



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

December 11, 2012

Karen Donahue, Superintendent  
Lyme Central School District  
11868 Academy St.  
Chaumont, NY 13622

Dear Superintendent Donahue:

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: Jack D. Boak

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 Monday, May 14, 2012

Updated Tuesday, October 30, 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 : 221301040000

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

*221301040000*

#### 1.2) School District Name: LYME CSD

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

*LYME 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?

*First-time submission*

## 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 Thursday, September 06, 2012

Updated Thursday, November 29, 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 | District, regional, or BOCES-developed assessment | JL BOCES developed K ELA Assessment    |
| 1 | District, regional, or BOCES-developed assessment | JL BOCES developed Gr 1 ELA Assessment |
| 2 | District, regional, or BOCES-developed assessment | JL BOCES developed Gr 2 ELA Assessment |

|   | ELA            | Assessment                 |
|---|----------------|----------------------------|
| 3 | Not applicable | 3rd Grade State Assessment |

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

|   |   |
|---|---|
| Use this box, if needed, to describe the general process for assigning HEDI categories for these grades/subjects in this subcomponent. If needed, you may upload a table or graphic at 2.11, below. | Students will be given a pre-test at the beginning of the year to establish a baseline. Using that baseline data, teachers, in collaboration with the principal, will set growth targets for students. HEDI points will be allocated to a teacher based on the percentage of students meeting or exceeding their individual growth targets. The district has set a goal that 80% of students, will meet or exceed their growth targets. |
| Highly Effective (18 - 20 points) Results are well-above state average for similar students (or District goals if no state test).   | Student performance results are outstanding and 85-100% of students met or exceeded their individual growth target.<br>20= 95-100%<br>19= 90-94%<br>18= 89-85%  |
| Effective (9 - 17 points) Results meet state average for similar students (or District goals if no state test).   | Student performance results are on par with district expectations and 70-84% of students met or exceeded their individual growth target.<br>17= 84%<br>16= 83%<br>15= 82%<br>14=81%<br>13=77-80%<br>12= 74-76%<br>11= 73%<br>10= 72%<br>9= 70-71%   |
| Developing (3 - 8 points) Results are below state average for similar students (or District goals if no state test).  | Student performance results are below district expectations and 60-69% of students met or exceeded their individual growth target.<br>8= 67-69%<br>7=65-66%<br>6= 63-64%<br>5= 62%<br>4= 61%<br>3= 60%  |
| Ineffective (0 - 2 points) Results are well-below state average for similar students (or District goals if no state test).  | Student performance results are far-below district goals and 0-59% of students met or exceeded their individual growth target.<br>2= 45-59%<br>1= 21-44%<br>0= 0-20%  |

### 2.3) Grades K-3 Math

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

|   | Math  | Assessment                              |
|---|---|---|
| K | District, regional, or BOCES-developed assessment | JL BOCES developed K math Assessment    |
| 1 | District, regional, or BOCES-developed assessment | JL BOCES developed Gr 1 math Assessment |
| 2 | District, regional, or BOCES-developed assessment | JL BOCES developed Gr 2 math Assessment |

|   | Math           | Assessment                 |
|---|----------------|----------------------------|
| 3 | Not applicable | 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. | Students will be given a pre-test at the beginning of the year to establish a baseline. Using that baseline data, teachers, in collaboration with the principal, will set growth targets for students. HEDI points will be allocated to a teacher based on the percentage of students meeting or exceeding their individual growth targets. The district has set a goal that 80% of students, will meet or exceed their growth targets. |
| Highly Effective (18 - 20 points) Results are well-above state average for similar students (or District goals if no state test).   | Student performance results are outstanding and 85-100% of students met or exceeded their individual growth target.<br>20= 95-100%<br>19= 90-94%<br>18= 89-85%  |
| Effective (9 - 17 points) Results meet state average for similar students (or District goals if no state test).   | Student performance results are on par with district expectations and 70-84% of students met or exceeded their individual growth target.<br>17= 84%<br>16= 83%<br>15= 82%<br>14=81%<br>13=77-80%<br>12= 74-76%<br>11= 73%<br>10= 72%<br>9= 70-71%   |
| Developing (3 - 8 points) Results are below state average for similar students (or District goals if no state test).  | Student performance results are below district expectations and 60-69% of students met or exceeded their individual growth target.<br>8= 67-69%<br>7=65-66%<br>6= 63-64%<br>5= 62%<br>4= 61%<br>3= 60%  |
| Ineffective (0 - 2 points) Results are well-below state average for similar students (or District goals if no state test).  | Student performance results are far-below district goals and 0-59% of students met or exceeded their individual growth target.<br>2= 45-59%<br>1= 21-44%<br>0= 0-20%  |

## 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 | JL BOCES developed Gr 6 science Assessment |
| 7 | District, regional or BOCES-developed assessment | JL BOCES developed Gr 7 science Assessment |
|   | Science  | Assessment                                 |
| 8 | State assessment                                 | 8th Grade State Science Assessment         |

For Grades 6-8 Science: describe the district-adopted expectations for the level of performance required for each HEDI rating category and the process for assigning points to teachers based on SLO results consistent with regulations and assurances in the Comparable Growth Measures subcomponent. Include any district-determined expectations for 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. | Students will be given a pre-test at the beginning of the year to establish a baseline. Using that baseline data, teachers, in collaboration with the principal, will set growth targets for students. HEDI points will be allocated to a teacher based on the percentage of students meeting or exceeding their individual growth targets. The district has set a goal that 80% of students, will meet or exceed their growth targets. |
| Highly Effective (18 - 20 points) Results are well-above state average for similar students (or District goals if no state test).   | Student performance results are outstanding and 85-100% of students met or exceeded their individual growth target.<br>20= 95-100%<br>19= 90-94%<br>18= 89-85%  |
| Effective (9 - 17 points) Results meet state average for similar students (or District goals if no state test).   | Student performance results are on par with district expectations and 70-84% of students met or exceeded their individual growth target.<br>17= 84%<br>16= 83%<br>15= 82%<br>14=81%<br>13=77-80%<br>12= 74-76%<br>11= 73%<br>10= 72%<br>9= 70-71%   |
| Developing (3 - 8 points) Results are below state average for similar students (or District goals if no state test).  | Student performance results are below district expectations and 60-69% of students met or exceeded their individual growth target.<br>8= 67-69%<br>7=65-66%<br>6= 63-64%<br>5= 62%<br>4= 61%<br>3= 60%  |
| Ineffective (0 - 2 points) Results are well-below state average for similar students (or District goals if no state test).  | Student performance results are far-below district goals and 0-59% of students met or exceeded their individual growth target.<br>2= 45-59%<br>1= 21-44%  |

## 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 | JL BOCES developed Gr 6 social studies assessment |
| 7 | District, regional or BOCES-developed assessment | JL BOCES developed Gr 7 social studies assessment |
| 8 | District, regional or BOCES-developed assessment | JL BOCES developed Gr 8 social studiesAssessment  |

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. | Students will be given a pre-test at the beginning of the year to establish a baseline. Using that baseline data, teachers, in collaboration with the principal, will set growth targets for students. HEDI points will be allocated to a teacher based on the percentage of students meeting or exceeding their individual growth targets. The district has set a goal that 80% of students, will meet or exceed their growth targets. |
| Highly Effective (18 - 20 points) Results are well-above District goals for similar students.   | Student performance results are outstanding and 85-100% of students met or exceeded their individual growth target.<br>20= 95-100%<br>19= 90-94%<br>18= 89-85%  |
| Effective (9 - 17 points) Results meet District goals for similar students.   | Student performance results are on par with district expectations and 70-84% of students met or exceeded their individual growth target.<br>17= 84%<br>16= 83%<br>15= 82%<br>14=81%<br>13=77-80%<br>12= 74-76%<br>11= 73%<br>10= 72%<br>9= 70-71%   |
| Developing (3 - 8 points) Results are below District goals for similar students.  | Student performance results are below district expectations and 60-69% of students met or exceeded their individual growth target.<br>8= 67-69%<br>7=65-66%<br>6= 63-64%<br>5= 62%<br>4= 61%<br>3= 60%  |

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

Student performance results are far-below district goals and 0-59% of students met or exceeded their individual growth target.  
 2= 45-59%  
 1= 21-44%  
 0= 0-20%

## 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 | Lyme CSD developed Global 1 assessment |

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

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

Students will be given a pre-test at the beginning of the year to establish a baseline. Using that baseline data, teachers, in collaboration with the principal, will set growth targets for students. HEDI points will be allocated to a teacher based on the percentage of students meeting or exceeding their individual growth targets. The district has set a goal that 80% of students, will meet or exceed their growth targets.

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

Student performance results are outstanding and 85-100% of students met or exceeded their individual growth target.  
 20= 95-100%  
 19= 90-94%  
 18= 89-85%

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

Student performance results are on par with district expectations and 70-84% of students met or exceeded their individual growth target.  
 17= 84%  
 16= 83%  
 15= 82%  
 14=81%  
 13=77-80%  
 12= 74-76%  
 11= 73%

10= 72%  
9= 70-71%

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

Student performance results are below district expectations and 60-69% of students met or exceeded their individual growth target.

8= 67-69%  
7=65-66%  
6= 63-64%  
5= 62%  
4= 61%  
3= 60%

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

Student performance results are far-below district goals and 0-59% of students met or exceeded their individual growth target.

## 2.7) High School Science Regents Courses

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

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

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

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

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

Students will be given a pre-test at the beginning of the year to establish a baseline. Using that baseline data, teachers, in collaboration with the principal, will set growth targets for students. HEDI points will be allocated to a teacher based on the percentage of students meeting or exceeding their individual growth targets. The district has set a goal that 80% of students, will meet or exceed their growth targets.

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

Student performance results are outstanding and 85-100% of students met or exceeded their individual growth target.

20= 95-100%  
19= 90-94%  
18= 89-85%

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

Student performance results are on par with district expectations and 70-84% of students met or exceeded their individual growth target.

17= 84%  
16= 83%

15= 82%  
 14=81%  
 13=77-80%  
 12= 74-76%  
 11= 73%  
 10= 72%  
 9= 70-71%

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

Student performance results are below district expectations and 60-69% of students met or exceeded their individual growth target.

8= 67-69%  
 7=65-66%  
 6= 63-64%  
 5= 62%  
 4= 61%  
 3= 60%

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

Student performance results are far-below district goals and 0-59% of students met or exceeded their individual growth target.

## 2.8) High School Math Regents Courses

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

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

|           | Math Regents Courses | Assessment         |
|-----------|----------------------|--------------------|
| Algebra 1 | Regents assessment   | Regents assessment |
| Geometry  | 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.

Students will be given a pre-test at the beginning of the year to establish a baseline. Using that baseline data, teachers, in collaboration with the principal, will set growth targets for students. HEDI points will be allocated to a teacher based on the percentage of students meeting or exceeding their individual growth targets. The district has set a goal that 80% of students, will meet or exceed their growth targets.

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

Student performance results are outstanding and 85-100% of students met or exceeded their individual growth target.

20= 95-100%  
 19= 90-94%  
 18= 89-85%

|  |   |
|--|---|
| Effective (9 - 17 points) Results meet District goals for similar students.            | Student performance results are on par with district expectations and 70-84% of students met or exceeded their individual growth target.<br>17= 84%<br>16= 83%<br>15= 82%<br>14=81%<br>13=77-80%<br>12= 74-76%<br>11= 73%<br>10= 72%<br>9= 70-71% |
| Developing (3 - 8 points) Results are below District goals for similar students.       | Student performance results are below district expectations and 60-69% of students met or exceeded their individual growth target.<br>8= 67-69%<br>7=65-66%<br>6= 63-64%<br>5= 62%<br>4= 61%<br>3= 60%  |
| Ineffective (0 - 2 points) Results are well-below District goals for similar students. | Student performance results are far-below district goals and 0-59% of students met or exceeded their individual growth target.  |

## 2.9) High School English Language Arts

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

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

|              | High School English Courses                      | Assessment                              |
|--------------|--|---|
| Grade 9 ELA  | District, regional or BOCES-developed assessment | Lyme CSD developed Gr 9 ELA assessment  |
| Grade 10 ELA | District, regional or BOCES-developed assessment | Lyme CSD developed Gr 10 ELA assessment |
| Grade 11 ELA | Regents assessment                               | Regents Assessment                      |

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

|   |   |
|---|---|
| Use this box, if needed, to describe the general process for assigning HEDI categories for these grades/subjects in this subcomponent. If needed, you may upload a table or graphic at 2.11, below. | Students will be given a pre-test at the beginning of the year to establish a baseline. Using that baseline data, teachers, in collaboration with the principal, will set growth targets for students. HEDI points will be allocated to a teacher based on the percentage of students meeting or exceeding their individual growth targets. The district has set a goal that 80% of students, will meet or exceed their growth targets. |
|---|---|



|   |   |
|---|---|
| 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. | Students will be given a pre-test at the beginning of the year to establish a baseline. Using that baseline data, teachers, in collaboration with the principal, will set growth targets for students. HEDI points will be allocated to a teacher based on the percentage of students meeting or exceeding their individual growth targets. The district has set a goal that 80% of students, will meet or exceed their growth targets. |
| Highly Effective (18 - 20 points) Results are well-above District goals for similar students.   | Student performance results are outstanding and 85-100% of students met or exceeded their individual growth target.<br>20= 95-100%<br>19= 90-94%<br>18= 89-85%  |
| Effective (9 - 17 points) Results meet District goals for similar students.   | Student performance results are on par with district expectations and 70-84% of students met or exceeded their individual growth target.<br>17= 84%<br>16= 83%<br>15= 82%<br>14=81%<br>13=77-80%<br>12= 74-76%<br>11= 73%<br>10= 72%<br>9= 70-71%   |
| Developing (3 - 8 points) Results are below District goals for similar students.  | Student performance results are below district expectations and 60-69% of students met or exceeded their individual growth target.<br>8= 67-69%<br>7=65-66%<br>6= 63-64%<br>5= 62%<br>4= 61%<br>3= 60%  |
| Ineffective (0 - 2 points) Results are well-below District goals for similar students.  | Student performance results are far-below district goals and 0-59% of students met or exceeded their individual growth target.  |

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

*(No response)*

## 2.11) HEDI Tables or Graphics

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

*assets/survey-uploads/5364/172914-TXEttx9bQW/SLO -HEDI Rating Conversion Chart.docx*

## 2.12) Locally Developed Controls

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

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

*(No response)*

## 2.13) Teachers with more than one growth measure

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

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

## 2.14) Assurances

Please check all of the boxes below:

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

### 3. Local Measures (Teachers)

Created Wednesday, June 06, 2012

Updated Monday, December 10, 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 | 5) District, regional, or BOCES–developed assessments   | Lyme CSD developed Grade 4 writing assessment |
| 5 | 5) District, regional, or BOCES–developed assessments   | Lyme CSD developed Grade 5 writing assessment |

|   |   |   |
|---|---|---|
| 6 | 5) District, regional, or BOCES–developed assessments | Lyme CSD developed Grade 6 writing assessment |
| 7 | 5) District, regional, or BOCES–developed assessments | Lyme CSD developed Grade 7 writing assessment |
| 8 | 5) District, regional, or BOCES–developed assessments | Lyme CSD developed Grade 8 writing assessment |

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

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

|  |   |
|--|---|
| Use this box, if needed, to describe the general process for assigning HEDI categories for these grades/subjects in this subcomponent. If needed, you may upload a table or graphic at 3.3, below. | District wide goal to improve student writing performance as measured by our district developed writing rubric. Every teacher will strive to have 50% or more of all student work samples, collected in the second semester, receive a composite rating of 3 or 4 when measured by the LCS writing rubric. A composite score will be generated by averaging the ratings earned for each of the 5 rubric elements. The % of scoring 3 or 4 is then calculated by:<br>#of students scoring a "3" + # of students scoring a "4" divided by the total # of student in the class or group. The % is converted to point using the "Local Achievement Conversion Chart". |
| Highly Effective (14 - 15 points) Results are well above District- or BOCES-adopted expectations for growth or achievement for grade/subject.  | 50-100% of students surpassed the district writing goal.  |
| Effective (8- 13 points) Results meet District- or BOCES-adopted expectations for growth or achievement for grade/subject.   | 25-49% of students met the district writing goal.   |
| Developing (3 - 7 points) Results are below District- or BOCES-adopted expectations for growth or achievement for grade/subject.   | 11-24% of students met district writing goal.   |
| Ineffective (0 - 2 points) Results are well below District- or BOCES-adopted expectations for growth or achievement for grade/subject.   | 0-10% of students met district writing goal.  |

### 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 | 5) District, regional, or BOCES–developed assessments   | Lyme CSD developed Grade 4 writing assessment |
| 5 | 5) District, regional, or BOCES–developed assessments   | Lyme CSD developed Grade 5 writing assessment |

|   |   |   |
|---|---|---|
| 6 | 5) District, regional, or BOCES–developed assessments | Lyme CSD developed Grade 6 writing assessment |
| 7 | 5) District, regional, or BOCES–developed assessments | Lyme CSD developed Grade 7 writing assessment |
| 8 | 5) District, regional, or BOCES–developed assessments | Lyme CSD developed Grade 8 writing 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. | District wide goal to improve student writing performance as measured by our district developed writing rubric. Every teacher will strive to have 50% or more of all student work samples, collected in the second semester, receive a composite rating of 3 or 4 when measured by the LCS writing rubric. A composite score will be generated by averaging the ratings earned for each of the 5 rubric elements. The % of scoring 3 or 4 is then calculated by:<br>#of students scoring a "3" + # of students scoring a "4" divided by the total # of student in the class or group. The % is converted to point using the "Local Achievement Conversion Chart". |
| Highly Effective (14 - 15 points) Results are well above District- or BOCES-adopted expectations for growth or achievement for grade/subject.  | 50-100% of students surpassed the district writing goal.  |
| Effective (8- 13 points) Results meet District- or BOCES-adopted expectations for growth or achievement for grade/subject.   | 25-49% of students met the district writing goal.   |
| Developing (3 - 7 points) Results are below District- or BOCES-adopted expectations for growth or achievement for grade/subject.   | 11-24% of students met district writing goal.   |
| Ineffective (0 - 2 points) Results are well below District- or BOCES-adopted expectations for growth or achievement for grade/subject.   | 0-10% of students met district writing goal.  |

### 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/5139/139513-rhJdBgDruP/APPR-local 20 pts, Appendix G,H,I.pdf*

## 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 | 5) District, regional, or BOCES–developed assessments   | Lyme CSD developed Grade K writing assessment |
| 1 | 5) District, regional, or BOCES–developed assessments   | Lyme CSD developed Grade 1 writing assessment |
| 2 | 5) District, regional, or BOCES–developed assessments   | Lyme CSD developed Grade 2 writing assessment |
| 3 | 5) District, regional, or BOCES–developed assessments   | Lyme CSD developed Grade 3 writing 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. | District wide goal to improve student writing performance as measured by our district developed writing rubric. Every teacher will strive to have 50% or more of all student work samples, collected in the second semester, receive a composite rating of 3 or 4 when measured by the LCS writing rubric. A composite score will be generated by averaging the ratings earned for each of the 5 rubric elements. The % of scoring 3 or 4 is then calculated by:<br>#of students scoring a "3" + # of students scoring a "4" divided by the total # of student in the class or group. The % is converted to point using the "Local Achievement Conversion Chart". |
| Highly Effective (18-20 points) Results are well above District- or BOCES-adopted expectations for growth or achievement for grade/subject.   | 50-100% of students surpassed the district writing goal.  |
| Effective (9-17 points) Results meet District- or BOCES-adopted expectations for growth or achievement for grade/subject.   | 25-49% of students met the district writing goal.   |
| Developing (3 - 8 points) Results are below District- or BOCES-adopted expectations for growth or achievement for grade/subject.  | 11-24% of students met district writing goal.   |
| Ineffective (0 - 2 points) Results are well below District- or BOCES-adopted expectations for growth or achievement for grade/subject.  | 0-10% of students met district writing goal.  |

### 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 | 5) District, regional, or BOCES–developed assessments   | Lyme CSD developed Grade K writing assessment |
| 1 | 5) District, regional, or BOCES–developed assessments   | Lyme CSD developed Grade 1 writing assessment |
| 2 | 5) District, regional, or BOCES–developed assessments   | Lyme CSD developed Grade 2 writing assessment |
| 3 | 5) District, regional, or BOCES–developed assessments   | Lyme CSD developed Grade 3 writing assessment |

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

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

|   |   |
|---|---|
| Use this box, if needed, to describe the general process for assigning HEDI categories for these grades/subjects in this subcomponent. If needed, you may upload a table or graphic at 3.13, below. | District wide goal to improve student writing performance as measured by our district developed writing rubric. Every teacher will strive to have 50% or more of all student work samples, collected in the second semester, receive a composite rating of 3 or 4 when measured by the LCS writing rubric. A composite score will be generated by averaging the ratings earned for each of the 5 rubric elements. The % of scoring 3 or 4 is then calculated by:<br>#of students scoring a "3" + # of students scoring a "4" divided by the total # of student in the class or group. The % is converted to point using the "Local Achievement Conversion Chart". |
| Highly Effective (18-20 points) Results are well above District- or BOCES-adopted expectations for growth or achievement for grade/subject.   | 50-100% of students surpassed the district writing goal.  |
| Effective (9-17 points) Results meet District- or BOCES-adopted expectations for growth or achievement for grade/subject.   | 25-49% of students met the district writing goal.   |
| Developing (3 - 8 points) Results are below District -or BOCES-adopted expectations for growth or achievement for grade/subject.  | 11-24% of students met district writing goal.   |
| Ineffective (0 - 2 points) Results are well below District- or BOCES-adopted expectations for growth or achievement for grade/subject.  | 0-10% of students met district writing goal.  |

### 3.6) Grades 6-8 Science

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

|   | Locally-Selected Measure from List of Approved Measures | Assessment                                    |
|---|---|---|
| 6 | 5) District, regional, or BOCES–developed assessments   | Lyme CSD developed Grade 6 writing assessment |
| 7 | 5) District, regional, or BOCES–developed assessments   | Lyme CSD developed Grade 7 writing assessment |
| 8 | 5) District, regional, or BOCES–developed assessments   | Lyme CSD developed Grade 8 writing assessment |

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

|   |   |
|---|---|
| Use this box, if needed, to describe the general process for assigning HEDI categories for these grades/subjects in this subcomponent. If needed, you may upload a table or graphic at 3.13, below. | District wide goal to improve student writing performance as measured by our district developed writing rubric. Every teacher will strive to have 50% or more of all student work samples, collected in the second semester, receive a composite rating of 3 or 4 when measured by the LCS writing rubric. A composite score will be generated by averaging the ratings earned for each of the 5 rubric elements. The % of scoring 3 or 4 is then calculated by:<br>#of students scoring a "3" + # of students scoring a "4" divided by the total # of student in the class or group. The % is converted to point using the "Local Achievement Conversion Chart". |
| Highly Effective (18 - 20 points) Results are well above District- or BOCES-adopted expectations for growth or achievement for grade/subject.   | 50-100% of students surpassed the district writing goal.  |
| Effective (9 - 17 points) Results meet District- or BOCES-adopted expectations for growth or achievement for grade/subject.   | 25-49% of students met the district writing goal.   |
| Developing (3 - 8 points) Results are below District- or BOCES-adopted expectations for growth or achievement for grade/subject.  | 11-24% of students met district writing goal.   |
| Ineffective (0 - 2 points) Results are well below District- or BOCES-adopted expectations for growth or achievement for grade/subject.  | 0-10% of students met district writing goal.  |

### 3.7) Grades 6-8 Social Studies

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

|   | Locally-Selected Measure from List of Approved Measures | Assessment                                    |
|---|---|---|
| 6 | 5) District, regional, or BOCES–developed assessments   | Lyme CSD developed Grade 6 writing assessment |
| 7 | 5) District, regional, or BOCES–developed assessments   | Lyme CSD developed Grade 7 writing assessment |
| 8 | 5) District, regional, or BOCES–developed assessments   | Lyme CSD developed Grade 8 writing 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. | District wide goal to improve student writing performance as measured by our district developed writing rubric. Every teacher will strive to have 50% or more of all student work samples, collected in the second semester, receive a composite rating of 3 or 4 when measured by the LCS writing rubric. A composite score will be generated by averaging the ratings earned for each of the 5 rubric elements. The % of scoring 3 or 4 is then calculated by:<br>#of students scoring a "3" + # of students scoring a "4" divided by the total # of student in the class or group. The % is converted to point using the "Local Achievement Conversion Chart". |
| Highly Effective (18 - 20 points) Results are well above District- or BOCES-adopted expectations for growth or achievement for grade/subject.   | 50-100% of students surpassed the district writing goal.  |
| Effective (9 - 17 points) Results meet District- or BOCES-adopted expectations for growth or achievement for grade/subject.   | 25-49% of students met the district writing goal.   |
| Developing (3 - 8 points) Results are below District- or BOCES-adopted expectations for growth or achievement for grade/subject.  | 11-24% of students met district writing goal.   |
| Ineffective (0 - 2 points) Results are well below District- or BOCES-adopted expectations for growth or achievement for grade/subject.  | 0-10% of students met district writing goal.  |

### 3.8) High School Social Studies

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

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

|                  | Locally-Selected Measure from List of Approved Measures | Assessment   |
|------------------|---|--|
| Global 1         | 5) District, regional, or BOCES–developed assessments   | Lyme CSD developed Global 1 writing assessment         |
| Global 2         | 5) District, regional, or BOCES–developed assessments   | Lyme CSD developed Global 2 writing assessment         |
| American History | 5) District, regional, or BOCES–developed assessments   | Lyme CSD developed American History writing assessment |

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

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

|  |  |
|--|--|
| <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>District wide goal to improve student writing performance as measured by our district developed writing rubric. Every teacher will strive to have 50% or more of all student work samples, collected in the second semester, receive a composite rating of 3 or 4 when measured by the LCS writing rubric. A composite score will be generated by averaging the ratings earned for each of the 5 rubric elements. The % of scoring 3 or 4 is then calculated by:<br/> <math display="block">\frac{\text{\# of students scoring a "3"} + \text{\# of students scoring a "4"}}{\text{total \# of student in the class or group}}</math> The % is converted to point using the "Local Achievement Conversion Chart".</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>50-100% of students surpassed the district writing goal.</p>  |
| <p>Effective (9 - 17 points) Results meet District- or BOCES-adopted expectations for growth or achievement for grade/subject.</p>   | <p>25-49% of students met the district writing goal.</p>   |
| <p>Developing (3 - 8 points) Results are below District- or BOCES-adopted expectations for growth or achievement for grade/subject.</p>  | <p>11-24% of students met district writing goal.</p>   |
| <p>Ineffective (0 - 2 points) Results are well below District- or BOCES-adopted expectations for growth or achievement for grade/subject.</p>  | <p>0-10% of students met district writing goal.</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 | 5) District, regional, or BOCES–developed assessments   | Lyme CSD developed Living Environment writing assessment |
| Earth Science      | 5) District, regional, or BOCES–developed assessments   | Lyme CSD developed Earth Science writing assessment      |
| Chemistry          | 5) District, regional, or BOCES–developed assessments   | Lyme CSD developed Chemistry writing assessment          |
| Physics            | 5) District, regional, or BOCES–developed assessments   | Lyme CSD developed Physics writing assessment            |

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

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

|   |   |
|---|---|
| Use this box, if needed, to describe the general process for assigning HEDI categories for these grades/subjects in this subcomponent. If needed, you may upload a table or graphic at 3.13, below. | District wide goal to improve student writing performance as measured by our district developed writing rubric. Every teacher will strive to have 50% or more of all student work samples, collected in the second semester, receive a composite rating of 3 or 4 when measured by the LCS writing rubric. A composite score will be generated by averaging the ratings earned for each of the 5 rubric elements. The % of scoring 3 or 4 is then calculated by:<br>#of students scoring a "3" + # of students scoring a "4" divided by the total # of student in the class or group. The % is converted to point using the "Local Achievement Conversion Chart". |
| Highly Effective (18-20 points) Results are well above District- or BOCES-adopted expectations for growth or achievement for grade/subject.   | 50-100% of students surpassed the district writing goal.  |
| Developing (3 - 8 points) Results are below District- or BOCES-adopted expectations for growth or achievement for grade/subject.  | 25-49% of students met the district writing goal.   |
| Effective (9 - 17points) Results meet District- or BOCES-adopted expectations for growth or achievement for grade/subject.  | 11-24% of students met district writing goal.   |
| Ineffective (0 - 2 points) Results are well below District- or BOCES-adopted expectations for growth or achievement for grade/subject.  | 0-10% of students met district writing goal.  |

### 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 | 5) District, regional, or BOCES–developed assessments   | Lyme CSD developed Algebra 1 writing assessment |
| Geometry  | 5) District, regional, or BOCES–developed assessments   | Lyme CSD developed Geometry writing assessment  |
| Algebra 2 | 5) District, regional, or BOCES–developed assessments   | Lyme CSD developed Algebra 2 writing assessment |

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

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

|   |   |
|---|---|
| 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. | District wide goal to improve student writing performance as measured by our district developed writing rubric. Every teacher will strive to have 50% or more of all student work samples, collected in the second semester, receive a composite rating of 3 or 4 when measured by the LCS writing rubric. A composite score will be generated by averaging the ratings earned for each of the 5 rubric elements. The % of scoring 3 or 4 is then calculated by:<br>#of students scoring a "3" + # of students scoring a "4" divided by the total # of student in the class or group. The % is converted to point using the "Local Achievement Conversion Chart". |
| Highly Effective (18 - 20 points) Results are well above District- or BOCES-adopted expectations for growth or achievement for grade/subject.   | 50-100% of students surpassed the district writing goal.  |
| Effective (9 - 17 points) Results meet District- or BOCES-adopted expectations for growth or achievement for grade/subject.   | 25-49% of students met the district writing goal.   |
| Developing (3 - 8 points) Results are below District- or BOCES-adopted expectations for growth or achievement for grade/subject.  | 11-24% of students met district writing goal.   |
| Ineffective (0 - 2 points) Results are well below District- or BOCES-adopted expectations for growth or achievement for grade/subject.  | 0-10% of students met district writing goal.  |

### 3.11) High School English Language Arts

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

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

|              | Locally-Selected Measure from List of Approved Measures | Assessment                                     |
|--------------|---|--|
| Grade 9 ELA  | 5) District, regional, or BOCES–developed assessments   | Lyme CSD developed Grade 9 writing assessment  |
| Grade 10 ELA | 5) District, regional, or BOCES–developed assessments   | Lyme CSD developed Grade 10 writing assessment |
| Grade 11 ELA | 5) District, regional, or BOCES–developed assessments   | Lyme CSD developed Grade 11 writing 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.*

|  |  |
|--|--|
| <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>District wide goal to improve student writing performance as measured by our district developed writing rubric. Every teacher will strive to have 50% or more of all student work samples, collected in the second semester, receive a composite rating of 3 or 4 when measured by the LCS writing rubric. A composite score will be generated by averaging the ratings earned for each of the 5 rubric elements. The % of scoring 3 or 4 is then calculated by:<br/> <math display="block">\frac{\text{\# of students scoring a "3"} + \text{\# of students scoring a "4"}}{\text{total \# of student in the class or group}}</math> The % is converted to point using the "Local Achievement Conversion Chart".</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>50-100% of students surpassed the district writing goal.</p>  |
| <p>Effective (9 - 17 points) Results meet District- or BOCES-adopted expectations for growth or achievement for grade/subject.</p>   | <p>25-49% of students met the district writing goal.</p>   |
| <p>Developing (3 - 8 points) Results are below District- or BOCES-adopted expectations for growth or achievement for grade/subject.</p>  | <p>11-24% of students met district writing goal.</p>   |
| <p>Ineffective (0 - 2 points) Results are well below District- or BOCES-adopted expectations for growth or achievement for grade/subject.</p>  | <p>0-10% of students met district writing goal.</p>  |

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/5139/139513-y92vNseFa4/Local Achievement conversion chart \(HEDI\).pdf](#)

### 3.14) Locally Developed Controls

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

### 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.

*They will be combined proportionately.*

### 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 Thursday, September 06, 2012

Updated Tuesday, December 04, 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.)

*NYSUT Teacher Practice Rubric*

*(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] | 40 |
| 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   | 20 |

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.

#### *Other measures of Effectiveness (0-60 points)*

*Building Principal or other trained Administrators will conduct all observations of all tenured and probationary teachers. The evidence from each observation will be submitted in a data program. The collection of that data will be matched to the standards of the NYSUT Teacher Practice Rubric, 2012 Edition. For the summative, evaluation the building Principal will use the evidence collected all year long to determine a final score that each teacher will receive. The range of points a teacher can receive from this is 0-60 points. Standards 1,2,6,7 = 20 points Standards 3,4,5 = 40 pts.*

*Teachers receiving a composite score with a decimal of .5 or higher will be rounded up to the next higher whole number.*

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/5091/172958-eka9yMJ855/other measures.pdf*

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

|   |   |
|---|---|
| Highly Effective: Overall performance and results exceed NYS Teaching Standards.                      | To be highly effective, a teacher will have to earn between 59-60 points on the NYSUT Rubric, 2012 Edition. |
| Effective: Overall performance and results meet NYS Teaching Standards.                               | To be effective, a teacher will have to earn between 57-58 points on the NYSUT Rubric, 2012 Edition.        |
| Developing: Overall performance and results need improvement in order to meet NYS Teaching Standards. | To be developing a teacher will have to earn between 50-56 points on the NYSUT Rubric, 2012 Edition.        |
| Ineffective: Overall performance and results do not meet NYS Teaching Standards.                      | To be ineffective, a teacher will have to earn between 0-49 points on the NYSUT Rubric, 2012 Edition.       |

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    | 2 |
| 4.6) Observations of Probationary Teachers   Informal/Short | 2 |
| 4.6) Observations of Probationary Teachers   Enter Total    | 4 |

By trained in-school peer teachers or other trained reviewers

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

Independent evaluators

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

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

- 
- In Person
- 

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

- 
- In Person
- 

#### 4.7) Observations of Tenured Teachers

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

By building principals or other trained administrators

|  |   |
|--|---|
| 4.7) Observations of Tenured Teachers   Formal/Long    | 0 |
| 4.7) Observations of Tenured Teachers   Informal/Short | 4 |
| 4.7) Observations of Tenured Teachers   Total          | 4 |

By trained in-school peer teachers or other trained reviewers

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

Independent evaluators

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

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

- 
- Not Applicable
- 

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

- 
- In Person
-

# 5. Composite Scoring (Teachers)

Created Sunday, September 23, 2012

Updated Thursday, November 29, 2012

---

## Page 1

### **Standards for Rating Categories**

#### **Growth or Comparable Measures**

#### **Locally-selected Measures of**

#### **growth or achievement**

#### **Other Measures of Effectiveness**

#### **(Teacher and Leader standards)**

#### **Highly**

#### **Effective**

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

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

Overall performance and results exceed NYS Teaching Standards.

#### **Effective**

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

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

Overall performance and results meet NYS Teaching Standards.

#### **Developing**

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

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

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

#### **Ineffective**

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

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

Overall performance and results do not meet NYS Teaching Standards.

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

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

**2012-13 where there is no Value-Added measure**

**Growth or Comparable Measures**

**Locally-selected Measures of**

**growth or achievement**

**Other Measures of Effectiveness**

**(60 points)**

**Overall**

**Composite Score**

**Highly Effective**

**18-20**

**18-20**

**Ranges determined locally--see below**

**91-100**

**Effective**

**9-17**

**9-17**

**75-90**

**Developing**

**3-8**

**3-8**

**65-74**

**Ineffective**

**0-2**

**0-2**

**0-64**

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

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

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

**2012-13 where Value-Added growth measure applies**

**Growth or Comparable Measures**

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

**Other Measures of Effectiveness**

**(60 points)**

**Overall**

**Composite Score**

**Highly Effective**

**22-25**

**14-15**

**Ranges determined locally--see above**

**91-100**

**Effective**

**10-21**

**8-13**

**75-90**

**Developing**

**3-9**

**3-7**

**65-74**

**Ineffective**

**0-2**

**0-2**

**0-64**

# 6. Additional Requirements - Teachers

Created Sunday, September 23, 2012  
Updated Tuesday, November 27, 2012

---

## Page 1

### 6.1) Assurances -- Improvement Plans

Please check the boxes below:

|   |         |
|---|---------|
| 6.1) Assurances -- Improvement Plans<br>  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<br>  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/5265/180855-Df0w3Xx5v6/TIP Forms.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:*

*Appeals of annual professional performance reviews shall be limited to those that rate a teacher as ineffective or developing. The scope of appeals under Education Law 3012-c shall be limited to the following subjects:*

- 1. The school district's adherence to the standards and methodologies required for such reviews, pursuant to Education Law 3012-c;*
- 2. The adherence to the Commissioner's Regulations, as applicable to such review;*

3. Compliance with any applicable locally negotiated procedures pertaining to annual professional performance reviews or improvement plans; and
4. The school district's issuance and/or implementation of the terms of the teacher improvement plan under Education Law 3012-c. ([www.capregbooces.org/LeaderToLeaderLinks/2010-2011/PDF/EdLaw3012.pdf](http://www.capregbooces.org/LeaderToLeaderLinks/2010-2011/PDF/EdLaw3012.pdf)).

*Prohibition against more than one appeal: A teacher may not file multiple appeals regarding the same performance review or improvement plan. 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 a waiver of the right to appeal and the appeal shall be deemed abandoned.*

*Under this appeals process the teacher bears the burden of providing by substantial evidence the merits of his or her appeal.*

*Timeframe for filing an appeal: All appeals must be submitted to the evaluator in writing no later than 10 school days of the date when the teacher or principal receives his/her annual performance review. The failure to file an appeal within this timeframe shall be deemed a waiver of the right to appeal and the appeal shall be deemed abandoned.*

*Appeals process: When filing an appeal, the teacher must submit a detailed written description of the specific areas of disagreement over his or her performance review. Within five school days from receipt of the filing, the Evaluator will respond in writing to the Appellant. If the Appellant is dissatisfied with the Evaluator's response he/she may appeal to the Superintendent or his/her designee. The Appellant has three school days to submit the appeal and Evaluator's response, the performance review being challenged, and any additional documents or materials relevant to the appeal. Any information not submitted at the time the appeal is filed, shall not be considered. After receiving a teacher appeal, the Superintendent or his/her designee will convene an Appeals Committee comprised of an administrator and an association member who have been trained and calibrated in the NYSUT Rubric, 2012 edition. The Appeals Committee must present a decision to the Appellant, Evaluator and Superintendent, within 5 school days of receipt of the appeal. If the Appellant is dissatisfied with the decision rendered by the Appeal Committee, he/she has three school days to notify the Superintendent or his/her designee by providing all the documentation previously submitted to the Appeals Committee. The Superintendent will review and make a final determination on the appeal and notify the Appellant of his/her decision within three school days. If still dissatisfied the Appellant may submit a written response to this evaluation within ten school days of the Superintendent's or his/her designee's decision. This letter will be placed in the Appellant's personnel file along with the final annual evaluation.*

*The district assures that the appeals process will be timely and expeditious and in compliance with education laws 3012-c*

## 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.

*Any Evaluator who participate in the evaluation of teachers for the purpose of determining an APPR rating shall be fully trained and/or certified as required by Education Law 3012-c and the implementing Regulations of the Commissioner of education prior to conducting a teacher evaluation.*

*All professional staff subject to the district's APPR Plan will be provided with an orientation and/or training on the evaluation system that will include: a review of the content and use of the evaluation system, the NYS Teaching Standards, the NYSUT Teacher evaluation Rubric, 2012 edition, forms and the procedures to be followed consistent with the approved APPR plan.*

*To ensure inter-rater reliability lead Evaluators will continue annual training at the District BOCES as required by NYSED. Training includes:*

*All Evaluators of teachers will receive ongoing training through the Jefferson-Lewis BOCES. They will meet the standards set forth in all training sessions provided by the JL BOCES. Each year the District's Board of education will pass a resolution that certifies each Lead Evaluator of classroom teachers who have met all training requirements as set forth above.*

## 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 | Checked |
|---|---------|

|  |         |
|--|---------|
| 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.  |         |
| 6.6) Assurances -- Teachers   Assure that the APPR will be put on the district website by September 10 or within 10 days after approval, whichever is later.                                   | Checked |
| 6.6) Assurances -- Teachers   Assure that the evaluation system will be used as a significant factor for employment decisions.   | Checked |
| 6.6) Assurances -- Teachers   Assure that teachers will receive timely and constructive feedback as part of the evaluation process.  | Checked |
| 6.6) Assurances -- Teachers   Assure the district has appeal procedures that are consistent with the regulations and that they provide for the timely and expeditious resolution of an appeal. | Checked |

## 6.7) Assurances -- Data

Please check all of the boxes below:

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

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

Created Sunday, September 23, 2012

Updated Tuesday, October 30, 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):

|               |
|---------------|
| K-12          |
| (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 |
|------------------------|----------------------------|------------------------|
|                        |                            |                        |
|                        |                            |                        |
|                        |                            |                        |

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

|  |   |
|--|---|
| Use this box, if needed, to describe the process for assigning HEDI categories in this subcomponent. If needed, you may upload a table or graphic below. | The K-12 Principal will receive a state growth score. |
| Highly Effective (18 - 20 points) Results are well above state average for similar students (or District goals if no state test).                        | Results are well above the district's expectations    |
| Effective (9 - 17 points) Results meet state average for similar students (or District goals if no state test).  | Results meet the district's expectations.             |
| Developing (3 - 8 points) Results are below state average for similar students (or District goals if no state test).                                     | Results are below the district's expectations.        |
| Ineffective (0 - 2 points) Results are well below state average for similar students (or District goals if no state test).                               | Results are well-below the district's expectations.   |

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/5365/180917-lha0DogRNw/STATE CHART, Principals.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.

N/A

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

# 8. Local Measures (Principals)

Created Sunday, September 23, 2012  
Updated Monday, December 10, 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   |
|---------------------|---|--|
| K-12                | (d) measures used by district for teacher evaluation    | Lyme CSD developed Grades K-12 writing assessments |
|                     |   |  |
|                     |   |  |
|                     |   |  |
|                     |   |  |
|                     |   |  |

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.           | District wide goal to improve student writing performance as measured by our district developed writing rubric. The The total number of students who attained a 3 or 4 on the writing rubric will be divided by the total number of students. This percentage will then be converted to points earned using the local achievement conversion chart. |
| Highly Effective (14 - 15 points) Results are well above District- or BOCES-adopted expectations for growth or achievement for grade/subject. | 50-100% of students will meet the District expectation.   |
| Effective (8- 13 points) Results meet District- or BOCES-adopted expectations for growth or achievement for grade/subject.                    | 25-49% of the student population will meet the District expectation.  |
| Developing (3 - 7 points) Results are below District- or BOCES-adopted expectations for growth or achievement for grade/subject.              | 11-24% of the student population will meet the District expectation.  |
| Ineffective (0 - 2 points) Results are well below District- or BOCES-adopted expectations for growth or achievement for grade/subject.        | 0-10% of the student population will meet the District expectation.   |

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

[assets/survey-uploads/5366/180922-8o9AH60arN/Local Achievement chart, Principals, 20 pts, 15 pts.pdf](#)

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

(No response)

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

| Grade Configuration | Locally-Selected Measure from List of Approved Measures | Assessment |
|---------------------|---|------------|
| Not Applicable      |   |            |
|                     |   |            |
|                     |   |            |
|                     |   |            |
|                     |   |            |
|                     |   |            |

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

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

*(No response)*

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

*(No response)*

### 8.3) Locally Developed Controls

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

NA

#### 8.4) Principals with More Than One Locally Selected Measure

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

(No response)

#### 8.5) Assurances

Please check all of the boxes below:

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

# 9. Other Measures of Effectiveness (Principals)

Created Monday, September 24, 2012

Updated Tuesday, December 04, 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)

*assets/survey-uploads/5143/180925-qacV8kgLux/locally negotiated Principals 60 pts.pdf*

### 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.

*Broad assessment of principal leadership and management actions will be based the selected rubric. There are six domains in the Multidimensional Principal Performance Rubric. Data will be collected for each domain all year long and at the end of the year it will be scored. The data includes building visits, visits to faculty meetings, and communication by the principal, presentations done by the principal, written observations, parent communication, etc. The principal will receive a rating of 0-4 for each domain.*

*For each domain there are ineffective, developing, effective and highly effective score:*

*Ineffective- 0-1*

*Developing- 2*

*Effective- 3*

*Highly Effective- 4*

*These 6 scores are then averaged and an overall average score (HEDI rating) is established. This rating is then converted using the "Other Measures of Effectiveness" conversion chart.*

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/5143/180925-pMADJ4gk6R/APPR-Process- Principals-HEDI.pdf>

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

|   |  |
|---|--|
| Highly Effective: Overall performance and results exceed standards. | Each year, principals will be rated based on the six domains contained in the selected rubric covering the ISLLC Standards. The ratings for each domain will be averaged and used as the overall measure of effectiveness. An average HEDI score of 3.5-4.0 would result in an overall rating of highly effective. |
| Effective: Overall performance and results meet standards.          | Each year, principals will be rated based on the six domains contained in the selected rubric covering the ISLLC Standards. The ratings for each domain will be averaged and used as the overall measure of effectiveness. An average HEDI score of 2.5-3.4 would result in an overall rating of effective.        |

|  |  |
|--|--|
| Developing: Overall performance and results need improvement in order to meet standards. | Each year, principals will be rated based on the six domains contained in the selected rubric covering the ISLLC Standards. The ratings for each domain will be averaged and used as the overall measure of effectiveness. An average HEDI score of 1.5-2.4 would result in an overall rating of developing. |
| Ineffective: Overall performance and results do not meet standards.                      | Each year, principals will be rated based on the six domains contained in the selected rubric covering the ISLLC Standards. The ratings for each domain will be averaged and used as the overall measure of effectiveness. An average HEDI score of 0-1.4 would result in an overall rating of ineffective.  |

Please provide the locally-negotiated 60 point scoring bands.

|                  |       |
|------------------|-------|
| Highly Effective | 56-60 |
| Effective        | 41-55 |
| Developing       | 21-40 |
| Ineffective      | 0-20  |

## 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                    | 5 |
| By trained administrator         | 3 |
| By trained independent evaluator | 0 |
| Enter Total                      | 8 |

### **Tenured Principals**

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

# 10. Composite Scoring (Principals)

Created Monday, September 24, 2012

Updated Tuesday, December 04, 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 | 56-60 |
| Effective        | 41-55 |
| Developing       | 21-40 |
| Ineffective      | 0-20  |

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

**2012-13 where Value-Added growth measure applies**

**Growth or Comparable Measures**

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

**Other Measures of Effectiveness**

**(60 points)**

**Overall**

**Composite Score**

**Highly Effective**

22-25

14-15

Ranges determined locally--see above

91-100

**Effective**

10-21

8-13

75-90

**Developing**

3-9

3-7

**65-74**

**Ineffective**

**0-2**

**0-2**

**0-64**

# 11. Additional Requirements - Principals

Created Monday, September 24, 2012

Updated Monday, December 10, 2012

## Page 1

### 11.1) Assurances -- Improvement Plans

Please check the boxes below.

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

### 11.2) Attachment: Principal Improvement Plan Forms

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

[assets/survey-uploads/5276/180928-Df0w3Xx5v6/PIP Plan form.docx](#)

### 11.3) Appeals Process

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

(1) the substance of the annual professional performance review

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

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

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

#### *Appeals:*

*Appeals of annual professional performance reviews shall be limited to those that rate a Principal as ineffective or developing. The scope of appeals under Education Law 3012-c shall be limited to the following subjects:*

- 1. The school district's adherence to the standards and methodologies required for such reviews, pursuant to Education Law 3012-c;*
- 2. The adherence to the Commissioner's Regulations, as applicable to such review;*
- 3. Compliance with any applicable locally negotiated procedures pertaining to annual professional performance reviews or*

improvement plans; and

4. The school district's issuance and/or implementation of the terms of the teacher or principal improvement plan under Education Law 3012-c. ([www.capregboces.org/LeaderToLeaderLinks/2010-2011/PDF/EdLaw3012.pdf](http://www.capregboces.org/LeaderToLeaderLinks/2010-2011/PDF/EdLaw3012.pdf)).

*Prohibition against more than one appeal: A Principal may not file multiple appeals regarding the same performance review or improvement plan. 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 a waiver of the right to appeal and the appeal shall be deemed abandoned.*

*Under this appeals process the Principal bears the burden of providing by substantial evidence the merits of his or her appeal.*

*Timeframe for filing an appeal: All appeals must be submitted to the Evaluator in writing no later than 5 school days of the date when the Principal receives his/her annual performance review. The failure to file an appeal within this timeframe shall be deemed a waiver of the right to appeal and the appeal shall be deemed abandoned.*

*Appeals process: When filing an appeal, the Principal must submit a detailed written description of the specific areas of disagreement over his or her performance review. Within five school days from receipt of the filing, the Evaluator will respond in writing to the Appellant. If the Appellant is dissatisfied with the Evaluator's response he/she may appeal to the Superintendent or his/her designee to request that a Review Team be convened. The Appellant has three school days to submit: the appeal and Evaluator's response, the performance review being challenged, and any additional documents or materials relevant, to the BOCES District Superintendent. Any information not submitted at the time the appeal is filed, shall not be considered. The Review team will consist of 2 neutral administrators, selected through consultation with the BOCES District Superintendent. They can be appointed to a Review Team at the request of the Evaluator or Principal. The role of the Review Team will be to evaluate facts and evidence submitted by the Principal and report their findings to the BOCES District Superintendent. The DS will then make recommendation to the Evaluator (Superintendent). The Superintendent will have two days to provide their written final decision regarding the appeal to the Appellant.*

*If still dissatisfied the Appellant may submit a written response to this evaluation within five school days of the Superintendent's or his/her designee's decision. This letter will be placed in the Appellant's personnel file along with the final annual evaluation.*

*The district assures that the appeals process will be timely and expeditious in compliance with the education law 3012-c.*

## 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.

*Any Evaluator who participate in the evaluation of Principals for the purpose of determining an APPR rating shall be fully trained and/or certified as required by Education Law 3012-c and the implementing Regulations of the Commissioner of Education prior to conducting a Principal evaluation.*

*All professional staff subject to the district's APPR Plan will be provided with an orientation and/or training on the evaluation system that will include: a review of the content and use of the evaluation system, the ISLLC Standards, the Multidimensional Principal Performance rubric, forms and the procedures to be followed consistent with the approved APPR plan.*

*To ensure inter-rater reliability and will be recertified on an annual basis, all Evaluators will receive ongoing training as required by SED through the Jefferson-Lewis BOCES. They will meet the standards set forth in all training sessions provided by the JL BOCES.*

## 11.5) Assurances -- Evaluators

Please check the boxes below:

- 
- Checked
- 

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

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

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

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

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

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

(7) use of the Statewide Instructional Reporting System

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

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

---

• Checked

---

## 11.6) Assurances -- Principals

Please check all of the boxes below:

|  |         |
|--|---------|
| 11.6) Assurances -- Principals   Assure the entire APPR plan will be completed for each principal as soon as practicable, but in no case later than September 1 of the school year next following the school year for which the building principal's performance is being measured.  | Checked |
| 11.6) Assurances -- Principals   Assure that the district will provide the principal's score and rating on the locally selected measures subcomponent, if available, and on the other measures of principal effectiveness subcomponent for a principal's annual professional performance review, in writing, no later than the last school day of the school year for which the principal is being measured. | Checked |
| 11.6) Assurances -- Principals   Assure that the APPR will be put on the district website by September 10 or within 10 days after approval, whichever is later.  | Checked |

|   |         |
|---|---------|
| 11.6) Assurances -- Principals   Assure that the evaluation system will be used as a significant factor for employment decisions.   | Checked |
| 11.6) Assurances -- Principals   Assure that principals will receive timely and constructive feedback as part of the evaluation process.  | Checked |
| 11.6) Assurances -- Principals   Assure the district has appeal procedures that are consistent with the regulations and that they provide for the timely and expeditious resolution of an appeal. | Checked |

## 11.7) Assurances -- Data

Please check all of the boxes below:

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

## 12. Joint Certification of APPR Plan

Created Monday, September 24, 2012

Updated Monday, December 10, 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/5581/180932-3Uqgn5g9Iu/signature page, 12.10.12\\_1.pdf](assets/survey-uploads/5581/180932-3Uqgn5g9Iu/signature page, 12.10.12_1.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.

## Appendix F

### *Student Learning Objectives (SLO) HEDI Scoring*

*(When there is No State Assessment)*

The following HEDI band reflects the overall percentage of student growth within the Target of teacher's SLO. This band has been locally negotiated in compliance with the New York State Education Department.

| 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    |
| 100-95           | 94-90 | 89-85 | 84        | 83 | 82 | 81 | 80-77 | 76-74 | 73 | 72 | 71-70 | 69-67      | 66-65 | 64-63 | 62 | 61 | 60          | 59-45 | 44-21 | 20-0 |

## INFORMAL OBSERVATION NARRATIVE

Each tenured teacher will have 4 informal observations. Six elements have been chosen from standards 3, 4, 5. Each teacher will select an indicator from each of the six chosen elements. During each observation the administrator will assign a rating of 4, 3, 2, or 1 for each indicator observed. The scores will be recorded on the "Informal observation Feedback" form each time. At the end of the fourth observation the scores from each observed indicator will be recorded on the "Informal Observation Feedback" Summary Form. The lowest score from each observed indicator will be eliminated on the summary form. Each observation will be sub-totaled, and this score will be divided by the number of observed indicators, to arrive at the composite score for each observation. The four observation composite scores will be added together to get a subtotal which is then divided by four (the number of observations) to arrive at the teacher's annual observation score (or 40%). The teacher's annual observation score will be rounded to the nearest tenth, with .05 or above will be rounded up. Finally, the annual observation score will be noted on the APPR Rubric Conversion Chart (APPR Other 60 points).



**APPR RUBRIC CONVERSION CHART**  
**APPR Other 60 points**

|                          | Score | Weighting           | Total |
|--------------------------|-------|---------------------|-------|
| Annual Observation Score |       | X 2                 |       |
| Annual PLP Score         |       | X 1                 |       |
|                          |       | Total Score         |       |
|                          |       | Divided by 3        |       |
|                          |       | <b>FINAL SCORE:</b> |       |

**Conversion Chart A**

NYSUT Rubric Score (Other 60 Points) Conversion Based on Rubric Rating 1-4 Composite Conversion

|                         |      |
|-------------------------|------|
| <b>Ineffective</b>      |      |
| 1                       | 0    |
| 1.1                     | 12   |
| 1.2                     | 25   |
| 1.3                     | 37   |
| 1.4                     | 49   |
| 1.5                     | 50   |
| 1.6                     | 50.7 |
| 1.7                     | 51.4 |
| <b>Developing</b>       |      |
| 1.8                     | 52.1 |
| 1.9                     | 52.8 |
| 2.0                     | 53.5 |
| 2.1                     | 54.2 |
| 2.2                     | 54.9 |
| 2.3                     | 55   |
| 2.4                     | 56.3 |
| <b>Effective</b>        |      |
| 2.5                     | 57   |
| 2.6                     | 57.2 |
| 2.7                     | 57.4 |
| 2.8                     | 57.6 |
| 2.9                     | 57.8 |
| 3.0                     | 58.0 |
| 3.1                     | 58.2 |
| 3.2                     | 58.4 |
| 3.3                     | 58.6 |
| 3.4                     | 58.8 |
| <b>Highly Effective</b> |      |
| 3.5                     | 59.0 |
| 3.6                     | 59.3 |
| 3.7                     | 59.5 |
| 3.8                     | 59.8 |
| 3.9                     | 60.0 |
| 4                       | 60.0 |

# Appendix E

## *Professional Learning Plan Guidance*

Each teacher will develop and submit a Professional Learning Plan (PLP) to his/her building principal by no later October 31<sup>st</sup>. The PLP will be discussed/approved at the APPR Fall Conference.

Through a PLP, teachers have the opportunity to identify ways to enhance their instructional practice and student achievement, as well as, tie their professional goals to the attainment of school and district goals. Goals may focus on building professional skills in very specific ways or on exploring new avenues for enhancing student learning. A PLP may identify work that a teacher intends to pursue as an individual or efforts that require the contributions of partners or the participation of team members. PLPs will be discussed during all APPR meetings (beginning, mid and end of year) and other opportunities for professional dialogue throughout the school year so that evidence of professional learning and teacher effectiveness can be gathered for the APPR Summative Evaluation. Developing a successful PLP relies on three steps:

### **Step 1: Goals-Setting/Rationale**

- Before writing a PLP, review your summative evaluation report from the previous year. If applicable, areas in need of improvement should be directly reflected in your PLP goal(s).
- Set a SMART goal(s) (Specific, Measurable, Attainable, Realistic, Timely) for your own professional learning/growth. (This is not a student achievement goal.)
- Use these questions to guide the development of your goal:
  - In addition to the results of my evaluation, what data is available to inform my goal?
  - Based on data, what do I know about my students' needs?
  - What skills, knowledge, or ability do I want to gain?
  - How can I improve or strengthen my practice?
  - What impact on student learning should drive my goal-setting?
  - How do the schools' goals and improvement plan impact my goals?
  - How will I know I have accomplished my goals?
- Identify at least one indicator from each of the following Elements: I.4, II.5 or II.6, VI.3 and one indicator from any element from standard VII. You need to have one indicator from each of the NYS Teaching Standard areas I, II, VI and VII which will be addressed in your PLP.
- In the Rationale section, briefly describe how your PLP goal aligns with State and/or district priorities and how achieving your goal will positively impact student learning.

### **Step 2: Action Plan**

- Your Action Plan outlines the activities, steps, timeline, and resources that will lead to the achievement of your PLP goal. Your plan may include a wide array of professional development activities, collaborative work, study groups, professional projects, data analysis, curriculum/assessment development, collegial mentoring, etc. Identify resources and supports you will need to accomplish your action plan.

### **Step 3: Progress Review**

- PLP progress should be reviewed, at a minimum, through a mid-year reflection, at the Mid-Year Conference (as required/requested) and at the Spring Conference. Additionally, multiple, informal dialogues throughout the year will support relationship building between and among teachers and administrators, and provide opportunities for sharing and collecting evidence of professional growth and effective teaching for the summative evaluation.

## Evaluation & Scoring

### Evaluation Rubric

Each teacher will select a customized Evaluation Rubric, collaboratively agreed to between the District and the Association, for their own PLP using the appropriate elements and indicators from the NYSUT Teacher Practice Rubric.

### Common Indicators:

The following 2 elements will be included in every Evaluation Rubric as they apply to all PLPs:

- (I.4.a) Communicates with parents, guardians, and/or caregivers.
- (VI.3.a) Communicates student performance to families.

### Customized Indicators:

Each teacher will cut and paste the specific indicators from the Teacher Practice Rubric that apply to his/her specific PLP into their own Evaluation Rubric. At least one indicator each from Standards II.5 or II.6 and one indicator from the elements in Standard VII must be selected.

## **End of the Year Structured Review Process**

At the APPR Spring Conference, the teacher and administrator will conduct a Structured Review of the teacher's PLP. The Spring Conference may be held any point during the second semester at a time mutually agreed upon by the teacher and administrator.

- The teacher should prepare for the Structured Review by:
  - Compiling artifacts and other clear evidence of his/her professional growth/learning *and* its impact on his/her own teaching practice as well as student learning, and
  - Completing his/her own PLP Evaluation Rubric as part of a pre-Structured Review evaluation to present to their administrator.
- The teacher and administrator will collaboratively agree on a final score on the PLP Evaluation Rubric for the pre-Structured Review evaluation.
- The teacher and administrator will examine and discuss all evidence presented during the Structured Review as it relates to the teacher's identified goals and performance indicators.
- The teacher will share his/her self-evaluation and the rationale behind the chosen rating.
- Following the Spring Conference, the administrator will then complete a Structured Review Evaluation using the same PLP Evaluation Rubric, taking into consideration all evidence discussed during the Structured Review as well as any other pertinent evidence gathered throughout the school year.
- The final total component score for the PLP Evaluation Rubric (20 pts) shall be based upon 33% of the total score for the Structured Review Evaluation using the PLP Evaluation Rubric. This weighted score will then be converted to points using the APPR Other 60 Points Conversion Chart A.
- The overall PLP Evaluation Rubric final component score shall be provided to the teacher within 5 school days of the Structured Review.
- If a PLP involved a group project, the group may request that the Structured Review be conducted with the entire team – if all members desire to do so. However, rubric scoring will address only the standards that teachers shared within the project. All other elements will be addressed individually.

## Professional Learning Plan

Teacher \_\_\_\_\_

Fall Conference Date \_\_\_\_\_

Administrator \_\_\_\_\_

Mid-Year Conference \_\_\_\_\_

Assignment/Grade level \_\_\_\_\_

Spring Conference Date \_\_\_\_\_

School Year \_\_\_\_\_

Points for Share of  
"Other Measures" Score

(Attach PLP Evaluation Rubrics to this plan)

The Professional Learning Plan (PLP) should be developed and submitted by October 31st.

**Professional Learning Goal:** (Your goal should be specific, measurable, attainable, realistic and timely and should reflect your own professional growth/learning. All goals should be designed to ultimately have a positive impact on student achievement.)

### Elements and Performance Indicators addressed in this PLP

**Common for all:**

I.4.a

VI.3.a

**Individual choice (choose one element from standard II.5 or II.6 and standard VII.1 or VII.2 or VII.3 or VII.4):**

**Rationale:** *(How will this goal positively impact your own professional practice and your students' achievement?)*

**Action Plan:** *(Activities, timeline and resources that will support your PLP.)*

[Empty box for Action Plan content]

Signatures indicate PLP was reviewed and approved at Fall Conference.

\_\_\_\_\_  
Teacher's Signature

\_\_\_\_\_  
Date

\_\_\_\_\_  
Administrator's Signature

\_\_\_\_\_  
Date

**Structured Review Evaluation**  
**PLP Evaluation Rubric**  
(Part of the 0-20 points of “60 points Other Measures”)

Teacher \_\_\_\_\_ School Year \_\_\_\_\_

|   | <b>Highly Effective</b><br>4 | <b>Effective</b><br>3 | <b>Developing</b><br>2 | <b>Ineffective</b><br>1 |
|---|------------------------------|-----------------------|------------------------|-------------------------|
| <b>(Standard I.4a)</b><br>Communication with parents, guardians, and/or caregivers. |                              |                       |                        |                         |
| <b>Standard II.5 or II.6</b> (cut and paste here)                                   |                              |                       |                        |                         |
| <b>(Standard VI.3.a)</b><br>Communicates student’s performance to families.         |                              |                       |                        |                         |
| <b>Standard VII.1 or .2 or .3 or .4</b> (cut and paste here)                        |                              |                       |                        |                         |

\*Total PLP Score

\_\_\_\_\_  
Administrator’s Signature

\_\_\_\_\_  
Date

## Appendix G

### *K-12 Writing Rubric*

| Quality  | 4  | 3   | 2   | 1   |
|--|--|---|---|---|
| <p><b>Meaning:</b><br/>The student understands, interprets, and analyzes the task.</p>   | Fulfills all requirements of the task.   | Fulfills most requirements of the task.   | Fulfills some requirements of the task.   | Fulfills very few requirements of the task.   |
| <p><b>Development:</b><br/>The extent to which the student supports ideas with specific evidence.</p>                                      | Develops ideas fully. Makes effective use of relevant and accurate examples.   | Develops ideas. Provides some relevant examples. May include minor inaccuracies.  | Partially develops ideas. Provides few relevant examples. May include inaccuracies. | Attempts to develop ideas, but does not answer the question. Lacks examples. Contains inaccuracies. |
| <p><b>Organization:</b><br/>The extent through which the response exhibits focus, structure, and coherence.</p>                            | Very organized. Writing is in order and stays on topic.  | Somewhat organized and on topic.  | Shows some attempt at organization.   | Shows little or no organization.  |
| <p><b>Language Use:</b><br/>The extent to which the response exhibits effective words choice, sentence structure, and sentence length.</p> | Uses above grade level vocabulary. Sentences are fluent and easy to read. Where expected, there is a variety of sentences. | Uses grade level vocabulary. Sentences are readable and constructed correctly. Where expected, there is some variety in sentence structure. | Uses grade level words and simple sentences. Sentences are mostly readable.         | Uses below grade level vocabulary. Sentences are written incorrectly and difficult to read.         |
| <p><b>Mechanics:</b><br/>The extent to which the writing exhibits use of capitalization, punctuation, spelling, and grammar.</p>           | Makes no mistakes.   | Makes 1-2 mistakes.   | Makes 3-4 mistakes.   | Makes 5 or more mistakes.   |



# Appendix I

## *Local Achievement Conversion Charts*

### *Without State Approved Value Added Growth Scores (20 pts) & With State Approved Value Added Growth Scores (15 pts)*

W/O Value Added Growth Scores

With Value Added Growth Scores

| % Scoring "3" or "4" | Points Earned | HEDI Ranges      | Score Ranges |
|----------------------|---------------|------------------|--------------|
| 84-100%              | 20            | Highly Effective | 18-20        |
| 66-83%               | 19            |                  |              |
| 50-65%               | 18            |                  |              |
| 47-49%               | 17            | Effective        | 9-17         |
| 44-46%               | 16            |                  |              |
| 41-43%               | 15            |                  |              |
| 38-40%               | 14            |                  |              |
| 35-37%               | 13            |                  |              |
| 32-34%               | 12            |                  |              |
| 29-31%               | 11            |                  |              |
| 27-28%               | 10            |                  |              |
| 25-26%               | 9             |                  |              |
| 22-24%               | 8             |                  |              |
| 19-21%               | 7             |                  |              |
| 17-18%               | 6             |                  |              |
| 15-16%               | 5             |                  |              |
| 13-14%               | 4             |                  |              |
| 11-12%               | 3             |                  |              |
| 7-10%                | 2             |                  |              |
| 4-6%                 | 1             | Ineffective      | 0-2          |
| 0-3%                 | 0             |                  |              |

| % Scoring "3" or "4" | Points Earned | HEDI Ranges      | Score Ranges |
|----------------------|---------------|------------------|--------------|
| 75-100%              | 15            | Highly Effective | 14-15        |
| 50-74%               | 14            |                  |              |
| 45-49%               | 13            | Effective        | 8-13         |
| 40-44%               | 12            |                  |              |
| 35-39%               | 11            |                  |              |
| 31-34%               | 10            |                  |              |
| 28-30%               | 9             |                  |              |
| 25-27%               | 8             |                  |              |
| 22-24%               | 7             | Developing       | 3-7          |
| 19-21%               | 6             |                  |              |
| 16-18%               | 5             |                  |              |
| 13-15%               | 4             |                  |              |
| 11-12%               | 3             |                  |              |
| 7-10%                | 2             | Ineffective      | 0-2          |
| 4-6%                 | 1             |                  |              |
| 0-3%                 | 0             |                  |              |

NOTE: Purple highlighted boxes indicate NYS mandated scoring ranges

*STEPS to determine your total points earned for the Local 20 points portion of your summative evaluation:*

1. Use the formula below to determine the percentage of your student sample that scored a 3 or 4 on the LCS Writing Rubric (see Appendix G)

**FORMULA:** 
$$\frac{\text{total \# of students scoring "3"} + \text{total \# of students scoring "4"}}{\text{Total \# of students in your class, group, sample}}$$

2. Using the % determined in step 1, find the band in which you fall on the chart above.
3. Include your completed "Student Writing Sample Performance Results" Appendix H, in the Summative Evaluation documents submitted to the Lead Evaluator for review.
4. Note your total points earned for the "Local 20" on the Summative Evaluation Form (See Appendix B).

# Appendix I

## Local Achievement Conversion Charts

### Without State Approved Value Added Growth Scores (20 pts) & With State Approved Value Added Growth Scores (15 pts)

W/O Value Added Growth Scores

With Value Added Growth Scores

| % Scoring "3" or "4" | Points Earned | HEDI Ranges      | Score Ranges |
|----------------------|---------------|------------------|--------------|
| 84-100%              | 20            | Highly Effective | 18-20        |
| 66-83%               | 19            |                  |              |
| 50-65%               | 18            |                  |              |
| 47-49%               | 17            | Effective        | 9-17         |
| 44-46%               | 16            |                  |              |
| 41-43%               | 15            |                  |              |
| 38-40%               | 14            |                  |              |
| 35-37%               | 13            |                  |              |
| 32-34%               | 12            |                  |              |
| 29-31%               | 11            |                  |              |
| 27-28%               | 10            |                  |              |
| 25-26%               | 9             |                  |              |
| 22-24%               | 8             |                  |              |
| 19-21%               | 7             |                  |              |
| 17-18%               | 6             |                  |              |
| 15-16%               | 5             |                  |              |
| 13-14%               | 4             |                  |              |
| 11-12%               | 3             |                  |              |
| 7-10%                | 2             | Ineffective      | 0-2          |
| 4-6%                 | 1             |                  |              |
| 0-3%                 | 0             |                  |              |

| % Scoring "3" or "4" | Points Earned | HEDI Ranges      | Score Ranges |
|----------------------|---------------|------------------|--------------|
| 75-100%              | 15            | Highly Effective | 14-15        |
| 50-74%               | 14            |                  |              |
| 45-49%               | 13            | Effective        | 8-13         |
| 40-44%               | 12            |                  |              |
| 35-39%               | 11            |                  |              |
| 31-34%               | 10            |                  |              |
| 28-30%               | 9             |                  |              |
| 25-27%               | 8             |                  |              |
| 22-24%               | 7             | Developing       | 3-7          |
| 19-21%               | 6             |                  |              |
| 16-18%               | 5             |                  |              |
| 13-15%               | 4             |                  |              |
| 11-12%               | 3             |                  |              |
| 7-10%                | 2             | Ineffective      | 0-2          |
| 4-6%                 | 1             |                  |              |
| 0-3%                 | 0             |                  |              |

NOTE: Purple highlighted boxes indicate NYS mandated scoring ranges

*STEPS to determine your total points earned for the Local 20 points portion of your summative evaluation:*

1. Use the formula below to determine the percentage of your student sample that scored a 3 or 4 on the LCS Writing Rubric (see Appendix G)

**FORMULA:** 
$$\frac{\text{total \# of students scoring "3"} + \text{total \# of students scoring "4"}}{\text{Total \# of students in your class, group, sample}}$$

2. Using the % determined in step 1, find the band in which you fall on the chart above.
3. Include your completed "Student Writing Sample Performance Results" Appendix H, in the Summative Evaluation documents submitted to the Lead Evaluator for review.
4. Note your total points earned for the "Local 20" on the Summative Evaluation Form (See Appendix B).

# Appendix K

## *Teacher Improvement Plan*

**Teacher:** \_\_\_\_\_

**School:** \_\_\_\_\_

**Assignment/Grade Level:** \_\_\_\_\_

**Building:** \_\_\_\_\_

### Areas In Need of Improvement

Columns 1, 2, & 3 completed by Administrator: In column 1, identify the specific NYS Teaching Standards and rubric indicators that will be addressed in this TIP. In column 2, provide a description of the teacher’s current practice for each indicator illustrating why their performance is rated as “developing” or “ineffective”. In column 3, provide a clear description of the practice/performance the teacher must demonstrate in order to receive an effective rating.

Columns 4 to be completed by Teacher (in consultation with Administrator as needed): For each indicator identified in this TIP, create a SMART goal that, if achieved, will demonstrate acceptable improvement. Action Plan and timeline will be mutually agreed upon by teacher and administrator to ensure SMART goal(s) are in concert with Action Plan. Teacher may elect to have LCSTA Union representative in discussion of Action Plan.

| 1- NYS Teaching Standard & Specific Rubric Indicators | 2- Current Practice/Performance | 3- Expected Practice/Performance <sup>4</sup> | 4- SMART Goal |
|---|---------------------------------|---|---------------|
|   |                                 |   |               |

## Action Plan

In-District Supports: (Collegial mentors, class visitations, additional observations by administrator, release time, study groups, technology training, materials, etc.)

Workshops/Conferences: (Regional professional development opportunities)

Timeline/Plan for Interim Feedback and Evaluation of Progress: (Specify schedule for when the teacher will meet with the administrator to receive interim feedback toward TIP goals and what evidence should be reviewed at each interim meeting. A final evaluation of TIP goals will be included in the teacher's Summative Evaluation.)

Teacher Signature: \_\_\_\_\_

Date: \_\_\_\_\_

Administrator Signature: \_\_\_\_\_

Date: \_\_\_\_\_

I request that LCSTA be notified of this TIP

LCSTA: \_\_\_\_\_

Date: \_\_\_\_\_

**STATE  
CHART**

| 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                   | 91-100                  |
| Effective                                     | 9-17                          | 9-17   |   | 75-90                   |
| Developing                                    | 3-8                           | 3-8  |   | 65-74                   |
| Ineffective                                   | 0-2                           | 0-2  |   | 0-64                    |

*For 2012-13 for educators for whom there is an approved Value-Added measure for student growth the scoring ranges 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                   | 91-100                  |
| Effective  | 10-21                         | 8-13   |   | 75-90                   |
| Developing                                       | 3-9                           | 3-7  |   | 65-74                   |
| Ineffective                                      | 0-2                           | 0-2  |   | 0-64                    |

---

## Appendix A

### Local Achievement (20 points) Conversion Chart

| % Scoring a “3” or “4” | Points Earned | NYS HEDI Ranges  | Locally Selected Measures of Growth or Achievement |
|------------------------|---------------|------------------|--|
| 50-100%                | 20 points     | Highly Effective | 18-20  |
| 39-49%                 | 16 points     | Effective        | 9-17   |
| 25-38%                 | 13 points     |                  |  |
| 24%                    | 8 points      | Developing       | 3-8  |
| 11-23%                 | 6 points      |                  |  |
| 0-10%                  | 2 points      | Ineffective      | 0-2  |

NOTE: Purple highlighted boxes indicate NYS mandated scoring ranges

### Local Achievement (15 points) Conversion Chart

| % Scoring a “3” or “4” | Points Earned | NYS HEDI Ranges  | Locally Selected Measures of Growth or Achievement |
|------------------------|---------------|------------------|--|
| 80-100%                | 15 points     | Highly Effective | 15   |
| 50-79%                 | 14 points     |                  | 14   |
| 46-49%                 | 13 points     | Effective        | 13   |
| 42-45%                 | 12 points     |                  | 12   |
| 39-41%                 | 11 points     |                  | 11   |
| 37-38%                 | 10 points     |                  | 10   |
| 33-36%                 | 9 points      |                  | 9  |
| 29-32%                 | 8 points      |                  | 8  |
| 25-28%                 | 7 points      |                  | 7  |
| 21-24%                 | 6 points      | Developing       | 6  |
| 19-20%                 | 5 points      |                  | 5  |
| 15-18%                 | 4 points      |                  | 4  |
| 11-14%                 | 3 points      |                  | 3  |
| 6-10%                  | 2 points      | Ineffective      | 2  |
| 1-5%                   | 1 point       |                  | 1  |
| 0                      | 0 points      |                  | 0  |

## Locally Negotiated 60 Point Scoring Bands:

|                         |       |
|-------------------------|-------|
| <i>Highly Effective</i> | 56-60 |
| <i>Effective</i>        | 41-55 |
| <i>Developing</i>       | 21-40 |
| <i>Ineffective</i>      | 0-20  |

## STATE CHART

| 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 |
|---|-------------------------------|--|---|-------------------------|
| <b>Highly Effective</b>                       | 18-20                         | 18-20  | Ranges determined locally                   | 91-100                  |
| <b>Effective</b>                              | 9-17                          | 9-17   |   | 75-90                   |
| <b>Developing</b>                             | 3-8                           | 3-8  |   | 65-74                   |
| <b>Ineffective</b>                            | 0-2                           | 0-2  |   | 0-64                    |

For 2012-13 for educators for whom there is an approved Value-Added measure for student growth the scoring ranges 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 |
|--|-------------------------------|--|---|-------------------------|
| <b>Highly Effective</b>                          | 22-25                         | 14-15  | Ranges determined locally                   | 91-100                  |
| <b>Effective</b>                                 | 10-21                         | 8-13   |   | 75-90                   |
| <b>Developing</b>                                | 3-9                           | 3-7  |   | 65-74                   |
| <b>Ineffective</b>                               | 0-2                           | 0-2  |   | 0-64                    |

## 9.7) Process for Assigning Points and Determining HEDI Ratings

| <b>Lyme Central School District</b>                  |  |                   |                   |                   |                   |                   |                   |                   |                   |                   |                         |                   |                   |                   |                   |
|--|--|-------------------|-------------------|-------------------|-------------------|-------------------|-------------------|-------------------|-------------------|-------------------|-------------------------|-------------------|-------------------|-------------------|-------------------|
| <b>Other Measures of Effectiveness</b>               |  |                   |                   |                   |                   |                   |                   |                   |                   |                   |                         |                   |                   |                   |                   |
| <b>Multidimensional Principal Performance Rubric</b> |  |                   |                   |                   |                   |                   |                   |                   |                   |                   |                         |                   |                   |                   |                   |
| Ineffective:   | Overall average score of .0 to 1.4 on other measures of effectiveness  |                   |                   |                   |                   |                   |                   |                   |                   |                   |                         |                   |                   |                   |                   |
| Developing:  | Overall average score of 1.5 to 2.4 on other measures of effectiveness |                   |                   |                   |                   |                   |                   |                   |                   |                   |                         |                   |                   |                   |                   |
| Effective:   | Overall average score of 2.5 to 3.4 on other measures of effectiveness |                   |                   |                   |                   |                   |                   |                   |                   |                   |                         |                   |                   |                   |                   |
| Highly Effective:                                    | Overall average score of 3.5 to 4.0 on other measures of effectiveness |                   |                   |                   |                   |                   |                   |                   |                   |                   |                         |                   |                   |                   |                   |
| <b>Average HEDI Score</b>                            | <b>.0 to 1.0</b>   | <b>1.1 to 1.4</b> | <b>1.5 to 1.6</b> | <b>1.7 to 1.8</b> | <b>1.9 to 2.0</b> | <b>2.1 to 2.2</b> | <b>2.3 to 2.4</b> | <b>2.5 to 2.6</b> | <b>2.7 to 2.8</b> | <b>2.9 to 3.0</b> | <b>3.1 to 3.2</b>       | <b>3.3 to 3.4</b> | <b>3.5 to 3.6</b> | <b>3.7 to 3.8</b> | <b>3.9 to 4.0</b> |
| <b>Points</b>  | <b>0</b>   | <b>20</b>         | <b>21</b>         | <b>26</b>         | <b>31</b>         | <b>36</b>         | <b>40</b>         | <b>41</b>         | <b>45</b>         | <b>48</b>         | <b>51</b>               | <b>55</b>         | <b>56</b>         | <b>58</b>         | <b>60</b>         |
| <b>Rating</b>  | <b>Ineffective</b>   |                   | <b>Developing</b> |                   |                   |                   | <b>Effective</b>  |                   |                   |                   | <b>Highly Effective</b> |                   |                   |                   |                   |

Appendix \_\_\_\_\_

### 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.

- 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: 12/10/12



Teachers Union President Signature: Date: 12/10/12



Administrative Union President Signature: Date: 12/10/12



Board of Education President Signature: Date: 12/10/12

