



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

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

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

December 19, 2012

Chris Roser, Superintendent
Lewiston-Porter Central School District
4061 Creek Road
Youngstown, NY 14174

Dear Superintendent Roser:

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

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

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

Thank you again for your hard work.

Sincerely,



John B. King, Jr.
Commissioner

Attachment

c: Clark J. Godshall

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

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

Annual Professional Performance Reviews: 2012-13

Created Thursday, May 03, 2012

Updated Friday, December 14, 2012

1

Disclaimers

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

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

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

1. SCHOOL DISTRICT INFORMATION

1.1) School District's BEDS Number : 400301060000

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

400301060000

1.2) School District Name: LEWISTON-PORTER CSD

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

LEWISTON-PORTER CSD

1.3) School Improvement Grant (SIG) Districts Only

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

Not applicable

1.4) Award Classification

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

(No response)

1.5) Assurances

Please check all of the boxes below:

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

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

Re-submission to address deficiencies

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

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

Annual (2012-13)

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

Created Monday, June 04, 2012

Updated Monday, December 17, 2012

Page 1

STATE-PROVIDED MEASURES OF STUDENT GROWTH

(25 points with an approved value-added measure)

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

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

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

2.1) Assurances

Please check the boxes below:

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

STUDENT LEARNING OBJECTIVES AS COMPARABLE GROWTH MEASURES (20 points)

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

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

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

If no State assessment or Regents exam exists:

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

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

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

State assessments, *required if one exists*

List of State-approved 3rd party assessments

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

School- or BOCES-wide, group or team results based on State assessments

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

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

2.2) Grades K-3 ELA

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

	ELA	Assessment
K	State-approved 3rd party assessment	AIMSWEB K ELA
1	State-approved 3rd party assessment	STAR Reading Enterprise - 1st Grade ELA
2	State-approved 3rd party assessment	STAR Reading Enterprise - 2nd Grade ELA

	ELA	Assessment
3	State assessment	3rd Grade State Assessment

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

Use this box, if needed, to describe the general process for assigning HEDI categories for these grades/subjects in	The general process for assigning HEDI scores is as follows:
---	--

this subcomponent. If needed, you may upload a table or graphic at 2.11, below.

Each teacher who is not provided a State Growth score from NYS, will develop SLO's with pre and post assessments. The assessment will have an expected level of performance. The pre-assessment will be administered during the first 5 weeks of school. A final examination or State Assessment will be administered at the end of the school year or as prescribed by NYS Department of Education.

All students on the roster will be expected to take the examination and all efforts will be made to make sure this is accomplished. Students will be expected to make progress from the baseline assessment or to meet and maintain the target score. The number of students making progress or meeting and exceeding the target will be counted and converted to a percent. The percent will then be converted to Hiedi. (see the attached charts documentation in 2.11).

Highly Effective will be defined as 85% - 100% of students meeting their individual targets.

Effective will be defined as 65 - 84% of their students meeting their targets.

Developing will be defined as 26 - 64% of their students meeting their individual targets.

Ineffective will be defined as 0 - 25% of their students meeting their individual targets.

The point spread for each band is as follows:

Highly Effective - 18 - 20

Effective - 9 - 17

Developing 3 - 8

Ineffective 0 -2

Highly Effective (18 - 20 points) Results are well-above state average for similar students (or District goals if no state test).

Highly effective (18 - 20) points. Results are above district average for similar students. 85 - 100% of students met their individual targets as established by the district.

Effective (9 - 17 points) Results meet state average for similar students (or District goals if no state test).

Effective (9 - 17) points. Results meet district average for similar students. 65 - 84% of students met their individual targets as established by the district.

Developing (3 - 8 points) Results are below state average for similar students (or District goals if no state test).

Developing (3 - 8) points. Results are below district average for similar students. 26 - 64% of students met their individual targets as established by the district.

Ineffective (0 - 2 points) Results are well-below state average for similar students (or District goals if no state test).

Ineffective (0 - 2) points. Results are well-below district average for similar students. 0 - 25% of students met their individual targets as established by the district.

2.3) Grades K-3 Math

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

	Math	Assessment
K	State-approved 3rd party assessment	AIMSWEB K Math
1	District, regional, or BOCES-developed assessment	Lew-Port developed 1st Grade Mathematics Assessment

2	District, regional, or BOCES-developed assessment	Low-Port developed 2nd Grade Mathematics 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 student performance.

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

The general process for assigning HEDI scores is as follows:

Each teacher who is not provided a State Growth score from NYS, will develop SLO's with pre and post assessments. The assessment will have an expected level of performance. The pre-assessment will be administered during the first 5 weeks of school. A final examination or State Assessment will be administered at the end of the school year or as prescribed by NYS Department of Education.

All students on the roster will be expected to take the examination and all efforts will be made to make sure this is accomplished. Students will be expected to make progress from the baseline assessment or to meet and maintain the target score. The number of students making progress or meeting and exceeding the target will be counted and converted to a percent. The percent will then be converted to Hiedi. (see the attached charts documentation in 2.11).

Highly Effective will be defined as 85% - 100% of students meeting their individual targets.

Effective will be defined as 65 - 84% of their students meeting their targets.

Developing will be defined as 26 - 64% of their students meeting their individual targets.

Ineffective will be defined as 0 - 25% of their students meeting their individual targets.

The point spread for each band is as follows:

Highly Effective - 18 - 20

Effective - 9 - 17

Developing 3 - 8

Ineffective 0 - 2

Highly Effective (18 - 20 points) Results are well-above state average for similar students (or District goals if no state test).

Highly effective (18 - 20) points. Results are above district average for similar students. 85 - 100% of students met their individual targets as established by the district.

Effective (9 - 17 points) Results meet state average for similar students (or District goals if no state test).

Effective (9 - 17) points. Results meet district average for similar students. 65 - 84% of students met their individual targets as established by the district.

Developing (3 - 8 points) Results are below state average for similar students (or District goals if no state test).

Developing (3 - 8) points. Results are below district average for similar students. 26 - 64% of students met

their individual targets as established by the district.

Ineffective (0 - 2 points) Results are well-below state average for similar students (or District goals if no state test).

Ineffective (0 - 2) points. Results are well-below district average for similar students. 0 - 25% of students met their individual targets as established by the district.

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	Low-Port developed 6th Grade Science Assessment
7	District, regional or BOCES-developed assessment	Low-Port developed 7th Grade Science Assessment
8	State assessment	8th Grade State Science Assessment

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

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

The general process for assigning HEDI scores is as follows:

Each teacher who is not provided a State Growth score from NYS, will develop SLO's with pre and post assessments. The assessment will have an expected level of performance. The pre-assessment will be administered during the first 5 weeks of school. A final examination or State Assessment will be administered at the end of the school year or as prescribed by NYS Department of Education.

All students on the roster will be expected to take the examination and all efforts will be made to make sure this is accomplished. Students will be expected to make progress from the baseline assessment or to meet and maintain the target score. The number of students making progress or meeting and exceeding the target will be counted and converted to a percent. The percent will then be converted to Hiedi. (see the attached charts documentation in 2.11).

Highly Effective will be defined as 85% - 100% of students meeting their individual targets.
Effective will be defined as 65 - 84% of their students meeting their targets.
Developing will be defined as 26 - 64% of their students meeting their individual targets.
Ineffective will be defined as 0 - 25% of their students meeting their individual targets.

The point spread for each band is as follows:
 Highly Effective - 18 - 20
 Effective - 9 - 17
 Developing 3 - 8
 Ineffective 0 - 2

Highly Effective (18 - 20 points) Results are well-above state average for similar students (or District goals if no state test).

Highly effective (18 - 20) points. Results are above district average for similar students. 85 - 100% of students met their individual targets as established by the district.

Effective (9 - 17 points) Results meet state average for similar students (or District goals if no state test).

Effective (9 - 17) points. Results meet district average for similar students. 65 - 84% of students met their individual targets as established by the district.

Developing (3 - 8 points) Results are below state average for similar students (or District goals if no state test).

Developing (3 - 8) points. Results are below district average for similar students. 26 - 64% of students met their individual targets as established by the district.

Ineffective (0 - 2 points) Results are well-below state average for similar students (or District goals if no state test).

Ineffective (0 - 2) points. Results are well-below district average for similar students. 0 - 25% of students met their individual targets as established by the district.

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	Lew-Port developed 6th Grade Social Studies Assessment
7	District, regional or BOCES-developed assessment	Lew-Port developed 7th Grade Social Studies Assessment
8	District, regional or BOCES-developed assessment	Lew-Port developed 8th Grade Social Studies Assessment

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

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

The general process for assigning HEDI scores is as follows:

Each teacher who is not provided a State Growth score from NYS, will develop SLO's with pre and post assessments. The assessment will have an expected level of performance. The pre-assessment will be administered during the first 5 weeks of school. A final examination or State Assessment will be administered at the end of the school year or as prescribed by NYS Department of Education.

All students on the roster will be expected to take the examination and all efforts will be made to make sure this is accomplished. Students will be expected to make progress from the baseline assessment or to meet and maintain the target score. The number of students making

progress or meeting and exceeding the target will be counted and converted to a percent. The percent will then be converted to Hiedi. (see the attached charts documentation in 2.11).

Highly Effective will be defined as 85% - 100% of students meeting their individual targets.

Effective will be defined as 65 - 84% of their students meeting their targets.

Developing will be defined as 26 - 64% of their students meeting their individual targets.

Ineffective will be defined as 0 - 25% of their students meeting their individual targets.

The point spread for each band is as follows:

Highly Effective - 18 - 20

Effective - 9 - 17

Developing 3 - 8

Ineffective 0 - 2

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

Highly effective (18 - 20) points. Results are above district average for similar students. 85 - 100% of students met their individual targets as established by the district.

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

Effective (9 - 17) points. Results meet district average for similar students. 65 - 84% of students met their individual targets as established by the district.

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

Developing (3 - 8) points. Results are below district average for similar students. 26 - 64% of students met their individual targets as established by the district.

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

Ineffective (0 - 2) points. Results are well-below district average for similar students. 0 - 25% of students met their individual targets as established by the district.

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	Lew-Port District Developed 9th Grade Global 1 Social Studies Assessment
		Assessment
Social Studies Regents Courses		Assessment
Global 2	Regents assessment	Regents assessment
American History	Regents assessment	Regents assessment

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

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

The general process for assigning HEDI scores is as follows:

Each teacher who is not provided a State Growth score from NYS, will develop SLO's with pre and post assessments. The assessment will have an expected level of performance. The pre-assessment will be administered during the first 5 weeks of school. A final examination or State Assessment will be administered at the end of the school year or as prescribed by NYS Department of Education.

All students on the roster will be expected to take the examination and all efforts will be made to make sure this is accomplished. Students will be expected to make progress from the baseline assessment or to meet and maintain the target score. The number of students making progress or meeting and exceeding the target will be counted and converted to a percent. The percent will then be converted to Hiedi. (see the attached charts documentation in 2.11).

Highly Effective will be defined as 85% - 100% of students meeting their individual targets.

Effective will be defined as 65 - 84% of their students meeting their targets.

Developing will be defined as 26 - 64% of their students meeting their individual targets.

Ineffective will be defined as 0 - 25% of their students meeting their individual targets.

The point spread for each band is as follows:

Highly Effective - 18 - 20

Effective - 9 - 17

Developing 3 - 8

Ineffective 0 -2

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

Highly effective (18 - 20) points. Results are above district average for similar students. 85 - 100% of students met their individual targets as established by the district.

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

Effective (9 - 17) points. Results meet district average for similar students. 65 - 84% of students met their individual targets as established by the district.

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

Developing (3 - 8) points. Results are below district average for similar students. 26 - 64% of students met their individual targets as established by the district.

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

Ineffective (0 - 2) points. Results are well-below district average for similar students. 0 - 25% of students met their individual targets as established by the district.

2.7) High School Science Regents Courses

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

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

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

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

<p>Use this box, if needed, to describe the general process for assigning HEDI categories for these grades/subjects in this subcomponent. If needed, you may upload a table or graphic at 2.11, below.</p>	<p>The general process for assigning HEDI scores is as follows:</p> <p>Each teacher who is not provided a State Growth score from NYS, will develop SLO's with pre and post assessments. The assessment will have an expected level of performance. The pre-assessment will be administered during the first 5 weeks of school. A final examination or State Assessment will be administered at the end of the school year or as prescribed by NYS Department of Education.</p> <p>All students on the roster will be expected to take the examination and all efforts will be made to make sure this is accomplished. Students will be expected to make progress from the baseline assessment or to meet and maintain the target score. The number of students making progress or meeting and exceeding the target will be counted and converted to a percent. The percent will then be converted to Hiedi. (see the attached charts documentation in 2.11).</p> <p>Highly Effective will be defined as 85% - 100% of students meeting their individual targets. Effective will be defined as 65 - 84% of their students meeting their targets. Developing will be defined as 26 - 64% of their students meeting their individual targets. Ineffective will be defined as 0 - 25% of their students meeting their individual targets.</p> <p>The point spread for each band is as follows: Highly Effective - 18 - 20 Effective - 9 - 17 Developing 3 - 8 Ineffective 0 -2</p>
<p>Highly Effective (18 - 20 points) Results are well-above District goals for similar students.</p>	<p>Highly effective (18 - 20) points. Results are above district average for similar students. 85 - 100% of students met their individual targets as established by the district.</p>
<p>Effective (9 - 17 points) Results meet District goals for similar students.</p>	<p>Effective (9 - 17) points. Results meet district average for similar students. 65 - 84% of students met their individual targets as established by the district.</p>
<p>Developing (3 - 8 points) Results are below District goals for similar students.</p>	<p>Developing (3 - 8) points. Results are below district average for similar students. 26 - 64% of students met their individual targets as established by the district.</p>

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

Ineffective (0 - 2) points. Results are well-below district average for similar students. 0 - 25% of students met their individual targets as established by the district.

2.8) High School Math Regents Courses

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

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

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

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

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

The general process for assigning HEDI scores is as follows:

Each teacher who is not provided a State Growth score from NYS, will develop SLO's with pre and post assessments. The assessment will have an expected level of performance. The pre-assessment will be administered during the first 5 weeks of school. A final examination or State Assessment will be administered at the end of the school year or as prescribed by NYS Department of Education.

All students on the roster will be expected to take the examination and all efforts will be made to make sure this is accomplished. Students will be expected to make progress from the baseline assessment or to meet and maintain the target score. The number of students making progress or meeting and exceeding the target will be counted and converted to a percent. The percent will then be converted to Hiedi. (see the attached charts documentation in 2.11).

Highly Effective will be defined as 85% - 100% of students meeting their individual targets.

Effective will be defined as 65 - 84% of their students meeting their targets.

Developing will be defined as 26 - 64% of their students meeting their individual targets.

Ineffective will be defined as 0 - 25% of their students meeting their individual targets.

The point spread for each band is as follows:
Highly Effective - 18 - 20

	Effective - 9 - 17 Developing 3 - 8 Ineffective 0 - 2
Highly Effective (18 - 20 points) Results are well-above District goals for similar students.	Highly effective (18 - 20) points. Results are above district average for similar students. 85 - 100% of students met their individual targets as established by the district.
Effective (9 - 17 points) Results meet District goals for similar students.	Effective (9 - 17) points. Results meet district average for similar students. 65 - 84% of students met their individual targets as established by the district.
Developing (3 - 8 points) Results are below District goals for similar students.	Developing (3 - 8) points. Results are below district average for similar students. 26 - 64% of students met their individual targets as established by the district.
Ineffective (0 - 2 points) Results are well-below District goals for similar students.	Ineffective (0 - 2) points. Results are well-below district average for similar students. 0 - 25% of students met their individual targets as established by the district.

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	Low-Port Developed 9th Grade ELA Assessments
Grade 10 ELA	District, regional or BOCES-developed assessment	Low-Port developed 10th Grade ELA Assessment
Grade 11 ELA	Regents assessment	Regents Assessment for Comprehensive English

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

Use this box, if needed, to describe the general process for assigning HEDI categories for these grades/subjects in this subcomponent. If needed, you may upload a table or graphic at 2.11, below.	<p>The general process for assigning HEDI scores is as follows:</p> <p>Each teacher who is not provided a State Growth score from NYS, will develop SLO's with pre and post assessments. The assessment will have an expected level of performance. The pre-assessment will be administered during the first 5 weeks of school. A final examination or State Assessment will be administered at the end of the school year or as prescribed by NYS Department of Education.</p> <p>All students on the roster will be expected to take the examination and all efforts will be made to make sure this is accomplished. Students will be expected to make</p>
---	--

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

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

The general process for assigning HEDI scores is as follows:

Each teacher who is not provided a State Growth score from NYS, will develop SLO's with pre and post assessments. The assessment will have an expected level of performance. The pre-assessment will be administered during the first 5 weeks of school. A final examination or State Assessment will be administered at the end of the school year or as prescribed by NYS Department of Education.

All students on the roster will be expected to take the examination and all efforts will be made to make sure this is accomplished. Students will be expected to make progress from the baseline assessment or to meet and maintain the target score. The number of students making progress or meeting and exceeding the target will be counted and converted to a percent. The percent will then be converted to Hiedi. (see the attached charts documentation in 2.11).

Highly Effective will be defined as 85% - 100% of students meeting their individual targets.

Effective will be defined as 65 - 84% of their students meeting their targets.

Developing will be defined as 26 - 64% of their students meeting their individual targets.

Ineffective will be defined as 0 - 25% of their students meeting their individual targets.

The point spread for each band is as follows:

Highly Effective - 18 - 20

Effective - 9 - 17

Developing 3 - 8

Ineffective 0 - 2

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

Highly effective (18 - 20) points. Results are above district average for similar students. 85 - 100% of students met their individual targets as established by the district.

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

Effective (9 - 17) points. Results meet district average for similar students. 65 - 84% of students met their individual targets as established by the district.

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

Developing (3 - 8) points. Results are below district average for similar students. 26 - 64% of students met their individual targets as established by the district.

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

Ineffective (0 - 2) points. Results are well-below district average for similar students. 0 - 25% of students met their individual targets as established by the district.

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

(No response)

2.11) HEDI Tables or Graphics

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

assets/survey-uploads/5364/138486-TXEttx9bQW/HEDI Scoring Bands_3.doc

2.12) Locally Developed Controls

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

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

There will not be any district adjustments, controls or special considerations that will be used in setting targets for Comparable Growth Measures.

2.13) Teachers with more than one growth measure

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

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

2.14) Assurances

Please check all of the boxes below:

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

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

3. Local Measures (Teachers)

Created Monday, June 04, 2012

Updated Tuesday, December 18, 2012

Page 1

Locally Selected Measures of Student Achievement or Growth

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

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

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

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

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

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

Growth or achievement measure(s) from these options.

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

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

Measures based on:

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

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

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

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

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

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

3.1) Grades 4-8 ELA

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

	Locally-Selected Measure from List of Approved Measures	Assessment
4	6(ii) School wide measure computed locally	Grades 3 - 5 New York State Mathematics and ELA Assessment
5	6(ii) School wide measure computed locally	Grades 3 - 5 New York State Mathematics and ELA Assessment

6	6(ii) School wide measure computed locally	Grades 6 - 8 New York State Mathematics and ELA Assessment
7	6(ii) School wide measure computed locally	Grades 6 - 8 New York State Mathematics and ELA Assessment
8	6(ii) School wide measure computed locally	Grades 6 - 8 New York State Mathematics and 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.

<p>Use this box, if needed, to describe the general process for assigning HEDI categories for these grades/subjects in this subcomponent. If needed, you may upload a table or graphic at 3.3, below.</p>	<p>For the local component, the general process for assigning HEDI categories for Value-Added grades and subjects is as follows:</p> <p>Add together the ELA and Mathematics Performance Index from the State Assessments (provided by the State) for each corresponding school.</p> <p>Divide that total by 400 and then multiply that by 15.</p> <p>Round that number off to the nearest whole number.</p> <p>This provides teachers within that building a Performance Index based upon a 15 pt. scale. The index is then placed on a HEDI Scale:</p> <p>14-15 Highly Effective 8-13 Effective 3-7 Developing 0-2 Ineffective</p> <p>(See 3.3 for details)</p>
<p>Highly Effective (14 - 15 points) Results are well above District- or BOCES-adopted expectations for growth or achievement for grade/subject.</p>	<p>Highly Effective (14 - 15) School-wideresults are well above District or BOCES adopted expectations for growth or achievement for ELA/Mathematics</p>
<p>Effective (8- 13 points) Results meet District- or BOCES-adopted expectations for growth or achievement for grade/subject.</p>	<p>Effective (8 - 13) School-wide results meet District or BOCES adopted expectations for growth or achievement for ELA/Mathematics</p>
<p>Developing (3 - 7 points) Results are below District- or BOCES-adopted expectations for growth or achievement for grade/subject.</p>	<p>Developing (3 - 7) School-wide results are below District, or BOCES, adopted expectations for growth or achievement for ELA/Mathematics</p>
<p>Ineffective (0 - 2 points) Results are well below District- or BOCES-adopted expectations for growth or achievement for grade/subject.</p>	<p>Ineffective (0 -2) School-wide results are well below District, or BOCES, adopted expectation for growth or achievement in ELA/Mathematics</p>

3.2) Grades 4-8 Math

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

	Locally-Selected Measure from List of Approved Measures	Assessment
4	6(ii) School wide measure computed locally	Grades 3 - 5 New York State Mathematics and ELA Assessment
5	6(ii) School wide measure computed locally	Grades 3 - 5 New York State Mathematics and ELA Assessment
6	6(ii) School wide measure computed locally	Grades 6 - 8 New York State Mathematics and ELA Assessment
7	6(ii) School wide measure computed locally	Grades 6 - 8 New York State Mathematics and ELA Assessment
8	6(ii) School wide measure computed locally	Grades 6 - 8 New York State Mathematics and ELA 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.	<p>For the local component, the general process for assigning HEDI categories for Value-Added grades and subjects is as follows:</p> <p>Add together the ELA and Mathematics Performance Index from the State Assessments (provided by the State) for each corresponding school.</p> <p>Divide that total by 400 and then multiply that by 15.</p> <p>Round that number off to the nearest whole number.</p> <p>This provides teachers within that building a Performance Index based upon a 15 pt. scale. The index is then placed on a HEDI Scale:</p> <p>14-15 Highly Effective 8-13 Effective 3-7 Developing 0-2 Ineffective</p> <p>(See 3.3 for details)</p>
Highly Effective (14 - 15 points) Results are well above District- or BOCES-adopted expectations for growth or achievement for grade/subject.	Highly Effective (14 - 15) School-wide results are well above District or BOCES adopted expectations for growth or achievement for ELA/Mathematics
Effective (8- 13 points) Results meet District- or BOCES-adopted expectations for growth or achievement for grade/subject.	Effective (8 - 13) School-wide results meet District or BOCES adopted expectations for growth or achievement for ELA/Mathematics

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

Developing (3 - 7) School-wide results are below District, or BOCES, adopted expectations for growth or achievement for ELA/Mathematics

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

Ineffective (0 -2) School-wide results are well below District, or BOCES, adopted expectation for growth or achievement in ELA/Mathematics

3.3) HEDI Tables or Graphics

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

assets/survey-uploads/5139/138487-rhJdBgDruP/Locally Selected Measures of Achievement_2.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 assessment that will be used for the locally-selected measure for the grade/subject listed. Then name the specific assessment, listing the full name of the assessment.

	Locally-Selected Measure from List of Approved Measures	Assessment
K	6(ii) School-wide measure computed locally	Grade 3 New York State ELA and Mathematics Assessment
1	6(ii) School-wide measure computed locally	Grade 3 New York State ELA and Mathematics Assessment
2	6(ii) School-wide measure computed locally	Grade 3 New York State ELA and Mathematics Assessment
3	6(ii) School-wide measure computed locally	Grades 3 - 5 New York State Mathematics and 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.	For the local component, the general process for assigning HEDI categories for grades and subjects is as follows: Add together the ELA and Mathematics Performance Index from the State Assessments (provided by the State) for each corresponding school. Divide that total by 400 and then multiply that by 20.
---	---

Round that number off to the nearest whole number.

This provides teachers within that building a Performance Index based upon a 20 pt. scale. The index is then placed on a HEDI Scale:

- 18-20 Highly Effective
- 9-17 Effective
- 3-8 Developing
- 0-2 Ineffective

(See 3.13 for details)

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

Highly Effective (18 - 20) School-wide results are well above District or BOCES adopted expectations for growth or achievement for ELA/Mathematics

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

Effective (9-17) School-wide results meet District or BOCES adopted expectations for growth or achievement for ELA/Mathematics

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

Developing (3 - 8) School-wide results are below District, or BOCES, adopted expectations for growth or achievement for ELA/Mathematics

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

Ineffective (0 -2) School-wide results are well below District, or BOCES, adopted expectation for growth or achievement in ELA/Mathematics

3.5) Grades K-3 Math

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

	Locally-Selected Measure from List of Approved Measures	Assessment
K	6(ii) School-wide measure computed locally	Grade 3 New York State ELA and Mathematics Assessment
1	6(ii) School-wide measure computed locally	Grade 3 New York State ELA and Mathematics Assessment
2	6(ii) School-wide measure computed locally	Grade 3 New York State ELA and Mathematics Assessment
3	6(ii) School-wide measure computed locally	Grade 3 - 5 New York State ELA and Mathematics 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

For the local component, the general process for assigning HEDI categories for grades and subjects is as follows:

graphic at 3.13, below.

Add together the ELA and Mathematics Performance Index from the State Assessments (provided by the State) for each corresponding school.

Divide that total by 400 and then multiply that by 20.

Round that number off to the nearest whole number.

This provides teachers within that building a Performance Index based upon a 20 pt. scale. The index is then placed on a HEDI Scale:

- 18-20 Highly Effective
- 9-17 Effective
- 3-8 Developing
- 0-2 Ineffective

(See 3.13 for details)

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

Highly Effective (18 - 20) School-wide results are well above District or BOCES adopted expectations for growth or achievement for ELA/Mathematics

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

Effective (9-17) School-wide results meet District or BOCES adopted expectations for growth or achievement for ELA/Mathematics

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

Developing (3 - 8) School-wide results are below District, or BOCES, adopted expectations for growth or achievement for ELA/Mathematics

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

Ineffective (0 -2) School-wide results are well below District, or BOCES, adopted expectation for growth or achievement in ELA/Mathematics

3.6) Grades 6-8 Science

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

	Locally-Selected Measure from List of Approved Measures	Assessment
6	6(ii) School wide measure computed locally	Grades 6 - 8 New York State ELA and Mathematics Assessment
7	6(ii) School wide measure computed locally	Grades 6 - 8 New York State ELA and Mathematics Assessment
8	6(ii) School wide measure computed locally	Grades 6 - 8 New York State ELA and Mathematics 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

For the local component, the general process for assigning HEDI categories for grades and subjects is as follows:

graphic at 3.13, below.

Add together the ELA and Mathematics Performance Index from the State Assessments (provided by the State) for each corresponding school.

Divide that total by 400 and then multiply that by 20.

Round that number off to the nearest whole number.

This provides teachers within that building a Performance Index based upon a 20 pt. scale. The index is then placed on a HEDI Scale:

- 18-20 Highly Effective
- 9-17 Effective
- 3-8 Developing
- 0-2 Ineffective

(See 3.13 for details)

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

Highly Effective (18 - 20) School-wide results are well above District or BOCES adopted expectations for growth or achievement for ELA/Mathematics

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

Effective (9-17) School-wide results meet District or BOCES adopted expectations for growth or achievement for ELA/Mathematics

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

Developing (3 - 8) School-wide results are below District, or BOCES, adopted expectations for growth or achievement for ELA/Mathematics

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

Ineffective (0 -2) School-wide results are well below District, or BOCES, adopted expectation for growth or achievement in ELA/Mathematics

3.7) Grades 6-8 Social Studies

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

	Locally-Selected Measure from List of Approved Measures	Assessment
6	6(ii) School wide measure computed locally	Grades 6 - 8 New York State ELA and Mathematics Assessment
7	6(ii) School wide measure computed locally	Grades 6 - 8 New York State ELA and Mathematics Assessment
8	6(ii) School wide measure computed locally	Grades 6 - 8 New York State ELA and Mathematics 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.

For the local component, the general process for assigning HEDI categories for grades and subjects is as follows:

Add together the ELA and Mathematics Performance Index from the State Assessments (provided by the State) for each corresponding school.

Divide that total by 400 and then multiply that by 20.

Round that number off to the nearest whole number.

This provides teachers within that building a Performance Index based upon a 20 pt. scale. The index is then placed on a HEDI Scale:

- 18-20 Highly Effective
- 9-17 Effective
- 3-8 Developing
- 0-2 Ineffective

(See 3.13 for details)

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

Highly Effective (18 - 20) School-wide results are well above District or BOCES adopted expectations for growth or achievement for ELA/Mathematics

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

Effective (9-17) School-wide results meet District or BOCES adopted expectations for growth or achievement for ELA/Mathematics

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

Developing (3 - 8) School-wide results are below District, or BOCES, adopted expectations for growth or achievement for ELA/Mathematics

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

Ineffective (0 -2) School-wide results are well below District, or BOCES, adopted expectation for growth or achievement in ELA/Mathematics

3.8) High School Social Studies

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

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

	Locally-Selected Measure from List of Approved Measures	Assessment
Global 1	6(ii) School wide measure computed locally	New York State Regents Assessment in Integrated Algebra and Comprehensive English 11
Global 2	6(ii) School wide measure computed locally	New York State Regents Assessment in Integrated Algebra and Comprehensive English 11
American History	6(ii) School wide measure computed locally	New York State Regents Assessment in Integrated Algebra and Comprehensive English 11

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

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

<p>Use this box, if needed, to describe the general process for assigning HEDI categories for these grades/subjects in this subcomponent. If needed, you may upload a table or graphic at 3.13, below.</p>	<p>For the local component, the general process for assigning HEDI categories for grades and subjects is as follows:</p> <p>Add together the ELA and Mathematics Performance Index from the State Assessments (provided by the State) for each corresponding school.</p> <p>Divide that total by 400 and then multiply that by 20.</p> <p>Round that number off to the nearest whole number.</p> <p>This provides teachers within that building a Performance Index based upon a 20 pt. scale. The index is then placed on a HEDI Scale:</p> <p>18-20 Highly Effective 9-17 Effective 3-8 Developing 0-2 Ineffective</p> <p>(See 3.13 for details)</p>
<p>Highly Effective (18 - 20 points) Results are well above District- or BOCES-adopted expectations for growth or achievement for grade/subject.</p>	<p>Highly Effective (18 - 20) School-wide results are well above District or BOCES adopted expectations for growth or achievement for ELA/Mathematics</p>
<p>Effective (9 - 17 points) Results meet District- or BOCES-adopted expectations for growth or achievement for grade/subject.</p>	<p>Effective (9-17) School-wide results meet District or BOCES adopted expectations for growth or achievement for ELA/Mathematics</p>
<p>Developing (3 - 8 points) Results are below District- or BOCES-adopted expectations for growth or achievement for grade/subject.</p>	<p>Developing (3 - 8) School-wide results are below District, or BOCES, adopted expectations for growth or achievement for ELA/Mathematics</p>
<p>Ineffective (0 - 2 points) Results are well below District- or BOCES-adopted expectations for growth or achievement for grade/subject.</p>	<p>Ineffective (0 -2) School-wide results are well below District, or BOCES, adopted expectation for growth or achievement in ELA/Mathematics</p>

3.9) High School Science

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

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

	Locally-Selected Measure from List of Approved Measures	Assessment
Living Environment	6(ii) School wide measure computed locally	New York State Regents Assessment in Integrated Algebra and Comprehensive English 11

Earth Science	6(ii) School wide measure computed locally	New York State Regents Assessment in Integrated Algebra and Comprehensive English 11
Chemistry	6(ii) School wide measure computed locally	New York State Regents Assessment in Integrated Algebra and Comprehensive English 11
Physics	6(ii) School wide measure computed locally	New York State Regents Assessment in Integrated Algebra and Comprehensive English 11

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.	<p>For the local component, the general process for assigning HEDI categories for grades and subjects is as follows:</p> <p>Add together the ELA and Mathematics Performance Index from the State Assessments (provided by the State) for each corresponding school.</p> <p>Divide that total by 400 and then multiply that by 20.</p> <p>Round that number off to the nearest whole number.</p> <p>This provides teachers within that building a Performance Index based upon a 20 pt. scale. The index is then placed on a HEDI Scale:</p> <p>18-20 Highly Effective 9-17 Effective 3-8 Developing 0-2 Ineffective</p> <p>(See 3.13 for details)</p>
Highly Effective (18-20 points) Results are well above District- or BOCES-adopted expectations for growth or achievement for grade/subject.	Highly Effective (18 - 20) School-wide results are well above District or BOCES adopted expectations for growth or achievement for ELA/Mathematics
Developing (3 - 8 points) Results are below District- or BOCES-adopted expectations for growth or achievement for grade/subject.	Developing (3 - 8) School-wide results are below District, or BOCES, adopted expectations for growth or achievement for ELA/Mathematics
Effective (9 - 17points) Results meet District- or BOCES-adopted expectations for growth or achievement for grade/subject.	Effective (9-17) School-wide results meet District or BOCES adopted expectations for growth or achievement for ELA/Mathematics
Ineffective (0 - 2 points) Results are well below District- or BOCES-adopted expectations for growth or achievement for grade/subject.	Ineffective (0 -2) School-wide results are well below District, or BOCES, adopted expectation for growth or achievement in ELA/Mathematics

3.10) High School Math

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

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

	Locally-Selected Measure from List of Approved Measures	Assessment
Algebra 1	6(ii) School wide measure computed locally	New York State Regents Assessment in Integrated Algebra and Comprehensive English 11
Geometry	6(ii) School wide measure computed locally	New York State Regents Assessment in Integrated Algebra and Comprehensive English 11
Algebra 2	6(ii) School wide measure computed locally	New York State Regents Assessment in Integrated Algebra and Comprehensive English 11

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

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

Use this box, if needed, to describe the general process for assigning HEDI categories for these grades/subjects in this subcomponent. If needed, you may upload a table or graphic at 3.13, below.	<p>For the local component, the general process for assigning HEDI categories for grades and subjects is as follows:</p> <p>Add together the ELA and Mathematics Performance Index from the State Assessments (provided by the State) for each corresponding school.</p> <p>Divide that total by 400 and then multiply that by 20.</p> <p>Round that number off to the nearest whole number.</p> <p>This provides teachers within that building a Performance Index based upon a 20 pt. scale. The index is then placed on a HEDI Scale:</p> <p>18-20 Highly Effective 9-17 Effective 3-8 Developing 0-2 Ineffective</p> <p>(See 3.13 for details)</p>
Highly Effective (18 - 20 points) Results are well above District- or BOCES-adopted expectations for growth or achievement for grade/subject.	Highly Effective (18 - 20) School-wide results are well above District or BOCES adopted expectations for growth or achievement for ELA/Mathematics
Effective (9 - 17 points) Results meet District- or BOCES-adopted expectations for growth or achievement for grade/subject.	Effective (9-17) School-wide results meet District or BOCES adopted expectations for growth or achievement for ELA/Mathematics
Developing (3 - 8 points) Results are below District- or BOCES-adopted expectations for growth or achievement	Developing (3 - 8) School-wide results are below District, or BOCES, adopted expectations for growth or

for grade/subject.	achievement for ELA/Mathematics
Ineffective (0 - 2 points) Results are well below District- or BOCES-adopted expectations for growth or achievement for grade/subject.	Ineffective (0 -2) School-wide results are well below District, or BOCES, adopted expectation for growth or achievement in ELA/Mathematics

3.11) High School English Language Arts

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

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

	Locally-Selected Measure from List of Approved Measures	Assessment
Grade 9 ELA	6(ii) School wide measure computed locally	New York State Regents Assessment in Integrated Algebra and Comprehensive English 11
Grade 10 ELA	6(ii) School wide measure computed locally	New York State Regents Assessment in Integrated Algebra and Comprehensive English 11
Grade 11 ELA	6(ii) School wide measure computed locally	Calculation of the New York State Regents Assessment in Integrated Algebra and Comprehensive English 11

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

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

Use this box, if needed, to describe the general process for assigning HEDI categories for these grades/subjects in this subcomponent. If needed, you may upload a table or graphic at 3.13, below.	<p>For the local component, the general process for assigning HEDI categories for grades and subjects is as follows:</p> <p>Add together the ELA and Mathematics Performance Index from the State Assessments (provided by the State) for each corresponding school.</p> <p>Divide that total by 400 and then multiply that by 20.</p> <p>Round that number off to the nearest whole number.</p> <p>This provides teachers within that building a Performance Index based upon a 20 pt. scale. The index is then placed on a HEDI Scale:</p> <p>18-20 Highly Effective 9-17 Effective 3-8 Developing 0-2 Ineffective</p> <p>(See 3.13 for details)</p>
---	---

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

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
All other High School Courses	6(ii) School wide measure computed locally	New York State Regents Assessment in Integrated Algebra and Comprehensive English 11
All other Middle School Courses	6(ii) School wide measure computed locally	Grades 6 - 8 ELA and Mathematics State Assessment
All other Intermediate Education Center (IEC) Courses	6(ii) School wide measure computed locally	Grades 3 - 5 ELA and Mathematics State Assessment
All other Grades K-3 Courses	6(ii) School wide measure computed locally	Grade 3 ELA and Mathematics State 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.	For the local component, the general process for assigning HEDI categories for grades and subjects is as follows:
---	---

Add together the ELA and Mathematics Performance Index from the State Assessments (provided by the State) for each corresponding school.

Divide that total by 400 and then multiply that by 20.

Round that number off to the nearest whole number.

This provides teachers within that building a Performance Index based upon a 20 pt. scale. The index is then placed on a HEDI Scale:

18-20 Highly Effective
9-17 Effective
3-8 Developing
0-2 Ineffective

(See 3.13 for details)

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

Highly Effective (18 - 20) School-wide results are well above District or BOCES adopted expectations for growth or achievement for ELA/Mathematics

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

Effective (9-17) School-wide results meet District or BOCES adopted expectations for growth or achievement for ELA/Mathematics

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

Developing (3 - 8) School-wide results are below District, or BOCES, adopted expectations for growth or achievement for ELA/Mathematics

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

Ineffective (0 -2) School-wide results are well below District, or BOCES, adopted expectation for growth or achievement in ELA/Mathematics

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

(No response)

3.13) HEDI Tables or Graphics

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

assets/survey-uploads/5139/138487-y92vNseFa4/Locally Selected Measures of Achievement_2.doc

3.14) Locally Developed Controls

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

The District is not using any adjustments, controls, or other special considerations in setting targets for local measures.

3.15) Teachers with More Than One Locally Selected Measure

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

For teachers who have more than one measure (teachers who have scheduled duties in multiple buildings), will have their HEDI score calculated proportionately to the number of students they have in each building.

High School Teachers will use the ELA Comprehensive English 11 and Integrated Algebra Performance Index (as designated by the State). Middle School Teachers will use the Grades 6 - 8 ELA and Mathematics Performance Index (as designated by the State). IEC Teachers will use the Grades 3 - 5 ELA and Mathematics Performance Index (as designated by the State). PEC Teachers will use the Grade 3 ELA and Mathematics Performance Index (as designated by the State).

The process for combining the Math/ELA Performance Index is as follows:

Value Added (up to 15 points)

PI ELA + PI Mathematics = _____ :400

Total then divided by 400

Next, multiply by 15

Lastly, yield total score for Local Component (see scaled HEDI band and explanation for Value Added)

All Other (up to 20 points)

PI ELA + PI Mathematics = _____ :400

Total then divided by 400

Next, multiply by 20

Lastly, yield score for Local Component (see scaled HEDI band and explanation for all other)

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 Monday, June 04, 2012

Updated Friday, December 14, 2012

Page 1

4.1) Teacher Practice Rubric

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

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

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

Danielson's Framework for Teaching (2011 Revised Edition)

(No response)

4.2) Points Within Other Measures

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

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

Is the following points assignment applicable to all teachers?

Yes

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

(No response)

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

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

(No response)

4.3) Survey Tools (if applicable)

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

(No response)

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

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

4.4) Assurances

Please check all of the boxes below:

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

4.5) Process for Assigning Points and Determining HEDI Ratings

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

The observer will utilize the Danielson's Framework for Teacher (2011 revised edition) to make judgments during the observation sessions. Each domain is valued at the following percentages:

- Domain 1: 16%
- Domain 2: 30%
- Domain 3: 30%
- Domain 4: 24%

The observer will rate the teacher on each subcomponent which makes up Domain 2 (classroom environment) and Domain 3 (instruction) of the 2011 Charlotte Danielson Framework for Teacher Rubric. The scale used in the rating is as follows:

- 0 - not observed
- 1 - Ineffective
- 2 - Developing
- 3 - Effective
- 4 - Highly Effective

The weighting of each Domain and their subcomponents can be found on the table attached. Please note, composite score will be rounded to the nearest whole number using general rounding rules.

Domain 1 ratings will be based upon the quality and quantity of artifacts presented to the evaluator including the teacher's participation and preparedness in the Pre-Observation Conference, completion of the Pre-Observation form as well as the submission of the teacher's lesson/unit plans and the teacher's participation in the conference.

Domain 4 ratings will be based upon the quality and quantity of artifacts submitted as part of the teacher's Annual Documentation of Professional Performance (ADOPP) including the Post-Observation Conference, submission of relevant lesson plans, self-reflections, teacher artifacts, student work, communications with families and colleagues, examples of contributions made to the school community, descriptions of professional development undertaken, etc.

See attached document for "Other Measures of Effectiveness".

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

[assets/survey-uploads/5091/138488-eka9yMJ855/Other Measures of Effectiveness_4.docx](#)

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

Highly Effective: Overall performance and results exceed NYS Teaching Standards.	Teachers rated Highly Effective (59 - 50) have an overall performance that exceeds New York State Teacher Standards.
Effective: Overall performance and results meet NYS Teaching Standards.	Teachers rated Effective (57 - 58) have an overall performance that meets the New York State Teaching Standards.
Developing: Overall performance and results need improvement in order to meet NYS Teaching Standards.	Teachers rated Developing (50 - 56) have an overall performance that needs improvement in order to meet the New York State Teaching Standards.
Ineffective: Overall performance and results do not meet NYS Teaching Standards.	Teachers rated Ineffective (0 - 49) have an overall performance that do not meet New York State Teaching Standards.

Provide the ranges for the 60-point scoring bands.

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

4.6) Observations of Probationary Teachers

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

By building principals or other trained administrators

4.6) Observations of Probationary Teachers Formal/Long	1
4.6) Observations of Probationary Teachers Informal/Short	1
4.6) Observations of Probationary Teachers Enter Total	2

By trained in-school peer teachers or other trained reviewers

Formal/Long	0
Informal/Short	0

Independent evaluators

Formal/Long	0
Informal/Short	0

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

-
- In Person
-

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

-
- In Person
-

4.7) Observations of Tenured Teachers

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

By building principals or other trained administrators

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

By trained in-school peer teachers or other trained reviewers

Formal/Long	0
-------------	---

Informal/Short	0
----------------	---

Independent evaluators

Formal/Long	0
Informal/Short	0

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

-
- In Person
-

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

-
- In Person
-

5. Composite Scoring (Teachers)

Created Monday, June 04, 2012

Updated Friday, November 16, 2012

Page 1

Standards for Rating Categories

Growth or Comparable Measures

Locally-selected Measures of growth or achievement

Other Measures of Effectiveness (Teacher and Leader standards)

Highly

Effective

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

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

Overall performance and results exceed NYS Teaching Standards.

Effective

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

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

Overall performance and results meet NYS Teaching Standards.

Developing

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

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

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

Ineffective

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

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

Overall performance and results do not meet NYS Teaching Standards.

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

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

2012-13 where there is no Value-Added measure

Growth or Comparable Measures

Locally-selected Measures of

growth or achievement

Other Measures of Effectiveness

(60 points)

Overall

Composite Score

Highly Effective

18-20

18-20

Ranges determined locally--see below

91-100

Effective

9-17

9-17

75-90

Developing

3-8

3-8

65-74

Ineffective

0-2

0-2

0-64

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

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

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

2012-13 where Value-Added growth measure applies

Growth or Comparable Measures

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

Other Measures of Effectiveness

(60 points)

Overall

Composite Score

Highly Effective

22-25

14-15

Ranges determined locally--see above

91-100

Effective

10-21

8-13

75-90

Developing

3-9

3-7

65-74

Ineffective

0-2

0-2

0-64

6. Additional Requirements - Teachers

Created Monday, June 04, 2012

Updated Friday, December 14, 2012

Page 1

6.1) Assurances -- Improvement Plans

Please check the boxes below:

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

6.2) Attachment: Teacher Improvement Plan Forms

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

assets/survey-uploads/5265/138495-Df0w3Xx5v6/TIP_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 PROCESS

1. This appeal provision is limited to unit members who are covered by N.Y. Education Law § 3012 (“Covered Unit Members” or “teacher”).

a. A Covered Unit Member may challenge only the substance of an APPR, the District’s adherence to the standards and methodologies

required for such review, the District's compliance with its procedures and timelines for conducting the APPR, and the issuance and the regulations of the Commissioner and/or implementation of a teacher improvement plan (TIP).

An APPR or TIP challenge under this Agreement must be submitted in writing to the Administrator performing the review, together with any supporting documentation. The challenge must explain in detail the specific reason(s) for the matter which is the subject of the challenge. A teacher may not file multiple appeals regarding the same APPR or TIP. All grounds for appeal must be raised with specificity within one appeal. Any grounds not raised at the time the appeal is filed shall be deemed waived, unless the teacher establishes during the appeals process that there is new information that was used by the evaluator that raises new concern related to the appeal. Any information obtained in a teacher observation that affects a teacher's rating that has not been shared with the teacher at the time the observation is reviewed with the teacher may not be included in the teacher's summative review. As part of the appeal, the teacher may also submit mitigating circumstances that he/she believes relevant to the appeal, including, but not limited to, class size, students and classes assigned, student attendance, teacher leave time/personal life, new initiatives/requirements and physical environment, which shall be considered by the District. All supporting information must also be submitted at the time the appeal is filed. Any information not submitted at the time the appeal is filed shall not be considered. In an appeal, the teacher has the burden of demonstrating a legal right to the relief requested and the burden of establishing the facts upon which he or she seeks relief.

The challenge must be submitted within fifteen calendar days of the issuance of the Annual Professional Performance Review which is the subject of the challenge, or other act complained of, or it is deemed waived. For purposes of this Memorandum of Agreement, calendar days shall exclude the period of the Christmas, February and April recess.

The Administrator will schedule a meeting within 7 days to discuss the challenge.

A Covered Unit Member may select a LPUT representative and/or NYSUT Labor Relations Specialist/LPUT president to participate in the meeting. Within fifteen calendar days of the meeting, the Administrator conducting the Annual Professional Performance Review shall submit to the teacher a detailed written response to the Appeal. The teacher initiating the appeal shall receive a copy of the entire response, including supporting documentation.

For a tenured teacher who received a rating of highly effective, or effective, or a non-tenured teacher who received any rating, the Administrator's determination shall be final; if that teacher disagrees with the response, the teacher may submit a written statement outlining the basis for that disagreement to be included in his or her file along with the disputed Annual Professional Performance Review or TIP.

b. If a tenured Covered Unit Member received a rating of ineffective or developing and disagrees with the Administrator's response to the challenge, the teacher may submit the challenge, the Administrator's response, and a written statement explaining in detail the reason(s) for disagreement with the response to a Professional Standards Panel (PSP) comprised of two District administrators – other than the evaluator and two representatives of LPUT with seven days. Within ten days, the PSP shall review the entire record of the appeal and determine whether the APPR and/or process had been followed, and if not, whether such non-compliance had an impact on the APPR and/or TIP. If the PSP's findings are negative, the initial determination shall be sustained. The teacher may appeal the PSP determination to the Superintendent within five calendar days. If the PSP finds there was a substantive or procedural error that had an impact on the APPR or TIP, the appeal shall be immediately referred to the Superintendent of Schools. Upon an appeal to the Superintendent, a meeting will be scheduled to discuss the appeal within ten days. A Covered Unit Member may select a LPUT representative and/or NYSUT Labor Relations Specialist/LPUT president to participate in the meeting. The Superintendent shall render a final determination on the challenge within ten calendar days thereafter.

c. A challenge or determination under this appeal process shall not be the subject of a grievance, and the arbitration provisions of the Collective Negotiations Agreement shall not apply to matters under this section. The teacher retains any defenses he or she may have in the event the APPR is utilized in a subsequent 3020-a proceeding. Nothing in this appeals process shall be construed to alter or diminish, or in any way restrict or affect the District's non-reviewable authority to terminate the appointment of or deny tenure to a probationary teacher for statutorily and constitutionally permissible reasons other than performance of the teacher, including but not limited to misconduct, at any time including during the pendency of an appeal under this section, and any such termination or denial shall not in any way be subject to the grievance and arbitration process of the Collective Negotiations Agreement.

d. Any TIP that was implemented as a result of an APPR that is subsequently modified as a result of the challenge process in this Memorandum of Agreement shall be modified (or eliminated if the appeals process eliminates the reason for the TIP) to reflect any change in the APPR as a result of that process.

6.4) Training and Certification of Lead Evaluators and Evaluators

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

Throughout the 2011 - 2012 school year, all evaluators and lead evaluators participated in Regional Training with Orleans/Niagara BOCES to become certified evaluators. Lead evaluators throughout the district were identified and information regarding lead

evaluators were shared with teachers at the start of the school year.

In addition to participating throughout that school year, a monthly training has occurred (and is scheduled throughout the remainder of the 2012 - 2013 school year) to calibrate each trained evaluator throughout the district with a certified Danielson trainer.

Trainings throughout the 2011 - 2012 school year were monthly and the duration was three hours per session.

Trainings throughout the 2012 - 2013 school year for calibration are monthly and the duration is two hours per session with a certified Danielson trainer. All trained evaluators are required to attend and participate to ensure calibration and inter-rater reliability.

6.5) Assurances -- Evaluators

Please check the boxes below:

-
- Checked
-

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

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

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

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

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

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

(7) use of the Statewide Instructional Reporting System

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

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

• Checked

6.6) Assurances -- Teachers

Please check all of the boxes below:

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

6.7) Assurances -- Data

Please check all of the boxes below:

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

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

Created Thursday, November 08, 2012

Updated Friday, December 14, 2012

Page 1

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

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

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

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

3 - 5
6 - 8
9 - 12
(No response)
(No response)
(No response)
(No response)

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

Please check the boxes below:

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

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

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

State assessments, *required if one exists*

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

List of State-approved 3rd party assessments

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

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

School or Program Type	SLO with Assessment Option	Name of the Assessment
K - 3	District, regional, or BOCES-developed	Lew-Port developed K - 2 Mathematics and ELA Assessments
K - 3	State assessment	New York State ELA and Mathematics Assessment Grade 3

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

Use this box, if needed, to describe the process for assigning HEDI categories in this subcomponent. If needed, you may upload a table or graphic below.	<p>The expectation for receiving points for an SLO at the principal level would correlate directly with the district's expectations for students meeting their target scores on teachers' SLO's within their building.</p> <p>If an administrator has 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 students covered by the SLO to reach a combined score for this subcomponent.</p> <p>Districtwide administrators will take an average weighted score of each district building's HEDI score from the State Growth Measure.</p>
Highly Effective (18 - 20 points) Results are well above state average for similar students (or District goals if no state test).	Highly Effective - (18 - 20) Results are well above district goals for similar students. On average, 85% - 100% of students will have met their individual targets.
Effective (9 - 17 points) Results meet state average for similar students (or District goals if no state test).	Effective - (9 - 17) Results meet district goals for similar students. On average, 65 - 84% of students will have met their individual targets.
Developing (3 - 8 points) Results are below state average for similar students (or District goals if no state test).	Developing - (3 - 8) Results are below district goals for similar students. On average, 26 - 64% of students will

have met their individual targets.

Ineffective (0 - 2 points) Results are well below state average for similar students (or District goals if no state test).

Ineffective - (0 - 2) Results are well-below district goals for similar students. On average, 0 - 25% of students will have met their individual targets.

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

assets/survey-uploads/5365/222870-lha0DogRNw/SLO Template.docx

7.4) Special Considerations for Comparable Growth Measures

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

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

The district is not making any adjustments, controls, or other special considerations that will be used in setting targets for Comparable Growth Measures.

7.5) Principals with More Than One Growth Measure

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

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

7.6) Assurances -- Comparable Growth Measures

Please check all of the boxes below:

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

7.6) Assurances -- Comparable Growth Measures Assure that the process for assigning points for SLOs for the Growth Subcomponent will use the narrative HEDI descriptions described in the regulations to effectively differentiate educator performance in ways that improve student learning and instruction.	Checked
7.6) Assurances -- Comparable Growth Measures Assure that it is possible for a principal to earn each point, including 0, for SLOs in the Growth subcomponent scoring range.	Checked
7.6) Assurances -- Comparable Growth Measures Assure that processes are in place to monitor SLOs to ensure rigor and comparability across classrooms.	Checked

8. Local Measures (Principals)

Created Thursday, November 08, 2012

Updated Friday, December 14, 2012

Page 1

Locally-Selected Measures of Student Achievement or Growth

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

- (a) student achievement levels on State assessments in ELA and/or Math in Grades 4-8 (e.g., percentage of students in the school whose performance levels on State assessments are proficient or advanced)
- (b) student growth or achievement on State assessments in ELA and/or Math in Grades 4-8 for students in each specific performance level (e.g., Level 1, Level 2)
- (c) student growth or achievement on State assessments in ELA and/or Math in Grades 4-8 for students with disabilities and English Language Learners in Grades 4-8

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

Grade Configuration	Locally-Selected Measure from List of Approved Measures	Assessment
3-5	(d) measures used by district for teacher evaluation	New York State ELA and Mathematics Assessment Grades 3 - 5
6-8	(d) measures used by district for teacher evaluation	New York State ELA and Mathematics Assessment Grades 6 - 8
9-12	(d) measures used by district for teacher evaluation	New York State Regents Assessments for Integrated Algebra and Comprehensive English Grade 11

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

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

Use this box, if needed, to describe the process for assigning HEDI categories. If needed, you may upload a table or graphic below.	For all unit members, the locally selected measure of Student Performance will be derived from the Performance Index from the State Assessments. For High School, it will be derived from the Regents of English 11 and Integrated Algebra. For Middle School the performance index will be derived from the Grades 6 - 8 ELA and Mathematics Assessments, and for Grades 3 - 5 (IEC) the performance index will be derived from the Grades 3 - 5 ELA and Mathematics Assessment. A formula will be used to add the PI for ELA + Mathematics. The total will be divided by 400 and then multiplied by 15 to equate to 0 - 15 points for the local measure.
Highly Effective (14 - 15 points) Results are well above District- or BOCES-adopted expectations for growth or achievement for grade/subject.	Highly Effective (14 - 15) Results for the principal are well above District, or BOCES, adopted expectations for growth or achievement in ELA and Mathematics.

Effective (8- 13 points) Results meet District- or BOCES-adopted expectations for growth or achievement for grade/subject.	Effective (8 - 13) Results for the principal meet District, or BOCES, adopted expectations for growth or achievement in ELA and Mathematics.
Developing (3 - 7 points) Results are below District- or BOCES-adopted expectations for growth or achievement for grade/subject.	Developing (3-7) Results for the principal are below District, or BOCES, adopted expectations for growth or achievement in ELA and Mathematics.
Ineffective (0 - 2 points) Results are well below District- or BOCES-adopted expectations for growth or achievement for grade/subject.	Ineffective (0 - 2) Results for the principal are well below District, or BOCES, adopted expectations for growth or achievement in ELA and Mathematics.

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

(No response)

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

assets/survey-uploads/5366/222946-qBFVOWF7fC/Locally Selected Measures of Achievement 15pt - Principal.doc

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

Grade Configuration	Locally-Selected Measure from List of Approved Measures	Assessment
K-3	(d) measures used by district for teacher evaluation	New York State ELA and Mathematics Assessment Grade 3

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

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

Use this box, if needed, to describe the process for assigning HEDI categories. If needed, you may upload a table or graphic below.	For all unit members, the locally selected measure of Student Performance will be derived from the Performance Index from the State Assessments. A formula will be used to add the PI for ELA + Mathematics. The total will be divided by 400 and then multiplied by 20 to equate to 0 - 20 points for the local measure.
Highly Effective (18 - 20 points) Results are well above District- or BOCES-adopted expectations for growth or achievement for grade/subject.	Highly Effective (18 - 20) Results for the principal are well above District, or BOCES, adopted expectations for growth or achievement in ELA and Mathematics.
Effective (9- 17 points) Results meet District- or BOCES-adopted expectations for growth or achievement for grade/subject.	Effective (9 - 17) Results for the principal meet District, or BOCES, adopted expectations for growth or achievement in ELA and Mathematics.
Developing (3 - 8 points) Results are below District- or BOCES-adopted expectations for growth or achievement	Developing (3-8) Results for the principal are below District, or BOCES, adopted expectations for growth or

for grade/subject.	achievement in ELA and Mathematics.
Ineffective (0 - 2 points) Results are well below District- or BOCES-adopted expectations for growth or achievement for grade/subject.	Ineffective (0 - 2) Results for the principal are well below District, or BOCES, adopted expectations for growth or achievement in ELA and Mathematics.

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.

assets/survey-uploads/5366/222946-T8MIGWUVm1/Locally Selected Measures of Achievement 20pt - Principal.doc

8.3) Locally Developed Controls

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

The district will not be using any adjustments, controls, or other special considerations 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 administrator will have more than one locally selected measure. All teachers and principals K-12 will receive a local measure score based upon the building/grade level Performance Index.

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 Thursday, November 08, 2012

Updated Friday, December 14, 2012

Page 1

9.1) Principal Practice Rubric

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

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

Multidimensional Principal Performance Rubric

(No response)

9.2) Points Within Other Measures

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

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

Is the following points assignment for all principals?

Yes

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

(No response)

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

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

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

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

(No response)

9.3) Assurances -- Goals

Please check the boxes below (if applicable):

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

9.4) Sources of Evidence (if applicable)

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

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

9.5) Survey Tool(s) (if applicable)

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

(No response)

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

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

9.6) Assurances

Please check all of the boxes below:

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

9.7) Process for Assigning Points and Determining HEDI Ratings

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

OTHER MEASURES OF UNIT MEMBER EFFECTIVENESS

1. The district shall utilize the LCI Multidimensional rubric for unit member's evaluation as the basis for the 60 "Other" points allocated to measures of leadership and management. This shall be according to the attached instrument. The lead evaluator's assessment shall be based on at least three (3) 30 minutes or more observations or presentations no later than May 31st. The composite score will be rounded to the nearest whole number using general rounding rules.

a. The lead evaluator shall coordinate with the unit member the date and time of these observations or presentations.

2. Additional sources of information for the lead evaluator's consideration in developing the 60 point composite score for a unit member shall be:

a. A portfolio of school documents related to components of the rubric. These shall be provided to the lead evaluator by July 15th.

b. The lead evaluator shall consider the following discussions and review in assessing performance of the unit member in leadership and management:

1) The unit member and lead evaluator shall conduct a joint critical analysis of the NYS School Report Card (or other similar NYS accountability report) no later than July 31st, including identification of actions to be taken to address components and district resources to be made available to the unit member.

2) No later than July 31st, the unit member and lead evaluator shall meet to review the related initiatives and actions of the principal over the year as well as the availability and utilization of district provided resources.

c. The unit member's summary document of the rubric for the lead evaluator's consideration and discussion.

3. Final evaluations shall be provided to unit members no later than September 1st annually. Scores and ratings on Locally Selected Measures of Achievement and the "Other Measures" of Effectiveness shall be provided no later than July 31st annually. If data for the locally Selected Measures of Achievement is not available by July 31st, that score and rating shall be provided within 10 business days of receipt of those achievement results.

See attached "Final Principal Rubric" document.

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

[assets/survey-uploads/5143/222964-pMADJ4gk6R/Final Principal Rubric_1.xls](#)

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.	Highly Effective (59 - 60) Overall performance and results exceed ISSLC standards.
Effective: Overall performance and results meet standards.	Effective (57 - 58) Overall performance and results meet ISLLC standards.
Developing: Overall performance and results need improvement in order to meet standards.	Developing (50 - 56) Overall performance and results need improvement in order to meet ISLLC standards.
Ineffective: Overall performance and results do not meet standards.	Ineffective (0 - 49) Overall performance and results do not meet ISLLC standards.

Please provide the locally-negotiated 60 point scoring bands.

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

9.8) School Visits

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

Probationary Principals

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

Tenured Principals

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

10. Composite Scoring (Principals)

Created Thursday, November 08, 2012

Updated Friday, November 16, 2012

Page 1

Standards for Rating Categories

Growth or Comparable Measures

Locally-selected Measures of

growth or achievement

Other Measures of Effectiveness

(Teacher and Leader standards)

Highly

Effective

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

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

Overall performance and results exceed ISLLC leadership standards.

Effective

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

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

Overall performance and results meet ISLLC leadership standards.

Developing

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

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

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

Ineffective

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

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

Overall performance and results do not meet ISLLC leadership standards.

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

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

2012-13 where there is no Value-Added measure

Growth or Comparable Measures

Locally-selected Measures of

growth or achievement

Other Measures of Effectiveness

(60 points)

Overall

Composite Score

Highly Effective

18-20

18-20

Ranges determined locally--see below

91-100

Effective

9-17

9-17

75-90

Developing

3-8

3-8

65-74

Ineffective

0-2

0-2

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

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

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

2012-13 where Value-Added growth measure applies

Growth or Comparable Measures

Locally-selected Measures of growth or achievement

Other Measures of Effectiveness

(60 points)

Overall

Composite Score

Highly Effective

22-25

14-15

Ranges determined locally--see above

91-100

Effective

10-21

8-13

75-90

Developing

3-9

3-7

65-74

Ineffective

0-2

0-2

0-64

11. Additional Requirements - Principals

Created Thursday, November 08, 2012

Updated Friday, December 14, 2012

Page 1

11.1) Assurances -- Improvement Plans

Please check the boxes below.

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

11.2) Attachment: Principal Improvement Plan Forms

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

[assets/survey-uploads/5276/222994-Df0w3Xx5v6/PIP_1.doc](#)

11.3) Appeals Process

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

(1) the substance of the annual professional performance review

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

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

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

CHALLENGING AN APPR

1. This challenge provision is limited to unit members who are covered by N.Y. Education Law § 3012 ("Covered Unit Members). All steps in the challenge will remain timely and expeditious.

a) A Covered Unit Member may challenge only the substance of an APPR, the District's adherence to the standards and

methodologies required for such review, the District's compliance with its procedures and timelines for conducting the APPR, and the issuance and the regulations of the Commissioner and/or implementation of a principal/unit member's improvement plan.

b) Such challenge must be submitted in writing to the Superintendent or supervising administrator, together with any supporting documentation. The challenge must explain in detail the specific reason(s) for the matter which is the subject of the challenge. A unit member may not file multiple challenges regarding the same APPR or PIP.

c) All grounds for a challenge must be raised with specificity within one challenge. Any grounds not raised at the time the challenge is filed shall be deemed waived. All supporting information must also be submitted at the time the challenge is filed. Any information not submitted at the time the challenge is filed shall not be considered.

d) In a challenge, a unit member has the burden of demonstrating a clear legal right to the relief requested and the burden of establishing the facts upon which he or she seeks relief.

e) The challenge must be submitted within fifteen calendar days of the issuance of the Annual Professional Performance Review which is the subject of the challenge, or other act complained of, or it is deemed waived. For purposes of this Memorandum of Agreement, calendar days shall exclude the period of the December, February and April recess.

f) Within seven calendar days of the submission of the challenge, the Superintendent or supervising administrator will schedule a meeting with the unit member to discuss his/her APPR. A unit member may select a LPOEA representative and/or SAANYS Labor Relations Specialist/LPOEA president to participate in the meeting.

g) Within fifteen calendar days of the meeting, the Superintendent or supervising administrator conducting the Annual Professional Performance Review shall submit to the unit member a detailed written response to the challenge. The response must include any additional documents or written materials specific to the point(s) of disagreement and are relevant to the resolution of the challenge.

h) For a tenured unit member who received a rating of highly effective, effective, or developing, or a non-tenured unit member who received any rating, the Superintendent's or supervising administrator's determination shall be final; if the unit member disagrees with the response, the unit member may submit a written statement outlining the basis for that disagreement to be included in his or her file along with the disputed Annual Professional Performance Review.

7 "Nothing herein shall be construed to effect the statutory right of a school district or BOCES to terminate a probationary teacher or principal, for statutorily and constitutionally permissible reasons other than performance, including but not limited, to misconduct, or to restrict a school district's or BOCES' discretion in making a tenure determination pursuant to the law." 8 N.Y.C.R.R. 100.2 Subpart 30-2.1(c)

APPEALING A CHALLENGE TO AN APPR

1. This appeal is limited to unit members who are covered by N.Y. Education Law § 3012 ("Covered Unit Members).

a. If a building principal or district level unit member receives a rating of ineffective and disagrees with the Superintendent's response to the challenge, the unit member may submit a written statement explaining in detail the reason(s) for disagreement along with the original response to the challenge to the Orleans/Niagara District BOCES Superintendent. The appeal process will remain timely and expeditious and shall conclude within 60 days of a principal receiving an ineffective or developing rating.

b. For all other LPOEA unit members who receive a rating of ineffective and disagrees with his/her building supervisor's response to the challenge, the unit member may submit a written statement explaining in detail the reason(s) for disagreement along with the original response to the challenge will be directed to the L-P Superintendent.

c. All written appeals to either the Orleans/Niagara District BOCES Superintendent or L-P Superintendent must be submitted within seven calendar days of receipt of the original response to the challenge.

d. A meeting will be scheduled to discuss the appeal. A unit member may select an LPOEA representative to participate in the meeting.

e. The Orleans/Niagara District BOCES Superintendent shall render a final written determination on the appeal within fifteen calendar days thereafter. Final determination under this appeal process shall not be the subject of a grievance, and the arbitration provisions of the Collective Negotiations Agreement shall not apply to matters under this section.

f. The unit member retains any defenses he or she may have in the event the APPR is utilized in a subsequent 3020-a proceeding.

g. Nothing in this appeals process shall be construed to alter or diminish, or in any way restrict or affect the District's non-reviewable

authority to terminate the appointment of or deny tenure to a probationary unit member at any time including during the pendency of an appeal under this section, and any such termination or denial shall not in any way be subject to the grievance and arbitration process of the Collective Negotiations Agreement.

h. Any Principal or unit member Improvement Plan that was implemented as a result of an APPR that is subsequently modified as a result of the challenge process in this Memorandum of Agreement shall be modified to reflect any change in the APPR as a result of that process.

i. Improvement plans for unit members with developing or ineffective ratings shall be according to the attached format and process. Such plans shall be mutually agreed upon within 10 school days at the beginning of the year annually.

11.4) Training and Certification of Lead Evaluators and Evaluators

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

Evaluators have gone through rigorous training throughout the 2011 - 2012 school year. Training was focused specifically on the ISLLC standards and how they directly relate to the rubric. Training was throughout the second half of the year and the duration was three hours.

Once the rubric was selected, training became specific (throughout the 2012 - 2013 school year) to the MPPR rubric and how it is directly related to the ISLLC leadership standards. Training has been monthly and the duration is three hours.

All evaluators have been well trained and will continue to calibrate to ensure inter-rater reliability among the district. In addition, principals have attended the training to ensure understanding of the rubric and the evaluation process.

Training provided and into the future is described below:

RTTT Evaluator Certification

DATES of TRAINING

Description of Training NYSED Requirements for Training

Regional Training October:

10/26—8:30-11:30 or 12:30-3:30

10/28—8:30-11:30 or 12:30-3:30 Building and District Administrators are invited to attend the first session of the Evaluator Certification Series. This session will satisfy three of the nine requirements from Section 30-2.9:

- New York State Teaching Standards, their related elements and performance indicators.*
- Evidence-based observation techniques.*
- Application and use of State Approved teacher rubric. (This session will focus on Charlotte Danielson's Frameworks.)*

#1 - New York State Teaching Standards, and their related elements and performance indicators and the Leadership Standards and their related functions, as applicable.

#2 - Evidenced based observation techniques that are grounded in research.

#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.

In-House Administrative Training: December

Duration – 3 hours to review webinar and documentation to support understanding Webinar titled Other Assessment Tools Beyond the Classroom

#5 - Application and use of any assessment tools that the school district or BOCES utilize 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.

In-House Administrative Training: January

Duration: 2 hours Webinar titled Leadership Standards and Principal Evaluation Rubrics

#1 - New York State Teaching Standards, and their related elements and performance indicators and the Leadership Standards and their related functions, as applicable.

#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.

Regional Training: February:

2/15 8:30 – 11:30 or 12:30 – 3:30

Training for Lead Evaluators and Principals

Agenda:

- Highly Effective Leaders*
- ISLLC Standards and Evidence*
- Tools Protocols*
- Principal Rubrics – MPPR*
- SLO*

#1 - New York State Teaching Standards, and their related elements and performance indicators and the Leadership Standards and their related functions, as applicable.

#2 - Evidenced based observation techniques that are grounded in research.

#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 utilize 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.

Regional Training:

4/3—12:30-3:30 or 4:00-7:00

4/4—8:30-11:30 or 12:30-3:30

Student Learning Objectives Agenda:

- Evaluation System*
- Review of Purple Memo*
- Identifying criteria for writing SLO's*
- Samples*
- Group work to create SLO's*

#1 - New York State Teaching Standards, and their related elements and performance indicators and the Leadership Standards and their related functions, as applicable.

#2 - Evidenced 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 utilize 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 measure of student achievement used by the school district or BOCES to evaluate its teachers or principals.

Regional Training

5/1—12:30-3:30 or 4:00-7:00

5/2—8:30-11:30 or 12:30-3:30

SLO's

- Answers to SLO's*
- District Decisions*
- Establishing Targets and Expectations for SGP's*
- Understanding Banding/Target Setting Process*
- Elements of a Quality SLO*

#1 - New York State Teaching Standards, and their related elements and performance indicators and the Leadership Standards and their related functions, as applicable.

#2 - Evidenced 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 utilize 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 measure of student achievement used by the school district or BOCES to evaluate its teachers or principals.
- #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.

Regional Training:

June 7, 2012

June 12, 2012

8:30 – 11:30 or 12:30 – 3:30

Teacher and Principal SLO's Agenda:

- Scoring SLO's
- 4 stages of the SLO process
- Team, Group, School-Wide SLO's
- Principal SLO's
- State 20% vs. Local 20%

- #1 - New York State Teaching Standards, and their related elements and performance indicators and the Leadership Standards and their related functions, as applicable.
- #2 - Evidenced 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 utilize 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 measure of student achievement used by the school district or BOCES to evaluate its teachers or principals.
- #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.

In-House Administrative Training:

August 29, 2012

Duration: 3 hours

Trained in Danielson (by Certified Danielson Trainer)

Elements of the 2011 Rubric Domains

Training for inner rater reliability specifically as it applies to teacher observation across the district.

- #1 - New York State Teaching Standards, and their related elements and performance indicators and the Leadership Standards and their related functions, as applicable.
- #2 - Evidenced based observation techniques that are grounded in research.
- #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.

In-House Administrative Training:

August 30, 2012

Duration: 2 hours

Reviewing data and protocols for information system reporting

- #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.

#7 – Use of the Statewide Instructional Reporting System

In-House Administrative Training:

October 29, 2012

Duration: 1.5 hours

Annotated Rubric for SLO's

- *Understanding Elements of a Quality SLO*
- *Peer Review Process*
- *Submission and rubric*
- *Providing Feedback*
- *Consistency in adopting district set targets for growth*

#6 - Application and use of any State-approved locally selected measure of student achievement used by the school district or BOCES to evaluate its teachers or principals.

#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.

November 14, 2012

Duration: 3 hours

Trained in Danielson (by Certified Danielson Trainer)

- *Elements of the 2011 Rubric*
- *Domains*
- *Training by viewing a teacher lesson and anchoring responses of evaluators for purposes of calibration and inner rater reliability.*

#1 - New York State Teaching Standards, and their related elements and performance indicators and the Leadership Standards and their related functions, as applicable.

#2 - Evidenced based observation techniques that are grounded in research.

#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.

Training will continue 3 to 4 times a year in the future with a certified trainer from the Orleans-Niagara BOCES.

Evaluators will be recertified on an annual/biannual basis.

11.5) Assurances -- Evaluators

Please check the boxes below:

-
- Checked
-

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

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

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

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

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

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

(7) use of the Statewide Instructional Reporting System

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

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

-
- Checked
-

11.6) Assurances -- Principals

Please check all of the boxes below:

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

11.7) Assurances -- Data

Please check all of the boxes below:

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

12. Joint Certification of APPR Plan

Created Thursday, November 08, 2012

Updated Tuesday, December 18, 2012

Page 1

12.1) Upload the Joint Certification of the APPR Plan

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

[assets/survey-uploads/5581/223008-3Uqgn5g9Iu/District Certification 12-17-12.pdf](assets/survey-uploads/5581/223008-3Uqgn5g9Iu/District%20Certification%2012-17-12.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.

HEDI Scoring Bands for Growth SLO

Targets for SLOs shall be determined by teachers in the same grade level/subject or course and approved by building principals. 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:

0 - 25%		26 - 64 %		65 - 84%		85-100%	
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	≤18%	3	26%-31%	9	65%-66%	18	85%-89%
1	18%-21%	4	32%-37%	10	67%-68%	19	90%-93%
2	22%-25%	5	38%-43%	11	69%-70%	20	>94%
		6	44%-50%	12	71%-72%		
		7	51%-57%	13	73%-74%		
		8	58%-64%	14	75%-76%		
				15	77%-78%		
				16	79%-81%		
				17	82%-84%		

The HEDI scoring band was created by first establishing the highest percentage of students who need to meet the target in order for a teacher to be considered “Effective” at 84%, which would yield 17 points, and then establishing the lowest percentage of students who would need to meet the target in order for a teacher to be considered “Effective” at 65%, which would yield 9 points. Point values between 9 and 17 were then determined associated with percentages of students who met the target ranging from 65% to 84%.

Point values for the rating of “Ineffective” range from 0-2, corresponding with a low of ≤18% of students who met the target and a high of 25% of students who met the target. Point values for the rating of “Developing” range from 3-8 with a low of 26% of students who met the target and a high of 64% of students who met the target. Point values for the rating of “Highly Effective” range from 18-20 with a low of 85% of students who met the target and a high of >94% of students who met the target.

Translating Results of Multiple SLOs Into One Overall Rating for Growth Component

The evaluator will assess the results of Each SLO separately, arriving at a HEDI rating and point value between 0-20 points. Each SLO must then be weighted proportionately based on the number of students included in all SLOs. This will provide one overall growth component score between 0-20 points. The rating always rounds to the nearest whole number; ≥.5 rounds up and ≤.5 rounds down.

Sample Teacher with Three SLOs	SLO 1: (30 students)	SLO 2 (25 students)	SLO 3: (20 Students)
Step 1: Assess results of each SLO separately	17/20 points Effective	15/20 points Effective	19/20 points Highly Effective
Step 2: Weight each SLO proportionately	30 students/75 TOTAL students = 40% of overall	25 students/75 TOTAL students = 33% of overall	20 students/75 TOTAL students = 27% of overall
Step 3: Calculate proportional points for each SLO	17 points x 40% = 7 points	15 points x 33% = 5 points	19 points x 27% = 5 points
Overall Growth Component Score (Round to nearest whole number): 17 points, Effective			

HEDI Scoring Bands for Locally Selected Measures of Achievement

Performance Indicator APPR Calculation – 20pt. Scale:

Locally Selected Measures of Achievement for staff without a value added measure of student growth will be determined utilizing Building Level Performance Indicators for ELA and Mathematics. The combined total of the two Performance Indicators divided by 400 and subsequently multiply that by 20 (rounded to the nearest whole number) will determine the teacher's Locally Selected Measure of Achievement.

	Performance Index		ELA + Math	Divide by 10	Divide by 2	HEDI Score
	ELA	Math				
High School	200	199	399	39.9	19.95	20
Middle School	165	174	339	33.9	16.86	17
Intermediate School	164	171	335	33.5	16.75	17

HEDI Rating Scale:

Highly Effective	Effective	Developing	Ineffective
20	17	8	2
19	16	7	1
18	15	6	0
	14	5	
	13	4	
	12	3	
	11		
	10		
	9		

Performance Indicator APPR Calculation – 15pt. Scale:

Locally Selected Measures of Achievement for staff with a value added measure of student growth will be determined utilizing Building Level Performance Indicators for ELA and Mathematics. The combined total of the two Performance Indicators divided by 400 and subsequently multiply that by 15 (rounded to the nearest whole number) will determine the teacher's Locally Selected Measure of Achievement.

	Performance Index		ELA + Math	Divide by 400	Multiply by 15	HEDI Score
	ELA	Math				
High School	200	199	399	.997	14.96	15
Middle School	165	174	339	.847	12.71	13
Intermediate School	164	171	335	.837	12.56	13

HEDI Rating Scale:

Highly Effective	Effective	Developing	Ineffective
15	13	7	2
14	12	6	1
	11	5	0
	10	4	
	9	3	
	8		

HEDI Scoring Bands for Locally Selected Measures of Achievement

Performance Indicator APPR Calculation – 20pt. Scale:

Locally Selected Measures of Achievement for staff without a value added measure of student growth will be determined utilizing Building Level Performance Indicators for ELA and Mathematics. The combined total of the two Performance Indicators divided by 400 and subsequently multiply that by 20 (rounded to the nearest whole number) will determine the teacher's Locally Selected Measure of Achievement.

	Performance Index		ELA + Math	Divide by 10	Divide by 2	HEDI Score
	ELA	Math				
High School	200	199	399	39.9	19.95	20
Middle School	165	174	339	33.9	16.86	17
Intermediate School	164	171	335	33.5	16.75	17

HEDI Rating Scale:

Highly Effective	Effective	Developing	Ineffective
20	17	8	2
19	16	7	1
18	15	6	0
	14	5	
	13	4	
	12	3	
	11		
	10		
	9		

Performance Indicator APPR Calculation – 15pt. Scale:

Locally Selected Measures of Achievement for staff with a value added measure of student growth will be determined utilizing Building Level Performance Indicators for ELA and Mathematics. The combined total of the two Performance Indicators divided by 400 and subsequently multiply that by 15 (rounded to the nearest whole number) will determine the teacher's Locally Selected Measure of Achievement.

	Performance Index		ELA + Math	Divide by 400	Multiply by 15	HEDI Score
	ELA	Math				
High School	200	199	399	.997	14.96	15
Middle School	165	174	339	.847	12.71	13
Intermediate School	164	171	335	.837	12.56	13

HEDI Rating Scale:

Highly Effective	Effective	Developing	Ineffective
15	13	7	2
14	12	6	1
	11	5	0
	10	4	
	9	3	
	8		

Other Measures of Teacher Effectiveness

- (A) The District shall assess teachers under this subcomponent as required under §30-2.5(d) of the Commissioner's regulations. This subcomponent score shall be based on multiple measures and aligned with the New York State Teaching standards.
- (B) The District shall use the approved teacher rubric entitled **Danielson's Framework for Teaching. (2011 revised edition) Appendix F**
- (C) Multiple observations as detailed below shall account for all 60 points under this subpart.

At least two (2) classroom observations, only one (1) of which shall be a formal full lesson observation of each teacher will be completed between September 15th and June 15th as determined by Administration. Scheduled formal observations will include a pre-observation component in accordance with the Danielson model during which the observation date will be established by the teacher and the evaluator. There shall also be a post-observation component.

- The one announced formal observation will account for all 60 points. A pre and post observation will be an integral part of this observation and will be an important part of the teacher's overall rating. The pre-observation conference shall occur within the five (5) work days preceding the observation. The Teacher shall submit to the evaluator Pre and Post observation forms filled out in their entirety.
- Each teacher shall receive a minimum of one but no more than three (3) unannounced observations of no more than 15-20 minutes in length. No unannounced observation shall be carried out during the first week or the last week of any semester, nor on the two (2) days prior to Thanksgiving, winter (2) or spring breaks, or on the day following these breaks.
- Anecdotal Notes taken during unannounced observations will be attached/included with the teacher's end of the year summative evaluation form.
- Any certified administrator employed by the District with the exception of the superintendent can conduct observations of non-tenured teachers and tenured teachers. Under no circumstances shall an independently contracted evaluator be used.
- In any building with multiple administrators, the District will whenever practicable, ensure that a teacher's observation is rotated annually among the building principal/assistant principal(s).
- Teachers shall receive scores and any narrative feedback within 10 working days of the actual observation. In the case of formal, announced observations, a post-observation conference will be conducted within 10 working days.
- If an evaluator makes a judgment that the overall score places the teacher at ineffective or developing, it is understood that narrative written feedback shall accompany the score, that includes but is not limited to, feedback which explains the judgment and which offers suggestions for more effective practice.
- If an evaluator makes a determination that a teacher is ineffective or developing in any subcomponent of any of the 4 domains, a written narrative response must accompany said determination.

The observer will utilize the Danielson's Framework for Teaching (2011 revised edition) to make judgments during the observation sessions. Each Domain is valued at the following percentages:

Domain 1:	16%
Domain 2:	30%
Domain 3:	30%
Domain 4:	24%

The observer will rate the teacher on each subcomponent which makes up Domain 2 (Classroom Environment) and Domain 3 (Instruction) of the 2011 Charlotte Danielson Framework for Teaching Rubric. The scale used in the rating is given below:

Observer's Rating Scale	
0	Not Observed
1	Ineffective
2	Developing
3	Effective
4	Highly Effective

The weighting of each Domain and their subcomponents are provided on the following table.

Domain 1 16%	<u>Planning and Preparation</u>	
	1a - Demonstrating Knowledge of Content & Pedagogy	0.1667
	1b - Demonstrating Knowledge of Students	0.1667
	1c - Setting Instructional Outcomes	0.1667
	1d - Demonstrating Knowledge of Resources	0.1667
	1e - Designing Coherent Instruction	0.1666
	1f - Designing Student Assessments	0.1666
Domain 4 24%	<u>Professional Responsibilities</u>	
	4a - Reflecting on Teacher (Post Observation questions and session)	0.375
	<u>Collection of Evidence from the Teacher</u>	
	• 4b - Maintaining Accurate Records	0.125
	• 4c - Communicating with Families	0.125
	• 4d - Participating in a Professional Community	0.125
	• 4e - Growing and Developing Professionally	0.125
• 4f - Showing Professionalism	0.125	
Domain 2 30%	<u>The Classroom Environment</u>	
	2a - Creating an Environment of Respect and Rapport	0.200
	2b - Establishing a Culture of Learning	0.200
	2c - Managing Classroom Procedures	0.200
	2d - Managing Student Behavior	0.200
	2e - Organizing Physical Space	0.200
Domain 3 30%	<u>Instruction</u>	
	3a - Communicating with Students	0.200
	3b - Using Questioning and Discussion Techniques	0.200
	3c - Engaging Students in Learning	0.200
	3d - Using Assessment in Instruction	0.200
	3e - Demonstrating Flexibility and Responsiveness	0.200

Domain 1 ratings will be based upon the quality and quantity of artifacts presented to the evaluator including the teacher's participation and preparedness in the Pre-Observation Conference, completion of the Pre-Observation form as well as the submission of the Teachers lesson/unit plans, and the teacher's participation in the conference.

Domain 4 ratings will be based upon the quality and quantity of artifacts submitted as part of the teacher's Annual Documentation of Professional Performance (ADOPP) including the Post-Observation Conference, submission of relevant lesson plans, self-reflections, teacher artifacts, student work, communications with families and colleagues, examples of contributions made to the School community, descriptions of professional development undertaken, etc.

ADOPP artifacts must be submitted to their supervising administrator no later than May 1st. Materials submitted as artifacts shall be retained by the principal until the scoring is complete at which time it will be returned to the teacher. Such materials will not be copied, disseminated or otherwise made public without the teacher's written agreement.

Calculating the Composite Score:

Step 1: The score given by the observer for each subcomponent will be multiplied by the weight assigned to that subcomponent.

Step 2: The weighted score of the individual Domain's subcomponents will be totaled.

Step 3: The total weighted Subcomponent Score is then multiplied by the percentage which has been assigned to that Domain. This calculation provides the composite weighted score for that entire domain.

Evaluator's Subcomponent Score X Sum of Domain's Subcomponent Weighted Scores X Assigned Domain's Percentage = Total Weighted Score for the Domain

Step 4: The total weighted Scores for each Domain are added together to provide the teacher with their Final Rating on a 4 point Rubric.

Domain 1 Total Weighted Score + Domain 2 Total Weighted Score + Domain 3 Total Weighted Score + Domain 4 Total Weighted Score = Final Rating on a 4 pt. Scale

Step 5: The teacher's final rating on the 4 pt. scale is then converted to a 60 pt. scale score using the following Conversion Chart:

Ineffective (0 - 49)		Developing (50 - 56.3)		Effective (57 - 58.8)		Highly Effective (59 - 60)	
Average Rubric Score	L-P Converted Score	Average Rubric Score	L-P Converted Score	Average Rubric Score	L-P Converted Score	Average Rubric Score	L-P Converted Score
1	0.0	1.5	50.0	2.5	57.0	3.5	59
1.1	12.0	1.6	50.7	2.6	57.2	3.6	59.3
1.2	25.0	1.7	51.4	2.7	57.4	3.7	59.5
1.3	37.0	1.8	52.1	2.8	57.6	3.8	59.8
1.4	49.0	1.9	52.8	2.9	57.8	3.9	60
		2.0	53.5	3	57.8	4.0	60
		2.1	54.2	3.1	58.2		
		2.2	54.9	3.2	58.4		
		2.3	55.6	3.3	58.6		
		2.4	56.3	3.4	58.8		

Teacher's Name:

(Signature)

Subject:

Evaluator:

(Signature)

Date:

Evaluator's Rating Scale	
0	Not Observed
1	Ineffective
2	Developing
3	Effective
4	Highly Effective

2011 Charlotte Danielson Evaluation Tool

Evaluator's Comments

		Relative Value of Each Domain	Relative Value of Each Subdomain	Evaluator's Rating (0 - 4)	Weighted Subdomain Score	Weighted Domain Score
Domain 1: Planning and Preparation						
1a. Demonstrating Knowledge of Content and Pedagogy			0.1667	0	0	Weighted Domain Score
1b: Demonstrating Knowledge of Students			0.1667	0	0	
1c: Setting Instructional Outcomes			0.1667	0	0	
1d: Demonstrating Knowledge of Resources			0.1667	0	0	
1e: Designing Coherent Instruction			0.1666	0	0	
1f: Designing Student Assessments			0.1666	0	0	
Total:	16%	1.0000	0	0.0	0.0	
Domain 2: Classroom Environment						
2a: Creating an Environment of Respect and Rapport			0.2000	0	0	Weighted Domain Score
2b: Establish a Culture for Learning			0.2000	0	0	
2c: Managing Classroom Procedures			0.2000	0	0	
2d: Managing Student Behavior			0.2000	0	0	
2e: Organizing Physical Space			0.2000	0	0	
Total:	30%	1.0000	0	0.0	0.0	
Domain 3: Instruction						
3a: Communicating with Students			0.2000	0	0	Weighted Domain Score
3b: Using Questioning and Discussion Techniques			0.2000	0	0	
3c: Engaging Students in Learning			0.2000	0	0	
3d: Using Assessment in Instruction			0.2000	0	0	
3e: Demonstrating Flexibility and Responsiveness			0.2000	0	0	
Total:	30%	1.0000	0	0.0	0.0	
Domain 4: Professional Responsibilities						
4a: Reflecting on Teaching			0.3750	0	0	Weighted Domain Score
4b: Maintaining Accurate Records			0.1250	0	0	
4c: Communicating with Families			0.1250	0	0	
4d: Participating in a Professional Community			0.1250	0	0	
4e: Growing and Developing Professionally			0.1250	0	0	
4f: Showing Professionalism			0.1250	0	0	
Total:	24%	1.0000	0	0.0	0.0	
		100%				

Conversion Chart		
HEDI Scoring Bands	Average Rubric Score	L-P Conversion Score
Ineffective (0 - 49)	1	0.0
	1.1	12.0
	1.2	25.0
	1.3	37.0
	1.4	49.0
Developing (50 - 56.3)	1.5	50.0
	1.6	50.7
	1.7	51.4
	1.8	52.1
	1.9	52.8
	2	53.5
	2.1	54.2
	2.2	54.9
Effective (57 - 58.8)	2.3	55.6
	2.4	56.3
	2.5	57.0
	2.6	57.2
	2.7	57.4
	2.8	57.6
	2.9	57.8
	3	58.0
	3.1	58.2
	3.2	58.4
Highly Effective (59 - 60)	3.3	58.6
	3.4	58.8
	3.5	59.0
	3.6	59.3
	3.7	59.5
	3.8	59.8
	3.9	60.0
4	60.0	

Final Rating: **0.0**

Conversion Score: **0.0**

TEACHER IMPROVEMENT PLAN (TIP)

The District shall provide timely and constructive feedback to classroom teachers on their APPR by providing each teacher with his or her scores on the attached form within 30 days of the District receiving the teacher's State subcomponent score.

For those classroom teachers with a composite score of Developing or Ineffective the District shall develop and implement a Teacher Improvement Plan (TIP) as required under §30-2.10. The District shall formulate and commence implementation of a TIP for such teacher as soon as practicable but in no case later than 10 school days after the opening of classes in the school year following the school year for which such teacher's performance is being measured.

Upon receiving a rating of "developing" or "ineffective" a teacher shall be provided with a TIP. The TIP shall be provided as soon as practicable, but in no case later than ten days after the date on which teachers are required to report prior to the opening of classes for the school year. The Parties understand and agree that the sole and exclusive purpose of the TIP is the improvement of teaching practice and that issuance of a TIP is not a disciplinary action. The TIP shall be developed in consultation with the teacher. A union representative shall be afforded at the teacher's request. The Association president shall be timely informed whenever a teacher is placed on a TIP and, with the agreement of the teacher, shall be provided with a copy of the TIP.

A TIP shall clearly specify: (i) the area(s) in need of improvement; (ii) the performance goals, expectations, benchmarks, standards and timelines the teacher must meet in order to achieve an effective rating; (iii) how improvement will be measured and monitored, and provide for periodic reviews of progress; and (iv) the appropriate differentiated professional development opportunities, materials, resources and supports the District will make available to assist the teacher including, where appropriate, the assignment of a mentor teacher (see Appendix E)

The teacher, administrator, mentor (if one has been assigned) and an Association representative (if requested by the teacher) shall meet, according to the schedule identified in the TIP, to assess the effectiveness and appropriateness of the TIP, for the purpose of assisting the teacher to achieve the goals set forth in the TIP. Based on the outcome of this assessment, the TIP shall be modified accordingly.

A teacher who believes that the terms of a TIP are arbitrary, unreasonable, inappropriate or defective, or that the District has failed to meet its obligation to properly implement the terms of the TIP, may seek relief through an appeal to the Superintendent. The decision of the Superintendent on the merits of the TIP shall be final.

All costs associated with the implementation of a TIP including, but not limited to, tuition, fees, books, and travel, shall be borne by the District in their entirety.

Teacher Improvement Plan Template

Name of Teacher: _____

Participants in the formulation of this TIP:

_____	_____
_____	_____

Identify the area(s) of improvement identified in the annual evaluation:

1. _____
2. _____
3. _____
4. _____

This plan will begin on: _____

The parties to this agreement will meet on the following dates to review and evaluate the plan and formulate modifications if necessary:

_____	_____
_____	_____
_____	_____

Any changes or modification to the plan must be in writing and will be appended to this document.

Teacher

Date

Administrator

Date

Union Representative

Date

Appendix B:
Learning Objective Template

<i>All SLOs MUST include the following basic components:</i>	
Population	<i>These are the students assigned to the course section(s) in this SLO - all students who are assigned to the course section(s) must be included in the SLO. (Full class rosters of all students must be provided for all included course sections.)</i>
Learning Content	<i>What is being taught over the instructional period covered? Common Core/National/State standards? Will this goal apply to all standards applicable to a course or just to specific priority standards?</i>
Interval of Instructional Time	<i>What is the instructional period covered (if not a year, rationale for semester/quarter/etc)?</i>
Evidence	<i>What specific assessment(s) will be used to measure this goal? The assessment must align to the learning content of the course.</i>

Baseline	<i>What is the starting level of students' knowledge of the learning content at the beginning of the instructional period?</i>																																																																																			
Target(s)	<p data-bbox="394 451 1995 548"><i>What is the expected outcome (target) of students' level of knowledge of the learning content at the end of the instructional period?</i></p> <table border="1" data-bbox="667 553 1587 724"> <thead> <tr> <th data-bbox="667 553 940 586">Target Level</th> <th data-bbox="940 553 1276 586">Pre-Assessment Score</th> <th data-bbox="1276 553 1587 586">Target Score</th> </tr> </thead> <tbody> <tr> <td data-bbox="667 586 940 618">Above Grade Level</td> <td data-bbox="940 586 1276 618">≥56</td> <td data-bbox="1276 586 1587 618">85</td> </tr> <tr> <td data-bbox="667 618 940 651"></td> <td data-bbox="940 618 1276 651">46-55</td> <td data-bbox="1276 618 1587 651">75</td> </tr> <tr> <td data-bbox="667 651 940 683">At Grade Level</td> <td data-bbox="940 651 1276 683">36-45</td> <td data-bbox="1276 651 1587 683">70</td> </tr> <tr> <td data-bbox="667 683 940 716">Below Grade Level</td> <td data-bbox="940 683 1276 716">0-35</td> <td data-bbox="1276 683 1587 716">65</td> </tr> </tbody> </table>																					Target Level	Pre-Assessment Score	Target Score	Above Grade Level	≥56	85		46-55	75	At Grade Level	36-45	70	Below Grade Level	0-35	65																																																
Target Level	Pre-Assessment Score	Target Score																																																																																		
Above Grade Level	≥56	85																																																																																		
	46-55	75																																																																																		
At Grade Level	36-45	70																																																																																		
Below Grade Level	0-35	65																																																																																		
HEDI Scoring	<p data-bbox="394 760 1995 873"><i>How will evaluators determine what range of student performance "meets" the goal (effective) versus "well-below" (ineffective), "below" (developing), and "well-above" (highly effective)?</i></p> <table border="1" data-bbox="394 878 1995 1122"> <thead> <tr> <th colspan="3" data-bbox="394 878 604 954">HIGHLY EFFECTIVE</th> <th colspan="9" data-bbox="604 878 1255 954">EFFECTIVE</th> <th colspan="6" data-bbox="1255 878 1766 954">DEVELOPING</th> <th colspan="3" data-bbox="1766 878 1995 954">INEFFECTIVE</th> </tr> <tr> <td data-bbox="394 954 457 1036">20</td> <td data-bbox="457 954 531 1036">19</td> <td data-bbox="531 954 604 1036">18</td> <td data-bbox="604 954 678 1036">17</td> <td data-bbox="678 954 751 1036">16</td> <td data-bbox="751 954 825 1036">15</td> <td data-bbox="825 954 898 1036">14</td> <td data-bbox="898 954 972 1036">13</td> <td data-bbox="972 954 1045 1036">12</td> <td data-bbox="1045 954 1119 1036">11</td> <td data-bbox="1119 954 1192 1036">10</td> <td data-bbox="1192 954 1266 1036">9</td> <td data-bbox="1266 954 1339 1036">8</td> <td data-bbox="1339 954 1413 1036">7</td> <td data-bbox="1413 954 1486 1036">6</td> <td data-bbox="1486 954 1560 1036">5</td> <td data-bbox="1560 954 1633 1036">4</td> <td data-bbox="1633 954 1707 1036">3</td> <td data-bbox="1707 954 1780 1036">2</td> <td data-bbox="1780 954 1854 1036">1</td> <td data-bbox="1854 954 1995 1036">0</td> </tr> <tr> <td data-bbox="394 1036 457 1122">>94</td> <td data-bbox="457 1036 531 1122">90 To 94</td> <td data-bbox="531 1036 604 1122">85 To 89</td> <td data-bbox="604 1036 678 1122">82 To 84</td> <td data-bbox="678 1036 751 1122">79 To 81</td> <td data-bbox="751 1036 825 1122">77 To 78</td> <td data-bbox="825 1036 898 1122">75 To 76</td> <td data-bbox="898 1036 972 1122">73 To 74</td> <td data-bbox="972 1036 1045 1122">71 To 72</td> <td data-bbox="1045 1036 1119 1122">69 To 70</td> <td data-bbox="1119 1036 1192 1122">67 To 68</td> <td data-bbox="1192 1036 1266 1122">65 To 66</td> <td data-bbox="1266 1036 1339 1122">58 To 64</td> <td data-bbox="1339 1036 1413 1122">51 To 57</td> <td data-bbox="1413 1036 1486 1122">44 To 50</td> <td data-bbox="1486 1036 1560 1122">38 To 43</td> <td data-bbox="1560 1036 1633 1122">32 To 37</td> <td data-bbox="1633 1036 1707 1122">26 To 31</td> <td data-bbox="1707 1036 1780 1122">22 To 25</td> <td data-bbox="1780 1036 1854 1122">18 To 21</td> <td data-bbox="1854 1036 1995 1122">≤18</td> </tr> </thead></table>																					HIGHLY EFFECTIVE			EFFECTIVE									DEVELOPING						INEFFECTIVE			20	19	18	17	16	15	14	13	12	11	10	9	8	7	6	5	4	3	2	1	0	>94	90 To 94	85 To 89	82 To 84	79 To 81	77 To 78	75 To 76	73 To 74	71 To 72	69 To 70	67 To 68	65 To 66	58 To 64	51 To 57	44 To 50	38 To 43	32 To 37	26 To 31	22 To 25	18 To 21	≤18
HIGHLY EFFECTIVE			EFFECTIVE									DEVELOPING						INEFFECTIVE																																																																		
20	19	18	17	16	15	14	13	12	11	10	9	8	7	6	5	4	3	2	1	0																																																																
>94	90 To 94	85 To 89	82 To 84	79 To 81	77 To 78	75 To 76	73 To 74	71 To 72	69 To 70	67 To 68	65 To 66	58 To 64	51 To 57	44 To 50	38 To 43	32 To 37	26 To 31	22 To 25	18 To 21	≤18																																																																
Rationale	<i>Describe the reasoning behind the choices regarding learning content, evidence, and target and how they will be used together to prepare students for future growth and development in subsequent grades/courses, as well as college and career readiness.</i>																																																																																			

Measures of Growth

STATE PROVIDED GROWTH MEASURE

1. The 20 or 25 points for student growth measures shall be the state provided score. Where there is no state score generated, the principal shall develop Student Learning Objectives (SLO) for approval by the superintendent for the 20 points comparable measure. They shall be developed by November 1st.
2. The superintendent shall meet with the unit members submitting a SLO and provide the decision on approval within 10 days of submission by the Unit Member.
3. All Assistant Principal State Provided Growth Measures will be that of their building principal.
4. For district level administrators, the SLO will be a weighted composite score based on student population of the State Provided growth score of the building administrators that received said score.

LOCALLY DEVELOPED MEASURE OF GROWTH

1. For all unit members, the locally selected measure of Student Performance will be the Student Performance Index as provided by the NYS Report Card.
2. For all building administrators and assistant principals, the locally selected measure of Student Performance will be the Student Performance Index as provided by the NYS Report Card.
3. District level administrator's locally selected measure of Student Performance will be the composite score of each building's Student Performance Index weighted by the student population within each building.
4. The 15 or 20 points for locally selected measures of student achievement will be determined utilizing Building Level Performance Indicators for ELA and Mathematics. The combined total of the two Performance Indicators divided by 10 and subsequently divided by 2 (rounded to the nearest whole number) will determine the teacher's Locally Selected Measure of Achievement.

CALCULATING THE LOCAL MEASURE OF GROWTH:

(For unit members at the district level or building administrators without a State Provided Growth Measure)

Step 1: The State Growth Measure as determined by the State for each building in the L-P District will be multiplied by the percent of the students within that building of the sum total student population at the High School, Middle School, and Intermediate School.

Unit Member's PI for the Building	X	% of Students of the whole in the building	=	Total Weighted Score for the Building
---	---	--	---	---

Step 2: The total weighted Scores for each Building are added together and divided by three to provide the unit member with a district-wide State Provided Growth Measure.

High School Total Weighted Score	+	Middle School Total Weighted Score	+	Intermediate School Total Weighted Score	Divide by 3=	Local Measure Of Growth
---	---	---	---	---	--------------	----------------------------------

PERFORMANCE INDICATOR APPR CALCULATION: 15pt. Scale:

Locally Selected Measures of Achievement for staff without a value added measure of student growth will be determined utilizing Building Level Performance Indicators for ELA and Mathematics. The combined total of the two Performance Indicators divided by 400 and subsequently multiply that by 15 (rounded to the nearest whole number) will determine the teacher's Locally Selected Measure of Achievement.

	Performance Index		ELA + Math	Divide by 400	Multiply by 15	HEDI Score
	ELA	Math				
High School	200	199	399	.997	14.96	15
Middle School	165	174	339	.847	12.71	13
Intermediate School Primary School	164	171	335	.837	12.56	13

HEDI Rating Scale:

Highly Effective	Effective	Developing	Ineffective
15	13	7	2
14	12	6	1
	11	5	0
	10	4	
	9	3	
	8		

Measures of Growth

STATE PROVIDED GROWTH MEASURE

1. The 20 or 25 points for student growth measures shall be the state provided score. Where there is no state score generated, the principal shall develop Student Learning Objectives (SLO) for approval by the superintendent for the 20 points comparable measure. They shall be developed by November 1st.
2. The superintendent shall meet with the unit members submitting a SLO and provide the decision on approval within 10 days of submission by the Unit Member.
3. All Assistant Principal State Provided Growth Measures will be that of their building principal.
4. For district level administrators, the SLO will be a weighted composite score based on student population of the State Provided growth score of the building administrators that received said score.

LOCALLY DEVELOPED MEASURE OF GROWTH

1. For all unit members, the locally selected measure of Student Performance will be the Student Performance Index as provided by the NYS Report Card.
2. For all building administrators and assistant principals, the locally selected measure of Student Performance will be the Student Performance Index as provided by the NYS Report Card.
3. District level administrator's locally selected measure of Student Performance will be the composite score of each building's Student Performance Index weighted by the student population within each building.
4. The 15 or 20 points for locally selected measures of student achievement will be determined utilizing Building Level Performance Indicators for ELA and Mathematics. The combined total of the two Performance Indicators divided by 10 and subsequently divided by 2 (rounded to the nearest whole number) will determine the teacher's Locally Selected Measure of Achievement.

CALCULATING THE LOCAL MEASURE OF GROWTH:

(For unit members at the district level or building administrators without a State Provided Growth Measure)

Step 1: The State Growth Measure as determined by the State for each building in the L-P District will be multiplied by the percent of the students within that building of the sum total student population at the High School, Middle School, and Intermediate School.

Unit Member's PI for the Building	X	% of Students of the whole in the building	=	Total Weighted Score for the Building
---	---	--	---	---

Step 2: The total weighted Scores for each Building are added together and divided by three to provide the unit member with a district-wide State Provided Growth Measure.

High School Total Weighted Score	+	Middle School Total Weighted Score	+	Intermediate School Total Weighted Score	Divide by 3=	Local Measure Of Growth
---	---	---	---	---	--------------	----------------------------------

PERFORMANCE INDICATOR APPR CALCULATION: 20pt. Scale:

Locally Selected Measures of Achievement for staff without a value added measure of student growth will be determined utilizing Building Level Performance Indicators for ELA and Mathematics. The combined total of the two Performance Indicators divided by 400 and subsequently multiply that by 20 (rounded to the nearest whole number) will determine the teacher's Locally Selected Measure of Achievement.

	Performance Index		ELA + Math	Divide by 400	Multiply by 20	HEDI Score
	ELA	Math				
High School	200	199	399	.399	19.95	20
Middle School	165	174	339	.339	16.86	17
Intermediate School Primary School	164	171	335	.335	16.75	17

HEDI 20pt. Rating Scale:

Highly Effective	Effective	Developing	Ineffective
20	17	8	2
19	16	7	1
18	15	6	0
	14	5	
	13	4	
	12	3	
	11		
	10		
	9		

**LEWISTON-PORTER
ADMINISTRATOR ANNUAL PROFESSIONAL PERFORMANCE RUBRIC**

12/28/2012

Administrator's Name: _____ (Signature) _____

Position: _____

Evaluator: _____ (Signature) _____

Date: _____

Evaluator's Rating Scale	
0	Not Observed
1	Ineffective
2	Developing
3	Effective
4	Highly Effective

Multidimensional Principal Performance Rubric		Evaluator's Comments	Relative Value of Each Domain	Relative Value of Each Subdomain	Evaluator's Rating (0 - 4)	Weighted Subdomain Scores	WEIGHTED DOMAIN SCORE
Domain 1: Shared Vision of Learning							
1a:	Shared Decision Making		0.5000	0	0		0.0
1b:	Learning Environment		0.5000	0	0		
Total			10%	1.0000	0	0.0	

Domain 2: School Culture and Instructional Program		Evaluator's Comments	Relative Value of Each Domain	Relative Value of Each Subdomain	Evaluator's Rating (0 - 4)	Weighted Subdomain Scores	WEIGHTED DOMAIN SCORE
2a:	School Culture		0.1111	0	0		
2b:	Learning Environment		0.1111	0	0		
2c:	Curricular Program		0.1111	0	0		
2d:	Supervision of Instruction		0.1111	0	0		
2e:	Time on Task		0.1111	0	0		
2f:	Develops Leadership Capacity		0.1111	0	0		
2g:	Technology supporting instruction		0.1111	0	0		
2h:	Monitor student progress		0.1111	0	0		
2i:	Evaluate instructional program		0.1112	0	0		
Total			35%	1.0000	0	0.0	

Domain 3: Safe, Efficient, Effective Learning Environment		Evaluator's Comments	Relative Value of Each Domain	Relative Value of Each Subdomain	Evaluator's Rating (0 - 4)	Weighted Subdomain Scores	WEIGHTED DOMAIN SCORE
3a:	Use of resources		0.2000	0	0		
3b:	Distributed Leadership		0.2000	0	0		
3c:	Safety & welfare of students & staff		0.2000	0	0		
3d:	Monitors & evaluates management & operations		0.2000	0	0		
3e:	Organizational time focused on teaching & learning		0.2000	0	0		
Total			20%	1.0000	0	0.0	

Conversion Chart		
HEDI Scoring Bands	Average Rubric Score	Low-Port Conversion Score
Ineffective (0 - 49)	1	0.0
	1.1	12.0
	1.2	25.0
	1.3	37.0
	1.4	49.0
Developing (50 - 56.3)	1.5	50.0
	1.6	50.7
	1.7	51.4
	1.8	52.1
	1.9	52.8
	2	53.5
	2.1	54.2
	2.2	54.9
Effective (57 - 58.8)	2.3	55.6
	2.4	56.3
	2.5	57.0
	2.6	57.2
	2.7	57.4
	2.8	57.6
	2.9	57.8
	3	58.0
	3.1	58.2
	3.2	58.4
Highly Effective (59 - 60)	3.3	58.6
	3.4	58.8
	3.5	59.0
	3.6	59.3
	3.7	59.5
	3.8	59.8
	3.9	60.0
4	60.0	

Final Rating **0.0**

**LEWISTON-PORTER
ADMINISTRATOR ANNUAL PROFESSIONAL PERFORMANCE RUBRIC**

12/28/2012

Conversion Score:

Administrator's Name: _____

Position: _____

Evaluator: _____

Date: _____

Evaluator's Rating Scale	
0	Not Observed
1	Ineffective
2	Developing
3	Effective
4	Highly Effective

Multidimensional Principal Performance Rubric	Evaluator's Comments	Relative Value of Each Domain	Relative Value of Each Subdomain	Evaluator's Rating (0 - 4)	Weighted Subdomain Scores	WEIGHTED DOMAIN SCORE
Domain 4: Community						
4a: Collects & analyzes data & information			0.3333	0	0	0.0
4b: Use of community's cultural, social, intellectual resources			0.3333	0	0	
4c: Builds & maintains positive relationships			0.3334	0	0	
Total		20%	1.0000	0	0.0	

Multidimensional Principal Performance Rubric	Evaluator's Comments	Relative Value of Each Domain	Relative Value of Each Subdomain	Evaluator's Rating (0 - 4)	Weighted Subdomain Scores	WEIGHTED DOMAIN SCORE
Domain 5: Integrity, Fairness, Ethics						
5a: Accountability for every student's success			0.2000	0	0	0.0
5b: Moral and legal consequences			0.2000	0	0	
5c: Models appropriate administrative principles			0.2000	0	0	
5d: Values democracy, equity & diversity			0.2000	0	0	
5e: Promotes Social Justice			0.2000	0	0	
Total		5%	1.0000	0	0.0	

Multidimensional Principal Performance Rubric	Evaluator's Comments	Relative Value of Each Domain	Relative Value of Each Subdomain	Evaluator's Rating (0 - 4)	Weighted Subdomain Scores	WEIGHTED DOMAIN SCORE
Domain 6: Political, Social, Economic, Legal and Cultural Context						
6a: Influence on decisions affecting student learning			0.3333	0	0	0.0
6b: Emerging Trends			0.3333	0	0	
6c: Child/Family Advocacy			0.3334	0	0	
Total		10%	1.0000	0	0.0	

Conversion Chart		
HEDI Scoring Bands	Average Rubric Score	Low-Port Conversion Score
Ineffective (0 - 49)	1	0.0
	1.1	12.0
	1.2	25.0
	1.3	37.0
	1.4	49.0
Developing (50 - 56.3)	1.5	50.0
	1.6	50.7
	1.7	51.4
	1.8	52.1
	1.9	52.8
	2	53.5
	2.1	54.2
	2.2	54.9
	2.3	55.6
	2.4	56.3
Effective (57 - 58.8)	2.5	57.0
	2.6	57.2
	2.7	57.4
	2.8	57.6
	2.9	57.8
	3	58.0
	3.1	58.2
	3.2	58.4
	3.3	58.6
	3.4	58.8
Highly Effective (59 - 60)	3.5	59.0
	3.6	59.3
	3.7	59.5
	3.8	59.8
	3.9	60.0
	4	60.0

PRINCIPAL IMPROVEMENT PLAN PROCESS

Upon rating a principal as ineffective or developing, an improvement plan designed to rectify perceived or demonstrated deficiencies must be developed and commenced no later than ten (10) school days after the start of a school year. The superintendent or designee, in conjunction with the principal, must develop an improvement plan that contains:

1. A clear delineation of the deficiencies that resulted in the ineffective or developing assessment.
2. Specific improvement goal/outcome statements.
3. Specific improvement action steps/activities.
4. A reasonable timeline for achieving improvement.
5. Required and accessible resources to achieve goal.
6. A formative evaluation process documenting meetings strategically scheduled throughout the year to assess progress. These meetings shall occur at least twice during the year: the first between December 1 and December 15 and the second between March 1 and March 15. A written summary of feedback on progress shall be given within 5 business days of each meeting.
7. A clear manner in which improvement efforts will be assessed, including evidence demonstrating improvement.
8. A formal, final written summative assessment delineating progress made with an opportunity for comments by the principal.

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 for completion:

Required and Accessible Resources, including identification of responsibility for provision:

Dates of formative evaluation on progress (lead evaluator and principal initial each date to confirm the meeting):

December:

March:

Other:

Evidence to be provided for Goal Achievement:

Assessment Summary: Superintendent is to attach a narrative summary of improvement progress, including verification of the provision of support and resources as outlined above no later than 10 days after the identified completion date. Such summary shall be signed by the superintendent and principal with the opportunity for the principal to attach comments.

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

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

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

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

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

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

Signatures, dates

Superintendent Signature: Date: December 17, 2012

R. Christopher Ross

Teachers Union President Signature: Date: December 17, 2012

Ken Janfri

Administrative Union President Signature: Date: December 17, 2012

Paul J. Casu

Board of Education President Signature: Date: December 17, 2012

Jim Nindas