



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 4, 2012

James W. Polansky, Superintendent
Huntington Union Free School District
50 Tower St.
Huntington Station, NY 11746

Dear Superintendent Polansky:

Congratulations. I am pleased to inform you that your Annual Professional Performance Review Plan (APPR) meets the criteria outlined in Education Law §3012-c and Subpart 30-2 of the Commissioner's Regulations and has been approved for the 2012-2013 school year. As a reminder, we are relying on the information you provided on your APPR form, including the certifications and assurances that are part of your approved APPR. If any material changes are made to your approved APPR plan, your district/BOCES must submit such material changes to us for approval. Please see the attached notes for further information.

Please be advised that, pursuant to Education Law §3012-c, the Department will be analyzing data supplied by districts, BOCES, and/or schools and may order a corrective action plan if there are unacceptably low correlation results between the student growth subcomponent and any other measures of teacher and principal effectiveness and/or if the teacher or principal scores or ratings show little differentiation across educators and/or the lack of differentiation is not justified by equivalently consistent student achievement results.

The New York State Education Department and I look forward to continuing our work together, with the goal of ensuring that every school has world-class educators in the classroom, every teacher has a world-class principal to support his or her professional growth, and every student achieves college and career readiness.

Thank you again for your hard work.

Sincerely,



John B. King, Jr.
Commissioner

Attachment

c: Thomas L. Rogers

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 18, 2012

Updated Wednesday, November 14, 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 : 580403030000

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

580403030000

1.2) School District Name: HUNTINGTON UFSD

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

HUNTINGTON UFSD

1.3) School Improvement Grant (SIG) Districts Only

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

(No response)

1.4) Award Classification

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

-
- Strengthening Teacher and Leader Effectiveness RFP (NYSED)
-

1.5) Assurances

Please check all of the boxes below:

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

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

Re-submission to address deficiencies

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

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

Annual (2012-13)

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

Created Friday, May 18, 2012

Updated Tuesday, November 20, 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 | AIMSweb |
| 1 | State-approved 3rd party assessment | AIMSweb |
| 2 | State-approved 3rd party assessment | AIMSweb |

| | 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

The administration, in collaboration with the teachers, will establish individualized student growth targets. These

| | |
|---|--|
| this subcomponent. If needed, you may upload a table or graphic at 2.11, below. | targets will be determined based on pre-assessment baseline data collected at the beginning of the school year. Then based on the percentage of students who meet or exceeded their individualized growth targets, a corresponding 0-20 HEDI score will be determined using the conversion tables below. |
| Highly Effective (18 - 20 points) Results are well-above state average for similar students (or District goals if no state test). | 20: 94-100% meet or exceed individualized growth targets 19: 87-93% meet or exceed individualized growth targets 18: 80-86% meet or exceed individualized growth targets |
| Effective (9 - 17 points) Results meet state average for similar students (or District goals if no state test). | 17: 73-79% meet or exceed individualized growth targets 16: 66-72% meet or exceed individualized growth targets 15: 59-65% meet or exceed individualized growth targets 14: 53-58% meet or exceed individualized growth targets 13: 50-52% meet or exceed individualized growth targets 12: 47-49% meet or exceed individualized growth targets 11: 44-46% meet or exceed individualized growth targets 10: 41-43% meet or exceed individualized growth targets 9: 38-40% meet or exceed individualized growth targets |
| Developing (3 - 8 points) Results are below state average for similar students (or District goals if no state test). | 8: 34-37% meet or exceed individualized growth targets 7: 30-33% meet or exceed individualized growth targets 6: 26-29% meet or exceed individualized growth targets 5: 22-25% meet or exceed individualized growth targets 4: 18-21% meet or exceed individualized growth targets 3: 14-17% meet or exceed individualized growth targets |
| Ineffective (0 - 2 points) Results are well-below state average for similar students (or District goals if no state test). | 2: 10-13% meet or exceed individualized growth targets 1: 6-9% meet or exceed individualized growth targets 0: 0-5% meet or exceed individualized growth targets |

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 | AIMSweb |
| 1 | State-approved 3rd party assessment | AIMSweb |
| 2 | State-approved 3rd party assessment | AIMSweb |

| | 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 administration, in collaboration with the teachers, will establish individualized student growth targets. These targets will be determined based on pre-assessment baseline data collected at the beginning of the school year. Then based on the percentage of students who meet or exceeded their individualized growth targets, a |
|---|--|

corresponding 0-20 HEDI score will be determined using the conversion tables below.

| | |
|---|--|
| Highly Effective (18 - 20 points) Results are well-above state average for similar students (or District goals if no state test). | 20: 94-100% meet or exceed individualized growth targets 19: 87-93% meet or exceed individualized growth targets 18: 80-86% meet or exceed individualized growth targets |
| Effective (9 - 17 points) Results meet state average for similar students (or District goals if no state test). | 17: 73-79% meet or exceed individualized growth targets 16: 66-72% meet or exceed individualized growth targets 15: 59-65% meet or exceed individualized growth targets 14: 53-58% meet or exceed individualized growth targets 13: 50-52% meet or exceed individualized growth targets 12: 47-49% meet or exceed individualized growth targets 11: 44-46% meet or exceed individualized growth targets 10: 41-43% meet or exceed individualized growth targets 9: 38-40% meet or exceed individualized growth targets |
| Developing (3 - 8 points) Results are below state average for similar students (or District goals if no state test). | 8: 34-37% meet or exceed individualized growth targets 7: 30-33% meet or exceed individualized growth targets 6: 26-29% meet or exceed individualized growth targets 5: 22-25% meet or exceed individualized growth targets 4: 18-21% meet or exceed individualized growth targets 3: 14-17% meet or exceed individualized growth targets |
| Ineffective (0 - 2 points) Results are well-below state average for similar students (or District goals if no state test). | 2: 10-13% meet or exceed individualized growth targets 1: 6-9% meet or exceed individualized growth targets 0: 0-5% meet or exceed individualized growth targets |

2.4) Grades 6-8 Science

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

| | Science | Assessment |
|---|--|--|
| 6 | District, regional or BOCES-developed assessment | Huntington UFSD-Developed Grade 6 Summative Science Assessment |
| 7 | District, regional or BOCES-developed assessment | Huntington UFSD-Developed Grade 7 Summative 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 administration, in collaboration with the teachers, will establish individualized student growth targets. These targets will be determined based on pre-assessment baseline data collected at the beginning of the school year. Then based on the percentage of students who meet or exceeded their individualized growth targets, a corresponding 0-20 HEDI score will be determined using the conversion tables below. |
|---|--|

| | |
|---|--|
| Highly Effective (18 - 20 points) Results are well-above state average for similar students (or District goals if no state test). | 20: 98-100% meet or exceed individualized growth targets 19: 94-97% meet or exceed individualized growth targets 18: 90-93% meet or exceed individualized growth targets |
| Effective (9 - 17 points) Results meet state average for similar students (or District goals if no state test). | 17: 86-89% meet or exceed individualized growth targets 16: 82-85% meet or exceed individualized growth targets 15: 78-81% meet or exceed individualized growth targets 14: 74-77% meet or exceed individualized growth targets 13: 70-73% meet or exceed individualized growth targets 12: 65-69% meet or exceed individualized growth targets 11: 60-64% meet or exceed individualized growth targets 10: 55-59% meet or exceed individualized growth targets 9: 50-54% meet or exceed individualized growth targets |
| Developing (3 - 8 points) Results are below state average for similar students (or District goals if no state test). | 8: 45-49% meet or exceed individualized growth targets 7: 40-44% meet or exceed individualized growth targets 6: 35-39% meet or exceed individualized growth targets 5: 30-34% meet or exceed individualized growth targets 4: 25-29% meet or exceed individualized growth targets 3: 19-24% meet or exceed individualized growth targets |
| Ineffective (0 - 2 points) Results are well-below state average for similar students (or District goals if no state test). | 2: 13-18% meet or exceed individualized growth targets 1: 7-12% meet or exceed individualized growth targets 0: 0-6% meet or exceed individualized growth targets |

2.5) Grades 6-8 Social Studies

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

| | Social Studies | Assessment |
|---|--|---|
| 6 | District, regional or BOCES-developed assessment | Huntington UFSD-Developed Grade 6 Summative Social Studies Assessment |
| 7 | District, regional or BOCES-developed assessment | Huntington UFSD-Developed Grade 7 Summative Social Studies Assessment |
| 8 | District, regional or BOCES-developed assessment | Huntington UFSD-Developed Grade 8 Summative Social Studies Assessment |

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

| | |
|---|--|
| Use this box, if needed, to describe the general process for assigning HEDI categories for these grades/subjects in this subcomponent. If needed, you may upload a table or graphic at 2.11, below. | The administration, in collaboration with the teachers, will establish individualized student growth targets. These targets will be determined based on pre-assessment baseline data collected at the beginning of the school year. Then based on the percentage of students who meet or exceeded their individualized growth targets, a corresponding 0-20 HEDI score will be determined using the conversion tables below. |
| Highly Effective (18 - 20 points) Results are well-above District goals for similar students. | 20: 98-100% meet or exceed individualized growth targets 19: 94-97% meet or exceed individualized growth targets 18: 90-93% meet or exceed individualized growth targets |
| Effective (9 - 17 points) Results meet District goals for similar students. | 17: 86-89% meet or exceed individualized growth targets 16: 82-85% meet or exceed individualized growth targets 15: 78-81% meet or exceed individualized growth targets |

14: 74-77% meet or exceed individualized growth targets
 13: 70-73% meet or exceed individualized growth targets
 12: 65-69% meet or exceed individualized growth targets
 11: 60-64% meet or exceed individualized growth targets
 10: 55-59% meet or exceed individualized growth targets
 9: 50-54% meet or exceed individualized growth targets

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

8: 45-49% meet or exceed individualized growth targets
 7: 40-44% meet or exceed individualized growth targets
 6: 35-39% meet or exceed individualized growth targets
 5: 30-34% meet or exceed individualized growth targets
 4: 25-29% meet or exceed individualized growth targets
 3: 19-24% meet or exceed individualized growth targets

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

2: 13-18% meet or exceed individualized growth targets
 1: 7-12% meet or exceed individualized growth targets
 0: 0-6% meet or exceed individualized growth targets

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 | Huntington UFSD-Developed Summative Global 1 Assessment |

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

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

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

The administration, in collaboration with the teachers, will establish individualized student growth targets. These targets will be determined based on pre-assessment baseline data collected at the beginning of the school year. Then based on the percentage of students who meet or exceeded their individualized growth targets, a corresponding 0-20 HEDI score will be determined using the conversion tables below.

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

20: 98-100% meet or exceed individualized growth targets
 19: 94-97% meet or exceed individualized growth targets
 18: 90-93% meet or exceed individualized growth targets

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

17: 86-89% meet or exceed individualized growth targets
 16: 82-85% meet or exceed individualized growth targets
 15: 78-81% meet or exceed individualized growth targets

14: 74-77% meet or exceed individualized growth targets
 13: 70-73% meet or exceed individualized growth targets
 12: 65-69% meet or exceed individualized growth targets
 11: 60-64% meet or exceed individualized growth targets
 10: 55-59% meet or exceed individualized growth targets
 9: 50-54% meet or exceed individualized growth targets

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

8: 45-49% meet or exceed individualized growth targets
 7: 40-44% meet or exceed individualized growth targets
 6: 35-39% meet or exceed individualized growth targets
 5: 30-34% meet or exceed individualized growth targets
 4: 25-29% meet or exceed individualized growth targets
 3: 19-24% meet or exceed individualized growth targets

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

2: 13-18% meet or exceed individualized growth targets
 1: 7-12% meet or exceed individualized growth targets
 0: 0-6% meet or exceed individualized growth targets

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 administration, in collaboration with the teachers, will establish individualized student growth targets. These targets will be determined based on pre-assessment baseline data collected at the beginning of the school year. Then based on the percentage of students who meet or exceeded their individualized growth targets, a corresponding 0-20 HEDI score will be determined using the conversion tables below.

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

20: 98-100% meet or exceed individualized growth targets
 19: 94-97% meet or exceed individualized growth targets
 18: 90-93% meet or exceed individualized growth targets

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

17: 86-89% meet or exceed individualized growth targets
 16: 82-85% meet or exceed individualized growth targets
 15: 78-81% meet or exceed individualized growth targets
 14: 74-77% meet or exceed individualized growth targets
 13: 70-73% meet or exceed individualized growth targets
 12: 65-69% meet or exceed individualized growth targets
 11: 60-64% meet or exceed individualized growth targets

| | |
|--|--|
| | 10: 55-59% meet or exceed individualized growth targets 9: 50-54% meet or exceed individualized growth targets |
| Developing (3 - 8 points) Results are below District goals for similar students. | 8: 45-49% meet or exceed individualized growth targets 7: 40-44% meet or exceed individualized growth targets 6: 35-39% meet or exceed individualized growth targets 5: 30-34% meet or exceed individualized growth targets 4: 25-29% meet or exceed individualized growth targets 3: 19-24% meet or exceed individualized growth targets |
| Ineffective (0 - 2 points) Results are well-below District goals for similar students. | 2: 13-18% meet or exceed individualized growth targets 1: 7-12% meet or exceed individualized growth targets 0: 0-6% meet or exceed individualized growth targets |

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 administration, in collaboration with the teachers, will establish individualized student growth targets. These targets will be determined based on pre-assessment baseline data collected at the beginning of the school year. Then based on the percentage of students who meet or exceeded their individualized growth targets, a corresponding 0-20 HEDI score will be determined using the conversion tables below. |
| Highly Effective (18 - 20 points) Results are well-above District goals for similar students. | 20: 98-100% meet or exceed individualized growth targets 19: 94-97% meet or exceed individualized growth targets 18: 90-93% meet or exceed individualized growth targets |
| Effective (9 - 17 points) Results meet District goals for similar students. | 17: 86-89% meet or exceed individualized growth targets 16: 82-85% meet or exceed individualized growth targets 15: 78-81% meet or exceed individualized growth targets 14: 74-77% meet or exceed individualized growth targets 13: 70-73% meet or exceed individualized growth targets 12: 65-69% meet or exceed individualized growth targets 11: 60-64% meet or exceed individualized growth targets 10: 55-59% meet or exceed individualized growth targets 9: 50-54% meet or exceed individualized growth targets |
| Developing (3 - 8 points) Results are below District goals for similar students. | 8: 45-49% meet or exceed individualized growth targets 7: 40-44% meet or exceed individualized growth targets 6: 35-39% meet or exceed individualized growth targets |

5: 30-34% meet or exceed individualized growth targets
 4: 25-29% meet or exceed individualized growth targets
 3: 19-24% meet or exceed individualized growth targets
 2: 13-18% meet or exceed individualized growth targets
 1: 7-12% meet or exceed individualized growth targets
 0: 0-6% meet or exceed individualized growth targets

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

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 | Huntington UFSD-developed Grade 9 Summative ELA Assessment |
| Grade 10 ELA | District, regional or BOCES-developed assessment | Huntington UFSD-developed Grade 10 Summative ELA Assessment |
| 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 subcomponent. If needed, you may upload a table or graphic at 2.11, below. | The administration, in collaboration with the teachers, will establish individualized student growth targets. These targets will be determined based on pre-assessment baseline data collected at the beginning of the school year. Then based on the percentage of students who meet or exceeded their individualized growth targets, a corresponding 0-20 HEDI score will be determined using the conversion tables below. |
| Highly Effective (18 - 20 points) Results are well-above District goals for similar students. | 20: 98-100% meet or exceed individualized growth targets 19: 94-97% meet or exceed individualized growth targets 18: 90-93% meet or exceed individualized growth targets |
| Effective (9 - 17 points) Results meet District goals for similar students. | 17: 86-89% meet or exceed individualized growth targets 16: 82-85% meet or exceed individualized growth targets 15: 78-81% meet or exceed individualized growth targets 14: 74-77% meet or exceed individualized growth targets 13: 70-73% meet or exceed individualized growth targets 12: 65-69% meet or exceed individualized growth targets 11: 60-64% meet or exceed individualized growth targets 10: 55-59% meet or exceed individualized growth targets 9: 50-54% meet or exceed individualized growth targets |
| Developing (3 - 8 points) Results are below District goals for similar students. | 8: 45-49% meet or exceed individualized growth targets 7: 40-44% meet or exceed individualized growth targets 6: 35-39% meet or exceed individualized growth targets 5: 30-34% meet or exceed individualized growth targets 4: 25-29% meet or exceed individualized growth targets |

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

2: 13-18% meet or exceed individualized growth targets
1: 7-12% meet or exceed individualized growth targets
0: 0-6% meet or exceed individualized growth targets

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

(No response)

2.11) HEDI Tables or Graphics

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

(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.

Students' prior academic history and baseline assessment data will be used to set differentiated/individualized student growth targets.

2.13) Teachers with more than one growth measure

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

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

2.14) Assurances

Please check all of the boxes below:

| | |
|---|---------|
| 2.14) Assurances Assure the application of locally developed controls will be rigorous, fair, and transparent and only those used for State Growth will be used for Comparable Growth Measures. | Checked |
|---|---------|

| | |
|---|---------|
| 2.14) Assurances Assure that use of locally developed controls will not have a disparate impact on underrepresented students in accordance with applicable civil rights laws. | Checked |
|---|---------|

| | |
|--|---------|
| 2.14) Assurances Assure that enrolled students in accordance with teacher of record policies are included and may not be excluded. | Checked |
|--|---------|

| | |
|--|---------|
| 2.14) Assurances Assure that procedures for ensuring data accuracy and integrity are being utilized. | Checked |
| 2.14) Assurances Assure that district will develop SLOs according to the rules established by SED (see: http://usny.nysed.gov/rttt/teachers-leaders/slo/home.html). | Checked |
| 2.14) Assurances Assure that past academic performance and/or baseline academic data of students will be taken into account when developing an SLO. | Checked |
| 2.14) Assurances Assure that the process for assigning points for SLOs for the Growth Subcomponent will use the narrative HEDI descriptions described in the regulations to effectively differentiate educators in ways that improve student learning and instruction. | Checked |
| 2.14) Assurances Assure that it is possible for an educator to earn each point, including 0, for SLOs in the Growth subcomponent scoring range. | Checked |
| 2.14) Assurances Assure that processes are in place to monitor SLOs to ensure rigor and comparability across classrooms. | Checked |

3. Local Measures (Teachers)

Created Thursday, May 03, 2012

Updated Monday, November 26, 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 | AIMSweb |
| 5 | 4) State-approved 3rd party assessments | AIMSweb |
| 6 | 4) State-approved 3rd party assessments | AIMSweb |
| 7 | 4) State-approved 3rd party assessments | iReady Diagnostic Assessment |
| 8 | 4) State-approved 3rd party assessments | iReady Diagnostic Assessment |

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

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

| | |
|--|--|
| Use this box, if needed, to describe the general process for assigning HEDI categories for these grades/subjects in this subcomponent. If needed, you may upload a table or graphic at 3.3, below. | The administration, in collaboration with the teachers, will establish individualized student growth targets. These targets will be determined based on pre-assessment baseline data collected at the beginning of the school year. Then based on the percentage of students who meet or exceed their individualized growth targets, a corresponding 0-15 HEDI score will be determined using the conversion tables below. |
| Highly Effective (14 - 15 points) Results are well above District- or BOCES-adopted expectations for growth or achievement for grade/subject. | 15: 92-100% meet or exceed individualized growth targets 14: 83-91% meet or exceed individualized growth targets |
| Effective (8- 13 points) Results meet District- or BOCES-adopted expectations for growth or achievement for grade/subject. | 13: 74-82% meet or exceed individualized growth targets 12: 65-73% meet or exceed individualized growth targets 11: 55-64% meet or exceed individualized growth targets 10: 49-54% meet or exceed individualized growth targets 9: 43-48% meet or exceed individualized growth targets 8: 37-42% meet or exceed individualized growth targets |
| Developing (3 - 7 points) Results are below District- or BOCES-adopted expectations for growth or achievement for grade/subject. | 7: 31-36% meet or exceed individualized growth targets 6: 25-30% meet or exceed individualized growth targets 5: 20-24% meet or exceed individualized growth targets 4: 15-19% meet or exceed individualized growth targets 3: 11-14% meet or exceed individualized growth targets |
| Ineffective (0 - 2 points) Results are well below District- or BOCES-adopted expectations for growth or achievement for grade/subject. | 2: 7-10% meet or exceed individualized growth targets 1: 3-6% meet or exceed individualized growth targets 0: 0-2% meet or exceed individualized growth targets |

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 | AIMSweb |
| 5 | 4) State-approved 3rd party assessments | AIMSweb |
| 6 | 4) State-approved 3rd party assessments | AIMSweb |
| 7 | 4) State-approved 3rd party assessments | iReady Diagnostic Assessment |
| 8 | 4) State-approved 3rd party assessments | iReady Diagnostic Assessment |

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

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

| | |
|--|--|
| Use this box, if needed, to describe the general process for assigning HEDI categories for these grades/subjects in this subcomponent. If needed, you may upload a table or graphic at 3.3, below. | The administration, in collaboration with the teachers, will establish individualized student growth targets. These targets will be determined based on pre-assessment baseline data collected at the beginning of the school year. Then based on the percentage of students who meet or exceeded their individualized growth targets, a corresponding 0-15 HEDI score will be determined using the conversion tables below. |
| Highly Effective (14 - 15 points) Results are well above District- or BOCES-adopted expectations for growth or achievement for grade/subject. | 15: 92-100% meet or exceed individualized growth targets 14: 83-91% meet or exceed individualized growth targets |
| Effective (8- 13 points) Results meet District- or BOCES-adopted expectations for growth or achievement for grade/subject. | 13: 74-82% meet or exceed individualized growth targets 12: 65-73% meet or exceed individualized growth targets 11: 55-64% meet or exceed individualized growth targets 10: 49-54% meet or exceed individualized growth targets 9: 43-48% meet or exceed individualized growth targets 8: 37-42% meet or exceed individualized growth targets |
| Developing (3 - 7 points) Results are below District- or BOCES-adopted expectations for growth or achievement for grade/subject. | 7: 31-36% meet or exceed individualized growth targets 6: 25-30% meet or exceed individualized growth targets 5: 20-24% meet or exceed individualized growth targets 4: 15-19% meet or exceed individualized growth targets 3: 11-14% meet or exceed individualized growth targets |
| Ineffective (0 - 2 points) Results are well below District- or BOCES-adopted expectations for growth or achievement for grade/subject. | 2: 7-10% meet or exceed individualized growth targets 1: 3-6% meet or exceed individualized growth targets 0: 0-2% meet or exceed individualized growth targets |

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 | AIMSweb |
| 1 | 4) State-approved 3rd party assessments | AIMSweb |
| 2 | 4) State-approved 3rd party assessments | AIMSweb |
| 3 | 4) State-approved 3rd party assessments | AIMSweb |

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

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

| | |
|--|--|
| <p>Use this box, if needed, to describe the general process for assigning HEDI categories for these grades/subjects in this subcomponent. If needed, you may upload a table or graphic at 3.13, below.</p> | <p>AIMSweb will be providing a proficiency benchmark (an "average" rating) based on national assessment data. Based on the percentage of students who meet or exceed the proficiency benchmark, a corresponding 0-20 HEDI score will be determined using the conversion chart below.</p> |
| <p>Highly Effective (18-20 points) Results are well above District- or BOCES-adopted expectations for growth or achievement for grade/subject.</p> | <p>For all teachers, except those with special class assignments: 20: 98-100% meet or exceed proficiency benchmark (average rating) 19: 94-97% meet or exceed proficiency benchmark (average rating) 18: 90-93% meet or exceed proficiency benchmark (average rating)</p> <p>Teachers assigned to special class: 20: 94-100% meet or exceed proficiency benchmark (average rating) 19: 87-93% meet or exceed proficiency benchmark (average rating) 18: 80-86% meet or exceed proficiency benchmark (average rating)</p> |
| <p>Effective (9-17 points) Results meet District- or BOCES-adopted expectations for growth or achievement for grade/subject.</p> | <p>For all teachers, except those with special class assignments: 17: 86-89% meet or exceed proficiency benchmark (average rating) 16: 82-85% meet or exceed proficiency benchmark (average rating) 15: 78-81% meet or exceed proficiency benchmark (average rating) 14: 74-77% meet or exceed proficiency benchmark (average rating) 13: 70-73% meet or exceed proficiency benchmark (average rating) 12: 65-69% meet or exceed proficiency benchmark (average rating) 11: 60-64% meet or exceed proficiency benchmark (average rating) 10: 55-59% meet or exceed proficiency benchmark (average rating) 9: 50-54% meet or exceed proficiency benchmark (average rating)</p> <p>Teachers assigned to special class: 17: 73-79% meet or exceed proficiency benchmark (average rating) 16: 66-72% meet or exceed proficiency benchmark (average rating) 15: 59-65% meet or exceed proficiency benchmark (average rating) 14: 53-58% meet or exceed proficiency benchmark</p> |

(average rating)
13: 50-52% meet or exceed proficiency benchmark
(average rating)
12: 47-49% meet or exceed proficiency benchmark
(average rating)
11: 44-46% meet or exceed proficiency benchmark
(average rating)
10: 41-43% meet or exceed proficiency benchmark
(average rating)
9: 38-40% meet or exceed proficiency benchmark
(average rating)

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

For all teachers, except those with special class assignments:
8: 45-49% meet or exceed proficiency benchmark
(average rating)
7: 40-44% meet or exceed proficiency benchmark
(average rating)
6: 35-39% meet or exceed proficiency benchmark
(average rating)
5: 30-34% meet or exceed proficiency benchmark
(average rating)
4: 25-29% meet or exceed proficiency benchmark
(average rating)
3: 19-24% meet or exceed proficiency benchmark
(average rating)

Teachers assigned to special class:
8: 34-37% meet or exceed proficiency benchmark
(average rating)
7: 30-33% meet or exceed proficiency benchmark
(average rating)
6: 26-29% meet or exceed proficiency benchmark
(average rating)
5: 22-25% meet or exceed proficiency benchmark
(average rating)
4: 18-21% meet or exceed proficiency benchmark
(average rating)
3: 14-17% meet or exceed proficiency benchmark
(average rating)

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

For all teachers, except those with special class assignments:
2: 13-18% meet or exceed proficiency benchmark
(average rating)
1: 7-12% meet or exceed proficiency benchmark (average rating)
0: 0-6% meet or exceed proficiency benchmark (average rating)

Teachers assigned to special class:
2: 10-13% meet or exceed proficiency benchmark
(average rating)
1: 6-9% meet or exceed proficiency benchmark (average rating)
0: 0-5% meet or exceed proficiency benchmark (average rating)

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 | AIMSweb |
| 1 | 4) State-approved 3rd party assessments | AIMSweb |
| 2 | 4) State-approved 3rd party assessments | AIMSweb |
| 3 | 4) State-approved 3rd party assessments | AIMSweb |

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. | AIMSweb will be providing a proficiency benchmark (an "average" rating) based on national assessment data. Based on the percentage of students who meet or exceed the proficiency benchmark, a corresponding 0-20 HEDI score will be determined using the conversion chart below. |
| Highly Effective (18-20 points) Results are well above District- or BOCES-adopted expectations for growth or achievement for grade/subject. | <p>For all teachers, except those with special class assignments:</p> <p>20: 98-100% meet or exceed proficiency benchmark (average rating)</p> <p>19: 94-97% meet or exceed proficiency benchmark (average rating)</p> <p>18: 90-93% meet or exceed proficiency benchmark (average rating)</p> <p>Teachers assigned to special class:</p> <p>20: 94-100% meet or exceed proficiency benchmark (average rating)</p> <p>19: 87-93% meet or exceed proficiency benchmark (average rating)</p> <p>18: 80-86% meet or exceed proficiency benchmark (average rating)</p> |
| Effective (9-17 points) Results meet District- or BOCES-adopted expectations for growth or achievement for grade/subject. | <p>For all teachers, except those with special class assignments:</p> <p>17: 86-89% meet or exceed proficiency benchmark (average rating)</p> <p>16: 82-85% meet or exceed proficiency benchmark (average rating)</p> <p>15: 78-81% meet or exceed proficiency benchmark (average rating)</p> <p>14: 74-77% meet or exceed proficiency benchmark (average rating)</p> <p>13: 70-73% meet or exceed proficiency benchmark (average rating)</p> <p>12: 65-69% meet or exceed proficiency benchmark (average rating)</p> <p>11: 60-64% meet or exceed proficiency benchmark (average rating)</p> |

10: 55-59% meet or exceed proficiency benchmark (average rating)
9: 50-54% meet or exceed proficiency benchmark (average rating)

Teachers assigned to special class:

17: 73-79% meet or exceed proficiency benchmark (average rating)
16: 66-72% meet or exceed proficiency benchmark (average rating)
15: 59-65% meet or exceed proficiency benchmark (average rating)
14: 53-58% meet or exceed proficiency benchmark (average rating)
13: 50-52% meet or exceed proficiency benchmark (average rating)
12: 47-49% meet or exceed proficiency benchmark (average rating)
11: 44-46% meet or exceed proficiency benchmark (average rating)
10: 41-43% meet or exceed proficiency benchmark (average rating)
9: 38-40% meet or exceed proficiency benchmark (average rating)

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

For all teachers, except those with special class assignments:

8: 45-49% meet or exceed proficiency benchmark (average rating)
7: 40-44% meet or exceed proficiency benchmark (average rating)
6: 35-39% meet or exceed proficiency benchmark (average rating)
5: 30-34% meet or exceed proficiency benchmark (average rating)
4: 25-29% meet or exceed proficiency benchmark (average rating)
3: 19-24% meet or exceed proficiency benchmark (average rating)

Teachers assigned to special class:

8: 34-37% meet or exceed proficiency benchmark (average rating)
7: 30-33% meet or exceed proficiency benchmark (average rating)
6: 26-29% meet or exceed proficiency benchmark (average rating)
5: 22-25% meet or exceed proficiency benchmark (average rating)
4: 18-21% meet or exceed proficiency benchmark (average rating)
3: 14-17% meet or exceed proficiency benchmark (average rating)

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

For all teachers, except those with special class assignments:

2: 13-18% meet or exceed proficiency benchmark (average rating)
1: 7-12% meet or exceed proficiency benchmark (average rating)
0: 0-6% meet or exceed proficiency benchmark (average rating)

rating)

Teachers assigned to special class:

2: 10-13% meet or exceed proficiency benchmark (average rating)

1: 6-9% meet or exceed proficiency benchmark (average rating)

0: 0-5% meet or exceed proficiency benchmark (average rating)

3.6) Grades 6-8 Science

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

| | Locally-Selected Measure from List of Approved Measures | Assessment |
|---|--|--|
| 6 | 5) District, regional, or BOCES–developed assessments | Huntington UFSD-Developed Grade 6 Summative Science Assessment |
| 7 | 5) District, regional, or BOCES–developed assessments | Huntington UFSD-Developed Grade 8 Summative Science Assessment |
| 8 | 3) Teacher specific achievement or growth score computed locally | NYS Grade 8 Science Assessment |

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

| | |
|---|--|
| Use this box, if needed, to describe the general process for assigning HEDI categories for these grades/subjects in this subcomponent. If needed, you may upload a table or graphic at 3.13, below. | For grade 6 and 7 students, a proficiency benchmark of 65 or higher will be established. For grade 8 students, a proficiency benchmark of level 3 or higher will be established. Based on the percentage of students who meet or exceed the proficiency benchmark, a corresponding 0-20 HEDI score will be determined using the conversion chart below, which differentiates between students scoring 65 or higher on the prior year's final science assessment and those scoring 64 or below on the same. We will take the HEDI scores for each of the two groups (65 or higher/64 or below) and weight them proportionately to determine the final HEDI score. |
| Highly Effective (18 - 20 points) Results are well above District- or BOCES-adopted expectations for growth or achievement for grade/subject. | Students scoring 65 or higher on prior year summative assessment: 20: 98-100% meet or exceed proficiency benchmark 19: 94-97% meet or exceed proficiency benchmark 18: 90-93% meet or exceed proficiency benchmark Students scoring 64 or below on prior year summative assessment: 20: 94-100% meet or exceed proficiency benchmark 19: 87-93% meet or exceed proficiency benchmark 18: 80-86% meet or exceed proficiency benchmark |
| Effective (9 - 17 points) Results meet District- or BOCES-adopted expectations for growth or achievement for grade/subject. | Students scoring 65 or higher on prior year summative assessment: 17: 86-89% meet or exceed proficiency benchmark |

16: 82-85% meet or exceed proficiency benchmark
 15: 78-81% meet or exceed proficiency benchmark
 14: 74-77% meet or exceed proficiency benchmark
 13: 70-73% meet or exceed proficiency benchmark
 12: 65-69% meet or exceed proficiency benchmark
 11: 60-64% meet or exceed proficiency benchmark
 10: 55-59% meet or exceed proficiency benchmark
 9: 50-54% meet or exceed proficiency benchmark

Students scoring 64 or below on prior year summative assessment:

17: 73-79% meet or exceed proficiency benchmark
 16: 66-72% meet or exceed proficiency benchmark
 15: 59-65% meet or exceed proficiency benchmark
 14: 53-58% meet or exceed proficiency benchmark
 13: 50-52% meet or exceed proficiency benchmark
 12: 47-49% meet or exceed proficiency benchmark
 11: 44-46% meet or exceed proficiency benchmark
 10: 41-43% meet or exceed proficiency benchmark
 9: 38-40% meet or exceed proficiency benchmark

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

Students scoring 65 or higher on prior year summative assessment:

8: 45-49% meet or exceed proficiency benchmark
 7: 40-44% meet or exceed proficiency benchmark
 6: 35-39% meet or exceed proficiency benchmark
 5: 30-34% meet or exceed proficiency benchmark
 4: 25-29% meet or exceed proficiency benchmark
 3: 19-24% meet or exceed proficiency benchmark

Students scoring 64 or below on prior year summative assessment:

8: 34-37% meet or exceed proficiency benchmark
 7: 30-33% meet or exceed proficiency benchmark
 6: 26-29% meet or exceed proficiency benchmark
 5: 22-25% meet or exceed proficiency benchmark
 4: 18-21% meet or exceed proficiency benchmark
 3: 14-17% meet or exceed proficiency benchmark

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

Students scoring 65 or higher on prior year summative assessment:

2: 13-18% meet or exceed proficiency benchmark
 1: 7-12% meet or exceed proficiency benchmark
 0: 0-6% meet or exceed proficiency benchmark

Students scoring 64 or below on prior year summative assessment:

2: 10-13% meet or exceed proficiency benchmark
 1: 6-9% meet or exceed proficiency benchmark
 0: 0-5% meet or exceed proficiency benchmark

3.7) Grades 6-8 Social Studies

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

| | Locally-Selected Measure from List of Approved Measures | Assessment |
|---|---|---|
| 6 | 5) District, regional, or BOCES–developed assessments | Huntington UFSD-Developed Grade 6 Summative Social Studies Assessment |

| | | |
|---|---|---|
| 7 | 5) District, regional, or BOCES–developed assessments | Huntington UFSD-Developed Grade 7 Summative Social Studies Assessment |
| 8 | 5) District, regional, or BOCES–developed assessments | Huntington UFSD-Developed Grade 8 Summative Social Studies Assessment |

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

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

| | |
|--|--|
| <p>Use this box, if needed, to describe the general process for assigning HEDI categories for these grades/subjects in this subcomponent. If needed, you may upload a table or graphic at 3.13, below.</p> | <p>For grade 6 and 7 students, a proficiency benchmark of 65 or higher will be established. For grade 8 students, a proficiency benchmark of level 3 or higher will be established. Based on the percentage of students who meet or exceed the proficiency benchmark, a corresponding 0-20 HEDI score will be determined using the conversion chart below, which differentiates between students scoring 65 or higher on the prior year's final science assessment and those scoring 64 or below on the same. We will take the HEDI scores for each of the two groups (65 or higher/64 or below) and weight them proportionately to determine the final HEDI score.</p> |
| <p>Highly Effective (18 - 20 points) Results are well above District- or BOCES-adopted expectations for growth or achievement for grade/subject.</p> | <p>Students scoring 65 or higher on prior year summative assessment: 20: 98-100% meet or exceed proficiency benchmark 19: 94-97% meet or exceed proficiency benchmark 18: 90-93% meet or exceed proficiency benchmark</p> <p>Students scoring 64 or below on prior year summative assessment: 20: 94-100% meet or exceed proficiency benchmark 19: 87-93% meet or exceed proficiency benchmark 18: 80-86% meet or exceed proficiency benchmark</p> |
| <p>Effective (9 - 17 points) Results meet District- or BOCES-adopted expectations for growth or achievement for grade/subject.</p> | <p>Students scoring 65 or higher on prior year summative assessment: 17: 86-89% meet or exceed proficiency benchmark 16: 82-85% meet or exceed proficiency benchmark 15: 78-81% meet or exceed proficiency benchmark 14: 74-77% meet or exceed proficiency benchmark 13: 70-73% meet or exceed proficiency benchmark 12: 65-69% meet or exceed proficiency benchmark 11: 60-64% meet or exceed proficiency benchmark 10: 55-59% meet or exceed proficiency benchmark 9: 50-54% meet or exceed proficiency benchmark</p> <p>Students scoring 64 or below on prior year summative assessment: 17: 73-79% meet or exceed proficiency benchmark 16: 66-72% meet or exceed proficiency benchmark 15: 59-65% meet or exceed proficiency benchmark 14: 53-58% meet or exceed proficiency benchmark 13: 50-52% meet or exceed proficiency benchmark 12: 47-49% meet or exceed proficiency benchmark</p> |

11: 44-46% meet or exceed proficiency benchmark
 10: 41-43% meet or exceed proficiency benchmark
 9: 38-40% meet or exceed proficiency benchmark

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

Students scoring 65 or higher on prior year summative assessment:

8: 45-49% meet or exceed proficiency benchmark
 7: 40-44% meet or exceed proficiency benchmark
 6: 35-39% meet or exceed proficiency benchmark
 5: 30-34% meet or exceed proficiency benchmark
 4: 25-29% meet or exceed proficiency benchmark
 3: 19-24% meet or exceed proficiency benchmark

Students scoring 64 or below on prior year summative assessment:

8: 34-37% meet or exceed proficiency benchmark
 7: 30-33% meet or exceed proficiency benchmark
 6: 26-29% meet or exceed proficiency benchmark
 5: 22-25% meet or exceed proficiency benchmark
 4: 18-21% meet or exceed proficiency benchmark
 3: 14-17% meet or exceed proficiency benchmark

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

Students scoring 65 or higher on prior year summative assessment:

2: 13-18% meet or exceed proficiency benchmark
 1: 7-12% meet or exceed proficiency benchmark
 0: 0-6% meet or exceed proficiency benchmark

Students scoring 64 or below on prior year summative assessment:

2: 10-13% meet or exceed proficiency benchmark
 1: 6-9% meet or exceed proficiency benchmark
 0: 0-5% meet or exceed proficiency benchmark

3.8) High School Social Studies

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

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

| | Locally-Selected Measure from List of Approved Measures | Assessment |
|------------------|--|---|
| Global 1 | 5) District, regional, or BOCES–developed assessments | Huntington UFSD-Developed Summative Global 1 Assessment |
| Global 2 | 3) Teacher specific achievement or growth score computed locally | NYS Global History Geography Regents Examination |
| American History | 3) Teacher specific achievement or growth score computed locally | NYS US History Government Regents Examination |

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.

| | |
|--|--|
| <p>Use this box, if needed, to describe the general process for assigning HEDI categories for these grades/subjects in this subcomponent. If needed, you may upload a table or graphic at 3.13, below.</p> | <p>A proficiency benchmark of 65 or higher will be established. Based on the percentage of students who meet or exceed the proficiency benchmark, a corresponding 0-20 HEDI score will be determined using the conversion chart below, which differentiates between students scoring 65 or higher on the prior year's final science assessment and those scoring 64 or below on the same. We will take the HEDI scores for each of the two groups (65 or higher/64 or below) and weight them proportionately to determine the final HEDI score.</p> |
| <p>Highly Effective (18 - 20 points) Results are well above District- or BOCES-adopted expectations for growth or achievement for grade/subject.</p> | <p>Students scoring 65 or higher on prior year summative assessment: 20: 98-100% meet or exceed proficiency benchmark 19: 94-97% meet or exceed proficiency benchmark 18: 90-93% meet or exceed proficiency benchmark</p> <p>Students scoring 64 or below on prior year summative assessment: 20: 94-100% meet or exceed proficiency benchmark 19: 87-93% meet or exceed proficiency benchmark 18: 80-86% meet or exceed proficiency benchmark</p> |
| <p>Effective (9 - 17 points) Results meet District- or BOCES-adopted expectations for growth or achievement for grade/subject.</p> | <p>Students scoring 65 or higher on prior year summative assessment: 17: 86-89% meet or exceed proficiency benchmark 16: 82-85% meet or exceed proficiency benchmark 15: 78-81% meet or exceed proficiency benchmark 14: 74-77% meet or exceed proficiency benchmark 13: 70-73% meet or exceed proficiency benchmark 12: 65-69% meet or exceed proficiency benchmark 11: 60-64% meet or exceed proficiency benchmark 10: 55-59% meet or exceed proficiency benchmark 9: 50-54% meet or exceed proficiency benchmark</p> <p>Students scoring 64 or below on prior year summative assessment: 17: 73-79% meet or exceed proficiency benchmark 16: 66-72% meet or exceed proficiency benchmark 15: 59-65% meet or exceed proficiency benchmark 14: 53-58% meet or exceed proficiency benchmark 13: 50-52% meet or exceed proficiency benchmark 12: 47-49% meet or exceed proficiency benchmark 11: 44-46% meet or exceed proficiency benchmark 10: 41-43% meet or exceed proficiency benchmark 9: 38-40% meet or exceed proficiency benchmark</p> |
| <p>Developing (3 - 8 points) Results are below District- or BOCES-adopted expectations for growth or achievement for grade/subject.</p> | <p>Students scoring 65 or higher on prior year summative assessment: 8: 45-49% meet or exceed proficiency benchmark 7: 40-44% meet or exceed proficiency benchmark 6: 35-39% meet or exceed proficiency benchmark 5: 30-34% meet or exceed proficiency benchmark 4: 25-29% meet or exceed proficiency benchmark 3: 19-24% meet or exceed proficiency benchmark</p> <p>Students scoring 64 or below on prior year summative assessment:</p> |

8: 34-37% meet or exceed proficiency benchmark
 7: 30-33% meet or exceed proficiency benchmark
 6: 26-29% meet or exceed proficiency benchmark
 5: 22-25% meet or exceed proficiency benchmark
 4: 18-21% meet or exceed proficiency benchmark
 3: 14-17% meet or exceed proficiency benchmark

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

Students scoring 65 or higher on prior year summative assessment:

2: 13-18% meet or exceed proficiency benchmark
 1: 7-12% meet or exceed proficiency benchmark
 0: 0-6% meet or exceed proficiency benchmark

Students scoring 64 or below on prior year summative assessment:

2: 10-13% meet or exceed proficiency benchmark
 1: 6-9% meet or exceed proficiency benchmark
 0: 0-5% meet or exceed proficiency benchmark

3.9) High School Science

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

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

| | Locally-Selected Measure from List of Approved Measures | Assessment |
|--------------------|--|--|
| Living Environment | 3) Teacher specific achievement or growth score computed locally | NYS Living Environment Regents Examination |
| Earth Science | 3) Teacher specific achievement or growth score computed locally | NYS Physical Setting Earth Science Examination |
| Chemistry | 3) Teacher specific achievement or growth score computed locally | NYS Physical Setting Chemistry Regents Examination |
| Physics | 3) Teacher specific achievement or growth score computed locally | NYS Physical Setting Physics Regents Examination |

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.

A proficiency benchmark of 65 or higher will be established. Based on the percentage of students who meet or exceed the proficiency benchmark, a corresponding 0-20 HEDI score will be determined using the conversion chart below, which differentiates between students scoring 65 or higher on the prior year's final science assessment and those scoring 64 or below on the

same. We will take the HEDI scores for each of the two groups (65 or higher/64 or below) and weight them proportionately to determine the final HEDI score.

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

Students scoring 65 or higher on prior year summative assessment:

- 20: 98-100% meet or exceed proficiency benchmark
- 19: 94-97% meet or exceed proficiency benchmark
- 18: 90-93% meet or exceed proficiency benchmark

Students scoring 64 or below on prior year summative assessment:

- 20: 94-100% meet or exceed proficiency benchmark
- 19: 87-93% meet or exceed proficiency benchmark
- 18: 80-86% meet or exceed proficiency benchmark

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

Students scoring 65 or higher on prior year summative assessment:

- 17: 86-89% meet or exceed proficiency benchmark
- 16: 82-85% meet or exceed proficiency benchmark
- 15: 78-81% meet or exceed proficiency benchmark
- 14: 74-77% meet or exceed proficiency benchmark
- 13: 70-73% meet or exceed proficiency benchmark
- 12: 65-69% meet or exceed proficiency benchmark
- 11: 60-64% meet or exceed proficiency benchmark
- 10: 55-59% meet or exceed proficiency benchmark
- 9: 50-54% meet or exceed proficiency benchmark

Students scoring 64 or below on prior year summative assessment:

- 17: 73-79% meet or exceed proficiency benchmark
- 16: 66-72% meet or exceed proficiency benchmark
- 15: 59-65% meet or exceed proficiency benchmark
- 14: 53-58% meet or exceed proficiency benchmark
- 13: 50-52% meet or exceed proficiency benchmark
- 12: 47-49% meet or exceed proficiency benchmark
- 11: 44-46% meet or exceed proficiency benchmark
- 10: 41-43% meet or exceed proficiency benchmark
- 9: 38-40% meet or exceed proficiency benchmark

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

Students scoring 65 or higher on prior year summative assessment:

- 8: 45-49% meet or exceed proficiency benchmark
- 7: 40-44% meet or exceed proficiency benchmark
- 6: 35-39% meet or exceed proficiency benchmark
- 5: 30-34% meet or exceed proficiency benchmark
- 4: 25-29% meet or exceed proficiency benchmark
- 3: 19-24% meet or exceed proficiency benchmark

Students scoring 64 or below on prior year summative assessment:

- 8: 34-37% meet or exceed proficiency benchmark
- 7: 30-33% meet or exceed proficiency benchmark
- 6: 26-29% meet or exceed proficiency benchmark
- 5: 22-25% meet or exceed proficiency benchmark
- 4: 18-21% meet or exceed proficiency benchmark
- 3: 14-17% meet or exceed proficiency benchmark

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

Students scoring 65 or higher on prior year summative assessment:

- 2: 13-18% meet or exceed proficiency benchmark
- 1: 7-12% meet or exceed proficiency benchmark

0: 0-6% meet or exceed proficiency benchmark

Students scoring 64 or below on prior year summative assessment:

2: 10-13% meet or exceed proficiency benchmark

1: 6-9% meet or exceed proficiency benchmark

0: 0-5% meet or exceed proficiency benchmark

3.10) High School Math

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

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

| | Locally-Selected Measure from List of Approved Measures | Assessment |
|-----------|--|--|
| Algebra 1 | 3) Teacher specific achievement or growth score computed locally | NYS Integrated Algebra Regents Examination |
| Geometry | 3) Teacher specific achievement or growth score computed locally | NYS Geometry Regents |
| Algebra 2 | 3) Teacher specific achievement or growth score computed locally | NYS Algebra 2 Trigonometry Regents |

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

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

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

A proficiency benchmark of 65 or higher will be established. Based on the percentage of students who meet or exceed the proficiency benchmark, a corresponding 0-20 HEDI score will be determined using the conversion chart below, which differentiates between students scoring 65 or higher on the prior year's final science assessment and those scoring 64 or below on the same. We will take the HEDI scores for each of the two groups (65 or higher/64 or below) and weight them proportionately to determine the final HEDI score.

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

Students scoring 65 or higher on prior year summative assessment:
20: 98-100% meet or exceed proficiency benchmark
19: 94-97% meet or exceed proficiency benchmark
18: 90-93% meet or exceed proficiency benchmark

Students scoring 64 or below on prior year summative assessment:
20: 94-100% meet or exceed proficiency benchmark
19: 87-93% meet or exceed proficiency benchmark

18: 80-86% meet or exceed proficiency benchmark

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

Students scoring 65 or higher on prior year summative assessment:

- 17: 86-89% meet or exceed proficiency benchmark
- 16: 82-85% meet or exceed proficiency benchmark
- 15: 78-81% meet or exceed proficiency benchmark
- 14: 74-77% meet or exceed proficiency benchmark
- 13: 70-73% meet or exceed proficiency benchmark
- 12: 65-69% meet or exceed proficiency benchmark
- 11: 60-64% meet or exceed proficiency benchmark
- 10: 55-59% meet or exceed proficiency benchmark
- 9: 50-54% meet or exceed proficiency benchmark

Students scoring 64 or below on prior year summative assessment:

- 17: 73-79% meet or exceed proficiency benchmark
- 16: 66-72% meet or exceed proficiency benchmark
- 15: 59-65% meet or exceed proficiency benchmark
- 14: 53-58% meet or exceed proficiency benchmark
- 13: 50-52% meet or exceed proficiency benchmark
- 12: 47-49% meet or exceed proficiency benchmark
- 11: 44-46% meet or exceed proficiency benchmark
- 10: 41-43% meet or exceed proficiency benchmark
- 9: 38-40% meet or exceed proficiency benchmark

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

Students scoring 65 or higher on prior year summative assessment:

- 8: 45-49% meet or exceed proficiency benchmark
- 7: 40-44% meet or exceed proficiency benchmark
- 6: 35-39% meet or exceed proficiency benchmark
- 5: 30-34% meet or exceed proficiency benchmark
- 4: 25-29% meet or exceed proficiency benchmark
- 3: 19-24% meet or exceed proficiency benchmark

Students scoring 64 or below on prior year summative assessment:

- 8: 34-37% meet or exceed proficiency benchmark
- 7: 30-33% meet or exceed proficiency benchmark
- 6: 26-29% meet or exceed proficiency benchmark
- 5: 22-25% meet or exceed proficiency benchmark
- 4: 18-21% meet or exceed proficiency benchmark
- 3: 14-17% meet or exceed proficiency benchmark

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

Students scoring 65 or higher on prior year summative assessment:

- 2: 13-18% meet or exceed proficiency benchmark
- 1: 7-12% meet or exceed proficiency benchmark
- 0: 0-6% meet or exceed proficiency benchmark

Students scoring 64 or below on prior year summative assessment:

- 2: 10-13% meet or exceed proficiency benchmark
- 1: 6-9% meet or exceed proficiency benchmark
- 0: 0-5% meet or exceed proficiency benchmark

3.11) High School English Language Arts

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

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

| | Locally-Selected Measure from List of Approved Measures | Assessment |
|--------------|--|---|
| Grade 9 ELA | 5) District, regional, or BOCES–developed assessments | Huntington UFSD-Developed Summative Grade 9 ELA Assessment |
| Grade 10 ELA | 5) District, regional, or BOCES–developed assessments | Huntington UFSD-Developed Summative Grade 10 ELA Assessment |
| Grade 11 ELA | 3) Teacher specific achievement or growth score computed locally | NYS Comprehensive Examination in English |

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

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

| | |
|---|--|
| Use this box, if needed, to describe the general process for assigning HEDI categories for these grades/subjects in this subcomponent. If needed, you may upload a table or graphic at 3.13, below. | A proficiency benchmark of 65 or higher will be established. Based on the percentage of students who meet or exceed the proficiency benchmark, a corresponding 0-20 HEDI score will be determined using the conversion chart below, which differentiates between students scoring 65 or higher on the prior year's final science assessment and those scoring 64 or below on the same. We will take the HEDI scores for each of the two groups (65 or higher/64 or below) and weight them proportionately to determine the final HEDI score. |
| Highly Effective (18 - 20 points) Results are well above District- or BOCES-adopted expectations for growth or achievement for grade/subject. | <p>Students scoring 65 or higher on prior year summative assessment:</p> <p>20: 98-100% meet or exceed proficiency benchmark 19: 94-97% meet or exceed proficiency benchmark 18: 90-93% meet or exceed proficiency benchmark</p> <p>Students scoring 64 or below on prior year summative assessment:</p> <p>20: 94-100% meet or exceed proficiency benchmark 19: 87-93% meet or exceed proficiency benchmark 18: 80-86% meet or exceed proficiency benchmark</p> |
| Effective (9 - 17 points) Results meet District- or BOCES-adopted expectations for growth or achievement for grade/subject. | <p>Students scoring 65 or higher on prior year summative assessment:</p> <p>17: 86-89% meet or exceed proficiency benchmark 16: 82-85% meet or exceed proficiency benchmark 15: 78-81% meet or exceed proficiency benchmark 14: 74-77% meet or exceed proficiency benchmark 13: 70-73% meet or exceed proficiency benchmark 12: 65-69% meet or exceed proficiency benchmark 11: 60-64% meet or exceed proficiency benchmark 10: 55-59% meet or exceed proficiency benchmark 9: 50-54% meet or exceed proficiency benchmark</p> <p>Students scoring 64 or below on prior year summative</p> |

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. | A proficiency benchmark of 3 or higher will be established for Advanced Placement courses. A proficiency benchmark of 65 or higher will be established for all other courses not listed above. Based on the percentage of students who meet or exceed the proficiency benchmark, a corresponding 0-20 HEDI score will be determined using the conversion chart below. |
| Highly Effective (18 - 20 points) Results are well above District- or BOCES -adopted expectations for growth or achievement for grade/subject. | 20: 98-100% meet or exceed proficiency benchmark 19: 94-97% meet or exceed proficiency benchmark 18: 90-93% meet or exceed proficiency benchmark |
| Effective (9 - 17 points) Results meet District- or BOCES-adopted expectations for growth or achievement for grade/subject. | 17: 86-89% meet or exceed proficiency benchmark 16: 82-85% meet or exceed proficiency benchmark 15: 78-81% meet or exceed proficiency benchmark 14: 74-77% meet or exceed proficiency benchmark 13: 70-73% meet or exceed proficiency benchmark 12: 65-69% meet or exceed proficiency benchmark 11: 60-64% meet or exceed proficiency benchmark 10: 55-59% meet or exceed proficiency benchmark 9: 50-54% meet or exceed proficiency benchmark |
| Developing (3 - 8 points) Results are below District- or BOCES-adopted expectations for growth or achievement for grade/subject. | 8: 45-49% meet or exceed proficiency benchmark 7: 40-44% meet or exceed proficiency benchmark 6: 35-39% meet or exceed proficiency benchmark 5: 30-34% meet or exceed proficiency benchmark 4: 25-29% meet or exceed proficiency benchmark 3: 19-24% meet or exceed proficiency benchmark |
| Ineffective (0 - 2 points) Results are well below District- or BOCES-adopted expectations for growth or achievement for grade/subject. | 2: 13-18% meet or exceed proficiency benchmark 1: 7-12% meet or exceed proficiency benchmark 0: 0-6% meet or exceed proficiency benchmark |

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

(No response)

3.13) HEDI Tables or Graphics

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

(No response)

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.

- 1) For grade K-3 ELA/Math measures, differentiated achievement targets have been established for students with disabilities in the special class setting.
- 2) For grade 4-8 ELA/Math measures, students' prior academic history and baseline assessment data will be used to set differentiated/individualized student growth targets.
- 3) For all other measures, students' prior academic history will be used to establish differentiated achievement targets. For those courses except those listed as "All Other" (3.12), students will be separated into two categories - 65 or higher/64 or below. Refer to the applicable HEDI charts.

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 any teacher who has more than one measure contributing to an overall HEDI score, each measure will be weighted proportionately based on the number of students evaluated on that measure.

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 Sunday, May 20, 2012

Updated Tuesday, November 27, 2012

Page 1

4.1) Teacher Practice Rubric

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

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

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

Danielson's Framework for Teaching (2011 Revised Edition)

(No response)

4.2) Points Within Other Measures

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

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

Is the following points assignment applicable to all teachers?

Yes

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

(No response)

| | |
|--|---------------|
| Multiple (at least two) classroom observations by principal or other trained administrator, at least one of which must be unannounced [at least 31 points] | 33 |
| 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 | 27 |

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.

For each classroom observation, domain 1-3 subcomponents will be evaluated using the 2011 Danielson (Teachscape) rubric. Criteria for determining domain and overall lesson ratings are included in Tables 4.5.1a and 4.5.1b. Domain 1-3 subcomponents will be evaluated to determine a rating for each domain (Table 4.5.1a). Domain ratings will contribute to an overall lesson rating as per Table 4.5.1b

The evaluation of a teacher's meeting his/her professional responsibilities (domain 4) will be conducted using the above-mentioned rubric and a rating assigned as per Table 4.5.1c. Artifacts will be collected and evaluated using the Danielson domain 1-4 rubrics as well.

Artifacts will include:

- Two lesson plans for lessons other than those formally observed
- Written narrative/self-assessment of their performance on Danielson rubric elements
- Parent contact log
- Reflection on goal achievement or progress toward goal achievement
- Student work sample(s)

An overall "multiple measures" subcomponent score and rating will be determined as follows:

- Each observation rating, the professional responsibility rating, and the artifact composite rating will be equated to numerical values using a four point scale - highly effective (4), effective (3), developing (2), ineffective (1).
- Using weighting factors as indicated in Table 4.5.2, weighted items will be combined to determine a total score based on a 4-point scale.
- The 4-point scaled score will be converted to 0-60 HEDI score.

(Examples for a tenured and an untenured teacher are presented in Tables 4.5.3 and 4.5.4)

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/5091/131478-eka9yMJ855/Item 4.5\(a\)_6.pdf](assets/survey-uploads/5091/131478-eka9yMJ855/Item 4.5(a)_6.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. | 60: 3.700-4.000 on four-point scale 59: 3.300-3.699 |
| Effective: Overall performance and results meet NYS Teaching Standards. | 58: 2.800-3.299 57: 2.500-2.799 |
| Developing: Overall performance and results need improvement in order to meet NYS Teaching Standards. | 56: 2.300-2.499 55: 2.200-2.299 54: 2.100-2.199 53: 1.900-2.099 52: 1.800-1.899 51: 1.600-1.799 50: 1.500-1.599 |
| Ineffective: Overall performance and results do not meet NYS Teaching Standards. | 49: 1.400-1.499 48: 1.392-1.399 47: 1.384-1.391 46: 1.376-1.383 45: 1.367-1.375 44: 1.359-1.366 43: 1.351-1.358 42: 1.343-1.350 41: 1.335-1.342 40: 1.327-1.334 39: 1.318-1.326 38: 1.310-1.317 37: 1.302-1.309 36: 1.294-1.301 35: 1.286-1.293 34: 1.278-1.285 33: 1.269-1.277 32: 1.261-1.268 31: 1.253-1.260 |

30: 1.245-1.252
 29: 1.237-1.244
 28: 1.229-1.236
 27: 1.220-1.228
 26: 1.212-1.219
 25: 1.204-1.211
 24: 1.196-1.203
 23: 1.188-1.195
 22: 1.180-1.187
 21: 1.171-1.179
 20: 1.163-1.170
 19: 1.155-1.162
 18: 1.147-1.154
 17: 1.139-1.146
 16: 1.131-1.138
 15: 1.122-1.130
 14: 1.114-1.121
 13: 1.106-1.113
 12: 1.098-1.105
 11: 1.090-1.097
 10: 1.082-1.089
 9: 1.073-1.081
 8: 1.065-1.072
 7: 1.057-1.064
 6: 1.049-1.056
 5: 1.041-1.048
 4: 1.033-1.040
 3: 1.024-1.032
 2: 1.016-1.023
 1: 1.008-1.015
 0: 1.000-1.007

Provide the ranges for the 60-point scoring bands.

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

4.6) Observations of Probationary Teachers

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

By building principals or other trained administrators

| | |
|---|---|
| 4.6) Observations of Probationary Teachers Formal/Long | 4 |
| 4.6) Observations of Probationary Teachers Informal/Short | 0 |
| 4.6) Observations of Probationary Teachers Enter Total | 4 |

By trained in-school peer teachers or other trained reviewers

| | |
|----------------|---|
| Formal/Long | 0 |
| Informal/Short | 0 |

Independent evaluators

| | |
|----------------|---|
| Formal/Long | 0 |
| Informal/Short | 0 |

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

-
- In Person
-

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

-
- 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 | 0 |
| 4.7) Observations of Tenured Teachers Total | 2 |

By trained in-school peer teachers or other trained reviewers

| | |
|----------------|---|
| Formal/Long | 0 |
| Informal/Short | 0 |

Independent evaluators

| | |
|----------------|---|
| Formal/Long | 0 |
| Informal/Short | 0 |

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

-
- In Person
-

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

-
- In Person
-

5. Composite Scoring (Teachers)

Created Sunday, May 27, 2012

Updated Wednesday, June 20, 2012

Page 1

Standards for Rating Categories

Growth or Comparable Measures

Locally-selected Measures of

growth or achievement

Other Measures of Effectiveness

(Teacher and Leader standards)

Highly

Effective

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

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

Overall performance and results exceed NYS Teaching Standards.

Effective

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

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

Overall performance and results meet NYS Teaching Standards.

Developing

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

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

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

Ineffective

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

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

Overall performance and results do not meet NYS Teaching Standards.

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

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

2012-13 where there is no Value-Added measure

Growth or Comparable Measures

Locally-selected Measures of

growth or achievement

Other Measures of Effectiveness

(60 points)

Overall

Composite Score

Highly Effective

18-20

18-20

Ranges determined locally--see below

91-100

Effective

9-17

9-17

75-90

Developing

3-8

3-8

65-74

Ineffective

0-2

0-2

0-64

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

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

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

2012-13 where Value-Added growth measure applies

Growth or Comparable Measures

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

Other Measures of Effectiveness

(60 points)

Overall

Composite Score

Highly Effective

22-25

14-15

Ranges determined locally--see above

91-100

Effective

10-21

8-13

75-90

Developing

3-9

3-7

65-74

Ineffective

0-2

0-2

0-64

6. Additional Requirements - Teachers

Created Sunday, May 27, 2012

Updated Tuesday, November 20, 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/5265/133571-Df0w3Xx5v6/Item 6.2 \(TIP\)_2.pdf](assets/survey-uploads/5265/133571-Df0w3Xx5v6/Item 6.2 (TIP)_2.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:

ANNUAL PROFESSIONAL PERFORMANCE REVIEW APPEALS

- Appeals shall be limited to those annual evaluations resulting in a rating of developing or ineffective.
- A teacher or administrator may appeal the annual evaluation to the Superintendent of Schools or his/her designee within 10 school days of its receipt. The appeal shall be in writing and shall articulate in detail the basis of the appeal. Appeals shall be limited to:
 1. the substance of the annual professional performance review;

2. the school district's failure to adhere to the standards and methodologies required for the APPR that are set forth in Education Law §3012-c, and applicable rules and regulations;
 3. the school district's failure to comply with locally negotiated procedures; and
 4. the school district's failure to issue and/or implement of the terms of a Teacher Improvement Plan, where applicable, as required under Education Law §3012-c.
- Any issue not raised in the written appeal shall be deemed waived.
 - The Superintendent of Schools or his/her designee shall render a written determination in response within 10 school days of receipt of the appeal.
 - The determination of the Superintendent of Schools or his/her designee as to the substance of the annual professional performance review shall not be grievable, arbitrable, or reviewable in any other forum.
 - A probationer shall not be permitted to appeal an evaluation during the last year of his/her probationary period.

6.4) Training and Certification of Lead Evaluators and Evaluators

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

The district has an obligation to provide the appropriate training for all evaluators and lead evaluators prior to the completion of any 2012-13 annual evaluations. For the purpose of this plan, all personnel involved in the writing of an annual evaluation for teachers and administrators will be included in such training. Lead evaluator certification and the training of evaluators will be coordinated through the office of the Superintendent as per Commissioner's Regulations. Resources for this certification and training will be included annually in the district's budget development process.

Ongoing training will include:

- Completion of the Teachscape Proficiency System (2011 Danielson Rubric), including evidence-based observer training, scoring practice, and proficiency test
- Formal professional training in use of the Reeves Leadership Performance Matrix
- Video/on-line analysis of lesson implementation and subsequent discussion
- Training in the use of the AIMSweb curriculum-based measure and iReady diagnostic assessment
- Additional professional workshops, conferences, and administrative team meetings

All training activities and hours will be logged and records maintained through the MyLearningPlan system. Lead evaluators will be certified by the Board of Education, based on appropriate training completed.

This process will be used both to certify and recertify lead evaluators in the Huntington Union Free School District, and will also be utilized to ensure inter-rater reliability.

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 Monday, May 28, 2012

Updated Tuesday, November 20, 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):

| |
|---------------|
| 5-6 |
| 7-8 |
| 9-12 |
| (No response) |
| (No response) |
| (No response) |
| (No response) |

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

Please check the boxes below:

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

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

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

State assessments, *required if one exists*

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

List of State-approved 3rd party assessments

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

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

| School or Program Type | SLO with Assessment Option | Name of the Assessment |
|------------------------|-------------------------------------|-----------------------------|
| K-4 Primary Schools | State assessment | NYS Grade 4 ELA Assessment |
| K-4 Primary Schools | State assessment | NYS Grade 4 Math Assessment |
| K-4 Primary Schools | State-approved 3rd party assessment | AIMSweb |

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 administration, in collaboration with the principals, will establish individualized AIMSweb student growth targets. These targets will be determined based on pre-assessment baseline data collected at the beginning of the school year. Then based on the percentage of students who meet or exceeded their individualized growth targets, a corresponding 0-20 HEDI score will be determined using the conversion tables below. The overall HEDI score will be determined by weighting proportionately the scores based on the NYS Grade 4 ELA, NYS Grade 4 Math, and K-3 AIMSweb assessment measures. |
| Highly Effective (18 - 20 points) Results are well above state average for similar students (or District goals if no state test). | 20: 94-100% meet or exceed individualized growth targets 19: 87-93% meet or exceed individualized growth targets 18: 80-86% meet or exceed individualized growth targets |
| Effective (9 - 17 points) Results meet state average for similar students (or District goals if no state test). | 17: 73-79% meet or exceed individualized growth targets 16: 66-72% meet or exceed individualized growth targets 15: 59-65% meet or exceed individualized growth targets 14: 53-58% meet or exceed individualized growth targets 13: 50-52% meet or exceed individualized growth targets 12: 47-49% meet or exceed individualized growth targets 11: 44-46% meet or exceed individualized growth targets 10: 41-43% meet or exceed individualized growth targets 9: 38-40% meet or exceed individualized growth targets |

| | |
|--|--|
| Developing (3 - 8 points) Results are below state average for similar students (or District goals if no state test). | 8: 34-37% meet or exceed individualized growth targets 7: 30-33% meet or exceed individualized growth targets 6: 26-29% meet or exceed individualized growth targets 5: 22-25% meet or exceed individualized growth targets 4: 18-21% meet or exceed individualized growth targets 3: 14-17% meet or exceed individualized growth targets |
| Ineffective (0 - 2 points) Results are well below state average for similar students (or District goals if no state test). | 2: 10-13% meet or exceed individualized growth targets 1: 6-9% meet or exceed individualized growth targets 0: 0-5% meet or exceed individualized growth targets |

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

(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.

Students' prior academic history and baseline assessment data will be used to set differentiated/individualized student growth targets.

7.5) Principals with More Than One Growth Measure

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

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

7.6) Assurances -- Comparable Growth Measures

Please check all of the boxes below:

| | |
|--|---------|
| 7.6) Assurances -- Comparable Growth Measures Assure the application of locally developed controls will be rigorous, fair, and transparent and only those used for State Growth will be used for Comparable Growth Measures. | Checked |
| 7.6) Assurances -- Comparable Growth Measures Assure that use of locally developed controls will not have a disparate impact on underrepresented students in accordance with applicable civil rights laws. | Checked |
| 7.6) Assurances -- Comparable Growth Measures Assure that procedures for ensuring data accuracy and integrity are being utilized. | Checked |

| | |
|--|---------|
| 7.6) Assurances -- Comparable Growth Measures Assure that district will develop SLOs according to the rules established by NYSED for principal SLOs: http://usny.nysed.gov/rttt/teachers-leaders/slo/home.html . | Checked |
| 7.6) Assurances -- Comparable Growth Measures Assure that the process for assigning points for SLOs for the Growth Subcomponent will use the narrative HEDI descriptions described in the regulations to effectively differentiate educator performance in ways that improve student learning and instruction. | Checked |
| 7.6) Assurances -- Comparable Growth Measures Assure that it is possible for a principal to earn each point, including 0, for SLOs in the Growth subcomponent scoring range. | Checked |
| 7.6) Assurances -- Comparable Growth Measures Assure that processes are in place to monitor SLOs to ensure rigor and comparability across classrooms. | Checked |

8. Local Measures (Principals)

Created Monday, May 28, 2012

Updated Tuesday, November 20, 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 |
|---------------------|---|------------------------------|
| 5-6 | (a) achievement on State assessments | State Grade 6 ELA Assessment |
| 7-8 | (a) achievement on State assessments | State Grade 8 ELA Assessment |
| 9-12 | (e) 4, 5, and/or 6-year high school grad and/or dropout rates | 4-year graduation rate |
| | | |
| | | |
| | | |
| | | |

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. | <p>For the grade 5-6 principal, a target of sixty (60) percent of grade 6 students will achieve proficiency (level 3) or higher on the NYS Grade 6 ELA Assessment.</p> <p>For the grade 7-8 principal, a target of sixty (60) percent of grade 8 students will achieve proficiency (level 3) or higher on the NYS Grade 8 ELA Assessment.</p> <p>For grades 9-12, a target of 85% of total student cohort members (all students group) will graduate within four years (June).</p> |
| Highly Effective (14 - 15 points) Results are well above District- or BOCES-adopted expectations for growth or achievement for grade/subject. | <p>Grades 5-8: 15: 94-100% achieve proficiency or higher 14: 87-93% achieve proficiency or higher</p> <p>Grades 9-12:</p> |

15: 98-100% of all 2009 cohort members will graduate in 4 years
14: 95-97% of all 2009 cohort members will graduate in 4 years

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

Grades 5-8:
13: 80-86% achieve proficiency or higher
12: 73-79% achieve proficiency or higher
11: 66-72% achieve proficiency or higher
10: 59-65% achieve proficiency or higher
9: 52-58% achieve proficiency or higher
8: 46-51% achieve proficiency or higher

Grades 9-12:
13: 92-94% of all 2009 cohort members will graduate in 4 years
12: 89-91% of all 2009 cohort members will graduate in 4 years
11: 86-88% of all 2009 cohort members will graduate in 4 years
10: 84-85% of all 2009 cohort members will graduate in 4 years
9: 82-83% of all 2009 cohort members will graduate in 4 years
8: 80-81% of all 2009 cohort members will graduate in 4 years

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

Grades 5-8:
7: 40-45% achieve proficiency or higher
6: 34-39% achieve proficiency or higher
5: 28-33% achieve proficiency or higher
4: 22-27% achieve proficiency or higher
3: 16-21% achieve proficiency or higher

Grades 9-12:
7: 77-79% of all 2009 cohort members will graduate in 4 years
6: 74-76% of all 2009 cohort members will graduate in 4 years
5: 71-73% of all 2009 cohort members will graduate in 4 years
4: 68-70% of all 2009 cohort members will graduate in 4 years
3: 65-67% of all 2009 cohort members will graduate in 4 years

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

Grades 5-8:
2: 10-15% achieve proficiency or higher
1: 5-9% achieve proficiency or higher
0: 0-4% achieve proficiency or higher

Grades 9-12:
2: 43-64% of all 2009 cohort members will graduate in 4 years
1: 21-42% of all 2009 cohort members will graduate in 4 years
0: 0-20% of all 2009 cohort members will graduate in 4 years

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-4 | (a) achievement on State assessments | NYS Grade 4 ELA Assessment |
| | | |
| | | |
| | | |
| | | |
| | | |
| | | |

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. | For grade K-4 principals, a target of sixty (60) percent of grade 4 students will achieve proficiency (level 3) or higher on the NYS Grade 4 ELA Assessment. |
| Highly Effective (18 - 20 points) Results are well above District- or BOCES-adopted expectations for growth or achievement for grade/subject. | 20: 95-100% achieve proficiency or higher 19: 89-94% achieve proficiency or higher 18: 83-88% achieve proficiency or higher |
| Effective (9- 17 points) Results meet District- or BOCES-adopted expectations for growth or achievement for grade/subject. | 17: 77-82% achieve proficiency or higher 16: 71-76% achieve proficiency or higher 15: 66-70% achieve proficiency or higher 14: 61-65% achieve proficiency or higher 13: 56-60% achieve proficiency or higher 12: 51-55% achieve proficiency or higher 11: 46-50% achieve proficiency or higher 10: 41-45% achieve proficiency or higher 9: 36-40% achieve proficiency or higher |
| Developing (3 - 8 points) Results are below District- or BOCES-adopted expectations for growth or achievement for grade/subject. | 8: 33-35% achieve proficiency or higher 7: 30-32% achieve proficiency or higher 6: 27-29% achieve proficiency or higher 5: 24-26% achieve proficiency or higher 4: 21-23% achieve proficiency or higher 3: 18-20% achieve proficiency or higher |
| Ineffective (0 - 2 points) Results are well below District- or BOCES-adopted expectations for growth or achievement for grade/subject. | 2: 13-17% achieve proficiency or higher 1: 7-12% achieve proficiency or higher 0: 0-6% achieve proficiency or higher |

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.

None

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.

Scores associated with each measure or SLO will contribute to the overall subcomponent score in a partial manner that is proportional to the number of students associated with each.

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 Friday, May 18, 2012

Updated Wednesday, June 20, 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.

The Reeves Leadership Performance Matrix

(No response)

9.2) Points Within Other Measures

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

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

Is the following points assignment for all principals?

Yes

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

(No response)

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

| | |
|---|----|
| Broad assessment of principal leadership and management actions based on the practice rubric by the supervisor, a trained administrator or a trained independent evaluator. This must incorporate multiple school visits by supervisor, trained administrator, or trained independent evaluator, at least one of which must be from a supervisor, and at least one of which must be unannounced. [At least 31 points] | 60 |
|---|----|

| | |
|--|---|
| Any remaining points shall be assigned based on results of one or more ambitious and measurable goals set collaboratively with principals and their superintendents or district superintendents. | 0 |
|--|---|

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

(No response)

9.3) Assurances -- Goals

Please check the boxes below (if applicable):

| | |
|--|---------|
| 9.3) Assurances -- Goals Assure that if any points are assigned to goals, at least one goal will address the principal's contribution to improving teacher effectiveness based on one or more of the following: improved retention of high performing teachers; correlation of student growth scores to teachers granted vs. denied tenure; or improvements in proficiency rating of the principal on specific teacher effectiveness standards in the principal practice rubric. | Checked |
| 9.3) Assurances -- Goals Assure that any other goals, if applicable, shall address quantifiable and verifiable improvements in academic results or the school's learning environment (e.g. student or teacher attendance). | Checked |

9.4) Sources of Evidence (if applicable)

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

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

9.5) Survey Tool(s) (if applicable)

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

(No response)

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

(No response)

(No response)

(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.

Each dimension in Reeves matrix is rated on a point scale of 0-6, with 6 representing the maximum. The total points earned by a principal within each of the ten dimensions will be totaled to determine a score for the subcomponent.

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/5143/131111-pMADJ4gk6R/Item 9.7_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. | 55-60 total dimension points earned. An example is attached (Item 9.7). |
| Effective: Overall performance and results meet standards. | 45-54 total dimension points earned. An example is attached (Item 9.7). |
| Developing: Overall performance and results need improvement in order to meet standards. | 37-44 total dimension points earned. An example is attached (Item 9.7). |
| Ineffective: Overall performance and results do not meet standards. | 0-36 total dimension points earned. An example is attached (Item 9.7). |

Please provide the locally-negotiated 60 point scoring bands.

| | |
|------------------|-------|
| Highly Effective | 55-60 |
| Effective | 45-54 |
| Developing | 37-44 |
| Ineffective | 0-36 |

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 | 4 |
| By trained administrator | 0 |
| By trained independent evaluator | 0 |
| Enter Total | 4 |

Tenured Principals

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

10. Composite Scoring (Principals)

Created Monday, May 28, 2012

Updated Wednesday, June 20, 2012

Page 1

Standards for Rating Categories

Growth or Comparable Measures

Locally-selected Measures of growth or achievement

Other Measures of Effectiveness (Teacher and Leader standards)

Highly

Effective

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

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

Overall performance and results exceed ISLLC leadership standards.

Effective

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

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

Overall performance and results meet ISLLC leadership standards.

Developing

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

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

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

Ineffective

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

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

Overall performance and results do not meet ISLLC leadership standards.

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

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

2012-13 where there is no Value-Added measure

Growth or Comparable Measures

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

Other Measures of Effectiveness

(60 points)

Overall

Composite Score

Highly Effective

18-20

18-20

Ranges determined locally--see below

91-100

Effective

9-17

9-17

75-90

Developing

3-8

3-8

65-74

Ineffective

0-2

0-2

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

| | |
|------------------|-------|
| Highly Effective | 55-60 |
| Effective | 45-54 |
| Developing | 37-44 |
| Ineffective | 0-36 |

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, May 28, 2012

Updated Tuesday, November 20, 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/5276/133578-Df0w3Xx5v6/Item 11.2 \(PIP\)_2.pdf](assets/survey-uploads/5276/133578-Df0w3Xx5v6/Item 11.2 (PIP)_2.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:

ANNUAL PROFESSIONAL PERFORMANCE REVIEW APPEALS

- Appeals shall be limited to those annual evaluations resulting in a rating of developing or ineffective.
- A teacher or administrator may appeal the annual evaluation to the Superintendent of Schools or his/her designee within 5 school days of its receipt. The appeal shall be in writing and shall articulate in detail the basis of the appeal. Appeals shall be limited to:
 1. the substance of the annual professional performance review;
 2. the school district's adherence to the standards and methodologies required for

such reviews pursuant to Section 3012-c of the Education Law;

3. the school district's adherence to the Regulations of the Commissioner and compliance with any applicable locally negotiated procedures; and

4. the school district's issuance and/or implementation of the terms of a TIP/PIP.

• Any issue not raised in the written appeal shall be deemed waived.

• The Superintendent of Schools or his/her designee shall render a written determination in response within 5 school days of receipt of the appeal.

• The determination of the Superintendent of Schools or his/her designee as to the substance of the annual professional performance review shall not be grievable, arbitrable, or reviewable in any other forum.

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 district has an obligation to provide the appropriate training for all evaluators and lead evaluators prior to the completion of any 2012-13 annual evaluations. For the purpose of this plan, all personnel involved in the writing of an annual evaluation for teachers and administrators will be included in such training. Lead evaluator certification and the training of evaluators will be coordinated through the office of the Superintendent as per Commissioner's Regulations. Resources for this certification and training will be included annually in the district's budget development process.

Ongoing training will include:

• Completion of the Teachscape Proficiency System (2011 Danielson Rubric), including evidence-based observer training, scoring practice, and proficiency test

• Formal professional training in use of the Reeves Leadership Performance Matrix

• Video/on-line analysis of lesson implementation and subsequent discussion

• Training in the use of the AIMSweb curriculum-based measure and iReady diagnostic assessment

• Additional professional workshops, conferences, and administrative team meetings

All training activities and hours will be logged and records maintained through the MyLearningPlan system. Lead evaluators will be certified by the Board of Education, based on appropriate training completed.

This process will be used both to certify and recertify lead evaluators in the Huntington Union Free School District, and will also be utilized to ensure inter-rater reliability.

11.5) Assurances -- Evaluators

Please check the boxes below:

-
- Checked
-

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

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

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

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

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

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

(7) use of the Statewide Instructional Reporting System

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

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

• Checked

11.6) Assurances -- Principals

Please check all of the boxes below:

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

11.7) Assurances -- Data

Please check all of the boxes below:

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

12. Joint Certification of APPR Plan

Created Thursday, May 03, 2012

Updated Saturday, December 01, 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/5581/124614-3Uqgn5g9Iu/District Certification Form - Huntington UFSD.pdf](assets/survey-uploads/5581/124614-3Uqgn5g9Iu/District%20Certification%20Form%20-%20Huntington%20UFSD.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.

TABLE 4.5.1a

| Domain 1-3 Ratings | |
|---------------------------|--|
| Rating | Criteria |
| Highly Effective | <i>Highly Effective</i> ratings on at least half of the components of the domain, with the remaining components rated no lower than <i>Effective</i> |
| Effective | No more than one component rated <i>Developing</i> , with the remaining components rated <i>Effective</i> or higher |
| Developing | More than one component rated <i>Developing</i> , with the remaining components rated as <i>Effective</i> or higher |
| Ineffective | Any component rated as <i>Ineffective</i> |

TABLE 4.5.1b

| Overall Lesson Rating | |
|------------------------------|--|
| Rating | Criteria |
| Highly Effective | <i>Highly Effective</i> rating in at least two of the three domains, with the remaining domain rated as <i>Effective</i> |
| Effective | No more than one domain rated <i>Developing</i> , with the remaining domains rated at <i>Effective</i> or higher |
| Developing | More than one domain rated <i>Developing</i> , with the remaining domain rated as <i>Effective</i> or higher |
| Ineffective | Any domain rated <i>Ineffective</i> |

TABLE 4.5.1c

| Domain 4 Ratings | |
|-------------------------|--|
| Rating | Criteria |
| Highly Effective | <i>Highly Effective</i> ratings on at least half of the components of the domain, with the remaining components rated no lower than <i>Effective</i> |
| Effective | No more than one component rated <i>Developing</i> , with the remaining components rated <i>Effective</i> or higher |
| Developing | More than one component rated <i>Developing</i> , with the remaining components rated as <i>Effective</i> or higher |
| Ineffective | Any component rated as <i>Ineffective</i> |

TABLE 4.5.2

| Multiple Measures | Available Points (out of 60 total) | Weighting |
|--|---------------------------------------|--|
| Observations (Domains 1-3): Tenured Teacher (2) | 33 | .55 total (.275 per observation) ^{1, 2} |
| Non-Tenured Teacher (4) | 33 | .55 total (.1375 per observation) ¹ |
| Professional Responsibilities (Domain 4) | 11 | .18 |
| Artifacts (Evaluated using Danielson Rubric) | 16 | .27 |

1 Weighting to be altered accordingly if a greater number of observations is conducted for a given teacher, at the district's discretion.

2 If a tenured teacher observation results in an "ineffective" rating, this rating will be included in the multiple measures calculation, however said teacher may request that an additional formal observation be conducted subsequently. This additional observation will be included in the calculation as well.

TABLE 4.5.3

| Sample: Tenured Teacher | Rating/Score | Weighting | Converted Score | Total Points |
|----------------------------------|----------------|-----------|--------------------|--------------|
| Lesson #1 | Effective (3) | .275 | .825 | |
| Lesson #2 | Developing (2) | .275 | .55 | |
| Professional Responsibilities | Developing (2) | .18 | .36 | |
| Artifacts | Effective (3) | .27 | .81 | |
| | | | 2.545 | 57 |

TABLE 4.5.4

| Sample: Untenured Teacher | Rating/Score | Weighting | Converted Score | Total Points |
|----------------------------------|----------------------|-----------|--------------------|--------------|
| Lesson #1 | Effective (3) | .1375 | .4125 | |
| Lesson #2 | Developing (2) | .1375 | .275 | |
| Lesson #3 | Effective (3) | .1375 | .4125 | |
| Lesson #4 | Highly Effective (4) | .1375 | .55 | |
| Professional Responsibilities | Effective (3) | .18 | .36 | |
| Artifacts | Developing (2) | .27 | .54 | |
| | | | 2.55 | 57 |

**HUNTINGTON UNION FREE SCHOOL DISTRICT
TEACHER IMPROVEMENT PLAN**

The Teacher Improvement Plan (TIP) will consist of the following components:

- a) **SPECIFIC AREAS FOR IMPROVEMENT**: Identify specific areas in need of improvement and specific measurable goals for the teacher to accomplish during the period of the plan.
- b) **EXPECTED OUTCOMES**: Construct specific recommendations with respect to what the teacher is expected to do in order to improve in the identified areas. This will include specific, realistic, achievable activities for the teacher, as applicable.
- c) **RESOURCES**: Identify specific resources available to assist the teacher toward improving his/her performance. Examples: colleagues; courses; workshops; peer visits; materials; etc.
- d) **RESPONSIBILITIES**: Identify administrator(s) responsible for plan implementation and steps to be taken by the administrator(s) and the teacher throughout the Plan. Examples: formal classroom observations of the teacher; informal classroom walk-throughs; supervisory conferences between the teacher and administrator(s); written reports and/or evaluations, etc. Note: Formal observations of a teacher on a TIP will be shared by at least two (2) administrators.
- e) **EVIDENCE OF ACHIEVEMENT**: Identify how progress will be measured and assessed. Specify steps to be taken based upon whether the teacher is successful, partially successful or unsuccessful in efforts to improve his/her performance.
- f) **TIMELINE**: Provide a specific timeline for TIP component implementation. Identify the dates for preparation of associated written documentation. As per Commissioner Regulation, an Ineffective or Developing teacher must receive the TIP within 10 school days from the opening of classes in the school year following the performance year.

A teacher with a TIP in place will be offered the opportunity to work with a collegial mentor from the District's mentor program. The teacher will select the mentor, with the approval of the Superintendent and the ATH President. If the teacher cannot decide on a mentor, the Superintendent and the ATH president will select a mentor. The teacher will be observed by designated members of the supervisory team, again at least two (2), who will concentrate on observing and evaluating goals identified in the TIP. They will meet with the teacher in a timely manner (within 5 school days) to discuss the observations. A written observation report will be provided within 5 school days of the post-observation conference; the report will be signed by both parties. The teacher will have the right to respond in writing to observation summaries. Any such response will be attached.

After the first designated report period of teacher/mentor collaboration, the administration will assess the effectiveness of the intervention(s) and the level of improvement. Based on that assessment, the TIP may be adjusted accordingly and meetings among all parties will continue. If TIP goals are met by the end of the established timeframe, TIP provisions will conclude.

**HUNTINGTON UNION FREE SCHOOL DISTRICT
TEACHER IMPROVEMENT PLAN**

I. TARGETED AREAS FOR IMPROVEMENT

- A. Instructional Planning:
- B. Instructional Delivery:
- C. Student Assessment:
- D. Classroom Management:
- E. Fulfillment of Professional Responsibilities:
- F. Attendance:
- G. Communication with colleagues/administration:
- H. Communication with home:

II. EXPECTED OUTCOMES/RECOMMENDED ACTIVITIES

- A. Specific expectations related to targeted areas identified in Section I:
- B. Specific activities recommended to improve targeted areas identified in Section I:

III. RECOMMENDED RESOURCES

- A. Lead evaluator who has oversight of the TIP:
- B. Materials, workshops, colleagues that may be used to support the TIP:
- C. Instrument or rubrics used to monitor progress:

IV. EVIDENCE OF ACHIEVEMENT

- A. Lesson plans Dates, if applicable: _____
- B. Classroom observation reports Dates, if applicable: _____
- C. Evidence of professional development Dates, if applicable: _____
- D. Self-Reflections Dates, if applicable: _____

V. TIMELINE FOR MEASURING ACHIEVEMENT OF EXPECTED OUTCOMES

- A. Timeframe:
- B. Classroom observation dates:

C. Dates for meetings with administrators related to targeted goals:

D. Dates for assessment of overall progress:

Teacher

Date

Curriculum Supervisor

Date

Building Principal

Date

Item 9.7: Principal “Multiple Measures” Rating Example

Administrator Individual Dimension Ratings & Scores

| Dimension Rating | Dimension Score |
|------------------|-----------------|
| Ineffective | 0 |
| Developing | 4 |
| Effective | 5 |
| Highly Effective | 6 |

Dimension Ratings:

- **Highly Effective** – *Highly Effective* ratings in at least half of the dimension components, with the remaining components rated no lower than *Effective*.
- **Effective** – No more than one component rated *Developing*, with the remaining components rated *Effective* or higher.
- **Developing** – More than one component rated *Developing*, with the remaining components rated *Effective* or higher.
- **Ineffective** – Any component rated as *Ineffective*.

| Example (Dimension 2.0 for Administrators – Personal Behavior and Professional Ethics) | | | | |
|---|-------------------|------------|-----------|------------------|
| Element | Ineffective | Developing | Effective | Highly Effective |
| 2.1 | | | X | |
| 2.2 | | X | | |
| 2.3 | | X | | |
| 2.4 | | | X | |
| 2.5 | | | X | |
| Dimension Rating | Developing | | | |
| Dimension Score | 4 | | | |

Overall Multiple Measures Rating (Total 60 points available)

| Final Summative Score | | | | |
|---|--|------------|-----------|------------------|
| Dimension | Ineffective | Developing | Effective | Highly Effective |
| Dimension 1 | | | 5 | |
| Dimension 2 | | 4 | | |
| Dimension 3 | | | 5 | |
| Dimension 4 | | 4 | | |
| Dimension 5 | | | 5 | |
| Dimension 6 | | | 5 | |
| Dimension 7 | | | 5 | |
| Dimension 8 | | | 5 | |
| Dimension 9 | | | 5 | |
| Dimension 10 | | 4 | | |
| Total Subcomponent Points/Rating | 47 points out of a possible 60 “Multiple Measures” points (EFFECTIVE) | | | |

**HUNTINGTON UNION FREE SCHOOL DISTRICT
PRINCIPAL (ADMINISTRATOR) IMPROVEMENT PLAN**

The Principal (Administrator) Improvement Plan (PIP) will consist of the following components:

- a) **SPECIFIC AREAS FOR IMPROVEMENT**: Identify specific areas in need of improvement and specific measurable goals for the administrator to accomplish during the Plan period.
- b) **EXPECTED OUTCOMES**: Construct specific recommendations with respect to what the administrator is expected to do in order to improve in the identified areas. This will include specific, realistic, achievable activities for the administrator, as applicable.
- c) **RESOURCES**: Identify specific resources available to assist the administrator toward improving his/her performance. Examples: colleagues; courses; workshops; peer visits; materials; etc.
- d) **RESPONSIBILITIES**: Identify administrator(s) responsible for plan implementation and steps to be taken by the administrator(s) and the teacher throughout the Plan. Examples: building visits/direct observations; supervisory conferences between the administrator and Superintendent; written reports and/or evaluations, etc.
- e) **EVIDENCE OF ACHIEVEMENT**: Identify how progress will be measured and assessed. Specify steps to be taken based upon whether the administrator is successful, partially successful or unsuccessful in efforts to improve his/her performance.
- f) **TIMELINE**: Provide a specific timeline for PIP component implementation. Identify the dates for preparation of associated written documentation. As per Commissioner Regulation, an Ineffective or Developing administrator must receive the PIP within 10 school days from the opening of classes in the school year following the performance year.

An administrator with a PIP in place will be offered the opportunity to work with a peer mentor. The administrator will select the mentor, with the approval of the Superintendent and the DSPA President. If the administrator cannot decide on a mentor, the Superintendent and the DSPA president will select a mentor. The administrator will be observed by designated members of the Superintendent's Cabinet who will concentrate on observing and evaluating goals identified in the PIP. They will meet with the administrator in a timely manner (within 5 school days) to discuss the observations. Written observation summaries will be provided within 5 school days of the observation conference; these summaries will be signed by both parties. The administrator will have the right to respond in writing to observation summaries. Any response will be attached.

After the first designated report period of administrator/mentor collaboration, the Superintendent will assess the effectiveness of the intervention and the level of improvement. Based on that assessment, the PIP may be adjusted accordingly and meetings among all parties will continue. If PIP goals are met by the end of the designated timeframe, PIP provisions will conclude.

**HUNTINGTON UNION FREE SCHOOL DISTRICT
PRINCIPAL (ADMINISTRATOR) IMPROVEMENT PLAN**

I. TARGETED AREAS FOR IMPROVEMENT

- A.
- B.
- C.
- D.

II. EXPECTED OUTCOMES/RECOMMENDED ACTIVITIES

- A. Specific expectations related to targeted areas identified in Section I:
 - 1.
 - 2.
 - 3.
 - 4.
 - 5.

- B. Specific activities recommended to address areas identified in Section I
 - 1.
 - 2.
 - 3.

III. RECOMMENDED RESOURCES

- A.
- B.
- C.

IV. EVIDENCE OF ACHIEVEMENT

- A.
- B.
- C.
- D.

V. TIMELINE FOR MEASURING ACHIEVEMENT OF EXPECTED OUTCOMES

- A. Plan timeframe: _____
- B. Meeting dates with members of Superintendent's Cabinet: _____, _____, _____
- C. Document submission deadlines:
 - 1. Document: _____ Deadline: _____
 - 2. Document: _____ Deadline: _____
 - 3. Document: _____ Deadline: _____
 - 4. Document: _____ Deadline: _____
 - 5. Document: _____ Deadline: _____

Administrator

Date

Immediate Supervisor

Date

Superintendent

Date

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

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

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


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

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


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

Signatures, dates


Superintendent Signature: Date:

 11/30/12


Teachers Union President Signature: Date:

 11/30/12

Administrative Union President Signature: Date:

 11/30/12

Board of Education President Signature: Date:

 11/30/12