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

April 17, 2013

Revised

Dr. Kenneth Byalin, President
John W. Lavelle Preparatory Charter School
One Corporate Commons at 1 Teleport Drive
Staten Island, NY 10311

Dear President Byalin:

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

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 Wednesday, January 02, 2013
Updated Tuesday, April 16, 2013

1

Disclaimers

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

The Department will not review any attachments other than those required in the online form. Any additional attachments supplied by the school district or BOCES are for informational purposes only for the teachers and principals reviewed under this APPR plan. Statements and/or materials in such additional attachments have not been approved and/or endorsed by the Department. However, the Department 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 :

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

353100860959

1.2) School District Name:

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

John W. Lavelle Preparatory Charter School

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)

- Teacher Incentive Fund (US Dept of Education)

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?

Submission of material changes to an approved APPR plan

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 Wednesday, January 02, 2013
Updated Tuesday, April 16, 2013

Page 1

STATE-PROVIDED MEASURES OF STUDENT GROWTH

(25 points with an approved value-added measure)

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

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

Please note that if the Board of Regents does not approve a value-added measure for these grades/subjects 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	Not applicable	NA
1	Not applicable	NA
2	Not applicable	NA

	ELA	Assessment
3	Not applicable	Not applicable

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

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

below.	
Highly Effective (18 - 20 points) Results are well-above state average for similar students (or District goals if no state test).	NA
Effective (9 - 17 points) Results meet state average for similar students (or District goals if no state test).	NA
Developing (3 - 8 points) Results are below state average for similar students (or District goals if no state test).	NA
Ineffective (0 - 2 points) Results are well-below state average for similar students (or District goals if no state test).	NA

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	Not applicable	NA
1	Not applicable	NA
2	Not applicable	NA

	Math	Assessment
3	Not applicable	Not applicable

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.	NA
Highly Effective (18 - 20 points) Results are well-above state average for similar students (or District goals if no state test).	NA
Effective (9 - 17 points) Results meet state average for similar students (or District goals if no state test).	NA
Developing (3 - 8 points) Results are below state average for similar students (or District goals if no state test).	NA
Ineffective (0 - 2 points) Results are well-below state average for similar students (or District goals if no state test).	NA

2.4) Grades 6-8 Science

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

	Science	Assessment
6	State-approved 3rd party assessment	Terra Nova 3 6th grade science test
7	State-approved 3rd party assessment	Terra Nova 3 7th grade science test

	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.	Analyzing baseline data, teachers in collaboration with their principal shall establish individual growth targets for each student. HEDI points will be assigned based on the percentage of students meeting or exceeding their individual growth target on the final assessment. For a full description, please see attachment 2.11.
Highly Effective (18 - 20 points) Results are well-above state average for similar students (or District goals if no state test).	86-100% of students meet their growth target
Effective (9 - 17 points) Results meet state average for similar students (or District goals if no state test).	75-85% of students meet their growth target
Developing (3 - 8 points) Results are below state average for similar students (or District goals if no state test).	65-74% of students meet their growth target
Ineffective (0 - 2 points) Results are well-below state average for similar students (or District goals if no state test).	64% or less of students meet their growth target

2.5) Grades 6-8 Social Studies

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

	Social Studies	Assessment
6	State-approved 3rd party assessment	Terra Nova 3 6th grade social studies test
7	State-approved 3rd party assessment	Terra Nova 3 7th grade social studies test
8	State-approved 3rd party assessment	Terra Nova 3 8th grade social studies test

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.	Analyzing baseline data, teachers in collaboration with their principal shall establish individual growth targets for each student. HEDI points will be assigned based on the percentage of students meeting or exceeding their individual growth target on the final assessment. For a full description, see attachment in 2.11.
Highly Effective (18 - 20 points) Results are well-above District goals for similar students.	86-100% of students meet their growth target
Effective (9 - 17 points) Results meet District goals for similar students.	75-85% of students meet their growth target

Developing (3 - 8 points) Results are below District goals for similar students.	65-74% of students meet their growth target
Ineffective (0 - 2 points) Results are well-below District goals for similar students.	64% or less of students meet

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	Not applicable	NA

	Social Studies Regents Courses	Assessment
Global 2	Not applicable	Not applicable
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.	Analyzing baseline data, teachers in collaboration with their principal shall establish individual growth targets for each student. HEDI points will be assigned based on the percentage of students meeting or exceeding their individual growth target on the final assessment. For a full description, see attachment in 2.11.
Highly Effective (18 - 20 points) Results are well-above District goals for similar students.	86-100% of students meet their growth
Effective (9 - 17 points) Results meet District goals for similar students.	75-85% of students meet their growth target
Developing (3 - 8 points) Results are below District goals for similar students.	65-74% of students meet their growth target
Ineffective (0 - 2 points) Results are well-below District goals for similar students.	64% or less of students meet their growth target

2.7) High School Science Regents Courses

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

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

	Science Regents Courses	Assessment

Living Environment	Regents Assessment	Regents assessment
Earth Science	Not applicable	Not applicable
Chemistry	Not applicable	Not applicable
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.	Analyzing baseline data, teachers in collaboration with their principal shall establish individual growth targets for each student. HEDI points will be assigned based on the percentage of students meeting or exceeding their individual growth target on the final assessment. For a full description, see attachment in 2.11.
Highly Effective (18 - 20 points) Results are well-above District goals for similar students.	86-100% of students meet their growth
Effective (9 - 17 points) Results meet District goals for similar students.	75-85% of students meet their growth target
Developing (3 - 8 points) Results are below District goals for similar students.	65-74% of students meet their growth target
Ineffective (0 - 2 points) Results are well-below District goals for similar students.	64% or less of students meet their growth target

2.8) High School Math Regents Courses

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

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

	Math Regents Courses	Assessment
Algebra 1	Regents assessment	Regents assessment
Geometry	Not applicable	Not applicable
Algebra 2	Not applicable	Not applicable

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.	Analyzing baseline data, teachers in collaboration with their principal shall establish individual growth targets for each student. HEDI points will be assigned based on the percentage of students meeting or exceeding their individual growth target on the final assessment. For a full description, see attachment in 2.11.

Highly Effective (18 - 20 points) Results are well-above District goals for similar students.	86-100% of students meet their growth
Effective (9 - 17 points) Results meet District goals for similar students.	75-85% of students meet their growth target
Developing (3 - 8 points) Results are below District goals for similar students.	65-74% of students meet their growth target
Ineffective (0 - 2 points) Results are well-below District goals for similar students.	64% or less of students meet their growth target

2.9) High School English Language Arts

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

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

	High School English Courses	Assessment
Grade 9 ELA	State approved 3rd party assessment	Performance Series (Scantron Corporation) Grade 9 ELA Assessment.
Grade 10 ELA	Not applicable	NA
Grade 11 ELA	Not applicable	NA

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.	Analyzing baseline data, teachers in collaboration with their principal shall establish individual growth targets for each student. HEDI points will be assigned based on the percentage of students meeting or exceeding their individual growth target on the final assessment. For a full description, see attachment in 2.11.
Highly Effective (18 - 20 points) Results are well-above District goals for similar students.	86-100% of students meet their growth
Effective (9 - 17 points) Results meet District goals for similar students.	75-85% of students meet their growth target
Developing (3 - 8 points) Results are below District goals for similar students.	65-74% of students meet their growth target
Ineffective (0 - 2 points) Results are well-below District goals for similar students.	64% or less of students meet their growth targe

2.10) All Other Courses

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

Course(s) or Subject(s)	Option	Assessment

	Grade 6 Spanish, Physical Education (Dance), Visual Arts	School/BOCES-wide/group/team results based on State	Grade 6 Statewide Assessments in Math and ELA.
	Grade 7 Spanish, Physical Education, Theater arts	School/BOCES-wide/group/team results based on State	Grade 7 Statewide Assessments in Math and ELA.
	Grade 8 Spanish, Physical Education, Music	School/BOCES-wide/group/team results based on State	Grade 8 Statewide Assessments in Math and ELA.
	All other teachers not named above	District, Regional or BOCES-developed	John Lavelle Prep developed grade and subject specific assessment.

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

Use this box, if needed, to describe the general process for assigning HEDI categories for these grades/subjects in this subcomponent. If needed, you may upload a table or graphic at 2.11, below.	Analyzing baseline data, teachers in collaboration with their principal shall establish individual growth targets for each student. HEDI points will be assigned based on the percentage of students meeting or exceeding their individual growth target on the final assessment. For a full description, see attachment in 2.11.
Highly Effective (18 - 20 points) Results are well-above District goals for similar students.	86-100% of students meet their growth target
Effective (9 - 17 points) Results meet District goals for similar students.	75-85% of students meet their growth target
Developing (3 - 8 points) Results are below District goals for similar students.	65-74% of students meet their growth target
Ineffective (0 - 2 points) Results are well-below District goals for similar students.	64% or less of students meet their growth target

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

(No response)

2.11) HEDI Tables or Graphics

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

assets/survey-uploads/5364/297590-TXEtxx9bQW/6230879-Attachment_2-11_1.docx

2.12) Locally Developed Controls

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

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

(No response)

2.13) Teachers with more than one growth measure

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

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

2.14) Assurances

Please check all of the boxes below:

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

3. Local Measures (Teachers)

Created Thursday, January 03, 2013
Updated Tuesday, April 16, 2013

Page 1

Locally Selected Measures of Student Achievement or Growth

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

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

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

.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	Not applicable	NA
5	Not applicable	NA
6	6(ii) School wide measure computed locally	Grade 6 Statewide Assessment in ELA.
7	6(ii) School wide measure computed locally	Grade 7 Statewide Assessment in ELA.

8	6(ii) School wide measure computed locally	Grade 8 Statewide Assessment in ELA.

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

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

Use this box, if needed, to describe the general process for assigning HEDI categories for these grades/subjects in this subcomponent. If needed, you may upload a table or graphic at 3.3, below.	Analyzing baseline data, teachers in collaboration with their principal shall establish individual growth targets for each student. The local sub-component HEDI scores will be calculated based on the percentage of SPED students meeting or exceeding their individual growth targets on the final assessment.For a full description, see attachment in 3.3.
Highly Effective (14 - 15 points) Results are well above District- or BOCES-adopted expectations for growth or achievement for grade/subject.	86-100% of students meet their growth target
Effective (8- 13 points) Results meet District- or BOCES-adopted expectations for growth or achievement for grade/subject.	75-85% of students meet their growth target
Developing (3 - 7 points) Results are below District- or BOCES-adopted expectations for growth or achievement for grade/subject.	65-74% of students meet their growth target
Ineffective (0 - 2 points) Results are well below District- or BOCES-adopted expectations for growth or achievement for grade/subject.	64% or less of students meet their growth target

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	Not applicable	NA
5	Not applicable	NA
6	6(ii) School wide measure computed locally	Grade 6 Statewide Assessment in math
7	6(ii) School wide measure computed locally	Grade 7 Statewide Assessment in math.
8	6(ii) School wide measure computed locally	Grade 8 Statewide Assessment in math

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

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

Use this box, if needed, to describe the general process for assigning HEDI categories for these grades/subjects in this subcomponent. If needed, you may upload a table or graphic at 3.3, below.	Analyzing baseline data, teachers in collaboration with their principal shall establish individual growth targets for each student. The local sub-component HEDI scores will be calculated based on the percentage of SPED students meeting or exceeding their individual growth targets on the final assessment.For a full description, see attachment in 3.3.
Highly Effective (14 - 15 points) Results are well above District- or BOCES-adopted expectations for growth or achievement for grade/subject.	86-100% of students meet their growth target
Effective (8- 13 points) Results meet District- or BOCES-adopted expectations for growth or achievement for grade/subject.	75-85% of students meet their growth target
Developing (3 - 7 points) Results are below District- or BOCES-adopted expectations for growth or achievement for grade/subject.	65-74% of students meet their growth target
Ineffective (0 - 2 points) Results are well below District- or BOCES-adopted expectations for growth or achievement for grade/subject.	64% or less of students meet their growth target

3.3) HEDI Tables or Graphics

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

assets/survey-uploads/5139/299125-rhJdBgDruP/6283225-Attachment 3-3_1.docx

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

Growth or achievement measure(s) from these options.

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

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

Measures based on:

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

3.4) Grades K-3 ELA

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

	Locally-Selected Measure from List of Approved Measures	Assessment
K	Not applicable	NA
1	Not applicable	NA
2	Not applicable	NA
3	Not applicable	NA

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

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

assurances listed to the left of each box.

Use this box, if needed, to describe the general process for assigning HEDI categories for these grades/subjects in this subcomponent. If needed, you may upload a table or graphic at 3.13, below.	NA
Highly Effective (18-20 points) Results are well above District- or BOCES-adopted expectations for growth or achievement for grade/subject.	NA
Effective (9-17 points) Results meet District- or BOCES-adopted expectations for growth or achievement for grade/subject.	NA
Developing (3 - 8 points) Results are below District- or BOCES-adopted expectations for growth or achievement for grade/subject.	NA
Ineffective (0 - 2 points) Results are well below District- or BOCES-adopted expectations for growth or achievement for grade/subject.	NA

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	Not applicable	NA
1	Not applicable	NA
2	Not applicable	NA
3	Not applicable	NA

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

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	6(ii) School wide measure computed locally	Grade 6 state-wide assessments in ELA and math.
7	6(ii) School wide measure computed locally	Grade 7 state-wide assessments in ELA and math.
8	6(ii) School wide measure computed locally	Grade 8 state-wide assessments in ELA and math.

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.	Analyzing baseline data, teachers in collaboration with their principal shall establish individual growth targets for each student. The local sub-component HEDI scores will be calculated based on the percentage of SPED students meeting or exceeding their individual growth targets on the final assessment. HEDI score for two assessments is a weighted average of the two. For a full description, see chart on 3.13.
Highly Effective (18 - 20 points) Results are well above District- or BOCES-adopted expectations for growth or achievement for grade/subject.	86-100% of students meet their growth target
Effective (9 - 17 points) Results meet District- or BOCES-adopted expectations for growth or achievement for grade/subject.	75-85% of students meet their growth target
Developing (3 - 8 points) Results are below District- or BOCES-adopted expectations for growth or achievement for grade/subject.	65-74% of students meet their growth target
Ineffective (0 - 2 points) Results are well below District- or BOCES-adopted expectations for growth or achievement for grade/subject.	64% or less of students meet their growth target

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	6(ii) School wide measure computed locally	Grade 6 state-wide assessments n ELA and math.
7	6(ii) School wide measure computed locally	Grade 7 state-wide assessments in ELA and math.
8	6(ii) School wide measure computed locally	Grade 8 state-wide assessments in ELA and math.

For Grades 6-8 Social Studies: describe the district-adopted expectations for the level of growth or achievement needed for a teacher to earn each of the four HEDI rating categories and the process for assigning points within rating categories that ensures it is possible for

a teacher to earn any of the points in a scoring range, consistent with regulations and assurances.

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

Use this box, if needed, to describe the general process for assigning HEDI categories for these grades/subjects in this subcomponent. If needed, you may upload a table or graphic at 3.13, below.	Analyzing baseline data, teachers in collaboration with their principal shall establish individual growth targets for each student. The local sub-component HEDI scores will be calculated based on the percentage of SPED students meeting or exceeding their individual growth targets on the final assessment. HEDI score for two assessments is a weighted average of the two. For a full description, plese see attachment 3.13.
Highly Effective (18 - 20 points) Results are well above District- or BOCES-adopted expectations for growth or achievement for grade/subject.	86-100% of students meet their growth target
Effective (9 - 17 points) Results meet District- or BOCES-adopted expectations for growth or achievement for grade/subject.	75-85% of students meet their growth target
Developing (3 - 8 points) Results are below District- or BOCES-adopted expectations for growth or achievement for grade/subject.	65-74% of students meet their growth target
Ineffective (0 - 2 points) Results are well below District- or BOCES-adopted expectations for growth or achievement for grade/subject.	64% or less of students meet their growth target

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	Not applicable	NA
Global 2	Not applicable	NA
American History	6(ii) School wide measure computed locally	NYS American History Regents

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

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

Use this box, if needed, to describe the general process for assigning HEDI categories for these grades/subjects in this subcomponent. If needed, you may upload a table or graphic at 3.13, below.	Analyzing baseline data, teachers in collaboration with their principal shall establish individual growth targets for each student. The local sub-component HEDI scores will be calculated based on the percentage of SPED students meeting or exceeding their individual growth targets on the final assessment. For a full description of HEDI methodology, please see attachment 3.13.
Highly Effective (18 - 20 points) Results are well above District- or BOCES-adopted expectations for growth or achievement for grade/subject.	86-100% of students meet their growth target
Effective (9 - 17 points) Results meet District- or BOCES-adopted expectations for growth or achievement for grade/subject.	75-85% of students meet their growth target
Developing (3 - 8 points) Results are below District- or BOCES-adopted expectations for growth or achievement for grade/subject.	65-74% of students meet their growth target
Ineffective (0 - 2 points) Results are well below District- or BOCES-adopted expectations for growth or achievement for grade/subject.	64% or less of students meet their growth target

3.9) High School Science

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

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

	Locally-Selected Measure from List of Approved Measures	Assessment
Living Environment	6(ii) School wide measure computed locally	NYS Living Environment Regents
Earth Science	Not applicable	NA
Chemistry	Not applicable	NA
Physics	6(ii) School wide measure computed locally	NYS Physics Regents

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

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

Use this box, if needed, to describe the general process for assigning HEDI categories for these grades/subjects in this subcomponent. If needed, you may upload a table or graphic at 3.13, below.	Analyzing baseline data, teachers in collaboration with their principal shall establish individual growth targets for each student. The local sub-component HEDI scores will be calculated based on the percentage of SPED students meeting or exceeding their individual growth targets on the final assessment. For a full description of HEDI methodology, please see attachment 3.13.

Highly Effective (18-20 points) Results are well above District- or BOCES-adopted expectations for growth or achievement for grade/subject.	86-100% of students meet their growth target
Developing (3 - 8 points) Results are below District- or BOCES-adopted expectations for growth or achievement for grade/subject.	75-85% of students meet their growth target
Effective (9 - 17points) Results meet District- or BOCES-adopted expectations for growth or achievement for grade/subject.	65-74% of students meet their growth target
Ineffective (0 - 2 points) Results are well below District- or BOCES-adopted expectations for growth or achievement for grade/subject.	64% or less of students meet their growth target

3.10) High School Math

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

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

	Locally-Selected Measure from List of Approved Measures	Assessment
Algebra 1	6(ii) School wide measure computed locally	NYS Algebra 1 Regents
Geometry	Not applicable	NA
Algebra 2	Not applicable	NA

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.	Analyzing baseline data, teachers in collaboration with their principal shall establish individual growth targets for each student. The local sub-component HEDI scores will be calculated based on the percentage of SPED students meeting or exceeding their individual growth targets on the final assessment. For a full description of HEDI methodology, please see attachment 3.13.
Highly Effective (18 - 20 points) Results are well above District- or BOCES-adopted expectations for growth or achievement for grade/subject.	86-100% of students meet their growth target
Effective (9 - 17 points) Results meet District- or BOCES-adopted expectations for growth or achievement for grade/subject.	75-85% of students meet their growth target
Developing (3 - 8 points) Results are below District- or BOCES-adopted expectations for growth or achievement for grade/subject.	65-74% of students meet their growth target

Ineffective (0 - 2 points) Results are well below District- or BOCES-adopted expectations for growth or achievement for grade/subject.	64% or less of students meet their growth target

3.11) High School English Language Arts

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

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

	Locally-Selected Measure from List of Approved Measures	Assessment
Grade 9 ELA	4) State-approved 3rd party assessments	Performance Series (Scantron Corporation) Grade 9 ELA Assessment.
Grade 10 ELA	Not applicable	NA
Grade 11 ELA	Not applicable	NA

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.	Analyzing baseline data, teachers in collaboration with their principal shall establish individual growth targets for each student. The local sub-component HEDI scores will be calculated based on the percentage of SPED students meeting or exceeding their individual growth targets on the final assessment. For a full description of HEDI methodology, please see attachment 3.13.
Highly Effective (18 - 20 points) Results are well above District- or BOCES-adopted expectations for growth or achievement for grade/subject.	86-100% of students meet their growth target
Effective (9 - 17 points) Results meet District- or BOCES-adopted expectations for growth or achievement for grade/subject.	75-85% of students meet their growth target
Developing (3 - 8 points) Results are below District- or BOCES-adopted expectations for growth or achievement for grade/subject.	65-74% of students meet their growth target
Ineffective (0 - 2 points) Results are well below District- or BOCES-adopted expectations for growth or achievement for grade/subject.	64% or less of students meet their growth target

3.12) All Other Courses

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

	Course(s) or Subject(s)	Locally-Selected Measure from List of Approved Measures	Assessment
	Grade 6 Spanish, Physical Education (Dance), Visual Arts	6(ii) School wide measure computed locally	Grade 6 Statewide Assessments in Math and ELA.
	Grade 7 Spanish, Physical Education, Theater arts	6(ii) School wide measure computed locally	Grade 7 Statewide Assessments in Math and ELA.
	Grade 8 Spanish, Physical Education, Music	6(ii) School wide measure computed locally	Grade 8 Statewide Assessments in Math and ELA.
	All other teachers not named above	5) District/regional/BOCES–developed	Lavelle Prep developed grade and subject specific assessments

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

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

Use this box, if needed, to describe the general process for assigning HEDI categories for these grades/subjects in this subcomponent. If needed, you may upload a table or graphic at 3.13, below.	Analyzing baseline data, teachers in collaboration with their principal shall establish individual growth targets for each student. The local sub-component HEDI scores will be calculated based on the percentage of SPED students meeting or exceeding their individual growth targets on the final assessment. HEDI score for two assessments is a weighted average of the two. For a full description of HEDI methodology, please see attachment 3.13.
Highly Effective (18 - 20 points) Results are well above District- or BOCES -adopted expectations for growth or achievement for grade/subject.	86-100% of students meet their growth target
Effective (9 - 17 points) Results meet District- or BOCES-adopted expectations for growth or achievement for grade/subject.	75-85% of students meet their growth target
Developing (3 - 8 points) Results are below District- or BOCES-adopted expectations for growth or achievement for grade/subject.	65-74% of students meet their growth target
Ineffective (0 - 2 points) Results are well below District- or BOCES-adopted expectations for growth or achievement for grade/subject.	64% or less of students meet their growth target

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

(No response)

3.13) HEDI Tables or Graphics

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

assets/survey-uploads/5139/299125-y92vNseFa4/6283353-Attachment 3-13_1.docx

3.14) Locally Developed Controls

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

NA

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.

Measures will be weighted proportionately based on percentage of students and then averaged and combined for one overall HEDI.

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, January 06, 2013
Updated Thursday, January 17, 2013

Page 1

4.1) Teacher Practice Rubric

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

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

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

Danielson's Framework for Teaching (2011 Revised Edition)

Not Applicable

4.2) Points Within Other Measures

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

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

Is the following points assignment applicable to all teachers?

Yes

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

(No response)

Multiple (at least two) classroom observations by principal or other trained administrator, at least one of which must be unannounced [at least 31 points]	60
One or more observation(s) by trained independent evaluators	0
Observations by trained in-school peer teachers	0
Feedback from students using State-approved survey tool	0
Feedback from parents/caregivers using State-approved survey tool	0
Structured reviews of lesson plans, student portfolios and other teacher artifacts	0

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.

Highly Effective: Overall performance and results exceed NYS Teaching Standards. 91-100
Effective: Overall performance and results meet NYS Teaching Standards. 75-90
Developing: Overall performance and results need improvement in order to meet NYS Teaching Standards. 65-74
Ineffective: Overall performance and results do not meet NYS Teaching Standards. 0-64
See process for calculating HEDI score in chart uploaded in 4.5.

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/5091/305216-eka9yMJ855/6444816-Attachment 4-5.docx

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

Highly Effective: Overall performance and results exceed NYS Teaching Standards.	55-60
Effective: Overall performance and results meet NYS Teaching Standards.	45-54
Developing: Overall performance and results need improvement in order to meet NYS Teaching Standards.	39-44
Ineffective: Overall performance and results do not meet NYS Teaching Standards.	0-38

Provide the ranges for the 60-point scoring bands.

Highly Effective	55-60
Effective	45-54
Developing	39-44
Ineffective	0-38

4.6) Observations of Probationary Teachers

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

By building principals or other trained administrators

4.6) Observations of Probationary Teachers | Formal/Long	2
4.6) Observations of Probationary Teachers | Informal/Short	0
4.6) Observations of Probationary Teachers | Enter 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 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, January 06, 2013

Page 1

Standards for Rating Categories

Growth or Comparable Measures

Locally-selected Measures of

growth or achievement

Other Measures of Effectiveness

(Teacher and Leader standards)

Highly

Effective

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

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

Overall performance and results exceed NYS Teaching Standards.

Effective

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

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

Overall performance and results meet NYS Teaching Standards.

Developing

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

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

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

Ineffective

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

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

Overall performance and results do not meet NYS Teaching Standards.

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	55-60
Effective	45-54
Developing	39-44
Ineffective	38 or lesss

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, January 06, 2013
Updated Thursday, January 17, 2013

Page 1

6.1) Assurances -- Improvement Plans

Please check the boxes below:

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

6.2) Attachment: Teacher Improvement Plan Forms

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

assets/survey-uploads/5265/305223-Df0w3Xx5v6/Teacher Improvement Plan.PDF

6.3) Appeals Process

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

(1) the substance of the annual professional performance review

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

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

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

APPEALS PROCESS

A Lavelle Prep teacher is not authorized to trigger the appeal process until he or she receives a composite score. Depending on the assessment used, a score may not be available until after the end of the school year. Teachers must receive their composite scores no later than September 1 of the school year next following the school year for which they are being evaluated. Therefore, the appeal

process will be triggered on or before September 1, when the teacher receives his or her composite score.

Only a unit member who is covered by N.Y. Education Law § 3012¬c ("Covered Unit Member" or "teacher") may appeal the result of a performance review and/or an improvement plan pursuant to the following procedure:

a. A Teacher may challenge only the substance of an APPR, the School's adherence to the statutory standards and methodologies required for such review, the School's compliance with its own procedures and timelines for conducting the APPR and the Regulations of the Commissioner of Education and/or the issuance or implementation of a teacher improvement plan ("TIP"). Such challenge must be submitted in writing to the Administrator performing the review, together with any supporting documentation. The challenge must explain in detail the specific reason(s) why the matter identified is the subject of the challenge. A teacher may not file multiple appeals regarding the same APPR or TIP. All grounds for appeal must be raised with specificity within one appeal. Any information in a teacher observation that affects a teacher's rating that has not been shared with the teacher at the time the observation is reviewed with the teacher may not be included in the teacher's summative review. Any grounds not raised at the time the appeal is filed shall be deemed waived. All supporting information must also be submitted at the time the appeal is filed. Any information not submitted at the time the appeal is filed shall not be considered. As part of the documentation supporting an appeal, the teacher may also submit mitigating circumstances that he or she believes to be relevant to the appeal, including but not limited to, class size, students and classes assigned, student attendance, teacher leave/personal time, new initiatives/requirements and physical environment. In an appeal, the teacher has the burden of demonstrating a clear legal right to the relief requested and the burden of establishing the facts upon which he or she seeks relief.

b. A teacher who receives a rating of ineffective on his/her Composite Effectiveness Score may appeal the ineffective rating to the President of Lavelle Prep no later than 15 work days after receiving the ineffective rating. Within 5 work days of receiving the appeal, the President will schedule a meeting with the teacher making the appeal. The meeting will be held within 10 work days of the filing of the appeal unless it is mutually agreed upon between the teacher and the President to meet outside the 10-day requirement. Since the APPR may not be finalized prior to the end of the school year, allowances will be made for approved vacation time which will not count toward the 10-day requirement. The meeting will occur in a timely and expeditious manner and no later than 30 days after the filing of the appeal.
The purpose of the meeting is to discuss the reasons for the appeal and to gather any information the teacher may wish to submit to the President for consideration. Following this meeting, the President will meet with the teacher's principal and supervisor (e.g., Administrator for Pupil Personnel, Athletic Director) to discuss the purpose of the appeal and to gather relevant evidence from the principal and supervisor. This evidence will relate to the reason given for the appeal: (1) substance of the APPR, (2) adherence to applicable standards and methodologies, and/or (3) adherence to regulations of the Commissioner, compliance with locally negotiated procedures, and implementation of the teacher improvement plan (TIP) if applicable.
The President will consider all information received during these meetings and review all observation reports and other evidence used to determine the rating (if the appeal relates to the substance of the APPR) before rendering a final decision on the appeal. The President's decision will be rendered within 10 work days after meeting with the teacher.
c. If the teacher disagrees with the President's response, the teacher may appeal the President's response by submitting a written statement within fifteen (15) days explaining in detail the reason(s) for disagreement with the response to the Lavelle Prep Board of Trustees. Within ten (10) days of its receipt of same, a meeting will be scheduled to discuss the appeal. The Board of Trustees shall render a final determination on the challenge within thirty calendar days thereafter. All appeal processes will be timely and expeditious in accordance with Education Law 3012c.

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.

CEI-PEA, the lead applicant for the TIF grant in which Lavelle Prep is participating, facilitates an 8-week training program in the Danielson Framework for Teaching, which leads to certification as a Danielson Observer/Evaluator upon successful completion of an Educational Testing Service-developed and scored final assessment. Certification prepares evaluators to effectively conduct classroom observations, hold pre- and post-conferences, and utilize the observation data as part of a larger evaluation framework. The individuals who conduct the formal evaluations for teachers are engaged in this certification program in order to prepare them to effectively implement the evaluation system.
In order to further ensure inter-rater reliability, CEI-PEA will engage a nationally-certified Danielson trainer to make regular site visits to ensure that their implementation meets the certification standards.
For the principal evaluation, CEI-PEA also provides a training program in Val-ED, including an introduction to the key processes and components of school leadership that are measured, the survey instrument, and the summative assessment process and tools.
CEI-PEA will provide training to the President and selected Trustees in how to conduct an effective school visit, including selecting the appropriate time, using a principal shadowing protocol, and documenting the visit in a comprehensive and clear narrative. In

order to help ensure quality summative assessments resulting from these observations and inter-rater reliability, the CEI-PEA evaluation expert will help facilitate the summative
assessment process, which occurs during a meeting where the principal and the President compare their rubric-based summative assessments to arrive at a final summative assessment that is then converted to a HEDI score and rating. The evidence of all the training will be presented to the Lavelle Prep Board of Trustees who will certify that each principal is highly qualified to be the lead evaluator for the teachers' evaluations. The Board will re-certify the lead evaluators each school year after reviewing the ongoing training they have received.

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 Sunday, January 06, 2013
Updated Wednesday, January 16, 2013

Page 1

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

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

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

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):

Grades 6-9
NA
NA
NA
NA
NA
NA

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

Please check the boxes below:

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

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

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

State assessments, *required if one exists*

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

List of State-approved 3rd party assessments

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

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

School or Program Type	SLO with Assessment Option	Name of the Assessment

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

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

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

(No response)

7.4) Special Considerations for Comparable Growth Measures

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

Note: The only allowable controls or adjustments for Comparable Growth Measures are those used in State Growth measures, which

include: prior student achievement results, students with disabilities, English language learners, students in poverty, and, in the future, any other student-, classroom-, and school-level characteristics approved by the Board of Regents.

(No response)

7.5) Principals with More Than One Growth Measure

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

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

7.6) Assurances -- Comparable Growth Measures

Please check all of the boxes below:

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

8. Local Measures (Principals)

Created Sunday, January 06, 2013
Updated Tuesday, April 16, 2013

Page 1

Locally-Selected Measures of Student Achievement or Growth

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

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

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

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
	6-9	(d) measures used by district for teacher evaluation	Statewide ELA and math 6-8.

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.	Analyzing baseline data, teachers in collaboration with their principal shall establish individual growth targets for each student. The local sub-component HEDI scores will be calculated based on the percentage of SPED students meeting or exceeding their individual growth targets on the final assessment. For a full description, see attachment 8.1.
Highly Effective (14 - 15 points) Results are well above District- or BOCES-adopted expectations for growth or achievement for grade/subject.	86-100% of students meet their growth target
Effective (8- 13 points) Results meet District- or BOCES-adopted expectations for growth or achievement for grade/subject.	75-85% of students meet their growth target
Developing (3 - 7 points) Results are below District- or BOCES-adopted expectations for growth or achievement for grade/subject.	65-74% of students meet their growth target
Ineffective (0 - 2 points) Results are well below District- or BOCES-adopted expectations for growth or achievement for grade/subject.	64% or less of students meet their growth target

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

(No response)

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

assets/survey-uploads/5366/305284-qBFVOWF7fC/Attachment 8 - 1.docx

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

(i) student learning objectives (only allowable for principals in programs/buildings without a Value-Added measure for the State

Growth subcomponent). Used with one of the following assessments: State, State-approved 3rd party, or a District, regional, or BOCES-developed assessment that is rigorous and comparable across classrooms

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

	Grade Configuration	Locally-Selected Measure from List of Approved Measures	Assessment
	NA		NA

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

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

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

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

(No response)

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

(No response)

8.3) Locally Developed Controls

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

(No response)

8.4) Principals with More Than One Locally Selected Measure

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

(No response)

8.5) Assurances

Please check all of the boxes below:

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

9. Other Measures of Effectiveness (Principals)

Created Sunday, January 06, 2013
Updated Tuesday, April 16, 2013

Page 1

9.1) Principal Practice Rubric

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

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

Vanderbilt Assessment of Leadership in Education (VAL-ED)

(No response)

9.2) Points Within Other Measures

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

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

Is the following points assignment for all principals?

Yes

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

(No response)

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

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

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

(No response)

9.3) Assurances -- Goals

Please check the boxes below (if applicable):

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

9.4) Sources of Evidence (if applicable)

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

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

9.5) Survey Tool(s) (if applicable)

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

(No response)

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

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

District variance	(No response)
Principal Evaluation Tripod School Perception Survey (Combined Parent Survey)	(No response)
Principal Evaluation Tripod School Perception Survey (Combined Student Surveys)	(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.

See process for calculating HEDI score in chart uploaded in 9.7.

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/5143/305296-pMADJ4gk6R/Attachment 9-7_2.docx

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

Highly Effective: Overall performance and results exceed standards.	54-60
Effective: Overall performance and results meet standards.	44-53
Developing: Overall performance and results need improvement in order to meet standards.	38-43
Ineffective: Overall performance and results do not meet standards.	0-37

Please provide the locally-negotiated 60 point scoring bands.

Highly Effective	54-60
Effective	44-53
Developing	38-43

Ineffective	0-37

9.8) School Visits

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

Probationary Principals

By supervisor	2
By trained administrator	0
By trained independent evaluator	2
Enter Total	4

Tenured Principals

By supervisor	2
By trained administrator	0
By trained independent evaluator	2
Enter Total	4

10. Composite Scoring (Principals)

Created Sunday, January 06, 2013
Updated Tuesday, April 16, 2013

Page 1

Standards for Rating Categories

Growth or Comparable Measures

Locally-selected Measures of

growth or achievement

Other Measures of Effectiveness

(Teacher and Leader standards)

Highly

Effective

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

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

Overall performance and results exceed ISLLC leadership standards.

Effective

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

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

Overall performance and results meet ISLLC leadership standards.

Developing

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

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

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

Ineffective

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

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

Overall performance and results do not meet ISLLC leadership standards.

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

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

2012-13 where there is no Value-Added measure

Growth or Comparable Measures

Locally-selected Measures of

growth or achievement

Other Measures of Effectiveness

(60 points)

Overall

Composite Score

Highly Effective

18-20

18-20

Ranges determined locally--see below

91-100

Effective

9-17

9-17

75-90

Developing

3-8

3-8

65-74

Ineffective

0-2

0-2

0-64

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

Highly Effective	54-60
Effective	44-53
Developing	38-43
Ineffective	0-37

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 Sunday, January 06, 2013
Updated Tuesday, April 16, 2013

Page 1

11.1) Assurances -- Improvement Plans

Please check the boxes below.

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

11.2) Attachment: Principal Improvement Plan Forms

As a required attachment to this APPR plan, upload the PIP forms that are used in 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/5276/305300-Df0w3Xx5v6/Lavelle_PIP_appr.doc

11.3) Appeals Process

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

(1) the substance of the annual professional performance review

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

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

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

A Lavelle Prep principal is not authorized to trigger the appeal process until he or she receives a composite score. Depending on the assessment used, a score may not be available until after the end of the school year. Principals must receive their composite scores no later than September 1 of the school year next following the school year for which they are being evaluated. Therefore, the appeal process will be triggered on or before September 1, when the principal receives his or her composite score.

A principal may appeal the result of a performance review and/or an improvement plan pursuant to the following procedure:

a. A Principal may challenge only the substance of an APPR, the School's adherence to the statutory standards and methodologies required for such review, the School's compliance with its own procedures and timelines for conducting the APPR and the Regulations of the Commissioner of Education and/or the issuance or implementation of a principal improvement plan ("PIP"). Such challenge must be submitted in writing to the Administrator performing the review, together with any supporting documentation. The challenge must explain in detail the specific reason(s) why the matter identified is the subject of the challenge. A principal may not file multiple appeals regarding the same APPR or PIP. All grounds for appeal must be raised with specificity within one appeal. Any information in a principal observation that affects a principal's rating that has not been shared with the principal at the time the observation is reviewed with the principal may not be included in the principal's summative review. Any grounds not raised at the time the appeal is filed shall be deemed waived. All supporting information must also be submitted at the time the appeal is filed. Any information not submitted at the time the appeal is filed shall not be considered. As part of the documentation supporting an appeal, the principal may also submit mitigating circumstances that he or she believes to be relevant to the appeal, including but not limited to, class size, students and classes assigned, student attendance, principal leave/personal time, new initiatives/requirements and physical environment. In an appeal, the principal has the burden of demonstrating a clear legal right to the relief requested and the burden of establishing the facts upon which he or she seeks relief.

b. A principal who receives a rating of ineffective on his/her Composite Effectiveness Score may appeal the ineffective rating to the Lavelle Prep Board of Trustees no later than 15 work days after receiving the ineffective rating. Within 5 work days of receiving the appeal, the Board will schedule a meeting with the principal making the appeal. The meeting will be held within 10 work days of the filing of the appeal unless it is mutually agreed upon between the principal and the President to meet outside the 10-day requirement. Since the APPR may not be finalized prior to the end of the school year, allowances will be made for approved vacation time which will not count toward the 10-day requirement. The meeting will occur in a timely and expeditious manner and no later than 30 days after the filing of the appeal.
The purpose of the meeting is to discuss the reasons for the appeal and to gather any information the principal may wish to submit for consideration. Following this meeting, the President will meet with the Principal and at their discretion with other administrators to discuss the purpose of the appeal and to gather relevant evidence. This evidence will relate to the reason given for the appeal: (1) substance of the APPR, (2) adherence to applicable standards and methodologies, and/or (3) adherence to regulations of the Commissioner, compliance with locally negotiated procedures, and implementation of the principal improvement plan (PIP) if applicable.
The Board will consider all information received during these meetings and review all observation reports and other evidence used to determine the rating (if the appeal relates to the substance of the APPR) before rendering a final decision on the appeal. The Board of Trustees shall render a final determination on the challenge within thirty calendar days thereafter. All appeal processes will be timely and expeditious in accordance with Education Law 3012c.

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.

CEI-PEA, the lead applicant for the TIF grant in which Lavelle Prep is participating, facilitates an 8-week training program in the Danielson Framework for Teaching, which leads to certification as a Danielson Observer/Evaluator upon successful completion of an Educational Testing Service-developed and scored final assessment. Certification prepares evaluators to effectively conduct classroom observations, hold pre- and post-conferences, and utilize the observation data as part of a larger evaluation framework. The individuals who conduct the formal evaluations for teachers are engaged in this certification program in order to prepare them to effectively implement the evaluation system.
In order to further ensure inter-rater reliability, CEI-PEA will engage a nationally-certified Danielson trainer to make regular site visits to ensure that their implementation meets the certification standards.
For the principal evaluation, CEI-PEA also provides a training program in Val-ED, including an introduction to the key processes and components of school leadership that are measured, the survey instrument, and the summative assessment process and tools. CEI-PEA will provide training to the President and selected Trustees in how to conduct an effective school visit, including selecting the appropriate time, using a principal shadowing protocol, and documenting the visit in a comprehensive and clear narrative. In order to help ensure quality summative assessments resulting from these observations and inter-rater reliability, the CEI-PEA evaluation expert will help facilitate the summative
assessment process, which occurs during a meeting where the principal and the President compare their rubric-based summative assessments to arrive at a final summative assessment that is then converted to a HEDI score and rating. The evidence of all the training will be presented to the Lavelle Prep Board of Trustees who will certify that each principal is highly qualified to be the lead evaluator for the teachers' evaluations. The Board will re-certify the lead evaluators each school year after reviewing the ongoing training they have received.

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 Sunday, January 06, 2013
Updated Tuesday, April 16, 2013

Page 1

12.1)Upload the Joint Certification of the APPR Plan

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

assets/survey-uploads/5581/305302-3Uqgn5g9Iu/distrcit certification.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.

2.11 -- Growth on State Assessments or Comparable Measures (Teachers)

20 Points

Method

Student Achievement Data Source: For each grade level and subject area, Lavelle Prep assigns an appropriate assessment that is implemented to measure “pre” and “post” student achievement. These assessments are aligned with NYS law 3012-c.

Growth Targets: At the outset of each school year, all teachers will work with their supervisor to establish rigorous Growth Targets for students in their classroom as measured through the “pre-test” and “post-test” on the approved assessment. In order to properly track student growth outcomes for each teacher, all teachers will be matched to their students at the outset of the school year.

Sub-Component HEDI Rating: The % of students within the teacher’s assigned classroom that meet their growth targets is assigned to a 0-20 score on the HEDI scale (see below), which in turn corresponds to one of four categories—Highly Effective, Effective, Developing or Ineffective.

HEDI	% of students achieving or meeting target	Scale Point
Highly effective	96-100	20
Highly effective	91-95	19
Highly effective	86-90	18
Effective	84-85	17
Effective	82-83	16
Effective	81	15
Effective	70-81	14
Effective	79	13
Effective	78-79	12
Effective	77	11
Effective	76-77	10
Effective	75	09
Developing	73-74	08
Developing	71-72	07
Developing	69-70	06
Developing	68	05
Developing	67-68	04
Developing	65-66	03
Ineffective	44-64	02
Ineffective	22-43	01
Ineffective	0-21	00

3.3 – Local Growth Measures (Teachers)

15 Points

Method

Student Achievement Data Source: For each grade level and subject area, Lavelle Prep assigns an appropriate assessment that is implemented to measure "pre" and "post" student achievement. These assessments are aligned with NYS law 3012-c.

Growth Targets: At the outset of each school year, all teachers will work with their supervisor to establish rigorous Growth Targets for students in their classroom as measured through the "pre-test" and "post-test" on the approved assessment. In order to properly track student growth outcomes for each teacher, all teachers will be matched to their students at the outset of the school year.

Sub-Component HEDI Rating: The % of students within the teacher's assigned classroom that meet their growth targets is assigned to a 0-15 score on the HEDI scale (see below), which in turn corresponds to one of four categories—Highly Effective, Effective, Developing or Ineffective.

HEDI	% of students achieving or meeting target	Scale Point
Highly effective	94-100	15
Highly effective	86-93	14
Effective	84-85	13
Effective	83-84	12
Effective	81-82	11
Effective	79-80	10
Effective	77-78	09
Effective	75-76	08
Developing	73-74	07
Developing	71-72	06
Developing	69-70	05
Developing	67-68	04
Developing	65-66	03
Ineffective	44-64	02
Ineffective	22-43	01
Ineffective	0-21	00

3.13 – Local Growth Measures Other (Teachers)

20 Points

Method

Student Achievement Data Source: For each grade level and subject area, Lavelle Prep assigns an appropriate assessment that is implemented to measure “pre” and “post” student achievement. These assessments are aligned with NYS law 3012-c.

Growth Targets: At the outset of each school year, all teachers will work with their supervisor to establish rigorous Growth Targets for students in their classroom as measured through the “pre-test” and “post-test” on the approved assessment. In order to properly track student growth outcomes for each teacher, all teachers will be matched to their students at the outset of the school year.

Sub-Component HEDI Rating: The % of students within the teacher’s assigned classroom that meet their growth targets is assigned to a 0-20 score on the HEDI scale (see below), which in turn corresponds to one of four categories—Highly Effective, Effective, Developing or Ineffective.

HEDI	% of students achieving or meeting target	Scale Point
Highly effective	96-100	20
Highly effective	91-95	19
Highly effective	86-90	18
Effective	84-85	17
Effective	82-83	16
Effective	81	15
Effective	70-81	14
Effective	79	13
Effective	78-79	12
Effective	77	11
Effective	76-77	10
Effective	75	09
Developing	73-74	08
Developing	71-72	07
Developing	69-70	06
Developing	68	05
Developing	67-68	04
Developing	65-66	03
Ineffective	44-64	02
Ineffective	22-43	01
Ineffective	0-21	00

Attachment 4.5 -- Other Measures of Effectiveness (Teachers)

Danielson Framework for Teaching
60 points

METHODOLOGY

Using the Danielson Framework for Teaching, a trained evaluator (supervisor) will conduct the following (at a minimum) in order to arrive at a **summative evaluation score** for the teacher:
Required: Two classroom observations: one announced; one unannounced
Required: Pre-Observation and Post-Observation conferences for the announced observation.
Required: Post-Observation conference for unannounced observation
Recommended: Additional walkthroughs and post-walkthrough conferences that collect evidence (not checklists) of teacher effectiveness related to the Danielson rubric.

The **summative evaluation** will provide a rating for the teacher in all 22 components across the 4 Domains according to the Danielson Rating levels of Unsatisfactory, Basic, Proficient and Distinguished. Please reference the rubric for the Danielson Framework for Teaching to see how Domain components are assessed at the four levels. In turn, each of these levels will be converted to a "Quality Point" (0-3) that is used to calculate the teacher's HEDI score and rating that. The Quality Point score is then converted to a HEDI score for each Domain; the conversion plan from Quality to HEDI points accounts for varying weights given to the Domains and is aligned with the overall composite score ranges.

Sub-Component HEDI Rating

The HEDI rating for this sub-component is determined by totaling the HEDI points awarded in each Domain and then converting them to the score ranges below:

Domain 1 – 10 points
Domain 2 – 20 points
Domain 3 – 20 points
Domain 4 – 10 points
TOTAL POSSIBLE – 60 points

Scoring Ranges based on Total Points
Highly Effective: 55 to 60 points.
Effective: 45 to 54 points
Developing: 39 to 44 points
Ineffective: 38 points or less

Domain 1 – Planning and Preparation (10 points)

STEP 1 – DANIELSON RATING → QUALITY POINT

Component	Unsatisfactory	Basic	Proficient	Distinguished	QUALITY POINTS (Score)
Domain 1 - A	0	1	2	3	0-3
Domain 1 - B	0	1	2	3	0-3
Domain 1 - C	0	1	2	3	0-3
Domain 1 - D	0	1	2	3	0-3
Domain 1 - E	0	1	2	3	0-3

Domain 1 - F	0	1	2	3	0-3
TOTAL QUALITY POINTS					**0-18**

Convert Domain 1 Quality Points to HEDI points by Multiplying Quality Points by 10 and Dividing by 18.

Domain 2 – Classroom Environment (20 points)

STEP 1 – DANIELSON RATING → QUALITY POINT

Component	Unsatisfactory	Basic	Proficient	Distinguished	QUALITY POINTS (Score)
Domain 2 - A	0	1	2	3	0-3
Domain 2 - B	0	1	2	3	0-3
Domain 2 - C	0	1	2	3	0-3
Domain 2 - D	0	1	2	3	0-3
Domain 2 - E	0	1	2	3	0-3
TOTAL QUALITY POINTS					**0-15**

Convert Domain 2 Quality Points to HEDI points by Multiplying Quality Points by 20 and Dividing by 15.

Domain 3 – Instruction (20 points)

STEP 1 – DANIELSON RATING → QUALITY POINT

Component	Unsatisfactory	Basic	Proficient	Distinguished	QUALITY POINTS (Score)
Domain 3 - A	0	1	2	3	0-3
Domain 3 - B	0	1	2	3	0-3
Domain 3 - C	0	1	2	3	0-3
Domain 3 - D	0	1	2	3	0-3
Domain 3 - E	0	1	2	3	0-3
TOTAL QUALITY POINTS					**0-15**

Convert Domain 3 Quality Points to HEDI points by Multiplying Quality Points by 20 and Dividing by 15.

Domain 4 – Professional Responsibilities (10 points)

STEP 1 – DANIELSON RATING → QUALITY POINT

Component	Unsatisfactory	Basic	Proficient	Distinguished	QUALITY POINTS (Score)
Domain 4 - A	0	1	2	3	0-3
Domain 4 - B	0	1	2	3	0-3
Domain 4 - C	0	1	2	3	0-3
Domain 4 - D	0	1	2	3	0-3
Domain 4 - E	0	1	2	3	0-3
Domain 4 - F	0	1	2	3	0-3
TOTAL QUALITY POINTS					**0-18**

Convert Domain 4 Quality Points to HEDI points by Multiplying Quality Points by 10 and Dividing by 18.

Computing the Sub-Component HEDI Rating for Danielson

Add up the HEDI points earned within teach Domain (see above) and it provides the HEDI rating and score for this sub-component:

Domain 1 HEDI points– maximum 10 points	**Scoring Ranges based on Total Points**
Domain 2 HEDI points – maximum 20 points	Highly Effective: 55 to 60 points.
Domain 3 HEDI points – maximum 20 points	Effective: 45 to 54 points
Domain 4 HEDI points – maximum 10 points	Developing: 39 to 44 points
TOTAL HEDI points – maximum 60 points	Ineffective: 38 points or less

Normal rounding rules apply. However, in no instance will rounding rules result in a teacher scoring out of their assigned HEDI rating.

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

Method

Student Achievement Data Source: For each grade level and subject area, Lavelle Prep assigns an appropriate assessment that is implemented to measure “pre” and “post” student achievement. These assessments are aligned with NYS law 3012-c.

Growth Targets: At the outset of each school year, all principals will work with their supervisor to establish rigorous Growth Targets for students as measured through the “pre-test” and “post-test” on the approved assessment.

Sub-Component HEDI Rating: Based on the % of students within the principal’s range of responsibility who meet their growth targets, the principal is assigned to a 0-15 score on the HEDI scale (see below), which in turn corresponds to one of four categories—Highly Effective, Effective, Developing or Ineffective.

HEDI	% of students achieving or meeting target	Scale Point
Highly effective	94-100	15
Highly effective	86-93	14
Effective	84-85	13
Effective	83-84	12
Effective	81-82	11
Effective	79-80	10
Effective	77-78	09
Effective	75-76	08
Developing	73-74	07
Developing	71-72	06
Developing	69-70	05
Developing	67-68	04
Developing	65-66	03
Ineffective	44-64	02
Ineffective	22-43	01
Ineffective	0-21	00

2.11 -- Growth on State Assessments or Comparable Measures (Teachers)

20 Points

Method

Student Achievement Data Source: For each grade level and subject area, Lavelle Prep assigns an appropriate assessment that is implemented to measure “pre” and “post” student achievement. These assessments are aligned with NYS law 3012-c.

Growth Targets: At the outset of each school year, all teachers will work with their supervisor to establish rigorous Growth Targets for students in their classroom as measured through the “pre-test” and “post-test” on the approved assessment. In order to properly track student growth outcomes for each teacher, all teachers will be matched to their students at the outset of the school year.

Sub-Component HEDI Rating: The % of students within the teacher’s assigned classroom that meet their growth targets is assigned to a 0-20 score on the HEDI scale (see below), which in turn corresponds to one of four categories—Highly Effective, Effective, Developing or Ineffective.

HEDI	% of students achieving or meeting target	Scale Point
Highly effective	96-100	20
Highly effective	91-95	19
Highly effective	86-90	18
Effective	84-85	17
Effective	82-83	16
Effective	81	15
Effective	80	14
Effective	79	13
Effective	78	12
Effective	77	11
Effective	76	10
Effective	75	09
Developing	73-74	08
Developing	71-72	07
Developing	69-70	06
Developing	68	05
Developing	67	04
Developing	65-66	03
Ineffective	44-64	02
Ineffective	22-43	01
Ineffective	0-21	00

3.3 – Local Growth Measures (Teachers)

15 Points

Method

Student Achievement Data Source: For each grade level and subject area, Lavelle Prep assigns an appropriate assessment that is implemented to measure "pre" and "post" student achievement. These assessments are aligned with NYS law 3012-c.

Growth Targets: At the outset of each school year, all teachers will work with their supervisor to establish rigorous Growth Targets for students in their classroom as measured through the "pre-test" and "post-test" on the approved assessment. In order to properly track student growth outcomes for each teacher, all teachers will be matched to their students at the outset of the school year.

Sub-Component HEDI Rating: The % of students within the teacher's assigned classroom that meet their growth targets is assigned to a 0-15 score on the HEDI scale (see below), which in turn corresponds to one of four categories—Highly Effective, Effective, Developing or Ineffective.

HEDI	% of students achieving or meeting target	Scale Point
Highly effective	94-100	15
Highly effective	86-93	14
Effective	84-85	13
Effective	83	12
Effective	81-82	11
Effective	79-80	10
Effective	77-78	09
Effective	75-76	08
Developing	73-74	07
Developing	71-72	06
Developing	69-70	05
Developing	67-68	04
Developing	65-66	03
Ineffective	44-64	02
Ineffective	22-43	01
Ineffective	0-21	00

3.13 – Local Growth Measures Other (Teachers)

20 Points

Method

Student Achievement Data Source: For each grade level and subject area, Lavelle Prep assigns an appropriate assessment that is implemented to measure “pre” and “post” student achievement. These assessments are aligned with NYS law 3012-c.

Growth Targets: At the outset of each school year, all teachers will work with their supervisor to establish rigorous Growth Targets for students in their classroom as measured through the “pre-test” and “post-test” on the approved assessment. In order to properly track student growth outcomes for each teacher, all teachers will be matched to their students at the outset of the school year.

Sub-Component HEDI Rating: The % of students within the teacher’s assigned classroom that meet their growth targets is assigned to a 0-20 score on the HEDI scale (see below), which in turn corresponds to one of four categories—Highly Effective, Effective, Developing or Ineffective.

HEDI	% of students achieving or meeting target	Scale Point
Highly effective	96-100	20
Highly effective	91-95	19
Highly effective	86-90	18
Effective	84-85	17
Effective	82-83	16
Effective	81	15
Effective	80	14
Effective	79	13
Effective	78	12
Effective	77	11
Effective	76	10
Effective	75	09
Developing	73-74	08
Developing	71-72	07
Developing	69-70	06
Developing	68	05
Developing	67	04
Developing	65-66	03
Ineffective	44-64	02
Ineffective	22-43	01
Ineffective	0-21	00

Attachment 4.5 -- Other Measures of Effectiveness (Teachers)

Danielson Framework for Teaching
60 points

METHODOLOGY

Using the Danielson Framework for Teaching, a trained evaluator (supervisor) will conduct the following (at a minimum) in order to arrive at a **summative evaluation score** for the teacher:
Required: Two classroom observations: one announced; one unannounced
Required: Pre-Observation and Post-Observation conferences for the announced observation.
Required: Post-Observation conference for unannounced observation
Recommended: Additional walkthroughs and post-walkthrough conferences that collect evidence (not checklists) of teacher effectiveness related to the Danielson rubric.

The **summative evaluation** will provide a rating for the teacher in all 22 components across the 4 Domains according to the Danielson Rating levels of Unsatisfactory, Basic, Proficient and Distinguished. Please reference the rubric for the Danielson Framework for Teaching to see how Domain components are assessed at the four levels. In turn, each of these levels will be converted to a "Quality Point" (0-3) that is used to calculate the teacher's HEDI score and rating that. The Quality Point score is then converted to a HEDI score for each Domain; the conversion plan from Quality to HEDI points accounts for varying weights given to the Domains and is aligned with the overall composite score ranges.

Sub-Component HEDI Rating

The HEDI rating for this sub-component is determined by totaling the HEDI points awarded in each Domain and then converting them to the score ranges below:

Domain 1 – 10 points
Domain 2 – 20 points
Domain 3 – 20 points
Domain 4 – 10 points
TOTAL POSSIBLE – 60 points

Scoring Ranges based on Total Points
Highly Effective: 55 to 60 points.
Effective: 45 to 54 points
Developing: 39 to 44 points
Ineffective: 38 points or less

Domain 1 – Planning and Preparation (10 points)

STEP 1 – DANIELSON RATING → QUALITY POINT

Component	Unsatisfactory	Basic	Proficient	Distinguished	QUALITY POINTS (Score)
Domain 1 - A	0	1	2	3	0-3
Domain 1 - B	0	1	2	3	0-3
Domain 1 - C	0	1	2	3	0-3
Domain 1 - D	0	1	2	3	0-3
Domain 1 - E	0	1	2	3	0-3

Domain 1 - F	0	1	2	3	0-3
TOTAL QUALITY POINTS					**0-18**

Convert Domain 1 Quality Points to HEDI points by Multiplying Quality Points by 10 and Dividing by 18.

Domain 2 – Classroom Environment (20 points)

STEP 1 – DANIELSON RATING → QUALITY POINT

Component	Unsatisfactory	Basic	Proficient	Distinguished	QUALITY POINTS (Score)
Domain 2 - A	0	1	2	3	0-3
Domain 2 - B	0	1	2	3	0-3
Domain 2 - C	0	1	2	3	0-3
Domain 2 - D	0	1	2	3	0-3
Domain 2 - E	0	1	2	3	0-3
TOTAL QUALITY POINTS					**0-15**

Convert Domain 2 Quality Points to HEDI points by Multiplying Quality Points by 20 and Dividing by 15.

Domain 3 – Instruction (20 points)

STEP 1 – DANIELSON RATING → QUALITY POINT

Component	Unsatisfactory	Basic	Proficient	Distinguished	QUALITY POINTS (Score)
Domain 3 - A	0	1	2	3	0-3
Domain 3 - B	0	1	2	3	0-3
Domain 3 - C	0	1	2	3	0-3
Domain 3 - D	0	1	2	3	0-3
Domain 3 - E	0	1	2	3	0-3
TOTAL QUALITY POINTS					**0-15**

Convert Domain 3 Quality Points to HEDI points by Multiplying Quality Points by 20 and Dividing by 15.

Domain 4 – Professional Responsibilities (10 points)

STEP 1 – DANIELSON RATING → QUALITY POINT

Component	Unsatisfactory	Basic	Proficient	Distinguished	QUALITY POINTS (Score)
Domain 4 - A	0	1	2	3	0-3
Domain 4 - B	0	1	2	3	0-3
Domain 4 - C	0	1	2	3	0-3
Domain 4 - D	0	1	2	3	0-3
Domain 4 - E	0	1	2	3	0-3
Domain 4 - F	0	1	2	3	0-3
TOTAL QUALITY POINTS					**0-18**

Convert Domain 4 Quality Points to HEDI points by Multiplying Quality Points by 10 and Dividing by 18.

Computing the Sub-Component HEDI Rating for Danielson

Add up the HEDI points earned within teach Domain (see above) and it provides the HEDI rating and score for this sub-component:

Domain 1 HEDI points– maximum 10 points	**Scoring Ranges based on Total Points**
Domain 2 HEDI points – maximum 20 points	Highly Effective: 55 to 60 points.
Domain 3 HEDI points – maximum 20 points	Effective: 45 to 54 points
Domain 4 HEDI points – maximum 10 points	Developing: 39 to 44 points
TOTAL HEDI points – maximum 60 points	Ineffective: 38 points or less

Normal rounding rules apply. However, in no instance will rounding rules result in a teacher scoring out of their assigned HEDI rating.

John W. Lavelle Preparatory Charter School

Teacher Improvement Plan (TIP) Policy and Procedure

The Teacher Improvement Plan (TIP) is designed to identify specific areas of performance that are in need of improvement and outlines a plan of action to assist the teacher in improving performance in those identified areas. The TIP clearly delineates the areas to be addressed, the expected improvement in performance, evidence that will be collected to determine if improvement has been made, and a timeline for improvement.

A TIP will be developed for any teacher who receives a rating of developing or ineffective in his/her year-end evaluation. The teacher and his/her principal will meet to discuss the need for the TIP no later than June 30th of the school year where the evaluation with a rating of developing or ineffective is received. If the Composite Effectiveness Score is not available by June 30, the district will not make the determination for a TIP until the Composite Effectiveness Score is received. The specific TIP will be developed by the supervisor in consultation with the teacher and put in place no later than September 10 of the following school year. An initial conference shall be held at the beginning of the school year to finalize the TIP, sign off on the document, and implement the plan.

A teacher who receives a rating of ineffective will be assigned a mentor who will work with the teacher to address the concerns outlined in the TIP. The mentor will be another teacher who has been trained as a mentor and who teaches the same grade and subject if possible.

If the teacher on a TIP receives a rating of developing or ineffective at the end of the school year for which the TIP is in place, the teacher will be given a new TIP following the process outlined above.

***

John W. Lavelle Preparatory Charter School Teacher Improvement Plan (TIP) Outline

Name _____

School year _____

Grade/Department _____ Principal _____

1. Areas in need of improvement:
2. Expectations to demonstrate improvement:
3. Recommended resources and activities to help the teacher's performance improve:
4. Assessment of the evidence to determine if expected improvement occurred:
5. Timeline to demonstrate improvement:

Teacher _____ Date _____

Principal _____ Date _____

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

Method

Student Achievement Data Source: For each grade level and subject area, Lavelle Prep assigns an appropriate assessment that is implemented to measure “pre” and “post” student achievement. These assessments are aligned with NYS law 3012-c.

Growth Targets: At the outset of each school year, all teachers will work with their supervisor to establish rigorous Growth Targets for students in their classroom as measured through the “pre-test” and “post-test” on the approved assessment. In order to properly track student growth outcomes for each teacher, all teachers will be matched to their students at the outset of the school year.

Sub-Component HEDI Rating: Based on the % of students within the principal’s range of responsibility who meet their growth targets, the principal is assigned to a 0-15 score on the HEDI scale (see below), which in turn corresponds to one of four categories—Highly Effective, Effective, Developing or Ineffective.

HEDI	% of students achieving or meeting target	Scale Point
Highly effective	96-100	15
Highly effective	90-95	14
Effective	83-89	13
Effective	76-82	12
Effective	69-75	11
Effective	62-68	10
Effective	56-61	09
Effective	50-55	08
Developing	44-49	07
Developing	39-43	06
Developing	33-38	05
Developing	25-32	04
Developing	20-24	03
Ineffective	15-19	02
Ineffective	10-14	01
Ineffective	0-9	00

Attachment 9.7 Other Measures of Effectiveness (Principals)

60 points

IN-SCHOOL REVIEWS OF LEADERSHIP (35 points)

Two announced observations conducted by a trained, independent observer who will use rubrics developed by CEI-PEA that have been reviewed and approved by national experts in school leader evaluation.

In-School Reviews of Leadership (35 points)

- Two announced observations conducted by a trained, supervisor who will use rubrics developed by CEI-PEA that have been reviewed and approved by national experts in school leader evaluation.
    - One observation will focus on implementation of the Danielson Framework for Teaching. This observation will assess the school leader's performance during a teacher's post-observation conference related to the Danielson Framework (see "Teacher Evaluation" for more information).
    - The other observation will focus on leadership at a group meeting that addresses issues of professional development such as creation and growth of data cultures and professional learning communities, implementing the Common Core, mapping the school's curriculum, etc. The meeting should not be administrative in focus.
- At least one unannounced visit conducted by a supervisor who will produce a narrative summary of his/her visit to be included as part of the data for the Summative Assessment (see below).
- Points allocated to a Summative Assessment conducted in Spring by the supervisor in consultation with the school leader, using (at a minimum) data from above the listed in-school reviews.

Survey of Leadership (25 points)

- Uses Val-ED, an independently-administered survey to assess school leader's performance.
- Includes self-assessment by the school leader and blind survey of teachers and the school leader's supervisor.
- Scoring correlated to national representative sample.
- Points allocated to Overall Mean Score.

SUMMATIVE ASSESSMENT

In-School Reviews of Leadership (35 points)

Data Source: Evidence and data collected through (at a minimum) the two observations and one school visit described above.

Process: In Spring of each year, the school leader will conference with his/her supervisor to review all evidence and establish a Summative Assessment by scoring the school leader in the Core Components of school leadership, as defined by Val-ED (Vanderbilt Assessment of Leadership in Education). The school leader will be scored at one of four levels, which correspond to a numerical value: Highly Effective (3), Effective (2), Developing (1) or Ineffective (0). The school leader is provided with a "Quality Point" score within each Component, which are then totaled and converted to a HEDI score and rating based upon the conversion charts on pages 7 to 8.

CORE COMPONENTS OF SCHOOL LEADERSHIP

1. High Standards for Student Learning.

Functions	Ineffective	Developing	Effective	Highly	QUALITY

				Effective	POINTS
Plans targets of faculty performance that emphasize improvement in student learning	0	1	2	3	0-3
Creates expectations that faculty maintain high standards for student learning.	0	1	2	3	0-3
Encourages students to successfully achieve rigorous goals for student learning	0	1	2	3	0-3
Challenges low expectations for special needs students.	0	1	2	3	0-3
Communicates with families and the community about goals for rigorous student learning	0	1	2	3	0-3
Monitors student learning against high standards of achievement	0	1	2	3	0-3
SUB-TOTAL QUALITY POINTS					**0-18**

2. Rigorous Curriculum

Functions	Ineffective	Developing	Effective	Highly Effective	QUALITY POINTS
Develops a rigorous curriculum for all students	0	1	2	3	0-3
Implements a rigorous curriculum in all classes	0	1	2	3	0-3
Supports teachers to teach a curriculum consistent with state and national content standards	0	1	2	3	0-3
Advocates a rigorous curriculum that honors the diversity of students and their families	0	1	2	3	0-3
Discusses the importance of addressing the same academic content in special and regular programs	0	1	2	3	0-3
Evaluates the rigor of the curriculum	0	1	2	3	0-3
SUB-TOTAL QUALITY POINTS					**0-18**

3. Quality Instruction

Functions	Ineffective	Developing	Effective	Highly Effective	QUALITY POINTS
Plans a schedule that enables quality instruction	0	1	2	3	0-3
Coordinates efforts to improve instruction in all classes	0	1	2	3	0-3
Supports collaboration among faculty to improve instruction that maximizes student learning	0	1	2	3	0-3
Advocates opportunities for high quality instruction beyond the regular school day and year	0	1	2	3	0-3
Discusses instructional practices during faculty meetings	0	1	2	3	0-3
Evaluates teachers' instructional practices	0	1	2	3	0-3
SUB-TOTAL QUALITY POINTS					**0-18**

4. Culture of Learning & Professional Behavior

Functions	Ineffective	Developing	Effective	Highly Effective	QUALITY POINTS
Plans a positive environment in which student learning is the central focus	0	1	2	3	0-3
Builds a culture that honors academic achievement	0	1	2	3	0-3
Allocates resources to build a culture focused on student learning	0	1	2	3	0-3
Advocates a culture of learning that respects diversity of students	0	1	2	3	0-3
Discusses standards of professional behavior with faculty	0	1	2	3	0-3
Assesses the culture of the school from students' perspectives	0	1	2	3	0-3
SUB-TOTAL QUALITY POINTS					**0-18**

5. Connections to External Communities

Functions	Ineffective	Developing	Effective	Highly Effective	QUALITY POINTS
Develops a plan for community outreach programs consistent with instructional goals	0	1	2	3	0-3
Implements programs to help address community needs	0	1	2	3	0-3
Allocates resources that build family and community partnerships to advance student learning	0	1	2	3	0-3
Promotes mechanisms for reaching families who are least comfortable at school	0	1	2	3	0-3
Listens to feedback from the community	0	1	2	3	0-3
Uses data on parent involvement in teacher evaluations	0	1	2	3	0-3
SUB-TOTAL QUALITY POINTS					**0-18**

6. Performance Accountability

Functions	Ineffective	Developing	Effective	Highly Effective	QUALITY POINTS
Develops a plan for individual and collective accountability among faculty for student learning	0	1	2	3	0-3
Uses faculty input to create methods to hold faculty accountable	0	2	2	3	0-3
Allocates time to evaluate student learning	0	1	2	3	0-3
Challenges faculty who blame others for student failure	0	1	2	3	0-3
Communicates to faculty how accountability results will be used for school improvement	0	1	2	3	0-3
Analyzes the influence of faculty evaluations on the rigor of the curriculum	0	1	2	3	0-3
SUB-TOTAL QUALITY POINTS					**0-18**

Total Quality Points

Add up the quality points from each Component to arrive at the total Quality Points.

Component	QUALITY POINTS
1. High Standards for Student Learning	0-18
2. Rigorous Curriculum	0-18
3. Quality Instruction	0-18
4. Culture of Learning & Professional Behavior	0-18
5. Connections to External Communities	0-18
6. Performance Accountability	0-18
TOTAL QUALITY POINTS	**0-108**

From Quality Points → HEDI Score

To compute the HEDI score, Multiply the Quality Score by 35 and divide by 108.

Normal rounding rules apply. However, in no instance will rounding rules result in a teacher scoring out of their assigned HEDI rating.

Survey of Leadership (25 points)

Data Source: VAL-ED (Vanderbilt Assessment of Leadership in Education)

Process: The VAL-ED assessment includes a principal self-assessment and survey of teachers and supervisors (Board members). Data from VAL-ED is designed to provide a summary of effectiveness of a principal's learning-centered leadership behaviors during the current school year. VAL-ED provides a total score across all respondents as well as separately by respondent group. The scores from the teachers are based on the average across all teacher respondents. The total score, core component, and key process effectiveness ratings are interpreted against a national representative sample that includes principals, supervisors, and teachers, providing a percentile rank. The results are also interpreted against a set of performance standards ranging from Below Basic to Distinguished. The scores associated with performance levels were determined by a national panel of principals, supervisors and teachers. For the purposes of the School Leader Evaluation, the principal's **Overall Mean Score** from all of the six core components and six key processes will be used to determine his or her HEDI score. These components and processes are:

Core Components	Key Processes
High Standards for Student Learning	Planning
Rigorous Curriculum	Implementing
Quality Instruction	Supporting
Culture of Learning & Professional Behavior	Advocating
Connections to External Communities	Communicating
Performance Accountability	Monitoring

HEDI Score: VAL-ED provides an **Overall Mean Score** on a 5-point scale of 1=Ineffective; 2=Minimally Effective; 3=Satisfactorily Effective; 4=Highly Effective; 5=Outstandingly Effective. The Overall Mean Score will then be aligned with one of the four HEDI categories—Highly Effective, Effective, Developing or Ineffective—using the chart below (0-25 points). The cut-offs are based upon a national field trial conducted by Discovery Education that

included 300 principals and resulted in 17% of principals at the Ineffective level, 33% at the Developing level, 36% at the Proficient level, and 14% at the Highly Effective level.[1]

	HIGHLY EFFECTIVE			EFFECTIVE					DEVELOPING		
HEDI	25	24	23	22.5	22	21	20	19	18.5	17	16
Mean Score	4.8-5	4.4-4.7	4-4.3	3.99	3.9	3.8	3.7	3.6	3.59	3.4	3.3

	INEFFECTIVE														
HEDI	15.9	15.5	15	14.5	14	13.5	13	12.5	12	11.5	11	10.5	10	5	0
Mean Score	3.2	3.1	3	2.9	2.8	2.7	2.6	2.5	2.4	2.3	2.2	2.1	2	1.5 - 1.9	1-1.4

[1] See http://usny.nysed.gov/rttt/teachers-leaders/practicerubrics/ for a link to the Val-ED conversion to HEDI process designed by Discovery Education, based on the national study of 300 principals.

Overcoming Barriers & Fulfilling the College Promise

John W. Lavelle Preparatory Charter School -- Principal Improvement Plan

Principal: _____ School Year: _____

Date of Principal Improvement Plan Conference: _____

Assignment and School Year for the Improvement: _____

I. List the specific areas that are targeted for improvement citing from the principal's evaluation and correlating with the District's APPR plan:

II. The following list will identify specific objectives and targeted goals that are needed to be met for improvement:

III. Outlined below are the activities and their respective timelines related to the Principal's responsibilities in working towards the achievement of the specific objectives and target goals for his/her improvement plan:

IV. Resources that will be provided in assisting the principal to improve his/her performance:

V. Criteria and evidence that will be utilized for measuring the principal's progress and achievement with respect to the specific objectives and targeted goals:

VI. Dates and timeline for measuring achievement and the expected outcomes of the plan:

Principal's Signature: _____ Date: _____

President's Signature: _____ Date: _____

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

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

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

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

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

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

Signatures, dates

Superintendent Signature: Date:

Kenneth Bogden 4/16/13

Teachers Union President Signature: Date:

NA

Administrative Union President Signature: Date:

NA

Board of Education President Signature: Date:

William Hf 4/16/2013