met to Improve Performance	Specifically Describe Successful Improvement Target(s)

Section 3: Specific Plan of Action - Describe in detail specific plans of action that must be taken by the principal to improve his/her performance. Indicate the resources (specific supports and professional development activities) that will be provided and timelines.

Actions to be Taken	Resources to Be Provided	Timelines for Achieving Improvement

Section 4: Signatures – Finalized Plan

Date Improvement Plan Will Be Evaluated: _____

Principal's Signature: _____

Date: _____

Evaluator's Signature: _____

Date: _____

The signatures above verify that the proper procedures as detailed in the Improvement Plan have been followed.

Appendix J:

Principal Improvement Plan: Evaluation of Plan

Principal Name: _____ **Date of Evaluation**: ____ _____

School Year: _____ **Building**: _____

The Improvement Plan will be evaluated at the end of the time specified in the plan and will result in one of the following actions:

- ☐ Problem resolved and performance demonstrated at a satisfactory level
- ☐ Continue with the Improvement Plan for a specified amount of time. Specify Period of Time:___
- ☐ Recommend dismissal.

Comments: Provide justification for recommendation indicated above and attach evidence to support recommended course of action.

I have reviewed this evaluation and discussed it with my evaluator. My signature indicates that I have been advised of my performance status; it does not necessarily imply that I agree with this evaluation.

Principal's Signature:_____ Date: _____

Supervisor's Signature: _____ Date: _____

The supervisor's signature on this form verifies that the proper procedures and board policies have been followed.

A. Teacher Improvement Plan

1. Upon receiving a rating of "developing" or "ineffective", a teacher shall be provided with a Teacher Improvement Plan ("TIP"). The TIP shall be provided as soon as practicable, but in no case later than ten (10) school days after the opening of classes for the school year. The parties understand and agree that the sole and exclusive purpose of a TIP is the improvement of teaching practice and that the issuance of a TIP is not a disciplinary action. The TIP shall be developed in consultation with the teacher. The Association President shall be informed of the District's intent to provide a TIP to a teacher within ten (10) days of the teacher's "developing" or "ineffective" rating. Whenever a teacher is placed on a TIP and with the agreement of the teacher, the Association President shall be provided with a copy of the TIP.

2. A TIP shall clearly specify: (i) the area(s) in need of improvement; (ii) the performance goals, expectations, benchmarks, standards and timeliness the teacher must meet in order to achieve an effective rating; (iii) how improvement will be measured and monitored, and provide for periodic reviews of progress and goal achievement; (iv) the anticipated frequency and duration of meetings of the teacher, administrator, and mentor (if one is assigned); and (v) the appropriate differentiated professional development opportunities, materials, resources and supports the District will make available to assist the teacher, including, where appropriate, the assignment of a mentor teacher.

3. The length of a TIP for a probationary teacher shall be three (3) to five (5) months in duration, as determined by the District. The length of a TIP shall be not less than five (5) months in duration for a tenured faculty member, as determined by the District.

4. In the event that the administrator recommends coursework, any tuition costs or registration fees shall be borne by the District in their entirety. No disciplinary action predicated upon ineffective performance shall be taken by the District against a teacher until a TIP has been fully implemented. However, nothing herein shall prevent the District from introducing into evidence an evaluation or a TIP in a subsequent disciplinary action.

5. A TIP shall be in a narrative form, or other mutually agreed upon format.

TEACHER IMPROVEMENT PLAN FORM

Please specify:[1]

(i) the area(s) in need of improvement:

(ii) the performance goals, expectations, benchmarks, standards and timeliness the teacher must meet in order to achieve an effective rating:

(iii) how improvement will be measured and monitored (providing for periodic reviews of progress and goal achievement):

(iv) the anticipated frequency and duration of meetings of the teacher, administrator, and mentor (if one is assigned):

(v) the appropriate differentiated professional development opportunities, materials, resources and supports the District will make available to assist the teacher, including, where appropriate, the assignment of a mentor teacher.

[1] Unless another form is mutually agreed upon by the parties a TIP shall be provided in a narrative form.

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

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

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

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

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

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

Signatures, dates

Superintendent Signature: Date:

10/16/12

Teachers Union President Signature: Date:

10/16/12

Administrative Union President Signature: Date:

10/16/12

Board of Education President Signature: Date:

10/16/12