THE STATE EDUCATION DEPARTMENT / THE UNIVERSITY OF THE STATE OF NEW YORK / ALBANY, NY 12234

COMMISSIONER OF EDUCATION
PRESIDENT OF THE UNIVERSITY OF THE STATE OF NEW YORK

August 24, 2012

Kenneth Eastwood, Superintendent
Middletown City School District
233 Wisner Avenue Ext
Middletown, NY 10940

Dear Superintendent Eastwood:

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 certification 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.

Pursuant to Education Law §3012-c and Subpart 30-2, the Department will continue to work with districts to help ensure compliance with the statute and the regulations. We will be analyzing data supplied by districts, BOCES, and/or schools and may ask for 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. Please be advised that, if any provisions of your APPR plan violate the statute or the regulations, the Department reserves the right to require your district to correct and/or resolve such violations.

The Department looks 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

c: John C. Pennoyer

NOTE: 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.

Annual Professional Performance Reviews: 2012-13

Created Thursday, June 21, 2012
Updated Thursday, August 23, 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 : 441000010000

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

441000010000

1.2) School District Name: MIDDLETOWN CITY SD

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

MIDDLETOWN CITY SD

1.3) School Improvement Grant (SIG) Districts Only

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

(No response)

1.4) Award Classification

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

- Governor’s Management Efficiency Grant

- Strengthening Teacher and Leader Effectiveness RFP (NYSED)

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, June 21, 2012
Updated Friday, August 24, 2012

Page 1

STATE-PROVIDED MEASURES OF STUDENT GROWTH

(25 points with an approved value-added measure)

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

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

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

2.1) Assurances

Please check the boxes below:

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

STUDENT LEARNING OBJECTIVES AS COMPARABLE GROWTH MEASURES (20 points)

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

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

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

If no State assessment or Regents exam exists:

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

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

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

State assessments, *required if one exists*

List of State-approved 3rd party assessments

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

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

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

2.2) Grades K-3 ELA

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

	ELA	Assessment
K	School-or BOCES-wide, group or team results based on State assessments	3-5 NYS ELA & 3-5 NYS Math
1	School-or BOCES-wide, group or team results based on State assessments	3-5 NYS ELA & 3-5 NYS Math
2	School-or BOCES-wide, group or team results based on State assessments	3-5 NYS ELA & 3-5 NYS Math

	ELA	Assessment
3	State assessment	3rd Grade State Assessment

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

Use this box, if needed, to describe the general process for assigning HEDI categories for these grades/subjects in this subcomponent. If needed, you may upload a table or graphic at 2.11, below.	Students in grades 3-5 will take Northwest Evaluation Association's (NWEA) Measures of Primary Progress (MPG)/Measures of Academic Progress (MAP) in ELA and Math. This fall testing will serve as pre-test data (baseline) for students in grades k-3. The baseline will be calculated using the following process: Step 1: Students take NWEA MPG/MAP in ELA and Math Step 2: Each student receives a scale score in ELA and Math Step 3: Scale scores for an entire building are averaged (grades 3-5) so that each building has a scale score average for ELA and one for Math. Step 4: These scale score averages (ELA and Math) are averaged to determine a final building scale score average (baseline). This baseline scale score average will be utilized for all teachers in grades k-3 to determine their point allocation on the HEDI rating scale for their state growth measure. See 2.11 for further details.
Highly Effective (18 - 20 points) Results are well-above state average for similar students (or District goals if no state test).	4 or more scale score points growth between pre-test (baseline) grade 3-5 ELA & Math NWEA MPG/MAP and post-test (summative) grade 3-5 NYS ELA & Math assessment.
Effective (9 - 17 points) Results meet state average for similar students (or District goals if no state test).	2.2-3 scale score points growth between pre-test (baseline) grade 3-5 ELA & Math NWEA MPG/MAP and post-test (summative) grade 3-5 NYS ELA & Math assessment.
Developing (3 - 8 points) Results are below state average for similar students (or District goals if no state test).	1.1-2.1 scale score points growth between pre-test (baseline) grade 3-5 ELA & Math NWEA MPG/MAP and post-test (summative) grade 3-5 NYS ELA & Math assessment.
Ineffective (0 - 2 points) Results are well-below state average for similar students (or District goals if no state test).	Negative growth - 1.0 scale score points growth between pre-test (baseline) grade 3-5 ELA & Math NWEA MPG/MAP and post-test (summative) grade 3-5 NYS ELA & Math assessment.

2.3) Grades K-3 Math

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

	Math	Assessment
K	School-or BOCES-wide, group or team results based on State assessments	3-5 NYS Math & 3-5 NYS ELA
1	School-or BOCES-wide, group or team results based on State assessments	3-5 NYS Math & 3-5 NYS ELA
2	School-or BOCES-wide, group or team results based on State assessments	3-5 NYS Math & 3-5 NYS ELA

	Math	Assessment
3	State assessment	3rd Grade State Assessment

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

Use this box, if needed, to describe the general process for assigning HEDI categories for these grades/subjects in this subcomponent. If needed, you may upload a table or graphic at 2.11, below.	Students in grades 3-5 will take Northwest Evaluation Association's (NWEA) Measures of Primary Progress (MPG)/Measures of Academic Progress (MAP) in ELA and Math. This fall testing will serve as pre-test data (baseline) for students in grades k-3. The baseline will be calculated using the following process: Step 1: Students take NWEA MPG/MAP in ELA and Math Step 2: Each student receives a scale score in ELA and Math Step 3: Scale scores for an entire building are averaged (grades 3-5) so that each building has a scale score average for ELA and one for Math. Step 4: These scale score averages (ELA and Math) are averaged to determine a final building scale score average (baseline). This baseline scale score average will be utilized for all teachers in grades k-3 to determine their point allocation on the HEDI rating scale for their state growth measure. See 2.11 for further details.
Highly Effective (18 - 20 points) Results are well-above state average for similar students (or District goals if no state test).	4 or more scale score points growth between pre-test (baseline) grade 3-5 ELA & Math NWEA MPG/MAP and post-test (summative) grade 3-5 NYS ELA & Math assessment.
Effective (9 - 17 points) Results meet state average for similar students (or District goals if no state test).	2.2-3.0 scale score points growth between pre-test (baseline) grade 3-5 ELA & Math NWEA MPG/MAP and post-test (summative) grade 3-5 NYS ELA & Math assessment.
Developing (3 - 8 points) Results are below state average for similar students (or District goals if no state test).	1.1-2.1 scale score points growth between pre-test (baseline) grade 3-5 ELA & Math NWEA MPG/MAP and post-test (summative) grade 3-5 NYS ELA & Math assessment.
Ineffective (0 - 2 points) Results are well-below state average for similar students (or District goals if no state test).	Negative growth - 1.0 scale score points growth between pre-test (baseline) grade 3-5 ELA & Math NWEA MPG/MAP and post-test (summative) grade 3-5 NYS ELA & Math assessment.

2.4) Grades 6-8 Science

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

	Science	Assessment
6	District, regional or BOCES-developed assessment	District Developed Assessment in Grade 6 Science
7	District, regional or BOCES-developed assessment	District Developed Assessment in Grade 7 Science

	Science	Assessment
8	State assessment	8th Grade State Science Assessment

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

Use this box, if needed, to describe the general process for assigning HEDI categories for these grades/subjects in this subcomponent. If needed, you may upload a table or graphic at	See 2.11 (page 2) for details.

2.11, below.	
Highly Effective (18 - 20 points) Results are well-above state average for similar students (or District goals if no state test).	71% or higher growth in number of students performing at proficiency (Score of 75 or above) from baseline to summative assessment.
Effective (9 - 17 points) Results meet state average for similar students (or District goals if no state test).	25-70% growth in number of students performing at proficiency (Score of 75 or above) from baseline to summative assessment.
Developing (3 - 8 points) Results are below state average for similar students (or District goals if no state test).	6-24% or growth in number of students performing at proficiency (Score of 75 or above) from baseline to summative assessment.
Ineffective (0 - 2 points) Results are well-below state average for similar students (or District goals if no state test).	Negative -5% growth in number of students performing at proficiency (Score of 75 or above) from baseline to summative assessment.

2.5) Grades 6-8 Social Studies

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

	Social Studies	Assessment
6	District, regional or BOCES-developed assessment	District Developed Assessment in Grade 6 Social Studies
7	District, regional or BOCES-developed assessment	District Developed Assessment in Grade 7 Social Studies
8	District, regional or BOCES-developed assessment	District Developed Assessment in Grade 8 Social Studies

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

Use this box, if needed, to describe the general process for assigning HEDI categories for these grades/subjects in this subcomponent. If needed, you may upload a table or graphic at 2.11, below.	See 2.11 (page 2) for details
Highly Effective (18 - 20 points) Results are well-above District goals for similar students.	71% or higher growth in number of students performing at proficiency (Score of 75 or above) from baseline to summative assessment.
Effective (9 - 17 points) Results meet District goals for similar students.	25-70% growth in number of students performing at proficiency (Score of 75 or above) from baseline to summative assessment.
Developing (3 - 8 points) Results are below District goals for similar students.	6-24% growth in number of students performing at proficiency (Score of 75 or above) from baseline to summative assessment.
Ineffective (0 - 2 points) Results are well-below District goals for similar students.	Negative -5% growth in number of students performing at proficiency (Score of 75 or above) from baseline to summative assessment.

2.6) High School Social Studies Regents Courses

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

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

		Assessment
Global 1	District, regional, or BOCES-developed assessment	District developed Social Studies assessment for Global I

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

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

Use this box, if needed, to describe the general process for assigning HEDI categories for these grades/subjects in this subcomponent. If needed, you may upload a table or graphic at 2.11, below.	See 2.11 (page 2) for details
Highly Effective (18 - 20 points) Results are well-above District goals for similar students.	71% or higher growth in number of students performing at proficiency (Score of 75 or above) from baseline to summative assessment.
Effective (9 - 17 points) Results meet District goals for similar students.	25-70% growth in number of students performing at proficiency (Score of 75 or above) from baseline to summative assessment.
Developing (3 - 8 points) Results are below District goals for similar students.	6-24% growth in number of students performing at proficiency (Score of 75 or above) from baseline to summative assessment.
Ineffective (0 - 2 points) Results are well-below District goals for similar students.	Negative -5% growth in number of students performing at proficiency (Score of 75 or above) from baseline to summative assessment.

2.7) High School Science Regents Courses

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

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

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

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

Use this box, if needed, to describe the general process for assigning HEDI categories for these grades/subjects in this subcomponent. If needed, you may upload a table or graphic at 2.11, below.	See 2.11 (page 2) for details
Highly Effective (18 - 20 points) Results are well-above District goals for similar students.	71% or higher growth in number of students performing at proficiency (Score of 75 or above) from baseline to summative assessment.
Effective (9 - 17 points) Results meet District goals for similar students.	25-70% growth in number of students performing at proficiency (Score of 75 or above) from baseline to summative assessment.
Developing (3 - 8 points) Results are below District goals for similar students.	6-24% growth in number of students performing at proficiency (Score of 75 or above) from baseline to summative assessment.
Ineffective (0 - 2 points) Results are well-below District goals for similar students.	Negative -5% growth in number of students performing at proficiency (Score of 75 or above) from baseline to summative assessment.

2.8) High School Math Regents Courses

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

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

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

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

Use this box, if needed, to describe the general process for assigning HEDI categories for these grades/subjects in this subcomponent. If needed, you may upload a table or graphic at 2.11, below.	See 2.11 (page 2) for details
Highly Effective (18 - 20 points) Results are well-above District goals for similar students.	71% or higher growth in number of students performing at proficiency (Score of 75 or above) from baseline to summative assessment.
Effective (9 - 17 points) Results meet District goals for similar students.	25-70% growth in number of students performing at proficiency (Score of 75 or above) from baseline to summative assessment.
Developing (3 - 8 points) Results are below District goals for similar students.	6-24% growth in number of students performing at proficiency (Score of 75 or above) from baseline to summative assessment.
Ineffective (0 - 2 points) Results are well-below District goals for similar students.	Negative -5% growth in number of students performing at proficiency (Score of 75 or above) from baseline to summative assessment.

2.9) High School English Language Arts

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

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

	High School English Courses	Assessment
Grade 9 ELA	District, regional or BOCES-developed assessment	District developed Grade 9 ELA assessment
Grade 10 ELA	District, regional or BOCES-developed assessment	District developed Grade 10 ELA assessment
Grade 11 ELA	Regents assessment	NYS Comprehensive English Regents

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

Use this box, if needed, to describe the general process for assigning HEDI categories for these grades/subjects in this subcomponent. If needed, you may upload a table or graphic at 2.11, below.	See 2.11 (page 2) for details
Highly Effective (18 - 20 points) Results are well-above District goals for similar students.	71% or higher growth in number of students performing at proficiency (Score of 75 or above) from baseline to summative assessment.
Effective (9 - 17 points) Results meet District goals for similar students.	25-70% growth in number of students performing at proficiency (Score of 75 or above) from baseline to summative assessment.
Developing (3 - 8 points) Results are below District goals for similar students.	6-24% growth in number of students performing at proficiency (Score of 75 or above) from baseline to summative assessment.
Ineffective (0 - 2 points) Results are well-below District goals for similar students.	Negative -5% growth in number of students performing at proficiency (Score of 75 or above) from baseline to summative assessment.

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
	all other teachers not named above grades K-5	School/BOCES-wide/group/team results based on State	Grades 3-5 NYS ELA and Math
	all other teachers not named above grades 9-12	School/BOCES-wide/group/team results based on State	NYS Comprehensive English Regents & NYS Integrated Algebra Regents
	all other teachers not named above grades 6-8	School/BOCES-wide/group/team results based on State	Grades 6-8 NYS ELA and Math

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

Use this box, if needed, to describe the general process for assigning HEDI categories for these grades/subjects in this subcomponent. If needed, you may upload a table or graphic at 2.11, below.	See chart 2.11 (page 1) for all other grades K-8 See chart 2.11 (page 3) for all other grades 9-12
Highly Effective (18 - 20 points) Results are well-above District goals for similar students.	Grades K-8 4 or more scale score points growth between pre-test (baseline) grade 3-5 & 6-8 ELA & Math NWEA MPG/MAP and post-test (summative) grade 3-5 & 6-8 NYS ELA & Math assessment. Grades 9-12 71% or higher growth in number of students performing at proficiency (Score of 75 or above) from baseline to summative assessment.
Effective (9 - 17 points) Results meet District goals for similar students.	Grades K-8 2.2-3.0 scale score points growth between pre-test (baseline) grade 3-5 & 6-8 ELA & Math NWEA MPG/MAP and post-test (summative) grade 3-5 & 6-8 NYS ELA & Math assessment. Grades 9-12 25-70% growth in number of students performing at proficiency (Score of 75 or above) from baseline to summative assessment.
Developing (3 - 8 points) Results are below District goals for similar students.	Grades K-8 1.1-2.1 scale score points growth between pre-test (baseline) grade 3-5 & 6-8 ELA & Math NWEA MPG/MAP and post-test (summative) grade 3-5 & 6-8 NYS ELA & Math assessment. Grades 9-12 6-24% growth in number of students performing at proficiency (Score of 75 or above) from baseline to summative assessment.
Ineffective (0 - 2 points) Results are well-below District goals for similar students.	Grades K-8 Negative growth - 1.0 scale score points growth between pre-test (baseline) grade 3-5 & 6-8 ELA & Math NWEA MPG/MAP and post-test (summative) grade 3-5 & 6-8 NYS ELA & Math assessment. Grades 9-12 Negative -5% growth in number of students performing at proficiency (Score of 75 or above) from baseline to summative assessment.

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

(No response)

2.11) HEDI Tables or Graphics

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

assets/survey-uploads/5364/144748-TXEtxx9bQW/State HEDI Section 2.11 - 8.24.pdf

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.

None

2.13) Teachers with more than one growth measure

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

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

2.14) Assurances

Please check all of the boxes below:

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

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

3. Local Measures (Teachers)

Created Tuesday, June 26, 2012
Updated Friday, August 24, 2012

Page 1

Locally Selected Measures of Student Achievement or Growth

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

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

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

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

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

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

Growth or achievement measure(s) from these options.

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

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

Measures based on:

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

3.1) Grades 4-8 ELA

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

	Locally-Selected Measure from List of Approved Measures	Assessment
4	6(ii) School wide measure computed locally	District developed Grade K-5 ELA & Math Assessments
5	6(ii) School wide measure computed locally	District developed Grade K-5 ELA & Math Assessments
6	6(ii) School wide measure computed locally	District developed Grade 6-8 ELA & Math Assessments

7	6(ii) School wide measure computed locally	District developed Grade 6-8 ELA & Math Assessments
8	6(ii) School wide measure computed locally	District developed Grade 6-8 ELA & Math Assessments

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

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

Use this box, if needed, to describe the general process for assigning HEDI categories for these grades/subjects in this subcomponent. If needed, you may upload a table or graphic at 3.3, below.	The process for assigning HEDI categories for grades 4-8 ELA is based on the percentage of students achieving proficiency (proficiency is reaching a score of 75 or above) on the District developed ELA and Math exam combined. See 3.3 for details.
Highly Effective (14 - 15 points) Results are well above District- or BOCES-adopted expectations for growth or achievement for grade/subject.	92-100% of students reaching proficiency (reaching a score of 75 or above) on District assessments.
Effective (8- 13 points) Results meet District- or BOCES-adopted expectations for growth or achievement for grade/subject.	60-91% of students reaching proficiency (reaching a score of 75 or above) on District assessments.
Developing (3 - 7 points) Results are below District- or BOCES-adopted expectations for growth or achievement for grade/subject.	41-59% of students reaching proficiency (reaching a score of 75 or above) on District assessments.
Ineffective (0 - 2 points) Results are well below District- or BOCES-adopted expectations for growth or achievement for grade/subject.	0-40% of students reaching proficiency (reaching a score of 75 or above) on District assessments.

3.2) Grades 4-8 Math

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

	Locally-Selected Measure from List of Approved Measures	Assessment
4	6(ii) School wide measure computed locally	District developed Grade K-5 ELA & Math Assessments
5	6(ii) School wide measure computed locally	District developed Grade K-5 ELA & Math Assessments
6	6(ii) School wide measure computed locally	District developed Grade 6-8 ELA & Math Assessments
7	6(ii) School wide measure computed locally	District developed Grade 6-8 ELA & Math Assessments
8	6(ii) School wide measure computed locally	District developed Grade 6-8 ELA & Math Assessments

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

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

Use this box, if needed, to describe the general process for assigning HEDI categories for these grades/subjects in this subcomponent. If needed, you may upload a table or graphic at 3.3, below.	The process for assigning HEDI categories for grades 4-8 Math is based on the percentage of students achieving proficiency (proficiency is reaching a score of 75 or above) on the District developed ELA and Math assessments combined. See 3.3 for details.
Highly Effective (14 - 15 points) Results are well above District- or BOCES-adopted expectations for growth or achievement for grade/subject.	92-100% of students reaching proficiency (reaching a score at or above 75) on District assessments.
Effective (8- 13 points) Results meet District- or BOCES-adopted expectations for growth or achievement for grade/subject.	60-91% of students reaching proficiency (reaching a score at or above 75) on District assessments.
Developing (3 - 7 points) Results are below District- or BOCES-adopted expectations for growth or achievement for grade/subject.	41-59% of students reaching proficiency (reaching a score at or above 75) on District assessments.
Ineffective (0 - 2 points) Results are well below District- or BOCES-adopted expectations for growth or achievement for grade/subject.	0-40% of students reaching proficiency (reaching a score at or above 75) on District assessments.

3.3) HEDI Tables or Graphics

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

assets/survey-uploads/5139/145926-rhJdBgDruP/Middletown Local HEDI Grades 4-8 ELA & Math Section 3.3.pdf

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

Growth or achievement measure(s) from these options.

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

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

Measures based on:

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

3.4) Grades K-3 ELA

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

	Locally-Selected Measure from List of Approved Measures	Assessment
K	6(ii) School-wide measure computed locally	District developed Grade K-5 ELA & Math Assessments
1	6(ii) School-wide measure computed locally	District developed Grade K-5 ELA & Math Assessments
2	6(ii) School-wide measure computed locally	District developed Grade K-5 ELA & Math Assessments
3	6(ii) School-wide measure computed locally	District developed Grade K-5 ELA & Math Assessments

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.	The process for assigning HEDI categories for grades K-3 ELA is based on the percentage of students achieving proficiency (students scoring at or above 75) on the District developed Grade K-5 ELA and Math assessments combined.
Highly Effective (18-20 points) Results are well above District- or BOCES-adopted expectations for growth or achievement for grade/subject.	89-100% of students reach proficiency (at or above 75) on the District assessments.
Effective (9-17 points) Results meet District- or BOCES-adopted expectations for growth or achievement for grade/subject.	60-88% of students reach proficiency (at or above 75) on the District assessments.
Developing (3 - 8 points) Results are below District- or BOCES-adopted expectations for growth or achievement for grade/subject.	50-59% of students reach proficiency (at or above 75) on the District assessments.
Ineffective (0 - 2 points) Results are well below District- or BOCES-adopted expectations for growth or achievement for grade/subject.	0-49% of students reach proficiency (at or above 75) on the District assessments.

3.5) Grades K-3 Math

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

	Locally-Selected Measure from List of Approved Measures	Assessment
K	6(ii) School-wide measure computed locally	District developed Grade K-5 ELA & Math Assessments
1	6(ii) School-wide measure computed locally	District developed Grade K-5 ELA & Math Assessments
2	6(ii) School-wide measure computed locally	District developed Grade K-5 ELA & Math Assessments
3	6(ii) School-wide measure computed locally	District developed Grade K-5 ELA & Math Assessments

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

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

Use this box, if needed, to describe the general process for assigning HEDI categories for these grades/subjects in this subcomponent. If needed, you may upload a table or graphic at 3.13, below.	The process for assigning HEDI categories for grades K-3 Math is based on the percentage of students achieving proficiency (students scoring at or above 75) on the District developed Grade K-5 ELA and Math assessments combined.

Highly Effective (18-20 points) Results are well above District- or BOCES-adopted expectations for growth or achievement for grade/subject.	89-100% of students reach proficiency (at or above 75) on the District assessments.
Effective (9-17 points) Results meet District- or BOCES-adopted expectations for growth or achievement for grade/subject.	60-88% of students reach proficiency (at or above 75) on the District assessments.
Developing (3 - 8 points) Results are below District -or BOCES-adopted expectations for growth or achievement for grade/subject.	50-59% of students reach proficiency (at or above 75) on the District assessments.
Ineffective (0 - 2 points) Results are well below District- or BOCES-adopted expectations for growth or achievement for grade/subject.	0-49% of students reach proficiency (at or above 75) on the District assessments.

3.6) Grades 6-8 Science

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

	Locally-Selected Measure from List of Approved Measures	Assessment
6	6(ii) School wide measure computed locally	District Developed Grade 6-8 ELA & Math Assessments
7	6(ii) School wide measure computed locally	District Developed Grade 6-8 ELA & Math Assessments
8	6(ii) School wide measure computed locally	District Developed Grade 6-8 ELA & Math Assessments

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

Use this box, if needed, to describe the general process for assigning HEDI categories for these grades/subjects in this subcomponent. If needed, you may upload a table or graphic at 3.13, below.	The process for assigning HEDI categories for grades 6-8 Science is based on the percentage of students achieving proficiency (students scoring at or above 75) on the District developed Grade 6-8 ELA & Math assessments.
Highly Effective (18 - 20 points) Results are well above District- or BOCES-adopted expectations for growth or achievement for grade/subject.	89-100% of students reach proficiency (at or above 75) on the District assessments.
Effective (9 - 17 points) Results meet District- or BOCES-adopted expectations for growth or achievement for grade/subject.	60-88% of students reach proficiency (at or above 75) on the District assessments.
Developing (3 - 8 points) Results are below District- or BOCES-adopted expectations for growth or achievement for grade/subject.	50-59% of students reach proficiency (at or above 75) on the District assessments
Ineffective (0 - 2 points) Results are well below District- or BOCES-adopted expectations for growth or achievement for grade/subject.	0-49% of students reach proficiency (at or above 75) on the District assessments.

3.7) Grades 6-8 Social Studies

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

	Locally-Selected Measure from List of Approved Measures	Assessment
6	6(ii) School wide measure computed locally	District Developed Grade 6-8 ELA & Math Assessment
7	6(ii) School wide measure computed locally	District Developed Grade 6-8 ELA & Math Assessment
8	6(ii) School wide measure computed locally	District Developed Grade 6-8 ELA & Math Assessment

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

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

Use this box, if needed, to describe the general process for assigning HEDI categories for these grades/subjects in this subcomponent. If needed, you may upload a table or graphic at 3.13, below.	The process for assigning HEDI categories for grades 6-8 Social Studies is based on the percentage of students achieving proficiency (students scoring at or above 75) on the District developed Grade 6-8 ELA & Math assessments.
Highly Effective (18 - 20 points) Results are well above District- or BOCES-adopted expectations for growth or achievement for grade/subject.	89-100% of students reach proficiency (at or above 75) on the District assessments.
Effective (9 - 17 points) Results meet District- or BOCES-adopted expectations for growth or achievement for grade/subject.	60-88% of students reach proficiency (at or above 75) on the District assessments.
Developing (3 - 8 points) Results are below District- or BOCES-adopted expectations for growth or achievement for grade/subject.	50-59% of students reach proficiency (at or above 75) on the District assessments.
Ineffective (0 - 2 points) Results are well below District- or BOCES-adopted expectations for growth or achievement for grade/subject.	0-49% of students reach proficiency (at or above 75) on the District assessments.

3.8) High School Social Studies

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

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

	Locally-Selected Measure from List of Approved Measures	Assessment
Global 1	6(ii) School wide measure computed locally	District Developed Grade 9-12 ELA & Math Assessments
Global 2	6(ii) School wide measure computed locally	District Developed Grade 9-12 ELA & Math Assessments
American History	6(ii) School wide measure computed locally	District Developed Grade 9-12 ELA & Math Assessments

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.	The process for assigning HEDI categories for High School Social Studies is based on the percentage of students achieving proficiency (students scoring at or above 75) on the District developed ELA & Math assessments grades 9-12.
Highly Effective (18 - 20 points) Results are well above District- or BOCES-adopted expectations for growth or achievement for grade/subject.	89-100% of students reach proficiency (at or above 75) on the District assessments.
Effective (9 - 17 points) Results meet District- or BOCES-adopted expectations for growth or achievement for grade/subject.	60-88% of students reach proficiency (at or above 75) on the District assessments.
Developing (3 - 8 points) Results are below District- or BOCES-adopted expectations for growth or achievement for grade/subject.	50-59% of students reach proficiency (at or above 75) on the District assessments.
Ineffective (0 - 2 points) Results are well below District- or BOCES-adopted expectations for growth or achievement for grade/subject.	0-49% of students reach proficiency (at or above 75) on the District assessments.

3.9) High School Science

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

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

	Locally-Selected Measure from List of Approved Measures	Assessment
Living Environment	6(ii) School wide measure computed locally	District Developed Grade 9-12 ELA & Math Assessments
Earth Science	6(ii) School wide measure computed locally	District Developed Grade 9-12 ELA & Math Assessments
Chemistry	6(ii) School wide measure computed locally	District Developed Grade 9-12 ELA & Math Assessments
Physics	6(ii) School wide measure computed locally	District Developed Grade 9-12 ELA & Math Assessments

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.	The process for assigning HEDI categories for High School Science is based on the percentage of students achieving proficiency (students scoring at or above 75) on the District developed ELA & Math assessments grades 9-12.
Highly Effective (18-20 points) Results are well above District- or BOCES-adopted expectations for growth or achievement for grade/subject.	89-100% of students reach proficiency (at or above 75) on the District assessments.
Developing (3 - 8 points) Results are below District- or BOCES-adopted expectations for growth or achievement for grade/subject.	60-88% of students reach proficiency (at or above 75) on the District assessments.
Effective (9 - 17points) Results meet District- or BOCES-adopted expectations for growth or achievement for grade/subject.	50-59% of students reach proficiency (at or above 75) on the District assessments.
Ineffective (0 - 2 points) Results are well below District- or BOCES-adopted expectations for growth or achievement for grade/subject.	0-49% of students reach proficiency (at or above 75) on the District assessments.

3.10) High School Math

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

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

	Locally-Selected Measure from List of Approved Measures	Assessment
Algebra 1	6(ii) School wide measure computed locally	District Developed Grade 9-12 ELA & Math Assessments
Geometry	6(ii) School wide measure computed locally	District Developed Grade 9-12 ELA & Math Assessments
Algebra 2	6(ii) School wide measure computed locally	District Developed Grade 9-12 ELA & Math Assessments

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

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

Use this box, if needed, to describe the general process for assigning HEDI categories for these grades/subjects in this subcomponent. If needed, you may upload a table or graphic at 3.13, below.	The process for assigning HEDI categories for High School Math is based on the percentage of students achieving proficiency (students scoring at or above 75) on the District developed ELA & Math assessments grades 9-12.
Highly Effective (18 - 20 points) Results are well above District- or BOCES-adopted expectations for growth or	89-100% of students reach proficiency (at or above 75) on the District assessments.

achievement for grade/subject.	
Effective (9 - 17 points) Results meet District- or BOCES-adopted expectations for growth or achievement for grade/subject.	60-88% of students reach proficiency (at or above 75) on the District assessments.
Developing (3 - 8 points) Results are below District- or BOCES-adopted expectations for growth or achievement for grade/subject.	50-59% of students reach proficiency (at or above 75) on the District assessments.
Ineffective (0 - 2 points) Results are well below District- or BOCES-adopted expectations for growth or achievement for grade/subject.	0-49% of students reach proficiency (at or above 75) on the District assessments.

3.11) High School English Language Arts

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

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

	Locally-Selected Measure from List of Approved Measures	Assessment
Grade 9 ELA	6(ii) School wide measure computed locally	District Developed Grade 9-12 ELA & Math Assessments
Grade 10 ELA	6(ii) School wide measure computed locally	District Developed Grade 9-12 ELA & Math Assessments
Grade 11 ELA	6(ii) School wide measure computed locally	District Developed Grade 9-12 ELA & Math Assessments

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.	The process for assigning HEDI categories for High School ELA is based on the percentage of students achieving proficiency (students scoring at or above 75) on the District developed ELA & Math assessments grades 9-12.
Highly Effective (18 - 20 points) Results are well above District- or BOCES-adopted expectations for growth or achievement for grade/subject.	89-100% of students reach proficiency (at or above 75) on the District assessments.
Effective (9 - 17 points) Results meet District- or BOCES-adopted expectations for growth or achievement for grade/subject.	60-88% of students reach proficiency (at or above 75) on the District assessments.
Developing (3 - 8 points) Results are below District- or BOCES-adopted expectations for growth or achievement for grade/subject.	50-59% of students reach proficiency (at or above 75) on the District assessments.

Ineffective (0 - 2 points) Results are well below District- or BOCES-adopted expectations for growth or achievement for grade/subject.	0-49% of students reach proficiency (at or above 75) on the District assessments.

3.12) All Other Courses

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

	Course(s) or Subject(s)	Locally-Selected Measure from List of Approved Measures	Assessment
	all other courses not named above K-5	6(ii) School wide measure computed locally	District Developed Grade K-5 ELA & Math Assessments
	all other courses not named above 9-12	6(ii) School wide measure computed locally	District Developed Grade 9-12 ELA & Math Assessments
	all other courses not named above 6-8	6(ii) School wide measure computed locally	District Developed Grade 6-8 ELA & Math Assessments

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

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

Use this box, if needed, to describe the general process for assigning HEDI categories for these grades/subjects in this subcomponent. If needed, you may upload a table or graphic at 3.13, below.	The process for assigning HEDI categories for High School ELA is based on the percentage of students achieving proficiency (students scoring at or above 75) on the District developed ELA & Math assessments.
Highly Effective (18 - 20 points) Results are well above District- or BOCES -adopted expectations for growth or achievement for grade/subject.	89-100% of students reach proficiency (at or above 75) on the District assessments.
Effective (9 - 17 points) Results meet District- or BOCES-adopted expectations for growth or achievement for grade/subject.	60-88% of students reach proficiency (at or above 75) on the District assessments.
Developing (3 - 8 points) Results are below District- or BOCES-adopted expectations for growth or achievement for grade/subject.	50-59% of students reach proficiency (at or above 75) on the District assessments.
Ineffective (0 - 2 points) Results are well below District- or BOCES-adopted expectations for growth or achievement for grade/subject.	0-49% of students reach proficiency (at or above 75) on the District assessments.

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

(No response)

3.13) HEDI Tables or Graphics

For questions 3.4 through 3.12 above, if you are using tables or other graphics to explain your general process for assigning HEDI categories, please combine all such tables or graphics into a single file, labeling each so it is clear which grades/subjects it applies to, and upload that file here.

assets/survey-uploads/5139/145926-y92vNseFa4/Middletown Local HEDI Section 3.13 8.24.pdf

3.14) Locally Developed Controls

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

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.

When applicable, a weighted average will be used, based on the number of students in each measure, to calcualte a composite score.

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 Tuesday, June 26, 2012
Updated Wednesday, August 22, 2012

Page 1

4.1) Teacher Practice Rubric

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

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

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

Danielson's Framework for Teaching (2011 Revised Edition)

(No response)

4.2) Points Within Other Measures

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

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

Is the following points assignment applicable to all teachers?

Yes

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

(No response)

Multiple (at least two) classroom observations by principal or other trained administrator, at least one of which must be unannounced [at least 31 points]	60
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	(No response)

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

(No response)

4.3) Survey Tools (if applicable)

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

(No response)

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

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

4.4) Assurances

Please check all of the boxes below:

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

4.5) Process for Assigning Points and Determining HEDI Ratings

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

See table Danielson Framework - Local 60%

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/5091/145982-eka9yMJ855/Danielson Revised Rubric Conversion Documents.pdf

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

Highly Effective: Overall performance and results exceed NYS Teaching Standards.	3.3-4 rubric weighted average score 59-60 rubric points (scoring band)
Effective: Overall performance and results meet NYS Teaching Standards.	2.5-3.2 rubric weighted average score 57-58 rubric points (scoring band)
Developing: Overall performance and results need improvement in order to meet NYS Teaching Standards.	1.5-2.4 rubric weighted average score 50-56 rubric points (scoring band)
Ineffective: Overall performance and results do not meet NYS Teaching Standards.	1-1.4 rubric weighted average score 0-49 rubric points (scoring band)

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	1
4.6) Observations of Probationary Teachers | Informal/Short	1
4.6) Observations of Probationary Teachers | Enter 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 probationary teachers be done in person, by video, or both?

- In Person

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

- In Person

4.7) Observations of Tenured Teachers

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

By building principals or other trained administrators

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

By trained in-school peer teachers or other trained reviewers

Formal/Long	0
Informal/Short	0

Independent evaluators

Formal/Long	0
Informal/Short	0

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

- In Person

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

- In Person

5. Composite Scoring (Teachers)

Created Tuesday, June 26, 2012
Updated Thursday, June 28, 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 Tuesday, June 26, 2012
Updated Thursday, August 23, 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/5265/145959-Df0w3Xx5v6/ECSDM TIP Document_2.pdf

6.3) Appeals Process

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

(1) the substance of the annual professional performance review

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

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

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

ECSDM APPR Appeal Process

Procedure for the 2012-2013 school year:

I. For the 2012-2013 school year, only an ineffective APPR composite rating may

be appealed.

II. The scope of any appeal will be limited to the following:
A. The substance of the individual's annual professional performance review (summative).
B. The District's adherence to the standards and methodologies required for such reviews, pursuant to Education Law 3012-c.
C. The adherence to the Commissioner's Regulations, as applicable to such reviews.
D. Compliance with any applicable locally negotiated procedures regarding annual professional performance reviews or improvements plans, as limited by Section I, above; or,
E. The District's issuance and/or implementation of the terms of the teacher improvement plan under Education Law 3012-c in connection with an ineffective rating for the 2012-2013 school year, and after the 2012-2013 school year, ineffective and developing rating.

III. A teacher may not file multiple appeals regarding the same performance review and required teacher improvement plan. All grounds for appeal must be electronically submitted with specificity within one appeal. Any grounds not submitted at the time the appeal is filed shall be deemed waived.

IV. In an appeal, the teacher has the responsibility of articulating the basis for the appeal and must provide the facts to support the appeal.

V. The following timelines will be strictly adhered to unless extended by mutual agreement. Every effort will be made to conduct the appeals in a timely and expeditious manner. Failure of the teacher to meet a timeline will nullify the appeal; failure of the evaluator to meet a timeline will allow movement of the appeal to the next level.

A. Level 1 – Evaluator

1. Informal – Within five (5) school days, following the summative conference date of an ineffective or developing APPR composite rating, as defined in Sections I and II, above, the teacher has the right to schedule a follow up meeting to informally discuss with the evaluator any and all related issues.

2. Formal - The appeal for an ineffective composite rating must be submitted electronically (to ensure evidence of adherence to the timeline) to the evaluator and the Association President in writing no later than ten (10) school days from the summative conference date when the teacher receives and discusses his/her summative. If an informal meeting was held (see above) with the evaluator, the written appeal must be electronically submitted within five (5) school days from the informal meeting but not to exceed ten (10) school days from the initial summative conference date.

a. When filing an appeal, the teacher must electronically submit a detailed written description of the specific grounds for the appeal citing relevant areas from the performance review. Along with the appeal, all supporting documentation must be electronically submitted, or specifically noted. Any grounds for appeal or any supporting documentation/information not submitted or noted at the time the appeal is filed shall not be considered.

b. Within five (5) school days of receipt of an appeal, the evaluator responsible for the issue(s) being appealed must electronically submit a detailed written response to the appeal to the teacher and the Association President. Along with the response, all supporting documentation must be electronically submitted, or specifically noted, as well as any additional documents or materials relevant to the response. Any supporting documentation/information not submitted or noted at the time the response is issued shall not be considered in the deliberations related to the resolution of the appeal.

B. Level 2 – Superintendent

1. Within two (2) school days of receipt of the Level 1 response, if a teacher is not satisfied with the resolution, the teacher must electronically submit the appeal to the Superintendent of Schools. The Superintendent will be provided with all documentation submitted in both the teacher's appeal and the evaluator's response.

2. Upon receipt of the teacher's appeal, the Superintendent will have seven (7) school days to conduct a meeting and electronically issue a decision. The Superintendent will conduct the meeting at which the teacher, the union representative of choice, and the evaluator will be allowed to present the arguments in support of the appeal and the response, respectively. The Superintendent will then electronically issue a written decision, which will be final and binding, to the teacher, the Association President, and the evaluator.

3. Whether the appeal is denied, upheld, or modified, such decision will set forth the reasons and factual basis for each determination on each of the specific grounds raised in the appeal. If the appeal is upheld, the Superintendent will modify a rating(s) and the composite score. In accordance with the timeline, the TIP process will then begin.

VI. If the appeal is denied, the entire appeals record will be part of the teacher's APPR. If the appeal is upheld, only the revised summative will be part of the teacher's APPR.

VII. This appeals procedure constitutes the exclusive means for initiating, reviewing, and resolving any and all appeals within the scope of Section I and II, above. A teacher may not resort to any other contractual grievance procedure for the resolution of these appeals, except as otherwise authorized by law.

VIII. Nothing in this appeals procedure will restrict the right of the District or the right of the teacher to proceed in accordance with otherwise standard practice. This will remain in compliance with education law 30-12C.

6.4) Training and Certification of Lead Evaluators and Evaluators

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

All evaluators are properly trained and lead evaluators, who complete an individual's performance review, are certified to conduct evaluations. In collaboration with the collective bargaining unit the District has selected the Danielson 2011 rubric which has contracted with Teachscape Inc. to conduct the lead evaluator and evaluator training. In compliance with this expectation, Teachscape provided training for all evaluators and lead evaluators on the Danielson 2011 rubric which included inter-rater reliability, evidence collection, knowledge of the four domains and 77 teacher behaviors/elements contained within the rubric, and collaborative and reflective practice. It is the intention of the District to provide ongoing training that will continue throughout the year by reviewing exemplars of best teaching practice utilizing online video and print resources. Utilization of video exemplars will give participants an opportunity to rate practice both independently and collaboratively with colleagues to build consistency in expectations across the district. Professional development opportunities throughout the year will focus on inter-rater reliability as well as evidence collection to be used in observations. Lead evaluators will be re-certified through ongoing, annual, participation in professional development courses that meet the requirements prescribed by the state. Re-certification will ensure that all evaluators and lead evaluators are engaged in the same process, providing a common approach for observing teaching practice, providing specific feedback, supported by evidence, aligned to consistent expectations.

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 Tuesday, June 26, 2012
Updated Thursday, June 28, 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-5
|	6-8
|	9-12
|	(No response)
|	(No response)
|	(No response)
|	(No response)

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

Please check the boxes below:

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
(No response)	(No response)	(No response)
(No response)	(No response)	(No response)
(No response)	(No response)	(No response)
(No response)	(No response)	(No response)
(No response)	(No response)	(No response)

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

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

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

(No response)

7.4) Special Considerations for Comparable Growth Measures

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

associated with the controls or adjustments.

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

(No response)

7.5) Principals with More Than One Growth Measure

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

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

7.6) Assurances -- Comparable Growth Measures

Please check all of the boxes below:

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

8. Local Measures (Principals)

Created Tuesday, June 26, 2012
Updated Friday, August 24, 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-5	(d) measures used by district for teacher evaluation	District Developed Grade K-5 ELA & Math Assessments
	6-8	(d) measures used by district for teacher evaluation	District Developed Grade 6-8 ELA & Math Assessments
	9-12	(e) 4, 5, and/or 6-year high school grad and/or dropout rates	Four year cohort graduation rate

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

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

Use this box, if needed, to describe the process for assigning HEDI categories. If needed, you may upload a table or graphic below.	See tables for details
Highly Effective (14 - 15 points) Results are well above District- or BOCES-adopted expectations for growth or achievement for grade/subject.	K-8 = 92-100% of students reached proficiency (score at or above 75) on District developed assessments. See table for more detail. 9-12 = 82-100% of students in the cohort graduate in four years (up to and including August).
Effective (8- 13 points) Results meet District- or BOCES-adopted expectations for growth or achievement for grade/subject.	K-8 = 60-91% of students reached proficiency (score at or above 75) on District developed assessments. See table for more detail. 9-12 = 76-81% of students in the cohort graduate in four years (up to and including August).

Developing (3 - 7 points) Results are below District- or BOCES-adopted expectations for growth or achievement for grade/subject.	K-8 = 41-59% of students reached proficiency (score at or above 75) on District developed assessments. See table for more detail. 9-12 = 65-75% of students in the cohort graduate in four years (up to and including August).
Ineffective (0 - 2 points) Results are well below District- or BOCES-adopted expectations for growth or achievement for grade/subject.	K-8 = 0-40% of students reached proficiency (score at or above 75) on District developed assessments. See table for more detail. 9-12 = 0-64% of students in the cohort graduate in four years (up to and including August).

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/5366/145869-qBFVOWF7fC/Local Measure Principals Section 8.1_2.pdf

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.	(No response)
Highly Effective (18 - 20 points) Results are well above District- or BOCES-adopted expectations for growth or achievement for grade/subject.	N/A
Effective (9- 17 points) Results meet District- or BOCES-adopted expectations for growth or achievement for grade/subject.	N/A
Developing (3 - 8 points) Results are below District- or BOCES-adopted expectations for growth or achievement for grade/subject.	N/A
Ineffective (0 - 2 points) Results are well below District- or BOCES-adopted expectations for growth or achievement for grade/subject.	N/A

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

(No response)

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

(No response)

8.3) Locally Developed Controls

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

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.

When applicable, a weighted average will be used, based on the number of students in each measure, to calculate a composite score.

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 Tuesday, June 26, 2012
Updated Thursday, June 28, 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.

Vanderbilt Assessment of Leadership in Education (VAL-ED)

(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.

Points on the rubric are weighted across domains. Ranges of rubric scores were determined to reflect the categories. Those scores were assigned to HEDI scoring bands.

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/5143/146001-pMADJ4gk6R/Val-Ed Scoring Chart - Middletown.pdf

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

Highly Effective: Overall performance and results exceed standards.	A distinguished leader exhibits learning-centered leadership behaviors at levels of effectiveness that are virtually certain to influence teachers positively and result in strong value-added to student achievement and social learning for all students. 55-60 points on the rubric
Effective: Overall performance and results meet standards.	A effective leader exhibits learning-centered leadership behaviors at levels of effectiveness that are likely to influennce teachers positively and result in acceptable value-added to student achievement and social learning for all students. 42-54 points on the rubric
Developing: Overall performance and results need improvement in order to meet standards.	A leader at the developing level of proficiency exhibits learning-centered leadership behaviors at levels of effectiveness that are likely to influence teachers positively and that result in acceptable value-added to student achievement and social learning for some sub-groups of students, but not all. 31-41 points on the rubric
Ineffective: Overall performance and results do not meet standards.	A leader at the ineffective level of proficiency exhibits learning-centered leadership behaviors at levels of effectiveness that are unlikely to influence teachers postively nor results in acceptable value-added to student achievement and social learning for students. 0-30 points on the rubric

Please provide the locally-negotiated 60 point scoring bands.

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

9.8) School Visits

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

Probationary Principals

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

Tenured Principals

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

10. Composite Scoring (Principals)

Created Tuesday, June 26, 2012
Updated Thursday, June 28, 2012

Page 1

Standards for Rating Categories

Growth or Comparable Measures

Locally-selected Measures of

growth or achievement

Other Measures of Effectiveness

(Teacher and Leader standards)

Highly

Effective

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

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

Overall performance and results exceed ISLLC leadership standards.

Effective

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

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

Overall performance and results meet ISLLC leadership standards.

Developing

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

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

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

Ineffective

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

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

Overall performance and results do not meet ISLLC leadership standards.

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

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

2012-13 where there is no Value-Added measure

Growth or Comparable Measures

Locally-selected Measures of

growth or achievement

Other Measures of Effectiveness

(60 points)

Overall

Composite Score

Highly Effective

18-20

18-20

Ranges determined locally--see below

91-100

Effective

9-17

9-17

75-90

Developing

3-8

3-8

65-74

Ineffective

0-2

0-2

0-64

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

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

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

2012-13 where Value-Added growth measure applies

Growth or Comparable Measures

Locally-selected Measures of

growth or achievement

Other Measures of Effectiveness

(60 points)

Overall

Composite Score

Highly Effective

22-25

14-15

Ranges determined locally--see above

91-100

Effective

10-21

8-13

75-90

Developing

3-9

3-7

65-74

Ineffective

0-2

0-2

0-64

11. Additional Requirements - Principals

Created Thursday, June 28, 2012
Updated Friday, August 24, 2012

Page 1

11.1) Assurances -- Improvement Plans

Please check the boxes below.

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

11.2) Attachment: Principal Improvement Plan Forms

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

assets/survey-uploads/5276/146982-Df0w3Xx5v6/ECSDM PIP.pdf

11.3) Appeals Process

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

(1) the substance of the annual professional performance review

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

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

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

ECSDM APPR Appeal Process

Procedure for the 2012-2013 school year:

I. For the 2012-2013 school year, only an ineffective APPR composite rating may be appealed.

II. The scope of any appeal will be limited to the following:
A. The substance of the individual's annual professional performance review (summative).
B. The District's adherence to the standards and methodologies required for such reviews, pursuant to Education Law 3012-c.
C. The adherence to the Commissioner's Regulations, as applicable to such reviews.
D. Compliance with any applicable locally negotiated procedures regarding annual professional performance reviews or improvements plans, as limited by Section I, above; or,
E. The District's issuance and/or implementation of the terms of the principal improvement plan under Education Law 3012-c in connection with an ineffective rating for the 2012-2013 school year, and after the 2012-2013 school year, ineffective and developing rating.

III. A principal may not file multiple appeals regarding the same performance review and required teacher improvement plan. All grounds for appeal must be electronically submitted with specificity within one appeal. Any grounds not submitted at the time the appeal is filed shall be deemed waived.

IV. In an appeal, the principal has the responsibility of articulating the basis for the appeal and must provide the facts to support the appeal.

V. The following timelines will be strictly adhered to unless extended by mutual agreement. Every effort will be made to conduct the appeals in a timely and expeditious manner. Failure of the principal to meet a timeline will nullify the appeal; failure of the evaluator to meet a timeline will allow movement of the appeal to the next level.

A. Level 1 – Evaluator

1. Informal – Within five (5) school days, following the summative conference date of an ineffective or developing APPR composite rating, as defined in Sections I and II, above, the principal has the right to schedule a follow up meeting to informally discuss with the evaluator any and all related issues.

2. Formal - The appeal for an ineffective composite rating must be submitted electronically (to ensure evidence of adherence to the timeline) to the evaluator and the Association President in writing no later than ten (10) school days from the summative conference date when the principal receives and discusses his/her summative. If an informal meeting was held (see above) with the evaluator, the written appeal must be electronically submitted within five (5) school days from the informal meeting but not to exceed ten (10) school days from the initial summative conference date.

a. When filing an appeal, the principal must electronically submit a detailed written description of the specific grounds for the appeal citing relevant areas from the performance review. Along with the appeal, all supporting documentation must be electronically submitted, or specifically noted. Any grounds for appeal or any supporting documentation/information not submitted or noted at the time the appeal is filed shall not be considered.
b. Within five (5) school days of receipt of an appeal, the evaluator responsible for the issue(s) being appealed must electronically submit a detailed written response to the appeal to the principal and the Association President. Along with the response, all supporting documentation must be electronically submitted, or specifically noted, as well as any additional documents or materials relevant to the response. Any supporting documentation/information not submitted or noted at the time the response is issued shall not be considered in the deliberations related to the resolution of the appeal.

B. Level 2 – Superintendent

1. Within two (2) school days of receipt of the Level 1 response, if a principal is not satisfied with the resolution, the principal must electronically submit the appeal to the Superintendent of Schools. The Superintendent will be provided with all documentation submitted in both the principal's appeal and the evaluator's response.

2. Upon receipt of the principal's appeal, the Superintendent will have seven (7) school days to conduct a meeting and electronically issue a decision. The Superintendent will conduct the meeting at which the principal, the union representative of choice, and the evaluator will be allowed to present the arguments in support of the appeal and the response, respectively. The Superintendent will then electronically issue a written decision, which will be final and binding, to the principal, the Association President, and the evaluator.

3. Whether the appeal is denied, upheld, or modified, such decision will set forth the reasons and factual basis for each determination on each of the specific grounds raised in the appeal. If the appeal is upheld, the Superintendent will modify a rating(s) and the composite score. In accordance with the timeline, the PIP process will then begin.

VI. If the appeal is denied, the entire appeals record will be part of the principal's APPR. If the appeal is upheld, only the revised summative will be part of the principalr's APPR.

VII. This appeals procedure constitutes the exclusive means for initiating, reviewing, and resolving any and all appeals within the scope of Section I and II, above. A principal may not resort to any other contractual grievance procedure for the resolution of these appeals, except as otherwise authorized by law.

VIII. Nothing in this appeals procedure will restrict the right of the District or the right of the principal to proceed in accordance with otherwise standard practice. This will remain in compliance with education law 30-12C.

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.

All evaluators will successfully complete various training courses that meet the requirements prescribed by the state. Evaluators and lead evaluators will be properly trained prior to completing an individual's performance review, and will be certified to conduct evaluations. In collaboration with the collective bargaining unit the District has selected the Vanderbilt Assessment of Leadership in Education (VAL-ED) rubric. It is the intention of the District to provide ongoing training that will continue throughout the year. Professional development opportunities throughout the year will focus on inter-rater reliability as well as evidence collection to be used in performance evaluations. Evaluators will be re-certified by through ongoing, annual, participation in professional development courses that meet the requirements prescribed by the state.

11.5) Assurances -- Evaluators

Please check the boxes below:

- Checked

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

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

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

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

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

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

(7) use of the Statewide Instructional Reporting System

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

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

- Checked

11.6) Assurances -- Principals

Please check all of the boxes below:

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

11.7) Assurances -- Data

Please check all of the boxes below:

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

12. Joint Certification of APPR Plan

Created Tuesday, June 26, 2012
Updated Friday, August 24, 2012

Page 1

12.1)Upload the Joint Certification of the APPR Plan

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

assets/survey-uploads/5581/145952-3Uqgn5g9Iu/Middletown Certfication 8.24.12.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.

Local Measure (15 pts.)

Principals K-8

Step 1: Using the HEDI chart below, determine category point value district developed ELA assessment.

Step 2: Using the HEDI chart below, determine category point value for district developed Math assessment.

Step 3: Calculate the composite category point value for ELA and Math based on the total number of students that took each test.

e.g. – If 1250 students took the district developed ELA exam and 86% of students scored proficient, the point value would be 12. If 1180 students took the district developed Math exam and 80% of students scored proficient (achieved a score of 75% or above), the point value would be 10. You then calculate the composite score. The points out of 20 is a weighted average. The weighted average includes the points and the number of students earning those points.

12 (ELA pts.) where 1250 students were tested = 12 * 1250 = 15000

10 (Math pts.) where 1180 students were tested = 10 * 1180 = 11800

15000 (ELA) + 11800 (Math) = 26800 total of both tests combined

26800 (total points of both tests combined) / 2430 (total number of student tested) = 11 pts.

11 out of a total of 20 pts. earned on the state side.

Category Rating	Highly Effective		Effective						Developing					Ineffective		
Category Point Value	15	14	13	12	11	10	9	8	7	6	5	4	3	2	1	0
% of students performing at proficiency	96-100	92-95	89-91	85-88	81-84	78-80	77-70	60-69	56-59	53-55	50-52	45 - 49	41-44	32-40	21-31	0-20

Local Measure (15 pts.)

Principals 9-12

Category Rating	Highly Effective		Effective						Developing					Ineffective		
Category Point Value	15	14	13	12	11	10	9	8	7	6	5	4	3	2	1	0
% of students in the cohort that graduate in 4 years (up to and including August).	91-100	82-90	81	80	79	78	77	76	75	72-74	69-71	67-68	65-66	42-64	21-41	0-20

State Growth (20 pts.)

Grade K-3 ELA & Math, all other subjects (grades K-8)

Pre-Test (Baseline) Calculation

Average scale score for grade 3-5 NWEA MAP ELA is **520** + Average scale score for grade 3-5 NWEA MAP Math is **530**

Add the two scale score averages together = **1050**

Total average scale score for pre-test = **1050** / 2 = Final average scale score for pre-test ELA & Math combined = **525**

Post-Test (Summative) Calculation

Average scale score for grade 3-5 NYS ELA is **523** + Average scale score for grade 3-5 NYS Math is **533**

Add the two scale score averages together = **1056**

Total average scale score = **1056** / 2 = Final average scale score for post-test ELA & Math combined = **528**

Final average scale score for pre-test – grade 3-5 NWEA ELA & Math = **525**

Final average scale score for post-test – grade 3-5 NYS ELA & Math = **528**

Growth = 3 scale score points

Score = 17 (Effective) out of 20 points earned on the state growth side

Category Rating	**Highly Effective**			**Effective**									**Developing**						**Ineffective**		
Category Point Value	20	19	18	17	16	15	14	13	12	11	10	9	8	7	6	5	4	3	2	1	0
Average building scale score growth	7 or more	5-6	4	3	2.9	2.8	2.7	2.6	2.5	2.4	2.3	2.2	2.1	1.9-2.0	1.7-1.8	1.5-1.6	1.3-1.4	1.1-1.2	1.0	0 Maintains	(-) Negative

State Growth (20 pts.)

Grade 6-8 Science & Social Studies, Global I, Global II, American History, Living Environment, Earth Science, Chemistry, Physics, Algebra I, Geometry, Algebra II, Grade 9 ELA, Grade 10, ELA, and Grade 11 ELA

Category Rating	**Highly Effective**			**Effective**									**Developing**						**Ineffective**		
Category Point Value	20	19	18	17	16	15	14	13	12	11	10	9	8	7	6	5	4	3	2	1	0
% Increase in # of students attaining proficiency (Score of 75 or above – Level 3 and 4) from pre-test to post-test	91-100	81-90	71-80	61-70	51-60	41-50	31-40	30	29	28	27	25-26	22-24	19-21	16-18	13-15	10-12	6-9	1-5	0	(-) Negative

Calculation Example:

Formula = # of students proficient/ # of students enrolled at time of testing

Class: 6th grade science

Class Size: **28** students

# of students at proficiency after pre-test = **8/28 = 29% proficient**

# of students that reach proficiency after post-test = **14/28 = 50% proficient**

Growth = 21% increase in proficiency

Teacher received 7 pts. (Developing)

State Growth (20 pts.)

All other subjects grades 9-12

Category Rating	Highly Effective			Effective									Developing						Ineffective		
Category Point Value	20	19	18	17	16	15	14	13	12	11	10	9	8	7	6	5	4	3	2	1	0
% Increase in # of students attaining proficiency (Score of 75 or above) from pre-test to post-test	91-100	81-90	71-80	61-70	51-60	41-50	31-40	30	29	28	27	25-26	22-24	19-21	16-18	13-15	10-12	6-9	1-5	0	(-) Negative

Calculation Example:

ELA
Pre-Test – Portion of NYS ELA Regents from previous school year
Formula = # of students proficient/ # of students tested **= average pre-test proficiency rate for ELA (baseline)**

Post –Test - NYS Comprehensive English Regents – Given at grade 11
Formula = # of students proficient/ # of students tested = **average post-test proficiency rate for ELA (summative)**

Calculate the amount of growth between pre-test (baseline) and post-test (summative) = **final average proficiency rate for ELA**

Math
Pre-Test – Portion of NYS Algebra Regents from previous school year
Formula = # of students proficient/ # of students tested **= average pre-test proficiency rate for Math (baseline)**

Post –Test - NYS Algebra Regents
Formula = # of students proficient/ # of students tested = **average post-test proficiency rate for Math (summative)**

Calculate the amount of growth between pre-test (baseline) and post-test (summative) = **final average proficiency rate for Math**

Final Calculation to determine HEDI rating:

Final average proficiency rate for ELA + final average proficiency rate for Math / 2 = Final average proficiency rate – HEDI point value

Local Measure (15 pts.) Grades 4-8 ELA & Math

Category Rating	Highly Effective		Effective						Developing					Ineffective		
Category Point Value	15	14	13	12	11	10	9	8	7	6	5	4	3	2	1	0
% of students performing at proficiency	96-100	92-95	89-91	85-88	78-84	71-77	66-70	60-65	56-59	53-55	50-52	45 - 49	41-44	32-40	21-31	0-20

Local Measure (20 pts.)

Grades K-3 ELA & Math, Grades 6-8 Science, Grades 6-8 Social Studies,
High School Social Studies, Science, Math, and ELA
All other subjects Grade K-12

Step 1: Using the HEDI chart below, determine category point value district developed ELA assessment.

Step 2: Using the HEDI chart below, determine category point value for district developed Math assessment.

Step 3: Calculate the composite category point value for ELA and Math based on the total number of students that took each test.

e.g. – If 1250 students took the district developed ELA exam and 86% of students scored proficient, the point value would be 17. If 1180 students took the district developed Math exam and 80% of students scored proficient (achieved a score of 75% or above), the point value would be 15. You then calculate the composite score. The points out of 20 is a weighted average. The weighted average includes the points and the number of students earning those points.

17 (ELA pts.) where 1250 students were tested = 17 * 1250 = 21250

15 (Math pts.) where 1180 students were tested = 15 * 1180 = 17700

21250 (ELA) + 17700 (Math) = 38950 total of both tests combined

38950 (total of both tests combined) / 2430 (total number of student tested) = 16 pts.

16 out of a total of 20 pts. earned on the state side.

Category Rating	**Highly Effective**			**Effective**									**Developing**						**Ineffective**		
Category Point Value	20	19	18	17	16	15	14	13	12	11	10	9	8	7	6	5	4	3	2	1	0
% of students performing at proficiency	95-100	92-94	89-91	86-88	83-85	80-82	75-79	72-74	69-71	66-68	63-65	60-62	58-59	56-57	54-55	52-53	51	50	31-49	16-30	0-15

Enlarged City School District of Middletown
Annual Professional Performance Review
Teacher Improvement Plan (TIP)

Description:

This component of the Annual Professional Performance Review plan is to provide specific assistance for teachers whose summative composite rating is either ineffective or developing. Teacher Improvement Plans (TIPs) are intended to help a teacher with professional performance and are not intended to be disciplinary in nature. In the TIP, the District proposes how it will help the teacher. TIPs are a collaborative effort between teacher and administrator demonstrating a level of mutual respect.

The Teacher Improvement Plan shall include, but not be limited to: scheduling of ongoing observations, ongoing professional dialogues, and providing specific strategies and activities. Refer to Section V–A of teacher Collective Bargaining Agreement (CBA). As a TIP is part of the evaluative process, all teachers are entitled to the MTA representative of choice throughout the process.

Criteria for evaluation:

- Domain 1: Planning and Preparation
  - A. Demonstrating Knowledge of Content and Pedagogy
  - B. Demonstrating Knowledge of Students
  - C. Setting Instructional Outcomes
  - D. Demonstrating Knowledge of Resources
  - E. Designing coherent Instruction
  - F. Designing Student Assessments
- Domain 2: Classroom Environment
  - A. Creating an environment of Respect and Rapport
  - B. Establishing a Culture for Learning
  - C. Managing Classroom Procedures
  - D. Managing Student Behavior
  - E. Organizing Physical space
- Domain 3: Instruction
  - A. Communicating with Students
  - B. Using Questioning and Discussion Techniques
  - C. Engaging Students in Learning
  - D. Using Assessment in Instruction
  - E. Demonstrating Flexibility and Responsiveness
- Domain 4: Teaching
  - A. Reflecting on Teaching
  - B. Maintaining Accurate Records
  - C. Communicating with Families
  - D. Participating in a Professional Community
  - E. Goring and Developing Professionally
  - F. Showing Professionalism

Timeline/Procedures:

1. On or before May 31st, the teacher will be notified through the yearly performance summative, of specific well-defined reasons for needing a Teacher Improvement Plan for the ensuing school year. At this time, the teacher and administrator will discuss and complete Section I on attached form.
2. On or before June 15th, the teacher and administrator will collaboratively develop a Teacher Improvement Plan, completing Sections II and III. This plan will include a summary of the area(s) requiring support and how improvement will be addressed (see attached form). The evidence that will be used to measure progress will be clearly delineated.
3. On or before the last teacher attendance day in June, the agreed upon Teacher Improvement Plan will be finalized and signed. The administrator will electronically submit the TIP to the Association President and the Superintendent.
4. On or before January 31st of the ensuing school year, the mid-year conference will be held to review and discuss progress, completing Section IV. The TIP with the written mid-year conference report will be electronically submitted by the administrator to the Association President and the Superintendent.
5. On or before April 30th, the end of year conference will be held citing evidence of objectives met from Sections I, II, and III. The entire document, with the end of the year conference report will be electronically submitted by the administrator to the Association President and the Superintendent.

Possible Resources:

- Courses (college or in-service)
- Videos
- Books
- Workshops
- Visitations

Possible Providers:

- Teacher Center
- NYSUT
- BOCES
- Private Agencies

Enlarged City School District of Middletown
Annual Professional Performance Review
Teacher Improvement Plan

Finalized Written Plan On or before June 15th - Complete I, II, and III at this time.

Mid-Year TIP Conference On or before January 31st - Complete IV at this time.

End of Year Conference On or before April 30th - Complete V at this time.

Name of Teacher _____

Position/Program _____

Name of Administrator _____

I. Area(s) requiring focused support as evidenced in summative evaluation

II. Specific objectives for improvement

III. Plan for improvement (activities and timeline; including teacher's and administrator's specific responsibilities)

Teacher's Signature _____ Date _____

Administrator's Signature _____ Date _____

IV. Mid-year TIP Conference summary with an indication of progress

Teacher's Signature _____ Date _____

Administrator's Signature _____ Date _____

V. End of Year Conference summary citing evidence from Sections I, II, and III

☐ Objectives of the Teacher Improvement Plan have been met

☐ Objectives of the Teacher Improvement Plan have not been met

Teacher's Signature _____ Date _____

Administrator's Signature _____ Date _____

Teacher's Comments (optional)

Teacher's Initials _____ Date _____

Administrator's Initials _____ Date _____
(Signifies the reading/review of teacher's comments)

Danielson's Framework for Teaching (2011 Revised Edition)
Conversion Flow Chart

		Step 1	Step 2	Step 3	Step 4	Step 5
		Determine Relative Value of Each Domain (hypo--to be negotiated)	Determine Relative Value of Each SubDomain as part of the Domain (hypo--to be negotiated)	Evaluator Gives Every Teacher a Rating of 1-4 in Each Subdomain (4=HE, 3=E, 2=D, 1=I) HYPO	Weigh Subdomain Scores	Total Domain Score
Domain1: Planning and Preparation		20%				
	A. Knowledge of Content and Pedagogy			20%		
	B. Knowledge of Students			15%		
	C. Setting Instructional Outcomes			15%	0	
	D. Knowledge of Resources			10%	0	
	E. Designing Coherent Instruction			25%	0	
	F. Designing Student Assessments			15%	0	
			100%			0
Domain 2: Classroom Environment		30%				
	A. Respect and Rapport			20%	0	
	B. Culture for Learning			15%	0	
	C. Managing Classroom Procedures			30%	0	
	D. Managing Student Behavior			25%	0	
	E. Organizing Physical Spaces			10%	0	
			100%			0
Domain 3: Instruction		30%				
	A. Communicating with Students			15%	0	
	B. Questioning/Prompts and Discussion			30%	0	
	C. Engaging Students in Learning			25%	0	
	D. Using Assessment in Instruction			20%	0	
	E. Using Flexibility and Responsiveness			10%	0	
			100%			0
Domain 4: Teaching		20%				
	A. Reflecting on Teaching			15%	0	
	B. Maintaining Accurate Records			20%	0	
	C. Communicating with Families			205	0	
	D. Participating in a Professional Community			10%	0	
	E. Growing and Developing Professionally			20%	0	
	F. Showing Professionalism			15%	0	

Vanderbilt Assessment of Leadership in Education

Performance Rubric

High Standards for Student Learning – 10
Description: The school leader ensures there are individual, team, and school goals for rigorous student academic and social learning.

Rigorous Curriculum – 15
Description: The school leader ensures ambitious academic content is provided to all students in core academic subjects.

Quality Instruction – 15
Description: The school leader ensures effective instructional practices maximize student academic and social learning.

Culture of Learning and Professional Behavior – 10
Description: The school leader ensures there are integrated communities of professional practice in the service of student academic and social learning — that is, a healthy school environment in which student learning is the central focus.

Connections to External Communities – 5
Description: The school leader ensures robust connections to the external community.

Performance Accountability – 5
Description: The school leader ensures individual and collective responsibility among the leadership, faculty, students, and the community for achieving the rigorous student academic and social learning goals.

Middletown
Val-Ed - Conversion Scale

HEDI Rating	Rubric Score (Val-Ed)	Scoring Bands – Points out of 60
Highly Effective	57-60	60
	55-56	59
Effective	49-54	58
	42-48	57
Developing	37-41	56
	36	55
	35	54
	34	53
	33	52
	32	51
	31	50
Ineffective	16-30	49
	0-15	0

Enlarged City School District of Middletown
Annual Professional Performance Review
Principal Improvement Plan (PIP)

Description:

This component of the Annual Professional Performance Review plan is to provide specific assistance for principals whose summative composite rating is either ineffective or developing. Principal Improvement Plans (PIPs) are intended to help a principal with professional performance and are not intended to be disciplinary in nature. In the PIP, the District proposes how it will help the principal. PIPs are a collaborative effort between principal and lead evaluator demonstrating a level of mutual respect.

The Principal Improvement Plan shall include, but not be limited to: scheduling of ongoing observations, ongoing professional dialogues, and providing specific strategies and activities. Refer to Section V–A of Administrators' Collective Bargaining Agreement (CBA). As a PIP is part of the evaluative process, all principals are entitled to the MAA representative of choice throughout the process.

Criteria for evaluation:

High Standards for Student Learning

- **Employs policies and practices for realizing high standards of student performance.**
- **Develops a plan for high standards of student performance that are measurable**
- **Maintains high standards of learning for students with special needs**
- **Uses data to guide actions for improving student learning**
- **Evaluates progress toward meeting student learning standards**

Rigorous Curriculum

- **Coordinates teacher collaboration to implement a rigorous curriculum**
- **Implements a rigorous curriculum in programs for students with special needs**
- **Supports professional development that deepens teachers' understanding of a rigorous curriculum**
- **Provides opportunities for teachers to work together to deliver a rigorous curriculum**
- **Advocates that all programs for students with special needs deliver a rigorous curriculum**
- **Disaggregates student achievement data to monitor the rigor of all curriculum programs**

Quality Instruction

- **Implements procedures to protect instructional time**
- **Secures resources necessary to deliver high quality instruction**
- **Provides professional development so all faculty have knowledge and skills for quality instruction**
- **Discusses instructional practices during faculty meetings**
- **Observes each teacher's instructional practices routinely to provide feedback**
- **Uses data to monitor the quality of instruction**

Culture of Learning and Professional Behavior

- **Treats all faculty fairly and with respect**
- **Creates a culture of trust**
- **Encourages teachers to learn from their most effective colleagues**
- **Provides recognition of faculty contributions to a positive school culture**
- **Communicates with teachers about aspects of a positive school environment focused on student learning**
- **Monitors disciplinary data to make determinations about school culture**

Connections to External Communities

- **Engages people, ideas, and resources to put into practice the activities necessary to realize high standards for student performance.**
- **Creates opportunities for parents to work with teachers on their child's instruction**
- **Provides opportunities for teachers to develop skills to work with parents**
- **Communicates with the media to publicize important events and accomplishments**
- **Discusses information on progress toward achieving school goals with families**

Performance Accountability

- **Identifies specific responsibilities for faculty so that students achieve high standards**
- **Plans for individual and collective accountability among faculty for student learning**
- **Builds behavioral and academic accountability measures with input from faculty**
- **Provides expertise to make decisions about holding students accountable for their learning**
- **Challenges faculty to hold all students accountable for achieving high levels of performance**
- **Advocates that all students are accountable for achieving high levels of performance**
- **Communicates to families how accountability results will be used for school improvement**
- **Discusses achievement test results with instructional teams and grade/departments**
- **Systematically collects and analyzes data to make judgments that guide decisions**
- **Monitors the accuracy and appropriateness of data used for student accountability**

Timeline/Procedures:

1. On or before May 31st, the principal will be notified through the yearly performance summative, of specific well-defined reasons for needing a Principal Improvement Plan for the ensuing school year. At this time, the principal and lead evaluator will discuss and complete Section I on attached form.
2. On or before June 15th, the principal and lead evaluator will collaboratively develop a Principal Improvement Plan, completing Sections II and III. This plan will include a summary of the area(s) requiring support and how improvement will be addressed (see attached form). The evidence that will be used to measure progress will be clearly delineated.

3. On or before the 10th school day in September, the agreed upon Principal Improvement Plan will be finalized and signed. The lead evaluator will electronically submit the PIP to the Association President and the Superintendent.
4. On or before January 31st of the ensuing school year, the mid-year conference will be held to review and discuss progress, completing Section IV. The PIP with the written mid-year conference report will be electronically submitted by the lead evaluator to the Association President and the Superintendent.
5. On or before April 30th, the end of year conference will be held citing evidence of objectives met from Sections I, II, and III. The entire document, with the end of the year conference report will be electronically submitted by the lead evaluator to the Association President and the Superintendent.

Possible Resources:

- Courses (college or in-service)
- Videos
- Books
- Workshops
- Visitations

Possible Providers:

- Teacher Center
- NYSUT
- BOCES
- Private Agencies

7/2009

Enlarged City School District of Middletown
Annual Professional Performance Review
Principal Improvement Plan

Finalized Written Plan	On or before June 15th - Complete I, II, and III at this time.
Mid-Year TIP Conference	On or before January 31st - Complete IV at this time.
End of Year Conference	On or before April 30th – Complete V at this time.

Name of Principal _____

Position/Program _____

Name of Lead Evaluator _____

I. Area(s) requiring focused support as evidenced in summative evaluation

II. Specific objectives for improvement

III. Plan for improvement (activities and timeline; including principal's and lead evaluators's specific responsibilities)

Principal's Signature _____ Date _____

Lead Evaluator's Signature _____ Date _____

IV. Mid-year PIP Conference summary with an indication of progress

Principal's Signature _____ Date _____

Lead Evaluator's Signature _____ Date _____

V. End of Year Conference summary citing evidence from Sections I, II, and III

☐ Objectives of the Principal Improvement Plan have been met

☐ Objectives of the Principal Improvement Plan have not been met

Principal's Signature _____ Date _____

Lead Evaluator's Signature _____ Date _____

Principal's Comments (optional)

Principal's Initials _____ Date _____

Evaluator's Initials _____ Date _____
(Signifies the reading/review of principal's comments)

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

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

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

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

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

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

Signatures, dates #3

Superintendent Signature: Date:

8-24-2012

Teachers Union President Signature: Date:

8-24-12

Administrative Union President Signature: Date: 8-24-12

Board of Education President Signature: Date:

Linda Knapp 8-24-2012