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 Avenue, Room 111
Albany, New York 12234

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

June 17, 2014

Revised-Expedited Assessment Material Change

Mark P. Mondanaro, Superintendent
Kenmore-Tonawanda Union Free School District
1500 Colvin Boulevard
Buffalo, NY 14223

Dear Superintendent Mondanaro:

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

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

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

Thank you again for your hard work.

Sincerely,

John B. King, Jr.
Commissioner

Attachment

c: Donald Ogilvie

NOTES:

Only the material changes included in your Expedited Assessment Material Change request were reviewed. The remaining sections of your district's/BOCES' plan, as approved by the Commissioner on [DATE], remain in effect. Therefore, it is the responsibility of the district/BOCES to ensure that the change(s) approved will not have any impact on the implementation of any other part of its approved plan.

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

Annual Professional Performance Reviews

Created Tuesday, April 30, 2013
Updated Thursday, February 27, 2014

1

Disclaimers

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

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

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

1. SCHOOL DISTRICT INFORMATION

1.1) School District's BEDS Number : 142601030000

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

142601030000

1.2) School District Name: KENMORE-TONAWANDA UFSD

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

KENMORE-TONAWANDA UFSD

1.3) Assurances

Please check all of the boxes below:

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

1.3) Assurances | Assure that it is understood that this district/BOCES' APPR plan will be posted in its entirety on the NYSED website following approval	Checked

1.4) Submission Status

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

Submission of material changes to an approved APPR plan

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

Created Tuesday, April 30, 2013
Updated Friday, May 09, 2014

Page 1

STATE-PROVIDED MEASURES OF STUDENT GROWTH (25 points with an approved value-added measure)

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

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

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

2.1) Assurances

Please check the boxes below:

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

STUDENT LEARNING OBJECTIVES AS COMPARABLE GROWTH MEASURES (20 points)

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

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

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

If no State assessment or Regents exam exists:

District-determined assessments from list of State-approved 3rd party assessments; or
District, regional or BOCES-developed assessments provided that it is rigorous and comparable across classrooms

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

State assessments, required if one exists
List of State-approved 3rd party assessments
District, regional, or BOCES-developed assessments provided that it is rigorous and comparable across classrooms
School- or BOCES-wide, group or team results based on State assessments

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

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

2.2) Grades K-3 ELA

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

	ELA	Assessment
K	District, regional, or BOCES-developed assessment	Kenmore-Town of Tonawanda developed grade K ELA assessment
1	District, regional, or BOCES-developed assessment	Kenmore-Town of Tonawanda developed grade 1 ELA assessment
2	District, regional, or BOCES-developed assessment	Kenmore-Town of Tonawanda developed grade 2 ELA assessment

	ELA	Assessment
3	State assessment	3rd Grade State Assessment

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

Use this box, if needed, to describe the general process for assigning HEDI categories for these grades/subjects in this subcomponent. If needed, you may upload a table or graphic at 2.11, below.	Growth targets for SLOs shall be determined by teachers and approved by building principals, using data from baseline assessments, as well as historical academic data. Targets will be established in accordance with guidance from the Commissioner and State Education Department. Based on the number of students that meet individual targets, teachers will be assigned 0-20 points within the HEDI rating categories as identified on the attached graphic upload in 2.11.
Highly Effective (18 - 20 points) Results are well-above state average for similar students (or District goals if no state test).	Evidence indicates exceptional student learning growth inclusive of special populations, with a low of 81% of students who met the target and a high of greater than 90% of students

	who met the target.
Effective (9 - 17 points) Results meet state average for similar students (or District goals if no state test).	Evidence indicates significant student learning growth inclusive of special populations, with a low of 61% of students who met the target and a high of 80% of students who met the target.
Developing (3 - 8 points) Results are below state average for similar students (or District goals if no state test).	Expectations are nearly met, however, overall student learning growth results are below District/State expectations, with a low of 41% of students who met the target and a high of 60% of students who met the target.
Ineffective (0 - 2 points) Results are well-below state average for similar students (or District goals if no state test).	Evidence indicates little to no student learning growth and is well below District/State expectations, with a low of equal to or less than 14% of students who met the target to a high of 40% of students who met the target.

2.3) Grades K-3 Math

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

	Math	Assessment
K	District, regional, or BOCES-developed assessment	Kenmore-Town of Tonawanda developed grade K Math assessment
1	District, regional, or BOCES-developed assessment	Kenmore-Town of Tonawanda developed grade 1 Math assessment
2	District, regional, or BOCES-developed assessment	Kenmore-Town of Tonawanda developed grade 2 Math assessment

	Math	Assessment
3	State assessment	3rd Grade State Assessment

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

Use this box, if needed, to describe the general process for assigning HEDI categories for these grades/subjects in this subcomponent. If needed, you may upload a table or graphic at 2.11, below.	Growth targets for SLOs shall be determined by teachers and approved by building principals, using data from baseline assessments, as well as historical academic data. Targets will be established in accordance with guidance from the Commissioner and State Education Department. Based on the number of students that meet individual targets, teachers will be assigned 0-20 points within the HEDI rating categories as identified on the attached graphic upload in 2.11.
Highly Effective (18 - 20 points) Results are well-above state average for similar students (or District goals if no state test).	Evidence indicates exceptional student learning growth inclusive of special populations, with a low of 81% of students who met the target and a high of greater than 90% of students who met the target.
Effective (9 - 17 points) Results meet state average for similar students (or District goals if no state test).	Evidence indicates significant student learning growth inclusive of special populations, with a low of 61% of students who met the target and a high of 80% of students who met the target.

Developing (3 - 8 points) Results are below state average for similar students (or District goals if no state test).	Expectations are nearly met, however, overall student learning growth results are below District/State expectations, with a low of 41% of students who met the target and a high of 60% of students who met the target.
Ineffective (0 - 2 points) Results are well-below state average for similar students (or District goals if no state test).	Evidence indicates little to no student learning growth and is well below District/State expectations, with a low of equal to or less than 14% of students who met the target to a high of 40% of students who met the target.

2.4) Grades 6-8 Science

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

	Science	Assessment
6	District, regional or BOCES-developed assessment	Kenmore-Town of Tonawanda developed grade 6 science assessment
7	District, regional or BOCES-developed assessment	Kenmore-Town of Tonawanda developed grade 7 science assessment

	Science	Assessment
8	State assessment	8th Grade State Science Assessment

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

Use this box, if needed, to describe the general process for assigning HEDI categories for these grades/subjects in this subcomponent. If needed, you may upload a table or graphic at 2.11, below.	Growth targets for SLOs shall be determined by teachers and approved by building principals, using data from baseline assessments, as well as historical academic data. Targets will be established in accordance with guidance from the Commissioner and State Education Department. Based on the number of students that meet individual targets, teachers will be assigned 0-20 points within the HEDI rating categories as identified on the attached graphic upload in 2.11.
Highly Effective (18 - 20 points) Results are well-above state average for similar students (or District goals if no state test).	Evidence indicates exceptional student learning growth inclusive of special populations, with a low of 81% of students who met the target and a high of greater than 90% of students who met the target.
Effective (9 - 17 points) Results meet state average for similar students (or District goals if no state test).	Evidence indicates significant student learning growth inclusive of special populations, with a low of 61% of students who met the target and a high of 80% of students who met the target.
Developing (3 - 8 points) Results are below state average for similar students (or District goals if no state test).	Expectations are nearly met, however, overall student learning growth results are below District/State expectations, with a low of 41% of students who met the target and a high of 60% of students who met the target.
Ineffective (0 - 2 points) Results are well-below state average for similar students (or District goals if no state test).	Evidence indicates little to no student learning growth and is well below District/State expectations, with a low of equal to or less than 14% of students who met the target to a high of 40% of students who met the target.

2.5) Grades 6-8 Social Studies

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

	Social Studies	Assessment
6	District, regional or BOCES-developed assessment	Kenmore-Town of Tonawanda developed grade 6 social studies assessment
7	District, regional or BOCES-developed assessment	Kenmore-Town of Tonawanda developed grade 7 social studies assessment
8	District, regional or BOCES-developed assessment	Kenmore-Town of Tonawanda developed grade 8 social studies assessment

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

Use this box, if needed, to describe the general process for assigning HEDI categories for these grades/subjects in this subcomponent. If needed, you may upload a table or graphic at 2.11, below.	Growth targets for SLOs shall be determined by teachers and approved by building principals, using data from baseline assessments, as well as historical academic data. Targets will be established in accordance with guidance from the Commissioner and State Education Department. Based on the number of students that meet individual targets, teachers will be assigned 0-20 points within the HEDI rating categories as identified on the attached graphic upload in 2.11.
Highly Effective (18 - 20 points) Results are well-above District goals for similar students.	Evidence indicates exceptional student learning growth inclusive of special populations, with a low of 81% of students who met the target and a high of greater than 90% of students who met the target.
Effective (9 - 17 points) Results meet District goals for similar students.	Evidence indicates significant student learning growth inclusive of special populations, with a low of 61% of students who met the target and a high of 80% of students who met the target.
Developing (3 - 8 points) Results are below District goals for similar students.	Expectations are nearly met, however, overall student learning growth results are below District/State expectations, with a low of 41% of students who met the target and a high of 60% of students who met the target.
Ineffective (0 - 2 points) Results are well-below District goals for similar students.	Evidence indicates little to no student learning growth and is well below District/State expectations, with a low of equal to or less than 14% of students who met the target to a high of 40% of students who met the target.

2.6) High School Social Studies Regents Courses

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

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

		Assessment
Global 1	District, regional, or BOCES-developed assessment	Kenmore-Town of Tonawanda developed Global 1 assessment

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

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

Use this box, if needed, to describe the general process for assigning HEDI categories for these grades/subjects in this subcomponent. If needed, you may upload a table or graphic at 2.11, below.	Growth targets for SLOs shall be determined by teachers and approved by building principals, using data from baseline assessments, as well as historical academic data. Targets will be established in accordance with guidance from the Commissioner and State Education Department. Based on the number of students that meet individual targets, teachers will be assigned 0-20 points within the HEDI rating categories as identified on the attached graphic upload in 2.11.
Highly Effective (18 - 20 points) Results are well-above District goals for similar students.	Evidence indicates exceptional student learning growth inclusive of special populations, with a low of 81% of students who met the target and a high of greater than 90% of students who met the target.
Effective (9 - 17 points) Results meet District goals for similar students.	Evidence indicates significant student learning growth inclusive of special populations, with a low of 61% of students who met the target and a high of 80% of students who met the target.
Developing (3 - 8 points) Results are below District goals for similar students.	Expectations are nearly met, however, overall student learning growth results are below District/State expectations, with a low of 41% of students who met the target and a high of 60% of students who met the target.
Ineffective (0 - 2 points) Results are well-below District goals for similar students.	Evidence indicates little to no student learning growth and is well below District/State expectations, with a low of equal to or less than 14% of students who met the target to a high of 40% of students who met the target.

2.7) High School Science Regents Courses

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

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

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

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

assessments listed for this Task.

Use this box, if needed, to describe the general process for assigning HEDI categories for these grades/subjects in this subcomponent. If needed, you may upload a table or graphic at 2.11, below.	Growth targets for SLOs shall be determined by teachers and approved by building principals, using data from baseline assessments, as well as historical academic data. Targets will be established in accordance with guidance from the Commissioner and State Education Department. Based on the number of students that meet individual targets, teachers will be assigned 0-20 points within the HEDI rating categories as identified on the attached graphic upload in 2.11.
Highly Effective (18 - 20 points) Results are well-above District goals for similar students.	Evidence indicates exceptional student learning growth inclusive of special populations, with a low of 81% of students who met the target and a high of greater than 90% of students who met the target.
Effective (9 - 17 points) Results meet District goals for similar students.	Evidence indicates significant student learning growth inclusive of special populations, with a low of 61% of students who met the target and a high of 80% of students who met the target.
Developing (3 - 8 points) Results are below District goals for similar students.	Expectations are nearly met, however, overall student learning growth results are below District/State expectations, with a low of 41% of students who met the target and a high of 60% of students who met the target.
Ineffective (0 - 2 points) Results are well-below District goals for similar students.	Evidence indicates little to no student learning growth and is well below District/State expectations, with a low of equal to or less than 14% of students who met the target to a high of 40% of students who met the target.

2.8) High School Math Regents Courses

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

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

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

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

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

Use this box, if needed, to describe the general process for assigning HEDI categories for these grades/subjects in this subcomponent. If needed, you may upload a table or graphic at 2.11, below.	Growth targets for SLOs shall be determined by teachers and approved by building principals, using data from baseline assessments, as well as historical academic data. Targets will be established in accordance with guidance from the Commissioner and State Education Department. Based on the number of students that meet individual targets, teachers will be assigned 0-20 points within the HEDI rating categories as identified on

	the attached graphic upload in 2.11. Please note that the Common Core Algebra Regents assessment will be given in place of the Regents Integrated Algebra I assessment starting in the 2013-2014 school year.
Highly Effective (18 - 20 points) Results are well-above District goals for similar students.	Evidence indicates exceptional student learning growth inclusive of special populations, with a low of 81% of students who met the target and a high of greater than 90% of students who met the target.
Effective (9 - 17 points) Results meet District goals for similar students.	Evidence indicates significant student learning growth inclusive of special populations, with a low of 61% of students who met the target and a high of 80% of students who met the target.
Developing (3 - 8 points) Results are below District goals for similar students.	Expectations are nearly met, however, overall student learning growth results are below District/State expectations, with a low of 41% of students who met the target and a high of 60% of students who met the target.
Ineffective (0 - 2 points) Results are well-below District goals for similar students.	Evidence indicates little to no student learning growth and is well below District/State expectations, with a low of equal to or less than 14% of students who met the target to a high of 40% of students who met the target.

2.9) High School English Language Arts

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

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

	High School English Courses	Assessment
Grade 9 ELA	District, regional or BOCES-developed assessment	Kenmore-Town of Tonawanda developed Grade 9 ELA assessment
Grade 10 ELA	District, regional or BOCES-developed assessment	Kenmore-Town of Tonawanda developed Grade 10 ELA assessment
Grade 11 ELA	Regents assessment	Common Core ELA Regents

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

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

Use this box, if needed, to describe the general process for assigning HEDI categories for these grades/subjects in this subcomponent. If needed, you may upload a table or graphic at 2.11, below.	Growth targets for SLOs shall be determined by teachers and approved by building principals, using data from baseline assessments, as well as historical academic data. Targets will be established in accordance with guidance from the Commissioner and State Education Department. Based on the number of students that meet individual targets, teachers will be assigned 0-20 points within the HEDI rating categories as identified on the attached graphic upload in 2.11.
Highly Effective (18 - 20 points) Results are well-above District goals for similar students.	Evidence indicates exceptional student learning growth inclusive of special populations, with a low of 81% of students

	who met the target and a high of greater than 90% of students who met the target.
Effective (9 - 17 points) Results meet District goals for similar students.	Evidence indicates significant student learning growth inclusive of special populations, with a low of 61% of students who met the target and a high of 80% of students who met the target.
Developing (3 - 8 points) Results are below District goals for similar students.	Expectations are nearly met, however, overall student learning growth results are below District/State expectations, with a low of 41% of students who met the target and a high of 60% of students who met the target.
Ineffective (0 - 2 points) Results are well-below District goals for similar students.	Evidence indicates little to no student learning growth and is well below District/State expectations, with a low of equal to or less than 14% of students who met the target to a high of 40% of students who met the target.

2.10) All Other Courses

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

	Course(s) or Subject(s)	Option	Assessment
	Elementary Art, Music, Physical Education	District, Regional or BOCES-developed	Kenmore-Town of Tonawanda developed assessments by grade level for each of the special area subject areas
	FACS grades 6,7,8	District, Regional or BOCES-developed	Kenmore-Town of Tonawanda developed assessments for FACS in grades 6,7,8
	Technology Education grades 6, 7, 8	District, Regional or BOCES-developed	Kenmore-Town of Tonawanda developed assessments for Technology in grades 6, 7, 8
	Art grades 6, 7, 8	District, Regional or BOCES-developed	Kenmore-Town of Tonawanda developed assessments for Art in grades 6, 7, 8
	General Music grades 6,7,8	District, Regional or BOCES-developed	Kenmore-Town of Tonawanda developed assessments for General Music in grades 6, 7, 8
	Physical Education grades 6,7,8	District, Regional or BOCES-developed	Kenmore-Town of Tonawanda developed assessments for Physical Education in grades 6, 7, 8
	Health grades 7,8	District, Regional or BOCES-developed	Kenmore-Town of Tonawanda developed assessments for Health in grades 7, 8
	Orchestra, Band, Chorus grades 6,7,8	District, Regional or BOCES-developed	Kenmore-Town of Tonawanda developed assessments for orchestra, band, chorus in grades 6, 7, 8
	Business grade 7, 8	District, Regional or BOCES-developed	Kenmore-Town of Tonawanda developed assessments for business in grades 7, 8
	LOTE grade 7,8 Spanish, French, German	District, Regional or BOCES-developed	Kenmore-Town of Tonawanda developed assessments for grades 7,8 in Spanish, French, German
	Reading grade 6	District, Regional or BOCES-developed	Kenmore-Town of Tonawanda developed assessment for grade 6 reading
	ESL all grades	State Assessment	NYSESLAT
	AP Language & Composition	State Assessment	Comprehensive English Regents Assessment
	AP Literature & Composition	State Assessment	Comprehensive English Regents Assessment
	AP Art Studio 3-D, Art Studio 2-D, Studio Drawing, Art History	District, Regional or BOCES-developed	Kenmore-Town of Tonawanda developed assessments for AP Art Studio 3-D, Art Studio 2-D, Studio Drawing, Art History

AP Calculus, AP Stats	District, Regional or BOCES-developed	Kenmore-Town of Tonawanda developed assessments for AP Calculus, Ap Stats
AP Biology, Chemistry, Physics	District, Regional or BOCES-developed	Kenmore-Town of Tonawanda developed assessments for AP Biology, Chemistry, Physics
AP European History	State Assessment	Global Studies Regents
AP Government	District, Regional or BOCES-developed	Kenmore-Town of Tonawanda developed assessment for AP Government
AP Microeconomics	District, Regional or BOCES-developed	Kenmore-Town of Tonawanda developed assessment for AP Microeconomics

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

Use this box, if needed, to describe the general process for assigning HEDI categories for these grades/subjects in this subcomponent. If needed, you may upload a table or graphic at 2.11, below.	Growth targets for SLOs shall be determined by teachers and approved by building principals, using data from baseline assessments, as well as historical academic data. Targets will be established in accordance with guidance from the Commissioner and State Education Department. Based on the number of students that meet individual targets, teachers will be assigned 0-20 points within the HEDI rating categories as identified on the attached graphic upload in 2.11.
Highly Effective (18 - 20 points) Results are well-above District goals for similar students.	Evidence indicates exceptional student learning growth inclusive of special populations, with a low of 81% of students who met the target and a high of greater than 90% of students who met the target.
Effective (9 - 17 points) Results meet District goals for similar students.	Evidence indicates significant student learning growth inclusive of special populations, with a low of 61% of students who met the target and a high of 80% of students who met the target.
Developing (3 - 8 points) Results are below District goals for similar students.	Expectations are nearly met, however, overall student learning growth results are below District/State expectations, with a low of 41% of students who met the target and a high of 60% of students who met the target.
Ineffective (0 - 2 points) Results are well-below District goals for similar students.	Evidence indicates little to no student learning growth and is well below District/State expectations, with a low of equal to or less than 14% of students who met the target to a high of 40% of students who met the 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)

assets/survey-uploads/12186/1053881-avH4IQNZMh/Form2_10_AllOtherCourses_revises_050914.doc

2.11) HEDI Tables or Graphics

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

assets/survey-uploads/5364/142991-TXEtxx9bQW/updated growth SCORING BANDS FOR state and SLO.docx

2.12) Locally Developed Controls

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

Note: The only allowable controls or adjustments for Comparable Growth Measures are the following: student prior academic history, students with disabilities, English language learners, and students in poverty.

(No response)

2.13) Teachers with more than one growth measure

If educators have more than one state-provided growth or value-added measure, those measures will be combined into one HEDI rating and score for the growth subcomponent according to a formula determined by the Commissioner. (Examples: Common branch teacher with state-provided value-added measures for both ELA and Math in 4th grades; Middle school math teacher with both 7th and 8th grade math courses.)
If educators have more than one SLO for comparable growth (or a State-provided growth measure and an SLO for comparable growth), the measures will each earn a score from 0-20 points which Districts must weight proportionately based on the number of students in each SLO.

2.14) Assurances

Please check all of the boxes below:

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

3. Local Measures (Teachers)

Created Tuesday, April 30, 2013
Updated Thursday, May 22, 2014

Page 1

Locally Selected Measures of Student Achievement or Growth

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

Growth or achievement measure(s) from these options.

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

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

Measures based on:

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

the percentage of a teacher's students earning the advanced performance level (four) on the 4th grade ELA or math State assessments compared to those students' performance levels on the 3rd grade ELA or math State assessments)

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

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

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

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

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

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

3.1) Grades 4-8 ELA

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

	Locally-Selected Measure from List of Approved Measures	Assessment
4	5) District, regional, or BOCES–developed assessments	Kenmore-Town of Tonawanda developed gr 4 ELA assessment
5	5) District, regional, or BOCES–developed assessments	Kenmore-Town of Tonawanda developed gr 5 ELA assessment
6	5) District, regional, or BOCES–developed assessments	Kenmore-Town of Tonawanda developed gr 6 ELA assessment
7	5) District, regional, or BOCES–developed assessments	Kenmore-Town of Tonawanda developed gr 7 ELA assessment
8	5) District, regional, or BOCES–developed assessments	Kenmore-Town of Tonawanda developed gr 8 ELA assessment

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

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

Use this box, if needed, to describe the general process for assigning HEDI categories for these grades/subjects in this subcomponent. If needed, you may upload a table or graphic at 3.3, below.	Achievement targets shall be determined by teachers and approved by building principals. Targets will be established in accordance with guidance from the Commissioner and State Education Department. Based on the number of students that meet the targets, teachers will be assigned 0-15 points within the

	HEDI rating categories as identified on the attached graphic upload in 3.3. Please note that until such time a value added measure is adopted, the teachers will be assigned 0-20 points.
Highly Effective (14 - 15 points) Results are well above District- or BOCES-adopted expectations for growth or achievement for grade/subject.	Evidence indicates exceptional student achievement results inclusive of special populations, with a low of 81% of students who met the target and a high of greater than 90% of students who met the target.
Effective (8- 13 points) Results meet District- or BOCES-adopted expectations for growth or achievement for grade/subject.	Evidence indicates significant student achievement results inclusive of special populations, with a low of 61% of students who met the target and a high of 80% of students who met the target.
Developing (3 - 7 points) Results are below District- or BOCES-adopted expectations for growth or achievement for grade/subject.	Expectations are nearly met; however, overall student achievement results are below District/State expectations, with a low of 41% of students who met the target and a high of 60% of students who met the target.
Ineffective (0 - 2 points) Results are well below District- or BOCES-adopted expectations for growth or achievement for grade/subject.	Evidence indicates little to no student achievement and is well below District/State expectations, with a low of equal to or less than 14% of students who met the target to a high of 40% of students who met the target.

3.2) Grades 4-8 Math

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

	Locally-Selected Measure from List of Approved Measures	Assessment
4	5) District, regional, or BOCES–developed assessments	Kenmore-Town of Tonawanda developed gr 4 Math assessment
5	5) District, regional, or BOCES–developed assessments	Kenmore-Town of Tonawanda developed gr 5 Math assessment
6	5) District, regional, or BOCES–developed assessments	Kenmore-Town of Tonawanda developed gr 6 Math assessment
7	5) District, regional, or BOCES–developed assessments	Kenmore-Town of Tonawanda developed gr 7 Math assessment
8	5) District, regional, or BOCES–developed assessments	Kenmore-Town of Tonawanda developed gr 8 Math assessment

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

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

Use this box, if needed, to describe the general process for assigning HEDI categories for these grades/subjects in this subcomponent. If needed, you may upload a table or graphic at 3.3, below.	Achievement targets shall be determined by teachers and approved by building principals. Targets will be established in accordance with guidance from the Commissioner and State Education Department. Based on the number of students that meet the targets, teachers will be assigned 0-15 points within the HEDI rating categories as identified on the attached graphic upload in 3.3. Please not that until such time a value added

	measure is adopted, the teachers will be assigned 0-20 points.
Highly Effective (14 - 15 points) Results are well above District- or BOCES-adopted expectations for growth or achievement for grade/subject.	Evidence indicates exceptional student achievement results inclusive of special populations, with a low of 81% of students who met the target and a high of greater than 90% of students who met the target.
Effective (8- 13 points) Results meet District- or BOCES-adopted expectations for growth or achievement for grade/subject.	Evidence indicates significant student achievement results inclusive of special populations, with a low of 61% of students who met the target and a high of 80% of students who met the target.
Developing (3 - 7 points) Results are below District- or BOCES-adopted expectations for growth or achievement for grade/subject.	Expectations are nearly met; however, overall student achievement results are below District/State expectations, with a low of 41% of students who met the target and a high of 60% of students who met the target.
Ineffective (0 - 2 points) Results are well below District- or BOCES-adopted expectations for growth or achievement for grade/subject.	Evidence indicates little to no student achievement and is well below District/State expectations, with a low of equal to or less than 14% of students who met the target to a high of 40% of students who met the 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/12149/1053882-rhJdBgDruP/15pointhediconversion_rev_05212014.doc

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

Growth or achievement measure(s) from these options.

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

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

Measures based on:

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

3.4) Grades K-3 ELA

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

	Locally-Selected Measure from List of Approved Measures	Assessment
K	5) District, regional, or BOCES–developed assessments	Kenmore-Town of Tonawanda developed gr K ELA assessment
1	5) District, regional, or BOCES–developed assessments	Kenmore-Town of Tonawanda developed gr 1 ELA assessment
2	5) District, regional, or BOCES–developed assessments	Kenmore-Town of Tonawanda developed gr 2 ELA assessment
3	5) District, regional, or BOCES–developed assessments	Kenmore-Town of Tonawanda developed gr 3 ELA assessment

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.	Achievement targets shall be determined by teachers and approved by building principals. Targets will be established in accordance with guidance from the Commissioner and State Education Department. Based on the number of students that meet the targets, teachers will be assigned 0-20 points within the HEDI rating categories as identified on the attached graphic upload in 3.13.
Highly Effective (18-20 points) Results are well above District- or BOCES-adopted expectations for growth or achievement for grade/subject.	Evidence indicates exceptional student achievement results inclusive of special populations, with a low of 81% of students who met the target and a high of greater than 90% of students who met the target.
Effective (9-17 points) Results meet District- or BOCES-adopted expectations for growth or achievement for grade/subject.	Evidence indicates significant student achievement results inclusive of special populations, with a low of 61% of students who met the target and a high of 80% of students who met the target.

Developing (3 - 8 points) Results are below District- or BOCES-adopted expectations for growth or achievement for grade/subject.	Expectations are nearly met; however, overall student achievement results are below District/State expectations, with a low of 41% of students who met the target and a high of 60% of students who met the target.
Ineffective (0 - 2 points) Results are well below District- or BOCES-adopted expectations for growth or achievement for grade/subject.	Evidence indicates little to no student achievement and is well below District/State expectations, with a low of equal to or less than 14% of students who met the target to a high of 40% of students who met the target.

3.5) Grades K-3 Math

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

	Locally-Selected Measure from List of Approved Measures	Assessment
K	5) District, regional, or BOCES–developed assessments	Kenmore-Town of Tonawanda developed gr K Math assessment
1	5) District, regional, or BOCES–developed assessments	Kenmore-Town of Tonawanda developed gr 1 Math assessment
2	5) District, regional, or BOCES–developed assessments	Kenmore-Town of Tonawanda developed gr 2 Math assessment
3	5) District, regional, or BOCES–developed assessments	Kenmore-Town of Tonawanda developed gr 3 Math assessment

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.	Achievement targets shall be determined by teachers and approved by building principals. Targets will be established in accordance with guidance from the Commissioner and State Education Department. Based on the number of students that meet the targets, teachers will be assigned 0-20 points within the HEDI rating categories as identified on the attached graphic upload in 3.13.
Highly Effective (18-20 points) Results are well above District- or BOCES-adopted expectations for growth or achievement for grade/subject.	Evidence indicates exceptional student achievement results inclusive of special populations, with a low of 81% of students who met the target and a high of greater than 90% of students who met the target.
Effective (9-17 points) Results meet District- or BOCES-adopted expectations for growth or achievement for grade/subject.	Evidence indicates significant student achievement results inclusive of special populations, with a low of 61% of students who met the target and a high of 80% of students who met the target.
Developing (3 - 8 points) Results are below District -or BOCES-adopted expectations for growth or achievement for grade/subject.	Expectations are nearly met; however, overall student achievement results are below District/State expectations, with a low of 41% of students who met the target and a high of 60% of students who met the target.

Ineffective (0 - 2 points) Results are well below District- or BOCES-adopted expectations for growth or achievement for grade/subject.	Evidence indicates little to no student achievement and is well below District/State expectations, with a low of equal to or less than 14% of students who met the target to a high of 40% of students who met the target.

3.6) Grades 6-8 Science

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

	Locally-Selected Measure from List of Approved Measures	Assessment
6	5) District, regional, or BOCES–developed assessments	Kenmore-Town of Tonawanda developed gr 6 science assessment
7	5) District, regional, or BOCES–developed assessments	Kenmore-Town of Tonawanda developed gr 7 science assessment
8	5) District, regional, or BOCES–developed assessments	Kenmore-Town of Tonawanda developed gr 8 science assessment

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

Use this box, if needed, to describe the general process for assigning HEDI categories for these grades/subjects in this subcomponent. If needed, you may upload a table or graphic at 3.13, below.	Achievement targets shall be determined by teachers and approved by building principals. Targets will be established in accordance with guidance from the Commissioner and State Education Department. Based on the number of students that meet the targets, teachers will be assigned 0-20 points within the HEDI rating categories as identified on the attached graphic upload in 3.13.
Highly Effective (18 - 20 points) Results are well above District- or BOCES-adopted expectations for growth or achievement for grade/subject.	Evidence indicates exceptional student achievement results inclusive of special populations, with a low of 81% of students who met the target and a high of greater than 90% of students who met the target.
Effective (9 - 17 points) Results meet District- or BOCES-adopted expectations for growth or achievement for grade/subject.	Evidence indicates significant student achievement results inclusive of special populations, with a low of 61% of students who met the target and a high of 80% of students who met the target.
Developing (3 - 8 points) Results are below District- or BOCES-adopted expectations for growth or achievement for grade/subject.	Expectations are nearly met; however, overall student achievement results are below District/State expectations, with a low of 41% of students who met the target and a high of 60% of students who met the target.
Ineffective (0 - 2 points) Results are well below District- or BOCES-adopted expectations for growth or achievement for grade/subject.	Evidence indicates little to no student achievement and is well below District/State expectations, with a low of equal to or less than 14% of students who met the target to a high of 40% of students who met the target.

3.7) Grades 6-8 Social Studies

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

	Locally-Selected Measure from List of Approved Measures	Assessment
6	5) District, regional, or BOCES–developed assessments	Kenmore-Town of Tonawanda developed gr 6 social studies assessment
7	5) District, regional, or BOCES–developed assessments	Kenmore-Town of Tonawanda developed gr 7 social studies assessment
8	5) District, regional, or BOCES–developed assessments	Kenmore-Town of Tonawanda developed gr 8 social studies assessment

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

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

Use this box, if needed, to describe the general process for assigning HEDI categories for these grades/subjects in this subcomponent. If needed, you may upload a table or graphic at 3.13, below.	Achievement targets shall be determined by teachers and approved by building principals. Targets will be established in accordance with guidance from the Commissioner and State Education Department. Based on the number of students that meet the targets, teachers will be assigned 0-20 points within the HEDI rating categories as identified on the attached graphic upload in 3.13.
Highly Effective (18 - 20 points) Results are well above District- or BOCES-adopted expectations for growth or achievement for grade/subject.	Evidence indicates exceptional student achievement results inclusive of special populations, with a low of 81% of students who met the target and a high of greater than 90% of students who met the target.
Effective (9 - 17 points) Results meet District- or BOCES-adopted expectations for growth or achievement for grade/subject.	Evidence indicates significant student achievement results inclusive of special populations, with a low of 61% of students who met the target and a high of 80% of students who met the target.
Developing (3 - 8 points) Results are below District- or BOCES-adopted expectations for growth or achievement for grade/subject.	Expectations are nearly met; however, overall student achievement results are below District/State expectations, with a low of 41% of students who met the target and a high of 60% of students who met the target.
Ineffective (0 - 2 points) Results are well below District- or BOCES-adopted expectations for growth or achievement for grade/subject.	Evidence indicates little to no student achievement and is well below District/State expectations, with a low of equal to or less than 14% of students who met the target to a high of 40% of students who met the target.

3.8) High School Social Studies

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

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

	Locally-Selected Measure from List of Approved Measures	Assessment
Global 1	5) District, regional, or BOCES–developed assessments	Kenmore-Town of Tonawanda developed Global 1 assessment

Global 2	5) District, regional, or BOCES–developed assessments	Kenmore-Town of Tonawanda developed Global 2 assessment
American History	5) District, regional, or BOCES–developed assessments	Kenmore-Town of Tonawanda developed American History assessment

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.	Achievement targets shall be determined by teachers and approved by building principals. Targets will be established in accordance with guidance from the Commissioner and State Education Department. Based on the number of students that meet the targets, teachers will be assigned 0-20 points within the HEDI rating categories as identified on the attached graphic upload in 3.13.
Highly Effective (18 - 20 points) Results are well above District- or BOCES-adopted expectations for growth or achievement for grade/subject.	Evidence indicates exceptional student achievement results inclusive of special populations, with a low of 81% of students who met the target and a high of greater than 90% of students who met the target.
Effective (9 - 17 points) Results meet District- or BOCES-adopted expectations for growth or achievement for grade/subject.	Evidence indicates significant student achievement results inclusive of special populations, with a low of 61% of students who met the target and a high of 80% of students who met the target.
Developing (3 - 8 points) Results are below District- or BOCES-adopted expectations for growth or achievement for grade/subject.	Expectations are nearly met; however, overall student achievement results are below District/State expectations, with a low of 41% of students who met the target and a high of 60% of students who met the target.
Ineffective (0 - 2 points) Results are well below District- or BOCES-adopted expectations for growth or achievement for grade/subject.	Evidence indicates little to no student achievement and is well below District/State expectations, with a low of equal to or less than 14% of students who met the target to a high of 40% of students who met the target.

3.9) High School Science

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

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

	Locally-Selected Measure from List of Approved Measures	Assessment
Living Environment	5) District, regional, or BOCES–developed assessments	Kenmore-Town of Tonawanda developed Living Environment assessment
Earth Science	5) District, regional, or BOCES–developed assessments	Kenmore-Town of Tonawanda developed Earth Science assessment
Chemistry	5) District, regional, or BOCES–developed assessments	Kenmore-Town of Tonawanda developed Chemistry assessment

Physics	5) District, regional, or BOCES–developed assessments	Kenmore-Town of Tonawanda developed Physics assessment

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.	Achievement targets shall be determined by teachers and approved by building principals. Targets will be established in accordance with guidance from the Commissioner and State Education Department. Based on the number of students that meet the targets, teachers will be assigned 0-20 points within the HEDI rating categories as identified on the attached graphic upload in 3.13.
Highly Effective (18-20 points) Results are well above District- or BOCES-adopted expectations for growth or achievement for grade/subject.	Evidence indicates exceptional student achievement results inclusive of special populations, with a low of 81% of students who met the target and a high of greater than 90% of students who met the target.
Developing (3 - 8 points) Results are below District- or BOCES-adopted expectations for growth or achievement for grade/subject.	Expectations are nearly met; however, overall student achievement results are below District/State expectations, with a low of 41% of students who met the target and a high of 60% of students who met the target.
Effective (9 - 17points) Results meet District- or BOCES-adopted expectations for growth or achievement for grade/subject.	Evidence indicates significant student achievement results inclusive of special populations, with a low of 61% of students who met the target and a high of 80% of students who met the target.
Ineffective (0 - 2 points) Results are well below District- or BOCES-adopted expectations for growth or achievement for grade/subject.	Evidence indicates little to no student achievement and is well below District/State expectations, with a low of equal to or less than 14% of students who met the target to a high of 40% of students who met the target.

3.10) High School Math

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

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

	Locally-Selected Measure from List of Approved Measures	Assessment
Algebra 1	5) District, regional, or BOCES–developed assessments	Kenmore-Town of Tonawanda developed Algebra 1 assessment
Geometry	5) District, regional, or BOCES–developed assessments	Kenmore-Town of Tonawanda developed Geometry assessment
Algebra 2	5) District, regional, or BOCES–developed assessments	Kenmore-Town of Tonawanda developed Algebra 2 assessment

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

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

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

Use this box, if needed, to describe the general process for assigning HEDI categories for these grades/subjects in this subcomponent. If needed, you may upload a table or graphic at 3.13, below.	Achievement targets shall be determined by teachers and approved by building principals. Targets will be established in accordance with guidance from the Commissioner and State Education Department. Based on the number of students that meet the targets, teachers will be assigned 0-20 points within the HEDI rating categories as identified on the attached graphic upload in 3.13.
Highly Effective (18 - 20 points) Results are well above District- or BOCES-adopted expectations for growth or achievement for grade/subject.	Evidence indicates exceptional student achievement results inclusive of special populations, with a low of 81% of students who met the target and a high of greater than 90% of students who met the target.
Effective (9 - 17 points) Results meet District- or BOCES-adopted expectations for growth or achievement for grade/subject.	Evidence indicates significant student achievement results inclusive of special populations, with a low of 61% of students who met the target and a high of 80% of students who met the target.
Developing (3 - 8 points) Results are below District- or BOCES-adopted expectations for growth or achievement for grade/subject.	Expectations are nearly met; however, overall student achievement results are below District/State expectations, with a low of 41% of students who met the target and a high of 60% of students who met the target.
Ineffective (0 - 2 points) Results are well below District- or BOCES-adopted expectations for growth or achievement for grade/subject.	Evidence indicates little to no student achievement and is well below District/State expectations, with a low of equal to or less than 14% of students who met the target to a high of 40% of students who met the target.

3.11) High School English Language Arts

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

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

	Locally-Selected Measure from List of Approved Measures	Assessment
Grade 9 ELA	5) District, regional, or BOCES–developed assessments	Kenmore-Town of Tonawanda developed Grade 9 ELA assessment
Grade 10 ELA	5) District, regional, or BOCES–developed assessments	Kenmore-Town of Tonawanda developed Grade 10 ELA assessment
Grade 11 ELA	5) District, regional, or BOCES–developed assessments	Kenmore-Town of Tonawanda developed Grade 11 ELA assessment

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

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

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

Use this box, if needed, to describe the general process for assigning HEDI categories for these grades/subjects in this subcomponent. If needed, you may upload a table or graphic at 3.13, below.	Achievement targets shall be determined by teachers and approved by building principals. Targets will be established in accordance with guidance from the Commissioner and State Education Department. Based on the number of students that meet the targets, teachers will be assigned 0-20 points within the HEDI rating categories as identified on the attached graphic upload in 3.13.
Highly Effective (18 - 20 points) Results are well above District- or BOCES-adopted expectations for growth or achievement for grade/subject.	Evidence indicates exceptional student achievement results inclusive of special populations, with a low of 81% of students who met the target and a high of greater than 90% of students who met the target.
Effective (9 - 17 points) Results meet District- or BOCES-adopted expectations for growth or achievement for grade/subject.	Evidence indicates significant student achievement results inclusive of special populations, with a low of 61% of students who met the target and a high of 80% of students who met the target.
Developing (3 - 8 points) Results are below District- or BOCES-adopted expectations for growth or achievement for grade/subject.	Expectations are nearly met; however, overall student achievement results are below District/State expectations, with a low of 41% of students who met the target and a high of 60% of students who met the target.
Ineffective (0 - 2 points) Results are well below District- or BOCES-adopted expectations for growth or achievement for grade/subject.	Evidence indicates little to no student achievement and is well below District/State expectations, with a low of equal to or less than 14% of students who met the target to a high of 40% of students who met the 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
Elementary Art, Music, Physical Education	5) District/regional/BOCES–developed	Kenmore-Town of Tonawanda developed grade level for each of the special subject areas assessments
FACS grades 6,7,8	5) District/regional/BOCES–developed	Kenmore-Town of Tonawanda developed assessments grades 6,7,8 FACS assessments
Technology Education grades 6,7,8	5) District/regional/BOCES–developed	Kenmore-Town of Tonawanda developed grades 6,7,8 Technology Education assessments
Art grades 6,7,8	5) District/regional/BOCES–developed	Kenmore-Town of Tonawanda developed grades 6,7,8 Art assessments
General Music grades 6,7,8	5) District/regional/BOCES–developed	Kenmore-Town of Tonawanda developed grades 6,7,8 general music assessments

	Physical Education grades 6,7,8	5) District/regional/BOCES–developed	Kenmore-Town of Tonawanda developed grades 6,7,8 Physical Education assessments
	Health grades 7,8	5) District/regional/BOCES–developed	Kenmore-Town of Tonawanda developed grades 7,8 Health assessments
	Orchestra, Band, Shorus grades 6,7,8	5) District/regional/BOCES–developed	Kenmore-Town of Tonawanda developed grades 6,7,8 Orchestra, Band, Chorus assessments
	Business grades 7,8	5) District/regional/BOCES–developed	Kenmore-Town of Tonawanda developed grades 7,8 Business assessments
	LOTE grades 7,8 Spanish, French, German	5) District/regional/BOCES–developed	Kenmore-Town of Tonawanda developed grades 7,8 LOTE Spanish, French, German assessments
	Reading grade 6	5) District/regional/BOCES–developed	Kenmore-Town of Tonawanda developed grade 6 Reading assessment Reading
	ESL all grades	5) District/regional/BOCES–developed	Kenmore-Town of Tonawanda developed all grades ESL assessment
	AP Language & Composition	5) District/regional/BOCES–developed	Kenmore-Town of Tonawanda developed AP Language & Composition assessment
	AP Literature & Composition	5) District/regional/BOCES–developed	Kenmore-Town of Tonawanda developed AP Literature & Composition assessment
	AP art Studio 3-D, Art Studio 2-D, Studio Drawing, Art History	5) District/regional/BOCES–developed	Kenmore-Town of Tonawanda developed AP art Studio 3-D, Art Studio 2-D, Studio Drawing, Art History assessments
	AP Calculus, AP Stats	5) District/regional/BOCES–developed	Kenmore-Town of Tonawanda developed AP Calculus, AP Stats assessments
	AP Biology, Chemistry, Physics	5) District/regional/BOCES–developed	Kenmore-Town of Tonawanda developed AP Biology, Chemistry, Physics assessments
	AP European History	5) District/regional/BOCES–developed	Kenmore-Town of Tonawanda developed AP European History assessment
	AP Government	5) District/regional/BOCES–developed	Kenmore-Town of Tonawanda developed AP Government assessment
	AP Microeconomics	5) District/regional/BOCES–developed	Kenmore-Town of Tonawanda developed AP Microeconomics assessment

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.	Achievement targets shall be determined by teachers and approved by building principals. Targets will be established in accordance with guidance from the Commissioner and State Education Department. Based on the number of students that meet the targets, teachers will be assigned 0-20 points within the HEDI rating categories as identified on the attached graphic upload in 3.13.
Highly Effective (18 - 20 points) Results are well above District- or BOCES -adopted expectations for growth or achievement for grade/subject.	Evidence indicates exceptional student achievement results inclusive of special populations, with a low of 81% of students who met the target and a high of greater than 90% of students who met the target.
Effective (9 - 17 points) Results meet District- or BOCES-adopted expectations for growth or achievement for grade/subject.	Evidence indicates significant student achievement results inclusive of special populations, with a low of 61% of students who met the target and a high of 80% of students who met the target.
Developing (3 - 8 points) Results are below District- or BOCES-adopted expectations for growth or achievement for grade/subject.	Expectations are nearly met; however, overall student achievement results are below District/State expectations, with a low of 41% of students who met the target and a high of 60% of students who met the target.
Ineffective (0 - 2 points) Results are well below District- or BOCES-adopted expectations for growth or achievement for grade/subject.	Evidence indicates little to no student achievement and is well below District/State expectations, with a low of equal to or less than 14% of students who met the target to a high of 40% of students who met the 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)

assets/survey-uploads/5139/142992-Rp0Ol6pk1T/Form3_12_AllOtherCourses_5.doc

3.13) HEDI Tables or Graphics

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

assets/survey-uploads/12149/1053882-y92vNseFa4/Achievement Targets reivsed_4-10-14.docx

3.14) Locally Developed Controls

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

(No response)

3.15) Teachers with More Than One Locally Selected Measure

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

We will average the scores of teachers who have more than one locally selected measure, weighted proportionately based on the number of students in each measure.

3.16) Assurances

Please check all of the boxes below:

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

4. Other Measures of Effectiveness (Teachers)

Created Tuesday, April 30, 2013
Updated Monday, June 16, 2014

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.)

4.1) Teacher Practice Rubric | Rubric	Danielson's Framework for Teaching (2011 Revised Edition)

Second Rubric, if applicable	(No response)

4.2) Points Within Other Measures

State the number of points (if any) that will be assigned to each of the following measures, making sure that the points total 60. If you are not using a particular measure, enter 0. This APPR form only provides one space for assigning points within other measures for teachers. If your district/BOCES prefers to assign points differently for different groups of teachers, enter the points assignment for one group of teachers below. For the other group(s) of teachers, fill out copies of this form and upload as an attachment for review. Is the following points assignment applicable to all teachers?

No

If you checked "no" above, fill in the group of teachers covered by the points assignment indicated immediately below (e.g., "probationary teachers"):

Tenured Teachers

Multiple (at least two) classroom observations by principal or other trained administrator, at least one of which must be unannounced [at least 31 points]	32
One or more observation(s) by trained independent evaluators	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	28

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

assets/survey-uploads/5091/142997-2UoxI2HPmn/Form4_2_PointsWithinOtherMeasures_1.doc

4.3) Survey Tools (if applicable)

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

(No response)

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

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

4.4) Assurances

Please check all of the boxes below:

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

4.5) Process for Assigning Points and Determining HEDI Ratings

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

The formal observation constitutes 28 points. An administrative walk through constitutes 4 points. Tenured teachers will be assigned each one of following evaluation methods once during a three year period for the remaining 28 points.

a. Peer coaching/clinical supervision
b. Portfolio
c. Video lesson
Teachers will be rated on the above items by a structured review of teacher artifacts and evidence and will align with the chosen Danielson domain and/or components.

Probationary teachers will not participate in the above cycle. Instead, they will have another formal observation. Please see the attached file that explain the point distributions and conversions that are computed into a single result for this sub component.

Summary of how 60 points are earned:

Tenured Staff
Observation 28 points
Walk Through 4 points
One of the following which will rotate on a three year cycle.:
Peer coaching
video any of these three require staff to focus on an Danielson element (see attachment)
portfolio
Total 60 points

Non Tenured Staff
Tenured Staff
Observations (2 x 28 points each)) 56 points
Walk Through 4 points
Total 60 points

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

assets/survey-uploads/12179/1053883-eka9yMJ855/teacher_other_measuresver2rev_061614b_1.docx

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

Highly Effective: Overall performance and results exceed NYS Teaching Standards.	The formal observation constitutes 28 points. An administrative walk through constitutes 4 points. Tenured teachers will be assigned one of following evaluation methods during a three year period for the remaining 28 points. a. Peer coaching/clinical supervision b. Portfolio c. Video lesson Probationary teachers will not participate in the above cycle. Instead, they will have another formal observation. Please see the attached file that explain the point distributions and conversions that are computed into a single result for this sub component. Summary of how 60points are earned: Tenured Staff Observation 28 points Walk Through 4 points One of the following: Peer coaching video any of these three require staff to focus on an Danielson element (see attachment) portfolio Total 60 points Non Tenured Staff Tenured Staff Observations (2 x 28 points each)) 56 points Walk Through 4 points Total 60 points

	The scores from this category range from 46-60 accumulated points as described above.
Effective: Overall performance and results meet NYS Teaching Standards.	The scores from this category range from 31-45 accumulated points as described above.
Developing: Overall performance and results need improvement in order to meet NYS Teaching Standards.	The scores from this category range from 16-30 accumulated points as described above.
Ineffective: Overall performance and results do not meet NYS Teaching Standards.	The scores from this category range from 0-15 accumulated points as described above.

Provide the ranges for the 60-point scoring bands.

Highly Effective	46-60
Effective	31-45
Developing	16-30
Ineffective	0-15

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

Formal/Long	2
Informal/Short	1
Enter Total	3

By trained in-school peer teachers or other trained reviewers

Formal/Long	0
Informal/Short	0

Independent evaluators

Formal/Long	0
Informal/Short	0

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

- In Person

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

- In Person

4.7) Observations of Tenured Teachers

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

By building principals or other trained administrators

Formal/Long	1
Informal/Short	1
Total	2

By trained in-school peer teachers or other trained reviewers

Formal/Long	0
Informal/Short	0

Independent evaluators

Formal/Long	0
Informal/Short	0

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

- In Person

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

- In Person

5. Composite Scoring (Teachers)

Created Tuesday, April 30, 2013
Updated Thursday, February 27, 2014

Page 1

Standards for Rating Categories

Growth or Comparable Measures

Locally-selected Measures of growth or achievement

Other Measures of Effectiveness (Teacher and Leader standards)

Highly Effective

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

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

Overall performance and results exceed NYS Teaching Standards.

Effective

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

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

Overall performance and results meet NYS Teaching Standards.

Developing

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

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

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

Ineffective

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

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

Overall performance and results do not meet NYS Teaching Standards.

The Commissioner shall review the specific scoring ranges for each of the rating categories annually before the start of each school year and shall recommend any changes to the Board of Regents for consideration.

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

Where there is no Value-Added measure

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

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

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

Highly Effective	46-60
Effective	31-45
Developing	16-30
Ineffective	0-15

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

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

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

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

6. Additional Requirements - Teachers

Created Tuesday, April 30, 2013
Updated Monday, April 28, 2014

Page 1

6.1) Assurances -- Improvement Plans

Please check the boxes below:

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

6.2) Attachment: Teacher Improvement Plan Forms

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

assets/survey-uploads/5265/142999-Df0w3Xx5v6/Teacher_improvement_plan_1.docx

6.3) Appeals Process

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

(1) the substance of the annual professional performance review

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

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

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

APPEALS OF DEVELOPING OR INEFFECTIVE TIPS ONLY

A) Use of a TIP shall be limited only to instances where the teacher has received an overall rating of “ineffective” or “developing” based on his/her single composite effectiveness score.
B) An appeal of a TIP is limited to the District’s issuance and/or implementation of the terms of the teacher improvement plan under

Education 3012-c.
C) A teacher who believes that the District has failed to meet its obligation to properly implement the terms of a TIP may seek relief through the appeal process in the current contract.

A) A teacher may appeal the improvement plan for the reasons stated above in accordance with the appeals process procedure included in the current contract.
a. Where and to the extent applicable, the Annual Professional Performance Review of classroom teachers shall be a significant factor for employment decisions and teacher development, and will be subject to any procedures which may in the future be negotiated by the District and the Association.
1. A unit member holding the position of classroom teacher, who has received either an overall APPR rating of 'ineffective" or "developing" may appeal only the substance of the Annual Professional Performance Review, the District's adherence to the standards and methodologies required for such review, and the District's compliance with its procedures for conducting the Annual Professional Performance Review, or its issuance and/or implementation of the terms of the Teacher Improvement Plan. Such appeal must be submitted in writing to the Administrator performing the Annual Professional Performance Review or Teacher Improvement Plan. The writing must explain in detail the specific basis for the appeal. The appeal must be submitted within five calendar days of the issuance of the Annual Professional Performance Review or Teacher Improvement Plan, or other act under this section which is the subject of the appeal, or it is deemed waived. Within ten calendar days of receipt of the appeal, the Administrator conducting the Annual Professional Performance Review or Teacher Improvement Plan shall submit a written determination. The absence of a determination shall be deemed a denial of the appeal. If the teacher received an "ineffective" or "developing" rating and disagrees with the determination, the teacher may submit a copy of the appeal, the determination, and a written statement explaining in detail the basis for disagreement with the determination, to a Labor-Management Panel within five calendar days of the date of the determination.

The Labor-Management Panel will consist of the Superintendent (or his designee), the KTA President (or his designee), and a third person to be determined by the other two panel members. If the other two members are unable to agree on a third member, the third member shall be selected by random draw from a pool consisting of two teachers, selected by the KTA President, and two administrators, selected by the Superintendent, all of whom shall have had at lease one year of service, past or present, on the Mentor Policy Board. The Labor-Management Panel shall provide the teacher with the opportunity to meet with the Panel within five calendar days of the date the teacher's request was received and shall render a final determination on the appeal within ten calendar days after the date on which the teacher was provided the opportunity to meet with the Panel. An appeal or determination under this section shall be exempt from the grievance and arbitration provisions in Article 11 of the Collective Negotiations Agreement, except that a classroom teacher may proceed through Article 11 of the Collective Negotiations Agreement solely to challenge the District's adherence to any procedural standards set forth in the Collective Negotiations Agreement which apply to the issuance of an Annual Professional Performance Review or a Teacher Improvement Plan. All aspects of the appeals process will be timely and in compliance with N.Y Education Law § 3012-c.

2. The Parties agree that they will conduct negotiations concerning the Annual Professional Performance Review as soon as practicable after adoption of Regulations by the Commissioner of Education as required by Chapter 103 of the Laws of 2010, and to the extent necessary to comply with said Regulations and N.Y. Education Law § 3012-c. The Parties further agree that if such negotiations are not concluded by July 1, 2011, the District reserves the right to vary the standards and procedures set forth in Section 4.6 of the Collective Negotiations Agreement, but only to the extent necessary to comply with N.Y Education Law § 3012-c and the accompanying regulations. The Association reserves the right to challenge any such variations through either a formal appeal to the State Education Department or the grievance procedure of the Collective Negotiations Agreement. Should changes be made to the Collective Negotiations Agreement, such changes will not be in conflict with N.Y Education Law § 3012-c. Such changes will be made to the APPR plan as necessary.

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

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

Certification of Kenmore Town of Tonawanda UFSD Lead Evaluators

Section 30-2.9 of the Rules of the Board of Regents provides that, in order to be certified as lead evaluators, administrators must be trained in the following nine elements:

Certification Criteria and Current State or Plan for Implementation
1. NYS Teaching Standards and the ISLLC, 2008 Leadership Standards

Administrators have been trained in the ISLLC standards and NYS Teaching Standards. All current administrators have been training in the ISLLC Standards; new administrators will be trained, as needed.

2. Evidence-based observation techniques
All administrators have been provided with training on evidence-based observation techniques. Training will be provided for new administrators. An intensive 30 hour training and certification test is used to train or re-train administrators on Danielson Model through the TeachScape on line system.

3. Application and use of the student growth
This topic is routinely covered is a variety of trainings and staff development.

4. Application and use of State-approved teacher/principal rubrics
The training for the Danielson model is incorporated in the Teachscape training system mentioned above. This intensive course was developed to sharpen evidence gathering skills and to ensure inter rater reliability. All lead evaluators must take a pass/fail test that certifies that they fully understand the model and are evaluating in a way that ensures inter-rater reliability Inter-rater reliability is a significant component of the Danielson Teachscape training. The training focuses on the discussion of evidence, applying the rubric, and to translating rubric results into appropriate ratings. This will continue to be an area of emphasis in efforts to enhance and ensure inter-rater reliability among evaluators.

The District has over four years of experience with this model and is leveraging that experience in the new APPR. The district had previously invested in publications, trainings and staff development around the Danielson model which will provide additional support to the new APPR.

5. Application and use of any assessment tools you intend to use (e.g., goals)
All principals and District administrators (instruction and special education) have had extensive training in the use of SLOs and have participated in all local decisions. No assessment tools have been selected that require additional training in their application or use.

6. Application and use of any State-approved locally developed measures of student achievement you intend to use. This is an on-going process. Where necessary lead evaluators will receive the appropriate training to administer these assessments.

7. Use of the Statewide Instructional Reporting System
Principals are receiving ongoing updates from the Office of Curriculum and Instruction and the Office of Accountability/Chief Information Officer on the information
provided by NYSED regarding the Instructional Reporting System; these are incorporated routinely into District-level Principals Meetings.

8. The scoring methodology used by the department and/or your district
All principals and District administrators, as well as the Ken-Ton Administrators Association (KAA), and the Kenmore Teachers Association (KTA), have and will continue to participate in the scoring decisions that relate to APPR.

9. Specific considerations in evaluating teachers and principals of English language learners
There is a District emphasis on best practices for ELL and SWD for curriculum, instruction, and assessment. This focus on these three inter-related areas is incorporated into all aspects of District work, including data team work, which will be considered in teacher evaluations.

The certification and re-certification process will contain the same elements. A regular menu of professional development will be offered to build and refine skills. during the year ans subsequent years.

The Superintendent will certify the evaluators.

6.5) Assurances -- Evaluators

Please check the boxes below:

- Checked

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

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

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

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

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

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

(7) use of the Statewide Instructional Reporting System

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

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

- Checked

6.6) Assurances -- Teachers

Please check all of the boxes below:

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

6.7) Assurances -- Data

Please check all of the boxes below:

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

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

Created Tuesday, April 30, 2013
Updated Friday, February 28, 2014

Page 1

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

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

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

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

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

k-5
6-8
9-12

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

Please check the boxes below:

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

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

Student Learning Objectives will be the other comparable growth measures for principals in buildings or programs in which fewer than 30% of students take Grades 4-8 ELA, Math, and/or High School courses with State or Regents assessments. SLOs will be developed

using the assessments covering the most students in the school or program and continuing until at least 30% of students in the school or program are covered by SLOs. The district must select the type of assessment that will be used with the SLO from the options below.

If any grade/course in the building has a State-provided growth measure AND the principal must have SLOs because fewer than 30% of students in the building are covered, then the SLOs will begin first with the SGP/VA results.
Additional SLOs will then be set based on grades/subjects with State assessments, where applicable.
If additional SLOs are necessary, principals must begin with the grade(s)/courses(s) that have the largest number of students using school-wide student results from one of the following assessment options: State-approved 3rd party or district/regional/BOCES-developed assessments that are rigorous and comparable across classrooms.
State assessments, *required if one exists*

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

List of State-approved 3rd party assessments

First, list the grade configuration of the school or program the SLO applies to. Then, using the drop-down boxes below, please select the type of assessment that will be used for SLOs for the school/program listed. Finally, name the specific assessment listing the full name of the assessment. Districts or BOCES that intend to use a district, regional, or BOCES-developed assessment must include the name, grade, and subject of the assessment in the following format: "[Name of your District/Region/BOCES] developed [Grade] [Subject] Assessment." For example, a BOCES-developed 7th grade Social Studies assessment would be written as follows: "GVEP-Developed Grade 7 Social Studies Assessment." For State-approved 3rd party assessments, please include the name of the assessment exactly as it appears in RED on the State-approved list. For State assessments or Regents examinations, please indicate as such in the assessment name.

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

Describe the district-adopted expectations for the level of performance required for each HEDI rating category and the process for assigning points to principals based on SLO results, consistent with regulations and assurances in the Comparable Growth Measures subcomponent. Include any district-determined expectations for student performance. Please describe the process your district is using to measure student growth on the assessments listed for this Task. If applicable, please also include a description of the process for combining the State-provided growth score with the SLO(s) for this Task.

Use this box, if needed, to describe the process for assigning HEDI categories in this subcomponent. If needed, you may upload a table or graphic below.	
Highly Effective (18 - 20 points) Results are well above state average for similar students (or District goals if no state test).	not applicable
Effective (9 - 17 points) Results meet state average for similar students (or District goals if no state test).	not applicable
Developing (3 - 8 points) Results are below state average for similar students (or District goals if no state test).	not applicable
Ineffective (0 - 2 points) Results are well below state average for similar students (or District goals if no state test).	not applicable

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

(No response)

7.4) Special Considerations for Comparable Growth Measures

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

Note: The only allowable controls or adjustments for Comparable Growth Measures are the following: prior student achievement results, students with disabilities, English language learners, and students in poverty.

(No response)

7.5) Principals with More Than One Growth Measure

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

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

7.6) Assurances -- Comparable Growth Measures

Please check all of the boxes below:

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

8. Local Measures (Principals)

Created Tuesday, April 30, 2013
Updated Monday, June 16, 2014

Page 1

Locally-Selected Measures of Student Achievement or Growth

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

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

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

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

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

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

In the table below, please list the grade configurations of the school(s)/program(s) in your district/BOCES where it is expected that 30-100% of a principal's students are taking assessments with a State-provided growth or value-added measure (e.g., K-5, 6-8, 9-12). Then for each grade configuration, select a measure of growoth or achievement from the drop-down menu. As a reminder, the grade configurations/programs listed in Task 8.1 should be the same as those listed in Task 7.1.

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

	Grade Configuration/Program	Locally-Selected Measure from List of Approved Measures	Assessment
	K-5	(a) achievement on State assessments	NYS ELA Grades 4-5
	K-5	(a) achievement on State assessments	NYS Math Grades 4-5
	6-8	(a) achievement on State assessments	NYS ELA Grades 6,7,8
	6-8	(a) achievement on State assessments	NYS Math Grades 6,7,8
	9-12	(e) 4, 5, and/or 6-year high school grad and/or dropout rates	4 year graduaiton rate
	9-12	(h) students' progress toward graduation	Credit accumulation for 9th and 10th grades
	9-12	(g) % achieving specific level on Regents or alternatives	Regents Assessments: Common Core ELA & Algebra, Algebra 2/Trig, Geometry, Global 10, US History, Chemistry Living Environment,Earth Science and Physics.
	K-5	(d) measures used by district for teacher evaluation	NYS Grade 4 in Science Assessment
	6-8	(d) measures used by district for teacher evaluation	NYS Grade 8 Science Assesment

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.	The target established for Elementary and Middle School principals is based on a percentage of students who receive a score of (2, 3 or 4) performance levels on the ELA and Mathematics assessments and performance levels 3 and 4 on the Science Grade 4 and 8 assessments. The target for High School

	principals is based on the percentage of those students receiving at least a 65 in the following Regents: Common Core ELA and Common Core Math, Geometry, Algebra 2/Trig, Global 10, US History, Chemistry, Earth Science, Living Environment and Physics plus a score derived for graduation rate and credit accumulation for ninth and tenth grade students. See the uploaded charts for details on how points are assigned for each target then combined to form a composite score.
Highly Effective (14 - 15 points) Results are well above District- or BOCES-adopted expectations for growth or achievement for grade/subject.	See the upload below for scoring details.
Effective (8- 13 points) Results meet District- or BOCES-adopted expectations for growth or achievement for grade/subject.	See the upload below for scoring details.
Developing (3 - 7 points) Results are below District- or BOCES-adopted expectations for growth or achievement for grade/subject.	See the upload below for scoring details.
Ineffective (0 - 2 points) Results are well below District- or BOCES-adopted expectations for growth or achievement for grade/subject.	See the upload below for scoring details..

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

assets/survey-uploads/5366/143001-8o9AH60arN/Form8_2_LocalforAllOtherPs_1.doc

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/12190/1053887-qBFVOWF7fC/principal_local_acievement_ revised_061614.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/programs used in your district or BOCES in which the district/BOCES expects that fewer than 30% of students will receive a State-provided growth score (e.g., K-2, K-3, CTE). Then for each grade configuration, select a measure from the drop-down menu. As a reminder, the grade configurations/programs listed in Task 8.2 should be the same as those listed in Task 7.3.

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

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

(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

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

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

(No response)

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

(No response)

8.3) Locally Developed Controls

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

No adjustments, controls, or other special considerations will be used in setting targets for local measures.

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 Tuesday, April 30, 2013
Updated Monday, June 16, 2014

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.

9.1) Principal Practice Rubric | Rubric	The Reeves Leadership Performance Matrix

Second rubric (if applicable)	(No response)

9.2) Points Within Other Measures

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

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

Is the following point assignment for all principals?

Yes

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

(No response)

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

Broad assessment of principal leadership and management actions based on the practice rubric by the supervisor, a trained administrator or a trained independent evaluator. This must incorporate multiple school visits by supervisor, trained administrator, or trained independent evaluator, at least one of which must be from a supervisor, and at least one of which must be unannounced. [At least 31 points]	35
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.	25

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

downloadable copy of Form 9.2. (MS Word)

(No response)

9.3) Assurances -- Goals

Please check the boxes below if assigning any points to "ambitious and measurable goals":

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

9.4) Sources of Evidence (if applicable)

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

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

9.5) Survey Tool(s) (if applicable)

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

(No response)

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

Principal Evaluation Tripod School Perception Survey for Teachers	(No response)
K12 Insight Student Survey (Grades 3-5) for Principal Evaluation in New York	(No response)
K12 Insight Student Survey (Grades 6-12) for Principal Evaluation in New York	(No response)
K12 Insight Parent Survey for Principal Evaluation in New York	(No response)
K12 Insight Teacher/Staff Survey for Principal Evaluation in New York	(No response)
District variance	(No response)
Principal Evaluation Tripod School Perception Survey (Combined Parent Survey)	(No response)
Principal Evaluation Tripod School Perception Survey (Combined Student Surveys)	(No response)
NYC School Survey-2012 Parent Survey	(No response)
NYC School Survey-2012 Student Survey	(No response)

NYC School Survey-2012 Teacher Survey	(No response)

9.6) Assurances

Please check all of the boxes below:

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

9.7) Process for Assigning Points and Determining HEDI Ratings

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

The Reeves Leadership Performance Matrix has a total of 40 elements. Points are distributed as follows:
ineffective rating = 1 point, developing = 2 points, effective = 3 points, highly effective = 4 points., for a possible total of 160 points. See attached chart detailing the conversion scoring for the Reeves Matrix. The Reeves Matrix makes up 25 points out of 60. School visits account for 10 points. These elements account for 35 points for broad assessment of principal leadership. The remaining 25 points comprise two ambitious and measurable goals set collaboratively with principals and their evaluator and will be assigned based on evidence gathered by other trained evaluators and the document review described in the attachment below. Based on the number of points accumulated principals are rated accordingly:
High Effective 51-60 points
Effective 36-50 points
Developing 16-35 points
Ineffective 0-15 points
See accompanying graphics and charts for specific details on point accumulation.

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

assets/survey-uploads/12205/1053888-pMADJ4gk6R/princpals_other_local_60_revision 061614.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.	The Reeves Leadership Performance Matrix has a total of 40 elements. Points are distributed as follows: ineffective rating = 1 point, developing = 2 points, effective = 3 points, highly effective = 4 points., for a possible total of 60 points. See attached chart detailing the conversion scoring for the Reeves Matrix. The Reeves Matrix makes up 25 points out of 60. School visits account for 10 points. These elements account for 35 points for broad assessment of principal leadership. The remaining 25 points comprise

	two ambitious and measurable goals set collaboratively with principals and their evaluator and will be assigned based on evidence gathered by other trained evaluators and the document review described in the attachment. The overall performance and documented results based on the Reeves Matrix, school visits, document review and two ambitious and measurable goals exceeds the expectations of the ISLLC 2008 Standards. The principal has earned a rating of 51 to 60 points.
Effective: Overall performance and results meet standards.	The overall performance and documented results based on the Reeves Matrix, school visits, document review and two ambitious and measurable goals meet the expectations of the ISLLC 2008 Standards. The principal has earned a rating of 36 to 50 points.
Developing: Overall performance and results need improvement in order to meet standards.	The overall performance and documented results based on the Reeves Matrix, school visits, document review and two ambitious and measurable goals needs improving in order to meet the expectations of the ISLLC 2008 Standards. The principal has earned a rating of 16 to 35 points.
Ineffective: Overall performance and results do not meet standards.	The overall performance and documented results based on the Reeves Matrix, school visits, document review and two ambitious and measurable goals do not meet the expectations of the ISLLC 2008 Standards. The principal has earned a rating of 0 to 15 points.

Please provide the locally-negotiated 60 point scoring bands.

Highly Effective	51-60
Effective	36-50
Developing	16-35
Ineffective	0-15

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	1
By trained administrator	1
By trained independent evaluator	0
Enter Total	2

Tenured Principals

By supervisor	1
By trained administrator	1

By trained independent evaluator	0
Enter Total	2

10. Composite Scoring (Principals)

Created Tuesday, April 30, 2013
Updated Thursday, February 27, 2014

Page 1

Standards for Rating Categories

Growth or Comparable Measures

Locally-selected Measures of growth or achievement

Other Measures of Effectiveness (Teacher and Leader standards)

Highly Effective

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

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

Overall performance and results exceed ISLLC leadership standards.

Effective

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

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

Overall performance and results meet ISLLC leadership standards.

Developing

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

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

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

Ineffective

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

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

Overall performance and results do not meet ISLLC leadership standards.

The Commissioner shall review the specific scoring ranges for each of the rating categories annually before the start of each school year and shall recommend any changes to the Board of Regents for consideration.

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

Where there is no Value-Added measure

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

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

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

Highly Effective	51-60
Effective	36-50
Developing	16-35
Ineffective	0-15

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

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

Overall Composite Score
Highly Effective
22-25

14-15
Ranges determined locally--see above
91-100
Effective
10-21
8-13
75-90
Developing
3-9
3-7
65-74
Ineffective
0-2
0-2
0-64

11. Additional Requirements - Principals

Created Tuesday, April 30, 2013
Updated Friday, May 09, 2014

Page 1

11.1) Assurances -- Improvement Plans

Please check the boxes below.

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

11.2) Attachment: Principal Improvement Plan Forms

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

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

assets/survey-uploads/5276/143005-Df0w3Xx5v6/Principal_PIP.docx

11.3) Appeals Process

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

(1) the substance of the annual professional performance review

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

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

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

The Kenmore Administrators' Association (herein called the "Association") and District share the philosophical belief in the desire to hire, retain, and promote strong, effective instructional leaders.
Grounds for appeal are defined and outlined in NY Education Law 3012-c and include the right of principals to appeal a Principal Improvement Plan.

STEPS:
1. For all appeals, if a principal receives a rating of “ineffective” or “developing”, and disagrees with the rating, the principal must within 10 business days of the receipt of the rating :
• Submit in writing to the Superintendent of Schools, a copy of a request for an appeal
• Attach the evaluation which is the subject of the appeal
• Submit a letter for basis of the appeal and attach documentation

2. Within 10 business days of the Superintendent’s receipt of the principal’s appeal
a panel of two administrators will be appointed to hear the appeal; one administrator appointed by the Association President and one administrator appointed by the Superintendent of Schools
• The Association appointee must be tenured and not actively involved in his or her own evaluation appeal
• The District may not appoint the administrator who wrote the appealed evaluation

3. The panel of two shall be given 10 business days to render a written decision, which may be to accept the rating, modify the rating, or come to no mutual agreement. The panel will report their findings to the Superintendent.
•
4. If a mutually agreeable decision cannot be reached by the appeals panel of two, then within 10 business days after notifying the Superintendent , a random drawing by the District Clerk will ascertain who selects the third panel member. This drawing will take place within the 10 business days noted above. This paragraph covers only the first evaluation appeal. Subsequent to this first appeal, the District and Association will alternate the ability to appoint the third panel member.

5. This panel of three shall render their final and binding decision within 10 business days after the District Clerk or District/ Association ascertains the third member of the panel. This panel of three will put their decision in writing and submit it to the Association President, the Superintendent of Schools, the Evaluator, and the Principal.

Time line for Appeal – An illustrative example

Principal receives a composite score on July 2, 2013.

The principal must notify the Superintendent of his/her desire to appeal by (10 business days) July 16.

Once the Superintendent is notified the district and the association have until July 30 (ten business days) to name their representatives to the panel.

The panel must report their findings to the Superintendent by August 13 (ten business days). If the panel is in agreement on a determination the process is ended.

If the panel cannot agree on a determination, they must so indicate to the Superintendent by August 13. A third member of the panel must be appointed by August 27.

Once the three person panel is in place, they must report their findings to the Superintendent by September 10. Every aspect of the appeals process will be conducted in a timely fashion and in compliance with NY Education Law 3012-c.

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

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

Certification of Kenmore Town of Tonawanda UFSD Lead Evaluators

Section 30-2.9 of the Rules of the Board of Regents provides that, in order to be certified as lead evaluators, administrators must be trained in the following nine elements:

Certification Criteria and Current State or Plan for Implementation
1. NYS Teaching Standards and the ISLLC, 2008 Leadership Standards

Principal evaluator(s) have been trained in the ISLLC standards and NYS Teaching Standards. All current administrators have been training in the ISLLC Standards; new administrators will be trained, as needed.

2. Evidence-based observation techniques
All administrators have been provided with training on evidence-based observation techniques. Lead evaluators for principals attended BOCES provided training on the Reeves Leadership Performance Matrix. This course of study focuses on data collection and inter-rater reliability. New lead evaluators will undergo this training.

3. Application and use of the student growth
This topic is routinely covered in various meetings and staff development sessions.

4. Application and use of State-approved teacher/principal rubrics
Principal Lead Evaluators have had extensive training on the Reeves model and are required to take the seminar facilitated by a Reeves certified expert offered through BOCES that focuses on data collection, evidence and inter-rater reliability..

The District has over four years of experience with this model and is leveraging that experience in the new APPR. The district has previously invested in publications, trainings and staff development around the Reeves model which will provide additional support to the new APPR.

5. Application and use of any assessment tools you intend to use (e.g., goals)
All principals and District administrators (instruction and special education) have had extensive training in the use of SLOs and have participated in all local decisions. No assessment tools have been selected that require additional training in their application or use. Initial training of administrators takes about 30 hours of intensive on-line work. Yearly re-certification takes approximately two hours of on-line work.

6. Application and use of any State-approved locally developed measures of student achievement you intend to use. This is an on-going process. Where necessary lead evaluators will receive the appropriate training to administer these assessments.

7. Use of the Statewide Instructional Reporting System
Lead evaluators are receiving ongoing updates from the Office of Curriculum and Instruction and the Office of Accountability/Chief Information Officer on the information
provided by NYSED regarding the Instructional Reporting System.

8. The scoring methodology used by the department and/or your district
All principals and District administrators, as well as the Ken-Ton Administrators Association (KAA), have and will continue to participate in the scoring decisions that relate to APPR.

9. Specific considerations in evaluating teachers and principals of English language learners
There is a District emphasis on best practices for ELL and SWD for curriculum, instruction, and assessment. This focus on these three inter-related areas is incorporated into all aspects of District work, including data team work, which will be considered in principal evaluations.

The certification and re-certification process will contain the same elements. A regular menu of professional development will be offered to build and refine skills.

The Superintendent will certify the evaluators.

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 Monday, June 09, 2014
Updated Monday, June 16, 2014

Page 1

12.1)Upload the Joint Certification of the APPR Plan

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

assets/survey-uploads/12158/1383924-3Uqgn5g9Iu/certificaiton061614.pdf

File types supported for uploads

PDF (preferred)

Microsoft Office (.doc, .ppt, .xls)

Microsoft Office 2007: Supported but not recommended (.docx, .pptx, .xlsx)

Open Office (.odt, .ott)

Images (.jpg, .gif)

Other Formats (.html, .xhtml, .txt, .rtf, .latex)

Please note that .docx, .pptx, and .xlsx formats are not entirely supported.
Please save your file types as .doc, .ppt or .xls respectively before uploading.

Form 2.10) All Other Courses

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

	Course(s) or Subject(s)	Option	Assessment
	AP US History	● State Assessment ○ State-approved 3rd party assessment ○ District, Regional or BOCES-developed ○ School/BOCES-wide/group/team results based on State	US History Regents assessment
	Studio in Art, Multimedia Studio in Art, Advanced Multimedia, Photography 1, Photography 2, 3D Design/Sculpture, Drawing and Painting, Illustration & Animation, Ceramics, Advertising Design	○ State Assessment ○ State-approved 3rd party assessment ● District, Regional or BOCES-developed ○ School/BOCES-wide/group/team results based on State	Kenmore-Town of Tonawanda developed Studio in Art, Multimedia Studio in Art, Advanced Multimedia, Photography 1, Photography 2, 3D Design/Sculpture, Drawing and Painting, Illustration & Animation, Ceramics, Advertising Design assessments
	Accounting 1, Advanced Accounting, Business Math, Financial Literacy, Keyboarding & Personal Documents, Marketing/Ownership: Sports, Fashion and More, Personal Law, Business &	○ State Assessment ○ State-approved 3rd party assessment ● District, Regional or BOCES-developed ○ School/BOCES-wide/group/team results based on State	Kenmore-Town of Tonawanda developed Accounting 1, Advanced Accounting, Business Math, Financial Literacy, Keyboarding & Personal Documents, Marketing/Ownership: Sports, Fashion and More, Personal Law, Business & Entertainment Law, Computers and the Internet, Web Design 1, Web Design 2,

	Entertainment Law, Computers and the Internet, Web Design 1, Web Design 2, Work Study/Work Experience, Internship, Virtual Enterprise		Work Study/Work Experience, Internship, Virtual Enterprise assessments
	12th grade English, Theatre 1, 2, 3, 4, Journalism, Yearbook, Creative Writing, Creative Writing/Film, Public Speaking	○ State Assessment ○ State-approved 3rd party assessment ● District, Regional or BOCES-developed ○ School/BOCES-wide/group/team results based on State	Kenmore-Town of Tonawanda developed 12th grade English, Theatre 1, 2, 3, 4, Journalism, Yearbook, Creative Writing, Creative Writing/Film, Public Speaking assessments
	Foods 1, Foods 2, Parenting, Child Development, Independent Living, Housing, International Foods, Nutrition/Health/Fitness	○ State Assessment ○ State-approved 3rd party assessment ● District, Regional or BOCES-developed ○ School/BOCES-wide/group/team results based on State	Kenmore-Town of Tonawanda developed Foods 1, Foods 2, Parenting, Child Development, Independent Living, Housing, International Foods, Nutrition/Health/Fitness assessments
	Astronomy & Oceanography, Chemistry in the Community, Consumer Chemistry, Ways of the Wilderness, Anatomy & Physiology	○ State Assessment ○ State-approved 3rd party assessment ● District, Regional or BOCES-developed ○ School/BOCES-wide/group/team results based on State	Kenmore-Town of Tonawanda developed Astronomy & Oceanography, Chemistry in the Community, Consumer Chemistry, Ways of the Wilderness, Anatomy & Physiology assessments

	Economy, P.I.G., 60s & 70s, Holocaust, Law in America, Psychology, Sociology, World Today, WWII	○ State Assessment ○ State-approved 3rd party assessment ● District, Regional or BOCES-developed ○ School/BOCES-wide/group/team results based on State	Kenmore-Town of Tonawanda developed Economy, P.I.G., 60s & 70s, Holocaust, Law in America, Psychology, Sociology, World Today, WWII assessments
	Algebra A, Intermediate Algebra, Advanced Algebra, PreCalculus	○ State Assessment ○ State-approved 3rd party assessment ● District, Regional or BOCES-developed ○ School/BOCES-wide/group/team results based on State	Kenmore-Town of Tonawanda developed Algebra A, Intermediate Algebra, Advanced Algebra, PreCalculus assessments
	PLTW IED/DDP, CIM, DE, EDD	○ State Assessment ○ State-approved 3rd party assessment ● District, Regional or BOCES-developed ○ School/BOCES-wide/group/team results based on State	Kenmore-Town of Tonawanda developed PLTW IED/DDP, CIM, DE, EDD assessments
	Architecture, Tool Time, Tool Time 2, Construction Systems, Computer Aided Drafting (CAD), Advanced CAD, Graphic Communications, Media Design & Video Production, Electricity &	○ State Assessment ○ State-approved 3rd party assessment ● District, Regional or BOCES-developed ○ School/BOCES-wide/group/team results based on State	Kenmore-Town of Tonawanda developed Architecture, Tool Time, Tool Time 2, Construction Systems, Computer Aided Drafting (CAD), Advanced CAD, Graphic Communications, Media Design & Video Production, Electricity & Electronics, Networking 1, Networking 2 assessments

	Electronics, Networking 1, Networking 2		
	Health High School	○ State Assessment ○ State-approved 3rd party assessment ● District, Regional or BOCES-developed ○ School/BOCES-wide/group/team results based on State	Kenmore-Town of Tonawanda developed High School Health assessment
	IB courses: Visual Arts, English (HL1 & 2), Theatre (year 1 & 2), Biology, Physics, Environmental Science, Economics, History HL II, Theory of Knowledge I, II, Math Studies II, Math SL1, Math SL2	○ State Assessment ○ State-approved 3rd party assessment ● District, Regional or BOCES-developed ○ School/BOCES-wide/group/team results based on State	Kenmore-Town of Tonawanda developed IB courses: Visual Arts, English (HL1 & 2), Theatre (year 1 & 2), Biology, Physics, Environmental Science, Economics, History HL II, Theory of Knowledge I, II, Math Studies II, Math SL1, Math SL2 assessments
	IB History HL I	● State Assessment ○ State-approved 3rd party assessment ○ District, Regional or BOCES-developed ○ School/BOCES-wide/group/team results based on State	US History Regents assessment
	IB Math Studies I	● State Assessment ○ State-approved 3rd party assessment	Algebra 2/Trig Regents assessment

		○ District, Regional or BOCES-developed ○ School/BOCES-wide/group/team results based on State	

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

Use this box, if needed, to describe the general process for assigning HEDI categories for these grades/subjects in this subcomponent. If needed, you may upload a table or graphic at 2.11.	Growth targets for SLOs shall be determined by teachers and approved by building principals, using data from baseline assessments, as well as historical academic data. Targets will be established in accordance with guidance from the Commissioner and State Education Department. Based on the number of students that meet individual targets, teachers will be assigned 0-20 points within the HEDI rating categories as identified on the attached graphic upload in 2.11.
Highly Effective (18 - 20 points) Results are well-above District goals for similar students.	Evidence indicates exceptional student learning growth inclusive of special populations, with a low of 81% of students who met the target and a high of greater than 90% of students who met the target.
Effective (9 - 17 points) Results meet District goals for similar students.	Evidence indicates significant student learning growth inclusive of special populations, with a low of 61% of students who met the target and a high of 80% of students who met the target.
Developing (3 - 8 points) Results are below District goals for similar students.	Expectations are nearly met, however, overall student learning growth results are below District/State expectations, with a low of 41% of students who met the target and a high of 60% of students who met the target.
Ineffective (0 - 2 points) Results are well-below District goals for similar students.	Evidence indicates little to no student learning growth and is well below District/State expectations, with a low of equal to or less than 14% of students who met the target to a high of 40% of students who met the target.

SCORING BANDS FOR STATE PROVIDED GROWTH SCORE AND DISTRICT PROVIDED GROWTH AS DETERMINED BY STUDENT LEARNING OBJECTIVES:

	Highly Effective (18-20 Points)	**Effective (9-17 Points)**	**Developing (3-8 Points)**	**Ineffective (0-2 Points)**
Target(s) and HEDI Scoring	Evidence indicates exceptional student learning growth inclusive of special populations.	Evidence indicates significant student learning growth inclusive of special populations.	Expectations are nearly met; however, overall student learning growth results are below District/State expectations.	Evidence indicates little to no student learning growth and is well below District/State expectations.

The scoring band used below will be utilized to determine the number of points assigned to teachers:

0-40%		**41-60%**		**61-80%**		**81-100%**	
INEFFECTIVE		**DEVELOPING**		**EFFECTIVE**		**HIGHLY EFFECTIVE**	
0	≤14%	3	41%-44%	9	61%-63%	18	81%-85%
1	15-27%	4	45%-48%	10	64%-66%	19	86%-90%
2	28-40%	5	49%-51%	11	67%-68%	20	>90%
		6	52%-54%	12	69%-70%		
		7	55%-57%	13	71%-72%		
		8	58%-60%	14	73%-74%		
				15	75%-76%		
				16	77%-78%		
				17	79%-80%		

Ken-Ton UFSD Teacher HEDI Scale (15 points)

0-2 Points		3-7 Points		8-13 Points		14-15 Points	
0 - 40%		41 - 60 %		61 - 80%		81 - 100%	
INEFFECTIVE Results are well-below state average for similar students (or District goals if no state test)		DEVELOPING Results are below state average for similar students (or District goals if no state test)		EFFECTIVE Results meet state average for similar students (or District goals if no state test)		HIGHLY EFFECTIVE Results are well-above state average for similar students (or District goals if no state test)	
0	≤14%	3	41%-44%	8	61%-63%	14	81%-90%
1	15-27%	4	45%-48%	9	64% - 65%	15	>90%
2	28-40%	5	49%-53%	10	66%-68%		
		6	54%-57%	11	69%-73%		
		7	58%-60%	12	74%-77%		
				13	78%-80%		

Before or until value added is implemented the following 20 point scoring chart will be used.

0-40%		41 - 60 %		61 - 80%		81 -100%	
INEFFECTIVE		DEVELOPING		EFFECTIVE		HIGHLY EFFECTIVE	
0	≤14%	3	41%-44%	9	61%-63%	18	81%-85%
1	15-27%	4	45%-48%	10	64%-66%	19	86%-90%
2	28-40%	5	49%-51%	11	67%-68%	20	>90%
		6	52%-54%	12	69%-70%		
		7	55%-57%	13	71%-72%		
		8	58%-60%	14	73%-74%		
				15	75%-76%		
				16	77%-78%		
				17	79%-80%		

Form 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 an attachment.

	Course(s) or Subject(s)	Locally-Selected Measure from List of Approved Measures	Assessment
	AP US History	○ 1) Change in % of student performance level on State ○ 2) Teacher specific growth computed by NYSED ○ 3) Teacher specific achievement/growth score computed locally ○ 4) State-approved 3rd party ● 5) District/regional/BOCES–developed ○ 6(i) School-wide measure based on State-provided measure ○ 6(ii) School wide measure computed locally ○ 7) Student Learning Objectives	Kenmore-Town of Tonawanda developed AP US History assessment
	Studio in Art, Multimedia Studio in Art, Advanced Multimedia, Photography 1, Photography 2, 3D Design/Sculpture, Drawing and Painting, Illustration & Animation, Ceramics, Advertising Design	○ 1) Change in % of student performance level on State ○ 2) Teacher specific growth computed by NYSED ○ 3) Teacher specific achievement/growth score computed locally	Kenmore-Town of Tonawanda developed Studio in Art, Multimedia Studio in Art, Advanced Multimedia, Photography 1, Photography 2, 3D Design/Sculpture, Drawing and Painting, Illustration & Animation, Ceramics, Advertising Design assessments

		○ 4) State-approved 3rd party ● 5) District/regional/BOCES–developed ○ 6(i) School-wide measure based on State-provided measure ○ 6(ii) School wide measure computed locally ○ 7) Student Learning Objectives	
	Accounting 1, Advanced Accounting, Business Math, Financial Literacy, Keyboarding & Personal Documents, Marketing/Ownership: Sports, Fashion and More, Personal Law, Business & Entertainment Law, Computers and the Internet, Web Design 1, Web Design 2, Work Study/Work Experience, Internship, Virtual Enterprise	○ 1) Change in % of student performance level on State ○ 2) Teacher specific growth computed by NYSED ○ 3) Teacher specific achievement/growth score computed locally ○ 4) State-approved 3rd party ● 5) District/regional/BOCES–developed ○ 6(i) School-wide measure based on State-provided measure ○ 6(ii) School wide measure computed locally ○ 7) Student Learning Objectives	Kenmore-Town of Tonawanda developed Accounting 1, Advanced Accounting, Business Math, Financial Literacy, Keyboarding & Personal Documents, Marketing/Ownership: Sports, Fashion and More, Personal Law, Business & Entertainment Law, Computers and the Internet, Web Design 1, Web Design 2, Work Study/Work Experience, Internship, Virtual Enterprise assessments
	12th grade English, Theatre 1, 2, 3, 4, Journalism, Yearbook, Creative Writing, Creative Writing/Film, Public Speaking	○ 1) Change in % of student performance level on State ○ 2) Teacher specific growth computed by NYSED	Kenmore-Town of Tonawanda developed 12th grade English, Theatre 1, 2, 3, 4, Journalism, Yearbook, Creative Writing, Creative Writing/Film, Public Speaking assessments

		○ 3) Teacher specific achievement/growth score computed locally ○ 4) State-approved 3rd party ● 5) District/regional/BOCES–developed ○ 6(i) School-wide measure based on State-provided measure ○ 6(ii) School wide measure computed locally ○ 7) Student Learning Objectives	
	Foods 1, Foods 2, Parenting, Child Development, Independent Living, Housing, International Foods, Nutrition/Health/Fitness	○ 1) Change in % of student performance level on State ○ 2) Teacher specific growth computed by NYSED ○ 3) Teacher specific achievement/growth score computed locally ○ 4) State-approved 3rd party ● 5) District/regional/BOCES–developed ○ 6(i) School-wide measure based on State-provided measure ○ 6(ii) School wide measure computed locally ○ 7) Student Learning Objectives	Kenmore-Town of Tonawanda developed Foods 1, Foods 2, Parenting, Child Development, Independent Living, Housing, International Foods, Nutrition/Health/Fitness assessments
	Astronomy & Oceanography, Chemistry in the Community, Consumer	○ 1) Change in % of student performance level on State	Kenmore-Town of Tonawanda developed Astronomy & Oceanography, Chemistry in the

	Chemistry, Ways of the Wilderness, Anatomy & Physiology	○ 2) Teacher specific growth computed by NYSED ○ 3) Teacher specific achievement/growth score computed locally ○ 4) State-approved 3rd party ● 5) District/regional/BOCES–developed ○ 6(i) School-wide measure based on State-provided measure ○ 6(ii) School wide measure computed locally ○ 7) Student Learning Objectives	Community, Consumer Chemistry, Ways of the Wilderness, Anatomy & Physiology assessments
	Economy, P.I.G., 60s & 70s, Holocaust, Law in America, Psychology, Sociology, World Today, WWII	○ 1) Change in % of student performance level on State ○ 2) Teacher specific growth computed by NYSED ○ 3) Teacher specific achievement/growth score computed locally ○ 4) State-approved 3rd party ● 5) District/regional/BOCES–developed ○ 6(i) School-wide measure based on State-provided measure ○ 6(ii) School wide measure computed locally ○ 7) Student Learning Objectives	Kenmore-Town of Tonawanda developed Economy, P.I.G., 60s & 70s, Holocaust, Law in America, Psychology, Sociology, World Today, WWII assessments

	Algebra A, Intermediate Algebra, Advanced Algebra, PreCalculus	○ 1) Change in % of student performance level on State ○ 2) Teacher specific growth computed by NYSED ○ 3) Teacher specific achievement/growth score computed locally ○ 4) State-approved 3rd party ● 5) District/regional/BOCES–developed ○ 6(i) School-wide measure based on State-provided measure ○ 6(ii) School wide measure computed locally ○ 7) Student Learning Objectives	Kenmore-Town of Tonawanda developed Algebra A, Intermediate Algebra, Advanced Algebra, PreCalculus assessments
	PLTW IED/DDP, CIM, DE, EDD	○ 1) Change in % of student performance level on State ○ 2) Teacher specific growth computed by NYSED ○ 3) Teacher specific achievement/growth score computed locally ○ 4) State-approved 3rd party ● 5) District/regional/BOCES–developed ○ 6(i) School-wide measure based on State-provided measure ○ 6(ii) School wide measure computed locally	Kenmore-Town of Tonawanda developed PLTW IED/DDP, CIM, DE, EDD assessments

		○ 7) Student Learning Objectives	
	Architecture, Tool Time, Tool Time 2, Construction Systems, Computer Aided Drafting (CAD), Advanced CAD, Graphic Communications, Media Design & Video Production, Electricity & Electronics, Networking 1, Networking 2	○ 1) Change in % of student performance level on State ○ 2) Teacher specific growth computed by NYSED ○ 3) Teacher specific achievement/growth score computed locally ○ 4) State-approved 3rd party ● 5) District/regional/BOCES–developed ○ 6(i) School-wide measure based on State-provided measure ○ 6(ii) School wide measure computed locally ○ 7) Student Learning Objectives	Kenmore-Town of Tonawanda developed Architecture, Tool Time, Tool Time 2, Construction Systems, Computer Aided Drafting (CAD), Advanced CAD, Graphic Communications, Media Design & Video Production, Electricity & Electronics, Networking 1, Networking 2 assessments
	Health High School	○ 1) Change in % of student performance level on State ○ 2) Teacher specific growth computed by NYSED ○ 3) Teacher specific achievement/growth score computed locally ○ 4) State-approved 3rd party ● 5) District/regional/BOCES–developed ○ 6(i) School-wide measure based on State-provided measure	Kenmore-Town of Tonawanda developed High School Health assessments

		○ 6(ii) School wide measure computed locally ○ 7) Student Learning Objectives	
	IB courses: Visual Arts, English (HL1 & 2), Theatre (year 1 & 2), Biology, Physics, Environmental Science, Economics, History HL II, Theory of Knowledge I, II, Math Studies II, Math SL1, Math SL2	○ 1) Change in % of student performance level on State ○ 2) Teacher specific growth computed by NYSED ○ 3) Teacher specific achievement/growth score computed locally ○ 4) State-approved 3rd party ● 5) District/regional/BOCES–developed ○ 6(i) School-wide measure based on State-provided measure ○ 6(ii) School wide measure computed locally ○ 7) Student Learning Objectives	Kenmore-Town of Tonawanda developed IB courses: Visual Arts, English (HL1 & 2), Theatre (year 1 & 2), Biology, Physics, Environmental Science, Economics, History HL II, Theory of Knowledge I, II, Math Studies II, Math SL1, Math SL2 assessments
	IB History HL I	○ 1) Change in % of student performance level on State ○ 2) Teacher specific growth computed by NYSED ○ 3) Teacher specific achievement/growth score computed locally ○ 4) State-approved 3rd party ● 5) District/regional/BOCES–developed	Kenmore-Town of Tonawanda developed IB History HL1 assessment

		○ 6(i) School-wide measure based on State-provided measure ○ 6(ii) School wide measure computed locally ○ 7) Student Learning Objectives	
	IB Math Studies 1	○ 1) Change in % of student performance level on State ○ 2) Teacher specific growth computed by NYSED ○ 3) Teacher specific achievement/growth score computed locally ○ 4) State-approved 3rd party ● 5) District/regional/BOCES–developed ○ 6(i) School-wide measure based on State-provided measure ○ 6(ii) School wide measure computed locally ○ 7) Student Learning Objectives	Kenmore-Town of Tonawanda developed IB Math Studies 1 assessment
	LOTE Level A, B1, B2, C1, C2 Spanish, French, German	○ 1) Change in % of student performance level on State ○ 2) Teacher specific growth computed by NYSED ○ 3) Teacher specific achievement/growth score computed locally ○ 4) State-approved 3rd party	Kenmore-Town of Tonawanda developed LOTE Level A, B1, B2, C1, C2 Spanish, French, German assessments

		● 5) District/regional/BOCES–developed ○ 6(i) School-wide measure based on State-provided measure ○ 6(ii) School wide measure computed locally ○ 7) Student Learning Objectives	

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.	Achievement targets shall be determined by teachers and approved by building principals. Targets will be established in accordance with guidance from the Commissioner and State Education Department. Based on the number of students that meet the targets, teachers will be assigned 0-20 points within the HEDI rating categories as identified on the attached graphic upload in 3.13.
Highly Effective (18-20 points) Results are well above District- or BOCES -adopted expectations for growth or achievement for grade/subject.	Evidence indicates exceptional student achievement results inclusive of special populations, with a low of 81% of students who met the target and a high of greater than 90% of students who met the target.
Effective (9-17 points) Results meet District- or BOCES-adopted expectations for growth or achievement for	Evidence indicates significant student achievement results inclusive of special populations, with a low of 61% of students who met the

grade/subject.	target and a high of 80% of students who met the target.
Developing (3-8 points) Results are below District- or BOCES-adopted expectations for growth or achievement for grade/subject.	Expectations are nearly met; however, overall student achievement results are below District/State expectations, with a low of 41% of students who met the target and a high of 60% of students who met the target.
Ineffective (0 - 2 points) Results are well below District- or BOCES-adopted expectations for growth or achievement for grade/subject.	Evidence indicates little to no student achievement and is well below District/State expectations, with a low of equal to or less than 14% of students who met the target to a high of 40% of students who met the target.

Achievement Targets for all other teachers

Targets will be established in accordance with guidance from the Commissioner and State Education Department. Regardless of how the target for individual courses/grade levels/subject areas is established, the scoring band listed below will be utilized to determine the number of points assigned to teachers. For teachers who have more than one locally selected measure, scores will be averaged, weighted proportionally based on the number of students is each measure. In this case standard rounding rules will apply:

HEDI Scoring Bands for Achievement

0-40%		41 - 60 %		61 - 80%		81 -100%	
INEFFECTIVE		DEVELOPING		EFFECTIVE		HIGHLY EFFECTIVE	
0	≤14%	3	41%-44%	9	61%-63%	18	81%-85%
1	15-27%	4	45%-48%	10	64%-66%	19	86%-90%
2	28-40%	5	49%-51%	11	67%-68%	20	>90%
		6	52%-54%	12	69%-70%		
		7	55%-57%	13	71%-72%		
		8	58%-60%	14	73%-74%		
				15	75%-76%		
				16	77%-78%		
				17	79%-80%		

Form 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.

Fill in the group of teachers covered probationary teachers:

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

Fill in the group of teachers covered tenured teachers:

Multiple (at least two) classroom observations by principal or other trained administrator, at least one of which must be unannounced [at least 31 points]	32
One or more observation(s) by trained independent evaluators	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	28

Computation for 60 points for Other measures of Teacher Effectiveness

Tenured Teachers

A. Score from Danielson Rubric	**0-28 points**
+	
B. Score from administrative walk through Based on guidelines below	**0-4 points**
+	
C. Score from three year cycle of Additional local measures Based on rubric below	**0-28 points**
Total	**0-60 points**

Probationary Teachers

A. Score from Danielson Rubric(observation 1)	**0-28 points**
+	
B. Score from Danielson Rubric(observation 2)	**0-28 points**
+	
C. Score from administrative walk through Based on guidelines below	**0-4 points**
Total	**0-60 points**

Total Average Rubric Score	Category	Conversion for Composite Score
Ineffective 0-4		
1		0
1.1		1
1.2		1.9
1.3		2.9
1.4		3.8
Developing 5-13		
1.5		4.8
1.6		5.8
1.7		6.7
1.8		7.7
1.9		8.6
2		9.6
2.1		10.6
2.2		11.5
2.3		12.5
2.4		13.4
Effective 14-23		
2.5		14.4
2.6		15.4
2.7		16.3
2.8		17.3
2.9		18.2
3		19.2
3.1		20.1
3.2		21.1
3.3		22.1
3.4		23
Highly Effective 24-28		
3.5		24
3.6		25
3.7		25.9
3.8		26.9
3.9		27.8
4		28

DIRECTIONS FOR DETERMINIG AND COMPUTING TOTAL SCORES FOR THE DANIELSON RUBRIC

There are four domains and each domain has a number of components. Each component receives a score from (1-4) based on the evidence gathered. A domain average is then computed based on the total number of points divided by the number of sub components.

Domain	# of Components
Domain 1 - Planning	6
Doman 2 - Classroom	5
Domain 3- Instruction	5
Domain 4 – Professional Dev	6

The four averages are added and divided by four(number of domains) to arrive at a Total Average Rubric Score

The chart to the left is used to find the conversion for the Total Average Rubric Score.

An example……..

Teacher's Scores:

Planning & Preparation = 3.4
Classroom Environment = 4
Instruction= 3.2
Professional & Leadership Responsibilities = 4

Total = 14.6 or 15; ALL SCORES WILL BE ROUNDED UP.

15/ 4 domains = 3.75 or 3.8 as ALL SCORES WILL BE ROUNDED UP.

FINAL CONVERSION SCORE = 26.9 OR 27 POINTS.

In all cases the final score will be a whole number. In no case will rounding result in a score moving from one band to another.

Total: _____ 4 pts.

Ken-Ton School District
Walk through Observation Report

Name of Teacher: _____ Date: _____

Observation Date & Time: _____ Evaluator: _____

Description of Lesson:

I. Student Behaviors

Evidence	**Comments:**
Students are actively engaged with concepts relevant to the content of the lesson.	
Students are able to explain what they're learning.	
Students have multiple opportunities to demonstrate mastery through varied, relevant, rigorous activities.	
Students are engaged in appropriate academic and social behaviors are observed.	

II. Teacher Behaviors/Instructional Strategies

Evidence	**Comments:**
Teacher demonstrates a solid grasp of the content.	
Teacher delivers instruction aligned to a rigorous learning objective.	
Teacher demonstrates strong pedagogical skills, balancing direct instruction with modeling, facilitating, and/or coaching students as appropriate.	

The walkthrough is conducted by a principal or assistant principal. It is scored holistically based on the evidence observed. The observer has discretion to award 0 to 4 points based on the quality and quantity of evidence observed during the walk-though. The evidence collected is directly tied to the elements of the rubric above.

Scoring

Ineffective	0 points
Developing	1-2 points
Effective	3 points
Highly Effective	4 points

Appendix D: Scoring Rubric for Portfolio, Peer Coaching, and Video requirements

Rubrics (28 points of 60) Other Local Measures (Revised 11-30-2012)

HEDI Scale	Ineffective	Developing	Effective	High Effective
Peer Coaching/Clinical Supervision	Did not complete all steps in the process and/or feedback and post conference did not reflect the selected Danielson domains/elements.	Completed all steps in the process. Post conference and feedback partially reflects the selected Danielson domain/element. The peer coaching report demonstrates the instructor has a basic understanding of the selected Danielson domain/element as it relates to the lesson(s) observed	Completed all steps in the process. Post conference and peer feedback mostly reflects the selected Danielson domain/element. The peer coaching report demonstrates the instructor's understanding of the selected Danielson domain/element as it relates to the lesson(s) observed.	Completed all steps in the process. Post conference and peer feedback strongly reflects the selected Danielson domain/element. The peer coaching report demonstrates the instructor's command of the selected Danielson domain/element as it relates to the lesson(s) observed.
HEDI Points	**0-4**	**13**	**23**	**28**
Portfolio	The portfolio contains insufficient student work and/or artifacts and/or is not necessarily linked to the selected Danielson domain/component.	The portfolio contains a variety of student work and/or artifacts but the linkage between the selected component/rubric is not satisfactorily explored.	The portfolio contains a variety of pertinent student work and/or artifacts and supports the selected Danielson component/rubric. There is a relationship between the selected Danielson component/rubric and the student work and/or artifacts. Professional growth is evident.	The portfolio contains a wide variety of pertinent student work and/or artifacts and supports the selected Danielson domain/component. The portfolio demonstrates the strong linkage between the selected Danielson domain/component and the student work and/or artifacts. The portfolio clearly demonstrates professional growth over the course of the period of study.
HEDI Points	**0-4**	**13**	**23**	**28**
Video	The work product and self-assessment do not adequately reflect the selected Danielson domain/element and/or teacher cannot adequately articulate professional growth.	The work product and self-assessment partially reflects the selected Danielson domain/element and/or teacher does not completely articulate professional growth	The work product and self-assessment reflects the selected Danielson domain/element. Teacher is able to articulate professional growth.	The work product and self-assessment demonstrates strong linkage to the selected Danielson domain/element. Teacher is able to articulate professional growth.
HEDI Points	**0-4**	**13**	**23**	**28**

Teachers will be rated on the above items by a structured review of teacher artifacts and evidence and will align with the chosen Danielson domain and/or components.

Ken-Ton UFSD Teacher Improvement Plan

Area to be Improved	Objectives for Improvement	Self-Improvement Plan	Administrator's Plan to Assist Educator	Improvement Measurement Criteria	Plan Evaluation Timeline

Teacher's Signature _____ Date: _____

Union Representative's Signature:_____ Date: _____

Administrator's Signature: _____ Date: _____

KEN-TON UFSD
Local Measures of Student Achievement for Principals Without Valued Added Growth Model – Twenty Points

Elementary

Achievement levels on the ELA and Math Grades 4-5(percentage of students scoring at proficiency levels 2,3 and 4) and Science Grade 4 (levels 3 and 4); scores and will be provided to the principals by the CIO. Points are obtained as indicated below:

PERCENTAGE	ELA/MATH/SCIENCE Scores/5
85 – 100 %	4
75 – 84 %	2.8
50 – 74 %	1.6
2– 48 %	1.2
0-1%	0

Elementary Calculation: Determine for each grade and assessment a score based on the percentage of students who reached proficiency levels 2,3,4 for ELA and Math and proficiency levels 3 or 4 in Science. Normal rounding rules apply, but in no case will rounding result in HEDI scores being moved into a different rating category.

#1. ELA Grade 4 _____+ ELA Grade 5_____ = _____ (max of 8)

#2. Math Grade 4 _____+ Math Grade 5_____ = _____(max of 8)

#3. Science Grade 4_____ = _____(max of 4)

#4. Combined Score Total #1 + #2 + #3 = _____ (max of 20)

Middle School

Achievement levels on the ELA and Math, Grades 6, 7, 8 (percentage of students scoring at proficiency levels 2,3 and 4)and Science Grade 8 (levels 3 and 4); scores will be provided to the Principals by The CIO. Points are obtained as indicated below.

PER-CEN-TAGE	ELA/ MATH/SCIENCE SCORE
85 – 100 %	2.85
75 – 84 %	2.1
50 – 74 %	1.0
2 – 49 %	.2
0-1%	0

Middle School Calculation: Determine for each grade a score based on the percentage of students who reached proficiency or higher. Normal rounding rules apply, but in no case will rounding result in HEDI scores being moved into a different rating category.

#1. ELA Score for Grades 6_____+7_____+8_____

=_____ (max of 8.55)

#2. Math Score for Grades 6_____+7_____+8_____

= _____ (max of 8.55)

#3. Science Score Grade 8_____

=_____ (max of 2.85)

#4. Total points= # 1 + #2 + #3 =_____(max of 20)

High School

State assessment data will be provided to the Principals by The CIO. Points are obtained as indicated below.

1. **Four Year Graduation Rate:** (All Students Including August Graduates, Excluding Out Of District Placements) The graduation rate of the current cohort within the evaluation cycle will be calculated by the High School Principals. The cohort will be those students graduating who began at grade nine four years earlier.
   Our district will be using student data from August of the previous year. For example student graduation data from August of 2013 will be included in the 2013-14 school year data.

RANGE (Percentage of Students Graduating)	SCORE
85-100 %	4.9
75-84 %	3.6
50-74 %	2.5
2-49 %	.8
0-1%	0

Score: _____ +

2. Regents Passing Rates: (All Students Group Passing Rates on Regents Exams)
The percent of "All Students" who score a 65 or higher on the following Regents: Common Core ELA and Common Core Algebra, Geometry, Algebra 2/Trig, Global 10, U.S. History, Chemistry, Earth Science, Living Environment and Physics. The calculations will be made by the High School Principals using the students' highest scores earned on the Regents Examinations administered within the evaluation cycle (out of the January, June, and August Regents' results). Our district will be using student data from the August of the previous year. For example, student Regents score data from August 2013 will be included in the 2013-14 Regents score data.

RANGE (Percentage of Students Passing Regents)	SCORE
85-100 %	4.9
75-84 %	3.6
50-74 %	2.5

2-49 %	.8
0-1%	0

Score: _____ +

3. Credit Accumulation for 9th and 10th Graders: (Percentage of Students who began 9th grade in the current and previous school year earning 5.5 credits by the end of the current school year. Credits are determined by successful completion of a course (passing final average). The calculations will be made by the High School Principals using the student information system to generate ad hoc student credit reports. Our district will be using credits earned from the August of the previous year. For example, credit earned in August of 2013 will be included in credit earned for the 2013-14 school year.

RANGE (Percentage of 9th and 10th grade Cohort Students Earning 5.5 + Credits by August)	SCORE
85-100 %	4.9
75-84 %	3.6
50-74 %	2.5
2-49 %	.8
0-1%	0

Score: _____

Using the composite score, accumulation will be given, and translated to a total of 20 using the following formula:
(Graduation Rate + Regents Passing Rates + Credit Accumulation for 9th and 10th Graders) /

Example: Scores 4.9, 3.6, and 3.6 in each of the respective fields =
(4.9 + 3.6 + 3.6)/14.7 = 0.82312
0.82312 x 20 = 16.46
Rounded, principal's score = 16/20

Graduation Rate Points _____ +
Regents Passing Points _____ +
Credit Accumulation Points _____+

Total Points _____ Divided by14.7_____ (Divisor)

Multiply Divisor by 20 to arrive at total points_____ normal rounding rules apply**, but in no case will rounding result in HEDI scores being moved into a different rating category.**

KEN-TON UFSD
Local Measures of Student Achievement for Principals With *Valued Added Growth Model*
Fifteen Points

Elementary

Achievement levels on the ELA and Math Grades 4-5(percentage of students scoring at proficiency levels 2,3 and 4) and Science Grade 4 (levels 3 and 4); scores and will be provided to the principals by the CIO. Points are obtained as indicated below:

PERCENTAGE	ELA/MATH/Science Scores
85 – 100 %	3.0
75 – 84 %	2.25
50 – 74 %	1.2
2 – 49 %	.4
0-1%	0

Elementary Calculation: Determine for each grade and assessment a score based on the percentage of students who reached proficiency levels 2,3,4 for ELA and Math and proficiency levels 3 or 4 in Science. Normal rounding rules apply, but in no case will rounding result in HEDI scores being moved into a different rating category.

.

#1. ELA Grade 4 _____+ ELA Grade 5_____ = _____ (max of 6.0)

#2. Math Grade 4 _____+ Math Grade 5_____ = _____(max of 6.0)

#3. Science Score Grade 4_____ = _____(max of 3.0)

#4. Combined Score Total #1 + #2 + #3 = _____ (max of 15)

Middle School

Achievement levels on the ELA and Math, Grades 6, 7, 8 (percentage of students scoring at proficiency levels 2,3 and 4)and Science Grade 8 (levels 3 and 4); scores will be provided to the Principals by The CIO. Points are obtained as indicated below.

PER-CEN-TAGE	ELA/ MATH/SCIENCE SCORE/
85 – 100 %	2.14
75 – 84 %	1.6
50 – 74 %	.9
2 – 49 %	.25
0-1%	0

Middle School Calculation: Determine for each grade a score based on the percentage of students who reached proficiency or higher. Normal rounding rules apply, but in no case will rounding result in HEDI scores being moved into a different rating category.

#1. ELA Score for Grades 6_____+7_____+8_____

=_____ (max of 6.42)

#2. Math Score for Grades 6_____+7_____+8_____

= _____ (max of 6.42)

#3. Science Score Grade 8_____

=_____(max of 2.14)

#4. Total points= # 1 + #2 + #3 =_____(max of 15)

High School

State assessment data will be provided to the Principals by The CIO. Points are obtained as indicated below.

1. **Four Year Graduation Rate:** (All Students Including August Graduates, Excluding Out Of District Placements) The graduation rate of the current cohort within the evaluation cycle will be calculated by the High School Principals. The cohort will be those students graduating who began at grade nine four years earlier.
   Our district will be using student data from August of the previous year. For example student graduation data from August of 2013 will be included in the 2013-14 school year data.

RANGE (Percentage of Students Graduating)	SCORE
85-100 %	4
75-84 %	3
50-74 %	1.4
2-49 %	.4
0-1%	0

Score: _____ +

2. Regents Passing Rates: (All Students Group Passing Rates on Regents Exams)
The percent of "All Students" who score a 65 or higher on the following Regents: Common Core ELA and Common Core Algebra, Geometry, Algebra 2/Trig, Global 10, U.S. History, Chemistry, Earth Science, Living Environment and Physics. The calculations will be made by the High School Principals using the students' highest scores earned on the Regents Examinations administered within the evaluation cycle (out of the January, June, and August Regents' results). Our district will be using student data from the August of the previous year. For example, student Regents score data from August 2013 will be included in the 2013-14 Regents score data.

RANGE (Percentage of Students Passing Regents)	SCORE
85-100 %	4
75-84 %	3

50-74 %	1.4
2-49 %	.4
0-1%	0

Score: _____ +

3. Credit Accumulation for 9th and 10th Graders: (Percentage of Students who began 9th grade in the current and previous school year earning 5.5 credits by the end of the current school year. Credits are determined by successful completion of a course (passing final average). The calculations will be made by the High School Principals using the student information system to generate ad hoc student credit reports. Our district will be using credits earned from the August of the previous year. For example, credit earned in August of 2013 will be included in the credit earned for the 2013-14 school year.

RANGE (Percentage of 9th and 10th grade Cohort Students Earning 5.5 + Credits by August)	SCORE
85-100 %	4
75-84 %	3
50-74 %	1.4
2-49 %	.4
0-1%	0

Score: _____

Using the composite score, accumulation will be given, and translated to a total of 15 using the following formula:
(Graduation Rate + Regents Passing Rates + Credit Accumulation for 9th and 10th Graders) /

Example: Scores 4, 3, and 3 in each of the respective fields =
(4 + 3 + 3)/12 = 0.833
0.833 x 15 = 12.5
Rounded, principal's score = 13/15

Graduation Rate Points _____ +
Regents Passing Points _____ +
Credit Accumulation Points _____+

Total Points _____ Divided by12_____ (Divisor)

Multiply Divisor by 15 to arrive at total points_____ normal rounding rules apply**, but in no case will rounding result in HEDI scores being moved into a different rating category.**

KEN-TON UFSD Make up of 60 points – OTHER LOCAL MEASURES FOR PRINCIPALS

Overall Score and Levels

Totals of Section 1 2 3

/			=	**TOTAL =**
10 pts	**25 pts**	**25 pts**		**60 points total**

Part 1: School Visit - 10 points Score

The Superintendent/Assistant Superintendent's ASSESSMENT shall be based on at least two (2) visits of 30 minutes or more to the school, while in session, date and time to be agreed to between the Principal and the Superintendent/Assistant Superintendent, visits to be completed no later than June 30 of the school year in which the evaluation occurs**.**

/10

Score	Descriptors
10 Highly Effective (H.E.)	✓ Demonstrates strong knowledge/purpose of classroom instruction and of program events (**3.1,3.2,3.3,3.4,3.5)** ✓ Demonstrates strong understanding of building mission/vision(**4.3)** ✓ Demonstrates strong evidence of planning (**7.3,8,1,8.2,8.3)** ✓ Articulates issues impacting staff/curriculum and plan in place for addressing the issues **(4.1,4.2,4.3,4.4)** ✓ Strong evidence of ongoing initiatives **(8.3)** Demonstrates strong knowledge/purpose of classroom instruction and of program events (**3.1,3.2,3.3,3.4,3.5)** ✓ Demonstrates strong understanding of building mission/vision(**4.3)** ✓ Demonstrates strong evidence of planning (**7.3,8,1,8.2,8.3)** ✓ Articulates issues impacting staff/curriculum and plan in place for addressing the issues **(4.1,4.2,4.3,4.4)** ✓ Strong evidence of ongoing initiatives **(8.3)**
8 Effective (E)	✓ Demonstrates knowledge/purpose of classroom instruction and of program events ✓ Demonstrates understanding of building mission/vision ✓ Demonstrates evidence of planning ✓ Articulates issues impacting staff/curriculum ✓ Evidence of ongoing initiatives
6 Effective (E)	✓ Some knowledge/purpose of classroom instruction ✓ Some understanding of building mission/vision ✓ Some evidence of planning ✓ Able to articulate to some degree issues impacting staff/curriculum ✓ Some evidence of ongoing initiatives
4 Developing (D)	✓ Insufficient preparation for school visit
0 Ineffective (I)	✓ Not prepared for school visits

Part 2: Reeves Leadership Matrix – 25 points

Points

25 Reeves' Leadership Performance Matrix (total of 40 questions; 4 possible responses = 160 point range; each unsatisfactory rating = 1 point; each needs improvement rating = 2 points; each effective rating = 3 points, and each highly effective rating = 4 points); attached in appendix

LEVEL	REEVES' CATEGORIES	RANGE	SCORE	PRINCIPAL SCORE
Highly Effective	Highly Effective (4)	137-160	25	
Effective	Effective (3)	101-136	20	
Developing	Needs Improvement (2)	60 – 100	15	
Ineffective	Unsatisfactory (1)	40 – 59	0	

Score

/25

SECTION 3: Two ambitious/measureable goals – 25 points

One or more ambitious/measureable goals set collaboratively between principal and supervisor; one goal must address principal's contribution to improving teacher effectiveness. Goals are based on the criteria identified in NYS Education Law 3012(c).

Goal One: Facilitating Teacher participation in LASW DAYS

Score

/15 = _____

Descriptors
o Communicates purpose, expectations, protocols, processes and/or structures o Documents progress toward goal and follows up o Provides constructive feedback or programs towards goal o Ensures professional development o Evidence of planning and preparation
Scoring – For each descriptor that is evident 3 points will be awarded 4 or more descriptors = Highly Effective 3 descriptors evident = Effective 2 descriptors evident = Developing 0-1 of these descriptors evident = Ineffective

Goal Two: Quality of Teacher Evaluations
Principal will have sample evaluations done to share with supervisor so the score can be entered. **Score**

____ x 2 /10

Score	Descriptors
5 Highly Effective (H.E.)	✓ Consistently uses evidence data that target instructional needs and strengths ✓ Consistently engages in two-way dialogue with teachers during post-observation ✓ Consistently solicits feedback via probing questions, input from teachers during pre- and post-observation process and in follow-up formal and informal walkthrough observations ✓ Consistently connects with Common Core Learning Standards ✓ Consistently gathers evidence data, including photos of student activities captured during lesson(s) and/or quotes from teacher and/or students, that demonstrate causal relationship between lesson design and learning ✓ Consistently maintains log of teacher evaluations
4 Effective (E)	✓ Regularly uses evidence data that target instructional needs and strengths ✓ Regularly engages in two-way dialogue with teachers ✓ Regularly solicits feedback via probing questions, input from teachers during pre- and post-observation process and in follow-up formal and informal walkthrough observations ✓ Regularly connects with Common Core Learning Standards ✓ Regularly gathers evidence data, including photos of student activities captured during lesson(s) and/or quotes from teacher and/or students, that demonstrate causal relationship between lesson design and learning ✓ Regularly maintains log of teacher evaluations
3 Effective (E)	✓ Uses evidence data that target instructional needs and strengths ✓ Engages in two-way dialogue with teachers ✓ Solicits feedback via probing questions, input from teachers during pre- and post-observation process and in follow-up formal and informal walkthrough observations ✓ Connects with Common Core Learning Standards ✓ Gathers evidence data, including photos of student activities captured during lesson(s) and/or quotes from teacher and/or students, that demonstrate causal relationship between lesson design and learning ✓ Maintains log of teacher evaluations
2 Developing (D)	✓ Sometimes uses evidence data that target instructional needs and strengths ✓ Sometimes engages in two-way dialogue with teachers ✓ Sometimes solicits feedback via probing questions, input from teachers during pre- and post-observation process and in follow-up formal and informal walkthrough observations ✓ Sometimes connects with Common Core Learning Standards ✓ Sometimes gathers evidence data, including photos of student activities captured during lesson(s) and/or quotes from teacher and/or students that may or may not demonstrate causal relationship between lesson design and learning ✓ Rarely maintains log of teacher evaluations

1 Developing (D)	✓ Rarely uses evidence data that target instructional needs and strengths ✓ Rarely engages in two-way dialogue with teachers ✓ Rarely solicits feedback via probing questions, input from teachers during pre- and post-observation process and little to no evidence of follow-up walkthrough observations ✓ Rarely connects with Common Core Learning Standards ✓ Rarely has evidence of log of teacher evaluations
0 Ineffective (I)	✓ No demonstrated ability to use evidence data that target instructional needs and strengths ✓ No evidence of engagement in two-way dialogue with teachers ✓ No evidence of soliciting feedback via probing questions, input from teachers during pre- and post-observation process and in follow-up formal and informal walkthrough observations ✓ No connection with Common Core Learning Standards ✓ No evidence of log of teacher evaluations ✓ No evidence that APPR reports are complete and/or submitted

Overall Score and Levels

Totals of Section 1 2 3

1	2	3		
/			=	**TOTAL =**
10 max	**25 max**	**25 max**		

HEDI	Accumulated points from I, II, IIIA, IIIB
Highly Effective	51-60
Effective	36-50
Developing	16-35
Ineffective	0-15

Ken-Ton UFSD Principal Improvement Plan

Name of Principal _____

School Building _____ Academic Year _____

Deficiency that promulgated the "ineffective" or "developing" performance rating: _____

_____

_____

_____

_____

Improvement Goal/Outcome: _____

_____

_____

_____

_____

Action Steps/Activities: _____

_____

_____

_____

Timeline: _____

Required and Accessible Resources: _____

_____

_____

Date(s) of formative evaluations: _____Signatures: _____

Evidence of Goal Achievement: _____

_____

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

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

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

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

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

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

- Assure that the evaluation system will be used as a significant factor for employment decisions and teacher and principal development
- Assure that the entire APPR plan will be completed for each teacher or principal as soon as practicable, but in no case later than September 1 of the school year next following the school year for which the classroom teacher or building principal's performance is being measured
- Assure that the district or BOCES will provide the teacher's or principal's score and rating on the locally selected measures subcomponent, if available, and on the other measures of teacher and principal effectiveness subcomponent for a teacher's or principal's annual professional performance review, in writing, no later than the last school day of the school year for which the teacher or principal is being measured
- Assure that the APPR plan will be posted on the district's or BOCES' website by September 10 or within 10 days after it is approved by the Commissioner, whichever is later
- Assure that accurate teacher and student data will be provided to the Commissioner in a format and timeline prescribed by the Commissioner
- Assure that the district or BOCES will report the individual subcomponent scores and the total composite effectiveness score for each classroom teacher and building principal in a manner prescribed by the Commissioner
- Certify that the district provides an opportunity for every classroom teacher and building principal to verify the subjects and/or student rosters assigned to them
- Assure that teachers and principals will receive timely and constructive feedback as part of the evaluation process
- Assure that any training course for lead evaluator certification addresses each of the requirements in the regulations, including specific considerations in evaluating teachers and principals of English Language Learners and students with disabilities

- Assure that educators who receive a Developing or Ineffective rating will receive a TIP or PIP plan, in accordance with the regulations, as soon as practicable but in no case later than 10 school days from the opening of classes in the school year following the performance year
- Assure that all evaluators and lead evaluators will be properly trained and that lead evaluators will be certified and recertified as necessary in accordance with the regulations
- Assure that the district or BOCES has appeal procedures that are consistent with the regulations and that they provide for the timely and expeditious resolution of an appeal
- Assure that, for teachers, all NYS Teaching Standards are assessed at least once per year, and, for principals, all Leadership Standards are assessed at least once per year
- Assure that it is possible for a teacher or principal to obtain each point in the scoring ranges, including 0 for each subcomponent and that the APPR Plan describes the process for assigning points for each subcomponent
- Assure that locally-selected measures are rigorous and comparable across all classrooms (for teachers, the same locally-selected measure is used across a subject and/or grade level; for principals, the same locally-selected measure must be used for all principals in the same or similar program or grade configuration)
- Assure that, if more than one type of locally-selected measure is used for different groups of teachers within a grade/subject, the measures are comparable based on the Standards of Educational and Psychological Testing
- Assure that, if more than one type of locally-selected measure is used for principals in the same or similar grade configuration or program, the measures are comparable based on the Standards of Educational and Psychological Testing
- Assure that the process for assigning points for all subcomponents and the composite scores will use the narrative HEDI descriptions described in the regulations to effectively differentiate educators' performance in ways that improve student learning and instruction
- Assure that district or BOCES will develop SLOs according to the rules and/or guidance established by SED and that past academic performance and / or baseline academic data of students is taken into account when developing an SLO
- Assure that Student Growth/Value Added Measure will be used where applicable
- Assure that any material changes to this APPR Plan will be submitted to the Commissioner for approval as soon as practicable and/or in a timeframe prescribed by the Commissioner
- Assure that this APPR Plan applies to all classroom teachers and building principals as defined in the regulation and SED guidance
- Assure that the district or BOCES will provide the Department with any information necessary to conduct annual monitoring pursuant to the regulations
- If this APPR Plan is being submitted subsequent to July 1, 2013, assure that this was the result of unresolved collective bargaining negotiations

Signatures, dates

Superintendent Signature: Date:

6/16/14

Teachers Union President Signature: Date:

6/16/14

Administrative Union President Signature: Date:

6/16/14

Board of Education President Signature: Date:

6/16/14