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

Acting Commissioner of Education
89 Washington Avenue, Room 111
Albany, New York 12234

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

June 25, 2015

Revised-Expedited Assessment Material Change

William Flynn, Interim Superintendent
Massena Central School District
84 Nightengale Avenue
Massena, NY 13662

Dear Superintendent Clough:

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

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

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

Thank you again for your hard work.

Sincerely,

Elizabeth R. Berlin
Acting Commissioner

Attachment

c: Thomas R. Burns

NOTES:

Only the material changes included in your Expedited Assessment Material Change request were reviewed. The remaining sections of your district's/BOCES' plan, as approved by the Commissioner on January 8, 2013, remain in effect. Therefore, it is the responsibility of the district/BOCES to ensure that the change(s) approved will not have any impact on the implementation of any other part of its approved plan.

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

Name of school district or BOCES: Massena CSD

Please check the applicable boxes below to indicate which portions of the APPR plan have been changed that relate to the elimination of unnecessary assessments on students.

Task 2. State Growth or Other Comparable Measures (Teachers)

2.2) Grades K-3 ELA

☒ Kindergarten ELA Assessment ☒ Kindergarten ELA HEDI Process ☒ Kindergarten ELA Assignment of Points	☒ Grade 1 ELA Assessment ☒ Grade 1 ELA HEDI Process ☒ Grade 1 ELA Assignment of Points
☒ Grade 2 ELA Assessment ☒ Grade 2 ELA HEDI Process ☒ Grade 2 ELA Assignment of Points	☐ Grade 3 ELA HEDI Process ☒ Grade 3 ELA Assignment of Points

2.3) Grades K-3 Math

☒ Kindergarten Math Assessment ☒ Kindergarten Math HEDI Process ☒ Kindergarten Math Assignment of Points	☒ Grade 1 Math Assessment ☒ Grade 1 Math HEDI Process ☒ Grade 1 Math Assignment of Points
☒ Grade 2 Math Assessment ☒ Grade 2 Math HEDI Process ☒ Grade 2 Math Assignment of Points	☐ Grade 3 Math HEDI Process ☒ Grade 3 Math Assignment of Points

2.4) Grades 6-8 Science

☒ Grade 6 Science Assessment ☒ Grade 6 Science HEDI Process ☒ Grade 6 Science Assignment of Points	☒ Grade 7 Science Assessment ☒ Grade 7 Science HEDI Process ☒ Grade 7 Science Assignment of Points
☒ Grade 8 Science HEDI Process ☒ Grade 8 Science Assignment of Points	

2.5) Grades 6-8 Social Studies

☒ Grade 6 Social Studies Assessment ☒ Grade 6 Social Studies HEDI Process ☒ Grade 6 Social Studies Assignment of Points	☒ Grade 7 Social Studies Assessment ☒ Grade 7 Social Studies HEDI Process ☒ Grade 7 Social Studies Assignment of Points
☒ Grade 8 Social Studies Assessment ☒ Grade 8 Social Studies HEDI Process ☒ Grade 8 Social Studies Assignment of Points	

2.6) High School Social Studies Regents Courses

☒ Global 1 Assessment ☒ Global 1 HEDI Process ☒ Global 1 Assignment of Points	☐ Global 2 HEDI Process ☐ Global 2 Assignment of Points
☐ American History HEDI Process ☐ American History Assignment of Points	

2.7) High School Science Regents Courses

☐ Living Environment HEDI Process ☐ Living Environment Assignment of Points	☐ Earth Science HEDI Process ☐ Earth Science Assignment of Points
☐ Chemistry HEDI Process ☐ Chemistry Assignment of Points	☐ Physics HEDI Process ☐ Physics Assignment of Points

2.8) High School Math Regents Courses

☐ Algebra 1 HEDI Process ☐ Algebra 1 Assignment of Points	☐ Geometry HEDI Process ☐ Geometry Assignment of Points
☐ Algebra 2 HEDI Process ☐ Algebra 2 Assignment of Points	

2.9) High School English Language Arts

☒ Grade 9 ELA Assessment ☒ Grade 9 ELA HEDI Process ☒ Grade 9 ELA Assignment of Points	☒ Grade 10 ELA Assessment ☒ Grade 10 ELA HEDI Process ☒ Grade 10 ELA Assignment of Points
☐ Grade 11 ELA Assessment ☐ Grade 11 ELA HEDI Process ☐ Grade 11 ELA Assignment of Points	

2.10) All Other Courses

☒ All other course(s) Assessment(s) ☒ All other course(s) HEDI Process ☐ All other course(s) Assignment of Points

2.11) HEDI Table(s)

☐ Listed course(s) Assessment(s) ☒ Listed course(s) HEDI Process ☒ Listed course(s) Assignment of Points

Task 3. Locally-Selected Measures (Teachers)

3.1) Grades 4-8 ELA

☐ Grade 4 ELA Assessment ☐ Grade 4 ELA HEDI Process ☐ Grade 4 ELA Assignment of Points	☐ Grade 5 ELA Assessment ☐ Grade 5 ELA HEDI Process ☐ Grade 5 ELA Assignment of Points
☐ Grade 6 ELA Assessment ☐ Grade 6 ELA HEDI Process ☐ Grade 6 ELA Assignment of Points	☐ Grade 7 ELA Assessment ☐ Grade 7 ELA HEDI Process ☐ Grade 7 ELA Assignment of Points
☐ Grade 8 ELA Assessment ☐ Grade 8 ELA HEDI Process ☐ Grade 8 ELA Assignment of Points	

3.2) Grades 4-8 Math

☐ Grade 4 Math Assessment ☐ Grade 4 Math HEDI Process ☐ Grade 4 Math Assignment of Points	☐ Grade 5 Math Assessment ☐ Grade 5 Math HEDI Process ☐ Grade 5 Math Assignment of Points
☐ Grade 6 Math Assessment ☐ Grade 6 Math HEDI Process ☐ Grade 6 Math Assignment of Points	☐ Grade 7 Math Assessment ☐ Grade 7 Math HEDI Process ☐ Grade 7 Math Assignment of Points
☐ Grade 8 Math Assessment ☐ Grade 8 Math HEDI Process ☐ Grade 8 Math Assignment of Points	

3.3) HEDI Table(s) or Graphic(s)

☐ Listed course(s) Assessment(s) ☐ Listed course(s) HEDI Process ☐ Listed course(s) Assignment of Points

3.4) Grades K-3 ELA

☐ Kindergarten ELA Assessment ☐ Kindergarten ELA HEDI Process ☐ Kindergarten ELA Assignment of Points	☐ Grade 1 ELA Assessment ☐ Grade 1 ELA HEDI Process ☐ Grade 1 ELA Assignment of Points
☐ Grade 2 ELA Assessment ☐ Grade 2 ELA HEDI Process ☐ Grade 2 ELA Assignment of Points	☐ Grade 3 ELA Assessment ☐ Grade 3 ELA HEDI Process ☐ Grade 3 ELA Assignment of Points

3.5) Grades K-3 Math

☐ Kindergarten Math Assessment ☐ Kindergarten Math HEDI Process ☐ Kindergarten Math Assignment of Points	☐ Grade 1 Math Assessment ☐ Grade 1 Math HEDI Process ☐ Grade 1 Math Assignment of Points
☐ Grade 2 Math Assessment ☐ Grade 2 Math HEDI Process ☐ Grade 2 Math Assignment of Points	☐ Grade 3 Math Assessment ☐ Grade 3 Math HEDI Process ☐ Grade 3 Math Assignment of Points

3.6) Grades 6-8 Science

☐ Grade 6 Science Assessment ☐ Grade 6 Science HEDI Process ☐ Grade 6 Science Assignment of Points	☐ Grade 7 Science Assessment ☐ Grade 7 Science HEDI Process ☐ Grade 7 Science Assignment of Points
☐ Grade 8 Science Assessment ☐ Grade 8 Science HEDI Process ☐ Grade 8 Science Assignment of Points	

3.7) Grades 6-8 Social Studies

☐ Grade 6 Social Studies Assessment ☐ Grade 6 Social Studies HEDI Process ☐ Grade 6 Social Studies Assignment of Points	☐ Grade 7 Social Studies Assessment ☐ Grade 7 Social Studies HEDI Process ☐ Grade 7 Social Studies Assignment of Points
☐ Grade 8 Social Studies Assessment ☐ Grade 8 Social Studies HEDI Process ☐ Grade 8 Social Studies Assignment of Points	

3.8) High School Social Studies Regents Courses

☐ Global 1 Assessment ☐ Global 1 HEDI Process ☐ Global 1 Assignment of Points	☐ Global 2 Assessment ☐ Global 2 HEDI Process ☐ Global 2 Assignment of Points
☐ American History Assessment ☐ American History HEDI Process ☐ American History Assignment of Points	

3.9) High School Science Regents Courses

☐ Living Environment Assessment ☐ Living Environment HEDI Process ☐ Living Environment Assignment of Points	☐ Earth Science Assessment ☐ Earth Science HEDI Process ☐ Earth Science Assignment of Points
☐ Chemistry Assessment ☐ Chemistry HEDI Process ☐ Chemistry Assignment of Points	☐ Physics Assessment ☐ Physics HEDI Process ☐ Physics Assignment of Points

3.10) High School Math Regents Courses

☐ Algebra 1 Assessment ☐ Algebra 1 HEDI Process ☐ Algebra 1 Assignment of Points	☐ Geometry Assessment ☐ Geometry HEDI Process ☐ Geometry Assignment of Points
☐ Algebra 2 Assessment ☐ Algebra 2 HEDI Process ☐ Algebra 2 Assignment of Points	

3.11) High School English Language Arts

☐ Grade 9 ELA Assessment ☐ Grade 9 ELA HEDI Process ☐ Grade 9 ELA Assignment of Points	☐ Grade 10 ELA Assessment ☐ Grade 10 ELA HEDI Process ☐ Grade 10 ELA Assignment of Points
☐ Grade 11 ELA Assessment ☐ Grade 11 ELA HEDI Process ☐ Grade 11 ELA Assignment of Points	

3.12) All Other Courses

☐ All other course(s) Assessment(s) ☐ All other course(s) HEDI Process ☐ All other course(s) Assignment of Points

3.13) HEDI Table(s)

- [ ] Listed course(s) Assessment(s)
- [ ] Listed course(s) HEDI Process
- [ ] Listed course(s) Assignment of Points

Task 7. State Growth or Other Comparable Measures (Principals)

7.3) Students Learning Objectives as Comparable Growth Measures (20 points)

- [x] Listed course(s) Assessment(s)
- [x] Listed course(s) HEDI Process
- [x] Listed course(s) Assignment of Points

7.3) HEDI Table(s)

- [x] Listed course(s) Assessment(s)
- [x] Listed course(s) HEDI Process
- [x] Listed course(s) Assignment of Points

Task 8. Locally-Selected Measures (Principals)

8.1) Locally Selected Measures of Student Achievement for Principals With an Approved Value-Added Measure (15 points) (20 points until Value-Added is implemented)

- [ ] Listed course(s) Assessment(s)
- [ ] Listed course(s) HEDI Process
- [ ] Listed course(s) Assignment of Points

8.1) HEDI Table(s)

- [ ] Listed course(s) Assessment(s)
- [ ] Listed course(s) HEDI Process
- [ ] Listed course(s) Assignment of Points

8.2) Locally Selected Measures of Student Achievement for All Other Principals (20 points)

- [ ] Listed course(s) Assessment(s)
- [ ] Listed course(s) HEDI Process
- [ ] Listed course(s) Assignment of Points

8.2) HEDI Table(s)

- [ ] Listed course(s) Assessment(s)
- [ ] Listed course(s) HEDI Process
- [ ] Listed course(s) Assignment of Points

Statement of Assurances

By signing this document, the superintendent, district superintendent, or chancellor, the president of the board of education and the collective bargaining agent(s) of the school district or BOCES, where applicable, certify that this expedited material change and the previously approved APPR plan and/or approved material changes constitute the district's or BOCES' complete Annual Professional Performance Review (APPR) plan, that collective bargaining negotiations have been completed on any requested material changes that affect provisions of the currently approved APPR plan that are subject to collective bargaining, and that such APPR plan complies with all of 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 district or BOCES and its collective bargaining agent(s), where applicable, also assure that upon information and belief, all statements made herein are true and accurate and that any applicable collective bargaining agreements for teachers and principals are consistent with and/or have been amended and/or modified or otherwise resolved to the extent required by Article 14 of the Civil Service Law, as necessary to require that all classroom teachers and building principals will be evaluated using a comprehensive annual evaluation system that rigorously adheres to Education Law §3012-c and Subpart 30-2 of the Rules of the Board of Regents. The school district or BOCES and its collective bargaining agent(s), where applicable, also certify that the district's or BOCES' complete APPR plan will be fully implemented by the school district or BOCES; that there are no collective bargaining agreements, memoranda of understanding, or any other agreements in any form that prevent, conflict or interfere with full implementation of the district's or BOCES APPR plan, including any approved material changes; and that no material changes will be made to the plan through collective bargaining or otherwise except with the approval of the Commissioner in accordance with Subpart 30-2 of the Rules of the Board of Regents.

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

- Assure that the material changes indicated in this form are in compliance with Education Law §3012-c and Subpart 30-2 of the Rules of the Board of Regents.
- Assure that collective bargaining negotiations have been completed on any requested material changes that affect provisions of the currently approved APPR plan that are subject to collective bargaining,
- Assure that the district's or BOCES' request for an expedited review of their APPR plan is only for material changes related to the elimination of unnecessary assessments in the Tasks identified by the district or BOCES in this form and that no other Tasks of the district's or BOCES' approved APPR plan have been changed.
- Assure that any material changes approved by the Commissioner as part of this expedited review shall constitute part of the school district's or BOCES' currently approved APPR plan.
- Assure 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.
- Assure that the district's or BOCES' entire approved APPR plan, including any approved material change, will be posted on the district or BOCES website within 10 days after it is approved by the Commissioner.
- Assure that the district's or BOCES' request for an expedited material change will not prevent, conflict, or interfere with any existing collective bargaining agreement and/or full implementation of the APPR plan currently approved by the Department in any way or the described timeframes for submission of data in Education Law §3012-c and Subpart 30-2 of the Rules of the Board of Regents. This includes, but is not limited to, that results will be provided and 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's or building principal's performance is being measured.

- Assure that the district or BOCES understands that the Department will only review, in an expedited fashion, the material changes described on this assurance form and that no other portion of the APPR plan will be reviewed as part of this material change request, by the Department for compliance with Education Law §3012-c and understands that the Commissioner reserves the right to revoke his/her approval of these material changes at any time if the Department determines that additional changes were made to the plan, other than those identified by the district or BOCES in this form.
- Assure that the district or BOCES will continue to fully implement the currently approved APPR plan and will not have collective bargaining agreements, memoranda of understanding, or any other agreements in any form that prevent that would prevent, conflict, or interfere with full implementation of the APPR plan.
- 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 the district or BOCES will provide the Department with any information necessary to conduct annual monitoring pursuant to the regulations.
- Assure that the district or BOCES understands that the use of an expedited material change does not preclude the Department from conducting annual monitoring regarding the implementation of the requested change or of its entire approved APPR plan pursuant to the regulations.
- Assure that any material change to the APPR plan relating to assessment use will align with the applicable HEDI description(s) and uploaded document(s) for the given Task.

Signatures, Dates

Superintendent Signature: Date:

William H. Flynn 6/15/15

Teachers Union President Signature: Date:

Elin Corell 6/18/15

Administrative Union President Signature: Date:

Allen W Rowledge 6/19/15

Board of Education President Signature: Date:

22 JUNE 2015

Effective May 10, 2014, the school district or BOCES also makes the following specific assurances with respect to their APPR plan:

Pursuant to Section 30-2.3(a)(4) of the Rules of the Board of Regents, the superintendent, district superintendent or chancellor certify that for the 2014-15 school year and thereafter:

- The amount of time devoted to traditional standardized assessments that are not specifically required by state or federal law for each classroom or program within a grade level does not exceed, in the aggregate, one percent of the minimum in required annual instructional hours for such grade.
- The amount of time devoted to test preparation under traditional standardized testing conditions for each classroom or program within a grade level does not exceed, in the aggregate, two percent of the minimum required annual instructional hours for such grade.
- Time devoted to teacher administered classroom quizzes or exams, portfolio reviews or performance assessments, formative and diagnostic assessments, including but not limited to assessments used for diagnostic screening required by Education Law §3208(5), shall not be counted toward the aforementioned limits. Additionally, these calculations do not supersede the requirements of a section of the 504 plan of a qualified student with a disability or federal law relating to English language learners or the individualized education program (IEP) of a student with a disability; assessments that are otherwise required to be administered by federal law; and/or assessments used for diagnostic or formative purposes.

Superintendent / District Superintendent / Chancellor Signature:	Date:
William H. Flynn	6/15/15

EXPEDITED MATERIAL CHANGE FORM

Directions:

The following certification form is for use by school districts/BOCES that request to make a material change to their approved Annual Professional Performance Review (APPR) plan that relates solely to the elimination of unnecessary student assessments as described in Section 30-2.3(a)(2) of the Rules of the Board of Regents. For more information please see http://www.regents.nysed.gov/meetings/2014/February2014/214p12hea1.pdf.

Districts/BOCES that wish to submit material changes to their approved APPR plan for use in the current school year must complete and submit this form to EducatorEval (educatoreval@mail.nysed.gov) ***no later than March 1***. Please note that the Department will not accept late submissions of this form. **Please type "Expedited Assessment Material Change" in the subject line of your email to ensure an expedited review of your material change request.**

The superintendent, district superintendent, or chancellor of each school district/BOCES must provide a written explanation of the changes to their approved APPR plan in addition to the required certification below---that no other material changes have been made to other portions of the APPR plan. In the form below, please identify the relevant Task(s) (2, 3, 7, and/or 8), as listed in the APPR Portal, that will be impacted by your requested material change. In each sub-task, please also indicate if changes were made to the selected assessment, HEDI process, and/or assignment of points.

The Department shall complete the review of properly and completely submitted material changes ***within 10 business days of submission***. In order to be considered properly and completely submitted, the submission must include this form with all appropriate signatures and dates and a corresponding submission in the APPR Portal (as described above) that meets the requirements of Education Law §3012-c and Subpart 30-2 of the Board of Regents. If a plan is reviewed and rejected by the Department because it was not properly and completely submitted or for any other reason, the 10 business day requirement for an expedited review does not apply until a new, properly and completely submitted material change is submitted for approval.

Please note that the Department will only review the Task(s) and sub-task(s) indicated in this certification form and no other portion of the APPR plan will be reviewed by the Department for compliance with Education Law §3012-c. Therefore, it is the responsibility of the district/BOCES to assure that the changes requested will not have an impact on the implementation of any other part of their approved APPR plan since the Department will not be reviewing the remaining portions of the approved APPR plan for compliance with Education Law §3012-c. The Department recommends that school districts/BOCES consult with their local counsel before submitting this certification form and any changes to their currently approved plan in the APPR Portal.

Annual Professional Performance Reviews

Created Tuesday, April 30, 2013
Updated Wednesday, February 25, 2015

1

Disclaimers

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

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

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

1. SCHOOL DISTRICT INFORMATION

1.1) School District's BEDS Number : 512001060000

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

512001060000

1.2) School District Name: MASSENA CSD

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

MASSENA CSD

1.3) Assurances

Please check all of the boxes below:

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

1.4) Submission Status

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

Submission of material changes to an approved APPR plan

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

Created: 04/30/2013
Last updated: 06/03/2015

For guidance on the State Growth or Comparable Measures subcomponent, see NYSED APPR Guidance sections D, F, and I. NYSED APPR Guidance is posted on www.EngageNY.org at https://www.engageny.org/resource/guidance-on-new-york-s-annual-professional-performance-review-law-and-regulations/.

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 where there is no State-provided measure. Teachers with 50 – 100% of students covered by State-provided growth measures will receive a growth score from the State for the full Growth subcomponent score of their evaluation. Teachers with 0 – 49% of students covered by State-provided growth measures must have SLOs for the Growth subcomponent of their evaluation and one SLO must use the State-provided measure if applicable for any courses. (See Guidance for more detail on teachers with State-provided measures AND SLOs.)

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

2.1) Assurances

Please check the boxes below:

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

STUDENT LEARNING OBJECTIVES AS COMPARABLE GROWTH MEASURES (20 points)

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

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

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

If no State assessment or Regents exam exists:

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

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

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

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

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

2.2) Grades K-3 ELA

Using the drop-down boxes below, please first select the assessment that will be used for SLOs for the grade/subject listed. Then name the specific assessment, listing the full name of the assessment. State assessments must be used where applicable. Please note that no APPR plan shall be approved by the Commissioner for use in the 2014-2015 school year or thereafter that provides for the administration of traditional standardized assessments for use with students in kindergarten through grade two for APPR purposes (see: http://www.engageny.org/resource/guidance-on-the-approved-regulatory-amendments-to-appr-to-help-reduce-local-testing).

	ELA	Assessment
K	School-or BOCES-wide, group or team results based on State assessments	NYS 3- 6 ELA and Math Assessments
1	School-or BOCES-wide, group or team results based on State assessments	NYS 3- 6 ELA and Math Assessments
2	School-or BOCES-wide, group or team results based on State assessments	NYS 3- 6 ELA and Math Assessments

	ELA	Assessment
3	State assessment	3rd Grade State Assessment

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

Use this box, if needed, to describe the general process for assigning HEDI categories for these grades/subjects in this subcomponent. If needed, you may upload a table or graphic at 2.11, below.	For teachers in grades K-2 ELA , a school-wide measure will be utilized. HEIDI points will be awarded based on the school-wide percentage of students meeting or exceeding a minimum rigor expectation for growth of a level 3 or higher. For grade 3 ELA each teacher will receive a HEDI score based on each teacher's class roster. The teacher in collaboration with the Principal will establish individual growth targets using baseline data. Based on overall percentage of students who meet or exceed their individual growth target a corresponding 0-20 HEDI score will be determined using the uploaded conversion chart in 2.11.
Highly Effective (18 - 20 points) Results are well-above state average for similar students (or District goals if no state test).	See the 2.11 attachment.

Effective (9 - 17 points) Results meet state average for similar students (or District goals if no state test).	See the 2.11 attachment.
Developing (3 - 8 points) Results are below state average for similar students (or District goals if no state test).	See the 2.11 attachment.
Ineffective (0 - 2 points) Results are well-below state average for similar students (or District goals if no state test).	See the 2.11 attachment.

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. Please note that no APPR plan shall be approved by the Commissioner for use in the 2014-2015 school year or thereafter that provides for the administration of traditional standardized assessments for use with students in kindergarten through grade two for APPR purposes (see: http://www.engageny.org/resource/guidance-on-the-approved-regulatory-amendments-to-appr-to-help-reduce-local-testing).

	Math	Assessment
K	School-or BOCES-wide, group or team results based on State assessments	NYS 3- 6 ELA and Math Assessments
1	School-or BOCES-wide, group or team results based on State assessments	NYS 3- 6 ELA and Math Assessments
2	School-or BOCES-wide, group or team results based on State assessments	NYS 3- 6 ELA and Math Assessments

	Math	Assessment
3	State assessment	3rd Grade State Assessment

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

Use this box, if needed, to describe the general process for assigning HEDI categories for these grades/subjects in this subcomponent. If needed, you may upload a table or graphic at 2.11, below.	For teachers in grades K-2 Math , a school-wide measure will be utilized. HEDI points will be awarded based on the school-wide percentage of students meeting or exceeding a minimum rigor expectation for growth of a level 3 or higher. For grade 3 Math each teacher will receive a HEDI score based on each teacher's class roster. The teacher in collaboration with the Principal will establish individual growth targets using baseline data. Base on overall percentage of students who meet or exceed their individual growth target a corresponding 0-20 HEDI score will be determined using the uploaded conversion chart in 2.11.
Highly Effective (18 - 20 points) Results are well-above state average for similar students (or District goals if no state test).	See the 2.11 attachment.
Effective (9 - 17 points) Results meet state average for similar students (or District goals if no state test).	See the 2.11 attachment.
Developing (3 - 8 points) Results are below state average for similar students (or District goals if no state test).	See the 2.11 attachment.
Ineffective (0 - 2 points) Results are well-below state average for similar students (or District goals if no state test).	See the 2.11 attachment.

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	School- or BOCES-wide, group or team results based on State assessments	NYS 3- 6 ELA and Math Assessments
7	School- or BOCES-wide, group or team results based on State assessments	NYS 7-8 ELA & Math ,Grade 8 Science, along with Earth Science and CC Algebra Regents for accelerated Grade 8 students

	Science	Assessment
8	State assessment	8th Grade State Science Assessment

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

Use this box, if needed, to describe the general process for assigning HEDI categories for these grades/subjects in this subcomponent. If needed, you may upload a table or graphic at 2.11, below.	There will be a School-Wide measure of student growth based upon the performance of all 3-6 ELA and Math for Grade 6 Science. For Grade 7 Science there will be a school wide measure which is based upon all NYS Assessments Grades 7-8. HEDI points will be awarded based on the school-wide percentage of students meeting or exceeding a minimum rigor expectation for growth of a level 3 (or 65 for Regents) or higher. A corresponding 0-20 HEDI score will be determined using the uploaded conversion chart in attachment 2.11. Student Growth targets will be developed by each Grade 8 Science teacher in collaboration with the building principal using baseline data. The SLO will reflect the percentage of students in 8th Grade who meet or exceed their individual growth target. A corresponding 0-20 HEDI score will be determined using the uploaded conversion chart in attachment 2.11
Highly Effective (18 - 20 points) Results are well-above state average for similar students (or District goals if no state test).	See the 2.11 attachment.
Effective (9 - 17 points) Results meet state average for similar students (or District goals if no state test).	See the 2.11 attachment.
Developing (3 - 8 points) Results are below state average for similar students (or District goals if no state test).	See the 2.11 attachment.
Ineffective (0 - 2 points) Results are well-below state average for similar students (or District goals if no state test).	See the 2.11 attachment.

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	School- or BOCES-wide, group or team results based on State assessments	NYS 3- 6 ELA and Math Assessments
7	School- or BOCES-wide, group or team results based on State assessments	NYS 7-8 ELA & Math ,Grade 8 Science, along with Earth Science and CC Algebra Regents for accelerated Grade 8 students

8	School- or BOCES-wide, group or team results based on State assessments	NYS 7-8 ELA & Math , Grade 8 Science, along with Earth Science and CC Algebra Regents for accelerated Grade 8 students

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

Use this box, if needed, to describe the general process for assigning HEDI categories for these grades/subjects in this subcomponent. If needed, you may upload a table or graphic at 2.11, below.	There will be a School-Wide measure of student growth based upon the performance of all 3-6 ELA and Math for Grade 6 Social Studies. For Grades 7-8 Social Studies there will be a school wide measure which is based upon all NYS Assessments Grades 7-8. HEDI points will be awarded based on the school-wide percentage of students meeting or exceeding a minimum rigor expectation for growth of a level 3 (or 65 for Regents) or higher. A corresponding 0-20 HEDI score will be determined using the uploaded conversion chart in attachment 2.11.
Highly Effective (18 - 20 points) Results are well-above District goals for similar students.	See the 2.11 attachment.
Effective (9 - 17 points) Results meet District goals for similar students.	See the 2.11 attachment.
Developing (3 - 8 points) Results are below District goals for similar students.	See the 2.11 attachment.
Ineffective (0 - 2 points) Results are well-below District goals for similar students.	See the 2.11 attachment.

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	School-/BOCES-wide group/team results based on State assessments	All NYS Regents Exams administered in Grades 9-12.

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

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

Use this box, if needed, to describe the general process for assigning HEDI categories for these grades/subjects in this subcomponent. If needed, you may upload a table or graphic at 2.11, below.	For Global 1 Teachers, a school-wide measure will be used. HEDI points will be awarded based on the school-wide percentage of students meeting or exceeding a minimum rigor expectation for growth of 65 or higher. So long as allowed by SED, the district will offer both the 2005 Learning Standards Regents and the Common Core Regents to students in Common Core courses. Where students take both, the higher of the two scores will be used for APPR purposes. When the 2005 Learning Standards Regents are no longer offered, only the Common Core Regents will be used. For Global 2 and American History,the teacher in collaboration with the Principal will establish individual growth targets using base-line data. HEDI points will be awarded based on the percentage of students meeting or exceeding their individual targets. See attachment 2.11
Highly Effective (18 - 20 points) Results are well-above District goals for similar students.	See the 2.11 attachment.
Effective (9 - 17 points) Results meet District goals for similar students.	See the 2.11 attachment.
Developing (3 - 8 points) Results are below District goals for similar students.	See the 2.11 attachment.
Ineffective (0 - 2 points) Results are well-below District goals for similar students.	See the 2.11 attachment.

2.7) High School Science Regents Courses

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

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

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

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

Use this box, if needed, to describe the general process for assigning HEDI categories for these grades/subjects in this subcomponent. If needed, you may upload a table or graphic at 2.11, below.	The teacher in collaboration with the Principal will establish individual growth targets using base-line data. Based on the overall percentage of students who meet or exceed their individual growth target, HEDI points will be determined. See attachment 2.11
Highly Effective (18 - 20 points) Results are well-above District goals for similar students.	See the 2.11 attachment.
Effective (9 - 17 points) Results meet District goals for similar students.	See the 2.11 attachment.
Developing (3 - 8 points) Results are below District goals for similar students.	See the 2.11 attachment.
Ineffective (0 - 2 points) Results are well-below District goals for similar students.	See the 2.11 attachment.

2.8) High School Math Regents Courses

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

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

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

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

NOTE: For Algebra 1 and Geometry, please specify whether your district will be offering the 2005 Learning Standards version of the assessment in addition to the Common Core version, or just the latter, and how the HEDI process will be adjusted accordingly.

Use this box, if needed, to describe the general process for assigning HEDI categories for these grades/subjects in this subcomponent. If needed, you may upload a table or graphic at 2.11, below.	The teacher in collaboration with the Principal will establish individual growth targets using base-line data. Based on the overall percentage of students who meet or exceed their individual growth target, HEDI points will be determined See attachment 2.11 So long as allowed by SED, the district will offer both the 2005 Learning Standards Regents and the Common Core Regents to students in Common Core courses. Where students take both, the higher of the two scores will be used for APPR purposes. When the 2005 Learning Standards Regents are no longer offered, only the Common Core Regents will be used.
Highly Effective (18 - 20 points) Results are well-above District goals for similar students.	See the 2.11 attachment.
Effective (9 - 17 points) Results meet District goals for similar students.	See the 2.11 attachment.
Developing (3 - 8 points) Results are below District goals for similar students.	See the 2.11 attachment.
Ineffective (0 - 2 points) Results are well-below District goals for similar students.	See the 2.11 attachment.

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	School-/BOCES-wide group/team results based on State assessments	All NYS Regents Exams administered in Grades 9-12.
Grade 10 ELA	School-/BOCES-wide group/team results based on State assessments	All NYS Regents Exams administered in Grades 9-12.
Grade 11 ELA	Regents assessment	Regents Assessment for ELA 11

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

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

Use this box, if needed, to describe the general process for assigning HEDI categories for these grades/subjects in this subcomponent. If needed, you may upload a table or graphic at 2.11, below.	For English 9-10, a school-wide measure will be used. HEDI points will be awarded based on the school-wide percentage of students meeting or exceeding a minimum rigor expectation for growth of 65 or higher. T For Grade 11 the teacher in collaboration with the Principal will establish individual growth targets using base-line data. HEDI points will be awarded based on the the percentage of students meeting or exceeding their individual targets . So long as allowed by SED, the district will offer both the 2005 Learning Standards Regents and the Common Core Regents to students in Common Core courses. Where students take both, the higher of the two scores will be used for APPR purposes. When the 2005 Learning Standards Regents are no longer offered, only the Common Core Regents will be used.
Highly Effective (18 - 20 points) Results are well-above District goals for similar students.	See the 2.11 attachment.
Effective (9 - 17 points) Results meet District goals for similar students.	See the 2.11 attachment.
Developing (3 - 8 points) Results are below District goals for similar students.	See the 2.11 attachment.
Ineffective (0 - 2 points) Results are well-below District goals for similar students.	See the 2.11 attachment.

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". Please note that no APPR plan shall be approved by the Commissioner for use in the 2014-2015 school year or thereafter that provides for the administration of traditional standardized assessments for use with students in kindergarten through grade two for APPR purposes (see: http://www.engageny.org/resource/guidance-on-the-approved-regulatory-amendments-to-appr-to-help-reduce-local-testing).

Please also note that, for students using 3d party assessments in this Task, the 2nd drop-down option applies to grades 3 and above and the 5th drop-down option applies to grades K-2.

	Course(s) or Subject(s)	Option	Assessment
	All other courses not named above	School/BOCES-wide/group/team results based on State	All NYS Regents Exams administered in Grades 9-12.
	Teachers of Grades 4-8 ELA and Math who do not receive a State Provided Growth Scrore	State Assessment	NYS ELa/Math 4-8

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

Use this box, if needed, to describe the general process for assigning HEDI categories for these grades/subjects in this subcomponent. If needed, you may upload a table or graphic at 2.11, below.	There will be a School-Wide measure of student growth based upon the performance of all NYS 9-12 Regents Exams HEDI points will be awarded based on the school-wide percentage of students meeting or exceeding a minimum rigor expectation for growth of a level 3/or 65 or higher See conversion chart in attachment 2.11. So long as allowed by SED, the district will offer both the 2005 Learning Standards Regents and the Common Core Regents to students in Common Core courses. Where students take both, the higher of the two scores will be used for APPR purposes. When the 2005 Learning Standards Regents are no longer offered, only the Common Core Regents will be used. For teachers of grades 4-8 ELA/Math who do not receive a state-provided growth score: Using historical baseline data, the district will set a minimum rigor expectation for growth students on the above listed assessments. HEDI points will be awarded based on the percentage of students meeting or exceeding the minimum rigor expectation for growth. For teachers of grades 4-8 ELA/Math who do not receive a state-provided growth score: Using historical baseline data, the district will set a minimum rigor expectation for growth students on the above listed assessments. HEDI points will be awarded based on the percentage of students meeting or exceeding the minimum rigor expectation for growth.
Highly Effective (18 - 20 points) Results are well-above District goals for similar students.	See the 2.11 attachment.
Effective (9 - 17 points) Results meet District goals for similar students.	See the 2.11 attachment.
Developing (3 - 8 points) Results are below District goals for similar students.	See the 2.11 attachment.
Ineffective (0 - 2 points) Results are well-below District goals for similar students.	See the 2.11 attachment.

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

(No response)

2.11) HEDI Tables or Graphics

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

https://NYSED-APPR2.fluidreview.com/media/assets/survey-uploads/12186/2850877-TXEtxx9bQW/Massena%20CSD%20HEDI%20Scales%20for%20SLO%20RR%204-15-2015.docx

2.12) Locally Developed Controls

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

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

(No response)

2.13) Teachers with more than one growth measure

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

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

2.14) Assurances

Please check all of the boxes below:

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
Assure that use of locally developed controls will not have a disparate impact on underrepresented students in accordance with applicable civil rights laws.	Checked
Assure that enrolled students in accordance with teacher of record policies are included and may not be excluded.	Checked
Assure that procedures for ensuring data accuracy and integrity are being utilized.	Checked
Assure that district will develop SLOs according to the rules established by SED (see: http://www.engageny.org/resource/student-learning-objectives-guidance-document).	Checked
Assure that past academic performance and/or baseline academic data of students will be taken into account when developing an SLO.	Checked
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
Assure that it is possible for an educator to earn each point, including 0, for SLOs in the Growth subcomponent scoring range.	Checked
Assure that processes are in place to monitor SLOs to ensure rigor and comparability across classrooms.	Checked
Assure that the amount of time devoted to traditional standardized assessments that are not specifically required by state or federal law for each classroom or program within a grade level does not exceed, in the aggregate, one percent of the minimum required annual instructional hours for the grade.	Checked

Assure that, as applicable, any third party assessment that is administered to students in kindergarten, first, or second grade, and being used for APPR purposes, is consistent with the State's APPR Assessment Guidance and is not a traditional standardized assessment.	Checked

3. Local Measures (Teachers)

Created: 04/30/2013
Last updated: 04/15/2015

For guidance on the Locally Selected Measures subcomponent, see NYSED APPR Guidance sections E, F, and I. NYSED APPR Guidance is posted on www.EngageNY.org at https://www.engageny.org/resource/guidance-on-new-york-s-annual-professional-performance-review-law-and-regulations/.

Page 1

Locally Selected Measures of Student Achievement or Growth

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

Growth or achievement measure(s) from these options.

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

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

Measures based on:

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

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

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

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

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

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

3.1) Grades 4-8 ELA

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

	Locally-Selected Measure from List of Approved Measures	Assessment
4	3) Teacher specific achievement or growth score computed locally	NYS 4th Grade Science Assessment
5	4) State-approved 3rd party assessments	STAR Reading Enterprise
6	4) State-approved 3rd party assessments	Star Reading Enterprise
7	4) State-approved 3rd party assessments	Scholastic Reading Inventory
8	4) State-approved 3rd party assessments	Scholastic Reading Inventory

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.	When using STAR system, each student is assigned a Student Growth Percentile score. The process used by STAR to derive these growth percentile scores is almost identical to the process used by the State Education Department to derive growth scores for students on the State ELA and Math Assessments. Each individual student's growth from pre-test to post-test is compared against the performance of all students (statewide and nationally) who scored at the same level on the pre-test. Relative to their similar students , each student's level of growth earns a growth score , and all of a teacher's students' growth scores are considered to determine the median gorwth of the teacher's students. Median growth at the 61st-99th percentile would earn a teacher the designation "Highly Effective". Median growth at 41st-60th percentile would earn a teahcher the designation "Effective". Median Growth of 21st-40th percentile would equate to "Developing". Median growth of 1st-20th percentile would be "Ineffective". (see attached chart for STAR Student Growth Percentile (SGP) with 15 point scale). For 4th Grade Science and Scholastice Reading Inventory each student score will be assigned to Level 1 through level 4, and the teacher's average student score will be computed (on the 4 point scale). Student achievement scores of 85-100 percent will be rated a 4. Scores of 65-84 will be a 3. Scores of 55-64 will be a 2 score Scores of 0-54 will be a 1. Teachers with average class scores of 3.5-4 will be "Highly Effective". Teachers with average class scores of 2.5-3.4 will be "Efeective. Teachers with average class scores of 1.5-2.4 will be "Developing". Teachers with average class scores of 1 to 1.4 will be "Ineffective". Each teacher's score on the 4 point scale will be converted to the 15 point scale using the attached chart.
Highly Effective (14 - 15 points) Results are well above District- or BOCES-adopted expectations for growth or achievement for grade/subject.	When using STAR, the Median SGP score for the teacher's students on the STAR Assessment is 61st-99th percentile. When using SRI or NYS 4th Grade Science Assessment the teacher's average student score, on the four point scale, is between 3.5 and 4 (see attached).
Effective (8- 13 points) Results meet District- or BOCES-adopted expectations for growth or achievement for grade/subject.	When using STAR, the Median SGP score for the teacher's students on the STAR Assessment is 41st-60th percentile. When using SRI or NYS 4th Grade Science Assessment the teacher's average student score, on the four point scale, is between 2.5 and 3.4 (see attached).
Developing (3 - 7 points) Results are below District- or BOCES-adopted expectations for growth or achievement for grade/subject.	When using STAR, the Median SGP score for the teacher's students on the STAR Assessment is 21st-40th percentile. When using SRI or NYS 4th Grade Science Assessment the teacher's average student score, on the four point scale, is between 1.5 and 2.4 (see attached).
Ineffective (0 - 2 points) Results are well below District- or BOCES-adopted expectations for growth or achievement for grade/subject.	When using STAR, the Median SGP score for the teacher's students on the STAR Assessment is 1st-20th percentile. When using SRI or NYS 4th Grade Science Assessment the teacher's average student score, on the four point scale, is between 1.0 and 1.4 (see attached).

3.2) Grades 4-8 Math

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

	Locally-Selected Measure from List of Approved Measures	Assessment
4	4) State-approved 3rd party assessments	STAR Math Enterprise

5	4) State-approved 3rd party assessments	STAR Math Enterprise
6	4) State-approved 3rd party assessments	STAR Math Enterprise
7	5) District, regional, or BOCES–developed assessments	SLL/FEH Regionally Developed Assessment for Grade 7 Math
8	5) District, regional, or BOCES–developed assessments	SLL/FEH Regionally Developed Assessment for Grade 8 Math

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

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

Use this box, if needed, to describe the general process for assigning HEDI categories for these grades/subjects in this subcomponent. If needed, you may upload a table or graphic at 3.3, below.	When using STAR system, each student is assigned a Student Growth Percentile score. The process used by STAR to derive these growth percentile scores is almost identical to the process used by the State Education Department to derive growth scores for students on the State ELA and Math Assessments. Each individual student's growth from pre-test to post-test is compared against the performance of all students (statewide and nationally) who scored at the same level on the pre-test. Relative to their similar students , each student's level of growth earns a growth score , and all of a teacher's students' growth scores are considered to determine the median gorwth of the teacher's students. Median growth at the 61st-99th percentile would earn a teacher the designation "Highly Effective". Median growth at the 41st-60th percentile would earn a teacher the designation "Effective". Median Growth of 21st-40th percentile would equate to "Developing". Median growth of 1st-20th percentile would be "Ineffective". (see attached chart for STAR Student Growth Percentile (SGP) with 15 point scale). When using a regionally developed assessment, each student score will be assigned to Level 1 through level 4, and the teacher's average student score will be computed (on the 4 point scale). Student achievement scores of 85-100 percent will be rated a 4. Scores of 65-84 will be a 3. Scores of 55-64 will be a 2 score Scores of 0-54 will be a 1. Teachers with average class scores of 3.5-4 will be "Highly Effective". Teachers with average class scores of 2.5-3.4 will be "Effective". Teachers with average class scores of 1.5-2.4 will be "Developing". Teachers with average class scores of 1 to 1.4 will be "Ineffective". Each teacher's score on the 4 point scale will be converted to the 15 point scale using the attached chart.
Highly Effective (14 - 15 points) Results are well above District- or BOCES-adopted expectations for growth or achievement for grade/subject.	When using STAR, the Median SGP score for the teacher's students on the STAR Assessment is 61st-99th percentile. When using Regionally Developed Assessment the teacher's average student score, on the four point scale, is between 3.5 and 4 (see attached).
Effective (8- 13 points) Results meet District- or BOCES-adopted expectations for growth or achievement for grade/subject.	When using STAR, the Median SGP score for the teacher's students on the STAR Assessment is 41st-60th percentile. When using Regionally Developed Assessment the teacher's average student score, on the four point scale, is between 2.5 and 3.4 (see attached). When using SRI or NYS 4th Grade Science Assessment the teacher's average student score, on the four point scale, is between 2.5 and 3.4 (see attached).

Developing (3 - 7 points) Results are below District- or BOCES-adopted expectations for growth or achievement for grade/subject.	When using STAR, the Median SGP score for the teacher's students on the STAR Assessment is 21st-40th percentile. When using Regionally Developed Assessments the teacher's average student score, on the four point scale, is between 1.5 and 2.4 (see attached).
Ineffective (0 - 2 points) Results are well below District- or BOCES-adopted expectations for growth or achievement for grade/subject.	When using STAR, the Median SGP score for the teacher's students on the STAR Assessment is 1st-20th percentile. When using Regionally Developed Assessment the teacher's average student score, on the four point scale, is between 1.0 and 1.4 (see attached).

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.

https://NYSED-APPR2.fluidreview.com/media/assets/survey-uploads/5139/237810-rhJdBgDruP/combined.15point STAR Chart and 15 Point Achievement 1-4.docx

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

Growth or achievement measure(s) from these options.

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

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

Measures based on:

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

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

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

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

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

6) A school-wide measure of either student growth or achievement based on either:
   (i) A State-provided student growth score covering all students in the school that took the State assessment in ELA or Math in Grades 4-8; or

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

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

3.4) Grades K-3 ELA

Using the drop-down boxes below, select the measure that will be used as the locally-selected measure of student achievement. Then name the specific assessment that will be used with the locally-selected measure, listing the full name of the assessment. Please note that no APPR plan shall be approved by the Commissioner for use in the 2014-2015 school year or thereafter that provides for the administration of traditional standardized assessments for use with students in kindergarten through grade two for APPR purposes (see: http://www.engageny.org/resource/guidance-on-the-approved-regulatory-amendments-to-appr-to-help-reduce-local-testing).

	Locally-Selected Measure from List of Approved Measures	Assessment
K	5) District, regional, or BOCES–developed assessments	Massena Central School District Developed Reading Assessment for Kindergarten
1	5) District, regional, or BOCES–developed assessments	Massena Central School District Developed Reading Assessment for Grade 1
2	5) District, regional, or BOCES–developed assessments	Massena Central School District Developed Reading Assessment for Grade 2
3	4) Grades K-2: 3rd party non-"traditional standardized" assessment that meets NYSED guidance requirements	STAR Reading Enterprise

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.	When using STAR system, each student is assigned a Student Growth Percentile score. The process used by STAR to derive these growth percentile scores is almost identical to the process used by the State Education Department to derive growth scores for students on the State ELA and Math Assessments. Each individual student's growth from pre-test to post-test is compared against the performance of all students (statewide and nationally) who scored at the same level on the pre-test. Relative to ther similar students , each student's level of growth earns a growth score , and all of a teacher's students' growth scores are considered to determine the median gorwth of the teacher's students. Median growth at the 61st-99th percentile would earn a teacher the designation "Highly Effective". Median growth at the 41st-60th percentile would earn a teacher the designation "Effective".Median Growth of 21st-40th percentile would equate to "Developing". Median growth of 1st-20th percentile would be "Ineffective". (see attached chart for STAR Student Growth Percentile (SGP) with 20 point scale). When using a regionally or district developed assessment, each student score will be assigned to Level 1 through level 4, and the teacher's average student score will be computed (on the 4 point scale). Student achievement scores of 85-100 percent will be rated a 4. Scores of 65-84 will be a 3. Scores of 55-64 will be a 2 score Scores of 0-54 will be a 1. Teachers with average class scores of 3.5-4 will be "Highly Effective". Teachers with average class scores of 2.5-3.4 will be "Efeective. Teachers with average class scores of 1.5-2.4 will be "Developing". Teachers with average class scores of 1 to 1.4 will be "Ineffective". Each teacher's score on the 4 point scale will be converted to the 20 point scale using the attached chart.
Highly Effective (18-20 points) Results are well above District- or BOCES-adopted expectations for growth or achievement for grade/subject.	When using STAR, the Median SGP score for the teacher's students on the STAR Assessment is 61st-99th percentile. When using Regionally or district Developed Assessment the teacher's average student score, on the four point scale, is between 3.5 and 4 (see attached).
Effective (9-17 points) Results meet District- or BOCES-adopted expectations for growth or achievement for grade/subject.	When using STAR, the Median SGP score for the teacher's students on the STAR Assessment is 41st-60th percentile. When using Regionally or district Developed Assessment the teacher's average student score, on the four point scale, is between 2.5 and 3.4 (see attached).
Developing (3 - 8 points) Results are below District- or BOCES-adopted expectations for growth or achievement for grade/subject.	When using STAR, the Median SGP score for the teacher's students on the STAR Assessment is 21st-40th percentile. When using Regionally or district Developed Assessments the teacher's average student score, on the four point scale, is between 1.5 and 2.4 (see attached).
Ineffective (0 - 2 points) Results are well below District- or BOCES-adopted expectations for growth or achievement for grade/subject.	When using STAR, the Median SGP score for the teacher's students on the STAR Assessment is 1st-20th percentile. When using Regionally or district Developed Assessment the teacher's average student score, on the four point scale, is between 1.0 and 1.4 (see attached).

3.5) Grades K-3 Math

Using the drop-down boxes below, select the measure that will be used as the locally-selected measure of student achievement. Then name the specific assessment that will be used with the locally-selected measure, listing the full name of the assessment. Please note that no APPR plan shall be approved by the Commissioner for use in the 2014-2015 school year or thereafter that provides for the administration of traditional standardized assessments for use with students in kindergarten through grade two for APPR purposes (see: http://www.engageny.org/resource/guidance-on-the-approved-regulatory-amendments-to-appr-to-help-reduce-local-testing).

	Locally-Selected Measure from List of Approved Measures	Assessment
K	5) District, regional, or BOCES–developed assessments	SLL/FEH Regionally Developed Math Assessment for Kindergarten
1	5) District, regional, or BOCES–developed assessments	SLL/FEH Regionally Developed Math Assessment for Grade 1
2	5) District, regional, or BOCES–developed assessments	SLL/FEH Regionally Developed Math Assessment for Grade 2
3	4) Grades K-2: 3rd party non-"traditional standardized" assessment that meets NYSED guidance requirements	STAR Math Enterprise

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.	When using STAR system, each student is assigned a Student Growth Percentile score. The process used by STAR to derive these growth percentile scores is almost identical to the process used by the State Education Department to derive growth scores for students on the State ELA and Math Assessments. Each individual student's growth from pre-test to post-test is compared against the performance of all students (statewide and nationally) who scored at the same level on the pre-test. Relative to ther similar students , each student's level of growth earns a growth score , and all of a teacher's students' growth scores are considered to determine the median gorwth of the teacher's students. Median growth at the 61st-99th percentile would earn a teacher the designation "Highly Effective". Median growth at the 41st-60th percentile would earn a teacher the designation "Effective". Median Growth of 21st-40th percentile would equate to "Developing". Median growth of 1st-20th percentile would be "Ineffective". (see attached chart for STAR Student Growth Percentile (SGP) with 20 point scale). When using regionally developed assesments, each student's score will be assigned to level 1 through level 4, and the teacher's average student score will be computed(on the 4 point scale). Student achievement scores of 85-100 percent will be rated a 4. Score of 65-84 will be scored a 3. Scores of 55-64 will be a 2. Scores of 0-54 will be a 1. Teachers with average class scores of 3.5 to 4 will be Highly Effective. Teachers with average class scores of 2.5-3.4 will be Effective. Teachers with average class scores of 1.5-2.4 will be Developing. Teachers with average class scores of 1 to 1.4 will be Ineffective. Each teacher's score on the 4 point scale will be converted to the 20 point scale using the attached chart.
Highly Effective (18-20 points) Results are well above District- or BOCES-adopted expectations for growth or achievement for grade/subject.	When using STAR, the Median SGP score for the teacher's students on the STAR Assessment is 61st-99th percentile. When using Regionally Developed Assessment the teacher's average student score, on the four point scale, is between 3.5 and 4 (see attached).
Effective (9-17 points) Results meet District- or BOCES-adopted expectations for growth or achievement for grade/subject.	When using STAR, the Median SGP score for the teacher's students on the STAR Assessment is 41st-60th percentile. When using Regionally Developed Assessment the teacher's average student score, on the four point scale, is between 2.5 and 3.4 (see attached).

Developing (3 - 8 points) Results are below District -or BOCES-adopted expectations for growth or achievement for grade/subject.	When using STAR, the Median SGP score for the teacher's students on the STAR Assessment is 21st-40th percentile. When using Regionally Developed Assessments the teacher's average student score, on the four point scale, is between 1.5 and 2.4 (see attached).
Ineffective (0 - 2 points) Results are well below District- or BOCES-adopted expectations for growth or achievement for grade/subject.	When using STAR, the Median SGP score for the teacher's students on the STAR Assessment is 1st-20th percentile. When using Regionally Developed Assessment the teacher's average student score, on the four point scale, is between 1.0 and 1.4 (see attached).

3.6) Grades 6-8 Science

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

	Locally-Selected Measure from List of Approved Measures	Assessment
6	5) District, regional, or BOCES–developed assessments	SLL/FEH Regionally Developed Science Assessment for Grade 6
7	5) District, regional, or BOCES–developed assessments	SLL/FEH Regionally Developed Science Assessment for Grade 7
8	5) District, regional, or BOCES–developed assessments	SLL/FEH Regionally Developed Assessment for Grade 8

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.	Each student's score will be assigned to level 1 through level 4, and the teacher's average student score will be computed(on the 4 point scale). Student achievement scores of 85-100 percent will be rated a 4. Score of 65-84 will be scored a 3. Scores of 55-64 will be a 2. Scores of 0-54 will be a 1. Teachers with average class scores of 3.5 to 4 will be Highly Effective. Teachers with average class scores of 2.5-3.4 will be Effective. Teachers with average class scores of 1.5-2.4 will be Developing. Teachers with average class scores of 1 to 1.4 will be Ineffective. Each teacher's score on the 4 point scale will be converted to the 20 point scale using the attached chart.
Highly Effective (18 - 20 points) Results are well above District- or BOCES-adopted expectations for growth or achievement for grade/subject.	Teacher's average students score, on the four point scale , is between 3.5 and 4(see attached chart)
Effective (9 - 17 points) Results meet District- or BOCES-adopted expectations for growth or achievement for grade/subject.	Teacher's average atudent acore, on the four point scale, is between 2.5 and 3.4(see attached chart)
Developing (3 - 8 points) Results are below District- or BOCES-adopted expectations for growth or achievement for grade/subject.	Teacher's average atudent acore, on the four point scale, is between 1.5 and 2.4(see attached chart)
Ineffective (0 - 2 points) Results are well below District- or BOCES-adopted expectations for growth or achievement for grade/subject.	Teacher's average atudent acore, on the four point scale, is between 1.0 and 1.4(see attached chart)

3.7) Grades 6-8 Social Studies

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

	Locally-Selected Measure from List of Approved Measures	Assessment
6	5) District, regional, or BOCES–developed assessments	SLL/FEH Regionally Developed Social Studies Assessment for Grade 6
7	5) District, regional, or BOCES–developed assessments	SLL/FEH BOCES Regionally Developed Social studies Assessment for Grade 7
8	5) District, regional, or BOCES–developed assessments	SLL/FEH Regionally Developed Social Studies Assessment for Grade 8

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.	Each student's score will be assigned to level 1 through level 4, and the teacher's average student score will be computed(on the 4 point scale). Student achievement scores of 85-100 percent will be rated a 4. Score of 65-84 will be scored a 3. Scores of 55-64 will be a 2. Scores of 0-54 will be a 1. Teachers with average class scores of 3.5 to 4 will be Highly Effective. Teachers with average class scores of 2.5-3.4 will be Effective. Teachers with average class scores of 1.5-2.4 will be Developing. Teachers with average class scores of 1 to 1.4 will be Ineffective. Each teacher's score on the 4 point scale will be converted to the 20 point scale using the attached chart.
Highly Effective (18 - 20 points) Results are well above District- or BOCES-adopted expectations for growth or achievement for grade/subject.	Teacher's average students score, on the four point scale , is between 3.5 and 4(see attached chart)
Effective (9 - 17 points) Results meet District- or BOCES-adopted expectations for growth or achievement for grade/subject.	Teacher's average atudent acore, on the four point scale, is between 2.5 and 3.4(see attached chart)
Developing (3 - 8 points) Results are below District- or BOCES-adopted expectations for growth or achievement for grade/subject.	Teacher's average atudent acore, on the four point scale, is between 1.5 and 2.4(see attached chart)
Ineffective (0 - 2 points) Results are well below District- or BOCES-adopted expectations for growth or achievement for grade/subject.	Teacher's average atudent acore, on the four point scale, is between 1.0 and 1.4(see attached chart)

3.8) High School Social Studies

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

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

	Locally-Selected Measure from List of Approved Measures	Assessment
Global 1	5) District, regional, or BOCES–developed assessments	SLL/FEH Regionally Developed Assessment for Global 1
Global 2	5) District, regional, or BOCES–developed assessments	SLL/FEH Regionally Developed Assessment for Global 2
American History	5) District, regional, or BOCES–developed assessments	SLL/FEH Regionally Developed Assessment for American History

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.	Each student's score will be assigned to level 1 through level 4, and the teacher's average student score will be computed(on the 4 point scale). Student achievement scores of 85-100 percent will be rated a 4. Score of 65-84 will be scored a 3. Scores of 55-64 will be a 2. Scores of 0-54 will be a 1. Teachers with average class scores of 3.5 to 4 will be Highly Effective. Teachers with average class scores of 2.5-3.4 will be Effective. Teachers with average class scores of 1.5-2.4 will be Developing. Teachers with average class scores of 1 to 1.4 will be Ineffective. Each teacher's score on the 4 point scale will be converted to the 20 point scale using the attached chart.
Highly Effective (18 - 20 points) Results are well above District- or BOCES-adopted expectations for growth or achievement for grade/subject.	Teacher's average students score, on the four point scale , is between 3.5 and 4(see attached chart)
Effective (9 - 17 points) Results meet District- or BOCES-adopted expectations for growth or achievement for grade/subject.	Teacher's average atudent acore, on the four point scale, is between 2.5 and 3.4(see attached chart)
Developing (3 - 8 points) Results are below District- or BOCES-adopted expectations for growth or achievement for grade/subject.	Teacher's average atudent acore, on the four point scale, is between 1.5 and 2.4(see attached chart)
Ineffective (0 - 2 points) Results are well below District- or BOCES-adopted expectations for growth or achievement for grade/subject.	Teacher's average atudent acore, on the four point scale, is between 1.0 and 1.4(see attached chart)

3.9) High School Science

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

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

	Locally-Selected Measure from List of Approved Measures	Assessment
Living Environment	5) District, regional, or BOCES–developed assessments	SLL/FEH Regionally Developed Assessment for Living Environment
Earth Science	5) District, regional, or BOCES–developed assessments	SLL/FEH Regionally Developed Assessment for Earth Science
Chemistry	5) District, regional, or BOCES–developed assessments	SLL/FEH Regionally Developed Assessment for Chemistry
Physics	5) District, regional, or BOCES–developed assessments	SLL/FEH Regionally Developed Assessment for Physics

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.	Each student's score will be assigned to level 1 through level 4, and the teacher's average student score will be computed(on the 4 point scale). Student achievement scores of 85-100 percent will be rated a 4. Score of 65-84 will be scored a 3. Scores of 55-64 will be a 2. Scores of 0-54 will be a 1. Teachers with average class scores of 3.5 to 4 will be Highly Effective. Teachers with average class scores of 2.5-3.4 will be Effective. Teachers with average class scores of 1.5-2.4 will be Developing. Teachers with average class scores of 1 to 1.4 will be Ineffective. Each teacher's score on the 4 point scale will be converted to the 20 point scale using the attached chart.
Highly Effective (18-20 points) Results are well above District- or BOCES-adopted expectations for growth or achievement for grade/subject.	Teacher's average students score, on the four point scale , is between 3.5 and 4(see attached chart)
Developing (3 - 8 points) Results are below District- or BOCES-adopted expectations for growth or achievement for grade/subject.	Teacher's average atudent acore, on the four point scale, is between 2.5 and 3.4(see attached chart)
Effective (9 - 17points) Results meet District- or BOCES-adopted expectations for growth or achievement for grade/subject.	Teacher's average atudent acore, on the four point scale, is between 1.5 and 2.4(see attached chart)
Ineffective (0 - 2 points) Results are well below District- or BOCES-adopted expectations for growth or achievement for grade/subject.	Teacher's average atudent acore, on the four point scale, is between 1.0 and 1.4(see attached chart)

3.10) High School Math

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

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

	Locally-Selected Measure from List of Approved Measures	Assessment
Algebra 1	5) District, regional, or BOCES–developed assessments	SLL/FEH Regionally Developed Assessment for Algebra 1
Geometry	5) District, regional, or BOCES–developed assessments	SLL/FEH Regionally Developed Assessment for Geometry
Algebra 2	5) District, regional, or BOCES–developed assessments	SII/FEH Regionally Developed Assessment for Algebra 2

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

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

NOTE: As applicable, for Algebra 1 and Geometry, please specify whether your district will be offering the 2005 Learning Standards version of the assessment in addition to the Common Core version, or just the latter, and how the HEDI process will be adjusted accordingly.

Use this box, if needed, to describe the general process for assigning HEDI categories for these grades/subjects in this subcomponent. If needed, you may upload a table or graphic at 3.13, below.	Each student's score will be assigned to level 1 through level 4, and the teacher's average student score will be computed(on the 4 point scale). Student achievement scores of 85-100 percent will be rated a 4. Score of 65-84 will be scored a 3. Scores of 55-64 will be a 2. Scores of 0-54 will be a 1. Teachers with average class scores of 3.5 to 4 will be Highly Effective. Teachers with average class scores of 2.5-3.4 will be Effective. Teachers with average class scores of 1.5-2.4 will be Developing. Teachers with average class scores of 1 to 1.4 will be Ineffective. Each teacher's score on the 4 point scale will be converted to the 20 point scale using the attached chart.

Highly Effective (18 - 20 points) Results are well above District- or BOCES-adopted expectations for growth or achievement for grade/subject.	Teacher's average students score, on the four point scale , is between 3.5 and 4(see attached chart)
Effective (9 - 17 points) Results meet District- or BOCES-adopted expectations for growth or achievement for grade/subject.	Teacher's average atudent acore, on the four point scale, is between 2.5 and 3.4(see attached chart)
Developing (3 - 8 points) Results are below District- or BOCES-adopted expectations for growth or achievement for grade/subject.	Teacher's average atudent acore, on the four point scale, is between 1.5 and 2.4(see attached chart)
Ineffective (0 - 2 points) Results are well below District- or BOCES-adopted expectations for growth or achievement for grade/subject.	Teacher's average atudent acore, on the four point scale, is between 1.0 and 1.4(see attached chart)

3.11) High School English Language Arts

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

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

	Locally-Selected Measure from List of Approved Measures	Assessment
Grade 9 ELA	5) District, regional, or BOCES–developed assessments	SLL/FEH Regionally Developed ELA Assessment for Grade 9
Grade 10 ELA	5) District, regional, or BOCES–developed assessments	SLL/FEH Regionally Developed ELA Assessment for Grade 10
Grade 11 ELA	5) District, regional, or BOCES–developed assessments	SLL/FEH Regionally Developed ELA Assessment for Grade 11

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

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

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

Use this box, if needed, to describe the general process for assigning HEDI categories for these grades/subjects in this subcomponent. If needed, you may upload a table or graphic at 3.13, below.	Each student's score will be assigned to level 1 through level 4, and the teacher's average student score will be computed(on the 4 point scale). Student achievement scores of 85-100 percent will be rated a 4. Score of 65-84 will be scored a 3. Scores of 55-64 will be a 2. Scores of 0-54 will be a 1. Teachers with average class scores of 3.5 to 4 will be Highly Effective. Teachers with average class scores of 2.5-3.4 will be Effective. Teachers with average class scores of 1.5-2.4 will be Developing. Teachers with average class scores of 1 to 1.4 will be Ineffective. Each teacher's score on the 4 point scale will be converted to the 20 point scale using the attached chart.
Highly Effective (18 - 20 points) Results are well above District- or BOCES-adopted expectations for growth or achievement for grade/subject.	Teacher's average students score, on the four point scale , is between 3.5 and 4(see attached chart)
Effective (9 - 17 points) Results meet District- or BOCES-adopted expectations for growth or achievement for grade/subject.	Teacher's average atudent acore, on the four point scale, is between 2.5 and 3.4(see attached chart)
Developing (3 - 8 points) Results are below District- or BOCES-adopted expectations for growth or achievement for grade/subject.	Teacher's average atudent acore, on the four point scale, is between 1.5 and 2.4(see attached chart)

Ineffective (0 - 2 points) Results are well below District- or BOCES-adopted expectations for growth or achievement for grade/subject.	Teacher's average atudent acore, on the four point scale, is between 1.0 and 1.4(see attached 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. Please note that no APPR plan shall be approved by the Commissioner for use in the 2014-2015 school year or thereafter that provides for the administration of traditional standardized assessments for use with students in kindergarten through grade two for APPR purposes (see: http://www.engageny.org/resource/guidance-on-the-approved-regulatory-amendments-to-appr-to-help-reduce-local-testing).

Please also note that, for students using 3d party assessments in this Task, drop-down option #4 applies to grades 3 and above and drop-down option #8 applies to grades K-2.

	Course(s) or Subject(s)	Locally-Selected Measure from List of Approved Measures	Assessment
	All other courses not named above	5) District/regional/BOCES–developed	Massena Central School District developed assessment in specific grade and subject

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.	Each student's score will be assigned to level 1 through level 4, and the teacher's average student score will be computed(on the 4 point scale). Student achievement scores of 85-100 percent will be rated a 4. Score of 65-84 will be scored a 3. Scores of 55-64 will be a 2. Scores of 0-54 will be a 1. Teachers with average class scores of 3.5 to 4 will be Highly Effective. Teachers with average class scores of 2.5-3.4 will be Effective. Teachers with average class scores of 1.5-2.4 will be Developing. Teachers with average class scores of 1 to 1.4 will be Ineffective. Each teacher's score on the 4 point scale will be converted to the 20 point scale using the attached chart.
Highly Effective (18 - 20 points) Results are well above District- or BOCES -adopted expectations for growth or achievement for grade/subject.	Teacher's average atudent acore, on the four point scale, is between 3.5 and 4(see attached chart)
Effective (9 - 17 points) Results meet District- or BOCES-adopted expectations for growth or achievement for grade/subject.	Teacher's average atudent acore, on the four point scale, is between 2.5 and 3.4(see attached chart)

Developing (3 - 8 points) Results are below District- or BOCES-adopted expectations for growth or achievement for grade/subject.	Teacher's average atudent acore, on the four point scale, is between 1.5 and 2.4(see attached chart)
Ineffective (0 - 2 points) Results are well below District- or BOCES-adopted expectations for growth or achievement for grade/subject.	Teacher's average atudent acore, on the four point scale, is between 1.0 and 1.4(see attached 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.

https://NYSED-APPR2.fluidreview.com/media/assets/survey-uploads/5139/237810-y92vNseFa4/combined.20 Point Star Chart with 20 Point Achievement Chart.docx

3.14) Locally Developed Controls

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

(No response)

3.15) Teachers with More Than One Locally Selected Measure

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

If educators have more than one local measure of student achievement, the measures will each earn a score from 0-20 points, or 0-15 points if value-added measures were used. These scores will then be averaged together, weighted proportionately based on the number of students in each Local Achievement Measure.

3.16) Assurances

Please check all of the boxes below:

Assure the application of locally-developed controls will be rigorous, fair, and transparent.	Checked
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
Assure that enrolled students in accordance with teacher of record policies are included and may not be excluded.	Checked
Assure that procedures for ensuring data accuracy and integrity are being utilized.	Checked

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
Assure that it is possible for an educator to earn each point, including 0, for the locally-selected measures subcomponent.	Checked
Assure that locally-selected measures are rigorous and comparable across all classrooms in the same grade/subject in the district.	Checked
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
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
Assure that the amount of time devoted to traditional standardized assessments that are not specifically required by state or federal law for each classroom or program within a grade level does not exceed, in the aggregate, one percent of the minimum in required annual instructional hours for the grade.	Checked
Assure that, as applicable, any third party assessment that is administered to students in kindergarten, first, or second grade, and being used for APPR purposes, is consistent with the State's APPR Assessment Guidance and is not a traditional standardized assessment.	Checked

4. Other Measures of Effectiveness (Teachers)

Created Tuesday, April 30, 2013
Updated Wednesday, February 25, 2015

Page 1

4.1) Teacher Practice Rubric

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

The "Second Rubric" space is required for districts that have chosen an observation-only rubric (CLASS or NYSTCE) from the State-approved list. (Note: Any district may use multiple rubrics, as long as the same rubric(s) is used for all classroom teachers in a grade/subject across the district.)

4.1) Teacher Practice Rubric | Rubric	Danielson's Framework for Teaching

Second Rubric, if applicable	(No response)

4.2) Points Within Other Measures

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

Yes

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

(No response)

Multiple (at least two) classroom observations by principal or other trained administrator, at least one of which must be unannounced [at least 31 points]	40
One or more observation(s) by trained independent evaluators	
Observations by trained in-school peer teachers	
Feedback from students using State-approved survey tool	
Feedback from parents/caregivers using State-approved survey tool	
Structured reviews of lesson plans, student portfolios and other teacher artifacts	20

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

(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)
[SurveyTools.4] My Student Survey, LLC’s Survey of Teacher Practice (STeP) survey for use in grades 3-12	(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.

We will use the Danielson Framework for Teaching Rubric on the iObservation electronic platform (from Learning Sciences International). Within this system, evaluators will assign scores for various domains based on evidence gathered during classroom observations, pre-observation conference, post-observation conference, and review of documents submitted by the evalutator and the teacher. All 60 points will be based upon the Danielson Rubric. 40 points will be based on evidence observable during classroom observations (Danielson, all Domains), and 20 points will be based on other evidence (Danielson, all Domains). Rated elements will receive scores of 1-4, and the iObservation system will be set up to weight elements to ensure that 40 of the 60 points are based on all Domains and the remaining 20 points are based on all Domains. After all evidence is submitted, the system will derive an overall score for each teacher on the scale of 1-4. This score will be applied against the attached conversion chart, which converts scores on the 4 point scale to score on the 60 points.

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

assets/survey-uploads/5091/176256-eka9yMJ855/60 point conversion_extended_1 - Copy.doc

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

Highly Effective: Overall performance and results exceed NYS Teaching Standards.	The teacher's average rating for scores assigned on the 4 point Danielson rubric must be 3.5 or higher.
Effective: Overall performance and results meet NYS Teaching Standards.	The teacher's average rating for scores assigned on a 4 point Danielson rubric must be 2.5-3.4.
Developing: Overall performance and results need improvement in order to meet NYS Teaching Standards.	The teacher's average rating for scores assigned on a 4 point Danielson rubric must be 1.5-2.4.
Ineffective: Overall performance and results do not meet NYS Teaching Standards.	The teacher's average rating for scores assigned on a 4 point Danielson rubric must be 1.0-1.4.

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

Formal/Long	2
Informal/Short	3
Enter Total	5

By trained in-school peer teachers or other trained reviewers

Formal/Long	0
Informal/Short	0

Independent evaluators

Formal/Long	0
Informal/Short	0

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

- In Person

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

- In Person

4.7) Observations of Tenured Teachers

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

By building principals or other trained administrators

Formal/Long	0
Informal/Short	3
Total	3

By trained in-school peer teachers or other trained reviewers

Formal/Long	0
Informal/Short	0

Independent evaluators

Formal/Long	0
Informal/Short	0

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

- In Person

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

- In Person

5. Composite Scoring (Teachers)

Created Tuesday, April 30, 2013
Updated Wednesday, February 25, 2015

Page 1

Standards for Rating Categories

Growth or Comparable Measures

Locally-selected Measures of growth or achievement

Other Measures of Effectiveness (Teacher and Leader standards)

Highly Effective

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

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

Overall performance and results exceed NYS Teaching Standards.

Effective

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

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

Overall performance and results meet NYS Teaching Standards.

Developing

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

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

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

Ineffective

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

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

Overall performance and results do not meet NYS Teaching Standards.

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

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

Where there is no Value-Added measure

	Growth or Comparable Measures	Locally-selected Measures of growth or achievement	Other Measures of Effectiveness (60 points)	Overall Composite Score
Highly Effective	18-20	18-20	Ranges determined locally--see below	91-100
Effective	9-17	9-17		75-90
Developing	3-8	3-8		65-74
Ineffective	0-2	0-2		0-64

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

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

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

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

Overall
Composite Score

Highly Effective
22-25
14-15
Ranges determined locally--see above
91-100

Effective
10-21
8-13
75-90

Developing
3-9
3-7
65-74

Ineffective
0-2
0-2
0-64

6. Additional Requirements - Teachers

Created Tuesday, April 30, 2013
Updated Wednesday, February 25, 2015

Page 1

6.1) Assurances -- Improvement Plans

Please check the boxes below:

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

6.2) Attachment: Teacher Improvement Plan Forms

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

assets/survey-uploads/5265/237716-Df0w3Xx5v6/Teacher Improvement Plan.pdf

6.3) Appeals Process

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

(1) the substance of the annual professional performance review

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

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

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

Appeals are limited to ineffective composite ratings for first-year teachers, to ineffective or developing ratings for all other teachers, and to those improvement plans that are generated as the result of an ineffective or developing composite rating. All grounds for appeal must be raised with specificity within a single appeal and the burden of demonstrating a right to the relief requested is with the teacher. A teacher has 10 school days to initiate an appeal after receiving their composite score. There are four levels of appeal which must be processed within a maximum of 50 school days: evaluator (filing within 10 school days and response within 10 school days);

superintendent (filing within 5 school days, superintendent hearing within 5 school days, and determination within 5 school days); bi-partisan panel (filing within 5 school days, review and recommendation within 5 school days); and then a return to the superintendent for final, binding, determination (within 5 school days of receipt of panel's recommendation. This appeals procedure constitutes the exclusive means for initiating, reviewing, and resolving these appeals.

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

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

All District evaluators have participated in (and will continue to participate in) the teacher evaluator training series that has been offered through the St. Lawrence-Lewis BOCES RttT Network Team. Network Team Institute participants have turn-keyed all of the essential elements from the SED Network Team Institute to the region and have conducted 8 training modules (for a total of 7 days of training during the 2011-2012 school year). Each of the training elements required in the regulations and provided by SED at the Network Team Institute has been turn-keyed to evaluators in the region with fidelity, and all district evaluators have participated fully in this series.

As further trainings are offered by SED throughout the 2012-2013 year, further regional sessions will be offered by the St. Lawrence-Lewis RttT Network Team and district teacher evaluators will attend them. Ongoing training opportunities through the St. Lawrence-Lewis BOCES RttT Network Team will enable evaluators to refresh their learning, and new administrators will receive the full training series. Those who have not been through the training series in 2011-2012 will go through the same series in 2012-13, and new evaluators will do so in years thereafter. Each year, certified evaluators will attend SLL BOCES-sponsored sessions in order to become re-certified. These sessions will focus upon continuing calibration of evaluators, ensuring inter-rater agreement and inter-rater reliability. All evaluators will participate in these yearly sessions to become re-callibrated.

All District teacher evaluators have also participated in two full days of Marzano framework instruction, focused on inter-rater agreement and inter-rater reliability. These sessions were led by trainers from Learning Sciences International who were deeply familiar with the Marzano framework. All have also participated in (and will continue to participate in) training from NorthEast Regional Information Center (NERIC) staff on the use of the iObservation electronic platform (within which the district will house its Marzano framework rubrics, instruments, and evidence).

Based upon their participation in these activities, District teacher evaluators will be certified by the Superintendent and Board of Education as lead evaluators and evaluators.

6.5) Assurances -- Evaluators

Please check the boxes below:

- Checked

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

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

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

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

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

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

(7) use of the Statewide Instructional Reporting System

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

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

- Checked

6.6) Assurances -- Teachers

Please check all of the boxes below:

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

6.7) Assurances -- Data

Please check all of the boxes below:

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

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

Created: 04/30/2013
Last updated: 06/03/2015

For guidance on the State Growth or Comparable Measures subcomponent, see NYSED APPR Guidance sections D, F, and I. NYSED APPR Guidance is posted on www.EngageNY.org at https://www.engageny.org/resource/guidance-on-new-york-s-annual-professional-performance-review-law-and-regulations/.

Page 1

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

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

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

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

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

	PK-6
	7-8
	9-12
	(No response)
	(No response)
	(No response)
	(No response)

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

Please check the boxes below:

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

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

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

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

State assessments, *required if one exists*
District, regional, or BOCES-developed assessments that are rigorous and comparable across classrooms
List of State-approved 3rd party assessments

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

Please note that no APPR plan shall be approved by the Commissioner for use in the 2014-2015 school year or thereafter that provides for the administration of traditional standardized assessments for use with students in kindergarten through grade two for APPR purposes (see: http://www.engageny.org/resource/guidance-on-the-approved-regulatory-amendments-to-appr-to-help-reduce-local-testing).

Please also note that, for students using 3d party assessments in this Task, the 2nd drop-down option applies to grades 3 and above and the 4th drop-down option applies to grades K-2.

	School or Program Type	SLO with Assessment Option	Name of the Assessment
	Pk-6	State assessment	NYS ELA/Math 3-6
	7-8	State assessment	NYS ELA/Math 7-8
	9-12	State assessment	All application NYS Regents

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

Use this box, if needed, to describe the process for assigning HEDI categories in this subcomponent. If needed, you may upload a table or graphic below.	If the State provides growth scores for the above listed principal(s), and such scores represent less than 30% of the students supervised by that principal, the district will set SLOs for the largest courses in the building until at least 30% of students are covered. Where such courses end in a State assessment, that assessment will be used with the SLO. The State-provided growth scores will then be weighted proportionately with the SLO results for the final HEDI score for the principals. Using baseline data, the principal will set and the Superintendent will approve individual growth targets for students and HEDI points will be assigned based on the percentage of students that meet their target. So long as allowed by SED, the district will offer both the 2005 Learning Standards Regents and the Common Core Regents to students in Common Core courses. Where students take both, the higher of the two scores will be used for APPR purposes. When the 2005 Learning Standards Regents are no longer offered, only the Common Core Regents will be used.

Highly Effective (18 - 20 points) Results are well above state average for similar students (or District goals if no state test).	Applicable
Effective (9 - 17 points) Results meet state average for similar students (or District goals if no state test).	Not Applicable
Developing (3 - 8 points) Results are below state average for similar students (or District goals if no state test).	Not Applicable
Ineffective (0 - 2 points) Results are well below state average for similar students (or District goals if no state test).	Not Applicable

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

https://NYSED-APPR2.fluidreview.com/media/assets/survey-uploads/12156/2850887-lha0DogRNw/Massena%20Principal%20Back%20Up%20SLO%20Chart%206-3-15%20docx.docx

7.4) Special Considerations for Comparable Growth Measures

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

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

(No response)

7.5) Principals with More Than One Growth Measure

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

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

7.6) Assurances -- Comparable Growth Measures

Please check all of the boxes below:

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
Assure that use of locally developed controls will not have a disparate impact on underrepresented students in accordance with applicable civil rights laws.	Checked
Assure that procedures for ensuring data accuracy and integrity are being utilized.	Checked
Assure that district will develop SLOs according to the rules established by NYSED for principal SLOs: http://www.engageny.org/resource/student-learning-objectives-guidance-document.	Checked

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
Assure that it is possible for a principal to earn each point, including 0, for SLOs in the Growth subcomponent scoring range.	Checked
Assure that processes are in place to monitor SLOs to ensure rigor and comparability across classrooms.	Checked
Assure that the amount of time devoted to traditional standardized assessments that are not specifically required by state or federal law for each classroom or program within a grade level does not exceed, in the aggregate, one percent of the minimum required annual instructional hours for the grade.	Checked
Assure that, as applicable, any third party assessment that is administered to students in kindergarten, first, or second grade, and being used for APPR purposes, is consistent with the State's APPR Assessment Guidance and is not a traditional standardized assessment.	Checked

8. Local Measures (Principals)

Created: 04/30/2013
Last updated: 04/15/2015

For guidance on locally selected measures of student achievement or growth, see NYSED APPR Guidance sections E, F, and I. NYSED APPR Guidance is posted on www.EngageNY.org at https://www.engageny.org/resource/guidance-on-new-york-s-annual-professional-performance-review-law-and-regulations/.

Page 1

Locally-Selected Measures of Student Achievement or Growth

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

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

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

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

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

Also note: no APPR plan shall be approved by the Commissioner for use in the 2014-2015 school year or thereafter that provides for the administration of traditional standardized assessments for use with students in kindergarten through grade two for APPR purposes (see: http://www.engageny.org/resource/guidance-on-the-approved-regulatory-amendments-to-appr-to-help-reduce-local-testing).

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

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

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

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

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

whose performance levels on State assessments are proficient or advanced)
(b) student growth or achievement on State assessments in ELA and/or Math in Grades 4-8 for students in each specific performance level (e.g., Level 1, Level 2)
(c) student growth or achievement on State assessments in ELA and/or Math in Grades 4-8 for students with disabilities and English Language Learners in Grades 4-8
(d) student performance on any or all of the district-wide locally selected measures approved for use in teacher evaluations
(e) four, five and/or six-year high school graduation and/or dropout rates for principals employed in a school with high school grades
(f) percentage of students who earn a Regents diploma with advanced designation and/or honors for principals employed in a school with high school grades
(g) percentage of a cohort of students that achieve specified scores on Regents examinations and/or Department approved alternative examinations (including, but not limited to, Advanced Placement examinations, International Baccalaureate examinations, SAT II, etc.), for principals employed in a school with high school grades (e.g., the percentage of students in the 2009 cohort that scored at least a 3 on an Advanced Placement examination since entry into the ninth grade)
(h) students' progress toward graduation in the school using strong predictive indicators, including but not limited to 9th and/or 10th grade credit accumulation and/or the percentage of students that pass 9th and/or 10th grade subjects most commonly associated with graduation and/or students' progress in passing the number of required Regents examinations for graduation, for principals employed in a school with high school grades

	Grade Configuration/Program	Locally-Selected Measure from List of Approved Measures	Assessment
	PK-6	(d) measures used by district for teacher evaluation	Grade 2 Massena District Math Assessment
	7-8	(d) measures used by district for teacher evaluation	Scholastic Reading Inventory
	9-12	(d) measures used by district for teacher evaluation	SLL/FEH Regionally Developed Assessment in Grade 9 ELA; SLL/FEH Regionally Developed Assessment in Grade 10 ELA; SLL/FEH Regionally Developed Assessment in Grade 11 ELA

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.	Regionally Developed Assessments and Scholastic Reading Inventory each student score will be assigned to Level 1 through level 4, and the principal's average student score will be computed (on the 4 point scale). Student achievement scores of 85-100 percent will be rated a 4. Scores of 65-84 will be a 3. Scores of 55-64 will be a 2 score Scores of 0-54 will be a 1. Principals with average class scores of 3.5-4 will be "Highly Effective". Principals with average class scores of 2.5-3.4 will be "Effective. Principals with average class scores of 1.5-2.4 will be "Developing". Principals with average class scores of 1 to 1.4 will be "Ineffective". Each principal's score on the 4 point scale will be converted to the 15 point scale using the attached chart.

Highly Effective (14 - 15 points) Results are well above District- or BOCES-adopted expectations for growth or achievement for grade/subject.	When using SRI or Regionally Developed Assessments the Principal's average student score, on the four point scale, is between 3.5 and 4 (see attached).
Effective (8- 13 points) Results meet District- or BOCES-adopted expectations for growth or achievement for grade/subject.	When using SRI or Regionally Developed Assessments the Principal's average student score, on the four point scale, is between 2.5 and 3.4 (see attached).
Developing (3 - 7 points) Results are below District- or BOCES-adopted expectations for growth or achievement for grade/subject.	When using SRI or Regionally Developed Assessments the Principal's average student score, on the four point scale, is between 1.5 and 2.4 (see attached).
Ineffective (0 - 2 points) Results are well below District- or BOCES-adopted expectations for growth or achievement for grade/subject.	When using SRI or Regionally Developed Assessments the Principal's average student score, on the four point scale, is between 1.0 and 1.4 (see attached).

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.

https://NYSED-APPR2.fluidreview.com/media/assets/survey-uploads/12190/2850889-qBFVOWF7fC/Principals.docx

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

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

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

Also note: no APPR plan shall be approved by the Commissioner for use in the 2014-2015 school year or thereafter that provides for the administration of traditional standardized assessments for use with students in kindergarten through grade two for APPR purposes (see: http://www.engageny.org/resource/guidance-on-the-approved-regulatory-amendments-to-appr-to-help-reduce-local-testing).

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.	Not Applicable
Highly Effective (18 - 20 points) Results are well above District- or BOCES-adopted expectations for growth or achievement for grade/subject.	Not Applicable
Effective (9- 17 points) Results meet District- or BOCES-adopted expectations for growth or achievement for grade/subject.	Not Applicable
Developing (3 - 8 points) Results are below District- or BOCES-adopted expectations for growth or achievement for grade/subject.	Not Applicable
Ineffective (0 - 2 points) Results are well below District- or BOCES-adopted expectations for growth or achievement for grade/subject.	Not Applicable

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

(No response)

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

(No response)

8.3) Locally Developed Controls

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

(No response)

8.4) Principals with More Than One Locally Selected Measure

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

If educators have more than one local measure of student achievement, the measures will each earn a score from 0-20 points, or 0-15 points if value-added measures were used. These scores will then be averaged together, weighted proportionately based on the number of students in each Local Achievement Measure.

8.5) Assurances

Please check all of the boxes below:

Assure that the application of locally developed controls will be rigorous, fair, and transparent	Check
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
Assure that enrolled students are included in accordance with policies for student assignment to schools and may not be excluded.	Check
Assure that procedures for ensuring data accuracy and integrity are being utilized.	Check
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
Assure that it is possible for a principal to earn each point, including 0, for the locally selected measures subcomponent.	Check
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
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
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
Assure that the amount of time devoted to traditional standardized assessments that are not specifically required by state or federal law for each classroom or program within a grade level does not exceed, in the aggregate, one percent of the minimum required annual instructional hours for the grade.	Check

Assure that, as applicable, any third party assessment that is administered to students in kindergarten, first, or second grade, and being used for APPR purposes, is consistent with the State's APPR Assessment Guidance and is not a traditional standardized assessment.	Check

9. Other Measures of Effectiveness (Principals)

Created Tuesday, April 30, 2013
Updated Friday, February 27, 2015

Page 1

9.1) Principal Practice Rubric

Select the choice of principal practice rubric from the menu of State-approved rubrics to assess performance based on ISLLC 2008 Standards. If your district has been granted a variance by NYSED through the variance process, select "district variance" from the menu.The "Second Rubric" space is optional. A district may use multiple rubrics, as long as the same rubric(s) is used for all principals in the same or similar programs or grade configurations across the district.

9.1) Principal Practice Rubric | Rubric	Multidimensional Principal Performance Rubric

Second rubric (if applicable)	(No response)

9.2) Points Within Other Measures

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

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

Is the following point assignment for all principals?

Yes

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

(No response)

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

Broad assessment of principal leadership and management actions based on the practice rubric by the supervisor, a trained administrator or a trained independent evaluator. This must incorporate multiple school visits by supervisor, trained administrator, or trained independent evaluator, at least one of which must be from a supervisor, and at least one of which must be unannounced. [At least 31 points]	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, label accordingly, combine them into a single file, and upload as an attachment for review.Click here for a

downloadable copy of Form 9.2. (MS Word)

(No response)

9.3) Assurances -- Goals

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

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

9.4) Sources of Evidence (if applicable)

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

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

9.5) Survey Tool(s) (if applicable)

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

(No response)

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

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

NYC School Survey-2012 Teacher Survey	(No response)

9.6) Assurances

Please check all of the boxes below:

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

9.7) Process for Assigning Points and Determining HEDI Ratings

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

The Principal will be assigned a score of 1-4 for the various elements of the Multidimensional Principal performance rubric, based upon Superintendent's broad assessment, with all 60 points coming from the rubric. Once all evidence is applied against the rubric to determine scores for the various rubric elements, the individual's average score (on the scale of 1-4) will be determined. This score will be applied against the attached conversion chart, which converts scores on the 1-4 scale to the 1-60 scale (see attached 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/5143/237726-pMADJ4gk6R/60 point conversion_extended_1 - Copy.doc

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

Highly Effective: Overall performance and results exceed standards.	The principal's average rating score assigned on the 4 point rubric must be 3.5 or greater.
Effective: Overall performance and results meet standards.	The principal's average rating score assigned on the 4 point rubric must be 2.5-3.4.
Developing: Overall performance and results need improvement in order to meet standards.	The principal's average rating score assigned on the 4 point rubric must be 1.5-2.4.
Ineffective: Overall performance and results do not meet standards.	The principal's average rating score assigned on the 4 point rubric must be 1-1.4.

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

Tenured Principals

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

10. Composite Scoring (Principals)

Created Tuesday, April 30, 2013
Updated Friday, February 27, 2015

Page 1

Standards for Rating Categories

Growth or Comparable Measures

Locally-selected Measures of growth or achievement

Other Measures of Effectiveness (Teacher and Leader standards)

Highly Effective

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

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

Overall performance and results exceed ISLLC leadership standards.

Effective

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

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

Overall performance and results meet ISLLC leadership standards.

Developing

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

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

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

Ineffective

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

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

Overall performance and results do not meet ISLLC leadership standards.

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

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

Where there is no Value-Added measure

	Growth or Comparable Measures	Locally-selected Measures of growth or achievement	Other Measures of Effectiveness (60 points)	Overall Composite Score
Highly Effective	18-20	18-20	Ranges determined locally--see below	91-100
Effective	9-17	9-17		75-90
Developing	3-8	3-8		65-74
Ineffective	0-2	0-2		0-64

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

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

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

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

Overall
Composite Score

Highly Effective
22-25
14-15
Ranges determined locally--see above
91-100

Effective
10-21
8-13
75-90

Developing
3-9
3-7
65-74

Ineffective
0-2
0-2
0-64

11. Additional Requirements - Principals

Created Tuesday, April 30, 2013
Updated Friday, February 27, 2015

Page 1

11.1) Assurances -- Improvement Plans

Please check the boxes below.

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

11.2) Attachment: Principal Improvement Plan Forms

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

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

assets/survey-uploads/5276/237747-Df0w3Xx5v6/Principal Improvement Plan.pdf

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 are limited to ineffective composite ratings for first-year principals, to ineffective or developing ratings for all other principals, and to those improvement plans that are generated as the result of an ineffective or developing composite rating. All grounds for appeal must be raised with specificity within a single appeal and the burden of demonstrating a right to the relief requested is with the principal. A principal has 15 school days to initiate an appeal after receiving their composite score. There are three levels of appeal which must be processed within a maximum of 70 calendar days: evaluator (filing within 15 calendar days and response within 15

calendar days); bi-partisan panel (filing within 10 calendar days, review and recommendation within 10 calendar days); and district superintendent of the St. Lawrence-Lewis BOCES for final determination (filing within 10 calendar days of panel's recommendation and binding determination by district superintendent within 10 calendar days. This appeals procedure constitutes the exclusive means for initiating, reviewing, and resolving these appeals.

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

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

All Principal Evaluators have participated in the St. Lawrence-Lewis BOCES RttT Network Team training series on Principal Evaluation. This series, incorporating all required training elements, involved 5 sessions during the 2011-2012 year. Network Team representatives attended all SED Network Team Institute sessions relating to Principal evaluation, and all NYSCOSS/LEAF sessions on Principal evaluation. These trainers turn-keyed the content from these sessions to all Principal evaluators in the St. Lawrence-Lewis BOCES region during the 5 sessions of the 2011-2012 year. As further training is provided by SED and NYSCOSS, it will be attended by St. Lawrence-Lewis BOCES RttT Network Team representatives and turn-keyed back to Principal evaluators in the region. The District will also utilize ongoing training materials provided through the LEAF Subscription Service of NYSCOSS to participate in ongoing training both regionally and in-district moving forward. Those who have not been through the training series in 2011-2012 will go through the same series in 2012-13, and new evaluators will do so in years thereafter. Each year, certified evaluators will attend SLL BOCES-sponsored sessions in order to become re-certified. These sessions will focus upon continuing calibration of evaluators, ensuring inter-rater agreement and inter-rater reliability. All evaluators will participate in these yearly sessions to become re-callibrated.

Based upon their participation in these activities, District principal evaluators will be certified by the Superintendent and Board of Education as lead evaluators and evaluators.

11.5) Assurances -- Evaluators

Please check the boxes below:

- Checked

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

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

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

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

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

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

(7) use of the Statewide Instructional Reporting System

(8) the scoring methodology utilized by the Department and/or the district or BOCES to evaluate a teacher or principal under this

Subpart, including how scores are generated for each subcomponent and the composite effectiveness score and application and use of the scoring ranges prescribed by the Commissioner for the four designated rating categories used for the teacher's or principal's overall rating and their subcomponent ratings

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

- Checked

11.6) Assurances -- Principals

Please check all of the boxes below:

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

11.7) Assurances -- Data

Please check all of the boxes below:

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

12. Joint Certification of APPR Plan

Created Tuesday, April 30, 2013
Updated Wednesday, February 25, 2015

Page 1

12.1)Upload the Joint Certification of the APPR Plan

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

assets/survey-uploads/5581/237750-3Uqgn5g9Iu/20130107090922.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.

Massena's Elementary HEDI Scale for SLOs
Grades K-6

% Meeting Target	Category	SLO Score
	Ineffective	
0-4%		0
5%-7%		1
8%-10%		2
	Developing	
11%-13%		3
14%-15%		4
16%-17%		5
18%-19%		6
20%-21%		7
22-23%		8
	Effective	
24%-25%		9
26%-27%		10
28%-29%		11
30%-31%		12
32%-35%		13
36%-39%		14
40%-44%		15
45%-49%		16
50%-59%		17
	Highly Effective	
60%-73%		18
74%-84%		19
85%-100%		20

The principal will approve all targets.

Massena's JW Leary Junior High HEDI Scale for SLOs
Grades 7-8

% Meeting Target	Category	SLO Score
	Ineffective	
0-2%		0
3%-6%		1
7%-10%		2
	Developing	
11%-14%		3
15%-18%		4
19%-22%		5
23%-26%		6
27%-30%		7
31%-34%		8
	Effective	
35%-37%		9
38%-42%		10
43%-47%		11
48%-50%		12
51%-55%		13
56%-61%		14
62%-66%		15
67%-72%		16
73%-79%		17
	Highly Effective	
80%-84%		18
85%-92%		19
93%-100%		20

The principal will approve all targets.

Massena High School's HEDI Scale for SLOs
Grades 9-12

% Meeting Target	Category	SLO Score
	Ineffective	
0-10%		0
11%-24%		1
25%-50%		2
	Developing	
51%-54%		3
55%-58%		4
59%-62%		5
63%-66%		6
67%-70%		7
71%-74%		8
	Effective	
75%		9
76%		10
77%		11
78-79%		12
80%		13
81%		14
82%-83%		15
84%		16
85%		17
	Highly Effective	
86-89%		18
90-92%		19
93%-100%		20

The principals will approve all targets.

HEDI Scale for STAR Student Growth Percentile Measures (15 Point Scale)

	Median Growth Percentile among Educator's Students	# of Points Earned by Teacher
Highly Effective (14-15 points)	87-99%	15
	61-86%	14
Effective (8-13 points)	55-60%	13
	53-54%	12
	51-52%	11
	49-50%	10
	45-48%	9
	41-44%	8
Developing (3-7 Points)	37-40%	7
	33-36%	6
	27-32%	5
	24-26%	4
	21-23%	3
Ineffective (0-2 points)	14-20%	2
	7-13%	1
	1-6%	0

APPENDIX A

HEDI Conversion Chart – 15% Local Measures

	Category	Conversion for Local Assessment Score
Ineffective		
1		0
1.1		1
1.2		1
1.3		2
1.4		2
Developing		
1.5		3
1.6		3
1.7		4
1.8		4
1.9		5
2		5
2.1		6
2.2		6
2.3		7
2.4		7
Effective		
2.5		8
2.6		8
2.7		9
2.8		10
2.9		10
3		11
3.1		11
3.2		12
3.3		13
3.4		13
Highly Effective		
3.5		14
3.6		14
3.7		14
3.8		15
3.9		15
4		15

HEDI Scale for STAR Student Growth Percentile Measures (20 point scale)

	Median growth percentile among educator's students	# of Points Earned by Teacher
Highly Effective (18-20 points)	87-99%	20
	74-86%	19
	61-73%	18
Effective (9-17 points)	58-60%	17
	55-57%	16
	53-54%	15
	51-52%	14
	49-50%	13
	47-48%	12
	45-46%	11
	43-44%	10
	41-42%	9
Developing (3-8 Points)	37-40%	8
	33-36%	7
	30-32%	6
	27-29%	5
	24-26%	4
	21-23%	3
Ineffective (0-2 points)	14-20%	2
	7-13%	1
	1-6%	0

HEIDI Conversion Chart – 20% Local Achievement Measures

Educator's average student achievement score	CATEGORY	CONVERSION FOR LOCAL ASSESSMENT SCORE
INEFFECTIVE		
1		0
1.1		1
1.2		1
1.3		2
1.4		2
DEVELOPING		
1.5		3
1.6		4
1.7		5
1.8		5
1.9		6
2		7
2.1		7
2.2		8
2.3		8
2.4		8
EFFECTIVE		
2.5		9
2.6		10
2.7		11
2.8		12
2.9		13
3		14
3.1		15
3.2		16
3.3		17
3.4		17
HIGHLY EFFECTIVE		
3.5		18
3.6		18
3.7		19
3.8		19
3.9		20
4		20

Appendix B

60% Other Measures Rubric Score to Sub-Component Conversion Chart

Total Average Rubric Score	Category	Conversion score for composite
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		54
2.1		54
2.2		55
2.3		56
2.4		56
Effective 57-58		
2.5		57
2.6		57
2.7		57
2.8		58
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		60
3.8		60
3.9		60
4		60

TEACHERS' IMPROVEMENT PLAN

Teacher _____ Composite Score _____

Subject/Grade Level _____ Score Breakdown _____

Administrator _____ Date(s): Preconference _____ Observation(s) _____ Coaching _____

Standards Chosen for Further Development	Action(s) to be Taken	Administrator's Responsibilities	Teacher's Responsibilities	Timeline for Progress	Indicators of Success	Improvements Made and Documented

Administrator's Signature: _____ Date: _____

Teacher's Signature: _____ Date: _____

Representative/Witness Signature: _____ Date: _____

Or Teacher's Signature Waiving Representation: _____ Date: _____

Massena Principal Back Up SLO Chart
PK-12

Avg. Score	Category	SLO Score
	Ineffective	
0-10%		0
11%-24%		1
25%-50%		2
	Developing	
51%-54%		3
55%-58%		4
59%-62%		5
63%-66%		6
67%-70%		7
71%-74%		8
	Effective	
75%		9
76%		10
77%		11
78-79%		12
80%		13
81%		14
82%-83%		15
84%		16
85%		17
	Highly Effective	
86-89%		18
90-92%		19
93%-100%		20

HEIDI Conversion Chart – 20% Local Achievement Measures

Educator's average student achievement score	CATEGORY	CONVERSION FOR LOCAL ASSESSMENT SCORE
INEFFECTIVE		
1		0
1.1		1
1.2		1
1.3		2
1.4		2
DEVELOPING		
1.5		3
1.6		4
1.7		5
1.8		5
1.9		6
2		7
2.1		7
2.2		8
2.3		8
2.4		8
EFFECTIVE		
2.5		9
2.6		10
2.7		11
2.8		12
2.9		13
3		14
3.1		15
3.2		16
3.3		17
3.4		17
HIGHLY EFFECTIVE		
3.5		18
3.6		18
3.7		19
3.8		19
3.9		20
4		20

Appendix B

60% Other Measures Rubric Score to Sub-Component Conversion Chart

Total Average Rubric Score	Category	Conversion score for composite
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		54
2.1		54
2.2		55
2.3		56
2.4		56
Effective 57-58		
2.5		57
2.6		57
2.7		57
2.8		58
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		60
3.8		60
3.9		60
4		60

PRINCIPAL/INSTRUCTIONAL ADMINISTRATOR IMPROVEMENT PLAN

_____
Principal/Instructional Administrator

_____
Composite Score

_____
Building/Area of Supervision

_____
Score Breakdown

_____
Supervisor

_____
Date(s) of Observation(s)

Differentiated Activities to Support Improvement						
Needed Areas of Improvement	Action(s) to be Taken	Supervisor's Responsibilities	Principal/Instructional Administrator's Responsibilities	Timeline for Achieving Improvement	The Manner in which Improvement will be Assessed	Progress Documentation

Supervisor's Signature: _____ Date: _____

Principal/Instructional Administrator's Signature: _____ Date: _____

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

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

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

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

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

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

Signatures, dates

Superintendent Signature: Date:

1/2/13

Teachers Union President Signature: Date:

1/7/13

Administrative Union President Signature: Date:

Allen W Rowlidge 1/7/13

Board of Education President Signature: Date:

4 JAN 2013