



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

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

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

December 20, 2012

Dr. Dominick Palma, Superintendent  
Merrick Union Free School District  
21 Babylon Road  
Merrick, NY 11566

Dear Superintendent Palma:

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: Thomas Rogers

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

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

# Annual Professional Performance Reviews: 2012-13

Created Thursday, May 24, 2012

Updated Thursday, November 29, 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 : 280225020000

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

*280225020000*

#### 1.2) School District Name: MERRICK UFSD

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

*MERRICK 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 Thursday, May 24, 2012

Updated Tuesday, December 18, 2012

---

### Page 1

#### STATE-PROVIDED MEASURES OF STUDENT GROWTH

(25 points with an approved value-added measure)

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

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

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

#### 2.1) Assurances

Please check the boxes below:

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

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

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

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

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

If no State assessment or Regents exam exists:

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

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

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

State assessments, *required if one exists*

List of State-approved 3rd party assessments

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

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

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

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

## 2.2) Grades K-3 ELA

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

	ELA	Assessment
K	District, regional, or BOCES-developed assessment	Merrick UFSD developed Kindergarten ELA assessment
1	District, regional, or BOCES-developed assessment	Merrick UFSD developed First Grade ELA assessment
2	District, regional, or BOCES-developed assessment	Merrick UFSD Developed Second Grade ELA assessment

	ELA	Assessment
3	State assessment	3rd Grade State Assessment

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



graphic at 2.11, below.	students who meet or exceed their individual student growth target, a corresponding 20 point HEDI score will be determined using the applicable uploaded conversion chart in Task 2.11.
Highly Effective (18 - 20 points) Results are well-above state average for similar students (or District goals if no state test).	Based on the District's goals and priorities, a large majority of the students meet district target goals in the areas of math as evaluated by district-created math assessments (for grades K-2) and the NYS math assessment (for grade 3).
Effective (9 - 17 points) Results meet state average for similar students (or District goals if no state test).	Based on the District's goals and priorities, a majority of the students meet district target goals in the areas of math as evaluated by district-created math (for grades K-2) and the NYS math assessment (for grade 3)
Developing (3 - 8 points) Results are below state average for similar students (or District goals if no state test).	Based on the District's goals and priorities, some of the students meet district target goals in the areas of math as evaluated by district-created math assessments (for grades K-2) and the NYS math assessment (for grade 3)
Ineffective (0 - 2 points) Results are well-below state average for similar students (or District goals if no state test).	Based on the District's goals and priorities, few students meet district target goals in the areas of math as evaluated by district-created math assessments (for grades K-2) and the NYS math assessment (for grade 3).

## 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	Not applicable	Not applicable
7	Not applicable	Not applicable
	Science	Assessment
8	Not applicable	Not applicable

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.	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
--	----------------

## 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	Not applicable	Not applicable
7	Not applicable	Not applicable
8	Not applicable	Not applicable

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.	Not applicable
Highly Effective (18 - 20 points) Results are well-above District goals for similar students.	Not applicable
Effective (9 - 17 points) Results meet District goals for similar students.	Not applicable
Developing (3 - 8 points) Results are below District goals for similar students.	Not applicable
Ineffective (0 - 2 points) Results are well-below District goals for similar students.	Not applicable

## 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

	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
Highly Effective (18 - 20 points) Results are well-above District goals for similar students.	Not applicable
Effective (9 - 17 points) Results meet District goals for similar students.	Not applicable
Developing (3 - 8 points) Results are below District goals for similar students.	Not applicable
Ineffective (0 - 2 points) Results are well-below District goals for similar students.	Not applicable

## 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	Not applicable	Not applicable
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.

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
Highly Effective (18 - 20 points) Results are well-above District goals for similar students.	Not applicable
Effective (9 - 17 points) Results meet District goals for similar students.	Not applicable
Developing (3 - 8 points) Results are below District goals for similar students.	Not applicable
Ineffective (0 - 2 points) Results are well-below District goals for similar students.	Not applicable

## 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	Not applicable	Not applicable
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.	Not applicable
Highly Effective (18 - 20 points) Results are well-above District goals for similar students.	Not applicable
Effective (9 - 17 points) Results meet District goals for similar students.	Not applicable
Developing (3 - 8 points) Results are below District goals for similar students.	Not applicable
Ineffective (0 - 2 points) Results are well-below District goals for similar students.	Not applicable

## 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	Not applicable
Grade 10 ELA	Not applicable	Not applicable
Grade 11 ELA	Not applicable	Not applicable

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
Highly Effective (18 - 20 points) Results are well-above District goals for similar students.	Not applicable
Effective (9 - 17 points) Results meet District goals for similar students.	Not applicable
Developing (3 - 8 points) Results are below District goals for similar students.	Not applicable
Ineffective (0 - 2 points) Results are well-below District goals for similar students.	Not applicable

## 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
Foreign Lanaguage	District, Regional or BOCES-developed	Merrick UFSD developed Foreign Language assessment (Grade 5 and 6)



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

*assets/survey-uploads/5364/132974-TXEttx9bQW/Revised 12 - 18- 12 Merrick UFSD SLO HEDI scoring charts.docx*

## 2.12) Locally Developed Controls

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

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

*No adjustments, controls or other special considerations are anticipated.*

## 2.13) Teachers with more than one growth measure

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

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

## 2.14) Assurances

Please check all of the boxes below:

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

2.14) Assurances | Assure that processes are in place to monitor SLOs to ensure rigor and comparability across classrooms.

Checked

### 3. Local Measures (Teachers)

Created Tuesday, May 29, 2012

Updated Wednesday, December 12, 2012

---

#### Page 1

#### Locally Selected Measures of Student Achievement or Growth

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

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

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

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

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

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

**Growth or achievement measure(s) from these options.**

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

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

Measures based on:

- 1) The change in percentage of a teacher’s students who achieve a specific level of performance as determined locally, on such assessments/examinations compared to those students’ level of performance on such assessments/examinations in the previous school year (e.g., a three percentage point increase in students earning the proficient level (three) or better performance level on the 7th grade math State assessment compared to those same students’ performance levels on the 6th grade math State assessment, or an increase in the percentage of a teacher’s students earning the advanced performance level (four) on the 4th grade ELA or math State assessments compared to those students’ performance levels on the 3rd grade ELA or math State assessments)
  
- 2) Teacher specific growth score computed by the Department based on the percent of the teacher’s students earning a State determined level of growth. The methodology to translate such growth into the State-established sub-component scoring ranges shall be determined locally
  
- 3) Teacher specific achievement or growth score computed in a manner determined locally based on a measure of student performance on the State assessments, Regents examinations and/or Department approved alternative examinations other than the measure described in subclause 1) or 2) of this clause
  
- 4) Student growth or achievement computed in a manner determined locally based on a State-approved 3rd party assessment
  
- 5) Student growth or achievement computed in a manner determined locally based on a district, regional or BOCES-developed assessment that is rigorous and comparable across classrooms
  
- 6) A school-wide measure of either student growth or achievement based on either:
  - (i) A State-provided student growth score covering all students in the school that took the State assessment in ELA or Math in Grades 4-8; or
  - (ii) A school-wide measure of student growth or achievement computed in a manner determined locally based on a State, State-approved 3rd party, or district, regional or BOCES developed assessment that is rigorous and comparable across classrooms.

### 3.1) Grades 4-8 ELA

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

	Locally-Selected Measure from List of Approved Measures	Assessment
4	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	Not applicable	Not applicable

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.

Merrick UFSD is utilizing the measurement of individual student fall to spring growth based upon NWEA MAP scoring system. Individual points are award to teacher based on this individual student growth in the following manner:

To assign teachers to HEDI categories, we will assume a normal distribution of teacher effects centered on 10.5. From this point, we will use the following cut points to assign teachers to categories:

Highly Effective: Greater than or equal to .9 standard deviations above average.

Effective: Less than .9 standard deviations above average and greater than or equal to -.9 standard deviations below average

Developing: Less than -.9 standard deviations below average and greater than or equal to -2.4 standard deviations below average

Ineffective: Less than -2.4 standard deviations below average

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

Within the category of Highly Effective are those teachers whose students' performance falls at greater than or equal to .9 standard deviations above average. We further divide the distribution to determine specific points as indicated in the attached chart.

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

Within the category of Effective are those teachers whose students' performance falls at less than .9 standard deviations above average and greater than or equal to -.9 standard deviations below average. We further divide the distribution to determine specific points as indicated in the attached chart.

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

Within the category of Developing are those teachers whose students' performance falls at less than -.9 standard deviations below average and greater than or equal to -2.4 standard deviations below average. We further divide the distribution to determine specific points as indicated in the attached chart.

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

Within the category of Ineffective, those teachers whose students' performance falls at less than -2.4 standard deviations below average. We further divide the distribution to determine specific points as indicated in the attached chart.

### 3.2) Grades 4-8 Math

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

	Locally-Selected Measure from List of Approved Measures	Assessment
4	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	Not applicable	Not applicable
8	Not applicable	Not applicable

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.*

<p>Use this box, if needed, to describe the general process for assigning HEDI categories for these grades/subjects in this subcomponent. If needed, you may upload a table or graphic at 3.3, below.</p>	<p>Merrick UFSD is utilizing the measurement of individual student fall to spring growth based upon NWEA MAP scoring system. Individual points are award to teacher based on this individual student growth in the following manner:            To assign teachers to HEDI categories, we will assume a normal distribution of teacher effects centered on 10.5. From this point, we will use the following cut points to assign teachers to categories:            Highly Effective: Greater than or equal to .9 standard deviations above average.            Effective: Less than .9 standard deviations above average and greater than or equal to -.9 standard deviations below average            Developing: Less than -.9 standard deviations below average and greater than or equal to -2.4 standard deviations below average            Ineffective: Less than -2.4 standard deviations below average</p>
<p>Highly Effective (14 - 15 points) Results are well above District- or BOCES-adopted expectations for growth or achievement for grade/subject.</p>	<p>Within the category of Highly Effective are those teachers whose students' performance falls at greater than or equal to .9 standard deviations above average. We further divide the distribution to determine specific points as indicated in the attached chart.</p>
<p>Effective (8- 13 points) Results meet District- or BOCES-adopted expectations for growth or achievement for grade/subject.</p>	<p>Within the category of Effective are those teachers whose students' performance falls at less than .9 standard deviations above average and greater than or equal to -.9 standard deviations below average. We further divide the distribution to determine specific points as indicated in the attached chart.</p>
<p>Developing (3 - 7 points) Results are below District- or BOCES-adopted expectations for growth or achievement</p>	<p>Within the category of Developing are those teachers whose students' performance falls at less than -.9</p>

for grade/subject.

standard deviations below average and greater than or equal to -2.4 standard deviations below average. We further divide the distribution to determine specific points as indicated in the attached chart.

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

Within the category of Ineffective, those teachers whose students' performance falls at less than -2.4 standard deviations below average. We further divide the distribution to determine specific points as indicated in the attached chart.

### 3.3) HEDI Tables or Graphics

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

[assets/survey-uploads/5139/134285-rhJdBgDruP/NWEA -MAPS HEDI point distribution for APPR - Teachers\(Merrick Appendix B\).xlsx](#)

## 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.*

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.

Merrick UFSD is utilizing the measurement of individual student fall to spring growth based upon NWEA MAP scoring system. Individual points are award to teacher based on this individual student growth in the following manner:  
To assign teachers to HEDI categories, we will assume a normal distribution of teacher effects centered on 13.

From this point, we will use the following cut points to assign teachers to categories:  
 Highly Effective: Greater than or equal to .9 standard deviations above average.  
 Effective: Less than .9 standard deviations above average and greater than or equal to -.9 standard deviations below average  
 Developing: Less than -.9 standard deviations below average and greater than or equal to -2.1 standard deviations below average  
 Ineffective: Less than -2.1 standard deviations below average

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

Within the category of Highly Effective are those teachers whose students' performance falls at greater than or equal to .9 standard deviations above average. We further divide the distribution to determine specific points as indicated in the attached chart.

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

Within the category of Effective are those teachers whose students' performance falls at less than .9 standard deviations above average and greater than or equal to -.9 standard deviations below average. We further divide the distribution to determine specific points as indicated in the attached chart.

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

Within the category of Developing are those teachers whose students' performance falls at less than -.9 standard deviations below average and greater than or equal to -2.1 standard deviations below average. We further divide the distribution to determine specific points as indicated in the attached chart.

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

Within the category of Ineffective, those teachers whose students' performance falls at less than -2.1 standard deviations below average. We further divide the distribution to determine specific points as indicated in the attached chart.

### 3.5) Grades K-3 Math

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

	Locally-Selected Measure from List of Approved Measures	Assessment
K	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.*

<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>Merrick UFSD is utilizing the measurement of individual student fall to spring growth based upon NWEA MAP scoring system. Individual points are award to teacher based on this individual student growth in the following manner:          To assign teachers to HEDI categories, we will assume a normal distribution of teacher effects centered on 13. From this point, we will use the following cut points to assign teachers to categories:          Highly Effective: Greater than or equal to .9 standard deviations above average.          Effective: Less than .9 standard deviations above average and greater than or equal to -.9 standard deviations below average          Developing: Less than -.9 standard deviations below average and greater than or equal to -2.1 standard deviations below average          Ineffective: Less than -2.1 standard deviations below average</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>Within the category of Highly Effective are those teachers whose students' performance falls at greater than or equal to .9 standard deviations above average. We further divide the distribution to determine specific points as indicated in the attached chart.</p>
<p>Effective (9-17 points) Results meet District- or BOCES-adopted expectations for growth or achievement for grade/subject.</p>	<p>Within the category of Effective are those teachers whose students' performance falls at less than .9 standard deviations above average and greater than or equal to -.9 standard deviations below average. We further divide the distribution to determine specific points as indicated in the attached chart.</p>
<p>Developing (3 - 8 points) Results are below District -or BOCES-adopted expectations for growth or achievement for grade/subject.</p>	<p>Within the category of Developing are those teachers whose students' performance falls at less than -.9 standard deviations below average and greater than or equal to -2.1 standard deviations below average. We further divide the distribution to determine specific points as indicated in the attached chart.</p>
<p>Ineffective (0 - 2 points) Results are well below District- or BOCES-adopted expectations for growth or achievement for grade/subject.</p>	<p>Within the category of Ineffective, those teachers whose students' performance falls at less than -2.1 standard deviations below average. We further divide the distribution to determine specific points as indicated in the attached chart.</p>

### 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	Not applicable	Not applicable
7	Not applicable	Not applicable
8	Not applicable	Not applicable

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.	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

### 3.7) 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	Not applicable	Not applicable
7	Not applicable	Not applicable
8	Not applicable	Not applicable

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

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

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

### 3.8) 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	Not applicable
Global 2	Not applicable	Not applicable
American History	Not applicable	Not applicable

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	Not applicable

Earth Science	Not applicable	Not applicable
Chemistry	Not applicable	Not applicable
Physics	Not applicable	Not applicable

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.	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
Developing (3 - 8 points) Results are below District- or BOCES-adopted expectations for growth or achievement for grade/subject.	Not applicable
Effective (9 - 17points) Results meet 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

### 3.10) 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	Not applicable	Not applicable
Geometry	Not applicable	Not applicable
Algebra 2	Not applicable	Not applicable

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,	Not applicable
--	----------------

below.	
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

### 3.11) 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	Not applicable
Grade 10 ELA	Not applicable	Not applicable
Grade 11 ELA	Not applicable	Not applicable

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.



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

Within the category of Developing are those teachers whose students' performance falls at less than -.9 standard deviations below average and greater than or equal to -2.1 standard deviations below average. We further divide the distribution to determine specific points as indicated in the attached chart.

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

Within the category of Ineffective, those teachers whose students' performance falls at less than -2.1 standard deviations below average. We further divide the distribution to determine specific points as indicated in the attached chart.

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

*assets/survey-uploads/5139/134285-Rp0Ol6pk1T/NWEA -MAPS HEDI point distribution for APPR - Teachers(Merrick Appendix B).xlsx*

### 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.

*None*

### 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.

*To combine multiple locally selected measures, we will take a population-weighted average of the measures. .*

### 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, May 24, 2012

Updated Friday, December 14, 2012

---

### Page 1

#### 4.1) Teacher Practice Rubric

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

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

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

*Danielson's Framework for Teaching (2011 Revised Edition)*

*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]	40
One or more observation(s) by trained independent evaluators	(No response)
Observations by trained in-school peer teachers	(No response)
Feedback from students using State-approved survey tool	(No response)
Feedback from parents/caregivers using State-approved survey tool	(No response)
Structured reviews of lesson plans, student portfolios and other teacher artifacts	20

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

(No response)

### 4.3) Survey Tools (if applicable)

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

(No response)

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

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

### 4.4) Assurances

Please check all of the boxes below:

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

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

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

*The Danielson's Framework for Teaching will be used as the teacher practice rubric.*

*Part I (0-40 points)*

*Administrators will use the rubric when observing a lesson. Each of the twenty-two components in the rubric, which can be observed/measured may be assigned a numerical value of 1 (ineffective), 2 (developing), 3 (effective) or 4 (highly effective). Not all items will be rated during an observation. An average score will be calculated across all observation. This average score will be utilized with the attached conversion chart to calculate 40 points of the 60 "other measures" points.*

*Part II (0-20 points)*

*The remaining twenty points will be based upon a combination of criteria including, but not limited to, a structured review of student*

work, teacher artifacts using portfolio or evidence binder processes and teacher self-reflection and progress on professional growth goals. The remaining Components of Domain 1 and all Components of Domain 4 may be rated based upon this data. An average score will be calculated. This average score will be utilized with the attached conversion chart to calculate 20 of the 60 "other measures" points.

Points obtained from Part I (0-40 points based upon attached conversion chart) will be added to points obtained in Part II (0-20 points based upon attached conversion chart). The total will be the points assigned for the "other measures of effectiveness" sub-component.

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/5091/132989-eka9yMJ855/Teacher Evaluation Other Measures Conversion Table -revised for resubmission.xlsx*

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

Highly Effective: Overall performance and results exceed NYS Teaching Standards.	Teachers obtaining the Highly Effective category will be those who display performance and results that exceed NYS Teaching Standards as documented utilizing the Danielson's Framework for Teaching. They will receive 59-60 "other measures" points as described above.
Effective: Overall performance and results meet NYS Teaching Standards.	Teachers obtaining the Effective category will be those who display performance and results that meet NYS Teaching Standards as documented utilizing the Danielson's Framework for Teaching. They will receive 57-58 "other measures" points as described above.
Developing: Overall performance and results need improvement in order to meet NYS Teaching Standards.	Teachers obtaining the Developing category will be those who display performance and results that need improvement in order to meet the NYS Teaching Standards as documented utilizing the Danielson's Framework for Teaching. They will receive 50-56 "other measures" points as described above.
Ineffective: Overall performance and results do not meet NYS Teaching Standards.	Teachers obtaining the Ineffective category will be those who display performance and results that do not meet the NYS Teaching Standards as documented utilizing the Danielson's Framework for Teaching. They will receive 0-49 "other measures" points as described above.

Provide the ranges for the 60-point scoring bands.

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

#### 4.6) Observations of Probationary Teachers

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

By building principals or other trained administrators

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

- 
- In Person
- 

## 4.7) Observations of Tenured Teachers

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

By building principals or other trained administrators

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

By trained in-school peer teachers or other trained reviewers

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

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

Independent evaluators

Formal/Long	0
Informal/Short	0

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

- 
- In Person
- 

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

- 
- In Person
-

# 5. Composite Scoring (Teachers)

Created Thursday, May 24, 2012

Updated Thursday, September 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 student growth or achievement for grade/subject.

Overall performance and results exceed NYS Teaching Standards.

#### **Effective**

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

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

Overall performance and results meet NYS Teaching Standards.

#### **Developing**

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

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

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

#### **Ineffective**

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

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

Overall performance and results do not meet NYS Teaching Standards.

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

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

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

**Growth or Comparable Measures**

**Locally-selected Measures of**

**growth or achievement**

**Other Measures of Effectiveness**

**(60 points)**

**Overall**

**Composite Score**

**Highly Effective**

**18-20**

**18-20**

**Ranges determined locally--see below**

**91-100**

**Effective**

**9-17**

**9-17**

**75-90**

**Developing**

**3-8**

**3-8**

**65-74**

**Ineffective**

**0-2**

**0-2**

**0-64**

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

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

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

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

**Growth or Comparable Measures**

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

**Other Measures of Effectiveness**

**(60 points)**

**Overall**

**Composite Score**

**Highly Effective**

**22-25**

**14-15**

**Ranges determined locally--see above**

**91-100**

**Effective**

**10-21**

**8-13**

**75-90**

**Developing**

**3-9**

**3-7**

**65-74**

**Ineffective**

**0-2**

**0-2**

**0-64**

# 6. Additional Requirements - Teachers

Created Thursday, May 24, 2012

Updated Wednesday, December 12, 2012

---

## Page 1

### 6.1) Assurances -- Improvement Plans

Please check the boxes below:

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

### 6.2) Attachment: Teacher Improvement Plan Forms

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

*assets/survey-uploads/5265/132986-Df0w3Xx5v6/Teacher Improvement Plan for resubmission.doc*

### 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:

*Merrick UFSD*

*Teacher APPR Appeals Process*

*Appeals of annual professional performance reviews are limited to those that rate a teacher as Ineffective or Developing only, except in the event a promotion is denied based on a teacher's APPR.*

*Teacher Request for Supporting Documents*

*Within five (5) business days of receipt of the APPR, a teacher may request, in writing, that the administrator issuing the APPR provide to the teacher a copy of any and all documents and written materials upon which the APPR was based. The authoring administrator shall provide all such documents to the teacher and the Superintendent within five (5) business days of the request. Only materials provided in response to this request shall be considered in the deliberations as to the validity of the APPR.*

#### *What May be Challenged in an Appeal*

*Appeal procedures are limited to the scope of appeals under Education Law 3012-c to the following subjects:*

- (1) the school district's adherence to the standards and methodologies required for such reviews, pursuant to Education Law 3012-c;*
- (2) the adherence to the Commissioner's regulations, as applicable to such reviews;*
- (3) compliance with any applicable locally negotiated procedures applicable to annual professional performance reviews or improvement plans; and*
- (4) the school district's issuance and/or implementation of the terms of the teacher improvement plan under Education Law 3012-c.*

#### *Prohibition Against More Than One Appeal*

*A teacher may not file multiple appeals regarding the same performance review plan. All grounds for appeal must be raised with specificity within one appeal. Any grounds not raised at the time of the appeal is filed shall be deemed invalid.*

#### *Procedures*

*All appeals must be submitted in writing in the procedures set forth herein. The failure to file an appeal within the timeframes set forth in the procedures shall be deemed a waiver of the right to appeal and the appeal shall be deemed abandoned. In the event the composite score is completed after the conclusion of the school year, the timeframes shall commence on the first day of the next school year as opposed to the date the composite score was received by the employee.*

*For the purposes of the appeals procedures "business days" shall mean any day in which the Merrick UFSD is open for business.*

#### *Step 1 Conference with Supervising Administrator*

*The conference shall be an informal meeting wherein the supervising administrator and the employee are able to discuss the evaluation and the areas of dispute. The meeting shall take place within seven (7) business days of the date the composite score was received by the employee. The employee shall upon request be entitled to a Merrick Faculty Association representative being present. The employee may bring evidence and/or artifacts relevant to the appeal to the informal meeting. If the employee is not satisfied with the outcome, he/she may proceed to the second step. This step shall conclude within five (5) business days of the start of the conference.*

#### *Step 2 Submission of Formal Appeal*

*The second step shall be initiated by the unit member notifying the Superintendent by written notification, within seven (7) business days of the conclusion of the conference of Step 1.*

*All appeals shall be submitted directly to the Superintendent of schools. When filing an appeal, the teacher must submit a detailed written description of the specific areas of disagreement over his or her performance review. The teacher shall submit any and all documentation, artifacts or like there of that supports the teacher's position for the appeal being filed. The performance review plan being challenged must also be submitted with the appeal.*

#### *Step 3 Supervising Administrator's Response to Appeal*

*Within seven (7) business days of the submission of the formal appeal in Step 2 by the employee, the supervising administrator who issued the performance review must submit a detailed written response to the appeal to the Superintendent of schools. The response must include any and all additional documents or written materials specific to the point(s) of disagreement that support the evaluator's response and are relevant to the resolution of the appeal. Any such information that is not submitted at the time the response is filed shall not be considered in the deliberations related to the resolution of the appeal. The teacher initiating the appeal shall receive a copy of the response filed by the evaluator to the Superintendent, and any and all additional information submitted with the response.*

#### *Step 4 Superintendent Final Decision*

*All supporting artifacts shall be submitted to the Superintendent for final appeal. A written decision on the merits of the appeal shall be rendered by the superintendent no later than fifteen (15) business days of receipt of the supervising administrator's response to Step 3. The appeal shall be based on a written record, comprised of the teacher's appeal papers and any documentary evidence accompanying the appeal, as well as the evaluator's response to the appeal and additional documentary evidence submitted with such papers. Such decision shall be final.*

*The decision shall set forth the reasons and factual basis for each determination on each of the specific issues raised in the teacher's appeal. If the appeal is sustained, the Superintendent may set aside a rating if it has been affected by substantial error or defect, modify a rating if it is affected by substantial error or defect or order a new evaluation if procedures have been violated. A copy of the decision shall be provided to the teacher and the evaluator or the person responsible for either issuing or implementing the terms of an improvement plan, if that person is different.*

*The Superintendent reserves the authority to delegate the review process to other appropriate administrative employees.*

*Second Year Appeals- The appeals shall follow the same process. It is understood that the committee may be comprised of different members than the committee that served in the initial appeal.*

#### *Exclusivity of 3012-c Appeal Procedure*

*The 3012-c appeal procedure shall constitute the exclusive means for initiating, reviewing and resolving any and all challenges and appeals. A teacher may not resort to any other contractual grievance procedures for the resolution of challenges and appeals related to a professional performance review, except as otherwise authorized by law. Procedural issues shall be subject to the grievance procedures of the collective bargaining agreement.*

*The district assures that the appeal process will be timely and expeditious in compliance with Education Law 3012-c.*

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

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

#### *Evaluator Training*

*Merrick UFSD will ensure that all lead evaluators/evaluators are properly trained. Evaluators will be certified by the Superintendent to complete an individual's performance review. Evaluator training has been conducted by certified BOCES Network.*

*The evaluator training has replicated the recommended SED model certification process, incorporating per the 3012c regulations. Training duration was the equivalent of ten (10) days of training. The training has included the following Requirements for Lead Evaluators:*

- New York State teaching Standards and ISSLC Standards*
- Evidence-based observation*
- Application and use of Student Growth Percentile and Value Added Growth Model data*
- Application and use of the State-approved teacher or principal rubrics*
- Application and use of any assessment tools used to evaluate teachers and principals*
- Application and use of State-approved locally selected measures of student achievement*
- Use of Statewide instructional Reporting System*
- Scoring methodology used to evaluate teachers and principals*
- Specific considerations in evaluating teachers and principals of ELLS and students with disabilities.*

*Merrick UFSD will continue to work with the BOCES Network Team to ensure that lead evaluators maintain inter-rater reliability over time and that they are re-certified on an annual basis.*

## 6.5) Assurances -- Evaluators

Please check the boxes below:

- 
- Checked
- 

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

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

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

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

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

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

(7) use of the Statewide Instructional Reporting System

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

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

---

• Checked

---

## 6.6) Assurances -- Teachers

Please check all of the boxes below:

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

6.6) Assurances -- Teachers   Assure that teachers will receive timely and constructive feedback as part of the evaluation process.	Checked
6.6) Assurances -- Teachers   Assure the district has appeal procedures that are consistent with the regulations and that they provide for the timely and expeditious resolution of an appeal.	Checked

### 6.7) Assurances -- Data

Please check all of the boxes below:

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

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

Created Thursday, May 24, 2012

Updated Thursday, September 27, 2012

## Page 1

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

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

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

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

K-6
(No response)

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

Please check the boxes below:

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

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

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

State assessments, *required if one exists*

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

List of State-approved 3rd party assessments

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

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

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

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

Use this box, if needed, to describe the process for assigning HEDI categories in this subcomponent. If needed, you may upload a table or graphic below.	All schools will have NYSED provided measures.
Highly Effective (18 - 20 points) Results are well above state average for similar students (or District goals if no state test).	All schools will have NYSED provided measures.
Effective (9 - 17 points) Results meet state average for similar students (or District goals if no state test).	All schools will have NYSED provided measures.
Developing (3 - 8 points) Results are below state average for similar students (or District goals if no state test).	All schools will have NYSED provided measures.
Ineffective (0 - 2 points) Results are well below state average for similar students (or District goals if no state test).	All schools will have NYSED provided measures.

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

*(No response)*

## 7.4) Special Considerations for Comparable Growth Measures

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

Note: The only allowable controls or adjustments for Comparable Growth Measures are those used in State Growth measures, which

include: prior student achievement results, students with disabilities, English language learners, students in poverty, and, in the future, any other student-, classroom-, and school-level characteristics approved by the Board of Regents.

*(No response)*

## 7.5) Principals with More Than One Growth Measure

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

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

## 7.6) Assurances -- Comparable Growth Measures

Please check all of the boxes below:

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

# 8. Local Measures (Principals)

Created Thursday, May 24, 2012

Updated Thursday, December 20, 2012

---

## Page 1

### Locally-Selected Measures of Student Achievement or Growth

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

Grade Configuration	Locally-Selected Measure from List of Approved Measures	Assessment
K-6	(d) measures used by district for teacher evaluation	Measures of Academic Progress (Primary, ELA, 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>Merrick UFSD is utilizing the measurement of individual student Fall to Spring growth based upon NWEA MAP scoring system. Individual points are awarded to a principal based on the principal's K-6 students individual growth in the following manner:          To assign principals to HEDI categories, we will assume a normal distribution of teacher effects centered on 10.5. From this point, we will use the following cut points to assign principals to categories:          Highly Effective: Greater than or equal to .9 standard deviations above average.          Effective: Less than .9 standard deviations above average and greater than or equal to -.9 standard deviations below average          Developing: Less than -.9 standard deviations below average and greater than or equal to -2.4 standard deviations below average          Ineffective: Less than -2.4 standard deviations below average</p>
--	--

Highly Effective (14 - 15 points) Results are well above District- or BOCES-adopted expectations for growth or achievement for grade/subject.	Within the category of Highly Effective are those principals whose students' performance falls at greater than or equal to .9 standard deviations above average. We further divide the distribution to determine specific points as indicated in the attached chart.
Effective (8- 13 points) Results meet District- or BOCES-adopted expectations for growth or achievement for grade/subject.	Within the category of Effective are those principals whose students' performance falls at less than .9 standard deviations above average and greater than or equal to -.9 standard deviations below average. We further divide the distribution to determine specific points as indicated in the attached chart.
Developing (3 - 7 points) Results are below District- or BOCES-adopted expectations for growth or achievement for grade/subject.	Within the category of Developing are those principals whose students' performance falls at less than -.9 standard deviations below average and greater than or equal to -2.4 standard deviations below average. We further divide the distribution to determine specific points as indicated in the attached chart.
Ineffective (0 - 2 points) Results are well below District- or BOCES-adopted expectations for growth or achievement for grade/subject.	Within the category of Ineffective, those principals whose students' performance falls at less than -2.4 standard deviations below average. We further divide the distribution to determine specific points as indicated in the attached chart.

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

*(No response)*

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

*assets/survey-uploads/5366/132951-qBFVOWF7fC/NWEA -MAPS HEDI 15 point distribution for APPR- Principals(Merrick Appendix B).xlsx*

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

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

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

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

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

whose performance levels on State assessments are proficient or advanced)

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

Use this box, if needed, to describe the process for assigning HEDI categories. If needed, you may upload a table or graphic below.	All principals have VAM (see 8.1)
---	-----------------------------------

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

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.

*None*

### 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.

*To combine multiple locally selected measures, we will take a population-weighted average of the measures.*

### 8.5) Assurances

Please check all of the boxes below:

8.5) Assurances   Assure that the application of locally developed controls will be rigorous, fair, and transparent	Check
8.5) Assurances   Assure that use of locally developed controls will not have a disparate impact on underrepresented students, in accordance with any applicable civil rights laws.	Check
8.5) Assurances   Assure that enrolled students are included in accordance with policies for student assignment to schools and may not be excluded.	Check
8.5) Assurances   Assure that procedures for ensuring data accuracy and integrity are being utilized.	Check
8.5) Assurances   Assure that the process for assigning points for locally selected measures will use the narrative HEDI descriptions described in the regulations to effectively differentiate principals' performance in ways that improve student learning and instruction.	Check

8.5) Assurances   Assure that it is possible for a principal to earn each point, including 0, for the locally selected measures subcomponent.	Check
8.5) Assurances   Assure that locally-selected measures are rigorous and comparable across all principals in the same or similar programs or grade configurations across the district.	Check
8.5) Assurances   If more than one type of locally-selected measure is used for different groups of principals in the same or similar grade configuration or program, certify that the measures are comparable based on the Standards of Educational and Psychological Testing.	Check
8.5) Assurances   Assure that all locally-selected measures for a principal are different than any measures used for the State assessment or other comparable measures subcomponent.	Check

# 9. Other Measures of Effectiveness (Principals)

Created Thursday, May 24, 2012

Updated Monday, October 15, 2012

---

## Page 1

### 9.1) Principal Practice Rubric

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

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

*Marshall's Principal Evaluation 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.

(No response)

(No response)

(No response)

### 9.6) Assurances

Please check all of the boxes below:

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

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

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

*The Marshall Principal Evaluation Rubric (MPER) will be utilized to assign up to 60 points in the area of "other measures". The completion of the matrix will be based upon evidence from a minimum of two school visits by the lead evaluator (at least one unannounced) and additional evidence provided by the principal as noted below. Additional information from artifacts, observations in other settings, observations by the Assistant Superintendent for Curriculum, Instruction and Student Services, etc. may be used as evidence in completing the rubric.*

*The Marshall Principal Evaluation Rubric is divided into six domains with 10 items in each domain for a total of 60 items. Principals will receive ratings for each item in the following manner: "Ineffective" = 1, "Developing" = 2, "Effective" = 3, "Highly Effective" = 4. Based upon this rubric, principals will receive a rubric score with a potential range of 60-240. Typically, principals will receive a rating for the majority of items within their scope of work. At times, insufficient evidence may exist to provide a rating for some items. When this occurs, the overall score will be prorated, i.e., the subdomains which actually are rated will be weighted to total a possible maximum score of 240. The conversion chart illustrates "raw rubric score" to "other measures" points.*

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

*assets/survey-uploads/5143/133048-pMADJ4gk6R/PRINCIPALS 60 (MERRICK APPENDIX C).docx*

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

Highly Effective: Overall performance and results exceed standards.	Principals rated as highly effective are those that display overall performance and results that exceed standards based upon the MPER . They will receive "other measures" points of 59 or 60.
Effective: Overall performance and results meet standards.	Principals rated as effective are those that display overall performance and results that meet standards based upon the MPER. They will receive "other measures" points of 57 or 58.
Developing: Overall performance and results need improvement in order to meet standards.	Principals rated as developing are those that display overall performance and results that need improvement to meet standards based upon the MPER. They will receive "other measures" points of 50 to 56.
Ineffective: Overall performance and results do not meet standards.	Principals rated as ineffective are those that display overall performance and results that do not meet standards based upon the MPER. They will receive "other measures" points of 0-49.

Please provide the locally-negotiated 60 point scoring bands.

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

## 9.8) School Visits

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

### **Probationary Principals**

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

### **Tenured Principals**

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

# 10. Composite Scoring (Principals)

Created Thursday, May 24, 2012

Updated Thursday, September 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	59-60
Effective	57-58
Developing	50-56
Ineffective	0-49

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

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

**Growth or Comparable Measures**

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

**Other Measures of Effectiveness**

**(60 points)**

**Overall**

**Composite Score**

**Highly Effective**

22-25

14-15

Ranges determined locally--see above

91-100

**Effective**

10-21

8-13

75-90

**Developing**

3-9

3-7

**65-74**

**Ineffective**

**0-2**

**0-2**

**0-64**

# 11. Additional Requirements - Principals

Created Thursday, May 24, 2012

Updated Wednesday, December 12, 2012

---

## Page 1

### 11.1) Assurances -- Improvement Plans

Please check the boxes below.

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

### 11.2) Attachment: Principal Improvement Plan Forms

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

[assets/survey-uploads/5276/133053-Df0w3Xx5v6/Principal Improvement Plan for resubmission.doc](#)

### 11.3) Appeals Process

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

(1) the substance of the annual professional performance review

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

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

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

*APPRs will not be grievable, but will be subject to the following appeals procedure. In all cases, the Superintendent will conduct the appeal review.*

*A. Any principal who receives an Ineffective or Developing rating on their annual total composite APPR or a tenured principal, who receives a Developing or Ineffective rating on the 60 Rubric HEDI rating, shall be entitled to appeal their annual APPR rating, based upon a written submission to the Superintendent of Schools.*

*B. The appeal must be brought in writing, specifying the area(s) of concern, but limited to those matters that may be appealed as prescribed in Section 3012-c of the Education Law. Further, a principal who is placed on a Principal Improvement Plan (“PIP”) shall have a corresponding right to appeal concerns regarding the PIP in accordance with the requirements set forth in Section 3012-c of the Education Law.*

*An appeal of an APPR evaluation or a PIP must be commenced within fifteen (15) business days of the presentation of the final document to the principal or else the right to appeal shall be deemed waived in all regards. At the outcome of a PIP, there shall be a second fifteen business day period for a PIP appeal following the end date of the PIP to appeal items solely related to the outcome of the PIP. Failure to file an appeal within this second period shall also result in a waiver of the right to appeal.*

*However, nothing herein shall be deemed a waiver of the right of the principal to challenge any aspect of the APPR in the context of a 3020-a proceeding.*

*C. The process for appealing a Developing rating or of a Principal Improvement Plan shall be as follows:*

*When filing an appeal, the principal must submit a detailed written description of the specific areas of disagreement over his or her performance review, or the issuance and/or implementation of the terms of his or her improvement plan and any additional documents or materials relevant to the appeal. The performance review and/or improvement plan being challenged must also be submitted with the appeal. Any information not submitted at the time the appeal is filed shall not be considered.*

*The principal will be entitled to a meeting with the Superintendent as well as a union representative of the principal’s choice where the merits of the appeal shall be presented. The Superintendent shall respond to the appeal with a written answer granting the appeal and directing further administrative action, or a written answer denying the appeal that must include explanation and rationale behind that decision. Prior to rendering a decision, the Superintendent shall review the evidence underlying the observations of the principal along with all other evidence submitted by the principal including any evidence presented at the meeting discussed above. The time period for the meeting step may be no longer than five (5) business days. Such decision shall be made within fifteen (15) business days of the receipt of the appeal or fifteen (15) business days after the meeting, whichever is later, and shall be considered final and binding.*

*D. The process for appealing an Ineffective rating shall be as follows:*

*When filing an appeal of an Ineffective rating, the principal must submit a detailed written description of the specific areas of disagreement over his or her performance review and any additional documents or materials relevant to the appeal. The performance review being challenged must also be submitted with the appeal. Any information not submitted at the time the appeal is filed shall not be considered.*

*The principal will be entitled to a meeting with the Superintendent as well as a union representative of the principal’s choice where the merits of the appeal shall be presented. The Superintendent shall respond to the appeal with a written answer granting the appeal and directing further administrative action, or a written answer denying the appeal that must include explanation and rationale behind that decision. Prior to rendering a decision, the Superintendent shall review the evidence underlying the observations of the principal along with all other evidence submitted by the principal. The time period for the meeting step may be no longer than five (5) business days. Such decision shall be made within fifteen (15) business days of the receipt of the appeal or fifteen (15) business days after the meeting, whichever is later and shall be considered advisory.*

*If not satisfied by the preliminary decision of the Superintendent, the building principal shall within three (3) business days request a review be performed by a mutually agreed upon school administrator who is experienced in evaluating principals. Within five (5) business days from the request for review, each party shall nominate four administrators, not currently employed by the district, willing to conduct a review. The list of names shall also include resume and fees. After receipt of this information, if the parties within five (5) business days cannot mutually agree upon the selection of the retired administrator from the list of eight (8) names, each party shall be afforded three (3) strike-outs and the reviewer shall be selected randomly from the remaining names. The cost of this review shall be split equally between the District and the Association.*

*The review shall consist of reviewing the preliminary decision, the evidence underlying the observations/evaluations of the principal, and all other evidence submitted by the principal and/or the district. The evidence and arguments shall be presented to the selected administrator for review within fifteen (15) business days after his/her selection. Upon completion of the review the selected administrator shall render a written advisory opinion within fifteen (15) business days after receipt of the evidence and arguments from both sides. The advisory opinion may recommend upholding, reversing, or modifying the preliminary determination as well as provide recommendations, including but not limited to, adjustments to the principal improvement plan or other corrective actions. Upon receipt of the advisory decision the Superintendent shall within five (5) school days review said advisory opinion and in his/her sole discretion either adopt, reject, in whole, or in part, the advisory opinion.*

*E. Procedural objections to the appeal process or PIP plan shall be subject to the grievance procedure within the parties’ collective*

*bargaining agreement. However, the Superintendent's final determination regarding the substance of the APPR evaluation and/or PIP shall not be subject to grievance procedures.*

*Notwithstanding the aforementioned language, nothing herein shall be construed as limiting the right of the employee to challenge any evaluation including the second consecutive ineffective annual composite APPR evaluation in any proceeding brought pursuant to Education Law Section 3020-a or an alternative disciplinary arbitration to the extent allowed by law. Nothing herein shall be deemed a waiver of the right of the principal to challenge any aspect of the APPR in the context of a 3020-a proceeding.*

*F. The district assures that the appeal process will be timely and expeditious in compliance with Education Law 3012-c.*

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

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

### *Evaluator Training*

*Merrick UFSD will ensure that all lead evaluators/evaluators are properly trained. Evaluators will be certified by the Superintendent to complete an individual's performance review. Evaluator training has been conducted by certified BOCES Network and by Dr. Kim Marshall, author of the Marshall Principal Evaluation Rubric.*

*The evaluator training has replicated the recommended SED model certification process, incorporating per the 3012c regulations. The duration of this training has been at least the equivalent of 10 days. The training has included the following Requirements for Lead Evaluators:*

- New York State teaching Standards and ISSLC Standards*
- Evidence-based observation*
- Application and use of Student Growth Percentile and Value Added Growth Model data*
- Application and use of the State-approved teacher or principal rubrics*
- Application and use of any assessment tools used to evaluate teachers and principals*
- Application and use of State-approved locally selected measures of student achievement*
- Use of Statewide instructional Reporting System*
- Scoring methodology used to evaluate teachers and principals*
- Specific considerations in evaluating teachers and principals of ELLS and students with disabilities.*

*Merrick UFSD will continue to work with the BOCES Network Team to ensure that lead evaluators maintain inter-rater reliability over time and that they are re-certified on an annual basis.*

## 11.5) Assurances -- Evaluators

Please check the boxes below:

- 
- Checked
- 

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

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

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

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

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

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

(7) use of the Statewide Instructional Reporting System

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

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

- 
- Checked
- 

## 11.6) Assurances -- Principals

Please check all of the boxes below:

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

## 11.7) Assurances -- Data

Please check all of the boxes below:

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

## 12. Joint Certification of APPR Plan

Created Thursday, May 24, 2012

Updated Thursday, December 20, 2012

---

### Page 1

#### 12.1) Upload the Joint Certification of the APPR Plan

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

[assets/survey-uploads/5581/133054-3Uqgn5g9Iu/APPR\\_CERTIFICATION\\_122012.pdf](assets/survey-uploads/5581/133054-3Uqgn5g9Iu/APPR_CERTIFICATION_122012.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.

Merrick UFSD Teacher Evaluation - "Other Mearsures" Conversion Chart

Part I

40 Points for Instructional Practices

Part II

20 Points for Professional Practices

Total Average Rubric Score	Conversion Score	Total Average Rubric Score	Conversion Score
1	0	1	0
1.01	1	1.03	1
1.02	2	1.06	2
1.03	3	1.1	3
1.04	4	1.125	4
1.05	5	1.15	5
1.06	6	1.175	6
1.07	7	1.2	7
1.08	8	1.225	8
1.09	9	1.25	9
1.1	10	1.275	10
1.11	11	1.3	11
1.12	12	1.325	12
1.13	13	1.35	13
1.14	14	1.375	14
1.2	21	1.4	15
1.3	28	1.5	16
1.4	34.5	1.6	17
1.5	36	1.7	17
1.6	36	1.8	17
1.7	36	1.9	18
1.8	36	2	18
1.9	37	2.1	18
2	37	2.2	18
2.1	38	2.3	18
2.2	38	2.4	18
2.3	38	2.5	19
2.4	38	2.6	19
2.5	39	2.7	19
2.6	39	2.8	19
2.7	39	2.9	19
2.8	39	3	19
2.9	39	3.1	19
3	39	3.2	19
3.1	39	3.3	19
3.2	39	3.4	19
3.3	39	3.5	20
3.4	39	3.6	20
3.5	40	3.7	20
3.6	40	3.8	20
3.7	40	3.9	20
3.8	40	4	20
3.9	40		
4	40		

**Part I Conversion Score + Part II Conversion Score = Total Assigned "other measures of effectiveness" score**

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

Appendix C

Merrick UFSD Marshall Principal Evaluation Rubric “Other Measures” Conversion Chart

No Rounding – Must obtain rubric score to receive “others measures” conversion score

<b>Ineffective</b>													
0	1	2	3	4	5	6	7	8	9	10	11	12	13
60	60.5	61	61.5	62	62.5	63	63.5	64	64.5	65	65.5	66	66.5
14	15	16	17	18	19	20	21	22	23	24	25	26	27
67	67.5	68	68.8	69	69.5	70	70.5	71	71.5	72	72.5	73	73.5
28	29	30	31	32	33	34	35	36	37	38	39	40	41
74	74.5	75	75.5	76	76.5	77	77.5	78	78.5	79	79.5	80	81
42	43	44	45	46	47	48	49						
82	83	84	85	86	87	88	89						

<b>Developing</b>						
50	51	52	53	54	55	56
90-98	99-107	108-116	117-125	126-134	135-143	144-149

<b>Effective</b>	
57	58
150-182	183-209

<b>Highly Effective</b>	
59	60
210-224	225-240

Merrick UFSD Principal Evaluation HEDI chart for 8.1  
**NWEA - Measures of Academic Progress**

<b>APPR Point</b>	<b>≥</b>	<b>&lt;</b>	<b>HEDI Category</b>
15	1.2		Highly Effective
14	0.9	1.2	Highly Effective
13	0.6	0.9	Effective
12	0.3	0.6	Effective
11	0	0.3	Effective
10	-0.3	0	Effective
9	-0.6	-0.3	Effective
8	-0.9	-0.6	Effective
7	-1.2	-0.9	Developing
6	-1.5	-1.2	Developing
5	-1.8	-1.5	Developing
4	-2.1	-1.8	Developing
3	-2.4	-2.1	Developing
2	-2.7	-2.4	Ineffective
1	-3	-2.7	Ineffective
0		-3	Ineffective

**MERRICK UFSD**  
**HEDI SCORING CHART**  
**KINDERGARTEN MATH SLO**

<b>HIGHLY EFFECTIVE</b>			<b>EFFECTIVE</b>									<b>DEVELOPING</b>					<b>INEFFECTIVE</b>			
20	19	18	17	16	15	14	13	12	11	10	9	8	7	6	5	4	3	2	1	0
100%	95%- 99%	90%- 94%	85%- 89%	80%- 84%	75%- 79%	70%- 74%	65%- 69%	60%- 64%	55%- 59%	50%- 54%	45%- 49%	40%- 44%	35%- 39%	30%- 34%	25%- 29%	20%- 24%	15%- 19%	10%- 14%	5%- 9%	0%- 4%

Percentage of Students Meeting Growth targets

**MERRICK UFSD**  
**HEDI SCORING CHART**  
**GRADE 1 MATH SLO**

<b>HIGHLY EFFECTIVE</b>			<b>EFFECTIVE</b>									<b>DEVELOPING</b>					<b>INEFFECTIVE</b>			
20	19	18	17	16	15	14	13	12	11	10	9	8	7	6	5	4	3	2	1	0
100%	95%- 99%	90%- 94%	85%- 89%	80%- 84%	75%- 79%	70%- 74%	65%- 69%	60%- 64%	55%- 59%	50%- 54%	45%- 49%	40%- 44%	35%- 39%	30%- 34%	25%- 29%	20%- 24%	15%- 19%	10%- 14%	5%- 9%	0%- 4%

Percentage of Students Meeting Growth targets

**MERRICK UFSD**  
**HEDI SCORING CHART**  
**GRADE 2 MATH SLO**

<b>HIGHLY EFFECTIVE</b>			<b>EFFECTIVE</b>									<b>DEVELOPING</b>					<b>INEFFECTIVE</b>			
20	19	18	17	16	15	14	13	12	11	10	9	8	7	6	5	4	3	2	1	0
100%	95%- 99%	90%- 94%	85%- 89%	80%- 84%	75%- 79%	70%- 74%	65%- 69%	60%- 64%	55%- 59%	50%- 54%	45%- 49%	40%- 44%	35%- 39%	30%- 34%	25%- 29%	20%- 24%	15%- 19%	10%- 14%	5%- 9%	0%- 4%

Percentage of Students Meeting Growth targets

**MERRICK UFSD**

**HEDI SCORING CHART**

**FOREIGN LANGUAGE SLO**

**GRADES 5 & 6**

<b>HIGHLY EFFECTIVE</b>			<b>EFFECTIVE</b>									<b>DEVELOPING</b>					<b>INEFFECTIVE</b>			
20	19	18	17	16	15	14	13	12	11	10	9	8	7	6	5	4	3	2	1	0
100%	95%-99%	90%-94%	85%-89%	80%-84%	75%-79%	70%-74%	65%-69%	60%-64%	55%-59%	50%-54%	45%-49%	40%-44%	35%-39%	30%-34%	25%-29%	20%-24%	15%-19%	10%-14%	5%-9%	0%-4%

Percentage of Students Meeting Growth targets

**MERRICK UFSD**  
**HEDI SCORING CHART**  
**APEX SLO**  
**GRADES 5 & 6**

<b>HIGHLY EFFECTIVE</b>			<b>EFFECTIVE</b>									<b>DEVELOPING</b>					<b>INEFFECTIVE</b>			
20	19	18	17	16	15	14	13	12	11	10	9	8	7	6	5	4	3	2	1	0
100%	95%- 99%	90%- 94%	85%- 89%	80%- 84%	75%- 79%	70%- 74%	65%- 69%	60%- 64%	55%- 59%	50%- 54%	45%- 49%	40%- 44%	35%- 39%	30%- 34%	25%- 29%	20%- 24%	15%- 19%	10%- 14%	5%- 9%	0%- 4%

**\*PERCENTAGE OF STUDENTS MEETING GROWTH TARGETS**

**MERRICK UFSD**  
**HEDI SCORING CHART**  
**GRADE 3 MATH**  
**GRADE 3 ELA**

<b>HIGHLY EFFECTIVE</b>			<b>EFFECTIVE</b>									<b>DEVELOPING</b>					<b>INEFFECTIVE</b>			
20	19	18	17	16	15	14	13	12	11	10	9	8	7	6	5	4	3	2	1	0
100%	95%- 99%	90%- 94%	85%- 89%	80%- 84%	75%- 79%	70%- 74%	65%- 69%	60%- 64%	55%- 59%	50%- 54%	45%- 49%	40%- 44%	35%- 39%	30%- 34%	25%- 29%	20%- 24%	15%- 19%	10%- 14%	5%- 9%	0%- 4%

\*Percentage of Students Meeting Growth targets

**MERRICK UFSD**  
**HEDI SCORING CHART**

**KINDERGARTEN ELA SLO (PAGE 1)**

**MERRICK UFSD ASSESSMENT 1**

<b>HIGHLY EFFECTIVE</b>			<b>EFFECTIVE</b>									<b>DEVELOPING</b>					<b>INEFFECTIVE</b>			
<b>20</b>	<b>19</b>	<b>18</b>	<b>17</b>	<b>16</b>	<b>15</b>	<b>14</b>	<b>13</b>	<b>12</b>	<b>11</b>	<b>10</b>	<b>9</b>	<b>8</b>	<b>7</b>	<b>6</b>	<b>5</b>	<b>4</b>	<b>3</b>	<b>2</b>	<b>1</b>	<b>0</b>
100%	96%-99%	92%-95%	87%-91%	83%-86%	79%-82%	75%-78%	71%-74%	66%-70%	62%-65%	58%-61%	54%-57%	48%-53%	42%-47%	36%-41%	30%-35%	24%-29%	18%-23%	12%-17%	6%-11%	0%-5%

**MERRICK UFSD ASSESSMENT 2**

<b>HIGHLY EFFECTIVE</b>			<b>EFFECTIVE</b>									<b>DEVELOPING</b>					<b>INEFFECTIVE</b>			
<b>20</b>	<b>19</b>	<b>18</b>	<b>17</b>	<b>16</b>	<b>15</b>	<b>14</b>	<b>13</b>	<b>12</b>	<b>11</b>	<b>10</b>	<b>9</b>	<b>8</b>	<b>7</b>	<b>6</b>	<b>5</b>	<b>4</b>	<b>3</b>	<b>2</b>	<b>1</b>	<b>0</b>
100%	95%-99%	90%-94%	85%-89%	80%-84%	75%-79%	70%-74%	65%-69%	60%-64%	55%-59%	50%-54%	45%-49%	40%-44%	35%-39%	30%-34%	25%-29%	20%-24%	15%-19%	10%-14%	5%-9%	0%-4%

**MERRICK UFSD  
HEDI SCORING CHART**

**KINDERGARTEN ELASLO (PAGE 2)**

**MERRICK UFSD ASSESSMENT 3**

HIGHLY EFFECTIVE			EFFECTIVE									DEVELOPING					INEFFECTIVE			
20	19	18	17	16	15	14	13	12	11	10	9	8	7	6	5	4	3	2	1	0
100%	96%- 99%	92%- 95%	89%- 91%	85%- 88%	81%- 84%	77%- 80%	73%- 76%	70%- 72%	66%- 69%	62%- 65%	58%- 61%	52%- 57%	45%- 51%	39%- 44%	32%- 38%	26%- 31%	19%- 25%	13%- 18%	6%- 12%	0%- 5%

**MERRICK UFSD ASSESSMENT 4**

HIGHLY EFFECTIVE			EFFECTIVE									DEVELOPING					INEFFECTIVE			
20	19	18	17	16	15	14	13	12	11	10	9	8	7	6	5	4	3	2	1	0
100%	98%- 99%	96%- 97%	94%- 95%	92%- 93%	90%- 91%	88%- 89%	86%- 87%	84%- 85%	82%- 83%	80%- 81%	78%- 79%	69%- 77%	61%- 68%	53%- 60%	43%- 52%	35%- 42%	26%- 34%	17%- 25%	9%- 16%	0%- 8%

Percentage of Students Meeting Growth targets

**HEDI SCORE WILL BE CALCULATED AS FOLLOWS:**

**(ASSESSMENT 1 + ASSESSMENT 2 + ASSESSMENT 3 + ASSESSMENT 4 )DIVIDED BY 4 = TEACHER SCORE**

**ALL STUDENTS IN THIS GRADE LEVEL/SUBJECT TAKE ALL FOUR ASSESSMENTS.**

**MERRICK UFSD**  
**HEDI SCORING CHARTS**  
**GRADE 1 ELA SLO (PAGE 1)**

**MERRICK UFSD ASSESSMENT 1**

<b>HIGHLY EFFECTIVE</b>			<b>EFFECTIVE</b>									<b>DEVELOPING</b>					<b>INEFFECTIVE</b>			
<b>20</b>	<b>19</b>	<b>18</b>	<b>17</b>	<b>16</b>	<b>15</b>	<b>14</b>	<b>13</b>	<b>12</b>	<b>11</b>	<b>10</b>	<b>9</b>	<b>8</b>	<b>7</b>	<b>6</b>	<b>5</b>	<b>4</b>	<b>3</b>	<b>2</b>	<b>1</b>	<b>0</b>
100%	97%- 99%	94%- 96%	91%- 93%	88%- 90%	85%- 87%	82%- 84%	79%- 81%	76%- 78%	73%- 75%	70%- 72%	67%- 69%	60%- 66%	52%- 59%	45%- 51%	37%- 44%	30%- 36%	22%- 29%	15%- 21%	7%- 14%	0%- 6%

**MERRICK UFSD ASSESSMENT 2**

<b>HIGHLY EFFECTIVE</b>			<b>EFFECTIVE</b>									<b>DEVELOPING</b>					<b>INEFFECTIVE</b>			
<b>20</b>	<b>19</b>	<b>18</b>	<b>17</b>	<b>16</b>	<b>15</b>	<b>14</b>	<b>13</b>	<b>12</b>	<b>11</b>	<b>10</b>	<b>9</b>	<b>8</b>	<b>7</b>	<b>6</b>	<b>5</b>	<b>4</b>	<b>3</b>	<b>2</b>	<b>1</b>	<b>0</b>
100%	93%- 99%	86%- 92%	79%- 85%	72%- 78%	65%- 71%	58%- 64%	51%- 57%	44%- 50%	37%- 43%	30%- 36%	23%- 29%	20%- 22%	18%- 19%	15%- 17%	13%- 14%	10%- 12%	8%- 9%	5%- 7%	3%- 4%	0%- 2%

**MERRICK UFSD**  
**HEDI SCORING CHART S**  
**GRADE 1 ELA SLO (PAGE 2)**

MERRICK UFSD ASSESSMENT 3

<b>HIGHLY EFFECTIVE</b>			<b>EFFECTIVE</b>									<b>DEVELOPING</b>					<b>INEFFECTIVE</b>			
<b>20</b>	<b>19</b>	<b>18</b>	<b>17</b>	<b>16</b>	<b>15</b>	<b>14</b>	<b>13</b>	<b>12</b>	<b>11</b>	<b>10</b>	<b>9</b>	<b>8</b>	<b>7</b>	<b>6</b>	<b>5</b>	<b>4</b>	<b>3</b>	<b>2</b>	<b>1</b>	<b>0</b>
100%	96%- 99%	92%- 95%	89%- 91%	85%- 88%	81%- 84%	77%- 80%	73%- 76%	70%- 72%	66%- 69%	62%- 65%	58%- 61%	52%- 57%	45%- 51%	39%- 44%	32%- 38%	26%- 31%	19%- 25%	13%- 18%	6%- 12%	0%- 5%

Percentage of Students Meeting Growth targets

**HEDI SCORE WILL BE CALCULATED AS FOLLOWS:**

**(ASSESSMENT 1 + ASSESSMENT 2 + ASSESSMENT 3) DIVIDED BY 3 = TEACHER SCORE**

**ALL STUDENTS IN THIS GRADE LEVEL/SUBJECT TAKE ALL THREE ASSESSMENTS.**

**MERRICK UFSD**  
**HEDI SCORING CHARTS**  
**GRADE 2 ELA SLO**

**MERRICK UFSD ASSESSMENT 1**

<b>HIGHLY EFFECTIVE</b>			<b>EFFECTIVE</b>									<b>DEVELOPING</b>					<b>INEFFECTIVE</b>			
<b>20</b>	<b>19</b>	<b>18</b>	<b>17</b>	<b>16</b>	<b>15</b>	<b>14</b>	<b>13</b>	<b>12</b>	<b>11</b>	<b>10</b>	<b>9</b>	<b>8</b>	<b>7</b>	<b>6</b>	<b>5</b>	<b>4</b>	<b>3</b>	<b>2</b>	<b>1</b>	<b>0</b>
100%	97%- 99%	93%- 96%	90%- 92%	86%- 89%	83%- 85%	80%- 82%	76%- 79%	73%- 75%	69%- 72%	66%- 68%	63%- 65%	56%- 62%	49%- 55%	42%- 48%	35%- 41%	28%- 34%	21%- 27%	14%- 20%	7%- 13%	0%- 6%

**MERRICK UFSD ASSESSMENT 2**

<b>HIGHLY EFFECTIVE</b>			<b>EFFECTIVE</b>									<b>DEVELOPING</b>					<b>INEFFECTIVE</b>			
<b>20</b>	<b>19</b>	<b>18</b>	<b>17</b>	<b>16</b>	<b>15</b>	<b>14</b>	<b>13</b>	<b>12</b>	<b>11</b>	<b>10</b>	<b>9</b>	<b>8</b>	<b>7</b>	<b>6</b>	<b>5</b>	<b>4</b>	<b>3</b>	<b>2</b>	<b>1</b>	<b>0</b>
100%	97%- 99%	94%- 96%	90%- 93%	87%- 89%	84%- 86%	81%- 83%	78%- 80%	74%- 77%	71%- 73%	68%- 70%	65%- 67%	58%- 64%	50%- 57%	43%- 49%	36%- 42%	29%- 35%	22%- 28%	14%- 21%	7%- 13%	0%- 6%

Percentage of Students Meeting Growth targets

**HEDI SCORE WILL BE CALCULATED AS FOLLOWS:**

**(ASSESSMENT 1 +ASSESSMENT 2 ) DIVIDED BY 2 = TEACHER SCORE**

**ALL STUDENTS IN THIS GRADE LEVEL/SUBJECT TAKE BOTH ASSESSMENTS.**

Teacher Evaluation HEDI Table for 3.13

**NWEA - Measures of Academic Progress**

APPR Point	≥	<	HEDI Category
15	1.2		Highly Effective
14	0.9	1.2	Highly Effective
13	0.6	0.9	Effective
12	0.3	0.6	Effective
11	0	0.3	Effective
10	-0.3	0	Effective
9	-0.6	-0.3	Effective
8	-0.9	-0.6	Effective
7	-1.2	-0.9	Developing
6	-1.5	-1.2	Developing
5	-1.8	-1.5	Developing
4	-2.1	-1.8	Developing
3	-2.4	-2.1	Developing
2	-2.7	-2.4	Ineffective
1	-3	-2.7	Ineffective
0		-3	Ineffective

APPR Point	≥	<
20	1.3	
19	1.1	1.3
18	0.9	1.1
17	0.7	0.9
16	0.5	0.7
15	0.3	0.5
14	0.1	0.3
13	-0.1	0.1
12	-0.3	-0.1
11	-0.5	-0.3
10	-0.7	-0.5
9	-0.9	-0.7
8	-1.1	-0.9
7	-1.3	-1.1
6	-1.5	-1.3
5	-1.7	-1.5
4	-1.9	-1.7
3	-2.1	-1.9
2	-2.3	-2.1
1	-2.5	-2.3
0		-2.5

<b>HEDI Category</b>
Highly Effective
Highly Effective
Highly Effective
Effective
Effective
Effective
Effective
Effective
Effective
Effective
Effective
Effective
Effective
Developing
Ineffective
Ineffective
Ineffective

Teacher Evaluation HEDI Table for 3.13

**NWEA - Measures of Academic Progress**

APPR Point	≥	<	HEDI Category
15	1.2		Highly Effective
14	0.9	1.2	Highly Effective
13	0.6	0.9	Effective
12	0.3	0.6	Effective
11	0	0.3	Effective
10	-0.3	0	Effective
9	-0.6	-0.3	Effective
8	-0.9	-0.6	Effective
7	-1.2	-0.9	Developing
6	-1.5	-1.2	Developing
5	-1.8	-1.5	Developing
4	-2.1	-1.8	Developing
3	-2.4	-2.1	Developing
2	-2.7	-2.4	Ineffective
1	-3	-2.7	Ineffective
0		-3	Ineffective

APPR Point	≥	<
20	1.3	
19	1.1	1.3
18	0.9	1.1
17	0.7	0.9
16	0.5	0.7
15	0.3	0.5
14	0.1	0.3
13	-0.1	0.1
12	-0.3	-0.1
11	-0.5	-0.3
10	-0.7	-0.5
9	-0.9	-0.7
8	-1.1	-0.9
7	-1.3	-1.1
6	-1.5	-1.3
5	-1.7	-1.5
4	-1.9	-1.7
3	-2.1	-1.9
2	-2.3	-2.1
1	-2.5	-2.3
0		-2.5

<b>HEDI Category</b>
Highly Effective
Highly Effective
Highly Effective
Effective
Effective
Effective
Effective
Effective
Effective
Effective
Effective
Effective
Effective
Developing
Ineffective
Ineffective
Ineffective

# APPR Teacher Improvement Plan

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

Assignment: \_\_\_\_\_

Principal: \_\_\_\_\_

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

## 1. TARGETED GOALS: AREAS FOR IMPROVEMENT

- a. Instructional Planning
- b. Student Assessment
- c. Classroom Management
- d. Professional Responsibilities

## 2. EXPECTED OUTCOMES

- a. List of specific expectations related to targeted goals identified in Section I

## 3. RECOMMENDED ACTIVITIES

- a. List of specific activities related to targeted goals identified in Section I
  - i. Observe colleagues identified by Principal
  - ii. Attend workshops related to targeted goals
  - iii. Meetings with the principal and/or the assistant principal

## 4. RECOMMENDED RESOURCES

- a. Identify the lead evaluator who has oversight of the TIP
- b. List specific materials, people, workshop to be used to support the TIP
- c. Identify the instrument or rubrics used to monitor progress
- d. Danielson video or online PD (Educational Impact or ASCD )

5. EVIDENCE OF ACHIEVEMENT

- a. Identify how progress will be measured and/or assessed
- b. Specify next steps to be taken based upon progress or lack thereof

6. TIMELINE FOR MEASURING ACHIEVEMENT OF EXPECTED OUTCOMES

- a. Identify dates for classroom observations consistent with APPR Plan
- b. Identify dates for meetings with administrators related to each targeted goal
- c. Identify dates for quarterly assessment of overall progress

\_\_\_\_\_

Principal

\_\_\_\_\_

Date

\_\_\_\_\_

Teacher

\_\_\_\_\_

Date

# APPR Principal Improvement Plan

Principal: \_\_\_\_\_

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

Superintendent: \_\_\_\_\_

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

1. SPECIFIC AREAS FOR IMPROVEMENT: Identify specific areas in need of improvement. Develop specific, behaviorally written goals for the principal to accomplish during the period of the PIP.

2. EXPECTED OUTCOMES OF THE PIP: Identify specific recommendations for what the principal is expected to do to improve in the identified areas. Delineate specific, realistic, and achievable activities for the principal.

3. RESOURCES: Identify specific resources available to assist the principal to improve performance. Examples: colleagues; courses; workshops; peer visits; materials; etc.

4. RESPONSIBILITIES: Identify responsible administrator(s) and steps to be taken by administrator(s) and the principal throughout the PIP.

5. EVIDENCE OF ACHIEVEMENT: Identify how progress will be measured and assessed. Specify next steps to be taken based upon whether the principal is successful, partially successful, or unsuccessful in efforts to improve performance.

6. TIMELINE: Provide a specific timeline for implementation of the various components of the PIP and for the final completion of the PIP. Identify the dates for preparation of written documentation regarding the completion of the PIP.

\_\_\_\_\_  
Principal

\_\_\_\_\_  
Date

\_\_\_\_\_  
Superintendent

\_\_\_\_\_  
Date

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

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

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

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

- Assure that the evaluation system will be used as a significant factor for employment decisions and teacher and principal development
- Assure that the entire APPR plan will be completed for each teacher or principal as soon as practicable, but in no case later than September 1 of the school year next following the school year for which the classroom teacher or building principal's performance is being measured
- Assure that the district or BOCES will provide the teacher's or principal's score and rating on the locally selected measures subcomponent, if available, and on the other measures of teacher and principal effectiveness subcomponent for a teacher's or principal's annual professional performance review, in writing, no later than the last school day of the school year for which the teacher or principal is being measured
- Assure that the APPR plan will be posted on the district's or BOCES' website by September 10 or within 10 days after it is approved by the Commissioner, whichever is later
- Assure that accurate teacher and student data will be provided to the Commissioner in a format and timeline prescribed by the Commissioner
- Assure that the district or BOCES will report the individual subcomponent scores and the total composite effectiveness score for each classroom teacher and building principal in a manner prescribed by the Commissioner
- Certify that the district provides an opportunity for every classroom teacher and building principal to verify the subjects and/or student rosters assigned to them
- Assure that teachers and principals will receive timely and constructive feedback as part of the evaluation process
- Assure that any training course for lead evaluator certification addresses each of the requirements in the regulations, including specific considerations in evaluating teachers and principals of English Language Learners and students with disabilities
- Assure that educators who receive a Developing or Ineffective rating will receive a TIP or PIP plan, in accordance with the regulations, as soon as practicable but in no case later than 10 school days from the opening of classes in the school year following the performance year
- Assure that all evaluators and lead evaluators will be properly trained and that lead evaluators will be certified and recertified as necessary in accordance with the regulations
- Assure that the district or BOCES has appeal procedures that are consistent with the regulations and that they provide for the timely and expeditious resolution of an appeal
- Assure that, for teachers, all NYS Teaching Standards are assessed at least once per year, and, for principals, all Leadership Standards are assessed at least once per year
- Assure that it is possible for a teacher or principal to obtain each point in the scoring ranges, including 0 for each subcomponent and 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: 12/18/12



Teachers Union President Signature: Date: 12-18-12



Administrative Union President Signature: Date: 12-18-12



Board of Education President Signature: Date:

 12/18/12