



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

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

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

January 3, 2013

Kathy Meany, Superintendent
Menands Union Free School District
19 Wards Lane
Menands, NY 12204

Dear Superintendent Meany:

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

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

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

Thank you again for your hard work.

Sincerely,



John B. King, Jr.
Commissioner

Attachment

c: Charles Dedrick

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

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

Annual Professional Performance Reviews: 2012-13

Created Sunday, November 04, 2012

Updated Wednesday, December 26, 2012

1

Disclaimers

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

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

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

1. SCHOOL DISTRICT INFORMATION

1.1) School District's BEDS Number : 010615020000

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

010615020000

1.2) School District Name: MENANDS UFSD

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

MENANDS UFSD

1.3) School Improvement Grant (SIG) Districts Only

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

Not applicable

1.4) Award Classification

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

(No response)

1.5) Assurances

Please check all of the boxes below:

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

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

Re-submission to address deficiencies

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

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

Annual (2012-13)

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

Created Sunday, November 04, 2012

Updated Tuesday, January 01, 2013

Page 1

STATE-PROVIDED MEASURES OF STUDENT GROWTH

(25 points with an approved value-added measure)

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

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

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

2.1) Assurances

Please check the boxes below:

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

STUDENT LEARNING OBJECTIVES AS COMPARABLE GROWTH MEASURES (20 points)

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

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

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

If no State assessment or Regents exam exists:

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

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

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

State assessments, *required if one exists*

List of State-approved 3rd party assessments

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

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

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

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

2.2) Grades K-3 ELA

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

| | ELA | Assessment |
|---|--|--|
| K | School-or BOCES-wide, group or team results based on State assessments | NYS English Language Arts Assessment- Menands School combined average results for grades 4 and 5 |
| 1 | School-or BOCES-wide, group or team results based on State assessments | NYS English Language Arts Assessment-Menands School combined average results for grades 4 and 5 |
| 2 | School-or BOCES-wide, group or team results based on State assessments | NYS English Language Arts Assessment-Menands School combined average results for grades 4 and 5 |
| | ELA | Assessment |
| 3 | State assessment | 3rd Grade State Assessment |

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

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

For K-2: The schoolwide value-added growth scores for Menands School students in grades 4 and 5 on the 2013 NYSED ELA will be used to assign a HEDI category and points for K-2 teachers. The value-added growth scores for fourth and fifth graders will be proportionately averaged. To assign a HEDI category and points for K-2 teachers, the resulting value-added growth score from 25-0 points will be converted into comparable growth points from 20-0. If the value-added growth score for grades 4 and 5 is 25-22 points, a K-2 teacher will be assigned from 20-18 comparable growth points in the highly effective range. If the value-added growth score for grades 4 and 5 is from 21-10 points, a K-2 teacher will be assigned from 17-9 comparable growth points in the effective range. If the value-added growth score for grades 4 and 5 is from 9-3 points, a K-2 teacher will be assigned from 8-3 comparable growth points in the developing range. If the value-added growth score for grades 4 and 5 is from 2-0 points, a K-2 teacher will be assigned from 2-0 comparable growth points in the ineffective range.

For Grade 3: The teacher and the administration used pre-assessment data to set growth targets for individual students on the NYSED grade 3 ELA. A HEDI category and points will be assigned based upon the percentage of students who achieve their individual growth target score on the spring 2013 ELA. If 100-93% of third graders reach their growth target, the teacher will be assigned points in the highly effective range. If 92-63% of third graders reach their growth target, the teacher will be assigned points in the effective range. If 62-21% of third graders reach their growth targets, the teacher will be assigned points in the developing range. If 20-0% of third graders reach their growth target, the teacher will be assigned points in the ineffective range.

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

For K-2: Grades 4 and 5 value-added growth score of 25=20 points comparable growth for K-2 teachers; value added growth score of 24= 19 points comparable growth; value-added growth score of 23 or 22=18 points comparable growth.

For 3rd grade: 100%-99% of students meeting their individual growth target on the ELA=20 points; 98-97% meeting their individual growth target=19 points; 96-93% meeting their individual growth target=18 points.

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

For K-2: Grades 4 and 5 value-added growth score of 21=17 points comparable growth for K-2 teachers; value-added growth score of 20=16 points comparable growth; value-added growth score of 19=15 points comparable growth; value-added growth score of 18 or 17=14 points comparable growth; value-added growth score of 16=13 points comparable growth; value-added growth score of 15=12 points comparable growth; value-added growth score of 14=11 points comparable growth; value-added growth score of 13 or 12=10 points comparable growth; value-added growth score of 11 or 10=9 points comparable growth.

For 3rd grade: 92-90% of students meeting their individual

growth targets=17 points; 89-87% of students meeting their individual growth targets=16 points; 86-83% of students meeting their individual growth targets=15 points; 82-80% of students meeting their individual growth targets=14 points; 79-77% of students meeting their individual growth targets=13 points; 76-73% of students meeting their individual growth targets=12 points; 72-70% of students meeting their individual growth targets=11 points; 69-67% of students meeting their individual growth targets= 10 points; 66-63% of students meeting their individual growth targets= 9 points.

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

For K-2: Grades 4 and 5 value-added growth score of 9=8 points comparable growth for K-2 teachers; value-added growth score of 8=7 points comparable growth; value-added growth score of 7=6 points comparable growth; value-added growth score of 6=5 points comparable growth; value-added growth score of 5=4 points comparable growth; value-added growth score of 4 or 3=3 points comparable growth.

For 3rd grade: 62-56% of students meeting their individual growth target=8 points; 55-49% of students meeting their individual growth target=7 points; 48-42% of students meeting their individual growth target= 6 points; 41-35% of students meeting their individual growth target=5 points; 34-28% of students meeting their individual growth target=4 points; 27-21% of students meeting their individual growth target=3 points.

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

For K-2: Grades 4 and 5 value-added growth score of 2=2 points comparable growth for K-2 teachers; value-added growth score of 1=1 point comparable growth; value-added growth score of 0=0 points comparable growth.

For 3rd grade: 20-14% of students meeting their individual growth target=2 points; 13-7% of students meeting their individual growth target=1 point; 6-0% of students meeting their individual growth target=0 points.

2.3) Grades K-3 Math

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

| | Math | Assessment |
|---|--|--|
| K | School-or BOCES-wide, group or team results based on State assessments | NYS Math Assessment-Menands School combined average results for grades 4 and 5 |
| 1 | School-or BOCES-wide, group or team results based on State assessments | NYS Math Assessment-Menands School combined average results for grades 4 and 5 |
| 2 | School-or BOCES-wide, group or team results based on State assessments | NYS Math Assessment-Menands School combined average results for grades 4 and 5 |

| | Math | Assessment |
|---|------------------|----------------------------|
| 3 | State assessment | 3rd Grade State Assessment |

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

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

For K-2: The schoolwide value-added growth scores for Menands School students in grades 4 and 5 on the 2013 NYSED math assessment will be used to assign a HEDI category and points for K-2 teachers. The value-added growth scores for fourth and fifth graders will be proportionately averaged. To assign a HEDI category and points for K-2 teachers, the resulting value-added growth score from 25-0 points will be converted into comparable growth points from 20-0. If the value-added growth score for grades 4 and 5 is 25-22 points, a K-2 teacher will be assigned from 20-18 comparable growth points in the highly effective range. If the value-added growth score for grades 4 and 5 is from 21-10 points, a K-2 teacher will be assigned from 17-9 comparable growth points in the effective range. If the value-added growth score for grades 4 and 5 is from 9-3 points, a K-2 teacher will be assigned from 8-3 comparable growth points in the developing range. If the value-added growth score for grades 4 and 5 is from 2-0 points, a K-2 teacher will be assigned from 2-0 comparable growth points in the ineffective range.

For Grade 3: The teacher and the administration used pre-assessment data to set growth targets for individual students on the NYSED grade 3 math assessment. A HEDI category and points will be assigned based upon the percentage of students who achieve their individual growth target score on the spring 2013 math assessment. If 100-93% of third graders reach their growth target, the teacher will be assigned points in the highly effective range. If 92-63% of third graders reach their growth target, the teacher will be assigned points in the effective range. If 62-21% of third graders reach their growth targets, the teacher will be assigned points in the developing range. If 20-0% of third graders reach their growth target, the teacher will be assigned points in the ineffective range.

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

For K-2: Grades 4 and 5 value-added growth score of 25=20 points comparable growth for K-2 teachers; value added growth score of 24= 19 points comparable growth; value-added growth score of 23 or 22=18 points comparable growth.

For 3rd grade: 100%-99% of students meeting their individual growth target=20 points; 98-97% meeting their individual growth target=19 points; 96-93% meeting their individual growth target=18 points.

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

For K-2: Grades 4 and 5 value-added growth score of 21=17 points comparable growth for K-2 teachers; value-added growth score of 20=16 points comparable growth; value-added growth score of 19=15 points comparable growth; value-added growth score of 18 or 17=14 points comparable growth; value-added growth score of 16=13 points comparable growth; value-added growth score of 15=12 points comparable growth; value-added growth score of 14=11 points comparable

growth; value-added growth score of 13 or 12=10 points comparable growth; value-added growth score of 11 or 10=9 points comparable growth.

For 3rd grade: 92-90% of students meeting their individual growth targets=17 points; 89-87% of students meeting their individual growth targets=16 points; 86-83% of students meeting their individual growth targets=15 points; 82-80% of students meeting their individual growth targets=14 points; 79-77% of students meeting their individual growth targets=13 points; 76-73% of students meeting their individual growth targets=12 points; 72-70% of students meeting their individual growth targets=11 points; 69-67% of students meeting their individual growth targets= 10 points; 66-63% of students meeting their individual growth targets= 9 points.

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

For K-2: Grades 4 and 5 value-added growth score of 9=8 points comparable growth for K-2 teachers; value-added growth score of 8=7 points comparable growth; value-added growth score of 7=6 points comparable growth; value-added growth score of 6=5 points comparable growth; value-added growth score of 5=4 points comparable growth; value-added growth score of 4 or 3=3 points comparable growth.

For 3rd grade: 62-56% of students meeting their individual growth target=8 points; 55-49% of students meeting their individual growth target=7 points; 48-42% of students meeting their individual growth target= 6 points; 41-35% of students meeting their individual growth target=5 points; 34-28% of students meeting their individual growth target=4 points; 27-21% of students meeting their individual growth target=3 points.

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

For K-2: Grades 4 and 5 value-added growth score of 2=2 points comparable growth for K-2 teachers; value-added growth score of 1=1 point comparable growth; value-added growth score of 0=0 points comparable growth.

For 3rd grade: 20-14% of students meeting their individual growth target=2 points; 13-7% of students meeting their individual growth target=1 point; 6-0% of students meeting their individual growth target=0 points.

2.4) Grades 6-8 Science

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

| | Science | Assessment |
|---|--|---|
| 6 | District, regional or BOCES-developed assessment | Menands Union Free School District Developed 6th Grade Science Assessment |
| 7 | District, regional or BOCES-developed assessment | Menands Union Free School District Developed 7th Grade Science Assessment |

| | Science | Assessment |
|---|------------------|------------------------------------|
| 8 | State assessment | 8th Grade State Science Assessment |

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

| | |
|---|--|
| Use this box, if needed, to describe the general process for assigning HEDI categories for these grades/subjects in this subcomponent. If needed, you may upload a table or graphic at 2.11, below. | The middle school science teacher and the administration used pre-assessment data to set growth targets for individual students on district developed science post assessments in grades 6 and 7 and on the 8th Grade State Science Assessment. A HEDI category and points will be assigned based upon the percentage of students who grow to reach their individual growth target on the spring 2013 science assessments. If 100-93% of students grow to reach their growth target, the teacher will be assigned points in the highly effective range. If 92-63% of students grow to reach their growth target, the teacher will be assigned points in the effective range. If 62-21% of students grow to reach their growth target, the teacher will be assigned points in the developing range. If 20-0% of students grow to reach their growth target, the teacher will be assigned points in the ineffective range. |
| Highly Effective (18 - 20 points) Results are well-above state average for similar students (or District goals if no state test). | 100%-99% of students meeting their individual growth target=20 points; 98-97% meeting their individual growth target=19 points; 96-93% meeting their individual growth target=18 points. |
| Effective (9 - 17 points) Results meet state average for similar students (or District goals if no state test). | 92-90% of students meeting their individual growth targets=17 points; 89-87% of students meeting their individual growth targets=16 points; 86-83% of students meeting their individual growth targets=15 points; 82-80% of students meeting their individual growth targets=14 points; 79-77% of students meeting their individual growth targets=13 points; 76-73% of students meeting their individual growth targets=12 points; 72-70% of students meeting their individual growth targets=11 points; 69-67% of students meeting their individual growth targets= 10 points; 66-63% of students meeting their individual growth targets= 9 points. |
| Developing (3 - 8 points) Results are below state average for similar students (or District goals if no state test). | 62-56% of students meeting their individual growth target=8 points; 55-49% of students meeting their individual growth target=7 points; 48-42% of students meeting their individual growth target= 6 points; 41-35% of students meeting their individual growth target=5 points; 34-28% of students meeting their individual growth target=4 points; 27-21% of students meeting their individual growth target=3 points. |
| Ineffective (0 - 2 points) Results are well-below state average for similar students (or District goals if no state test). | 20-14% of students meeting their individual growth target=2 points; 13-7% of students meeting their individual growth target=1 point; 6-0% of students meeting their individual growth target=0 points. |

2.5) Grades 6-8 Social Studies

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

| | Social Studies | Assessment |
|---|--|--|
| 6 | District, regional or BOCES-developed assessment | Menands Union Free School District Developed 6th Grade Social Studies Assessment |
| 7 | District, regional or BOCES-developed assessment | Menands Union Free School District Developed 7th Grade Social Studies Assessment |
| 8 | District, regional or BOCES-developed assessment | Menands Union Free School District Developed 8th Grade Social Studies Assessment |

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

| | |
|---|---|
| Use this box, if needed, to describe the general process for assigning HEDI categories for these grades/subjects in this subcomponent. If needed, you may upload a table or graphic at 2.11, below. | The middle school social studies teacher and the administration used pre-assessment data to set growth targets for individual students on district developed social studies post assessments. A HEDI category and points will be assigned based upon the percentage of students who grow to reach their individual growth target on the spring 2013 post assessments. If 100-93% of students grow to reach their growth target, the teacher will be assigned points in the highly effective range. If 92-63% of students grow to reach their growth target, the teacher will be assigned points in the effective range. If 62-21% of students grow to reach their growth target, the teacher will be assigned points in the developing range. If 20-0% of students grow to reach their growth target, the teacher will be assigned points in the ineffective range. |
| Highly Effective (18 - 20 points) Results are well-above District goals for similar students. | 100%-99% of students meeting their individual growth target=20 points; 98-97% meeting their individual growth target=19 points; 96-93% meeting their individual growth target=18 points. |
| Effective (9 - 17 points) Results meet District goals for similar students. | 92-90% of students meeting their individual growth targets=17 points; 89-87% of students meeting their individual growth targets=16 points; 86-83% of students meeting their individual growth targets=15 points; 82-80% of students meeting their individual growth targets=14 points; 79-77% of students meeting their individual growth targets=13 points; 76-73% of students meeting their individual growth targets=12 points; 72-70% of students meeting their individual growth targets=11 points; 69-67% of students meeting their individual growth targets= 10 points; 66-63% of students meeting their individual growth targets= 9 points. |
| Developing (3 - 8 points) Results are below District goals for similar students. | 62-56% of students meeting their individual growth target=8 points; 55-49% of students meeting their individual growth target=7 points; 48-42% of students meeting their individual growth target= 6 points; 41-35% of students meeting their individual growth target=5 points; 34-28% of students meeting their individual growth target=4 points; 27-21% of students meeting their individual growth target=3 points. |

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

20-14% of students meeting their individual growth target=2 points; 13-7% of students meeting their individual growth target=1 point; 6-0% of students meeting their individual growth target=0 points.

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 | Not applicable | Menands Union Free School District is a K-8 school district. We do not teach high school social studies courses. |

| | Social Studies Regents Courses | Assessment |
|------------------|--------------------------------|----------------|
| Global 2 | Not applicable | Not applicable |
| American History | Not applicable | Not applicable |

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

| | |
|---|---|
| Use this box, if needed, to describe the general process for assigning HEDI categories for these grades/subjects in this subcomponent. If needed, you may upload a table or graphic at 2.11, below. | Not applicable. We do not teach high school social studies courses. |
| Highly Effective (18 - 20 points) Results are well-above District goals for similar students. | Not applicable. We do not teach high school social studies courses. |
| Effective (9 - 17 points) Results meet District goals for similar students. | Not applicable. We do not teach high school social studies courses. |
| Developing (3 - 8 points) Results are below District goals for similar students. | Not applicable. We do not teach high school social studies courses. |
| Ineffective (0 - 2 points) Results are well-below District goals for similar students. | Not applicable. We do not teach high school social studies courses. |

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 | Not applicable | Not applicable |

| | | |
|---------------|--------------------|--------------------|
| Earth Science | Regents Assessment | Regents assessment |
| Chemistry | Not applicable | Not applicable |
| Physics | Not applicable | Not applicable |

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

| | |
|--|--|
| <p>Use this box, if needed, to describe the general process for assigning HEDI categories for these grades/subjects in this subcomponent. If needed, you may upload a table or graphic at 2.11, below.</p> | <p>Menands School District is a K-8 school district. The only Regents science course that we teach is Earth Science, which is taken by a small number of advanced eighth graders. The middle school science teacher and the administration used pre-assessment data to set growth targets for individual students on the Earth Science Regents Exam. A HEDI category and points will be assigned based upon the percentage of students who grow to reach their individual growth target on the spring 2013 Regents exam. If 100-93% of students grow to reach their growth target, the teacher will be assigned points in the highly effective range. If 92-63% of students grow to reach their growth target, the teacher will be assigned points in the effective range. If 62-21% of students grow to reach their growth target, the teacher will be assigned points in the developing range. If 20-0% of students grow to reach their growth target, the teacher will be assigned points in the ineffective range.</p> |
| <p>Highly Effective (18 - 20 points) Results are well-above District goals for similar students.</p> | <p>100%-99% of students meeting their individual growth target=20 points; 98-97% meeting their individual growth target=19 points; 96-93% meeting their individual growth target=18 points.</p> |
| <p>Effective (9 - 17 points) Results meet District goals for similar students.</p> | <p>92-90% of students meeting their individual growth targets=17 points; 89-87% of students meeting their individual growth targets=16 points; 86-83% of students meeting their individual growth targets=15 points; 82-80% of students meeting their individual growth targets=14 points; 79-77% of students meeting their individual growth targets=13 points; 76-73% of students meeting their individual growth targets=12 points; 72-70% of students meeting their individual growth targets=11 points; 69-67% of students meeting their individual growth targets= 10 points; 66-63% of students meeting their individual growth targets= 9 points.</p> |
| <p>Developing (3 - 8 points) Results are below District goals for similar students.</p> | <p>62-56% of students meeting their individual growth target=8 points; 55-49% of students meeting their individual growth target=7 points; 48-42% of students meeting their individual growth target= 6 points; 41-35% of students meeting their individual growth target=5 points; 34-28% of students meeting their individual growth target=4 points; 27-21% of students meeting their individual growth target=3 points.</p> |
| <p>Ineffective (0 - 2 points) Results are well-below District goals for similar students.</p> | <p>20-14% of students meeting their individual growth target=2 points; 13-7% of students meeting their individual growth target=1 point; 6-0% of students meeting their individual growth target=0 points.</p> |

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 | Not applicable | Not applicable |
| Algebra 2 | Not applicable | Not applicable |

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

| | |
|---|---|
| Use this box, if needed, to describe the general process for assigning HEDI categories for these grades/subjects in this subcomponent. If needed, you may upload a table or graphic at 2.11, below. | Menands School District is a K-8 school district. The only Regents math course that we teach is Algebra 1, which is taken by a small number of advanced eighth graders. The middle school math teacher and the administration would use pre-assessment data to set growth targets for individual students on the Regents Exam. A HEDI category and points will be assigned based upon the percentage of students who grow to reach their individual growth target on the Algebra 1 Regents exam. If 100-93% of students grow to reach their growth target, the teacher would be assigned points in the highly effective range. If 92-63% of students grow to reach their growth target, the teacher would be assigned points in the effective range. If 62-21% of students grow to reach their growth target, the teacher would be assigned points in the developing range. If 20-0% of students grow to reach their growth target, the teacher will be assigned points in the ineffective range. |
| Highly Effective (18 - 20 points) Results are well-above District goals for similar students. | 100%-99% of students meeting their individual growth target=20 points; 98-97% meeting their individual growth target=19 points; 96-93% meeting their individual growth target=18 points. |
| Effective (9 - 17 points) Results meet District goals for similar students. | 92-90% of students meeting their individual growth targets=17 points; 89-87% of students meeting their individual growth targets=16 points; 86-83% of students meeting their individual growth targets=15 points; 82-80% of students meeting their individual growth targets=14 points; 79-77% of students meeting their individual growth targets=13 points; 76-73% of students meeting their individual growth targets=12 points; 72-70% of students meeting their individual growth targets=11 points; 69-67% of students meeting their individual growth targets= 10 points; 66-63% of students meeting their individual growth targets= 9 points. |
| Developing (3 - 8 points) Results are below District goals for similar students. | 62-56% of students meeting their individual growth target=8 points; 55-49% of students meeting their individual growth target=7 points; 48-42% of students meeting their individual growth target= 6 points; 41-35% of |

students meeting their individual growth target=5 points; 34-28% of students meeting their individual growth target=4 points; 27-21% of students meeting their individual growth target=3 points.

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

20-14% of students meeting their individual growth target=2 points; 13-7% of students meeting their individual growth target=1 point; 6-0% of students meeting their individual growth target=0 points.

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 | Not applicable | Menands Union Free School District is a K-8 school District. We do not teach high school English courses. |
| Grade 10 ELA | Not applicable | Menands Union Free School District is a K-8 school District. We do not teach high school English courses. |
| Grade 11 ELA | Not applicable | Menands Union Free School District is a K-8 school District. We do not teach high school English courses. |

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

| | |
|---|---|
| Use this box, if needed, to describe the general process for assigning HEDI categories for these grades/subjects in this subcomponent. If needed, you may upload a table or graphic at 2.11, below. | Not applicable. Menands Union Free School District is a K-8 school District. We do not teach high school English courses. |
| Highly Effective (18 - 20 points) Results are well-above District goals for similar students. | Not applicable. Menands Union Free School District is a K-8 school District. We do not teach high school English courses. |
| Effective (9 - 17 points) Results meet District goals for similar students. | Not applicable. Menands Union Free School District is a K-8 school District. We do not teach high school English courses. |
| Developing (3 - 8 points) Results are below District goals for similar students. | Not applicable. Menands Union Free School District is a K-8 school District. We do not teach high school English courses. |
| Ineffective (0 - 2 points) Results are well-below District goals for similar students. | Not applicable. Menands Union Free School District is a K-8 school District. We do not teach high school English courses. |

2.10) All Other Courses

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

| Course(s) or Subject(s) | Option | Assessment |
|---|---|---|
| K-8 Art | District, Regional or BOCES-developed | Capital Region BOCES/Questar BOCES Developed Grades K-2 Art Assessment; Capital Region BOCES/Questar BOCES Developed Grades 6-8 Art Assessment |
| K-8 Physical Education | District, Regional or BOCES-developed | WSWHE BOCES Developed Kindergarten PE Assessment; WSWHE BOCES Developed Grade 1 PE Assessment; WSWHE BOCES Developed Grade 2 PE Assessment; WSWHE BOCES Developed Grade 5 PE Assessment; WSWHE BOCES Developed Grade 7 PE Assessment |
| K-6 Library | District, Regional or BOCES-developed | Capital Region BOCES School Library System Developed Kindergarten Library Assessment; Capital Region BOCES School Library System Developed Grade 1 Library Assessment; Capital Region BOCES School Library System Developed Grade 2 Library Assessment; Capital Region BOCES School Library System Developed Grade 6 Library Assessment |
| K-7 Music | District, Regional or BOCES-developed | Menands Union Free School District Developed Kindergarten Music Assessment; Menands Union Free School District Developed Grade 1 Music Assessment; Menands Union Free School District Developed Grade 2 Music Assessment; Menands Union Free School District Developed Grade 6 Music Assessment |
| K-8 Foreign Language | District, Regional or BOCES-developed | Menands Union Free School District Developed Kindergarten Spanish Assessment; Menands Union Free School District Developed Grade 1 Spanish Assessment; Menands Union Free School District Developed Grade 2 Spanish Assessment; Menands Union Free School District Developed Grade 6 Spanish Assessment |
| K-2 Special Education/Academic Intervention Services | School/BOCES-wide/group/team results based on State | NYS Grades 4 and 5 ELA Assessments; NYS Grades 4 and 5 Math Assessments |
| Grades 3-5 Special Education/Academic Intervention Services | School/BOCES-wide/group/team results based on State | NYS Grades 4 and 5 ELA Assessments; NYS Grades 4 and 5 Math Assessments |
| Grades 6-8 Special Education/Academic Intervention Services | School/BOCES-wide/group/team results based on State | NYS Grades 6,7,8 ELA Assessments; NYS Grades 6,7,8 Math Assessments |
| K-8 Reading Specialist/Academic Intervention Services | School/BOCES-wide/group/team results based on State | NYS Grades 4-8 ELA Assessments |
| K-8 ESL | State Assessment | NYS English as a Second Language Achievement Test |

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

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

Art, Physical Education, Library, Music, Foreign Language - Pre-assessments were given at every grade level in these subjects. Based upon student numbers, assessment results for specific grade levels in each subject will be used to assign points in the Comparable Growth Measures subcomponent. The other grade levels in each subject will be used to assign points in the Locally Selected Measures subcomponent. Assessments at different grade levels are being used for the Comparable Growth Measures subcomponent and for the Locally Selected Measures subcomponent.

The teachers in each subject and the administration analyzed pre-assessment data and set minimum growth targets for individual students or for the grade level. A HEDI category and points will be assigned based upon the percentage of students who grow to reach the minimum growth targets on the spring 2013 post assessments. If 100-93% of students grow to reach the minimum growth targets, the teacher will be assigned points in the highly effective range. If 92-63% of students grow to reach the minimum growth targets, the teacher will be assigned points in the effective range. If 62-21% of students grow to reach the minimum growth targets, the teacher will be assigned points in the developing range. If 20-0% of students grow to reach the minimum growth targets, the teacher will be assigned points in the ineffective range.

For Special Education and Academic Intervention Teachers -The value-added growth scores on the 2013 State assessments for Menands School students in the specific grade levels in which each of these teachers works will be used to assign a HEDI category and points. The value-added growth scores for specific grade levels will be proportionately averaged. To assign a HEDI category and points for these teachers, the resulting value-added growth score from 25-0 points will be converted into comparable growth points from 20-0. If the value-added growth score is from 25-22 points, the teacher will be assigned from 20-18 comparable growth points in the highly effective range. If the value-added growth score is from 21-10 points, the teacher will be assigned from 17-9 comparable growth points in the effective range. If the value-added growth score is from 9-3 points, the teacher will be assigned from 8-3 comparable growth points in the developing range. If the value-added growth score is from 2-0 points, the teacher will be assigned from 2-0 comparable growth points in the ineffective range.

For the ESL Teacher - The teacher and the administration used pre-assessment data to set growth targets for individual ESL students on the NYSESLAT. A HEDI

category and points will be assigned based upon the percentage of ESL students who achieve their individual growth target score on the spring 2013 NYSESLAT. If 100-93% of students reach their growth target, the teacher will be assigned points in the highly effective range. If 92-63% of students reach their growth target, the teacher will be assigned points in the effective range. If 62-21% of students reach their growth targets, the teacher will be assigned points in the developing range. If 20-0% of students reach their growth target, the teacher will be assigned points in the ineffective range.

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

Art, Physical Education, Library, Music, Foreign Language - 100%-99% of students reaching the minimum growth targets=20 points; 98-97% reaching the minimum growth targets=19 points; 96-93% reaching the minimum growth targets=18 points.

For Special Education and Academic Intervention Teachers - A value-added growth score for the grade levels in which these teachers work of 25=20 points comparable growth; value added growth score of 24= 19 points comparable growth; value-added growth score of 23 or 22=18 points comparable growth.

For the ESL Teacher-100%-99% of students meeting their individual growth target=20 points; 98-97% meeting their individual growth target=19 points; 96-93% meeting their individual growth target=18 points.

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

Art, Physical Education, Library, Music, Foreign Language - 92-90% of students reaching the minimum growth targets=17 points; 89-87% of students reaching the minimum growth targets=16 points; 86-83% of students reaching the minimum growth targets=15 points; 82-80% of students reaching the minimum growth targets=14 points; 79-77% of students reaching the minimum growth targets=13 points; 76-73% of students reaching the minimum growth targets=12 points; 72-70% of students reaching the minimum growth targets=11 points; 69-67% of students reaching the minimum growth targets= 10 points; 66-63% of students reaching the minimum growth targets= 9 points.

For Special Education and Academic Intervention Teachers - A value-added growth score for the grade levels in which these teachers work of 21=17 points comparable growth; value-added growth score of 20=16 points comparable growth; value-added growth score of 19=15 points comparable growth; value-added growth score of 18 or 17=14 points comparable growth; value-added growth score of 16=13 points comparable growth; value-added growth score of 15=12 points comparable growth; value-added growth score of 14=11 points comparable growth; value-added growth score of 13 or 12=10 points comparable growth; value-added growth score of 11 or 10=9 points comparable growth.

For the ESL Teacher-92-90% of students meeting their individual growth targets=17 points; 89-87% of students

meeting their individual growth targets=16 points; 86-83% of students meeting their individual growth targets=15 points; 82-80% of students meeting their individual growth targets=14 points; 79-77% of students meeting their individual growth targets=13 points; 76-73% of students meeting their individual growth targets=12 points; 72-70% of students meeting their individual growth targets=11 points; 69-67% of students meeting their individual growth targets= 10 points; 66-63% of students meeting their individual growth targets= 9 points.

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

Art, Physical Education, Library, Music, Foreign Language - 62-56% of students reaching the minimum growth targets=8 points; 55-49% of students reaching the minimum growth targets=7 points; 48-42% of students reaching the minimum growth targets= 6 points; 41-35% of students reaching the minimum growth targets=5 points; 34-28% of students reaching the minimum growth targets=4 points; 27-21% of students reaching the minimum growth targets=3 points.

For Special Education and Academic Intervention Teachers - A value-added growth score for the grade levels in which these teachers work of 9=8 points comparable growth; value-added growth score of 8=7 points comparable growth; value-added growth score of 7=6 points comparable growth; value-added growth score of 6=5 points comparable growth; value-added growth score of 5=4 points comparable growth; value-added growth score of 4 or 3=3 points comparable growth.

For the ESL Teacher-62-56% of students meeting their individual growth target=8 points; 55-49% of students meeting their individual growth target=7 points; 48-42% of students meeting their individual growth target= 6 points; 41-35% of students meeting their individual growth target=5 points; 34-28% of students meeting their individual growth target=4 points; 27-21% of students meeting their individual growth target=3 points.

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

Art, Physical Education, Library, Music, Foreign Language - 20-14% of students reaching the minimum growth targets=2 points; 13-7% of students reaching the minimum growth targets=1 point; 6-0% of students reaching the minimum growth targets=0 points.

For Special Education and Academic Intervention Teachers - A value-added growth score for the grade levels in which these teachers work of 2=2 points comparable growth; value-added growth score of 1=1 point comparable growth; value-added growth score of 0=0 points comparable growth.

For the ESL Teacher - 20-14% of students meeting their individual growth target=2 points; 13-7% of students meeting their individual growth target=1 point; 6-0% of students meeting their individual growth target=0 points.

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.

(No response)

2.12) Locally Developed Controls

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

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

No other local controls are being implemented.

2.13) Teachers with more than one growth measure

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

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

2.14) Assurances

Please check all of the boxes below:

| | |
|--|---------|
| 2.14) Assurances Assure the application of locally developed controls will be rigorous, fair, and transparent and only those used for State Growth will be used for Comparable Growth Measures. | Checked |
| 2.14) Assurances Assure that use of locally developed controls will not have a disparate impact on underrepresented students in accordance with applicable civil rights laws. | Checked |
| 2.14) Assurances Assure that enrolled students in accordance with teacher of record policies are included and may not be excluded. | Checked |
| 2.14) Assurances Assure that procedures for ensuring data accuracy and integrity are being utilized. | Checked |
| 2.14) Assurances Assure that district will develop SLOs according to the rules established by SED (see: http://usny.nysed.gov/rtt/teachers-leaders/slo/home.html). | Checked |

| | |
|--|---------|
| 2.14) Assurances Assure that past academic performance and/or baseline academic data of students will be taken into account when developing an SLO. | Checked |
| 2.14) Assurances Assure that the process for assigning points for SLOs for the Growth Subcomponent will use the narrative HEDI descriptions described in the regulations to effectively differentiate educators in ways that improve student learning and instruction. | Checked |
| 2.14) Assurances Assure that it is possible for an educator to earn each point, including 0, for SLOs in the Growth subcomponent scoring range. | Checked |
| 2.14) Assurances Assure that processes are in place to monitor SLOs to ensure rigor and comparability across classrooms. | Checked |

3. Local Measures (Teachers)

Created Sunday, November 11, 2012

Updated Tuesday, January 01, 2013

Page 1

Locally Selected Measures of Student Achievement or Growth

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

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

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

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

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

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

Growth or achievement measure(s) from these options.

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

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

Measures based on:

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

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

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

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

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

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

3.1) Grades 4-8 ELA

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

| | Locally-Selected Measure from List of Approved Measures | Assessment |
|---|---|-------------------------------------|
| 4 | 4) State-approved 3rd party assessments | Measures of Academic Progress (ELA) |
| 5 | 4) State-approved 3rd party assessments | Measures of Academic Progress (ELA) |
| 6 | 4) State-approved 3rd party assessments | Measures of Academic Progress (ELA) |
| 7 | 4) State-approved 3rd party assessments | Measures of Academic Progress (ELA) |

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.

The Menands School District will be using value-added measures based upon the NWEA MAP assessment to calculate teacher level effectiveness ratings for the locally selected measures of student growth in ELA in grades 4-8. The analyses will be conducted by the Value Added Research Center (VARC) on NWEA's MAP assessment. Major modeling decisions were made by a Technical Advisory Panel made up of volunteer districts from across the state. To assign teachers to HEDI categories, VARC assumes a normal distribution of teacher effects centered on 10.5. From this point, standard deviation cut points will be used to assign teachers to HEDI categories and points as described in each of the following sections.

Highly Effective (14 - 15 points) Results are well above District- or BOCES-adopted expectations for growth or achievement for grade/subject.

Teachers' VARC scores that fall at greater than or equal to .9 standard deviations (SDs) above average will be highly effective. In a fifteen point distribution, SDs greater than or equal to 1.2=15 points; SDs greater than or equal to .9 but less than 1.2=14 points. This distribution will be adjusted if a 20 point distribution is needed pending SED's decision on growth or value added scores on state assessments.

Effective (8- 13 points) Results meet District- or BOCES-adopted expectations for growth or achievement for grade/subject.

Teachers' VARC scores that fall at less than .9 SDs above average and greater than or equal to -.9 SDs below average will be in the effective range. In a fifteen point distribution, SDs that are less than .9 but greater than or equal to .6 = 13 points; SDs that are less than .6 but greater than or equal to .3 = 12 points; SDs that are less than .3 but greater than 0 = 11 points; SDs that are less than 0 but greater than -.3 = 10 points; SDs that are less than -.3 but greater than or equal to -.6 = 9 points; and SDs that are less than -.6 but greater than or equal to -.9 = 8 points. This will be adjusted if a twenty point distribution is needed pending SED's decision on growth or value added scores on state assessments.

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

Teachers' VARC scores that fall at less than -.9SDs below average and greater than or equal to -2.4SDs below average will be in the developing range. In a fifteen point distribution, SDs less than -.9 but greater than or equal to -1.2 = 7 points; SDs less than -1.2 but greater than or equal to -1.5 = 6 points; SDs less than -1.5 but greater than or equal to -1.8 = 5 points; SDs less than -1.8 but greater than or equal to -2.1 = 4 points; SDs less than -2.1 but greater than or equal to -2.4 = 3 points. This will be adjusted if a twenty point distribution is needed pending SED's decision on growth or value added scores on state assessments.

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

Teachers' VARC scores that fall at less than -2.4 SDs below average will be in the ineffective range. In a fifteen point distribution, SDs less than -2.4 but greater than or equal to -2.7 = 2 points; SDs less than -2.7 but greater than or equal to -3.0 = 1 point; SDs less than -3.0 = 0 points. This will be adjusted if a twenty point distribution is needed pending SED's decision on growth or value added scores on state assessments.

3.2) Grades 4-8 Math

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

| | Locally-Selected Measure from List of Approved Measures | Assessment |
|---|---|--------------------------------------|
| 4 | 4) State-approved 3rd party assessments | Measures of Academic Progress (Math) |
| 5 | 4) State-approved 3rd party assessments | Measures of Academic Progress (Math) |
| 6 | 4) State-approved 3rd party assessments | Measures of Academic Progress (Math) |
| 7 | 4) State-approved 3rd party assessments | Measures of Academic Progress (Math) |
| 8 | 4) State-approved 3rd party assessments | Measures of Academic Progress (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.

The Menands School District will be using value-added measures based upon the NWEA MAP assessments to calculate teacher level effectiveness ratings for the locally selected measures of student growth in math in grades 4-8. The analyses will be conducted by the Value Added Research Center (VARC) on NWEA's MAP assessment. Major modeling decisions were made by a Technical Advisory Panel made up of volunteer districts from across the state. To assign teachers to HEDI categories, VARC assumes a normal distribution of teacher effects centered on 10.5. From this point, standard deviation cut points will be used to assign teachers to HEDI categories and points as described in each of the following sections.

Highly Effective (14 - 15 points) Results are well above District- or BOCES-adopted expectations for growth or achievement for grade/subject.

Teachers' VARC scores that fall at greater than or equal to .9 standard deviations (SDs) above average will be highly effective. In a fifteen point distribution, SDs greater than or equal to 1.2=15 points; SDs greater than or equal to .9 but less than 1.2=14 points. This distribution will be adjusted if a 20 point distribution is needed pending SED's decision on growth or value added scores on state assessments.

Effective (8- 13 points) Results meet District- or BOCES-adopted expectations for growth or achievement for grade/subject.

Teachers' VARC scores that fall at less than .9 SDs above average and greater than or equal to -.9 SDs below average will be in the effective range. In a fifteen point distribution, SDs that are less than .9 but greater than or equal to .6 = 13 points; SDs that are less than .6 but greater than or equal to .3 = 12 points; SDs that are less than .3 but greater than 0 = 11 points; SDs that are less than 0 but greater than -.3 = 10 points; SDs that are less than -.3 but greater than or equal to -.6 = 9 points; and SDs that are less than -.6 but greater than or equal to -.9 = 8 points. This will be adjusted if a twenty point distribution is needed pending SED's decision on growth or value added scores on state assessments.

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

Teachers' VARC scores that fall at less than -.9SDs below average and greater than or equal to -2.4 SDs below average will be in the developing range. In a fifteen point distribution, SDs less than -.9 but greater than or equal to -1.2 = 7 points; SDs less than -1.2 but greater than or equal to -1.5 = 6 points; SDs less than -1.5 but greater than or equal to -1.8 = 5 points; SDs less than -1.8 but greater than or equal to -2.1 = 4 points; SDs less than -2.1 but greater than or equal to -2.4 = 3 points. This will be adjusted if a twenty point distribution is needed pending SED's decision on growth or value added scores on state assessments.

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

Teachers' VARC scores that fall at less than -2.4 SDs below average will be in the ineffective range. In a fifteen point distribution, SDs less than -2.4 but greater than or equal to -2.7 = 2 points; SDs less than -2.7 but greater than or equal to -3.0 = 1 point; SDs less than -3.0 = 0 points. This will be adjusted if a twenty point distribution is needed pending SED's decision on growth or value added scores on state assessments.

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.

(No response)

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

Growth or achievement measure(s) from these options.

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

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

Measures based on:

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

3.4) Grades K-3 ELA

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

| | Locally-Selected Measure from List of Approved Measures | Assessment |
|---|---|--|
| K | 4) State-approved 3rd party assessments | Measures of Academic Progress (Primary Grades) |
| 1 | 4) State-approved 3rd party assessments | Measures of Academic Progress (Primary Grades) |

| | | |
|---|---|--|
| 2 | 4) State-approved 3rd party assessments | Measures of Academic Progress (Primary Grades) |
| 3 | 4) State-approved 3rd party assessments | Measures of Academic Progress (ELA) |

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.

| | |
|--|---|
| <p>Use this box, if needed, to describe the general process for assigning HEDI categories for these grades/subjects in this subcomponent. If needed, you may upload a table or graphic at 3.13, below.</p> | <p>The Menands School District will be using value-added measures based upon the NWEA MAP assessments to calculate teacher level effectiveness ratings for the locally selected measures of student growth in ELA in grade 3 and the MAP for Primary Grades for teachers in K-2. The analyses will be conducted by the Value Added Research Center (VARC) on NWEA's MAP or MAP for Primary Grades assessments. Major modeling decisions were made by a Technical Advisory Panel made up of volunteer districts from across the state. To assign teachers to HEDI categories, VARC assumes a normal distribution of teacher effects centered on 13. From this point, standard deviation cut points will be used to assign teachers to HEDI categories and points as described in each of the following sections.</p> |
| <p>Highly Effective (18-20 points) Results are well above District- or BOCES-adopted expectations for growth or achievement for grade/subject.</p> | <p>Teachers' VARC scores that fall at greater than or equal to .9 SDs above average will be in the highly effective range. SD's greater than or equal to 1.3 = 20 points; SDs greater than 1.1 but less than 1.3 = 19 points; SDs greater than .9 but less than 1.1 = 18 points.</p> |
| <p>Effective (9-17 points) Results meet District- or BOCES-adopted expectations for growth or achievement for grade/subject.</p> | <p>Teachers' VARC scores that fall at less than .9 SDs above average and greater than or equal to -.9 SDs below average will be in the effective range. SDs less than .9 but greater than or equal to .7 = 17 points; SDs less than .7 but greater than or equal to .5 = 16 points; SDs less than .5 but greater than or equal to .3 = 15 points; SDs less than .3 but greater than or equal to .1 = 14 points; SDs less than .1 but greater than or equal to -.1 = 13 points; SDs less than -.1 but greater than or equal to -.3 = 12 points; SDs less than -.3 but greater than or equal to -.5 = 11 points; SDs less than -.5 but greater than or equal to -.7 = 10 points; SDs less than -.7 but greater than or equal to -.9 = 9 points.</p> |
| <p>Developing (3 - 8 points) Results are below District- or BOCES-adopted expectations for growth or achievement for grade/subject.</p> | <p>Teachers' VARC scores that fall at less than -.9 standard deviations below average but greater than or equal to -2.1 standard deviations below average will be in the developing range. SDs less than -.9 but greater than or equal to -1.1 = 8 points; SDs less than -1.1 but greater than or equal to -1.3 = 7 points; SDs less than -1.3 but greater than or equal to -1.5 = 6 points; SDs less than -1.5 but greater than or equal to -1.7 = 5 points; SDs less than -1.7 but greater than or equal to -1.9 = 4 points; SD's less than -1.9 but greater than or equal to -2.1 = 3 points.</p> |

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

Teachers' VARC scores that fall at less than -2.1 standard deviations below average will be in the ineffective range. SDs less than -2.1 but greater than or equal to -2.3 = 2 points; SDs less than -2.3 but greater than or equal to -2.5 = 1 point; SDs less than -2.5 = 0 points.

3.5) Grades K-3 Math

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

| | Locally-Selected Measure from List of Approved Measures | Assessment |
|---|---|--|
| K | 4) State-approved 3rd party assessments | Measures of Academic Progress (Primary Grades) |
| 1 | 4) State-approved 3rd party assessments | Measures of Academic Progress (Primary Grades) |
| 2 | 4) State-approved 3rd party assessments | Measures of Academic Progress (Primary Grades) |
| 3 | 4) State-approved 3rd party assessments | Measures of Academic Progress (Math) |

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.

The Menands School District will be using value-added measures based upon the NWEA MAP assessments to calculate teacher level effectiveness ratings for the locally selected measures of student growth in math in grade 3 and the MAP for Primary Grades for teachers in K-2. The analyses will be conducted by the Value Added Research Center (VARC) on NWEA's MAP and MAP for Primary Grades assessments. Major modeling decisions were made by a Technical Advisory Panel made up of volunteer districts from across the state. To assign teachers to HEDI categories, VARC assumes a normal distribution of teacher effects centered on 13. From this point, standard deviation cut points will be used to assign teachers to HEDI categories and points as described in each of the following sections.

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

Teachers' VARC scores that fall at greater than or equal to .9 SDs above average will be in the highly effective range. SD's greater than or equal to 1.3 = 20 points; SDs greater than 1.1 but less than 1.3 = 19 points; SDs greater than .9 but less than 1.1 = 18 points.

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

Teachers' VARC scores that fall at less than .9 SDs above average and greater than or equal to -.9 SDs below average will be in the effective range. SDs less than .9 but greater than or equal to .7 = 17 points; SDs less than .7

but greater than or equal to .5 = 16 points; SDs less than .5 but greater than or equal to .3 = 15 points; SDs less than .3 but greater than or equal to .1 = 14 points; SDs less than .1 but greater than or equal to -.1 = 13 points; SDs less than -.1 but greater than or equal to -.3 = 12 points; SDs less than -.3 but greater than or equal to -.5 = 11 points; SDs less than -.5 but greater than or equal to -.7 = 10 points; SDs less than -.7 but greater than or equal to -.9 = 9 points.

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

Teachers' VARC scores that fall at less than -.9 standard deviations below average but greater than or equal to -2.1 standard deviations below average will be in the developing range. SDs less than -.9 but greater than or equal to -1.1 = 8 points; SDs less than -1.1 but greater than or equal to -1.3 = 7 points; SDs less than -1.3 but greater than or equal to -1.5 = 6 points; SDs less than -1.5 but greater than or equal to -1.7 = 5 points; SDs less than -1.7 but greater than or equal to -1.9 = 4 points; SD's less than -1.9 but greater than or equal to -2.1 = 3 points.

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

Teachers' VARC scores that fall at less than -2.1 standard deviations below average will be in the ineffective range. SDs less than -2.1 but greater than or equal to -2.3 = 2 points; SDs less than -2.3 but greater than or equal to -2.5 = 1 point; SDs less than -2.5 = 0 points.

3.6) Grades 6-8 Science

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

| | Locally-Selected Measure from List of Approved Measures | Assessment |
|---|---|---|
| 6 | 7) Student Learning Objectives | Menands Union Free School District Developed 6th Grade Science Assessment |
| 7 | 7) Student Learning Objectives | Menands Union Free School District Developed 7th Grade Science Assessment |
| 8 | 7) Student Learning Objectives | Menands Union Free School District Developed 8th Grade Science Assessment |

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

Use this box, if needed, to describe the general process for assigning HEDI categories for these grades/subjects in this subcomponent. If needed, you may upload a table or graphic at 3.13, below.

The science teacher and the administration established a proficiency/mastery score on each of the district developed science assessments. As per the teacher's SLO's, a HEDI category and points will be assigned based upon the percentage of the teacher's students who achieve the proficiency/mastery score on the post assessment. If from 100-93% of students achieve the proficiency/mastery score, the teacher will be assigned from 20 to 18 points in the highly effective range. If from 92-63% of students achieve the proficiency/mastery score, the teacher will be assigned from 17 to 9 points in the

effective range. If from 62-21% of the students achieve the proficiency/mastery score, the teacher will be assigned from 8 to 3 points in the developing range. If from 20-0% of students achieve the proficiency/mastery score, the teacher will be assigned from 2 to 0 points in the ineffective range.

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

100-99% of the teacher's students achieving the proficiency/mastery score=20 points; 98-97% of students achieving the proficiency/mastery score=19 points; 96-93% of students achieving the proficiency/mastery score=18 points.

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

92-90% of the teacher's students achieving the proficiency/mastery score=17 points; 89-87% of students achieving the proficiency/mastery score=16 points; 86-83% of students achieving the proficiency/mastery score=15 points; 82-80% of students achieving the proficiency/mastery score=14 points; 79-77% of students achieving the proficiency/mastery score=13 points; 76-73% of students achieving the proficiency/mastery score=12 points; 72-70% of students achieving the proficiency/mastery score=11 points; 69-67% of students achieving the proficiency/mastery score=10 points; 66-63% of students achieving the proficiency/mastery score=9 points.

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

62-56% of the teacher's students achieving the proficiency/mastery score=8 points; 55-49% of students achieving the proficiency/mastery score=7 points; 48-42% of students achieving the proficiency/mastery score=6 points; 41-35% of students achieving the proficiency/mastery score=5 points; 34-28% of students achieving the proficiency/mastery score=4 points; 27-21% of students achieving the proficiency/mastery score=3 points.

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

20-14% of the teacher's students achieving the proficiency/mastery score=2 points; 13-7% of students achieving the proficiency/mastery score=1 point; 6-0% of students achieving the proficiency/mastery score=0 points.

3.7) Grades 6-8 Social Studies

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

| | Locally-Selected Measure from List of Approved Measures | Assessment |
|---|---|--|
| 6 | 7) Student Learning Objectives | Menands Union Free School District Developed 6th Grade Social Studies Assessment |
| 7 | 7) Student Learning Objectives | Menands Union Free School District Developed 7th Grade Social Studies Assessment |
| 8 | 7) Student Learning Objectives | Menands Union Free School District Developed 8th Grade Social Studies Assessment |

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

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

| | |
|--|---|
| <p>Use this box, if needed, to describe the general process for assigning HEDI categories for these grades/subjects in this subcomponent. If needed, you may upload a table or graphic at 3.13, below.</p> | <p>The social studies teacher and the administration established a proficiency/mastery score on each of the district developed social studies assessments. As per the teacher's SLO's, a HEDI category and points will be assigned based upon the percentage of the teacher's students who achieve the proficiency/mastery score on the post assessment. If from 100-93% of students achieve the proficiency/mastery score, the teacher will be assigned from 20 to 18 points in the highly effective range. If from 92-63% of students achieve the proficiency/mastery score, the teacher will be assigned from 17 to 9 points in the effective range. If from 62-21% of the students achieve the proficiency/mastery score, the teacher will be assigned from 8 to 3 points in the developing range. If from 20-0% of students achieve the proficiency/mastery score, the teacher will be assigned from 2 to 0 points in the ineffective range.</p> |
| <p>Highly Effective (18 - 20 points) Results are well above District- or BOCES-adopted expectations for growth or achievement for grade/subject.</p> | <p>100-99% of the teacher's students achieving the proficiency/mastery score=20 points; 98-97% of students achieving the proficiency/mastery score=19 points; 96-93% of students achieving the proficiency/mastery score=18 points.</p> |
| <p>Effective (9 - 17 points) Results meet District- or BOCES-adopted expectations for growth or achievement for grade/subject.</p> | <p>92-90% of the teacher's students achieving the proficiency/mastery score=17 points; 89-87% of students achieving the proficiency/mastery score=16 points; 86-83% of students achieving the proficiency/mastery score=15 points; 82-80% of students achieving the proficiency/mastery score=14 points; 79-77% of students achieving the proficiency/mastery score=13 points; 76-73% of students achieving the proficiency/mastery score=12 points; 72-70% of students achieving the proficiency/mastery score=11 points; 69-67% of students achieving the proficiency/mastery score=10 points; 66-63% of students achieving the proficiency/mastery score=9 points.</p> |
| <p>Developing (3 - 8 points) Results are below District- or BOCES-adopted expectations for growth or achievement for grade/subject.</p> | <p>62-56% of the teacher's students achieving the proficiency/mastery score=8 points; 55-49% of students achieving the proficiency/mastery score=7 points; 48-42% of students achieving the proficiency/mastery score=6 points; 41-35% of students achieving the proficiency/mastery score=5 points; 34-28% of students achieving the proficiency/mastery score=4 points; 27-21% of students achieving the proficiency/mastery score=3 points.</p> |
| <p>Ineffective (0 - 2 points) Results are well below District- or BOCES-adopted expectations for growth or achievement for grade/subject.</p> | <p>20-14% of the teacher's students achieving the proficiency/mastery score=2 points; 13-7% of students achieving the proficiency/mastery score=1 point; 6-0% of students achieving the proficiency/mastery score=0 points.</p> |

3.8) High School Social Studies

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

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

| | Locally-Selected Measure from List of Approved Measures | Assessment |
|------------------|---|--|
| Global 1 | Not applicable | Menands Union Free School District is a K-8 school district. We do not teach high school social studies courses. |
| Global 2 | Not applicable | Menands Union Free School District is a K-8 school district. We do not teach high school social studies courses. |
| American History | Not applicable | Menands Union Free School District is a K-8 school district. We do not teach high school social studies courses. |

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. | 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 |

3.9) High School Science

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

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

| | Locally-Selected Measure from List of Approved Measures | Assessment |
|--------------------|---|---|
| Living Environment | Not applicable | Menands Union Free School District is a K-8 school district. We do not teach high school science courses except for a small number of eighth graders who take Regents Earth |

| | | |
|---------------|--------------------------------|--|
| | | Science. |
| Earth Science | 7) Student Learning Objectives | NYS Earth Science Regents Exam |
| Chemistry | Not applicable | Menands Union Free School District is a K-8 school district. We do not teach high school science courses except for a small number of eighth graders who take Regents Earth Science. |
| Physics | Not applicable | Menands Union Free School District is a K-8 school district. We do not teach high school science courses except for a small number of eighth graders who take Regents Earth Science. |

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. | Based upon historical data and pre-assessment scores, the science teacher and the administration will establish a district expected proficiency/mastery scaled score on the Earth Science Regents exam. As per the teacher's SLO's, a HEDI category and points will be assigned based upon the percentage of the teacher's students who achieve the district expected proficiency/mastery scaled score on the Regents exam. If from 100-93% of students achieve the proficiency/mastery score, the teacher will be assigned from 20 to 18 points in the highly effective range. If from 92-63% of students achieve the proficiency/mastery score, the teacher will be assigned from 17 to 9 points in the effective range. If from 62-21% of the students achieve the proficiency/mastery score, the teacher will be assigned from 8 to 3 points in the developing range. If from 20-0% of students achieve the proficiency/mastery score, the teacher will be assigned from 2 to 0 points in the ineffective range. |
| Highly Effective (18-20 points) Results are well above District- or BOCES-adopted expectations for growth or achievement for grade/subject. | 100-99% of the teacher's students achieving the district expected proficiency/mastery score=20 points; 98-97% of students achieving the proficiency/mastery score=19 points; 96-93% of students achieving the proficiency/mastery score=18 points. |
| Developing (3 - 8 points) Results are below District- or BOCES-adopted expectations for growth or achievement for grade/subject. | The boxes are out of order- The boxes are out of order- Developing - 62-56% of the teacher's students achieving the district expected proficiency/mastery score=8 points; 55-49% of students achieving the proficiency/mastery score=7 points; 48-42% of students achieving the proficiency/mastery score=6 points; 41-35% of students achieving the proficiency/mastery score=5 points; 34-28% of students achieving the proficiency/mastery score=4 points; 27-21% of students achieving the district proficiency/mastery score=3 points. |
| Effective (9 - 17points) Results meet District- or BOCES-adopted expectations for growth or achievement | The boxes are out of order- Effective-92-90% of the teacher's students achieving the district expected |

for grade/subject.

proficiency/mastery score=17 points; 89-87% of students achieving the proficiency/mastery score=16 points; 86-83% of students achieving the proficiency/mastery score=15 points; 82-80% of students achieving the proficiency/mastery score=14 points; 79-77% of students achieving the proficiency/mastery score=13 points; 76-73% of students achieving the proficiency/mastery score=12 points; 72-70% of students achieving the proficiency/mastery score=11 points; 69-67% of students achieving the proficiency/mastery score=10 points; 66-63% of students achieving the proficiency/mastery score=9 points.

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

20-14% of the teacher's students achieving the district expected proficiency/mastery score=2 points; 13-7% of students achieving the proficiency/mastery score=1 point; 6-0% of students achieving the proficiency/mastery score=0 points.

3.10) High School Math

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

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

| | Locally-Selected Measure from List of Approved Measures | Assessment |
|-----------|---|---|
| Algebra 1 | 7) Student Learning Objectives | NYS Algebra 1 Regents Exam |
| Geometry | Not applicable | Menands Union Free School District is a K-8 school district. We do not teach high school math classes except for a small number of eighth graders who take Algebra 1. |
| Algebra 2 | Not applicable | Menands Union Free School District is a K-8 school district. We do not teach high school math classes except for a small number of eighth graders who take Algebra 1. |

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

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

Use this box, if needed, to describe the general process for assigning HEDI categories for these grades/subjects in this subcomponent. If needed, you may upload a table or graphic at 3.13, below.

Based upon historical data and pre-assessment scores, the math teacher and the administration will establish a district expected proficiency/mastery scaled score on the Algebra 1 Regents exam. As per the teacher's SLO's, a HEDI category and points will be assigned based upon the percentage of the teacher's students who achieve the district expected proficiency/mastery scaled score on the Regents exam. If from 100-93% of students achieve the proficiency/mastery score, the teacher will be assigned

from 20 to 18 points in the highly effective range. If from 92-63% of students achieve the proficiency/mastery score, the teacher will be assigned from 17 to 9 points in the effective range. If from 62-21% of the students achieve the proficiency/mastery score, the teacher will be assigned from 8 to 3 points in the developing range. If from 20-0% of students achieve the proficiency/mastery score, the teacher will be assigned from 2 to 0 points in the ineffective range.

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

100-99% of the teacher's students achieving the district expected proficiency/mastery score=20 points; 98-97% of students achieving the proficiency/mastery score=19 points; 96-93% of students achieving the proficiency/mastery score=18 points.

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

92-90% of the teacher's students achieving the district expected proficiency/mastery score=17 points; 89-87% of students achieving the proficiency/mastery score=16 points; 86-83% of students achieving the proficiency/mastery score=15 points; 82-80% of students achieving the proficiency/mastery score=14 points; 79-77% of students achieving the proficiency/mastery score=13 points; 76-73% of students achieving the proficiency/mastery score=12 points; 72-70% of students achieving the proficiency/mastery score=11 points; 69-67% of students achieving the proficiency/mastery score=10 points; 66-63% of students achieving the proficiency/mastery score=9 points.

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

62-56% of the teacher's students achieving the district expected proficiency/mastery score=8 points; 55-49% of students achieving the proficiency/mastery score=7 points; 48-42% of students achieving the proficiency/mastery score=6 points; 41-35% of students achieving the proficiency/mastery score=5 points; 34-28% of students achieving the proficiency/mastery score=4 points; 27-21% of students achieving the proficiency/mastery score=3 points.

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

20-14% of the teacher's students achieving the district expected proficiency/mastery score=2 points; 13-7% of students achieving the proficiency/mastery score=1 point; 6-0% of students achieving the proficiency/mastery score=0 points.

3.11) High School English Language Arts

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

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

| | Locally-Selected Measure from List of Approved Measures | Assessment |
|-------------|---|---|
| Grade 9 ELA | Not applicable | Menands Union Free School District is a K-8 school district. We do not teach high school English courses. |

| | | |
|-----------------|----------------|--|
| Grade 10 ELA | Not applicable | Menands Union Free School District is a K-8 school district. We do not teach high school English courses. |
| Grade 11 ELA | Not applicable | Menands Union Free School District is a K-8 school district. We do not teach high school English courses. |

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

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

| | |
|---|----------------|
| Use this box, if needed, to describe the general process for assigning HEDI categories for these grades/subjects in this subcomponent. If needed, you may upload a table or graphic at 3.13, below. | 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 |

3.12) All Other Courses

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

| Course(s) or Subject(s) | Locally-Selected Measure from List of Approved Measures | Assessment |
|-------------------------|---|--|
| K-8 Art | 7) Student Learning Objectives | Capital Region BOCES/Questar BOCES Developed Gr 3-5 Art Assessment |
| K-8 Physical Education | 7) Student Learning Objectives | WSWHE BOCES Developed Grade 3 Physical Education Assessment; WSWHE BOCES Developed Grade 4 Physical Education Assessment; WSWHE BOCES Developed Grade 6 Physical Education Assessment; WSWHE BOCES Developed Grade 8 Physical Education Assessment |
| K-6 Library | 7) Student Learning Objectives | Capital Region BOCES School Library System Developed Grade 3 Library Assessment; Capital Region BOCES School Library System Developed Grade 4 Library Assessment; Capital Region BOCES School Library System Developed Grade 5 Library Assessment |
| K-7 Music | 7) Student Learning Objectives | Menands Union Free School District Developed Grade 3 Music Assessment; Menands Union Free School District Developed Grade 4 Music |

| | | |
|---|--------------------------------|---|
| | | Assessment; Menands Union Free School District Developed Grade 5 Music Assessment; Menands Union Free School District Developed Grade 7 Music Assessment |
| K-8 Foreign Language | 7) Student Learning Objectives | Menands Union Free School District Developed Grade 3 Spanish Assessment; Menands Union Free School District Developed Grade 4 Spanish Assessment; Menands Union Free School District Developed Grade 5 Spanish Assessment; Menands Union Free School District Developed Grade 7 Spanish Assessment; Menands Union Free School District Developed Grade 8 Spanish Assessment |
| K-2 Special Education/Academic Intervention Services | 4) State-approved 3rd party | Measures of Academic Progress (Primary Grades) |
| Grades 3-5 Special Education/Academic Intervention Services | 4) State-approved 3rd party | Measures of Academic Progress (ELA, Math) |
| Grades 6-8 Special Education/Academic Intervention Services | 4) State-approved 3rd party | Measures of Academic Progress (ELA, Math) |
| K-8 Reading Specialist/Academic Intervention Services | 4) State-approved 3rd party | Measures of Academic Progress (Primary Grades) and Measures of Academic Progress (ELA) |
| K-8 ESL | 4) State-approved 3rd party | Measures of Academic Progress (Primary Grades) and Measures of Academic Progress (ELA) |
| | | |
| | | |
| | | |
| | | |
| | | |
| | | |
| | | |

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. | Art, Physical Education, Library, Music, Foreign Language - Pre-assessments were given at every grade level in these subjects. Based upon student numbers, assessment results for specific grade levels in each subject will be used to assign points in the Comparable Growth Measures subcomponent. The other grade levels in each subject will be used to assign points in the Locally Selected Measures subcomponent. Assessments at different grade levels are being used for the Comparable Growth Measures subcomponent and for the Locally Selected Measures subcomponent. |
|---|--|

The teachers in each subject and the administration analyzed pre-assessment data and set minimum growth targets for individual students or for the grade level. A HEDI category and points will be assigned based upon the percentage of students who grow to reach the minimum growth targets on the spring 2013 post assessments. If 100-93% of students grow to reach the minimum growth targets, the teacher will be assigned points in the highly effective range. If 92-63% of students grow to reach the minimum growth targets, the teacher will be assigned points in the effective range. If 62-21% of students grow to reach the minimum growth targets, the teacher will be assigned points in the developing range. If 20-0% of students grow to reach the minimum growth targets, the teacher will be assigned points in the ineffective range.

Special Education, Academic Intervention Services, and ESL- The Menands School District expects that these teachers will receive Value Added Research Center (VARC) scores for their students' growth on NWEA MAP and/or MAP Primary assessments, which will be converted into HEDI categories and points as described in each section below. VARC Scores based on NWEA MAP and/or MAP Primary assessments are explained in sections 3.1, 3.2, 3.4, and 3.5 of this document. If VARC scores are not possible for these teachers due to teacher/student linkage and dosage issues, these teachers will receive Conditional Growth Index (CGI) scores for their students' growth on NWEA MAP and/or MAP Primary assessments, which will be converted into HEDI categories and points as described in each section below.

To assign teachers to HEDI categories in a 20 point distribution, VARC assumes a normal distribution of teacher effects centered on 13. From this point, standard deviation (SD) cut points will be used to assign teachers to HEDI categories and points as described in each of the following sections. As per designations from NWEA/VARC, this will be adjusted if a 15 point distribution is needed depending upon what SED decides with value-added or growth scores on State assessments for some of these teachers.

If Conditional Growth Index (CGI) scores are used, NWEA also assumes a normal distribution of teacher effects centered on 13 for a 20 point distribution. From this point, standard deviation (SD) cut points are used to assign teachers to HEDI categories and points. Depending upon what SED decides with value added or growth scores for some of these teachers, the 20 point CGI distribution will be adjusted to a 15 point distribution as per NWEA's recommendations.

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

Art, Physical Education, Library, Music, Foreign Language - 100%-99% of students reaching the minimum growth targets=20 points; 98-97% reaching the minimum growth targets=19 points; 96-93% reaching the minimum growth targets=18 points.

Special Education, Academic Intervention Services, and ESL Teachers - VARC or CGI Scores- Teachers' scores that fall at greater than or equal to .9 SDs above average will be in the highly effective range. SD's greater than or equal to 1.3 = 20 points; SDs greater than or equal to 1.1 but less than 1.3 = 19 points; SDs greater than or equal to .9 but less than 1.1 = 18 points.

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

Art, Physical Education, Library, Music, Foreign Language - 92-90% of students reaching the minimum growth targets=17 points; 89-87% of students reaching the minimum growth targets=16 points; 86-83% of students reaching the minimum growth targets=15 points; 82-80% of students reaching the minimum growth targets=14 points; 79-77% of students reaching the minimum growth targets=13 points; 76-73% of students reaching the minimum growth targets=12 points; 72-70% of students reaching the minimum growth targets=11 points; 69-67% of students reaching the minimum growth targets= 10 points; 66-63% of students reaching the minimum growth targets= 9 points.

Special Education, Academic Intervention, and ESL Teachers - VARC or CGI scores- Teachers' scores that fall at less than .9 SDs above average and greater than or equal to
-.9 SDs below average will be in the effective range. SDs less than .9 but greater than or equal to .7 =17 points; SDs less than .7 but greater than or equal to .5 = 16 points; SDs less than .5 but greater than or equal to .3 = 15 points; SDs less than .3 but greater than or equal to .1 = 14 points; SDs less than .1 but greater than or equal to -.1 = 13 points; SDs less than -.1 but greater than or equal to -.3 = 12 points; SDs less than -.3 but greater than or equal to -.5 = 11 points; SDs less than -.5 but greater than or equal to -.7 = 10 points; SDs less than -.7 but greater than or equal to -.9 = 9 points.

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

Art, Physical Education, Library, Music, Foreign Language - 62-56% of students reaching the minimum growth targets=8 points; 55-49% of students reaching the minimum growth targets=7 points; 48-42% of students reaching the minimum growth targets= 6 points; 41-35% of students reaching the minimum growth targets=5 points; 34-28% of students reaching the minimum growth targets=4 points; 27-21% of students reaching the minimum growth targets=3 points.

Special Education, Academic Intervention Services, and ESL Teachers - VARC or CGI scores - Teachers' scores that fall at less than -.9 standard deviations below average but greater than or equal to
-2.1 standard deviations below average will be in the developing range. SDs less than -.9 but greater than or equal to -1.1 = 8 points; SDs less than -1.1 but greater than or equal to -1.3 = 7 points; SDs less than -1.3 but greater than or equal to -1.5 = 6 points; SDs less than -1.5 but greater than or equal to -1.7 = 5 points; SDs less than -1.7 but greater than or equal to -1.9 = 4 points; SD's less than -1.9 but greater than or equal to -2.1 = 3 points.

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

Art, Physical Education, Library, Music, Foreign Language - 20-14% of students reaching the minimum growth targets=2 points; 13-7% of students reaching the minimum growth targets=1 point; 6-0% of students reaching the minimum growth targets=0 points.

Special Education, Academic Intervention Services, and ESL Teachers - VARC or CGI scores - Teachers' scores that fall at less than -2.1 standard deviations below average will be in the ineffective range. SDs less than -2.1 but greater than or equal to -2.3 = 2 points; SDs less than -2.3 but greater than or equal to -2.5 = 1 point; SDs less than -2.5 = 0 points.

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.

(No response)

3.14) Locally Developed Controls

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

No other local controls are being implemented.

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 teachers have more than one local assessment measure, each measure will earn a HEDI score point. These score points will be weighted proportionately and then combined based upon the number of students assessed in each measure for a final local assessment HEDI category and points.

3.16) Assurances

Please check all of the boxes below:

| | |
|--|---------|
| 3.16) Assurances Assure the application of locally-developed controls will be rigorous, fair, and transparent. | Checked |
|--|---------|

| | |
|---|---------|
| 3.16) Assurances Assure that use of locally-developed controls will not have a disparate impact on underrepresented students in accordance with any applicable civil rights laws. | Checked |
|---|---------|

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

4. Other Measures of Effectiveness (Teachers)

Created Thursday, November 08, 2012

Updated Tuesday, January 01, 2013

Page 1

4.1) Teacher Practice Rubric

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

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

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

Danielson's Framework for Teaching (2011 Revised Edition)

Not Applicable

4.2) Points Within Other Measures

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

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

Is the following points assignment applicable to all teachers?

Yes

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

(No response)

| | |
|--|----|
| Multiple (at least two) classroom observations by principal or other trained administrator, at least one of which must be unannounced [at least 31 points] | 44 |
| One or more observation(s) by trained independent evaluators | 0 |
| Observations by trained in-school peer teachers | 0 |
| Feedback from students using State-approved survey tool | 0 |
| Feedback from parents/caregivers using State-approved survey tool | 0 |
| Structured reviews of lesson plans, student portfolios and other teacher artifacts | 16 |

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

(No response)

4.3) Survey Tools (if applicable)

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

(No response)

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

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

4.4) Assurances

Please check all of the boxes below:

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

4.5) Process for Assigning Points and Determining HEDI Ratings

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

The Danielson 2011 rubric is being used to assign all 60 points for all teachers affected by 3012c. Tenured teachers are formally observed a minimum of twice each year and probationary teachers are formally observed a minimum of three times. At the end of each observation, the administrator scores the teacher on the first 18 components of the Danielson rubric (1a, 1b, 1c, 1d, 1e, 1f; 2a, 2b, 2c, 2d, 2e; 3a, 3b, 3c, 3d, 3e; 4a, 4b) and provides the teacher with that feedback. In May/June, each teacher submits evidence so that the administrator can score the remaining 4 components on the Danielson rubric (4c-Communicating with Families; 4d-Participating in a Professional Community; 4e-Growing Professionally; 4f-Showing Professionalism). Scores on these 4 components make it possible for the administrator to go back and finalize the teacher's score on the 22 components of the Danielson rubric for each of his or her observations during the year. The average of the four domains on the Danielson rubric is then calculated for each observation. This is followed by calculating the final average on the Danielson rubric for all of the teacher's observations during the year. The

scoring methodology recommended by NYSUT for converting the teacher's final average from 1-4 on the Danielson rubric into a HEDI category and points will be used to assign a score from 0-60 on this section of the APPR. The conversion for each point from a final Danielson rubric score to a score from 0-60 points is explained in each section below. A final Danielson rubric score of 3.5-4.0 will be assigned from 59-60 points in the highly effective range. A final Danielson rubric score of 2.5-3.4 will be assigned 57-58 points in the effective range. A final Danielson rubric score of 1.5-2.4 will be assigned from 50-56 points in the developing range. A final Danielson score of 1.0-1.4 will be assigned 0-49 points in the ineffective range. The conversion of points from the Danielson rubric to a score from 0-60 is shown on the 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/5091/223632-eka9yMJ855/Danielson Rubric Conversion to 60 Points Dec 26, 2012.pdf

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

| | |
|---|---|
| Highly Effective: Overall performance and results exceed NYS Teaching Standards. | Final average on the Danielson rubric of 4.0=60 points; 3.9=60 points; 3.8=60 points; 3.7=60 points; 3.6=59 points; 3.5=59 points. |
| Effective: Overall performance and results meet NYS Teaching Standards. | Final average on the Danielson rubric of 3.4=58 points; 3.3=58 points; 3.2=58 points; 3.1=58 points; 3.0=58 points; 2.9=58 points; 2.8=58 points; 2.7=57 points; 2.6=57 points; 2.5=57 points. |
| Developing: Overall performance and results need improvement in order to meet NYS Teaching Standards. | Final average on the Danielson rubric of 2.4=56 points; 2.3=56 points; 2.2=55 points; 2.1=54 points; 2.0=54 points; 1.9=53 points; 1.8=52 points; 1.7=51 points; 1.6=51 points; 1.5=50 points. |
| Ineffective: Overall performance and results do not meet NYS Teaching Standards. | Final average on the Danielson rubric of 1.4=49 points; 1.392=48 points; 1.382=47 points; 1.375=46 points; 1.367=45 points; 1.358=44 points; 1.350=43 points; 1.342=42 points; 1.333=41 points; 1.325=40 points; 1.317=39 points; 1.308=38 points; 1.3=37 points; 1.292=36 points; 1.283=35 points; 1.275=34 points; 1.267=33 points; 1.258=32 points; 1.250=31 points; 1.242=30 points; 1.233=29 points; 1.225=28 points; 1.217=27 points; 1.208=26 points; 1.2=25 points; 1.192=24 points; 1.185=23 points; 1.177=22 points; 1.169=21 points; 1.162=20 points; 1.154=19 points; 1.146=18 points; 1.138=17 points; 1.131=16 points; 1.123=15 points; 1.115=14 points; 1.108=13 points; 1.1=12 points; 1.092=11 points; 1.083=10 points; 1.075=9 points; 1.067=8 points; 1.058=7 points; 1.050=6 points; 1.042=5 points; 1.033=4 points; 1.025=3 points; 1.017=2 points; 1.008=1 point; 1.0=0 points. |

Provide the ranges for the 60-point scoring bands.

| | |
|------------------|--|
| Highly Effective | 3.5-4.0 final average on the Danielson rubric=59-60 points |
| Effective | 2.5-3.4 final average on the Danielson rubric=57-58 points |
| Developing | 1.5-2.4 final average on the Danielson rubric=50-56 points |

Ineffective

1.0-1.4 final average on the Danielson rubric=0-49 points

4.6) Observations of Probationary Teachers

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

By building principals or other trained administrators

| | |
|---|---|
| 4.6) Observations of Probationary Teachers Formal/Long | 3 |
| 4.6) Observations of Probationary Teachers Informal/Short | 0 |
| 4.6) Observations of Probationary Teachers Enter Total | 3 |

By trained in-school peer teachers or other trained reviewers

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

Independent evaluators

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

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

- In Person

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

- Not Applicable

4.7) Observations of Tenured Teachers

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

By building principals or other trained administrators

| | |
|--|---|
| 4.7) Observations of Tenured Teachers Formal/Long | 2 |
| 4.7) Observations of Tenured Teachers Informal/Short | 0 |
| 4.7) Observations of Tenured Teachers Total | 2 |

By trained in-school peer teachers or other trained reviewers

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

Independent evaluators

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

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

-
- In Person
-

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

-
- Not Applicable
-

5. Composite Scoring (Teachers)

Created Wednesday, November 14, 2012

Updated Wednesday, December 26, 2012

Page 1

Standards for Rating Categories

Growth or Comparable Measures

Locally-selected Measures of

growth or achievement

Other Measures of Effectiveness

(Teacher and Leader standards)

Highly

Effective

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

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

Overall performance and results exceed NYS Teaching Standards.

Effective

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

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

Overall performance and results meet NYS Teaching Standards.

Developing

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

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

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

Ineffective

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

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

Overall performance and results do not meet NYS Teaching Standards.

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

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

2012-13 where there is no Value-Added measure

Growth or Comparable Measures

Locally-selected Measures of

growth or achievement

Other Measures of Effectiveness

(60 points)

Overall

Composite Score

Highly Effective

18-20

18-20

Ranges determined locally--see below

91-100

Effective

9-17

9-17

75-90

Developing

3-8

3-8

65-74

Ineffective

0-2

0-2

0-64

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

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

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

2012-13 where Value-Added growth measure applies

Growth or Comparable Measures

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

Other Measures of Effectiveness

(60 points)

Overall

Composite Score

Highly Effective

22-25

14-15

Ranges determined locally--see above

91-100

Effective

10-21

8-13

75-90

Developing

3-9

3-7

65-74

Ineffective

0-2

0-2

0-64

6. Additional Requirements - Teachers

Created Wednesday, November 14, 2012

Updated Wednesday, January 02, 2013

Page 1

6.1) Assurances -- Improvement Plans

Please check the boxes below:

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

6.2) Attachment: Teacher Improvement Plan Forms

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

[assets/survey-uploads/5265/233203-Df0w3Xx5v6/SKMBT 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:

Timelines for Summative Evaluation Forms

1) Each teacher will be given a summative evaluation form at the end of the school year detailing as many of the teacher's ratings as have been completed by that point in time. For many teachers, some of the ratings (including the overall composite score) will not be completed until State assessment and/or NWEA scores are received during the summer. These teachers will receive a partially

completed summative evaluation form at the end of the school year.

2) An updated summative evaluation form detailing remaining scores will be sent to teachers as soon as State assessment and/or NWEA scores are received. Summative evaluation forms sent to teachers during the summer will be sent via certified mail.

3) A teacher has ten business days from delivery of the summative evaluation form to return a signed copy of the summative evaluation form.

4) A teacher who chooses to appeal must do so in writing within the ten business days from delivery of the summative evaluation form. A teacher may only file an appeal once he or she has received a complete summative evaluation form that includes a composite score out of 100 points and an overall HEDI category.

5) A teacher may request an informal conference with the administrator responsible for the majority of the teacher's observations in the given year to review aspects of the scoring. However, this conference must be scheduled so that, should the teacher choose to proceed with an appeal, the written appeal is filed within the original ten business days from delivery of the summative evaluation form.

6) A teacher may choose to sign and return the summative evaluation form and attach a written rebuttal. The rebuttal will be maintained in the personnel file along with the teacher's APPR documentation for the year.

Appeals

1) Under 3012c, only challenges to the following areas may be appealed: Adherence to the standards and methodologies required for annual professional performance reviews, pursuant to Education Law 3012c; Adherence to the Commissioner's regulations, as applicable to annual professional performance reviews; Compliance with the District Annual Professional Review Plan (APPR); The issuance and/or implementation of a teacher improvement plan (TIP) under Education Law 3012c.

2) Only teachers whose composite rating on the APPR is Ineffective or Developing may file an appeal.

3) Only tenured teachers may appeal their APPR or the issuance or implementation of a TIP.

4) The teacher must file an appeal in writing to the Superintendent within ten business days of delivery of the completed summative evaluation form of the APPR or the issuance of the Teacher Improvement Plan.

5) A teacher may file only one appeal regarding the same APPR or Teacher Improvement Plan. All grounds for appeal must be explained within one appeal. Any grounds not raised at the time the appeal is filed shall be deemed waived.

6) The teacher must submit a written description of the specific areas of disagreement about the APPR or the issuance and/or implementation of the Teacher Improvement Plan, along with any additional documents or materials relevant to the appeal. Information not submitted with the appeal will not be considered.

7) The District Appeals Panel will consist of one representative selected by the MAT and one administrator. For an appeal of an APPR, the administrator for a given teacher's appeal will be the administrator who was not responsible for the majority of the teacher's observations for that given year. For an appeal of a Teacher Improvement Plan, the administrator will be the administrator not directly responsible for writing and overseeing the Teacher Improvement Plan for the given teacher.

8) The Appeals Panel may uphold or modify the APPR rating or the Teacher Improvement Plan. The Appeals Panel will issue a written decision on the appeal within ten business days of the Superintendent's receipt of the written appeal. The Appeals Panel will provide a copy of the decision to the teacher and to the administrator who was responsible for the APPR or the Teacher Improvement Plan.

9) The decision of the Appeals Panel shall be final and binding and not subject to the grievance procedure or to review in other forums, except as otherwise authorized by law.

10) All timelines noted within this appeals process will be timely and expeditious in accordance with Education Law 3012c.

6.4) Training and Certification of Lead Evaluators and Evaluators

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

Certification for Lead Evaluators in the Menands School District

The superintendent of the Menands School District and the principal of Menands School are the two lead evaluators for the teacher APPR. There are no other evaluators in the school district. Both of these administrators have participated in extensive training leading to district certification for lead evaluators. These trainings have addressed the nine criteria for lead evaluators as required in 3012c. While most of these trainings have been provided through the district's participation in the Capital Region BOCES Race to the Top Network Team, some of the trainings have been provided by the Teacher Center of the Greater Capital District, the Northwest Evaluation Association (NWEA), the Danielson Group, the NYS Council of School Superintendents (NYSCOSS), the NYS School Boards Association (NYSSBA), and the Capital Area School Development Association (CASDA).

Both administrators have maintained a log of participation in training as required for lead evaluators in 3012c. This log was used by the district/Board of Education to certify each lead evaluator. Both administrators will continue to maintain a log of participation in training related to 3012c. The log will be used by the Board of Education to recertify each lead evaluator on an annual basis. The log of lead evaluator training to date for the superintendent and for the principal are listed below.

Training on inter-rater reliability was provided through three days of professional development on the Danielson rubric by the Danielson Group. Both lead evaluators participated in this professional development on July 10, 11, and 12, 2012. Several Capital Region BOCES Network Team trainings have provided additional practice with inter-rater reliability. Both lead evaluators will participate in future sessions on inter-rater reliability provided by the Capital Region BOCES Race to the Top Network Team or other provider.

Superintendent's Log of Lead Evaluator Training for 3012c December 2010 – November 2012

*12/10/10 Teacher and Principal Evaluations- NYSSBA Law Conference 6 hours
12/15/10RTTT and APPR Training – Cap Region BOCES Network Team 2 hours
2/1/11 RTTT and APPR Training– Cap Region BOCES Network Team 2 hours
3/9/11 RTTT and APPR Training – Cap Region BOCES Network Team 2 hours
5/16/11 RTTT and APPR Training – Cap Region BOCES Network Team 2 hours
5/26/11 Local assessments and Measures of Academic Progress – NWEA 2 hours
6/13/11 APPR webinar- NYS Education Department 2 hours
7/14/11 Local assessments and Measures of Academic Progress – NWEA 4 hours
8/17/11 RTTT and APPR Training– Cap Region BOCES Network Team 2 hours
9/14/11 RTTT Training with District Inquiry Team- Cap Region BOCES Network Team 3 hours
9/19/11 Local assessments and Measures of Academic Progress – NWEA 6 hours
10/3/11 Lead Evaluator Training - Cap Region BOCES Network Team 6 hours
10/14/11Evidence Based Observation - Cap Region BOCES Network Team 4 hours
10/14/11BOCES Data Coaching with District Inquiry Team 3 hours
10/24/11RTTT and APPR Training– Cap Region BOCES Network Team 2 hours
11/1/11 RTTT and APPR Training– Cap Region BOCES Network Team 2 hours
11/15/11BOCES Data Coaching with District Inquiry Team 3 hours
11/29/11Local assessments and Measures of Academic Progress – NWEA 6 hours
11/30/11RTTT Training with District Inquiry Team- Cap Region BOCES Network Team 3 hours
12/8/11 Evidenced Based Observation - Cap Region BOCES Network Team 3 hours
12/14/11RTTT and APPR Training– Cap Region BOCES Network Team 2 hours
12/14/11APPR webinar- NYS Education Department 2 hours
12/21/11BOCES Data Coaching with District Inquiry Team 3 hours
1/11/12 Charlotte Danielson Presentation on Teacher Observation-Cap Region BOCES 2 hours
2/10/12 Principal Evaluation and the ISLLC Standards – CASDA 3 hours
3/2/12 Principal Evaluation and the ISLLC Standards – CASDA 3 hours
3/6/12 Charlotte Danielson Presentation on Teacher Observation-NYSCOSS 1 hour
3/8/12 RTTT and APPR Training– Cap Region BOCES Network Team 2 hours
3/12/12 Local assessments and Measures of Academic Progress – NWEA 2 hours
4/26/12 Local assessments and Measures of Academic Progress – NWEA 2 hours
5/7/12 SLO Development Work Session - Cap Region BOCES Network Team 3 hours
5/14/12 SLO Development - Teacher Center of the Capital District 1 hour
6/1/12 SLO Development Work Session - Cap Region BOCES Network Team 3 hours
6/12/12 RTTT and APPR Training– Cap Region BOCES Network Team 2 hours
6/25/12 Evidence Based Observation of Teachers- Teacher Center of the Capital District 6 hours*

7/10-12/12 Training on Using the Danielson Rubric - The Danielson Group 21 hours
7/23/12 Principal APPR and the ISLLC Standards - Cap Region BOCES Network Team 6 hours
8/2/12 Teacher Observation and the APPR - Cap Region BOCES Network Team 4 hours
8/29/12 Principal APPR/Principal Rubric Training - Cap Region BOCES Network Team 6 hours
10/23/12 RTTT and APPR Training- Cap Region BOCES Network Team 2 hours
10/31/12 Physical Education Assessments and Targets- WSWHE BOCES 2 hours
11/8/12 Local Assessments and Measures of Academic Progress – NWEA conference call 1 hour
11/13/12 Local Assessments and Measures of Academic Progress – NWEA conference call 1 hour

Principal's Log of Lead Evaluator Training for 3012c May 2011-November 2012

5/26/11 Local assessments and Measures of Academic Progress-NWEA 2 hours
7/14/11 Local assessments and Measures of Academic Progress-NWEA 4 hours
8/17/11 RTTT and APPR overview-Capital Region BOCES Network Team 2 hours
9/14/11 RTTT Training with District Inquiry Team-Capital Region BOCES Network Team 3 hours
9/19/11 Local assessments and Measures of Academic Progress-NWEA 6 hours
10/3/11 Lead Evaluator Training-Capital Region BOCES Network Team 6 hours
10/14/11 Evidence Based Observation-Capital Region BOCES Network Team 4 hours
10/14/11 BOCES Data Coaching with District Inquiry Team 3 hours
10/24/11 RTTT and APPR Training- Capital Region BOCES Network Team 2 hours
11/1/11 RTTT and APPR Training-Capital Region BOCES Network Team 2 hours
11/9/11 BOCES Data Coaching with District Inquiry Team 3 hours
11/15/11 BOCES Data Coaching with District Inquiry Team 3 hours
11/29/11 Local assessments and Measures of Academic Progress-NWEA 6 hours
11/30/11 RTTT Training with District Inquiry Team-Capital Region BOCES Network Team 3 hours
12/8/11 Evidenced Based Observation-Capital Region BOCES Network Team 3 hours
12/14/11 RTTT and APPR Training-Capital Region BOCES Network Team 2 hours
12/21/11 BOCES Data Coaching with District Inquiry Team 3 hours
7/10/12 Danielson Rubric for Teacher APPR- The Danielson Group 7 hours
7/11/12 Danielson Rubric for Teacher APPR-The Danielson Group 7 hours
7/12/12 Danielson Rubric for Teacher APPR-Orange-The Danielson Group 7 hours
7/26/12 Principal's Series-Teacher Observation-Capital Region BOCES 4 hours
11/2/12 Measures of Academic Progress – NWEA Data Reports 1.5 hours

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 Sunday, November 18, 2012

Updated Tuesday, January 01, 2013

Page 1

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

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

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

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

| |
|---------------|
| K-8 |
| (No response) |

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

Please check the boxes below:

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

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

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

State assessments, *required if one exists*

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

List of State-approved 3rd party assessments

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

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

| School or Program Type | SLO with Assessment Option | Name of the Assessment |
|------------------------|----------------------------|------------------------|
| Not applicable | | Not applicable |
| | | |
| | | |

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

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

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

(No response)

7.4) Special Considerations for Comparable Growth Measures

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

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

No other special considerations are being implemented.

7.5) Principals with More Than One Growth Measure

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

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

7.6) Assurances -- Comparable Growth Measures

Please check all of the boxes below:

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

8. Local Measures (Principals)

Created Sunday, November 18, 2012

Updated Tuesday, January 01, 2013

Page 1

Locally-Selected Measures of Student Achievement or Growth

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

| Grade Configuration | Locally-Selected Measure from List of Approved Measures | Assessment |
|---------------------|---|--|
| K-8 | (d) measures used by district for teacher evaluation | Measures of Academic Progress (Primary Grades) for Grades K-2 ELA and Math and Measures of Academic Progress for Grades 3-8 ELA and Math |
| | | |
| | | |
| | | |
| | | |
| | | |
| | | |

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.

| | |
|--|--|
| <p>Use this box, if needed, to describe the process for assigning HEDI categories. If needed, you may upload a table or graphic below.</p> | <p>The Menands School District will be using value-added measures based on the NWEA Measures of Academic Progress (MAP) and Measures of Academic Progress for Primary Grades (MAP Primary) to calculate teacher level effectiveness ratings for the locally selected measures of student growth in ELA and math in grades K-8. Value-added measures on the NWEA MAP and MAP Primary in ELA and math will also be used for the locally selected measure of student achievement for the principal. The Menands School District's value-added analyses will be conducted by the Value Added Research Center (VARC) on NWEA MAP and MAP Primary assessments.</p> <p>A schoolwide VARC score combining the growth of students in all grades in both ELA and math will be used to assign a HEDI category and HEDI points for the locally selected assessment measure on the principal APPR. On a 15 point distribution, VARC assumes a normal distribution centered on 10.5. From this point, standard deviation (SD) cut points for the schoolwide VARC score</p> |
|--|--|

will be used to assign a HEDI category and HEDI points as described in each of the following sections. If the NYSED does not approve a value-added measure on State assessments, the distribution will be adjusted by(VARC) to a 20 point distribution instead of a 15 point distribution for the principal APPR. Decisions on the locally selected measures for the principal's APPR at Menands School may also need to be adjusted to reflect final decisions by the Northwest Evaluation Association (NWEA) and the Value Added Research Center (VARC) related to the principal APPR in NYS.

Highly Effective (14 - 15 points) Results are well above District- or BOCES-adopted expectations for growth or achievement for grade/subject.

A schoolwide score from the Value Added Research Center (VARC) on MAP and MAP Primary assessments for the principal APPR that falls at greater than or equal to .9 standard deviations (SDs) above average will be highly effective. In a 15 point distribution, a schoolwide VARC score with an SD greater than or equal to 1.2=15 points; an SD greater than or equal to .9 but less than 1.2 = 14 points.

Effective (8- 13 points) Results meet District- or BOCES-adopted expectations for growth or achievement for grade/subject.

A schoolwide score from the Value Added Research Center (VARC) on MAP and MAP Primary assessments for the principal APPR that falls at less than .9 SDs above average and greater than or equal to -.9 SDs below average will be in the effective range. In a 15 point distribution, an SD that is less than .9 but greater than or equal to .6 =13 points; an SD that is less than .6 but greater than or equal to .3 = 12 points; an SD that is less than .3 but greater than or equal to 0 = 11 points; an SD that is less than 0 but greater than or equal to -.3 = 10 points; an SD that is less than -.3 but greater than or equal to -.6 = 9 points; an SD that is less than -.6 but greater than or equal to -.9 = 8 points.

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

A schoolwide score from the Value Added Research Center (VARC) on MAP and MAP Primary assessments for the principal APPR that falls at less than -.9 SDs below average and greater than or equal to -2.4 SDs below average will be in the developing range. In a 15 point distribution, an SD that is less than -.9 but greater than or equal to -1.2 = 7 points; an SD that is less than -1.2 but greater than or equal to -1.5 = 6 points; an SD that is less than -1.5 but greater than or equal to -1.8 = 5 points; an SD that is less than -1.8 but greater than or equal to -2.1 = 4 points; an SD that is less than -2.1 but greater than or equal to -2.4 = 3 points.

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

A schoolwide score from the Value Added Research Center (VARC) on MAP and MAP Primary assessments for the principal APPR that falls at less than -2.4 SDs below average will be in the ineffective range. In a fifteen point distribution, an SD that is less than -2.4 but greater than or equal to -2.7 = 2 points; an SD that is less than -2.7 but greater than or equal to -3.0 = 1 point; an SD that is less than -3.0 = 0 points.

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.

(No response)

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

| Grade Configuration | Locally-Selected Measure from List of Approved Measures | Assessment |
|---|---|----------------|
| The locally selected measure for the principal of Menands School was explained in section 8.1 | | Not Applicable |
| | | |
| | | |
| | | |
| | | |
| | | |

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

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

| | |
|---|---|
| Use this box, if needed, to describe the process for assigning HEDI categories. If needed, you may upload a table or graphic below. | Not applicable. The locally selected measure for the principal of Menands School was explained in section 8.1 |
| Highly Effective (18 - 20 points) Results are well above District- or BOCES-adopted expectations for growth or achievement for grade/subject. | Not applicable. The locally selected measure for the principal of Menands School was explained in section 8.1 |
| Effective (9- 17 points) Results meet District- or BOCES-adopted expectations for growth or achievement for grade/subject. | Not applicable. The locally selected measure for the principal of Menands School was explained in section 8.1 |
| Developing (3 - 8 points) Results are below District- or BOCES-adopted expectations for growth or achievement for grade/subject. | Not applicable. The locally selected measure for the principal of Menands School was explained in section 8.1 |
| Ineffective (0 - 2 points) Results are well below District- or BOCES-adopted expectations for growth or achievement for grade/subject. | Not applicable. The locally selected measure for the principal of Menands School was explained in section 8.1 |

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

(No response)

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

(No response)

8.3) Locally Developed Controls

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

No additional locally developed controls will be implemented.

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.

The Menands School principal should receive one schoolwide value added score from the Value Added Research Center (VARC) based upon student growth on NWEA Measures of Academic progress (MAP) and Measures of Academic Progress for Primary Grades (MAP Primary) assessments that will be converted into a HEDI category and HEDI points for the locally selected measure on the APPR. The analyses of schoolwide MAP and MAP Primary ELA and math scores will be conducted by the Value Added Research Center (VARC). If, for some reason, the principal receives more than one VARC score, (i.e. a VARC score for K-2 or for K-3 and a VARC score for the remaining grades), each VARC score will earn a HEDI score point that will be weighted proportionately and combined based upon the number of students assessed to arrive at that score. Decisions on the locally selected measures for the principal's APPR at Menands School may also need to be adjusted to reflect final decisions by the Northwest Evaluation Association (NWEA) and the Value Added Research Center (VARC) related to the principal APPR in NYS.

8.5) Assurances

Please check all of the boxes below:

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

9. Other Measures of Effectiveness (Principals)

Created Monday, November 19, 2012

Updated Tuesday, January 01, 2013

Page 1

9.1) Principal Practice Rubric

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

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

Multidimensional Principal Performance Rubric

(No response)

9.2) Points Within Other Measures

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

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

Is the following points assignment for all principals?

Yes

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

(No response)

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

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

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

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

(No response)

9.3) Assurances -- Goals

Please check the boxes below (if applicable):

| | |
|--|---------------|
| 9.3) Assurances -- Goals Assure that if any points are assigned to goals, at least one goal will address the principal's contribution to improving teacher effectiveness based on one or more of the following: improved retention of high performing teachers; correlation of student growth scores to teachers granted vs. denied tenure; or improvements in proficiency rating of the principal on specific teacher effectiveness standards in the principal practice rubric. | (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 posted, this form will be updated with dropdown menus of approved survey tools.

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

9.6) Assurances

Please check all of the boxes below:

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

9.7) Process for Assigning Points and Determining HEDI Ratings

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

The Multidimensional Principal Performance Rubric (MPPR) will be used to assess all 60 points of the other measures of effectiveness for the principal. The principal's performance for the year will be assessed according to the six domains of the rubric, which will yield a final average on the rubric from 1-4 points. The final average on the MPPR rubric will be converted into 60 points. A total average rubric score from 1.0 - 1.4 will be in the ineffective range, converting to from 0-49 points out of 60. A final average rubric score of 1.5 - 2.4 will be in the developing range, converting to from 50-56 points out of 60. A final average rubric score of 2.5 - 3.4 will be in the effective range, converting to from 57-58 points out of 60. A final average rubric score of 3.5 - 4.0 will be in the highly effective range, converting to from 59-60 points out of 60. The conversion from the MPPR rubric to 60-0 points is shown on the 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/5143/240669-pMADJ4gk6R/MPPR Rubric Conversion to 60 Points Jan 1, 2013.pdf](#)

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

| | |
|--|---|
| Highly Effective: Overall performance and results exceed standards. | MPPR Final rubric average of 4.0=60 points; 3.9=60 points; 3.8=60 points; 3.7=60 points; 3.6=59 points; 3.5=59 points. |
| Effective: Overall performance and results meet standards. | MPPR Final rubric average of 3.4=58 points; 3.3=58 points; 3.2=58 points; 3.1=58 points; 3.0=58 points; 2.9=58 points; 2.8=58 points; 2.7=57 points; 2.6=57 points; 2.5=57 points. |
| Developing: Overall performance and results need improvement in order to meet standards. | MPPR Final rubric average of 2.4=56 points; 2.3=56 points; 2.2=55 points; 2.1=54 points; 2.0=54 points; 1.9=53 points; 1.8=52 points; 1.7=51 points; 1.6=51 points; 1.5=50 points. |
| Ineffective: Overall performance and results do not meet standards. | MPPR Final rubric average of 1.4=49 points; 1.392=48 points; 1.382=47 points; 1.375=46 points; 1.367=45 points; 1.358=44 points; 1.350=43 points; 1.342=42 points; 1.333=41 points; 1.325=40 points; 1.317=39 points; 1.308=38 points; 1.300=37 points; 1.292=36 points; 1.283=35 points; 1.275=34 points; 1.267=33 points; 1.258=32 points; 1.250=31 points; |

1.242=30 points; 1.233=29 points; 1.225=28 points; 1.217=27 points; 1.208=26 points; 1.200=25 points; 1.192=24 points; 1.185=23 points; 1.177=22 points; 1.169=21 points; 1.162=20 points; 1.154=19 points; 1.146=18 points; 1.138=17 points; 1.131=16 points; 1.123=15 points; 1.115=14 points; 1.108=13 points; 1.100=12 points; 1.092=11 points; 1.083=10 points; 1.075=9 points; 1.067=8 points; 1.058=7 points; 1.050=6 points; 1.042=5 points; 1.033=4 points; 1.025=3 points; 1.017=2 points; 1.008=1 point; 1.00=0 points.

Please provide the locally-negotiated 60 point scoring bands.

| | |
|------------------|-------------------------------------|
| Highly Effective | 3.5-4.0 on MPPR rubric=59-60 points |
| Effective | 2.5-3.4 on MPPR rubric=57-58 points |
| Developing | 1.5-2.4 on MPPR rubric=50-56 points |
| Ineffective | 1.0-1.4 on MPPR rubric=0-49 points |

9.8) School Visits

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

Probationary Principals

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

Tenured Principals

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

10. Composite Scoring (Principals)

Created Sunday, November 25, 2012

Updated Thursday, December 27, 2012

Page 1

Standards for Rating Categories

Growth or Comparable Measures

Locally-selected Measures of

growth or achievement

Other Measures of Effectiveness

(Teacher and Leader standards)

Highly

Effective

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

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

Overall performance and results exceed ISLLC leadership standards.

Effective

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

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

Overall performance and results meet ISLLC leadership standards.

Developing

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

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

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

Ineffective

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

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

Overall performance and results do not meet ISLLC leadership standards.

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

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

2012-13 where there is no Value-Added measure

Growth or Comparable Measures

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

Other Measures of Effectiveness

(60 points)

Overall

Composite Score

Highly Effective

18-20

18-20

Ranges determined locally--see below

91-100

Effective

9-17

9-17

75-90

Developing

3-8

3-8

65-74

Ineffective

0-2

0-2

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

| | |
|------------------|---------------------------------------|
| Highly Effective | 3.5-4.0 on MPPR rubric = 59-60 points |
| Effective | 2.5-3.4 on MPPR rubric = 57-58 points |
| Developing | 1.5-2.4 on MPPR rubric = 50-56 points |
| Ineffective | 1.0-1.4 on MPPR rubric = 0-49 points |

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

2012-13 where Value-Added growth measure applies

Growth or Comparable Measures

Locally-selected Measures of growth or achievement

Other Measures of Effectiveness

(60 points)

Overall

Composite Score

Highly Effective

22-25

14-15

Ranges determined locally--see above

91-100

Effective

10-21

8-13

75-90

Developing

3-9

3-7

65-74

Ineffective

0-2

0-2

0-64

11. Additional Requirements - Principals

Created Sunday, November 25, 2012
Updated Wednesday, January 02, 2013

Page 1

11.1) Assurances -- Improvement Plans

Please check the boxes below.

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

11.2) Attachment: Principal Improvement Plan Forms

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

[assets/survey-uploads/5276/247029-Df0w3Xx5v6/SKMBT 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:

Timelines

1. By June 30, the principal will be given a partial summative evaluation form scoring points and a HEDI category on the 60 APPR points based on the MPPR rubric.
2. The principal may request an informal conference with the superintendent to review aspects of the MPPR score and to resolve

questions.

3. *A complete summative evaluation form detailing remaining scores will be given to the principal as soon as State assessment and NWEA VARC scores are received. The complete summative evaluation form will include the three subcomponent scores and HEDI ratings and the composite score and composite HEDI rating.*
4. *The principal has ten business days from delivery of the complete summative evaluation form to return a signed copy of the summative evaluation form.*
5. *If the principal chooses to appeal, he or she must do so in writing within the ten business days from delivery of the complete summative evaluation form.*
6. *The principal may request an informal conference with the superintendent to review aspects of the scoring and to resolve questions. However, this conference must be scheduled so that, should the principal choose to proceed with an appeal, the written appeal is filed within the original ten business days from delivery of the summative evaluation form.*
7. *The principal may choose to sign and return the summative evaluation form and attach a written rebuttal. The rebuttal will be maintained in the personnel file along with the principal's APPR documentation for the year.*

Appeals

1. *Under 3012c, only challenges to the following areas may be appealed: Adherence to the standards and methodologies required for annual professional performance reviews, pursuant to Education Law 3012c; Adherence to the Commissioner's regulations, as applicable to annual professional performance reviews; Compliance with the District Annual Professional Review Plan (APPR); The issuance and/or implementation of a teacher improvement plan (TIP) or principal improvement plan (PIP) under Education Law 3012c.*
2. *Only principals whose composite rating on the APPR is Ineffective or Developing may file an appeal. The principal may only submit an appeal once he or she has received her completed summative evaluation form and composite score/HEDI category.*
3. *Only tenured principals may appeal their APPR or the issuance or implementation of a PIP.*
4. *The principal must file an appeal in writing to the superintendent within ten business days of delivery of the completed summative evaluation form of the APPR or the issuance of the Principal Improvement Plan. The appeal will be dated on the day that it is submitted to the superintendent.*
5. *A principal may file only one appeal regarding the same APPR or Principal Improvement Plan. All grounds for appeal must be explained within one appeal. Any grounds not raised at the time the appeal is filed shall be deemed waived.*
6. *The principal's appeal must include a written description of the specific areas of disagreement about the APPR or the issuance and/or implementation of the Principal Improvement Plan, along with any additional documents or materials relevant to the appeal. Information not submitted with the appeal will not be considered.*
7. *The superintendent will submit the principal's appeal to the Labor Relations Service of Capital Region BOCES. The appeal will be reviewed by a designee of the Labor Relations Service at the hourly rate for this co-ser. The District will bear this additional BOCES cost.*
8. *The review of an appeal will include a meeting among the principal, the superintendent, and the designee of the Labor Relations Service to share information and respond to questions.*
9. *The Labor Relations Service will issue a decision on the appeal within twelve business days of the principal's submission of the written appeal to the superintendent. The Labor Relations Service may uphold or modify the APPR rating or Principal Improvement Plan.*
10. *The decision of the Labor Relations Service shall be final and binding and not subject to the grievance procedure or to review in other forums, except as otherwise authorized by law.*
11. *All timelines noted within this appeals process will be timely and expeditious in accordance with Education Law 3012c.*

11.4) Training and Certification of Lead Evaluators and Evaluators

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

There are two administrators in the Menands School District: one superintendent and one principal. The superintendent of the Menands School District is the only evaluator/lead evaluator for the principal's APPR. The superintendent and the principal are the only two evaluators/lead evaluators for the teacher APPR.

Germane to the principal's APPR, the superintendent has participated in extensive training leading to district certification for lead evaluators for the teacher and for the principal APPR. These trainings have addressed the nine criteria for lead evaluators as required in 3012c. While most of these trainings have been provided through the district's participation in the Capital Region BOCES Race to the Top Network Team, some of the trainings have been provided by the Teacher Center of the Greater Capital District, the Northwest Evaluation Association (NWEA), the Danielson Group, the NYS Council of School Superintendents (NYSCOSS), the NYS School Boards Association (NYSSBA), and the Capital Area School Development Association (CASDA).

Germane to the principal APPR, the superintendent has maintained a log of participation in the training required for lead evaluators in 3012c. This log was used by the district/Board of Education to certify the superintendent as a lead evaluator for the principal APPR. The superintendent will continue to maintain a log of future training related to 3012c. The district/Board of Education will use this log to re-certify the superintendent as the lead evaluator for the principal APPR on an annual basis. The log of lead evaluator training to date for the superintendent is listed below.

Germane to the teacher APPR, the principal has participated in similar training leading to district certification as a lead evaluator and also maintains a log of lead evaluator training. This log of training related to 3012c was used by the district/Board of Education to certify the principal as a lead evaluator for the teacher APPR. A similar process will be used in the future for re-certification.

Since there is only one principal and that principal will be evaluated by the superintendent, inter-rater reliability for the principal APPR is moot. However, the superintendent has participated in and will continue to participate in training on valid and reliable use of the Multidimensional Principal Performance Rubric through the Capital Region BOCES Network Team.

Superintendent's Log of Lead Evaluator Training for 3012c December 2010 – November 2012

*12/10/10 Teacher and Principal Evaluations- NYSSBA Law Conference 6 hours
12/15/10RTTT and APPR Training – Cap Region BOCES Network Team 2 hours
2/1/11 RTTT and APPR Training– Cap Region BOCES Network Team 2 hours
3/9/11 RTTT and APPR Training – Cap Region BOCES Network Team 2 hours
5/16/11 RTTT and APPR Training – Cap Region BOCES Network Team 2 hours
5/26/11 Local assessments and Measures of Academic Progress – NWEA 2 hours
6/13/11 APPR webinar- NYS Education Department 2 hours
7/14/11 Local assessments and Measures of Academic Progress – NWEA 4 hours
8/17/11 RTTT and APPR Training– Cap Region BOCES Network Team 2 hours
9/14/11 RTTT Training with District Inquiry Team- Cap Region BOCES Network Team 3 hours
9/19/11 Local assessments and Measures of Academic Progress – NWEA 6 hours
10/3/11 Lead Evaluator Training - Cap Region BOCES Network Team 6 hours
10/14/11Evidence Based Observation - Cap Region BOCES Network Team 4 hours
10/14/11BOCES Data Coaching with District Inquiry Team 3 hours
10/24/11RTTT and APPR Training– Cap Region BOCES Network Team 2 hours
11/1/11 RTTT and APPR Training– Cap Region BOCES Network Team 2 hours
11/15/11BOCES Data Coaching with District Inquiry Team 3 hours
11/29/11Local assessments and Measures of Academic Progress – NWEA 6 hours
11/30/11RTTT Training with District Inquiry Team- Cap Region BOCES Network Team 3 hours
12/8/11 Evidenced Based Observation - Cap Region BOCES Network Team 3 hours
12/14/11RTTT and APPR Training– Cap Region BOCES Network Team 2 hours
12/14/11APPR webinar- NYS Education Department 2 hours
12/21/11BOCES Data Coaching with District Inquiry Team 3 hours
1/11/12 Charlotte Danielson Presentation on Teacher Observation-Cap Region BOCES 2 hours
2/10/12 Principal Evaluation and the ISLLC Standards – CASDA 3 hours
3/2/12 Principal Evaluation and the ISLLC Standards – CASDA 3 hours
3/6/12 Charlotte Danielson Presentation on Teacher Observation-NYSCOSS 1 hour
3/8/12 RTTT and APPR Training– Cap Region BOCES Network Team 2 hours*

3/12/12 Local assessments and Measures of Academic Progress – NWEA 2 hours
 4/26/12 Local assessments and Measures of Academic Progress – NWEA 2 hours
 5/7/12 SLO Development Work Session - Cap Region BOCES Network Team 3 hours
 5/14/12 SLO Development - Teacher Center of the Capital District 1 hour
 6/1/12 SLO Development Work Session - Cap Region BOCES Network Team 3 hours
 6/12/12 RTTT and APPR Training– Cap Region BOCES Network Team 2 hours
 6/25/12 Evidence Based Observation of Teachers- Teacher Center of the Capital District 6 hours
 7/10-12/12 Training on Using the Danielson Rubric - The Danielson Group 21 hours
 7/23/12 Principal APPR and the ISLLC Standards - Cap Region BOCES Network Team 6 hours
 8/2/12 Teacher Observation and the APPR - Cap Region BOCES Network Team 4 hours
 8/29/12 Principal APPR/Principal Rubric Training - Cap Region BOCES Network Team 6 hours
 10/23/12 RTTT and APPR Training– Cap Region BOCES Network Team 2 hours
 10/31/12 Physical Education Assessments and Targets- WSWHE BOCES 2 hours
 11/8/12 Local Assessments and Measures of Academic Progress – NWEA conference call 1 hour
 11/13/12 Local Assessments and Measures of Academic Progress – NWEA conference call 1 hour

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 Sunday, November 18, 2012

Updated Thursday, January 03, 2013

Page 1

12.1) Upload the Joint Certification of the APPR Plan

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

[assets/survey-uploads/5581/239703-3Uqgn5g9Iu/District Certification Form Jan 2, 2013.pdf](assets/survey-uploads/5581/239703-3Uqgn5g9Iu/District%20Certification%20Form%20Jan%202,%202013.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.

**Menands School District Teacher APPR
Revised December 26, 2012**

NYSUT Conversion from Danielson Rubric Final Score of 1-4 Points to 0-60 Points

| SED Performance Level | Overall Rubric Average Score | 60 Point Distribution for Composite |
|-----------------------|------------------------------|-------------------------------------|
| Ineffective | 1.0-1.4 | 0-49 |
| Developing | 1.5-2.4 | 50-56 |
| Effective | 2.5-3.4 | 57-58 |
| Highly Effective | 3.5-4 | 59-60 |

1-4 Rubric Score Conversion to 60 Points

| 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 |
| 1.382 | | 47 |
| 1.392 | | 48 |
| 1.400 | | 49 |
| | Developing 50-56 | |
| 1.5 | | 50 |
| 1.6 | | 50.7 (round to 51) |
| 1.7 | | 51.4 (round to 51) |
| 1.8 | | 52.1 (round to 52) |
| 1.9 | | 52.8 (round to 53) |
| 2 | | 53.5 (round to 54) |
| 2.1 | | 54.2 (round to 54) |
| 2.2 | | 54.9 (round to 55) |
| 2.3 | | 55.6 (round to 56) |
| 2.4 | | 56.3 (round to 56) |
| | Effective 57-58 | |
| 2.5 | | 57 |
| 2.6 | | 57.2 (round to 57) |
| 2.7 | | 57.4 (round to 57) |
| 2.8 | | 57.6 (round to 58) |
| 2.9 | | 57.8 (round to 58) |
| 3 | | 58 |
| 3.1 | | 58.2 (round to 58) |
| 3.2 | | 58.4 (round to 58) |
| 3.3 | | 58.6 (round to 58) |
| 3.4 | | 58.8 (round to 58) |
| | Highly Effective 59-60 | |
| 3.5 | | 59 |
| 3.6 | | 59.3 (round to 59) |
| 3.7 | | 59.5 (round to 60) |
| 3.8 | | 59.8 (round to 60) |
| 3.9 | | 60 |
| 4 | | 60.25 (round to 60) |

Procedures and format that were locally negotiated in accordance with the regulations and the SED guidance documents governing Education Law 3012c:

- Upon rating a teacher as Ineffective or Developing through the APPR process, the school district must implement a teacher improvement plan (TIP) for that teacher.
- For teachers deemed Ineffective or Developing through the APPR process, implementation of a TIP must begin no later than 10 school days from the opening of classes in the school year following the year in which the teacher’s performance was deemed Ineffective or developing.
- A TIP can be instituted for other reasons and at other times as warranted. A TIP can be instituted at any time as warranted for a probationary or part-time teacher. A TIP can be instituted for a tenured teacher for a deficit in the NYS Teaching Standards, a deficit on the negotiated Danielson rubric, or a deficit on student outcomes provided that the deficit has been significant enough to be documented as a problem on at least two occasions in observations or in counseling memos.
- To the extent possible, summer meetings to formulate required Teacher Improvement Plans will be on a date set before the last day of classes in June.
- A Teacher Improvement Plan will be developed by the teacher, at least one administrator, and at least one tenured member of the MAT of the teacher’s choosing. Or, the MAT will provide a MAT officer to represent the teacher. The teacher can decline representation by the MAT.
- A teacher who chooses to appeal the issuance or the implementation of a TIP must follow the negotiated appeals procedures as outlined in APPR appendix K.
- The form that follows will be used. More than one page of this form can be used if needed.

Menands School District Teacher Improvement Plan Teacher Name Year

| Areas in Need of Improvement | Tasks/Activities/Expectations to Support or Demonstrate Improvement | Person(s) Responsible (including the teacher) | Manner and Time Frame for Assessing Improvement |
|------------------------------|---|---|---|
| | | | |

| Areas in Need of Improvement | Tasks/Activities/Expectations to Support or Demonstrate Improvement | Person(s) Responsible (including the teacher) | Manner and Time Frame for Assessing Improvement |
|------------------------------|---|---|---|
| | | | |
| | | | |
| | | | |

Presented to teacher on (date) _____

Teacher's Signature _____

MAT Representative _____

Administrator's Signature _____

Final Assessment on (date) _____

Determination _____

Teacher's Signature _____

MAT Representative _____

Administrator's Signature _____

**Menands School District
Principal APPR
Multidimensional Principal Performance Rubric (MPPR) 1-4 point Conversion to 60
Points for Composite Score – Appendix C**

Revised January 1, 2013

| SED Performance Level | Overall Rubric Average Score | 60 Point Distribution for Composite |
|-----------------------|------------------------------|-------------------------------------|
| Ineffective | 1-1.4 | 0-49 |
| Developing | 1.5-2.4 | 50-56 |
| Effective | 2.5-3.4 | 57-58 |
| Highly Effective | 3.5-4 | 59-60 |

1-4 Rubric Score Conversion to 60 Points

| 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 |

**Menands School District
Principal APPR
Multidimensional Principal Performance Rubric (MPPR) 1-4 point Conversion to 60
Points for Composite Score – Appendix C**

Revised January 1, 2013

| | | |
|-------|-------------------------------|---------------------|
| 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 |
| 1.382 | | 47 |
| 1.392 | | 48 |
| 1.400 | | 49 |
| | Developing 50-56 | |
| 1.5 | | 50 |
| 1.6 | | 50.7 (round to 51) |
| 1.7 | | 51.4 (round to 51) |
| 1.8 | | 52.1 (round to 52) |
| 1.9 | | 52.8 (round to 53) |
| 2 | | 53.5 (round to 54) |
| 2.1 | | 54.2 (round to 54) |
| 2.2 | | 54.9 (round to 55) |
| 2.3 | | 55.6 (round to 56) |
| 2.4 | | 56.3 (round to 56) |
| | Effective 57-58 | |
| 2.5 | | 57 |
| 2.6 | | 57.2 (round to 57) |
| 2.7 | | 57.4 (round to 57) |
| 2.8 | | 57.6 (round to 58) |
| 2.9 | | 57.8 (round to 58) |
| 3 | | 58 |
| 3.1 | | 58.2 (round to 58) |
| 3.2 | | 58.4 (round to 58) |
| 3.3 | | 58.6 (round to 58) |
| 3.4 | | 58.8 (round to 58) |
| | Highly Effective 59-60 | |
| 3.5 | | 59 |
| 3.6 | | 59.3 (round to 59) |
| 3.7 | | 59.5 (round to 60) |
| 3.8 | | 59.8 (round to 60) |
| 3.9 | | 60 |
| 4 | | 60.25 (round to 60) |

**Menands School District
Principal APPR
Multidimensional Principal Performance Rubric (MPPR) 1-4 point Conversion to 60
Points for Composite Score – Appendix C**

Revised January 1, 2013

MPPR Scoring: Weighted Scoring and Conversion to 60 Points

| Domains | Domain Average | Weighting | Weighted Score |
|---|-----------------------|------------------|---|
| Domain 1 Shared Vision of Learning | 3.3 | 10% 3.3 x .10 | .33 |
| Domain 2 School Culture and Instructional Program | 3.1 | 20% 3.1 x .20 | .62 |
| Domain 3 Safe, Efficient, Effective Learning Environment | 2.9 | 20% 2.9 x .20 | .58 |
| Domain 4 Community | 3.0 | 20% 3.0 x .20 | .60 |
| Domain 5 Integrity, Fairness, Ethics | 3.8 | 20% 3.8 x .20 | .76 |
| Domain 6 Political, Social, Economic, Legal, Cultural Context | 3.2 | 10% 3.2 x .10 | .32 |
| Weighted Total | | | 3.21 |
| HEDI Subcomponent Rating | | | Effective |
| Subcomponent Score Using the Conversion Chart | | | 58.4/60 Points\ As per chart, 58.4 rounds to 58 |

Procedures and format for a Principal Improvement Plan in accordance with the regulations and the SED guidance documents governing Education Law 3012c:

- Upon a composite rating of a principal as Ineffective or Developing through the APPR process, the school district must implement an improvement plan (PIP) for that principal.
- For a principal deemed Ineffective or Developing through the APPR process, implementation of a PIP must begin no later than 10 school days from the opening of classes in the school year following the year in which the principal’s performance was deemed Ineffective or Developing.
- A PIP can be instituted for other reasons and at other times as warranted.
- A Principal Improvement Plan will be developed by the principal and the superintendent.
- A principal who chooses to appeal the issuance or the implementation of a PIP following a composite APPR rating of Ineffective or Developing must follow the appeals procedures as outlined in APPR appendix B.
- The form that follows will be used. More than one page of this form can be used if needed.

Menands School District Principal Improvement Plan Principal’s Name

Year

| Areas in Need of Improvement | Tasks/Activities/Expectations to Support or Demonstrate Improvement | Person(s) Responsible (including the principal) | Manner and Time Frame for Assessing Improvement |
|------------------------------|---|---|---|
| | | | |
| | | | |

| Areas in Need of Improvement | Tasks/Activities/Expectations to Support or Demonstrate Improvement | Person(s) Responsible (including the principal) | Manner and Time Frame for Assessing Improvement |
|------------------------------|---|---|---|
| | | | |
| | | | |

Presented to principal on (date) _____

Principal's Signature _____

Superintendent's Signature _____

Final Assessment on (date) _____

Determination _____

Principal's Signature _____

Superintendent's Signature _____

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

Jan 2, 2013

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

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

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

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

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

Signatures, dates

Superintendent Signature: Date:

Kathy Meaney *1/2/2012*

Teachers Union President Signature: Date:

J. Smart *1/2/12*

Administrative Union President Signature: Date:

Merardo VFSD does not have an administrative union.

Board of Education President Signature: Date:

Jeffrey A. Maslino *Jan 2, 2013*