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

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

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

October 29, 2012

Kathryn Wegman, Superintendent
Marion Central School District
4034 Warner Road
Marion, NY 14505

Dear Superintendent Wegman:

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: Michael A. Glover

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

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

Annual Professional Performance Reviews: 2012-13

Created Thursday, July 19, 2012
Updated Thursday, October 18, 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 : 650701040000

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

650701040000

1.2) School District Name: MARION CSD

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

MARION 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.

(No response)

1.4) Award Classification

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

(No response)

1.5) Assurances

Please check all of the boxes below:

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

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

Re-submission to address deficiencies

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

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

Annual (2012-13)

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

Created Monday, July 23, 2012
Updated Wednesday, October 24, 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	JMT developed K ELA assessment
1	District, regional, or BOCES-developed assessment	JMT developed 1st grade ELA assessment
2	District, regional, or BOCES-developed assessment	JMT developed 2nd grade ELA assessment

	ELA	Assessment
3	State assessment	3rd Grade State Assessment

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

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

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	JMT developed K Math assessment
1	District, regional, or BOCES-developed assessment	JMT developed 1st grade Math assessment
2	District, regional, or BOCES-developed assessment	JMT developed 2nd grade Math assessment

	Math	Assessment
3	State assessment	3rd Grade State Assessment

For Grades K-3 Math: describe the district-adopted expectations for the level of performance required for each HEDI rating category and the process for assigning points to teachers based on SLO results consistent with regulations and assurances in the Comparable Growth Measures subcomponent. Include any district-determined expectations for 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.	see chart
Highly Effective (18 - 20 points) Results are well-above state average for similar students (or District goals if no state test).	see chart
Effective (9 - 17 points) Results meet state average for similar students (or District goals if no state test).	see chart
Developing (3 - 8 points) Results are below state average for similar students (or District goals if no state test).	see chart
Ineffective (0 - 2 points) Results are well-below state average for similar students (or District goals if no state test).	see chart

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	WFL BOCES dveloped grade 6 science assessment
7	District, regional or BOCES-developed assessment	WFL BOCES dveloped grade 7 science assessment

	Science	Assessment
8	State assessment	8th Grade State Science Assessment

For Grades 6-8 Science: describe the district-adopted expectations for the level of performance required for each HEDI rating category and the process for assigning points to teachers based on SLO results consistent with regulations and assurances in the Comparable Growth Measures subcomponent. Include any district-determined expectations for 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.	see chart
Highly Effective (18 - 20 points) Results are well-above state average for similar students (or District goals if no state test).	see chart
Effective (9 - 17 points) Results meet state average for similar students (or District goals if no state test).	see chart
Developing (3 - 8 points) Results are below state average for similar students (or District goals if no state test).	see chart
Ineffective (0 - 2 points) Results are well-below state average for similar students (or District goals if no state test).	see chart

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	WFL BOCES developed grade 6 social studies assessment
7	District, regional or BOCES-developed assessment	WFL BOCES developed grade 7social studies assessment
8	District, regional or BOCES-developed assessment	WFL BOCES developed grade 8social studies assessment

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

Use this box, if needed, to describe the general process for assigning HEDI categories for these grades/subjects in this subcomponent. If needed, you may upload a table or graphic at 2.11, below.	see chart
Highly Effective (18 - 20 points) Results are well-above District goals for similar students.	see chart
Effective (9 - 17 points) Results meet District goals for similar students.	see chart
Developing (3 - 8 points) Results are below District goals for similar students.	see chart
Ineffective (0 - 2 points) Results are well-below District goals for similar students.	see chart

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	WFL BOCES global 9 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.	see chart
Highly Effective (18 - 20 points) Results are well-above District goals for similar students.	see chart
Effective (9 - 17 points) Results meet District goals for similar students.	see chart
Developing (3 - 8 points) Results are below District goals for similar students.	see chart
Ineffective (0 - 2 points) Results are well-below District goals for similar students.	see chart

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.	see chart
Highly Effective (18 - 20 points) Results are well-above District goals for similar students.	see chart
Effective (9 - 17 points) Results meet District goals for similar students.	see chart
Developing (3 - 8 points) Results are below District goals for similar students.	see chart
Ineffective (0 - 2 points) Results are well-below District goals for similar students.	see chart

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.	see chart
Highly Effective (18 - 20 points) Results are well-above District goals for similar students.	see chart
Effective (9 - 17 points) Results meet District goals for similar students.	see chart
Developing (3 - 8 points) Results are below District goals for similar students.	see chart
Ineffective (0 - 2 points) Results are well-below District goals for similar students.	see chart

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	WFL BOCES developed grade 9 ELA assessment
Grade 10 ELA	District, regional or BOCES-developed assessment	WFL BOCES developed grade 10 ELA assessment
Grade 11 ELA	Regents assessment	regents ELA 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.	see chart
Highly Effective (18 - 20 points) Results are well-above District goals for similar students.	see chart
Effective (9 - 17 points) Results meet District goals for similar students.	see chart
Developing (3 - 8 points) Results are below District goals for similar students.	see chart
Ineffective (0 - 2 points) Results are well-below District goals for similar students.	see chart

2.10) All Other Courses

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

	Course(s) or Subject(s)	Option	Assessment
	Physical Edcuation (all Levels)	District, Regional or BOCES-developed	WFL BOCES developed PE assessment (all levels)
	Art-elementary/middle/HS	District, Regional or BOCES-developed	WFL BOCES developed Art assessments (all levels)
	Family and consumer Science-MS/HS	District, Regional or BOCES-developed	WFL BOCES developed Family and Consumer Science assessment-MS/HS
	Participation in government	District, Regional or BOCES-developed	WFL BOCES developed Participation in government assessment
	Economics	District, Regional or BOCES-developed	WFL BOCES developed Economics assessment
	Technology-middle school	District, Regional or BOCES-developed	WFL BOCES developed MS technology assessment
	Spanish 3,4	District, Regional or BOCES-developed	District developed Spanish 1,2,3,4 assessments
	German 7,8,3	District, Regional or BOCES-developed	District developed German 1,2,3,4 assessments
	Health-MS/HS	District, Regional or BOCES-developed	WFL BOCES developed Health assessments MS/HS
	Design and Drawing for Porduction	District, Regional or BOCES-developed	WFL BOCES developed DDP assessment
	elementary music	District, Regional or BOCES-developed	WFL BOCES developed music assessment
	Elementary band	District, Regional or BOCES-developed	WFL BOCES developed elementary band assessment
	Middle level Band	District, Regional or BOCES-developed	WFL BOCES developed middle level band assessment
	HS band	District, Regional or BOCES-developed	WFL BOCES developed HS band assessment
	Middle level chorus	District, Regional or BOCES-developed	WFL BOCES developed Middle level chorus assessment
	HS chorus	District, Regional or BOCES-developed	District developed HS chours assessment
	Libray media specialist, K-12	District, Regional or BOCES-developed	District developed library media specialist assessment
	Math 12 grade	District, Regional or BOCES-developed	Locally developed Math 12 assessment
	ESL K-12	State Assessment	NYSESLATS pre-and post test for ESL all levels
	See attached chart		

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

Use this box, if needed, to describe the general process for assigning HEDI categories for these grades/subjects in this subcomponent. If needed, you may upload a table or graphic at 2.11, below.	see chart
Highly Effective (18 - 20 points) Results are well-above District goals for similar students.	see chart
Effective (9 - 17 points) Results meet District goals for similar students.	see chart
Developing (3 - 8 points) Results are below District goals for similar students.	see chart
Ineffective (0 - 2 points) Results are well-below District goals for similar students.	see chart

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

assets/survey-uploads/5364/154389-avH4IQNZMh/Form2_10_AllOtherCourses[1]_3.doc

2.11) HEDI Tables or Graphics

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

assets/survey-uploads/5364/154389-TXEtxx9bQW/Process for assigning HEDI to SLOs_3.doc

2.12) Locally Developed Controls

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

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

NA

2.13) Teachers with more than one growth measure

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

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

2.14) Assurances

Please check all of the boxes below:

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

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

3. Local Measures (Teachers)

Created Thursday, July 19, 2012
Updated Wednesday, October 24, 2012

Page 1

Locally Selected Measures of Student Achievement or Growth

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

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

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

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

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

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

Growth or achievement measure(s) from these options.

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

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

Measures based on:

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

3.1) Grades 4-8 ELA

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

	Locally-Selected Measure from List of Approved Measures	Assessment
4	6(ii) School wide measure computed locally	Grade 3-6 ELA and Math, State 4th grade Science assessment
5	6(ii) School wide measure computed locally	Grade 3-6 ELA and Math, State 4th grade Science assessment

6	6(ii) School wide measure computed locally	Grade 3-6 ELA and Math, State 4th Grade Science assessment
7	6(ii) School wide measure computed locally	Grade 7-8 ELA and Math, State 8th Grade Science, Regents; ELA, Integrated Algebra, Global Studies, US History, Living Environment
8	6(ii) School wide measure computed locally	Grade 7-8 ELA and Math, State 8th Grade Science, Regents; ELA, Integrated Algebra, Global Studies, US History, Living Environment

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.	see chart
Highly Effective (14 - 15 points) Results are well above District- or BOCES-adopted expectations for growth or achievement for grade/subject.	see chart
Effective (8- 13 points) Results meet District- or BOCES-adopted expectations for growth or achievement for grade/subject.	see chart
Developing (3 - 7 points) Results are below District- or BOCES-adopted expectations for growth or achievement for grade/subject.	see chart
Ineffective (0 - 2 points) Results are well below District- or BOCES-adopted expectations for growth or achievement for grade/subject.	see chart

3.2) Grades 4-8 Math

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

	Locally-Selected Measure from List of Approved Measures	Assessment
4	6(ii) School wide measure computed locally	Grade 3-6 ELA and Math, State 4th grade Science assessment
5	6(ii) School wide measure computed locally	Grade 3-6 ELA and Math, State 4th grade Science assessment
6	6(ii) School wide measure computed locally	Grade 3-6 ELA and Math, State 4th grade Science assessment
7	6(ii) School wide measure computed locally	Grade 7-8 ELA and Math, State 8th Grade Science, Regents; ELA, Integrated Algebra, Global Studies, US History, Living Environment
8	6(ii) School wide measure computed locally	Grade 7-8 ELA and Math, State 8th Grade Science, Regents; ELA, Integrated Algebra, Global Studies, US History, Living Environment

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.	see chart
Highly Effective (14 - 15 points) Results are well above District- or BOCES-adopted expectations for growth or achievement for grade/subject.	see chart
Effective (8- 13 points) Results meet District- or BOCES-adopted expectations for growth or achievement for grade/subject.	see chart
Developing (3 - 7 points) Results are below District- or BOCES-adopted expectations for growth or achievement for grade/subject.	see chart
Ineffective (0 - 2 points) Results are well below District- or BOCES-adopted expectations for growth or achievement for grade/subject.	see chart

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/5139/153682-rhJdBgDruP/Local Measures conversion char.doc

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

Growth or achievement measure(s) from these options.

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

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

Measures based on:

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

3.4) Grades K-3 ELA

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

	Locally-Selected Measure from List of Approved Measures	Assessment
K	6(ii) School-wide measure computed locally	Grade 3-6 ELA and Math, State 4th grade Science assessment
1	6(ii) School-wide measure computed locally	Grade 3-6 ELA and Math, State 4th grade Science assessment
2	6(ii) School-wide measure computed locally	Grade 3-6 ELA and Math, State 4th grade Science assessment
3	6(ii) School-wide measure computed locally	Grade 3-6 ELA and Math, State 4th grade Science 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.	see chart
Highly Effective (18-20 points) Results are well above District- or BOCES-adopted expectations for growth or achievement for grade/subject.	see chart
Effective (9-17 points) Results meet District- or BOCES-adopted expectations for growth or achievement for grade/subject.	see chart
Developing (3 - 8 points) Results are below District- or BOCES-adopted expectations for growth or achievement for grade/subject.	see chart
Ineffective (0 - 2 points) Results are well below District- or BOCES-adopted expectations for growth or achievement for grade/subject.	see chart

3.5) Grades K-3 Math

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

	Locally-Selected Measure from List of Approved Measures	Assessment
K	6(ii) School-wide measure computed locally	Grade 3-6 ELA and Math, State 4th grade Science assessment
1	6(ii) School-wide measure computed locally	Grade 3-6 ELA and Math, State 4th grade Science assessment
2	6(ii) School-wide measure computed locally	Grade 3-6 ELA and Math, State 4th grade Science assessment
3	6(ii) School-wide measure computed locally	Grade 3-6 ELA and Math, State 4th grade Science 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.	see chart
Highly Effective (18-20 points) Results are well above District- or BOCES-adopted expectations for growth or achievement for grade/subject.	see chart
Effective (9-17 points) Results meet District- or BOCES-adopted expectations for growth or achievement for grade/subject.	see chart
Developing (3 - 8 points) Results are below District -or BOCES-adopted expectations for growth or achievement for grade/subject.	see chart
Ineffective (0 - 2 points) Results are well below District- or BOCES-adopted expectations for growth or achievement for grade/subject.	see chart

3.6) Grades 6-8 Science

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

	Locally-Selected Measure from List of Approved Measures	Assessment
6	6(ii) School wide measure computed locally	Grade 3-6 ELA and Math, State 4th grade Science assessment
7	6(ii) School wide measure computed locally	Grade 7-8 ELA and Math, State 8th Grade Science, Regents; ELA, Integrated Algebra, Global Studies, US History, Living Environment
8	6(ii) School wide measure computed locally	Grade 7-8 ELA and Math, State 8th Grade Science, Regents; ELA, Integrated Algebra, Global Studies, US History, Living Environment

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

3.7) Grades 6-8 Social Studies

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

	Locally-Selected Measure from List of Approved Measures	Assessment
6	6(ii) School wide measure computed locally	Grade 3-6 ELA and Math, State 4th grade Science assessment
7	6(ii) School wide measure computed locally	Grade 7-8 ELA and Math, State 8th Grade Science, Regents; ELA, Integrated Algebra, Global Studies, US History, Living Environment
8	6(ii) School wide measure computed locally	Grade 7-8 ELA and Math, State 8th Grade Science, Regents; ELA, Integrated Algebra, Global Studies, US History, Living Environment

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

3.8) High School Social Studies

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

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

	Locally-Selected Measure from List of Approved Measures	Assessment
Global 1	6(ii) School wide measure computed locally	Grade 7-8 ELA and Math, State 8th Grade Science, Regents; ELA, Integrated Algebra, Global Studies, US History, Living Environment
Global 2	6(ii) School wide measure computed locally	Grade 7-8 ELA and Math, State 8th Grade Science, Regents; ELA, Integrated Algebra, Global Studies, US History, Living Environment
American History	6(ii) School wide measure computed locally	Grade 7-8 ELA and Math, State 8th Grade Science, Regents; ELA, Integrated Algebra, Global Studies, US History, Living Environment

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

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

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

3.9) High School Science

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

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

	Locally-Selected Measure from List of Approved Measures	Assessment
Living Environment	6(ii) School wide measure computed locally	Grade 7-8 ELA and Math, State 8th Grade Science, Regents; ELA, Integrated Algebra, Global Studies, US History, Living Environment
Earth Science	6(ii) School wide measure computed locally	Grade 7-8 ELA and Math, State 8th Grade Science, Regents; ELA, Integrated Algebra, Global Studies, US History, Living Environment
Chemistry	6(ii) School wide measure computed locally	Grade 7-8 ELA and Math, State 8th Grade Science, Regents; ELA, Integrated Algebra, Global Studies, US History, Living Environment
Physics	6(ii) School wide measure computed locally	Grade 7-8 ELA and Math, State 8th Grade Science, Regents; ELA, Integrated Algebra, Global Studies, US History, Living Environment

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

3.10) High School Math

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

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

	Locally-Selected Measure from List of Approved Measures	Assessment
Algebra 1	6(ii) School wide measure computed locally	Grade 7-8 ELA and Math, State 8th Grade Science, Regents; ELA, Integrated Algebra, Global Studies, US History, Living Environment

Geometry	6(ii) School wide measure computed locally	Grade 7-8 ELA and Math, State 8th Grade Science, Regents; ELA, Integrated Algebra, Global Studies, US History, Living Environment
Algebra 2	6(ii) School wide measure computed locally	Grade 7-8 ELA and Math, State 8th Grade Science, Regents; ELA, Integrated Algebra, Global Studies, US History, Living Environment

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

3.11) High School English Language Arts

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

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

	Locally-Selected Measure from List of Approved Measures	Assessment
Grade 9 ELA	6(ii) School wide measure computed locally	Grade 7-8 ELA and Math, State 8th Grade Science, Regents; ELA, Integrated Algebra, Global Studies, US History, Living Environment
Grade 10 ELA	6(ii) School wide measure computed locally	Grade 7-8 ELA and Math, State 8th Grade Science, Regents; ELA, Integrated Algebra, Global Studies, US History, Living Environment
Grade 11 ELA	6(ii) School wide measure computed locally	Grade 7-8 ELA and Math, State 8th Grade Science, Regents; ELA, Integrated Algebra, Global Studies, US History, Living Environment

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

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

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

3.12) All Other Courses

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

	Course(s) or Subject(s)	Locally-Selected Measure from List of Approved Measures	Assessment
	All other courses K-6	6(ii) School wide measure computed locally	Grade 3-6 ELA and Math, State 4th grade Science assessment
	All other courses 7-12	6(ii) School wide measure computed locally	Grade 7-8 ELA and Math, State 8th Grade Science, Regents; ELA, Integrated Algebra, Global Studies, US History, Living Environment

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

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

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

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/5139/153682-y92vNseFa4/Local Measures conversion char.doc

3.14) Locally Developed Controls

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

NA

3.15) Teachers with More Than One Locally Selected Measure

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

NA

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, July 19, 2012
Updated Monday, October 22, 2012

Page 1

4.1) Teacher Practice Rubric

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

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

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

Danielson's Framework for Teaching (2011 Revised Edition)

(No response)

4.2) Points Within Other Measures

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

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

Is the following points assignment applicable to all teachers?

Yes

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

(No response)

Multiple (at least two) classroom observations by principal or other trained administrator, at least one of which must be unannounced [at least 31 points]	32
One or more observation(s) by trained independent evaluators	0
Observations by trained in-school peer teachers	0
Feedback from students using State-approved survey tool	0
Feedback from parents/caregivers using State-approved survey tool	0
Structured reviews of lesson plans, student portfolios and other teacher artifacts	28

If the above points assignment is not for "all teachers," fill out an additional copy of "Form 4.2: Points Within Other Measures" for each group of teachers, 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.

See description and 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/5091/153657-eka9yMJ855/Teacher Standards-60 pts-Other.docx

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

Highly Effective: Overall performance and results exceed NYS Teaching Standards.	3.5-4.0
Effective: Overall performance and results meet NYS Teaching Standards.	2.5-3.4
Developing: Overall performance and results need improvement in order to meet NYS Teaching Standards.	1.5-2.4
Ineffective: Overall performance and results do not meet NYS Teaching Standards.	0-1.4

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

By trained in-school peer teachers or other trained reviewers

Formal/Long	0
Informal/Short	0

Independent evaluators

Formal/Long	0
Informal/Short	0

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

- In Person

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

- In Person

5. Composite Scoring (Teachers)

Created Monday, July 23, 2012
Updated Thursday, October 18, 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 Thursday, July 19, 2012
Updated Wednesday, October 24, 2012

Page 1

6.1) Assurances -- Improvement Plans

Please check the boxes below:

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

6.2) Attachment: Teacher Improvement Plan Forms

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

assets/survey-uploads/5265/153709-Df0w3Xx5v6/Teacher Improvement Plan_1_1.docx

6.3) Appeals Process

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

(1) the substance of the annual professional performance review

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

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

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

Appeals Process
Part 1 – Substance (Composite Effectiveness Score)
• Evaluation appeals should be limited to "ineffective" composite effectiveness scores for probationary teachers and for tenured teachers, "ineffective" and "developing" composite effectiveness scores
• The appeals process should be based only on written record, no hearing or witnesses

• The rating of a principal on his/her own APPR should not be admissible as a basis for a teacher to appeal his or her own evaluation.
• Teacher evaluator must be trained on the 9 required components.
• A teacher cannot commence the appeal process prior to the receipt of their composite effectiveness score and rating from the district.
• A teacher may appeal the composite effectiveness score of his or her performance review.
• Appeals concerning a teacher's composite effectiveness score must be received in the office of the Superintendent of Schools no later than ten (10) calendar days after the date when the teacher receives his/her performance review.
• A teacher wishing to initiate an appeal must submit, in writing (e-mail or other electronic submissions are permitted), to the Superintendent or his/her designee, with a copy to the lead evaluator whose performance review is being appealed, a detailed description of the precise point(s) of disagreement over his or her performance review, along with any and all additional documents or written materials that he or she believes are relevant to the resolution of the appeal. Any such additional information not submitted at the time the appeal is filed shall not be considered in the deliberations related to the resolution of the appeal.
• Within ten (10) calendar days of the Superintendent's receipt of an appeal, the lead evaluator responsible for the performance review being appealed shall submit to the Superintendent a detailed response to the appeal, including copies of any and all documents or information used to develop the performance review being appealed.
• Under this appeals process the teacher has the burden of proving a clear legal right to the relief requested and the burden of establishing the facts upon which he/she seeks relief. The burden of proof shall be by the preponderance of the credible evidence.
• The Superintendent shall issue a written decision on the merits of the appeal no later than thirty (30) calendar days from the date when the teacher filed his or her appeal.
• The decision of the Superintendent shall be final and an appeal shall be deemed completed upon the issuance of that decision. The decision of the Superintendent or the Superintendent's designee shall not be subject to any further appeal.
• The district reserves the right to deny tenure or terminate a probationary teacher during the pendency of an appeal for statutorily and constitutionally permissible reasons other than the teacher's composite effectiveness score that is the subject of the appeal. If the determination to award or deny tenure is related to the subject of the appeal, then the decision to award or deny tenure will be made at the conclusion of the appeal process and tenure will not be awarded by estoppel if the appeal process goes beyond the probationary period.
• The Association and District intend and agree that any and all matters pertaining to the composite effectiveness score of a teacher's rating shall not be subject to the contractual grievance/arbitration procedure.
Part 2 – Procedure
• A teacher may appeal the school district's adherence to methodologies, adherence to applicable regulations of the commissioner of education, and compliance with the procedures for the conduct of performance reviews set forth in the annual professional performance review plan.
• The affected unit member or unit president must give written notice to the Superintendent of any failure to adhere to the procedures (such as not complying with timelines, not conducting the minimum number of observations, observations or evaluations done by a person not properly trained, not doing a formative or summative evaluation meeting with a teacher) noted in this Annual Professional Performance Plan within ten calendar days after the failure or it will be deemed waived as grounds of appeal.
• The Superintendent shall issue a written decision on the merits of the appeal no later than ten (10) calendar days after receiving written notice from unit president.
• The decision of the Superintendent shall be final and an appeal shall be deemed concluded for the purpose of any proceeding conducted pursuant to Education Law Section 3020-a upon the issuance of that decision.

Outcomes of Procedural Appeals Subject to Grievance Arbitration

• If a timely appeal of a procedural issue is not satisfactorily resolved within ten calendar days, the Association may submit the outcome of the appeal directly to binding grievance arbitration under Article VI of the collective bargaining agreement. In such case, if the Association does not deliver the demand for arbitration to the Superintendent within ten calendar days after the expiration of the ten-day resolution period, the grievance is deemed waived and arbitration is barred.
• The district reserves the right to deny tenure or terminate a probationary teacher, except on the basis of performance, during the pendency of a procedural appeal and/or subsequent grievance arbitration of the Superintendent's denial of such appeal, but the authority of a grievance arbitrator to fashion a lawfully authorized remedy for a procedural violation shall not be limited by this provision.

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.

All teacher evaluators will be trained (30+ hours program) and must pass the TeachScape Proficiency Exam (6 hour test) based on Charlotte Danielson's 2011 Frameworks for Teaching. The District Network Team Equivalent completed the RTTT Network Team

Institute provided by the State Education Department in Albany. Teacher/Principal evaluators will participate in training provided by the network team on an ongoing basis. The district will maintain a data base of all trainings. This data base will be updated on a regular basis. Training on inter-rater reliabity will continue throughout the year. Teacher evaluators have and will continue to complete training in all nine required components prior to conducting a formal evaluation. This process will be used as needed to recertify lead evaluators. All administrators in the district responsible for observing and evaluating teachers will participate in training sessions provided by the Network Team Equivalent trainers as well as other training sessions designed to sharpen observation skills, review criteria to be evaluated and methods of evaluation in accordance with the State Education Department's requirements.

6.5) Assurances -- Evaluators

Please check the boxes below:

- Checked

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

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

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

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

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

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

(7) use of the Statewide Instructional Reporting System

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

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

- Checked

6.6) Assurances -- Teachers

Please check all of the boxes below:

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

6.7) Assurances -- Data

Please check all of the boxes below:

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

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

Created Thursday, July 19, 2012
Updated Thursday, October 18, 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-6
7-12
(No response)
(No response)
(No response)
(No response)
(No response)

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

Please check the boxes below:

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

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

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

State assessments, *required if one exists*

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

List of State-approved 3rd party assessments

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

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

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

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

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

(No response)

7.4) Special Considerations for Comparable Growth Measures

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

Note: The only allowable controls or adjustments for Comparable Growth Measures are those used in State Growth measures, which include: prior student achievement results, students with disabilities, English language learners, students in poverty, and, in the future,

any other student-, classroom-, and school-level characteristics approved by the Board of Regents.

(No response)

7.5) Principals with More Than One Growth Measure

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

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

7.6) Assurances -- Comparable Growth Measures

Please check all of the boxes below:

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

8. Local Measures (Principals)

Created Thursday, July 19, 2012
Updated Monday, October 22, 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-6	(a) achievement on State assessments	Grade 4-6 NYS assessments-ELA and Math
	7-12	(h) students' progress toward graduation	Regents exams-ELA, Integrated Algebra, Global Studies, US HIstory and Living Environment

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.	See table
Highly Effective (14 - 15 points) Results are well above District- or BOCES-adopted expectations for growth or achievement for grade/subject.	see table
Effective (8- 13 points) Results meet District- or BOCES-adopted expectations for growth or achievement for grade/subject.	see table
Developing (3 - 7 points) Results are below District- or BOCES-adopted expectations for growth or achievement for grade/subject.	see table
Ineffective (0 - 2 points) Results are well below District- or BOCES-adopted expectations for growth or achievement for grade/subject.	see table

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

(No response)

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

assets/survey-uploads/5366/153613-qBFVOWF7fC/Principal Local.doc

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

Districts or BOCES that intend to use a district, regional, or BOCES-developed assessment must include the name, grade, and

subject of the assessment. For example, a regionally-developed 7th grade Social Studies assessment would be written as follows: [INSERT SPECIFIC NAME OF REGION]-developed 7th grade Social Studies assessment.

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

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

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.

At Jr. Sr. High School to account for students with disabilities, we will be including those students that qualify under the safety net provisions established by NYSED in the percent passing rate. For students with disabilities that score between 55 and 64 on one of the five Regents examinations will be considered as a passing grade, as they have met the established criteria in the State of New York to

earn a local diploma as outlined in Section 100.5(5)(a-e) of the Regulations of the Commissioner of Education.

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.

NA

8.5) Assurances

Please check all of the boxes below:

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

9. Other Measures of Effectiveness (Principals)

Created Thursday, July 19, 2012
Updated Wednesday, October 24, 2012

Page 1

9.1) Principal Practice Rubric

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

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

The Reeves Leadership Performance Matrix

(No response)

9.2) Points Within Other Measures

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

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

Is the following points assignment for all principals?

Yes

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

(No response)

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

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

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

(No response)

9.3) Assurances -- Goals

Please check the boxes below (if applicable):

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

9.4) Sources of Evidence (if applicable)

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

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

9.5) Survey Tool(s) (if applicable)

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

(No response)

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

(No response)

(No response)

(No response)

9.6) Assurances

Please check all of the boxes below:

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

9.7) Process for Assigning Points and Determining HEDI Ratings

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

See description and 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/5143/153642-pMADJ4gk6R/Principal 60 points-final_1.docx

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

Highly Effective: Overall performance and results exceed standards.	see table
Effective: Overall performance and results meet standards.	see table
Developing: Overall performance and results need improvement in order to meet standards.	see table
Ineffective: Overall performance and results do not meet standards.	see table

Please provide the locally-negotiated 60 point scoring bands.

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

9.8) School Visits

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

Probationary Principals

By supervisor	5
By trained administrator	0
By trained independent evaluator	0
Enter Total	5

Tenured Principals

By supervisor	5
By trained administrator	0
By trained independent evaluator	0
Enter Total	5

10. Composite Scoring (Principals)

Created Friday, September 07, 2012
Updated Thursday, October 18, 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

0-64

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

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

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

2012-13 where Value-Added growth measure applies

Growth or Comparable Measures

Locally-selected Measures of

growth or achievement

Other Measures of Effectiveness

(60 points)

Overall

Composite Score

Highly Effective

22-25

14-15

Ranges determined locally--see above

91-100

Effective

10-21

8-13

75-90

Developing

3-9

3-7

65-74

Ineffective

0-2

0-2

0-64

11. Additional Requirements - Principals

Created Friday, September 07, 2012
Updated Wednesday, October 24, 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/5276/173238-Df0w3Xx5v6/PIP-final_1.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 Process
• Use a mutually agreed upon 3rd party, who is a certified administrator with experience evaluating principals
• Paper review only
• Completed with 30 days of the appeal being filed
• Appeals concerning a principal's performance review must be received in the office of the Superintendent of Schools no later than ten (10) calendar days after the date when the principal receives his/her performance review.
• A principal wishing to initiate an appeal must submit, in writing (e-mail or other electronic submissions are not permitted), to the

Superintendent or his/her designee, with a copy to the lead evaluator whose performance review is being appealed, a detailed description of the precise point(s) of disagreement over his or her performance review, along with any and all additional documents or written materials that he or she believes are relevant to the resolution of the appeal. Any such additional information not submitted at the time the appeal is filed shall not be considered in the deliberations related to the resolution of the appeal.
• Within ten (10) calendar days of the 3rd party's receipt of an appeal, the lead evaluator responsible for the performance review being appealed shall submit to the 3rd party a detailed response to the appeal, including copies of any and all documents or information used to develop the performance review being appealed.
• Under this appeals process the principal has the burden of proving a clear legal right to the relief requested and the burden of establishing the facts upon which he/she seeks relief. The burden of proof shall be by the preponderance of the credible evidence.
• The 3rd party shall issue a written decision on the merits of the appeal no later than thirty (30) calendar days from the date when the principal filed his or her appeal.
• The decision of the 3rd party shall be final and an appeal shall be deemed completed upon the issuance of that decision. The decision of the 3rd party shall not be subject to any further appeal.
• The district reserves the right to deny tenure or terminate a probationary principal during the pendency of an appeal for statutorily and constitutionally permissible reasons other than the principals's performance that is the subject of the appeal. If the determination to award or deny tenure is related to the subject of the appeal, then the decision to award or deny tenure will be made at the conclusion of the appeal process and tenure will not be awarded by estoppel if the appeal process goes beyond the probationary period.

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.

TRAINING/CERTIFICATION

All principal evaluators will be trained in using Reeves Leadership Performance Matrix. The District Network Team Equivalent completed the RTTT Network Team Institute provided by the State Education Department in Albany. Principal evaluators will participate in training provided by the network team on an ongoing basis. The district will maintain a data base of all trainings. This data base will be updated on a regular basis. Principal evaluators will complete a minimum of 3 days of training in all nine required components as outlined in Regents regulation 30-2.9 prior to conducting a formal evaluation.

All administrators in the district responsible for observing and evaluating principals will participate in training sessions provided by the Network Team Equivalent trainers as well as other training sessions designed to sharpen observation skills, review criteria to be evaluated and methods of evaluation in accordance with the State Education Department's requirements. Ongoing training in inter-rater reliability will be conducted throughout the year. This process will be used to recertify lead evaluator as needed throughout the school year.

11.5) Assurances -- Evaluators

Please check the boxes below:

- Checked

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

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

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

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

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

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

(7) use of the Statewide Instructional Reporting System

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

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

- Checked

11.6) Assurances -- Principals

Please check all of the boxes below:

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

11.7) Assurances -- Data

Please check all of the boxes below:

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

12. Joint Certification of APPR Plan

Created Thursday, July 19, 2012
Updated Wednesday, October 24, 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/5581/153708-3Uqgn5g9Iu/district certification form_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.

Locally Selected Measures of Student Achievement

Marion Jr. Sr. High School

- At the Jr. Sr. High School, the measure will be based on the five Regents exams commonly associated with a strong prediction of progression towards graduation. The Regents exams that will be used: Comprehensive ELA, Integrated Algebra, Global Studies, US History and Living Environment
- The score will be compiled using the passing rates (65% or above) of the June Regents exams, including safety net students.
- The passing rates from each of the assessments will be averaged together to get an overall proficiency/achievement score for the building.
- The agreed upon conversion chart will be used to convert to a HEDI Score.
- The scores will be rounded up to align with the conversion chart. ***See Appendix B***

<u>Example of process for determining Local Score @ Jr. Sr. High</u>

1. Determine the average proficiency rate at the Jr-Sr High. The average rate is 87.6% (see table on left for data)
2. You would look that number up on the ***Conversion Chart for % Proficient (*** in ***Appendix B)*** Based on that chart you would get a 3.6 score.
3. Then using the ***20 Point Conversion Chart 1-4 Rubric to Sub- Component Score*** or the ***15 Point Conversion Chart 1-4 Rubric to Sub-Component Score***, which ever applies you would determine the points earned.
4. In this example 3.3 = 18 points on the 20 point scale or 14 points on the 15 point scale.

Jr. Sr. Principal Local score based on:	
Comp ELA	93%
Integrated Algebra	93%
Global	72%
US History	92%
Living Environ.	88%
	87.60%

Marion Elementary School

- At the Marion Elementary, the measure will be based on student achievement levels on State assessments in ELA and math in Grades 4-8
- The score will be compiled using the proficiency rate (% of 3's and 4's) of each of the state assessments.
- These proficiency percentages from each assessment will be averaged together to get an overall proficiency/achievement score for the building.
- The agreed upon conversion chart will be used to convert to a HEDI Score. ***See Appendix B***

<u>Example of process for determining Local Score @ Marion Elementary School</u>

1. Determine the average proficiency rate on the 4-6 ELA and Math Assessments at the MES. The average rate is 66.83% (see table on left for data)
2. You would look that number up on the ***Conversion Chart for % Proficient (*** in ***Appendix B)*** Based on that chart you would get a 2.5 score.

ELA 4	64%
Math 4	69%
ELA 5	61%
Math 5	78%
ELA 6	59%
Math 6	70%
	66.83%

3. Then using the ***20 Point Conversion Chart 1-4 Rubric to Sub- Component Score*** or the ***15 Point Conversion Chart 1-4 Rubric to Sub-Component Score***, which ever applies you would determine the points earned.
4. In this example 2.5 = 9 points on the 20 point scale or 8 points on the 15 point scale.

Based on the law the points will be distributed as follows:

Rating Categories	**Locally-Selected Measures of achievement 20 Point Scale**	**Locally-Selected Measures of achievement 15 Point Scale**
Highly Effective	18-20	14-15
Effective	9-17	8-13
Developing	3-8	3-7
Ineffective	0-2	0-2

Appendix-B

LOCAL MEASURE

Conversion Chart for % Proficient

0-100 Point Scale Conversion Chart*							
Based on a 100 Point Scale	Converted to 1-4 Rating	Based on a 100 Point Scale	Converted to 1-4 Rating	Based on a 100 Point Scale	Converted to 1-4 Rating	Based on a 100 Point Scale	Converted to 1-4 Rating
Ineffective		Developing		Effective		Highly Effective	
0-14	1	55	1.5	65-66	2.5	85-87	3.5
15-27	1.1	56	1.6	67-68	2.6	88-90	3.6
28-40	1.2	57	1.7	69-70	2.7	91-93	3.7
41-53	1.3	58	1.8	71-72	2.8	94-96	3.8
54	1.4	59	1.9	73-74	2.9	97-99	3.9
		60	2	75-76	3	100	4
		61	2.1	77-78	3.1		
		62	2.2	79-81	3.2		
		63	2.3	82-83	3.3		
		64	2.4	84	3.4		

LOCAL MEASURES

20 Point Conversion Charts 1-4 Rubric to Sub-component Score

1-4 Rubric Conversion Scale							
Based on a 1-4 Rubric Rating	20 Point Conversion	Based on a 1-4 Rubric Rating	20 Point Conversion	Based on a 1-4 Rubric Rating	20 Point Conversion	Based on a 1-4 Rubric Rating	20 Point Conversion
Ineffective		Developing		Effective		Highly Effective	
1	0	1.5	3	2.5	9	3.5	18
1.1	1	1.6	3.6	2.6	10	3.6	18
1.2	1.5	1.7	4.2	2.7	10	3.7	18
1.3	2.0	1.8	4.8	2.8	11	3.8	19
1.4	2.5	1.9	5.4	2.9	12	3.9	19
		2	6	3.0	13	4	20
		2.1	6.6	3.1	14		
		2.2	7.2	3.2	15		
		2.3	7.8	3.3	16		
		2.4	8.4	3.4	17		

LOCAL MEASURES

15 Point Conversion Charts 1-4 Rubric to Sub-Component Score

1-4 Rubric Conversion Scale							
Based on a 1-4 Rubric Rating	15 Point Conversion	Based on a 1-4 Rubric Rating	15 Point Conversion	Based on a 1-4 Rubric Rating	15 Point Conversion	Based on a 1-4 Rubric Rating	15 Point Conversion
Ineffective		Developing		Effective		Highly Effective	
1	0	1.5	3	2.5	8	3.5	14
1.2	1	1.7	4	2.7	9	4	15
1.4	2	2.0	5	2.9	10		
		2.2	6	3.0	11		
		2.4	7	3.2	12		
				3.4	13		

Principal Standards

- Marion will use the Reeves' Leadership Performance Matrix

Points	Evidence
60 Points	The full 60 points of a principal's evaluation to the broad assessment of principal leadership and management actions based on the Matrix Building Observations (minimum of 5 per year): • Standard 3, 4, 5, 7, 8 Teacher Evaluation • Standard 6 Leadership Portfolio • Standard 1 & 2 (Philosophical Framework and Vision Action Plan) • Standard 9 and 10
	60 points HE 59-60 3.5-4.0 E 57-58 2.5-3.4 D 50-56 1.5-2.4 I 0-49 1-1.4
	Conversion chart attached to Self-Assessment Form ***APPENDIX A***

Each principal will meet with their administrator prior to June 15th for the purpose of discussing "Other Measures". Both the evaluator and the principal will share related evidence. The rubric will be used to discuss the evidence and the teacher's performance. The administrator will present the score on the 60 points within 10 school days.

Calculating Scores:

1) Scores will be calculated by assigning a rating to each component area observed (e.g.: Domain 1a) of: Highly Effective, Effective, Developing or Ineffective. Components not observed will not be rated or considered.
2) Once a rating is assigned then a corresponding number shall be assigned to each rating as follows: 4 for Highly Effective, 3 for Effective, 2 for Developing, and 1 for Ineffective.
3) Prior to the End of the Year Evaluation, an average score for each standard will be calculated based on the standards observed throughout the year.

Appendix A

Reeves Leadership Performance Matrix

	H	E	D	I	
Resilience	**4**	**3**	**2**	**1**	
1.1 Constructive Reactions					
1.2 Willingness to Admit Error					
1.3 Disagreement					
1.4 Dissent					
1.5 Improvement of Specific Performance Areas					
Totals for Standard 1	0	0	0	0	0.0
					AVG
Personal Behavior and Professional Ethics	**4**	**3**	**2**	**1**	
2.1 Integrity					
2.2 Emotional Self-Control					
2.3 Ethical and Legal Compliance w/Employees					
2.4 Tolerance					
2.5 Respect					
Totals for Standard 2	0	0	0	0	0.0
					AVG
Student Achievement	**4**	**3**	**2**	**1**	
3.1 Planning and Goal Setting					
3.2 Student Achievement Results					
3.3 Instructional Leadership Decisions					
3.4 Student Requirements and Academic Standards					
3.5 Student Performance					
Totals for Standard 3	0	0	0	0	0.0
					AVG
Decision Making	**4**	**3**	**2**	**1**	
4.1 Factual Basis for Decisions					
4.2 Decision Making Structure					
4.3 Decisions Linked to Vision					
4.4 Decisions Evaluated for Effectiveness					
Totals for Standard 4	0	0	0	0	0.0
					AVG
Communication	**4**	**3**	**2**	**1**	
5.1 Two-Way Communication w/Students					
5.2 Two-Way Communication w/Faculty-Staff					

5.3 Two- Way Communication w/ Parents-Community					
5.4 Analysis of Input and Feedback					
Totals for Standard 5	0	0	0	0	0.0
					AVG

	H	E	D	I	
Faculty Development	**4**	**3**	**2**	**1**	
6.1 Faculty Proficiencies and Needs					
6.2 Leading Professional Development					
6.3 Formal and Informal Feedback					
6.4 Modeling Coaching and Mentoring					
6.5 Recruitment and Hiring of Faculty					
Totals for Standard 6	0	0	0	0	0.0
					AVG
Leadership Development	**4**	**3**	**2**	**1**	
7.1 Mentoring Emerging Leaders					
7.2 Identification of Potentially Future Leaders					
7.3 Delegation and Trust					
Totals for Standard 7	0	0	0	0	0.0
					AVG
Time/Task/Project Management	**4**	**3**	**2**	**1**	
8.1 Organization of Time and Projects					
8.2 Fiscal Stewardship					
8.3 Project Objectives and Plans					
Totals for Standard 8	0	0	0	0	0.0
					AVG
Technology	**4**	**3**	**2**	**1**	
9.1 Use of Technology to Improve Teaching/Learning					
9.2 Personal Proficiency in Electronic Communication					
Totals for Standard 9	0	0	0	0	0.0
					AVG
Personal Professional Learning	**4**	**3**	**2**	**1**	
10.1 Personal Understanding of Research Trends					
10.2 Personal Professional Focus					
10.3 Professional Development Focus					

10.4 Application of Learning					
Totals for Standard 10	0	0	0	0	0.0
					AVG

Total		-
Average	HEDI	0.0
HEDI Conversion		

HEDI Scoring 60 Points

Total Average Rubric Score	Category	Conversion score for Other Measures
Ineffective 0-49		
1.000		0
1.008		1
1.017		2
1.025		3
1.033		4
1.042		5
1.050		6
1.058		7
1.067		8
1.075		9
1.083		10
1.092		11
1.100		12
1.108		13
1.115		14
1.123		15
1.131		16
1.138		17
1.146		18
1.154		19
1.162		20
1.169		21
1.177		22
1.185		23
1.192		24
1.200		25
1.208		26
1.217		27

1.225		28
1.233		29
1.242		30
1.250		31
1.258		32
1.267		33
1.275		34
1.283		35
1.292		36
1.300		37
1.308		38
1.317		39
1.325		40
1.333		41
1.342		42
1.350		43
1.358		44
1.367		45
1.375		46
1.383		47
1.392		48
1.400		49
Developing 50-56		
1.5		50
1.6		51
1.7		51
1.8		52
1.9		53
2		53
2.1		54
2.2		55
2.3		55
2.4		56
Effective 57-58		
2.5		57
2.6		57
2.7		57
2.8		57
2.9		58
3		58
3.1		58
3.2		58
3.3		58
3.4		58
Highly Effective 59-60		
3.5		59
3.6		59
3.7		59
3.8		60

3.9		60
4		60

Teacher Standards

Other 60 Points

The MCS District and the MTA agree that a properly administered teacher evaluation system is desirable. It shall be the District's responsibility to provide resources and services as appropriate in an effort to help unit members develop towards their fullest potential as they work to meet the district goals of improved student performance. It shall be the unit member's responsibility to implement District curriculum and keep their knowledge and skills current.

Unit member evaluations will be based on Professional Conversations. Professional Conversations shall be defined as ongoing conversations between a unit member and his/her principal/director that focus on professional practice, evidence collection, rubric scoring, necessary modifications, and professional development. This shall apply to all unit members, as per regulation, set forth below.

- The MCS and the MTA agree that the 2011 Charlotte Danielson's Framework for Teaching will be used for performance evaluation of unit members.
- All teacher evaluators will be trained per regulation in the nine required components of teacher evaluation and be certified by the Board of Education prior to the final evaluation being conducted.
- Points will be assigned holistically during the summative conversation based on the following evidence:

Points	Evidence
32 Points	Domain 2 & 3 Observation: <u>Tenured</u>- • Minimum of one formal announced observation (pre-observation, observation (full period), post observation) • Minimum of one unannounced walk through (at least 10 minutes) • Teacher will receive electronic report <u>Probationary</u>- • Minimum of one formal announced observation in the fall (pre-observation, observation (full period), post observation) • Minimum of one formal observation in the spring (pre-observation, observation (full period), post observation) • One formative evaluation mid-year • One summative evaluation in the spring • Minimum of 1 unannounced walk through (at least 10 minutes) • Teacher will receive electronic report
28 Points	Domains 1, 2, 3, 4 Other evidence/artifacts collected by teacher or administrator: Ideas (List is not intended to be inclusive): • Lesson revisions • Unit plan presented to principal • Parent communication log • System for using paraprofessionals • Student work/data • Video analysis • Curriculum maps • Use of resources in pre-planning • Professional organizations • System for keeping records • Reflection • Other ***See Appendix B – Other Measures Conversion Chart***

Teachscape may be used to store evidence for the 60 points.

Meetings: There will be a minimum of four (4) meetings between unit members and their supervising administrator each school year; A beginning of the year goal setting meeting, a pre-observation meeting, a mid-year check/post-observation meeting, and an end of year summary meeting. Additional meetings may be scheduled as needed or desired by the unit member or supervising administrator.

Post observation meetings shall be held no more than five school days following the observation. The observation report will be delivered to teachers within five days of the post observation conference.

Evaluation ratings will be recorded on a running record form with ratings and evidence recorded periodically throughout the school year as a result of a professional conversation. The running record form can be found in ***Appendix C*** of this Agreement.

Each unit member will meet with their administrator prior to June 15th for the purpose of discussing "Other Measures". Both the principal and teacher will share related evidence. The rubric will be used to discuss the evidence and the teacher's performance. The administrator will present the score on the 60 points within 10 school days.

Calculating Scores:

1) Scores will be calculated by assigning a rating to each component area observed (e.g.: Domain 1a) of: Highly Effective, Effective, Developing or Ineffective. Components not observed will not be rated or considered.
2) Once a rating is assigned then a corresponding number shall be assigned to each rating as follows: 4 for Highly Effective, 3 for Effective, 2 for Developing, and 1 for Ineffective.

Domains	**Weighting**	**Calculation**
Domain 1 **Planning and Preparation**	24%	(D1 Average) x (24%) = D1 Weighted Score
Domain 2 **Classroom Environment**	26%	(D2 Average) x (26%) = D2 Weighted Score
Domain 3 **Instruction**	26%	(D3 Average) x (26%) = D3 Weighted Score
Domain 4	24%	(D4 Average) x (24%) = D4 Weighted Score

3) Prior to the End of the Year Evaluation, an average score for each domain will be calculated based on the components observed throughout the year.
4) Members' Multiple Measures of Teaching Practice scores shall be derived from an average score in each domain of the rubric and then weighted according to the following chart:

Professional Responsibilities		
Totals	**100%**	**Sum Total of Weighted Scores**

a) The Sum Total of Weighted Scores, 1-4 will be converted to a score out of sixty (60) using the agreed upon conversion chart. The conversion chart can be found in ***Appendix D*** of this Agreement.

Appendix-B

Other Measures Conversion Chart

Total Average Rubric Score	Category	Conversion score for Other Measures
Ineffective 0-49		
1.000		0
1.008		1
1.017		2
1.025		3
1.033		4
1.042		5
1.050		6
1.058		7
1.067		8
1.075		9
1.083		10
1.092		11
1.100		12
1.108		13
1.115		14
1.123		15
1.131		16
1.138		17
1.146		18
1.154		19
1.162		20
1.169		21
1.177		22
1.185		23
1.192		24
1.200		25
1.208		26
1.217		27
1.225		28
1.233		29
1.242		30

1.250		31
1.258		32
1.267		33
1.275		34
1.283		35
1.292		36
1.300		37
1.308		38
1.317		39
1.325		40
1.333		41
1.342		42
1.350		43
1.358		44
1.367		45
1.375		46
1.383		47
1.392		48
1.400		49
Developing 50-56		
1.5		50
1.6		51
1.7		51
1.8		52
1.9		53
2		53
2.1		54
2.2		55
2.3		55
2.4		56
Effective 57-58		
2.5		57
2.6		57
2.7		57
2.8		57
2.9		58
3		58
3.1		58
3.2		58
3.3		58
3.4		58
Highly Effective 59-60		
3.5		59
3.6		59
3.7		59
3.8		60
3.9		60
4		60

The follow conversion chart will be used to convert a Rubric Score to an Other Measures Score

Locally Selected Measures of Student Achievement

20 Points (15 points with approved Value-Added measure)

6(ii) School-wide measure completed locally

Marion Jr. Sr. High School

- At the Jr. Sr. High School, the school wide measure will be based on five Regents exams, as well as the middle level state assessments
- The Regents exams that will be used: Comprehensive ELA, Integrated Algebra, Global Studies, US History and Living Environment
- The state assessments that will be used: 7-8 ELA; 7-8 Math and Grade 8 Science.
- The score will be compiled using the passing rates (65% or above) of the June Regents exams, including safety net students and the proficiency rates (% of 3's and 4's) of each of the middle level assessments.
- The passing rates and proficiency percentages from each of the assessments will be averaged together to get an overall proficiency/achievement score for the building.
- The agreed upon conversion chart will be used to convert to a HEDI Score.
- The scores will be rounded up to align with the conversion chart. ***See Appendix A***

<u>Example of process for determining Local Score @ Jr. Sr. High</u>

1. Determine the average proficiency rate at the Jr-Sr High. The average rate is 83.20% (see table on left for data)
2. You would look that number up on the ***Conversion Chart for % Proficient (*** in ***Appendix A)*** Based on that chart you would get a 3.3 score.
3. Then using the ***20 Point Conversion Chart 1-4 Rubric to Sub- Component Score*** or the ***15 Point Conversion Chart 1-4 Rubric to Sub-Component Score***, which ever applies you would determine the points earned.
4. In this example 3.3 = 16 points on the 20 point scale or 12 points on the 15 point scale.

7-12 School-wide measure based on:	
Comp ELA	93%
Integrated Algebra	93%
Global	72%
US History	92%
Living Environ.	88%
ELA 7	76%
ELA 8	54%
Math 7	94%
Math 8	84%
Science 8	86%
	83.20%

Marion Elementary School

- At the Marion Elementary, the school wide measure will be based on state assessments.
- The state assessments that will be used include: 3-6 ELA, 3-6 Math and Grade 4 Science.
- The score will be compiled using the proficiency rate (% of 3's and 4's) of each of the state assessments.
- These proficiency percentages from each assessment will be averaged together to get an overall proficiency/achievement score for the building.
- The agreed upon conversion chart will be used to convert to a HEDI Score. ***See Appendix A***

Example of process for determining Local Score @ Marion Elementary School

1. Determine the average proficiency rate at the MES. The average rate is 68.22% (see table on left for data)
2. You would look that number up on the ***Conversion Chart for % Proficient (*** in ***Appendix A)*** Based on that chart you would get a 2.6 score.
3. Then using the ***20 Point Conversion Chart 1-4 Rubric to Sub- Component Score*** or the ***15 Point Conversion Chart 1-4 Rubric to Sub-Component Score***, which ever applies you would determine the points earned.
4. In this example 2.6 = 16 points on the 10 point scale or 8 points on the 15 point scale.

K-6 School-wide measure based on:	
ELA 3	71%
Math 3	53%
ELA 4	64%
Math 4	69%
ELA 5	61%
Math 5	78%
ELA 6	59%
Math 6	70%
Science 4	89%
	68.22%

Based on the law the points will be distributed as follows:

Rating Categories	**Locally-Selected Measures of achievement 20 Point Scale**	**Locally-Selected Measures of achievement 15 Point Scale**
Highly Effective	18-20	14-15
Effective	9-17	8-13
Developing	3-8	3-7
Ineffective	0-2	0-2

Appendix-A

LOCAL MEASURE

Conversion Chart for % Proficient

0-100 Point Scale Conversion Chart*							
Based on a 100 Point Scale	Converted to 1-4 Rating	Based on a 100 Point Scale	Converted to 1-4 Rating	Based on a 100 Point Scale	Converted to 1-4 Rating	Based on a 100 Point Scale	Converted to 1-4 Rating
Ineffective		Developing		Effective		Highly Effective	
0-14	1	55	1.5	65-66	2.5	85-87	3.5
15-27	1.1	56	1.6	67-68	2.6	88-90	3.6
28-40	1.2	57	1.7	69-70	2.7	91-93	3.7
41-53	1.3	58	1.8	71-72	2.8	94-96	3.8
54	1.4	59	1.9	73-74	2.9	97-99	3.9
		60	2	75-76	3	100	4
		61	2.1	77-78	3.1		
		62	2.2	79-81	3.2		
		63	2.3	82-83	3.3		
		64	2.4	84	3.4		

LOCAL MEASURES

20 Point Conversion Charts 1-4 Rubric to Sub-component Score

1-4 Rubric Conversion Scale							
Based on a 1-4 Rubric Rating	20 Point Conversion	Based on a 1-4 Rubric Rating	20 Point Conversion	Based on a 1-4 Rubric Rating	20 Point Conversion	Based on a 1-4 Rubric Rating	20 Point Conversion
Ineffective		Developing		Effective		Highly Effective	
1	0	1.5	3	2.5	9	3.5	18
1.1	1	1.6	3.6	2.6	10	3.6	18
1.2	1.5	1.7	4.2	2.7	10	3.7	18
1.3	2.0	1.8	4.8	2.8	11	3.8	19
1.4	2.5	1.9	5.4	2.9	12	3.9	19
		2	6	3.0	13	4	20
		2.1	6.6	3.1	14		
		2.2	7.2	3.2	15		
		2.3	7.8	3.3	16		
		2.4	8.4	3.4	17		

LOCAL MEASURES

15 Point Conversion Charts 1-4 Rubric to Sub-Component Score

1-4 Rubric Conversion Scale							
Based on a 1-4 Rubric Rating	15 Point Conversion	Based on a 1-4 Rubric Rating	15 Point Conversion	Based on a 1-4 Rubric Rating	15 Point Conversion	Based on a 1-4 Rubric Rating	15 Point Conversion
Ineffective		Developing		Effective		Highly Effective	
1	0	1.5	3	2.5	8	3.5	14
1.2	1	1.7	4	2.7	9	4	15
1.4	2	2.0	5	2.9	10		
		2.2	6	3.0	11		
		2.4	7	3.2	12		
				3.4	13		

Locally Selected Measures of Student Achievement

20 Points (15 points with approved Value-Added measure)

6(ii) School-wide measure completed locally

Marion Jr. Sr. High School

- At the Jr. Sr. High School, the school wide measure will be based on five Regents exams, as well as the middle level state assessments
- The Regents exams that will be used: Comprehensive ELA, Integrated Algebra, Global Studies, US History and Living Environment
- The state assessments that will be used: 7-8 ELA; 7-8 Math and Grade 8 Science.
- The score will be compiled using the passing rates (65% or above) of the June Regents exams, including safety net students and the proficiency rates (% of 3's and 4's) of each of the middle level assessments.
- The passing rates and proficiency percentages from each of the assessments will be averaged together to get an overall proficiency/achievement score for the building.
- The agreed upon conversion chart will be used to convert to a HEDI Score.
- The scores will be rounded up to align with the conversion chart. ***See Appendix A***

<u>Example of process for determining Local Score @ Jr. Sr. High</u>

1. Determine the average proficiency rate at the Jr-Sr High. The average rate is 83.20% (see table on left for data)
2. You would look that number up on the ***Conversion Chart for % Proficient (*** in ***Appendix A)*** Based on that chart you would get a 3.3 score.
3. Then using the ***20 Point Conversion Chart 1-4 Rubric to Sub- Component Score*** or the ***15 Point Conversion Chart 1-4 Rubric to Sub-Component Score***, which ever applies you would determine the points earned.
4. In this example 3.3 = 16 points on the 20 point scale or 12 points on the 15 point scale.

7-12 School-wide measure based on:	
Comp ELA	93%
Integrated Algebra	93%
Global	72%
US History	92%
Living Environ.	88%
ELA 7	76%
ELA 8	54%
Math 7	94%
Math 8	84%
Science 8	86%
	83.20%

Marion Elementary School

- At the Marion Elementary, the school wide measure will be based on state assessments.
- The state assessments that will be used include: 3-6 ELA, 3-6 Math and Grade 4 Science.
- The score will be compiled using the proficiency rate (% of 3's and 4's) of each of the state assessments.
- These proficiency percentages from each assessment will be averaged together to get an overall proficiency/achievement score for the building.
- The agreed upon conversion chart will be used to convert to a HEDI Score. ***See Appendix A***

Example of process for determining Local Score @ Marion Elementary School

1. Determine the average proficiency rate at the MES. The average rate is 68.22% (see table on left for data)
2. You would look that number up on the ***Conversion Chart for % Proficient (*** in ***Appendix A)*** Based on that chart you would get a 2.6 score.
3. Then using the ***20 Point Conversion Chart 1-4 Rubric to Sub- Component Score*** or the ***15 Point Conversion Chart 1-4 Rubric to Sub-Component Score***, which ever applies you would determine the points earned.
4. In this example 2.6 = 16 points on the 10 point scale or 8 points on the 15 point scale.

K-6 School-wide measure based on:	
ELA 3	71%
Math 3	53%
ELA 4	64%
Math 4	69%
ELA 5	61%
Math 5	78%
ELA 6	59%
Math 6	70%
Science 4	89%
	68.22%

Based on the law the points will be distributed as follows:

Rating Categories	**Locally-Selected Measures of achievement 20 Point Scale**	**Locally-Selected Measures of achievement 15 Point Scale**
Highly Effective	18-20	14-15
Effective	9-17	8-13
Developing	3-8	3-7
Ineffective	0-2	0-2

Appendix-A

LOCAL MEASURE

Conversion Chart for % Proficient

0-100 Point Scale Conversion Chart*							
Based on a 100 Point Scale	Converted to 1-4 Rating	Based on a 100 Point Scale	Converted to 1-4 Rating	Based on a 100 Point Scale	Converted to 1-4 Rating	Based on a 100 Point Scale	Converted to 1-4 Rating
Ineffective		Developing		Effective		Highly Effective	
0-14	1	55	1.5	65-66	2.5	85-87	3.5
15-27	1.1	56	1.6	67-68	2.6	88-90	3.6
28-40	1.2	57	1.7	69-70	2.7	91-93	3.7
41-53	1.3	58	1.8	71-72	2.8	94-96	3.8
54	1.4	59	1.9	73-74	2.9	97-99	3.9
		60	2	75-76	3	100	4
		61	2.1	77-78	3.1		
		62	2.2	79-81	3.2		
		63	2.3	82-83	3.3		
		64	2.4	84	3.4		

LOCAL MEASURES

20 Point Conversion Charts 1-4 Rubric to Sub-component Score

1-4 Rubric Conversion Scale							
Based on a 1-4 Rubric Rating	20 Point Conversion	Based on a 1-4 Rubric Rating	20 Point Conversion	Based on a 1-4 Rubric Rating	20 Point Conversion	Based on a 1-4 Rubric Rating	20 Point Conversion
Ineffective		Developing		Effective		Highly Effective	
1	0	1.5	3	2.5	9	3.5	18
1.1	1	1.6	3.6	2.6	10	3.6	18
1.2	1.5	1.7	4.2	2.7	10	3.7	18
1.3	2.0	1.8	4.8	2.8	11	3.8	19
1.4	2.5	1.9	5.4	2.9	12	3.9	19
		2	6	3.0	13	4	20
		2.1	6.6	3.1	14		
		2.2	7.2	3.2	15		
		2.3	7.8	3.3	16		
		2.4	8.4	3.4	17		

LOCAL MEASURES

15 Point Conversion Charts 1-4 Rubric to Sub-Component Score

1-4 Rubric Conversion Scale							
Based on a 1-4 Rubric Rating	15 Point Conversion	Based on a 1-4 Rubric Rating	15 Point Conversion	Based on a 1-4 Rubric Rating	15 Point Conversion	Based on a 1-4 Rubric Rating	15 Point Conversion
Ineffective		Developing		Effective		Highly Effective	
1	0	1.5	3	2.5	8	3.5	14
1.2	1	1.7	4	2.7	9	4	15
1.4	2	2.0	5	2.9	10		
		2.2	6	3.0	11		
		2.4	7	3.2	12		
				3.4	13		

Teacher Improvement Plan

- The principal reserves the right to put a teacher on a TIP regardless of rating if there are documented concerns regarding a teacher based on the rubric at any time during the year.
- A TIP shall be developed in consultation with the teacher and union representation shall be afforded at the teacher's request.
- A TIP is not a disciplinary action. At the end of a mutually agreed upon timeline, the teacher, administrator and mentor (if one has been assigned), and a union representative (if requested by the teacher) shall meet to assess the effectiveness of the TIP in assisting the teacher to achieve the goals set forth in the TIP.
- Based on the outcome of this assessment, the TIP shall be modified accordingly.
- See ***Appendix E*** for format of TIP

Appendix-E

Marion Teacher Improvement Plan (TIP)

Status

☐1st Year Probationer

☐2nd Year Probationer

☐3rd Year Probationer

☐Tenured

☐Other_____

Date Composite Score was Received: _____

Date TIP was Initiated: _____

Teacher:_____ Tenure Area:_____

Evaluator:_____

Participants:_____

Place a check mark in the box next to any domain below that is rated as Developing or Ineffective or seen as areas of concern:

____ Domain 1: Planning and Preparation:

____ Domain 2: Classroom Environment

____ Domain 3: Instruction

____ Domain 4: Professional Responsibilities

In the space below, describe the following: List goals to address the domains assessed as Developing or Ineffective; list individual actions that will guide the teacher's improvement in the areas listed above; describe the manner in which the improvement will be assessed and provide a timeline for achieving improvement.

Improvement Goal(s):	**Suggested Actions: (some items below are actions you are currently engaged in.)**	**Desired Outcomes:**	**Timeframe:**
Evidence of Improvement: **Formative Assessment:** **Summative Assessment:**			

_____ _____

Teacher Signature Date

I understand the goals, expectations & outcomes of this collaboratively developed TIP.

_____ _____

Administrator Signature Date

TIP Progress Monitoring Conference(s)

Evidence & Feedback:	**Evidence & Feedback:**	**Evidence & Feedback:**	**Evidence & Feedback:**	**Evidence & Feedback:**
Date: **Comments:**	**Date:** **Comments:**	**Date:** **Comments:**	**Date:** **Comments:**	**Date:** **Comments:**

Final TIP Conference

Administrator's Comments:

Administrator's Signature_____ Date _____

Educator's Comments:

Educator's Signature _____ Date _____

cc: Superintendent and Shared Administrator (if applicable)

PRINCIPAL IMPROVEMENT PLAN

- The Superintendent reserves the right to put a principal on a PIP regardless of rating if there are documented concerns regarding a principal based on the rubric at any time during the year.
- A PIP shall be developed in consultation with the principal and association representation shall be afforded at the principal's request.
- A PIP is not a disciplinary action. At the end of a mutually agreed upon timeline, the principal, Superintendent and mentor (if one has been assigned), and a Unit representative (if requested by the principal) shall meet to assess the effectiveness of the PIP in assisting the principal to achieve the goals set forth in the PIP.
- Based on the outcome of this assessment, the PIP shall be modified accordingly.
- See ***Appendix C*** for format of PIP

Appendix-C

Marion Principal Improvement Plan (PIP)

Status

☐1st Year Probationer

☐2nd Year Probationer

☐3rd Year Probationer

☐Tenured

☐Other_____

Date Composite Score was Received: _____

Date PIP was Initiated: _____

Principal:_____ Tenure Area:_____

Evaluator:_____

Place a check mark in the box next to any domain below that is rated as Developing or Ineffective or seen as areas of concern:

____ Standard 1
____Standard 2
____Standard 3
____Standard 4
____Standard 5
____Standard 6
____Standard 7
____Standard 8
____Standard 9
____Standard 10

In the space below, describe the following: List goals to address the domains assessed as Developing or Ineffective; list individual actions that will guide the teacher's improvement in the areas listed above;

describe the manner in which the improvement will be assessed and provide a timeline for achieving improvement.

Improvement Goal(s):	**Suggested Actions: (some items below are actions you are currently engaged in.)**	**Desired Outcomes:**	**Timeframe:**
Evidence of Improvement: **Formative Assessment:** **Summative Assessment:**			

_____ _____

Principal Signature Date

I understand the goals, expectations & outcomes of this collaboratively developed PIP.

_____ _____

Evaluator Signature Date

PIP Progress Monitoring Conference(s)

Evidence & Feedback:	**Evidence & Feedback:**	**Evidence & Feedback:**	**Evidence & Feedback:**	**Evidence & Feedback:**
Date: **Comments:**	**Date:** **Comments:**	**Date:** **Comments:**	**Date:** **Comments:**	**Date:** **Comments:**

Final PIP Conference

Evaluator's Comments:

Evaluator's Signature_____ Date _____

Principal's Comments:

Principal's Signature _____ Date _____

Form 2.10) All Other Courses

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

	Course(s) or Subject(s)	Option	Assessment
	AIS/Reading: Grade 3-6	○ State Assessment ○ State-approved 3rd party assessment ○ District, Regional or BOCES-developed X○ School/BOCES-wide/group/team results based on State	ELA state assessments for Grade level supported
	AIS/ Reading: Grade K-2	o State Assessment o State-approved 3rd party assessment o X District, Regional or BOCES-developed o School/BOCES-wide/group/team results based on State	JMT ELA developed assessment, grade specific
	Other Special Education not using state assessments (CTS/RR, 7-12)	○ State Assessment ○ State-approved 3rd party assessment X○ District, Regional or BOCES-developed ○ School/BOCES-wide/group/team results based on State	WFL BOCES developed assessment grade and course specific
	Special Education (CTS/RR, 7-12)	X State Assessment o State-approved 3rd party assessment o District, Regional or BOCES-developed o School/BOCES-wide/group/team results based on State	NYS Assessment grade and course specific

	Special Education (CT/RR, K-6)	○ State Assessment ○ State-approved 3rd party assessment ○ District, Regional or BOCES-developed X○ School/BOCES-wide/group/team results based on State	ELA and/or State assessments for Grade level supported
	Special Education (self-contained, K-2)	○ State Assessment ○ State-approved 3rd party assessment X○ District, Regional or BOCES-developed ○ School/BOCES-wide/group/team results based on State	JMT/WFL BOCES developed assessment for the Grade level(s) contained in classroom
	Special Education (self-contained, 3-6)	O State assessment	ELA and Math state assessment for the Grades contained in class

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

Use this box, if needed, to describe the general process for assigning HEDI categories for these grades/subjects in this subcomponent. If needed, you may upload a table or graphic at 2.11.	
Highly Effective (18 - 20 points) Results are well-above District goals for similar students.	See chart
Effective (9 - 17 points) Results meet District goals for similar students.	See chart

Developing (3 - 8 points) Results are below District goals for similar students.	See chart
Ineffective (0 - 2 points) Results are well-below District goals for similar students.	See chart

Process for assigning HEDI scores to SLOs

The Marion Central School District will be establishing individual targets for each student that appears on an SLO roster. The individual targets will be developed using baseline data arrived from students' performance on pre-assessments and other data that teachers have on their individual students. The principal and the teacher will meet to finalize the individual growth targets for the students. HEDI scores will be assigned based on the percentage of students that meet their individual target.

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

95% of students or more met or exceed their growth target.

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

76%-94% of students met or exceed their growth target.

Developing: (3-8) Results meet state average for similar students (or District goals if no state test).

46%-75% of students met or exceed their growth target.

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

45% or less of the students met or exceed their growth target.

New York State Student Learning Objective Template

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

Target(s)	*What is the expected outcome (target) of students' level of knowledge of the learning content at the end of the instructional period?*
HEDI Scoring	*How will evaluators determine what range of student performance "meets" the goal (effective) versus "well-below" (ineffective), "below" (developing), and "well-above" (highly effective)?*

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
100-99	98-97	96-95	94-93	92-91	90-89	88-87	86-85	84-82	81-80	79-78	77-76	75-71	70-66	65-61	60-56	55-51	50-46	45-31	30-16	15-0

Rationale	*Describe the reasoning behind the choices regarding learning content, evidence, and target and how they will be used together to prepare students for future growth and development in subsequent grades/courses, as well as college and career readiness.*

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

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

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

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

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

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

Signatures, dates

Superintendent Signature: Date:

Kathy A. Wagner 10/24/12

Teachers Union President Signature: Date:

10/24/12

Administrative Union President Signature: Date:

No admin union - NA

Board of Education President Signature: Date: 10/24/12