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

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

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

May 14, 2013

Revised

Robert Nole, Superintendent
New Hartford Central School District
33 Oxford Road
New Hartford, NY 13413

Dear Superintendent Nole:

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

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

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

Thank you again for your hard work.

Sincerely,

John B. King, Jr.
Commissioner

Attachment

c: Howard D. Mettelman

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

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

Annual Professional Performance Reviews: 2012-13

Created Wednesday, May 09, 2012
Updated Monday, May 06, 2013

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 :

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

411501060000

1.2) School District Name:

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

NEW HARTFORD CSD

1.3) School Improvement Grant (SIG) Districts Only

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

Not applicable

1.4) Award Classification

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

(No response)

1.5) Assurances

Please check all of the boxes below:

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

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

Submission of material changes to an approved APPR plan

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 Wednesday, May 09, 2012
Updated Tuesday, April 23, 2013

Page 1

STATE-PROVIDED MEASURES OF STUDENT GROWTH

(25 points with an approved value-added measure)

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

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

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

2.1) Assurances

Please check the boxes below:

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

STUDENT LEARNING OBJECTIVES AS COMPARABLE GROWTH MEASURES (20 points)

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

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

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

If no State assessment or Regents exam exists:

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

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

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

State assessments, *required if one exists*

List of State-approved 3rd party assessments

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

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

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

2.2) Grades K-3 ELA

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

	ELA	Assessment
K	District, regional, or BOCES-developed assessment	New Hartford District Developed Reading Assessment, Kindergarten
1	State-approved 3rd party assessment	STAR Reading Enterprise
2	State-approved 3rd party assessment	STAR Reading Enterprise

	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.	The District's two processes for determining student growth and assigning HEDI categories for this subcomponent are described below. For teachers using STAR Reading Enterprise, Grades 1 and 2, growth is measured by determining a teacher's Median Student Growth Percentile (MSGP). Students will take a STAR Reading Enterprise Assessment in the fall, prior to October 31 and again in the spring, prior to June 15. Following the spring assessment, STAR Reading Enterprise generates a Student Growth Percentile report for each student. STAR Reading Enterprise also generates a teacher MSGP. HEDI points are assigned as based on the teacher's MGSP as described on Table E. For teachers with more than one MSGP (Reading and Math, for example), the scores will be combined into one score for APPR purposes. The scores will be combined proportionally based on a teacher's class roster. For example, if Teacher A is a grade 1 teacher, then he/she is using STAR Enterprise Reading and STAR Enterprise Math as a Comparable Growth Measure. If her STAR Reading MSGP is 49 and her STAR Math MSGP is 51, then her HEDI Score is 12 (The reading score falls in the 14 point range and the math score falls in the 10 point range. These scores are combined and divided by 2). Kindergarten and Grade 3 teachers in collaboration with the principal will establish individual growth targets. Growth is measured by the percentage of students demonstrating growth comparing a baseline score from a pre-assessment or a score from students' prior academic performance and an end-of-year assessment score. Using Table A, an overall percentage of students who meet or exceed their individual growth targets will be applied. Then, using Table B, a corresponding 0-20 HEDI score will be determined. The end-of-year score for Kindergarten is a New Hartford developed Kindergarten Reading Assessment. For Grade 3, the end-of-course assessment is the New York State Grade 3 ELA Assessment.
Highly Effective (18 - 20 points) Results are well-above state average for similar students (or District goals if no state test).	See applicable uploaded attachment(s).
Effective (9 - 17 points) Results meet state average for similar students (or District goals if no state test).	See applicable uploaded attachment(s).
Developing (3 - 8 points) Results are below state average for similar students (or District goals if no state test).	See applicable uploaded attachment(s).
Ineffective (0 - 2 points) Results are well-below state average for similar students (or District goals if no state test).	See applicable uploaded attachment(s).

2.3) Grades K-3 Math

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

Math	Assessment

K	District, regional, or BOCES-developed assessment	New Hartford District-developed Math Assessment (B), Kindergarten
1	State-approved 3rd party assessment	STAR Enterprise Math
2	State-approved 3rd party assessment	STAR Enterprise Math

	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.	The District's two processes for determining student growth and assigning HEDI categories for this subcomponent are described below. For teachers using STAR Reading Enterprise, Grades 1-2, growth is measured by determining a teacher's Median Student Growth Percentile (MSGP). Students will take a STAR Enterprise Math Assessment in the fall, prior to October 31 and again in the spring, prior to June 15. Following the spring assessment, STAR Enterprise Math generates a Student Growth Percentile report for each student. STAR Enterprise Math also generates a teacher MSGP. HEDI points are assigned as based on the teacher's MGSP as described on Table E. For teachers with more than one MSGP (Reading and Math, for example), the scores will be combined into one score for APPR purposes. The scores will be combined proportionally based on a teacher's class rosterFor example, if Teacher A is a grade 1 teacher, then he/she is using STAR Enterprise Reading and STAR Enterprise Math as a Comparable Growth Measure. If her STAR Reading MSGP is 49 and her STAR Math MSGP is 51, then her HEDI Score is 12 (The reading score falls in the 14 point range and the math score falls in the 10 point range. These scores are combined and divided by 2). Kindergarten and Grade 3 teachers in collaboration with the principal will establish individual growth targets. Growth is measured by the percentage of students demonstrating growth by comparing a baseline score from a pre-assessment or a score from students' prior academic performance and an end-of-year assessment score. Using Table A, an overall percentage of students who meet or exceed their individual growth targets will be determined. Then, using Table B, a corresponding 0-20 HEDI score will be applied.The end-of-year score for Kindergarten is a New Hartford developed Kindergarten Math Assessment. For Grade 3, the end-of-course assessment is the New York State Grade 3 Math Assessment.

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

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	New Hartford District-developed Science Assessment, Grade 6
7	District, regional or BOCES-developed assessment	New Hartford District-developed Science Assessment, Grade 7 and Grade 7 Accelerated

	Science	Assessment
8	State assessment	8th Grade State Science Assessment

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

Use this box, if needed, to describe the general process for assigning HEDI categories for these grades/subjects in this subcomponent. If needed, you may upload a table or graphic at 2.11, below.	Teachers in collaboration with the principal will establish individual growth targets. Growth is measured by the percentage of students demonstrating growth comparing a baseline score from a pre-assessment or a score from students' prior academic performance and an end-of-year assessment score. Using Table A, an overall percentage of students who meet or exceed their individual growth targets will be applied. Then, using Table B, a corresponding 0-20 HEDI score will be determined. The process is as follows. • Collect and submit baseline data by October 5. • If needed, convert the baseline score into a four-point scale using Table C (for grades 7 and 8) and Table D (for grade 6). • Between June 1 and Regents week (or January 1 and Regents week for semester one classes), collect end of course evidence of student performance. • Convert the end of course evidence into a four-point scale using Table C (for grades 7 and 8) and Table D (for grade 6). • Using Table A, determine the growth of individual students.

	• Calculate percentage of students demonstrating growth. • Apply District Growth Target - 70% of students will demonstrate growth. • Determine HEDI scoring using Table B.
Highly Effective (18 - 20 points) Results are well-above state average for similar students (or District goals if no state test).	See applicable uploaded attachment(s).
Effective (9 - 17 points) Results meet state average for similar students (or District goals if no state test).	See applicable uploaded attachment(s).
Developing (3 - 8 points) Results are below state average for similar students (or District goals if no state test).	See applicable uploaded attachment(s).
Ineffective (0 - 2 points) Results are well-below state average for similar students (or District goals if no state test).	See applicable uploaded attachment(s).

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	New Hartford District-developed Social Studies Assessment, Grade 6
7	District, regional or BOCES-developed assessment	New Hartford District-developed Social Studies Assessment, Grade 7
8	District, regional or BOCES-developed assessment	New Hartford District-developed Social Studies Assessment, Grade 8

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.	Teachers in collaboration with the principal will establish individual growth targets. Growth is measured by the percentage of students demonstrating growth comparing a baseline score from a pre-assessment or a score from students' prior academic performance and an end-of-year assessment score. Using Table A, an overall percentage of students who meet or exceed their individual growth targets will be applied. Then, using Table B, a corresponding 0-20 HEDI score will be determined. The process is as follows. • Collect and submit baseline data by October 5. • If needed, convert the baseline score into a four-point scale using Table C (for grades 7 and 8) and Table D (for grade 6). • Between June 1 and Regents week (or January 1 and Regents week for semester one classes), collect end of course evidence of student performance. • Convert the end of course evidence into a four-point scale using Table C (for grades 7 and 8) and Table D (for grade 6).

	• Using Table A, determine the growth of individual students. • Calculate percentage of students demonstrating growth. • Apply District Growth Target - 70% of students will demonstrate growth. • Determine HEDI scoring using Table B.
Highly Effective (18 - 20 points) Results are well-above District goals for similar students.	See applicable uploaded attachment(s).
Effective (9 - 17 points) Results meet District goals for similar students.	See applicable uploaded attachment(s).
Developing (3 - 8 points) Results are below District goals for similar students.	See applicable uploaded attachment(s).
Ineffective (0 - 2 points) Results are well-below District goals for similar students.	See applicable uploaded attachment(s).

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	New Hartford District-developed Social Studies Assessment, Global 1

	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.	Teachers in collaboration with the principal will establish individual growth targets. Growth is measured by the percentage of students demonstrating growth comparing a baseline score from a pre-assessment or a score from students' prior academic performance and an end-of-year assessment score. Using Table A, an overall percentage of students who meet or exceed their individual growth targets will be applied. Then, using Table B, a corresponding 0-20 HEDI score will be determined. The process is as follows. • Collect and submit baseline data by October 5. • If needed, convert the baseline score into a four-point scale using Table C.

	• Between June 1 and Regents week (or January 1 and Regents week for semester one classes), collect end of course evidence of student performance. • Convert the end of course evidence into a four-point scale using Table C. • Using Table A, determine the growth of individual students. • Calculate percentage of students demonstrating growth. • Apply District Growth Target - 70% of students will demonstrate growth. • Determine HEDI scoring using Table B.
Highly Effective (18 - 20 points) Results are well-above District goals for similar students.	See applicable uploaded attachment(s).
Effective (9 - 17 points) Results meet District goals for similar students.	See applicable uploaded attachment(s).
Developing (3 - 8 points) Results are below District goals for similar students.	See applicable uploaded attachment(s).
Ineffective (0 - 2 points) Results are well-below District goals for similar students.	See applicable uploaded attachment(s).

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.	Teachers in collaboration with the principal will establish individual growth targets. Growth is measured by the percentage of students demonstrating growth comparing a baseline score from a pre-assessment or a score from students' prior academic performance and an end-of-year assessment score. Using Table A, an overall percentage of students who meet or exceed their individual growth targets will be applied. Then, using Table B, a corresponding 0-20 HEDI score will be determined. The process is as follows. • Collect and submit baseline data by October 5.

	• If needed, convert the baseline score into a four-point scale using Table C. • Between June 1 and Regents week (or January 1 and Regents week for semester one classes), collect end of course evidence of student performance. • Convert the end of course evidence into a four-point scale using Table C. • Using Table A, determine the growth of individual students. • Calculate percentage of students demonstrating growth. • Apply District Growth Target - 70% of students will demonstrate growth. • Determine HEDI scoring using Table B.
Highly Effective (18 - 20 points) Results are well-above District goals for similar students.	See applicable uploaded attachment(s).
Effective (9 - 17 points) Results meet District goals for similar students.	See applicable uploaded attachment(s).
Developing (3 - 8 points) Results are below District goals for similar students.	See applicable uploaded attachment(s).
Ineffective (0 - 2 points) Results are well-below District goals for similar students.	See applicable uploaded attachment(s).

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.	Teachers in collaboration with the principal will establish individual growth targets. Growth is measured by the percentage of students demonstrating growth comparing a baseline score from a pre-assessment or a score from students' prior academic performance and an end-of-year assessment score. Using Table A, an overall percentage of students who meet or exceed their individual growth targets will be applied. Then, using Table B, a corresponding 0-20 HEDI score will be determined. The process is as follows. • Collect and submit baseline data by October 5. • If needed, convert the baseline score into a four-point

	scale using Table C. • Between June 1 and Regents week (or January 1 and Regents week for semester one classes), collect end of course evidence of student performance. • Convert the end of course evidence into a four-point scale using Table C. • Using Table A, determine the growth of individual students. • Calculate percentage of students demonstrating growth. • Apply District Growth Target - 70% of students will demonstrate growth. • Determine HEDI scoring using Table B.
Highly Effective (18 - 20 points) Results are well-above District goals for similar students.	See applicable uploaded attachment(s).
Effective (9 - 17 points) Results meet District goals for similar students.	See applicable uploaded attachment(s).
Developing (3 - 8 points) Results are below District goals for similar students.	See applicable uploaded attachment(s).
Ineffective (0 - 2 points) Results are well-below District goals for similar students.	See applicable uploaded attachment(s).

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	New Hartford District-developed English Assessment, Grade 9
Grade 10 ELA	District, regional or BOCES-developed assessment	New Hartford District-developed English Assessment, Grade 10
Grade 11 ELA	Regents assessment	New Hartford New York State 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.	Teachers in collaboration with the principal will establish individual growth targets. Growth is measured by the percentage of students demonstrating growth comparing a baseline score from a pre-assessment or a score from students' prior academic performance and an end-of-year assessment score. Using Table A, an overall percentage of students who meet or exceed their individual growth targets will be applied. Then, using Table B, a corresponding 0-20 HEDI score will be determined. The process is as follows.

	• Collect and submit baseline data by October 5. • If needed, convert the baseline score into a four-point scale using Table C. • Between June 1 and Regents week (or January 1 and Regents week for semester one classes), collect end of course evidence of student performance. • Convert the end of course evidence into a four-point scale using Table C. • Using Table A, determine the growth of individual students. • Calculate percentage of students demonstrating growth. • Apply District Growth Target - 70% of students will demonstrate growth. • Determine HEDI scoring using Table B.
Highly Effective (18 - 20 points) Results are well-above District goals for similar students.	See applicable uploaded attachment(s).
Effective (9 - 17 points) Results meet District goals for similar students.	See applicable uploaded attachment(s).
Developing (3 - 8 points) Results are below District goals for similar students.	See applicable uploaded attachment(s).
Ineffective (0 - 2 points) Results are well-below District goals for similar students.	See applicable uploaded attachment(s).

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
	Orchestra	District, Regional or BOCES-developed	New Hartford District-developed String, Orchestra Performance Assessment, Grades 10-12
	Band	District, Regional or BOCES-developed	New Hartford District-developed Band Performance Assessment, Grades 7-12
	Vocal/General Music	District, Regional or BOCES-developed	New Hartford District-developed Vocal/General Music Assessment, Grades 7-12
	Participation in Government	District, Regional or BOCES-developed	New Hartford District-developed Social Studies Assessment, Participation in Government, Grade 12
	Advanced Placement US Gov't and Politics	District, Regional or BOCES-developed	New Hartford District-developed Social Studies Assessment, AP US Govt and Pol, Grade 12.
	Economics	District, Regional or BOCES-developed	New Hartford District-developed Social Studies Assessment, Economics, Grade 12
	Advanced Placement Economics	District, Regional or BOCES-developed	New Hartford District-developed Social Studies Assessment, AP Economics, Grade 12
	Humanitarian Law	District, Regional or BOCES-developed	New Hartford District-developed Social Studies Assessment, Humanitarian Law, Grades 10-12
	Psychology	District, Regional or BOCES-developed	New Hartford District-developed Social Studies Assessment, Psychology, Grades 10-12
	Advanced Placement Psychology	District, Regional or BOCES-developed	New Hartford District- developed Social Studies Assessment, AP Psychology, Grades 11-12

	General Earth Science	District, Regional or BOCES-developed	New Hartford District-developed Science Assessment, General Earth Science, Grade 9
	AP Bio Prep	State Assessment	Living Environment Regents Exam
	Forensic Science I II	District, Regional or BOCES-developed	New Hartord District-developed Science Assessment, Forensic Science, Grades 10-12
	Earth Science	State Assessment	Earth Science Regents
	Ecology	District, Regional or BOCES-developed	New Hartford District-developed Science Assessment, Ecology, Grades 10-12
	Anatomy and Physiology	District, Regional or BOCES-developed	New Hartford District-developed Science Assessment, Anatomy and Physiology, Grades 10-12
	Advanced Placement Biology	District, Regional or BOCES-developed	New Hartford District-developed Science Assessment, Advanced Placement Biology, Grades 11-12
	Advanced Placement Chemistry	State Assessment	Chemistry Regents Exam
	Advanced Placement Physics	District, Regional or BOCES-developed	New Hartford District-developed Science Assessment, AP Physics, Grades 11-12

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.	Teachers in collaboration with the principal will establish individual growth targets. Growth is measured by the percentage of students demonstrating growth comparing a baseline score from a pre-assessment or a score from students' prior academic performance and an end-of-year assessment score. Using Table A, an overall percentage of students who meet or exceed their individual growth targets will be applied. Then, using Table B, a corresponding 0-20 HEDI score will be determined. The process is as follows. • Collect and submit baseline data by October 5. • If needed, convert the baseline score into a four-point scale using Table C. • Between June 1 and Regents week (or January 1 and Regents week for semester one classes), collect end of course evidence of student performance. • Convert the end of course evidence into a four-point scale using Table C. • Using Table A, determine the growth of individual students. • Calculate percentage of students demonstrating growth. • Apply District Growth Target - 70% of students will demonstrate growth. • Determine HEDI scoring using Table B. For special education teachers in grades 4-8, 11, will receive the same HEDI score based on the overall percentage of students who have met or exceed individual growth targets. For special education teachers with students in more than one grade level, the scores will be

	combined proportionally based on the teacher's class roster.
Highly Effective (18 - 20 points) Results are well-above District goals for similar students.	See applicable uploaded attachment(s).
Effective (9 - 17 points) Results meet District goals for similar students.	See applicable uploaded attachment(s).
Developing (3 - 8 points) Results are below District goals for similar students.	See applicable uploaded attachment(s).
Ineffective (0 - 2 points) Results are well-below District goals for similar students.	See applicable uploaded attachment(s).

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

assets/survey-uploads/5364/127474-avH4IQNZMh/2.10 All Other Courses_3.docx

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/5364/127474-TXEtxx9bQW/Tables for Section 2 State Growth or Comparable Measures - Teacher_1.docx

2.12) Locally Developed Controls

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

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

There are no additional adjustments.

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 Wednesday, May 09, 2012
Updated Monday, May 06, 2013

Page 1

Locally Selected Measures of Student Achievement or Growth

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

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

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

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

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

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

Growth or achievement measure(s) from these options.

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

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

Measures based on:

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

3.1) Grades 4-8 ELA

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

	Locally-Selected Measure from List of Approved Measures	Assessment
4	4) State-approved 3rd party assessments	STAR Reading Enterprise
5	4) State-approved 3rd party assessments	STAR Reading Enterprise
6	4) State-approved 3rd party assessments	STAR Reading Enterprise
7	5) District, regional, or BOCES–developed assessments	New Hartford District-Developed English Assessment, Grade 7

8	5) District, regional, or BOCES–developed assessments	New Hartford District-Developed English Assessment, Grade 8

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.	For grades 4-6, HEDI categories will be assigned by determining the Median Student Growth Percentile (MSGP) for each teacher using STAR Enterprise Reading assessment. Students will take a STAR Enterprise Reading Assessment in the fall (prior to October 31) and again in the spring (prior to June 15). STAR generates a report determining the student growth percentile for each student as well as a Median Student Growth Percentile for each teacher. For teachers with more than one MSGP (Reading and Math, for example), the scores will be combined into one score for APPR purposes. The scores will be combined proportionally based on a teacher's class roster. For example, if Teacher A is a grade 1 teacher, then he/she is using STAR Enterprise Reading and STAR Enterprise Math as a Comparable Growth Measure. If her STAR Reading MSGP is 49 and her STAR Math MSGP is 51, then her HEDI Score is 12 (The reading score falls in the 14 point range and the math score falls in the 10 point range. These scores are combined and divided by 2). HEDI points are assigned based Table F. For grades 7 and 8, there are two achievement targets that will be combined to determine HEDI scores. One achievement target is a proficiency target (All Students) based on percentage of students scoring 65 or higher (or level 3 or higher). The second achievement target is a mastery target (85 – 100) based on the percentage of students scoring 85 or higher (or level 4 or higher).Calculating the HEDI score is a three-step process: 1) Determine the percentage of students who meet or exceed the proficiency benchmark of 65 or above; determine the corresponding HEDI proficiency points (All Students) using Table G. 2) Determine the percentage of students who meet or exceed the mastery benchmark of 85 or above; determine the corresponding HEDI mastery points (85 – 100) using Table G. 3) Determine the sum of proficiency and mastery points to get an overall HEDI score of 0 – 15 and then apply the HEDI categories.
Highly Effective (14 - 15 points) Results are well above District- or BOCES-adopted expectations for growth or achievement for grade/subject.	See applicable uploaded attachment(s).
Effective (8- 13 points) Results meet District- or BOCES-adopted expectations for growth or achievement for grade/subject.	See applicable uploaded attachment(s).
Developing (3 - 7 points) Results are below District- or BOCES-adopted expectations for growth or achievement for	See applicable uploaded attachment(s).

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

3.2) Grades 4-8 Math

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

	Locally-Selected Measure from List of Approved Measures	Assessment
4	4) State-approved 3rd party assessments	STAR Enterprise Math
5	4) State-approved 3rd party assessments	STAR Enterprise Math
6	4) State-approved 3rd party assessments	STAR Enterprise Math
7	6(ii) School wide measure computed locally	New Hartford District-Developed Math Assessment, Grade 7
8	6(ii) School wide measure computed locally	New Hartford District-Developed Math Assessment, Grade 8

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.	For grades 4-6, HEDI categories will be assigned by determining the Median Student Growth Percentile (MSGP) for each teacher using STAR Enterprise Math assessment. Students will take a STAR Enterprise Math Assessment in the fall (prior to October 31) and again in the spring (prior to June 15). STAR generates a report determining the student growth percentile for each student as well as a Median Student Growth Percentile for each teacher. For teachers with more than one MSGP (Reading and Math, for example), the scores will be combined into one score for APPR purposes. The scores will be combined proportionally based on a teacher's class roster. For example, if Teacher A is a grade 1 teacher, then he/she is using STAR Enterprise Reading and STAR Enterprise Math as a Comparable Growth Measure. If her STAR Reading MSGP is 49 and her STAR Math MSGP is 51, then her HEDI Score is 12 (The reading score falls in the 14 point range and the math score falls in the 10 point range. These scores are combined and divided by 2). HEDI points are assigned based Table F. For grades 7 and 8, there are two achievement targets that will be combined to determine HEDI scores. One achievement target is a proficiency target (All Students) based on percentage of students scoring 65 or higher (or level 3 or higher). The second achievement target is a mastery target (85 – 100) based on the percentage of students scoring 85 or higher (or level 4 or

	higher).Calculating the HEDI score is a three-step process: 1) Determine the percentage of students who meet or exceed the proficiency benchmark of 65 or above; determine the corresponding HEDI proficiency points (All Students) using Table G. 2) Determine the percentage of students who meet or exceed the mastery benchmark of 85 or above; determine the corresponding HEDI mastery points (85 – 100) using Table G. 3) Determine the sum of proficiency and mastery points to get an overall HEDI score of 0 – 15 and then apply the HEDI categories.
Highly Effective (14 - 15 points) Results are well above District- or BOCES-adopted expectations for growth or achievement for grade/subject.	See applicable uploaded attachment(s).
Effective (8- 13 points) Results meet District- or BOCES-adopted expectations for growth or achievement for grade/subject.	See applicable uploaded attachment(s).
Developing (3 - 7 points) Results are below District- or BOCES-adopted expectations for growth or achievement for grade/subject.	See applicable uploaded attachment(s).
Ineffective (0 - 2 points) Results are well below District- or BOCES-adopted expectations for growth or achievement for grade/subject.	See applicable uploaded attachment(s).

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/5139/127475-rhJdBgDruP/Tables for Section 3 Locally Selected Measures - Teachers.docx

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

Growth or achievement measure(s) from these options.

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

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

Measures based on:

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

the percentage of a teacher's students earning the advanced performance level (four) on the 4th grade ELA or math State assessments compared to those students' performance levels on the 3rd grade ELA or math State assessments)

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

3.4) Grades K-3 ELA

Using the drop-down boxes below, select the 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	5) District, regional, or BOCES–developed assessments	New Hartford District-developed Early Literacy Assessment, Kindergarten
1	5) District, regional, or BOCES–developed assessments	New Hartford District-developed Diagnostic Reading Assessment, Grade 1
2	5) District, regional, or BOCES–developed assessments	New Hartford District-developed Diagnostic Reading Assessment, Grade 2
3	4) State-approved 3rd party assessments	STAR Enterprise Reading

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.	For grade 3, HEDI categories will be assigned by determining the Median Student Growth Percentile (MSGP) for each teacher using STAR Reading assessment. Students will take a STAR Assessment in the fall (prior to October 31) and again in the spring (prior to June 15). STAR generates a report determining the student growth percentile for each student as well as a Median Student Growth Percentile for each teacher. For teachers with more than one MSGP (Reading and Math, for example), the scores will be combined into one score for APPR purposes. The scores will be combined proportionally based on a teacher's class roster. For example, if Teacher A is a grade 1 teacher, then he/she is using STAR Enterprise Reading and STAR Enterprise Math as a Comparable Growth Measure. If her STAR Reading MSGP is 49 and her STAR Math MSGP is 51, then her HEDI Score is 12 (The reading score falls in the 14 point range and the math score falls in the 10 point range. These scores are combined and divided by 2). HEDI points are assigned based on Table E. Kindergarten, Grade 1 and 2 teachers in collaboration with the principal will establish individual growth targets. Growth is measured by the percentage of students demonstrating growth comparing a baseline score from a pre-assessment or a score from students' prior academic performance and an end-of-year assessment score. Using Table A, an overall percentage of students who meet or exceed their individual growth targets will be applied. Then, using Table B, a corresponding 0-20 HEDI score will be determined.
Highly Effective (18-20 points) Results are well above District- or BOCES-adopted expectations for growth or achievement for grade/subject.	See applicable uploaded attachment(s).
Effective (9-17 points) Results meet District- or BOCES-adopted expectations for growth or achievement for grade/subject.	See applicable uploaded attachment(s).
Developing (3 - 8 points) Results are below District- or BOCES-adopted expectations for growth or achievement for grade/subject.	See applicable uploaded attachment(s).
Ineffective (0 - 2 points) Results are well below District- or BOCES-adopted expectations for growth or achievement for grade/subject.	See applicable uploaded attachment(s).

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	5) District, regional, or BOCES–developed assessments	New Hartford District-developed Math Assessment (A), Kindergarten
1	5) District, regional, or BOCES–developed assessments	New Hartford District-developed Math Assessment, Grade 1
2	5) District, regional, or BOCES–developed assessments	New Hartford District-developed Math Assessment, Grade 2
3	4) State-approved 3rd party assessments	STAR Enterprise Math

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

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

Use this box, if needed, to describe the general process for assigning HEDI categories for these grades/subjects in this subcomponent. If needed, you may upload a table or graphic at 3.13, below.	For grade 3, HEDI categories will be assigned by determining the Median Student Growth Percentile (MSGP) for each teacher using STAR Math assessment. Students will take a STAR Assessment in the fall (prior to October 31) and again in the spring (prior to June 15). STAR generates a report determining the student growth percentile for each student as well as a Median Student Growth Percentile for each teacher. For teachers with more than one MSGP (Reading and Math, for example), the scores will be combined into one score for APPR purposes. The scores will be combined proportionally based on a teacher's class roster. For example, if Teacher A is a grade 1 teacher, then he/she is using STAR Enterprise Reading and STAR Enterprise Math as a Comparable Growth Measure. If her STAR Reading MSGP is 49 and her STAR Math MSGP is 51, then her HEDI Score is 12 (The reading score falls in the 14 point range and the math score falls in the 10 point range. These scores are combined and divided by 2). HEDI points are assigned based on Table E. Kindergarten, Grade 1 and 2 teachers in collaboration with the principal will establish individual growth targets. Growth is measured by the percentage of students demonstrating growth comparing a baseline score from a pre-assessment or a score from students' prior academic performance and an end-of-year assessment score. Using Table A, an overall percentage of students who meet or exceed their individual growth targets will be applied. Then, using Table B, a corresponding 0-20 HEDI score will be determined.
Highly Effective (18-20 points) Results are well above District- or BOCES-adopted expectations for growth or achievement for grade/subject.	See applicable uploaded attachment(s).
Effective (9-17 points) Results meet District- or BOCES-adopted expectations for growth or achievement for grade/subject.	See applicable uploaded attachment(s).
Developing (3 - 8 points) Results are below District -or BOCES-adopted expectations for growth or achievement for grade/subject.	See applicable uploaded attachment(s).

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

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	5) District, regional, or BOCES–developed assessments	New Hartford District-developed Science Lab Performance Assessment,Grade 6
7	6(ii) School wide measure computed locally	New Hartford District-developed Science Assessment, Grade 7
8	6(ii) School wide measure computed locally	NYS Science 8 Exam

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.	For Science 6-8, there are two achievement targets that will be combined to determine HEDI scores. One achievement target is a proficiency target (All Students) based on percentage of students scoring 65 or higher (or level 3 or higher). The second achievement target is a mastery target (85 – 100) based on the percentage of students scoring 85 or higher (or level 4 or higher). For grade 7 and 8 all teachers will receive the same HEDI score. Calculating the HEDI score is a three-step process: 1) Determine the percentage of students who meet or exceed the proficiency benchmark of 65 or above; determine the corresponding HEDI proficiency points (All Students) using Table G for grades 7 and 8, and Table H for grade 6. 2) Determine the percentage of students who meet or exceed the mastery benchmark of 85 or above; determine the corresponding HEDI mastery points (85 – 100) using Table G for grades 7 and 8, and Table H for grade 6.. 3) Determine the sum of proficiency and mastery points to get an overall HEDI score using Table G for grades 7 and 8, and Table H for grade 6.
Highly Effective (18 - 20 points) Results are well above District- or BOCES-adopted expectations for growth or achievement for grade/subject.	See applicable uploaded attachment(s).
Effective (9 - 17 points) Results meet District- or BOCES-adopted expectations for growth or achievement for grade/subject.	See applicable uploaded attachment(s).
Developing (3 - 8 points) Results are below District- or BOCES-adopted expectations for growth or achievement for grade/subject.	See applicable uploaded attachment(s).
Ineffective (0 - 2 points) Results are well below District- or BOCES-adopted expectations for growth or achievement for grade/subject.	See applicable uploaded attachment(s).

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	5) District, regional, or BOCES–developed assessments	New Hartford District-developed Social Studies DBQ, Grade 6
7	6(ii) School wide measure computed locally	New Hartford District-developed Social Studies Assessment, Grade 7
8	6(ii) School wide measure computed locally	New Hartford District-developed Social Studies Assessment, Grade 8

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

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

Use this box, if needed, to describe the general process for assigning HEDI categories for these grades/subjects in this subcomponent. If needed, you may upload a table or graphic at 3.13, below.	For Social Studies 6-8, there are two achievement targets that will be combined to determine HEDI scores. One achievement target is a proficiency target (All Students) based on percentage of students scoring 65 or higher (or level 3 or higher). The second achievement target is a mastery target (85 – 100) based on the percentage of students scoring 85 or higher (or level 4 or higher). For grade 7 and 8 all teachers will receive the same HEDI score. Calculating the HEDI score is a three-step process: 1) Determine the percentage of students who meet or exceed the proficiency benchmark of 65 or above; determine the corresponding HEDI proficiency points (All Students) using Table G for grades 7 and 8, and Table H for grade 6. 2) Determine the percentage of students who meet or exceed the mastery benchmark of 85 or above; determine the corresponding HEDI mastery points (85 – 100) using Table G for grades 7 and 8, and Table H for grade 6.. 3) Determine the sum of proficiency and mastery points to get an overall HEDI score using Table G for grades 7 and 8, and Table H for grade 6.
Highly Effective (18 - 20 points) Results are well above District- or BOCES-adopted expectations for growth or achievement for grade/subject.	See applicable uploaded attachment(s).
Effective (9 - 17 points) Results meet District- or BOCES-adopted expectations for growth or achievement for grade/subject.	See applicable uploaded attachment(s).
Developing (3 - 8 points) Results are below District- or BOCES-adopted expectations for growth or achievement for grade/subject.	See applicable uploaded attachment(s).
Ineffective (0 - 2 points) Results are well below District- or BOCES-adopted expectations for growth or achievement for grade/subject.	See applicable uploaded attachment(s).

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	New Hartford District-developed Social Studies Assessment, Global 1
Global 2	6(ii) School wide measure computed locally	Global History Regents
American History	6(ii) School wide measure computed locally	US History and Government Regents

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.	For High School Social Studies, there are two achievement targets that will be combined to determine HEDI scores. One achievement target is a proficiency target (All Students) based on percentage of students scoring 65 or higher (or level 3 or higher). The second achievement target is a mastery target (85 – 100) based on the percentage of students scoring 85 or higher (or level 4 or higher). All teachers will receive the same HEDI score. Calculating the HEDI score is a three-step process: 1) Determine the percentage of students who meet or exceed the proficiency benchmark of 65 or above; determine the corresponding HEDI proficiency points (All Students) using Table G. 2) Determine the percentage of students who meet or exceed the mastery benchmark of 85 or above; determine the corresponding HEDI mastery points (85 – 100) using Table G. 3) Determine the sum of proficiency and mastery points to get an overall HEDI score using Table G.
Highly Effective (18 - 20 points) Results are well above District- or BOCES-adopted expectations for growth or achievement for grade/subject.	See applicable uploaded attachment(s).
Effective (9 - 17 points) Results meet District- or BOCES-adopted expectations for growth or achievement for grade/subject.	See applicable uploaded attachment(s).
Developing (3 - 8 points) Results are below District- or BOCES-adopted expectations for growth or achievement for grade/subject.	See applicable uploaded attachment(s).
Ineffective (0 - 2 points) Results are well below District- or BOCES-adopted expectations for growth or achievement for grade/subject.	See applicable uploaded attachment(s).

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	Living Environment Regents Exam
Earth Science	6(ii) School wide measure computed locally	Earth Science Regents Exam
Chemistry	6(ii) School wide measure computed locally	Chemistry Regents Exam
Physics	6(ii) School wide measure computed locally	Physics Regents Exam

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.	For High School Science, there are two achievement targets that will be combined to determine HEDI scores. One achievement target is a proficiency target (All Students) based on percentage of students scoring 65 or higher (or level 3 or higher). The second achievement target is a mastery target (85 – 100) based on the percentage of students scoring 85 or higher (or level 4 or higher). All teachers will receive the same HEDI score. Calculating the HEDI score is a three-step process: 1) Determine the percentage of students who meet or exceed the proficiency benchmark of 65 or above; determine the corresponding HEDI proficiency points (All Students) using Table G. 2) Determine the percentage of students who meet or exceed the mastery benchmark of 85 or above; determine the corresponding HEDI mastery points (85 – 100) using Table G. 3) Determine the sum of proficiency and mastery points to get an overall HEDI score using Table G.
Highly Effective (18-20 points) Results are well above District- or BOCES-adopted expectations for growth or achievement for grade/subject.	See applicable uploaded attachment(s).
Developing (3 - 8 points) Results are below District- or BOCES-adopted expectations for growth or achievement for grade/subject.	See applicable uploaded attachment(s).
Effective (9 - 17points) Results meet District- or BOCES-adopted expectations for growth or achievement for grade/subject.	See applicable uploaded attachment(s).
Ineffective (0 - 2 points) Results are well below District- or BOCES-adopted expectations for growth or achievement for	See applicable uploaded attachment(s).

grade/subject.

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	Algebra 1 Regents Exam
Geometry	6(ii) School wide measure computed locally	Geometry Regents Exam
Algebra 2	6(ii) School wide measure computed locally	Algebra 2 Regents Exam

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.	For High School Math, there are two achievement targets that will be combined to determine HEDI scores. One achievement target is a proficiency target (All Students) based on percentage of students scoring 65 or higher (or level 3 or higher). The second achievement target is a mastery target (85 – 100) based on the percentage of students scoring 85 or higher (or level 4 or higher). All teachers will receive the same HEDI score. Calculating the HEDI score is a three-step process: 1) Determine the percentage of students who meet or exceed the proficiency benchmark of 65 or above; determine the corresponding HEDI proficiency points (All Students) using Table G. 2) Determine the percentage of students who meet or exceed the mastery benchmark of 85 or above; determine the corresponding HEDI mastery points (85 – 100) using Table G. 3) Determine the sum of proficiency and mastery points to get an overall HEDI score using Table G.
Highly Effective (18 - 20 points) Results are well above District- or BOCES-adopted expectations for growth or achievement for grade/subject.	See applicable uploaded attachment(s).
Effective (9 - 17 points) Results meet District- or BOCES-adopted expectations for growth or achievement for grade/subject.	See applicable uploaded attachment(s).
Developing (3 - 8 points) Results are below District- or BOCES-adopted expectations for growth or achievement for grade/subject.	See applicable uploaded attachment(s).

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

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	New Hartford District-developed English Assessment, Grade 9
Grade 10 ELA	6(ii) School wide measure computed locally	New Hartford District-developed English Assessment, Grade 10
Grade 11 ELA	6(ii) School wide measure computed locally	Comprehensive English Regents

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.	For High School English, there are two achievement targets that will be combined to determine HEDI scores. One achievement target is a proficiency target (All Students) based on percentage of students scoring 65 or higher (or level 3 or higher). The second achievement target is a mastery target (85 – 100) based on the percentage of students scoring 85 or higher (or level 4 or higher). All teachers will receive the same HEDI score. Calculating the HEDI score is a three-step process: 1) Determine the percentage of students who meet or exceed the proficiency benchmark of 65 or above; determine the corresponding HEDI proficiency points (All Students) using Table G. 2) Determine the percentage of students who meet or exceed the mastery benchmark of 85 or above; determine the corresponding HEDI mastery points (85 – 100) using Table G. 3) Determine the sum of proficiency and mastery points to get an overall HEDI score using Table G.
Highly Effective (18 - 20 points) Results are well above District- or BOCES-adopted expectations for growth or achievement for grade/subject.	See applicable uploaded attachment(s).
Effective (9 - 17 points) Results meet District- or BOCES-adopted expectations for growth or achievement for grade/subject.	See applicable uploaded attachment(s).

Developing (3 - 8 points) Results are below District- or BOCES-adopted expectations for growth or achievement for grade/subject.	See applicable uploaded attachment(s).
Ineffective (0 - 2 points) Results are well below District- or BOCES-adopted expectations for growth or achievement for grade/subject.	See applicable uploaded attachment(s).

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
	Orchestra	6(ii) School wide measure computed locally	New Hartford District-developed String, Orchestra Performance Assessment
	Band	6(ii) School wide measure computed locally	New Hartford District-developed Band Performance Assessment
	Vocal/General Music	6(ii) School wide measure computed locally	New Hartford District-developed Vocal/General Music Assessment, Grades 7-12
	Physical Education K-6	5) District/regional/BOCES–developed	New Hartford District-developed Core Strength Assessment, Grades K-6
	Participation in Government	6(ii) School wide measure computed locally	New Hartford District-developed Social Studies Assessment, Participation in Government, Grade 12
	Advanced Placement US Gov't and Politics	6(ii) School wide measure computed locally	New Hartford District-developed Social Studies Assessment, AP US Govt and Pol, Grades 11-12
	Economics	6(ii) School wide measure computed locally	New Hartford District-developed Social Studies Assessment, Economics, Grade 12
	Advanced Placement Economics	6(ii) School wide measure computed locally	New Hartford District-developed Social Studies Assessment, AP Economics, Grade 12
	Humanitarian Law	6(ii) School wide measure computed locally	New Hartford District-developed Social Studies Assessment, Humanitarian Law, Grades 10-12
	Psychology	6(ii) School wide measure computed locally	New Hartford District-developed Social Studies Assessment, Psychology, Grades 10-12
	Advanced Placement Psychology	6(ii) School wide measure computed locally	New Hartford District-developed Social Studies Assessment, AP Psychology, Grades 11-12
	General Earth Science	6(ii) School wide measure computed locally	New Hartford District-developed Science Assessment, General Earth Science, Grade 9
	AP Bio Prep	6(ii) School wide measure computed locally	Living Environment Regents Exam
	Forensic Science I and II	6(ii) School wide measure computed locally	New Hartord District-developed Science Assessment, Forensic Science, Grades 10-12 I
	Earth Science	6(ii) School wide measure computed locally	Earth Science Regents
	Ecology	5) District/regional/BOCES–developed	New Hartford District-developed Science Assessment, Watershed Assessment, Grades 10-12
	Anatomy and Physiology	6(ii) School wide measure computed locally	New Hartford District-developed Science Assessment, Anatomy and Physiology, Grades 10-12

	Advanced Placement Biology	6(ii) School wide measure computed locally	New Hartford District-developed Science Assessment, Advanced Placement Biology, Grades 10-12
	Advanced Placement Chemistry	6(ii) School wide measure computed locally	Chemistry Regents Exam
	Advanced Placement Physics	6(ii) School wide measure computed locally	New Hartford District-developed Science Assessment, AP Physics, Grades 11-12

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.	For Other Courses the locally selected measure is an achievement measure with the exception of Ecology (for 2012-13) which is a growth measure using a different assessment than the one described in 2.10. For all courses using an achievement measure, there are two achievement targets that will be combined to determine HEDI scores. One achievement target is a proficiency target (All Students) based on percentage of students scoring 65 or higher (or level 3 or higher). The second achievement target is a mastery target (85 – 100) based on the percentage of students scoring 85 or higher (or level 4 or higher). All teachers will receive the same HEDI score. Calculating the HEDI score is a three-step process: 1) Determine the percentage of students who meet or exceed the proficiency benchmark of 65 or above; determine the corresponding HEDI proficiency points (All Students) using Table G. 2) Determine the percentage of students who meet or exceed the mastery benchmark of 85 or above; determine the corresponding HEDI mastery points (85 – 100) using Table G. 3) Determine the sum of proficiency and mastery points to get an overall HEDI score using Table G. Teachers using a growth measure (Ecology, 2012-13) will establish, in collaboration with the principal, individual growth targets. Growth is measured by the percentage of students demonstrating growth comparing a baseline score from a pre-assessment or a score from students' prior academic performance and an end-of-year assessment score. Using Table A, an overall percentage of students who meet or exceed their individual growth targets will be applied. Then, using Table B, a corresponding 0-20 HEDI score will be determined. The process is as follows. • Collect and submit baseline data by October 5. • If needed, convert the baseline score into a four-point scale using Table C.

	• Between June 1 and Regents week (or January 1 and Regents week for semester one classes), collect end of course evidence of student performance. • Convert the end of course evidence into a four-point scale using Table C. • Using Table A, determine the growth of individual students. • Calculate percentage of students demonstrating growth. • Apply District Growth Target - 70% of students will demonstrate growth. • Determine HEDI scoring using Table B.
Highly Effective (18 - 20 points) Results are well above District- or BOCES -adopted expectations for growth or achievement for grade/subject.	See applicable uploaded attachment(s).
Effective (9 - 17 points) Results meet District- or BOCES-adopted expectations for growth or achievement for grade/subject.	See applicable uploaded attachment(s).
Developing (3 - 8 points) Results are below District- or BOCES-adopted expectations for growth or achievement for grade/subject.	See applicable uploaded attachment(s).
Ineffective (0 - 2 points) Results are well below District- or BOCES-adopted expectations for growth or achievement for grade/subject.	See applicable uploaded attachment(s).

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

assets/survey-uploads/5139/127475-Rp0Ol6pk1T/3.10 Local Measures_1.docx

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/5139/127475-y92vNseFa4/Tables for Section 3 Locally Selected Measures - Teachers_1.docx

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.

There are no additional adjustments.

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.

Teachers with more than one locally selected measure will have scores combined commensurate with the ratio of students tested or the number of assessments administered to the same population.

3.16) Assurances

Please check all of the boxes below:

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

4. Other Measures of Effectiveness (Teachers)

Created Thursday, May 10, 2012
Updated Friday, April 19, 2013

Page 1

4.1) Teacher Practice Rubric

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

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

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

District Variance

(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	0
Observations by trained in-school peer teachers	0
Feedback from students using State-approved survey tool	0
Feedback from parents/caregivers using State-approved survey tool	0
Structured reviews of lesson plans, student portfolios and other teacher artifacts	0

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.

Teachers are assigned scores from the 1)Summative Evaluation Report, 2) The Professional Responsibilities/Collaboration Report, and 3) The Professional Growth Plan. This is a combined score from 0-60. This score is then converted to a scale score to determine HEDI points and quality rating. Details of this process are further described in the supporting document, "Process to Determine HEDI Other Measures."

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/5091/127941-eka9yMJ855/Other Measures 60_1.docx

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

Highly Effective: Overall performance and results exceed NYS Teaching Standards.	A converted score of 59-60 indicates an overall performance and results exceed standards
Effective: Overall performance and results meet NYS Teaching Standards.	A converted score of 57-58 indicates an overall performance and results meet standards.
Developing: Overall performance and results need improvement in order to meet NYS Teaching Standards.	A converted score of 50-56 indicates an overall performance and results need improvement in order to meet standards.
Ineffective: Overall performance and results do not meet NYS Teaching Standards.	A converted score of 49 or less indicates an overall performance and results do not meet standards.

Provide the ranges for the 60-point scoring bands.

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

4.6) Observations of Probationary Teachers

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

By building principals or other trained administrators

4.6) Observations of Probationary Teachers | Formal/Long	2
4.6) Observations of Probationary Teachers | Informal/Short	1
4.6) Observations of Probationary Teachers | Enter Total	3

By trained in-school peer teachers or other trained reviewers

Formal/Long	0
Informal/Short	0

Independent evaluators

Formal/Long	0
Informal/Short	0

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

- In Person

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

- In Person

4.7) Observations of Tenured Teachers

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

By building principals or other trained administrators

4.7) Observations of Tenured Teachers | Formal/Long	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 Wednesday, May 09, 2012
Updated Sunday, September 30, 2012

Page 1

Standards for Rating Categories

Growth or Comparable Measures

Locally-selected Measures of

growth or achievement

Other Measures of Effectiveness

(Teacher and Leader standards)

Highly

Effective

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

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

Overall performance and results exceed NYS Teaching Standards.

Effective

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

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

Overall performance and results meet NYS Teaching Standards.

Developing

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

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

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

Ineffective

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

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

Overall performance and results do not meet NYS Teaching Standards.

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

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

2012-13 where there is no Value-Added measure

Growth or Comparable Measures

Locally-selected Measures of

growth or achievement

Other Measures of Effectiveness

(60 points)

Overall

Composite Score

Highly Effective

18-20

18-20

Ranges determined locally--see below

91-100

Effective

9-17

9-17

75-90

Developing

3-8

3-8

65-74

Ineffective

0-2

0-2

0-64

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

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

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

2012-13 where Value-Added growth measure applies

Growth or Comparable Measures

Locally-selected Measures of

growth or achievement

Other Measures of Effectiveness

(60 points)

Overall

Composite Score

Highly Effective

22-25

14-15

Ranges determined locally--see above

91-100

Effective

10-21

8-13

75-90

Developing

3-9

3-7

65-74

Ineffective

0-2

0-2

0-64

6. Additional Requirements - Teachers

Created Wednesday, May 09, 2012
Updated Friday, April 19, 2013

Page 1

6.1) Assurances -- Improvement Plans

Please check the boxes below:

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

6.2) Attachment: Teacher Improvement Plan Forms

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

assets/survey-uploads/5265/127477-Df0w3Xx5v6/TIP Draft 1.docx

6.3) Appeals Process

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

(1) the substance of the annual professional performance review

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

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

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

Appeals Procedure
Section 3012-c of the Education Law establishes a comprehensive annual evaluation system for classroom teachers and building principals, as well as the issuance and implementation of improvement plans for teachers and principals whose performance is assessed as either Developing or Ineffective. To the extent that a teacher wishes to challenge a performance review and/or improvement plan under the new evaluation system, the law requires the establishment of an appeals procedure, the specifics of which

are to be locally negotiated pursuant to article XIV of the Civil Service Law.

APPEALS OF INEFFECTIVE AND DEVELOPING RATINGS ONLY
Appeals of annual professional performance reviews should be limited to those that rate a teacher as Ineffective or Developing only. Additional procedures may be appropriate where compensation decisions are linked to rating categories.

WHAT MAY BE CHALLENGED IN AN APPEAL
Appeal procedures should limit the scope of appeals under Education Law §3012-c to the following subjects:
(1) the school services' adherence to the standards and methodologies required for such reviews, pursuant to EducationLaw §3012-c;
(2) the adherence to the Commissioner's regulations, as applicable to such reviews;
(3) compliance with any applicable locally negotiated procedures applicable to annual professional performance reviews or improvement plans; and
(4) the school district's issuance and/or implementation of the terms of the teacher or principal improvement plan under Education Law §3012-c.

PROHIBITION AGAINST MORE THAN ONE APPEAL
A teacher/principal may not file multiple appeals regarding the same performance review or teacher improvement plan. All grounds for appeal must be raised with specificity within one appeal. Any grounds not raised at the time the appeal is filed shall be deemed waived.

BURDEN OF PROOF
In an appeal, the teacher has the burden of demonstrating a clear legal right to the relief requested and the burden of establishing the facts upon which petitioner seeks relief.

TIMEFRAME FOR FILING APPEAL
All appeals must be submitted in writing no later than 15 calendar days after the date when the teacher receives his or her annual professional performance review. If a teacher is challenging the issuance of a teacher improvement plan; appeals must be filed with 15 days of issuance of such plan. The failure to file an appeal within these timeframes shall be deemed a waiver of the right to appeal and the appeal shall be deemed abandoned. When filing an appeal, the teacher must submit a detailed written description of the specific areas of disagreement over his or her performance review, or the issuance and/or implementation of the terms of his or her improvement plan and any additional documents or materials relevant to the appeal. The performance review and/or improvement plan being challenged must also be submitted with the appeal. Any information not submitted at the time the appeal is filed shall not be considered.

TIMEFRAME FOR DISTRICT/BOCES RESPONSE
Within 15 calendar days of receipt of an appeal, the school district member(s) who issued the performance review or were or are responsible for either the issuance and/or implementation of the terms of the teacher's improvement plan must submit a detailed written response to the appeal. The response must include any and all additional documents or written materials specific to the point(s) of disagreement that support the school district's response and are relevant to the resolution of the appeal. Any such information that is not submitted at the time the response is filed shall not be considered in the deliberations related to the resolution of the appeal. The teacher initiating the appeal shall receive a copy of the response filed by the school district, and any and all additional information submitted with the response, at the same time the school district files its response.

DECISION-MAKER ON APPEAL
The superintendent of schools or the superintendent's designee shall render a decision except that the same individual who was responsible for making the final rating decision may not decide an appeal. In such case, the board of education shall appoint another person to decide the appeal.

DECISION
A written decision on the merits of the appeal shall be rendered no later than 30 calendar days from the date upon which the teacher filed his or her appeal. The appeal shall be based on a written record, comprised of the teacher's appeal papers and any documentary evidence accompanying the appeal, as well as the school district response to the appeal and additional documentary evidence submitted with such papers. The appeal shall be decided on the evaluation and/or improvement plan record maintained by the District alone. Upon request of the teacher, the Superintendent or designated Appeal Officer will provide him/her with an opportunity to meet to review the merits of the appeal (should the teacher elect to request one). However, no additional information or evidence beyond that already contained in the evaluation and/or improvement plan shall be considered by the Superintendent and/or Appeal Officer. Such decision shall be final. The decision shall set forth the reasons and factual basis for each determination on each of the specific issues raised in the teacher appeal. If the appeal is sustained, the reviewer may set aside a rating if it has been affected by substantial error or defect, modify a rating if it is affected by substantial error or defect or order a new evaluation if procedures have been violated. A copy of the decision shall be provided to the teacher and the evaluator or the person responsible for either issuing or

implementing the terms of an improvement plan, if that person is different.

EXCLUSIVITY OF §3012-C APPEAL PROCEDURE
The 3012-c appeal procedure shall constitute the exclusive means for initiating, reviewing and resolving any and all challenges and appeals related to a teacher's performance review and/or improvement plan. The decision by the Superintendent or his/her designee with respect to such appeal shall be final and binding, and not otherwise subject to the grievance and/or arbitration provisions contained within the collective bargaining agreement by and between the parties, or to review in any other forum including the Commissioner and/or the courts. Nothing in this paragraph shall preclude an employee from raising any substantive or procedural issues as an affirmative defense in a 3020-a proceeding. A teacher may not resort to any other contractual grievance procedures for the resolution of challenges and appeals related to a professional performance review and/or improvement plan, except as otherwise authorized by law.

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 lead evaluators attend 11 training sessions of 2-5 hours per session. The training includes the following.

Training of Evaluators
All administrator evaluators receive training in 11 sessions each lasting at least two hours. The training includes the following:

1) New York State Teaching Standards and Leadership Standards
2) Evidence-based observation
3) Application and use of Student Growth Percentile and VA Growth Model data
4) Application and use of the State-approved teacher or principal rubrics
5) Application and use of any assessment tools used to evaluate teachers and principals
6) Application and use of State-approved locally selected measures of student achievement
7) Use of the Statewide Instructional Reporting System
8) Scoring methodology used to evaluate teachers and principals
9) Specific considerations in evaluating teachers and principals of ELLs and students with disabilities
10) Local training on the use of the state approved New Hartford Framework for Teaching
11) Local training on the use of OASYS software to manage the classroom observation procedure

The Oneida-Herkimer-Madison BOCES office of Program and Professional Development Network Team and/or the New Hartford Central School Assistant Superintendent for Curriculum and Instruction conducts the training. The training emphasizes understanding the district teacher practice rubric, observing classrooms, collecting evidence, providing effective feedback, determining levels of teacher practice, inter-rater reliability and developmental supervision.

Upon completion of these sessions, the Superintendent of Schools certifies the administrators. All certified lead evaluators are approved as lead evaluators by the Board of Education. The District will follow a similar process to re-certify evaluators.

The process of inter-rater reliability will includes close examination of the approved rubric, observation simulation through video, and co-observing and rating classroom practice in the field with a lead evaluator and the Assistant Superintendent for Curriculum and Instruction.

Any administrator serving as an evaluator, including new administrators, shall be required to complete similar training, including all required elements of the training. Upon completion of the training, the Superintendent of Schools shall certify the administrator as an evaluator, and the Board of Education shall approve the certification.

The principals of each building shall serve as lead evaluators. Other trained administrators include the Superintendent of Schools, the Assistant Superintendent for Curriculum and Instruction, the Director of Student Services, and the Deans of Students for the high school and the junior high school.

The Assistant Superintendent of Curriculum and Instruction provides additional evaluator training. The training emphasizes understanding the district teacher practice rubric, observing classrooms, collecting evidence, providing effective feedback, determining levels of teacher practice, inter-rater reliability and developmental supervision.

6.5) Assurances -- Evaluators

Please check the boxes below:

- Checked

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

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

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

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

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

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

(7) use of the Statewide Instructional Reporting System

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

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

- Checked

6.6) Assurances -- Teachers

Please check all of the boxes below:

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

6.7) Assurances -- Data

Please check all of the boxes below:

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

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

Created Sunday, September 09, 2012
Updated Tuesday, November 20, 2012

Page 1

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

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

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

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

K-6
7-9
10-12
(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

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

Use this box, if needed, to describe the process for assigning HEDI categories in this subcomponent. If needed, you may upload a table or graphic below.	Not applicable. All principals are in buildings with Grades 4-8 ELA, Math and/or High School courses with State or Regents assessments. As such, NYSED will provide value-added measures. NYSED will also provide a HEDI subcomponent rating category and score from 0 to 25 points.
Highly Effective (18 - 20 points) Results are well above state average for similar students (or District goals if no state test).	Not applicable
Effective (9 - 17 points) Results meet state average for similar students (or District goals if no state test).	Not applicable
Developing (3 - 8 points) Results are below state average for similar students (or District goals if no state test).	Not applicable
Ineffective (0 - 2 points) Results are well below state average for similar students (or District goals if no state test).	Not applicable

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

(No response)

7.4) Special Considerations for Comparable Growth Measures

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

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

There are no additional adjustments.

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 Saturday, September 15, 2012
Updated Friday, April 19, 2013

Page 1

Locally-Selected Measures of Student Achievement or Growth

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

	Grade Configuration	Locally-Selected Measure from List of Approved Measures	Assessment
	K-6	(a) achievement on State assessments	State ELA and Math 4-6 Assessments
	7-9	(d) measures used by district for teacher evaluation	Earth Science, Living Environment, Algebra I and GeometryRegents Exams
	10-12	(d) measures used by district for teacher evaluation	All Regents Exams except Earth Science

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.	For Secondary Principals (7-9, 10-12), there are two achievement targets that will be combined to determine HEDI scores. One achievement target is a proficiency target (Regents Exams Scored 65-100) based on percentage of students scoring 65 or higher. The second achievement target is a mastery target (Regents Exams Scored 85 – 100) based on the percentage of students scoring 85 or higher. Calculating the HEDI score is a three-step process: 1) Calculate the percentage of students who meet or exceed the proficiency benchmark of 65 or above and determine the appropriate target met. Assign the appropriate number of HEDI points according to Table I. 2) Calculate the percentage of students who meet or exceed the mastery benchmark of 85 or above and determine the appropriate target met. Assign the

	appropriate number of HEDI points according to Table I. 3) Combine the HEDI points from steps 1 and 2 into a single score. Assign the HEDI category from Table I. For elementary principals (K-6), the process to determine student achievement is as follows: 1. Determine the percentage of students scoring at Levels 3 and 4 on the New York State ELA and Math Assessments for grades 4-6. 2. Combine the two averages (ELA and Math) into one combined score by adding the scores and dividing by two. 3. Using Table J determine the appropriate combined target met for each school. 4. Using the HEDI Points Section on Table J, apply the appropriate HEDI points and category.
Highly Effective (14 - 15 points) Results are well above District- or BOCES-adopted expectations for growth or achievement for grade/subject.	Refer to Table I for secondary principals and Table J for elementary principals for specific achievement targets well above district expectations.
Effective (8- 13 points) Results meet District- or BOCES-adopted expectations for growth or achievement for grade/subject.	Refer to Table I for secondary principals and Table J for elementary principals for specific achievement meeting district expectations.
Developing (3 - 7 points) Results are below District- or BOCES-adopted expectations for growth or achievement for grade/subject.	Refer to Table I for secondary principals and Table J for elementary principals for specific achievement below district expectations.
Ineffective (0 - 2 points) Results are well below District- or BOCES-adopted expectations for growth or achievement for grade/subject.	Refer to Table I for secondary principals and Table J for elementary principals for specific achievement well below district expectations.

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/5366/177573-qBFVOWF7fC/Tables for Section 8 Locally Selected - Principals.docx

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

In the table below, list all of the grade configurations 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.	(No response)
Effective (9- 17 points) Results meet District- or BOCES-adopted expectations for growth or achievement for grade/subject.	(No response)
Developing (3 - 8 points) Results are below District- or BOCES-adopted expectations for growth or achievement for grade/subject.	(No response)
Ineffective (0 - 2 points) Results are well below District- or BOCES-adopted expectations for growth or achievement for grade/subject.	(No response)

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.

There are no additional adjustments.

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.

For principals with a mix of sections/courses resulting in the use of multiple locally selected measures, all of the student scores from the multiple sections/courses will be combined into one overall component score of 0-15 or 0-20 as applicable, weighted proportionately based on the number of students in each section/course.

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 Friday, August 31, 2012
Updated Tuesday, April 23, 2013

Page 1

9.1) Principal Practice Rubric

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

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

Multidimensional Principal Performance Rubric

(No response)

9.2) Points Within Other Measures

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

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

Is the following points assignment for all principals?

Yes

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

(No response)

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

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

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

(No response)

9.3) Assurances -- Goals

Please check the boxes below (if applicable):

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

9.4) Sources of Evidence (if applicable)

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

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

9.5) Survey Tool(s) (if applicable)

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

(No response)

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

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

District variance	(No response)
Principal Evaluation Tripod School Perception Survey (Combined Parent Survey)	(No response)
Principal Evaluation Tripod School Perception Survey (Combined Student Surveys)	(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.

A. The Multidimensional Principal Performance Rubric shall be used as the principal practice rubric.
B. The principal practice rubric will be assigned 60 points of the total sixty points for Other Measures.
C. The total number of assigned points shall be allocated to the domains/standards in the rubric as follows:
1. Domain 1-Shared Vision of Learning: 0-10 points
2. Domain 2-School Culture and Instructional Program: 0-20 points
3. Domain 3-Safe, Efficient, Effective Learning Environment: 0-10 points
4. Domain 4-Community: 0-5 points
5. Domain 5-Integrity, Fairness, and Ethics: 0-10 points
6. Domain 6-Policical, Social, Economic, Legal and Cultural Context: 0-5 points
D. Collecting Evidence
1. The Assistant Superintendent for Curriculum and Instruction (ASCI), the lead evaluator, shall meet with each principal prior to the opening of school to discuss and share with the principal the expected evidence for each rating of each domain in the Rubric in accordance with the State issued Standards in E. of this section. The ASCI shall provide to each principal by September 30th of each school year a written description of expected evidence for each rating of each domain in the Rubric.
2. The ASCI will make at least two visits to the principal's school for at least one hour during the school year. One of the visits shall be unannounced. The ASCI shall shadow the principal during the visit observing and collecting evidence benchmarked against the MPPR. The ASCI will meet within 5 working days after the unannounced visit with the principal to provide feedback on the evidence gathered during the visit. The principal shall invite the ASCI and schedule an announced visit. The principal shall review at the beginning of the visit the intended evidence to be provided benchmarked against the MPPR. The principal and ASCI shall meet within five school days to provide feedback on the evidence gathered during the visit. The principal may submit to the ASCI a portfolio of evidence benchmarked against the principal practice rubric.
3. The ASCI will utilize the MPPR to rate the principal on each of the observed dimensions on a scale from 1.0-4.0 scale for each visit and the portfolio (if applicable). All rating of each dimensions within a domain will be averaged to determine a score on each domain, again from 1.0-4.0. The average rating for each domain will be rounded to the nearest tenth. This score will be converted to a point value specified for each domain as described in Section B of this process (above) using the conversion scale below. Domain values will be totaled (0-60). The 0-60 points assigned using the process above is then converted to a scale score for the purpose of assigning HEDI points and categories using in the attached document.
4. Ratings (1.0-4.0) for each domain will be averaged and converted to domain points as follows:
1. Domain 2 - 20 points
1.0 = 0

1.1 = 1
1.2 = 2
1.3 = 3
1.4 = 4
1.5 = 5
1.6 = 6
1.7 = 7
1.8 = 8
1.9 = 9
2.0 = 10
2.1-2.2 = 11
2.3-2.4 = 12
2.5-2.6 = 13
2.7-2.9 = 14
3.0-3.2 = 15
3.3-3.4 = 16
3.5-3.6 = 17
3.7 = 18
3.8 = 19
4.0 = 20

2. Domains 1,3,5 - 10 points each
1.0-1.2 = 0
1.3-1.5 = 1
1.6-1.9 = 2
2.0-2.1 = 3
2.2-2.3 = 4
2.4-2.6 = 5
2.7-2.9 = 6
3.0-3.1 = 7
3.2-3.3 = 8
3.4-3.7 = 9
3.8-4.0 = 10

3. Domain 4,6- 5 points
1.0-1.5 = 0
1.6-2.0 = 1
2.1-2.5 = 2
2.6-3.0 = 3
3.1-3.5 = 4
3.6-4.0 = 5

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/5143/170787-pMADJ4gk6R/9.7 Process Other Measures Principals.docx

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

Highly Effective: Overall performance and results exceed standards.	Using the process describes above and in the attached document "9.7 Process Other Measures Principals" a Scale Score of 59-60 is required for a rating of Highly Effective: Overall performance and results exceed standards.

Effective: Overall performance and results meet standards.	Using the process describes above and in the attached document "9.7 Process Other Measures Principals" a Scale Score of 57-58 is required for a rating of Effective: Overall performance and results meets standards.
Developing: Overall performance and results need improvement in order to meet standards.	Using the process describes above and in the attached document "9.7 Process Other Measures Principals" a Scale Score of 50-56 is required for a rating of Developing: Overall performance and results need improvement in order to meet standards.
Ineffective: Overall performance and results do not meet standards.	Using the process describes above and in the attached document "9.7 Process Other Measures Principals" a Scale Score of 0-49 will results in a rating of Ineffective: Overall performance and results do not meet standards.

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 Saturday, September 29, 2012
Updated Tuesday, October 16, 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 Sunday, September 09, 2012
Updated Tuesday, November 20, 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/5276/173993-Df0w3Xx5v6/PIPForm.docx

11.3) Appeals Process

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

(1) the substance of the annual professional performance review

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

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

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

Appeals Procedure
A. Appeals are limited to those identified by Education Law §3012-c, as follows:
1. The substance of the annual professional performance review;
2. The school district's or board of cooperative educational services' adherence to the standards and methodologies required for such reviews;
3. The adherence to the Commissioner's regulations, as applicable to such reviews;

4. Compliance with any applicable locally negotiated procedures applicable to annual professional performance reviews or improvement plans; and
5. The school district's or board of cooperative educational services' issuance and/or implementation of the terms of the principal improvement plan.
B. Appeals of annual professional performance reviews may be brought for ineffective, developing or any rating tied to compensation for principals with tenure. The appeals process it not available to principals with probationary status.
C. A principal may not file multiple appeals regarding the same performance review. The issuance of an improvement plan may prompt an appeal independent of the performance review. The implementation of an improvement plan may be appealed upon each alleged breach thereof. All grounds for appeal must be raised with specificity within such appeal. Any grounds not raised shall be deemed waived.
D. The burden shall be on the district to establish by the preponderance of the evidence that the rating given to the appellant was justified or that an improvement plan was appropriately issued and/or implemented.
E. All appeals shall be filed in writing and personally delivered to the Office of Superintendent by either the principal filing the appeal or an officer of the Administrators' Association.
F. An appeal of a performance review must be filed no later than fifteen (15) business days of the date when the principal receives their final and complete annual professional performance review.
G. If a principal is challenging the issuance of a principal improvement plan, appeals must be filed with fifteen (15) business days of issuance of such plan. An appeal of the implementation of an improvement plan shall be within fifteen (15) business days of the failure of the district to implement any component of the plan.
H. When filing an appeal, the principal must submit a written description of the specific areas of disagreement over his or her performance review, or the issuance and/or implementation of the terms of his or her improvement plan. Supportive evidence about the challenges shall be submitted with the appeal. Any additional documents or materials relevant to the appeal must be provided by the district within 10 business days of the filing of the appeal upon written request by the principal. The performance review and/or improvement plan being challenged must also be submitted with the appeal. The district shall transit all documents and materials herein described to the appeals hearing officer with a transmittal letter identifying the contents and providing a copy of the transmittal letter to the principal. Any such information that is not submitted at the time the appeal is filed shall not be considered on behalf of the principal in the deliberations related to the resolution of the appeal.
I. Within ten (10) business days of receipt of an appeal, the ASCI must submit a detailed written response to the appeal. The response must include all additional documents or written materials relevant to the point(s) of disagreement that support the ASCI's response. Any such information that is not submitted at the time the response is filed shall not be considered on behalf of the ASCI in the deliberations related to the resolution of the appeal. The principal initiating the appeal shall receive a copy of the response filed by the ASCI, and all additional information submitted with the response, at the same time the ASCI files the response.
J. Within twenty (20) business days of the ASCI's response, the Superintendent shall review all materials and documents submitted by the principal and ASCI. The Superintendent shall not discuss the appeal with the principal or the ASCI from between the time the appeal is filed until his decision except in K. below.
K.
a. The principal may request within five (5) days of the ASCI's response in I. above to meet with the Superintendent to discuss the materials and documents submitted in H. and I. above.
b. The Superintendent shall meet with the principal in a timely manner after the meeting request is made, but in no event shall it be less than five (5) business days or more than fifteen (15) business days after the meeting request is made.
c. The meeting shall be conducted in the Office of the Superintendent with the ASCI and principal and the principal may have an Association representative present. The meeting will conclude no later than two days after the commencement of the meeting.
d. The principal or the principal's representation shall have the right to comment on any materials or documents previously presented to the Superintendent. The ASCI shall have the right to comment on any materials or documents previously presented to the Superintendent.
e. The Superintendent as the hearing officer will facilitate the meeting and may ask questions of the principal and/or ASCI related to the materials or documents previously presented to the Superintendent.
K. A written decision on the merits of the appeal shall be rendered no later than ten (10) business days from the close of the meeting or the review of materials in J. Such decision shall be a final administrative decision. The decision shall set forth the reasons and factual basis for the determination on each of the specific issues raised in the appeal. The Superintendent must either affirm or set aside a ASCI's rating or improvement plan. A copy of the decision shall be provided to the principal and the ASCI.
L. This appeal procedure shall constitute the means for initiating, reviewing and resolving challenges to a principal performance review or improvement plan. A principal may not resort to any other contractual grievance procedures for the resolution of challenges and appeals related to a professional performance review and/or improvement plan.
M. All costs of the appeals process shall be the responsibility of the District.
N. In addition to any further limitations agreed to within the APPR agreement, an evaluation shall not be placed in a principal's personnel file until either the expiration of the fifteen (15) business day period in which to file an notice of appeal without action being taken by the principal or the conclusion of the appeal process described herein, whichever is later.
O. A principal who takes advantage of the appeals process described herein does not waive his/her right to submit a written rebuttal to the final evaluation. A principal who elects to submit a written rebuttal to his/her evaluation prior to the expiration of the fifteen (15) business days in which to file a notice of appeal does not waive her/his right to file an appeal.

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.

During the 2011-2012 school year the Superintendent for Curriculum and Instruction attended several sessions conducted by the Oneida-Herkimer-Madison BOCES as well as a conference sponsored by NYSCROSS. The focus of the training was on the ISSLC standards, school leadership, and data driven instruction. The District conducted several training sessions as part of the administrative cabinet meetings. The training focused on a deep understanding of the Multidimensional Principal Performance Rubric.

The focus of future training will be to continue learning to use the Multi-Dimensional Principal Performance Rubric and developing a strong sense of both meaning and language and how these relate to specific leadership behaviors. We will rely on the rubric to help describe the leadership competencies that we observe and use this evidence to complete our evaluation form in support of District use of the Multi-Dimensional approach to evaluation. In an effort to reduce subjectivity, we will work to develop an understanding of our rating scales and, by way of discussion and comparison of field experiences, seek to calibrate our responses in similar fashion. Raters will be trained to interpret administrative behaviors and consistently apply our rating scale.

Co-visitations to schools by the lead evaluator and another trained administrator will ensure inter-rater reliability.

A minimum of ten (10) hours of training is required to become a lead evaluator.

The Board of Education will certify lead evaluators based on the recommendation of the Superintendent and on the level of training that has already occurred. Further training will only serve to make the Board more confident in this action.

The process described above will be used to retrain and recertify lead evaluators and evaluators on an annual basis.

11.5) Assurances -- Evaluators

Please check the boxes below:

- Checked

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

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

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

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

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

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

(7) use of the Statewide Instructional Reporting System

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

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

- Checked

11.6) Assurances -- Principals

Please check all of the boxes below:

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

11.7) Assurances -- Data

Please check all of the boxes below:

11.7) Assurances -- Data | Assure that the NYSED will receive accurate teacher and student data, including enrollment and attendance data and any other student, teacher, school, course, and teacher/student linkage data necessary to comply with this Subpart, in a format and timeline prescribed by the Commissioner.	Checked

11.7) Assurances -- Data | Certify that the district provides an opportunity for every classroom teacher to verify the subjects and/or student rosters assigned to them.	Checked
11.7) Assurances -- Data | Assure scores for all principals will be reported to NYSED for each subcomponent, as well as the composite rating, as per NYSED requirements.	Checked

12. Joint Certification of APPR Plan

Created Saturday, September 29, 2012
Updated Wednesday, May 08, 2013

Page 1

12.1)Upload the Joint Certification of the APPR Plan

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

assets/survey-uploads/5581/184175-3Uqgn5g9Iu/Joint Cert. 5 8 13.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.

State and Comparable Growth Measures
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".

Bio Technology	District Regional or BOCES Developed	New Hartford District-developed Bio Tech Assessment, Grades 10-12
Statistics	District Regional or BOCES Developed	New Hartford District-developed Statistics Assessment, Grades 10-12
Advanced Placement Statistics	District Regional or BOCES Developed	New Hartford District-developed AP Statistics Assessment, Grade 11-12.
Advanced Placement Calculus AB and BC	District Regional or BOCES Developed	New Hartford District-developed AP Calculus AB and BC Assessment, Grades 11-12
Geometry Prep	District Regional or BOCES Developed	New Hartford District-wide Mathematics Assessment, Geometry Prep
Intermediate Math	District Regional or BOCES Developed	New Hartford District-developed Mathematics Assessment, Intermediate Math, Grades 10-12.
Algebra Prep	District Regional or BOCES Developed	New Hartford District-developed Mathematics Assessment, Algebra Prep, Grades 10-12.
Senior English Electives: Journalism, American Film, Creative Writing, English 12	District Regional or BOCES Developed	New Hartford District-developed English Assessment, Grade 12
Advanced Placement Literature	Regents Exam	Comprehensive English Regents Examination
Advanced Placement Language and Composition	District Regional or BOCES Developed	New Hartford District-developed English Assessment, Advanced Placement Language, Grades 11-12.
French, Spanish, Latin 1A	District Developed	New Hartford District-

	assessment	developed World Language Assessment, Level 1A, Grade 7-9.
French, Spanish, Latin 1	District Developed assessment	New Hartford District-developed World Language Assessment, Level 1, Grades 7-8.
French, Spanish, Latin 2	District Developed assessment	New Hartford District-developed World Language Assessment, Level 2, Grades 8-10.
French, Spanish, Latin 3	Regionally Developed Developed	O-H-M BOCES developed Checkpoint B Exam
French, Spanish 4	District Developed assessment	New Hartford District-developed World Language Assessment, Level 4, Grades 10-12.
Advanced Placement Spanish and French	District Developed assessment	New Hartford District-developed World Language Assessment, Level 5, Grades 11-12.
Computer Applications	District Developed assessment	New Hartford District-developed Technology Assessment, Computer Applications, Grades 8-12.
Business Law	District Regional or BOCES Developed	New Hartford District-developed Business and Technology Assessment, Business Law, Grades 10-12.
Accounting	District Regional or BOCES Developed	New Hartford District-developed Business and Technology Assessment, Accounting, Grades 10-12.
Design, Drawing and Production	District Regional or BOCES Developed	Project Lead the Way Final Exam
Computer Integrated Manufacturing	District Regional or BOCES Developed	Project Lead the Way Final Exam
Home and Careers	District Regional or BOCES Developed	New Hartford District-developed Business and Technology Assessment, Home and Careers, Grade 7-8
Technology 8	District Regional or BOCES Developed	New Hartford District-developed Business and Technology Assessment,

		Technology, Grade 8
Web Design	District Regional or BOCES Developed	New Hartford District-developed Business and Technology Assessment, Web Design, Grades 10-12
Video Production	District Regional or BOCES Developed	New Hartford District-developed Business and Technology Assessment, Video Production, Grades 10-12
Art 7	District Regional or BOCES Developed	New Hartford District-developed Art Assessment, Grade 7
Studio Art 1	District Regional or BOCES Developed	New Hartford District-developed Art Assessment, Studio 1, Grades 8-12
Drawing	District Regional or BOCES Developed	New Hartford District-developed Art Assessment, Drawing, Grades 10-12
Painting	District Regional or BOCES Developed	New Hartford District-developed Art Assessment, Painting, Grades 10-12
Ceramics	District Regional or BOCES Developed	New Hartford District-developed Art Assessment, Ceramics, Grades 10-12
Digital Photography	District Regional or BOCES Developed	New Hartford District-developed Art Assessment, Digital Photography, Grades 10-12
Art Workshop	District Regional or BOCES Developed	New Hartford District-developed Art Assessment, Art Workshop, Grades 10-12
Physical Education 7-9	District Regional or BOCES Developed	New Hartford District-developed Physical Education Assessment Core Strength, Grades 7-9
Physical Education 10-12	District Regional or BOCES Developed	New Hartford District-developed Physical Education Assessment Core Strength, Grades 10-12
Health 7	District Regional or BOCES Developed	New Hartford District-developed Health Assessment, Grade 7
High School Health	District Regional or BOCES Developed	New Hartford District-developed Health

		Assessment, Grades 9-12
Physical Education K-6	District Developed assessment	New Hartford District-developed Physical Education Assessment, Core Strength K-6
Special Education 1-2	State Approved 3rd party assessment	STAR Enterprise Reading
Special Education 9-10, 12	District Regional or BOCES Developed	New Hartford District-developed English Assessment, Grades 9, 10, 12
Special Education 11	Group wide results based on state assessment	Comprehensive English Regents
Special Education K	District Regional or BOCES Developed	New Hartford District-developed Early Literacy Assessment, Kindergarten
ELL	Group wide results based on state assessment	NYSESLAT

Table A: Derterming Individual Student Growth Targets

What student progress meets expectation?				
	End Level I	End Level 2	End Level 3	End Level 4
Start Level I	N	Y	Y	Y
Start Level 2	N	Y	Y	Y
Start Level 3	N	N	Y	Y
Start Level 4	N	N	Y	Y

Table B: District Growth HEDI Scale for Teachers Without an Approved Value Added Measure (20 pts)

Highly Effective	Effective	Developing	Ineffective
Results are well above district goals	Results meet district goals	Results are below district goals	Results are well below district goals
98-100% = 20 pts 94-97% = 19 pts 90-93% = 18 pts	87-89% = 17 pts 84-86% = 16 pts 80-83% = 15 pts 77-79% = 14 pts 74-76-% =13 pts 73% = 12 pts 72% = 11 pts 71% = 10 pts 70% = 9 pts	64-69% = 8 pts 56-63% = 7 pts 50-55% = 6 pts 44-49% = 5 pts 38-43% = 4 pts 35-37% = 3 pts	26-34% = 2 pts 11-25% = 1 pt 0-10% = 0 pts

Table C: Converting Scores from a 100 point scale to a four point scale, Grades 7-12 and Special Subject Areas

4 Point Scale	100 Point Scale
Level 1	0-54
Level 2	55-64
Level 3	65-84
Level 4	85-100

Table D: Converting Scores from a 100 point scale to a four point scale, Grades K-6

Report Card Score	100 Point Scale	4 Point Rubric Score (ex. E.C. essays)
4	93 and up	3.6 or above
3	80 – 92	3.0 – 3.5
2	70 – 79	2.0 – 2.9
1	69 or below	1.9 or below

Table E: Determining Student Growth and HEDI Categories Using STAR Enterprise for Teachers Without a State Comparable Growth Measure

Median SGP	HEDI Points	HEDI Category
61-100	20	Highly Effective
59-60	19	Highly Effective
57-58	18	Highly Effective
55-56	17	Effective
53-54	16	Effective
51-52	15	Effective
49-50	14	Effective
47-48	13	Effective
45-46	12	Effective
43-44	11	Effective
41-42	10	Effective
39-40	9	Effective
38	8	Developing
37	7	Developing
36	6	Developing
35	5	Developing
34	4	Developing
33	3	Ineffective
32	2	Ineffective
26-31	1	Ineffective
0-25	0	Ineffective

Other Measures 60%

Teacher Practice Rubric

The New Hartford Framework of Teaching is the approved teacher practice rubric for the District. It is a custom rubric for use exclusively in New Hartford Schools. It is aligned to the New York State Teaching Standards. The New York State Education Department approved the District's application for a variance to allow its use in our schools.

Scoring Other Measures

All 60 points of the "Other Measures" component of the APPR are derived from The New Hartford Framework for Teaching.

Knowledge of Subject Matter (5 pts)
This domain is assessed through classroom observations by lead evaluators (principals) and other trained evaluators, including peer evaluators (department chairs). All classroom observations serve as evidence for the lead evaluator.

By May 31, the lead evaluator will complete the *Summative Observation Report*, assigning a point value and rating for this domain based on the consistency of the evidence.

Planning and Preparation (5 pts)
This domain is assessed through classroom observations by lead evaluators (principals) and other trained administrators. All classroom observations serve as evidence for the lead evaluator.

By May 31, the lead evaluator will complete the *Summative Observation Report*, assigning a point value and rating for this domain based on the consistency of the evidence.

Learning Environment (10 pts)
This domain is assessed through classroom observations by lead evaluators (principals) and other trained administrators. All classroom observations serve as evidence for the lead evaluator.

By May 31, the lead evaluator will complete the *Summative Observation Report*, assigning a point value and rating for this domain based on the consistency of the evidence.

Constructing Meaning of Content (10 pts)
This domain is assessed through classroom observations by lead evaluators (principals) and other trained evaluators, including peer evaluators (department chairs). All classroom observations serve as evidence for the lead evaluator.

By May 31, the lead evaluator will complete the *Summative Observation Report*, assigning a point value and rating for this domain based on the consistency of the evidence.

Cognitive Engagement (10 pts)
This domain is assessed through classroom observations by lead evaluators (principals) and other trained administrators. All classroom observations serve as evidence for the lead evaluator.

By May 31, the lead evaluator will complete the *Summative Observation Report*, assigning a point value and rating for this domain based on the consistency of the evidence.

Attention to Individuals (10 pts)
This domain is assessed through classroom observations by lead evaluators (principals) and other trained administrators. All classroom observations serve as evidence for the lead evaluator.

By May 31, the lead evaluator will complete the *Summative Observation Report*, assigning a point value and rating for this domain based on the consistency of the evidence.

Professional Responsibilities and Collaboration (5 pts)
The lead evaluator assesses this domain by completing the *Professional Responsibilities and Collaboration Report.*

Professional Growth Plan (5 pts)
In the beginning of the school year (by BEDS day) the teacher completes the *Professional Growth Plan*. The lead evaluator reviews the plan.

Assigning HEDI Categories for the 60% Other Measures

Teachers are assigned scores from the *Summative Evaluation Report*, *the Professional Responsibilities/Collaboration Summary*, and *the Professional Growth Plan*. This is a combined score from 0-60. This score is then **converted** to a scale score to determine HEDI points and quality rating.

Table: Converting the Framework Score to HEDI Quality Rating

Combined Score from Summative Observation Report, Professional Responsibilities Report and Professional Growth Plan	HEDI Score	HEDI Category
0	0	Ineffective
1	7	
2	14	
3	21	
4	28	
5	35	
6	42	
7	49	
8-10	50	Developing
11-13	51	
14-16	52	
17-19	53	
20-22	54	
23-25	55	
26-27	56	
28-35	57	Effective
36-52	58	
53-58	59	Highly Effective
59-60	60	

Table G: New Hartford Achievement Table for Teachers Without a State Provided Growth Score

Achievement Targets				
	NYS Avg	Target E1	Target E2	Target E3
English (All Students)	84	90	93	96
English (85-100)	35	50	58	65
Integrated Alg (All Students)	87	91	92	94
Integrated Alg (85-100)	17	30	37	43
Geometry (All Students)	75	83	87	91
Geometry (85-100)	23	32	37	41
Algebra II Trig (All Students)	65	72	76	79
Algebra II Trig (85-100)	25	30	33	35
Global History (All Students)	69	80	86	91
Global History (85-100)	29	41	46	52
US Hist and Govt (All Students)	80	88	91	95
US Hist and Govt (85-100)	44	58	64	71
Science 8 (All Students)	68	79	85	90
Science 8 (Level 4)	27	34	37	40
Living Environment (All Students)	81	89	93	97
Living Environment (85-100)	31	46	54	61
Earth Science (All Students)	72	82	87	92
Earth Science (85-100)	30	42	48	54
Chemistry (All Students)	78	85	88	91
Chemistry (85-100)	18	25	29	32
Physics (All Students)	79	83	84	86
Physics (85-100)	31	36	38	40
	Developing	Target E1	Target E2	Target E3
All Other Courses (All Students)	70	80	85	90
All Other Courses (85-100)	20	35	45	50

Determining HEDI Points		
	All Students	85-100
Above Target E3	14	6
Target E3	12	5
Target E2	9	4
Target E1	6	3
NYS Avg/Developing	5	2
1-20% below NYS Avg/Developing	2	1
21-100% below NYS Avg/Developing	0	0

HEDI Categories	
Highly Effective	18-20 combined points
Effective	9-17 combined points
Developing	3-8 combined points
Ineffective	0-2 combined points

Determining Targets	
Targets for Regents courses determined by formulas using the NYS average and the NYS Low Need Schools average.	E3 = Average for NYS Low Need Schools E1 = (NYS Avg+Low Need Avg.)/2 E2 = (E1+E2)/2
Targets for All Other Courses and Grade Levels	Long standing District targets for locally developed assessments.

Table H: New Hartford Achievement Table for Teachers With a State Provided Growth Score

Achievement Targets				
	Developing	Target E1	Target E2	Target E3
All Courses/Grade Level (All Students)	70	80	85	90
All Courses/Grade Level (85-100)	20	35	45	50
Determining HEDI Points				
	All Students		85-100	
Above Target E3	12		3	
Target E3	11		2	
Target E2	8		2	
Target E1	6		2	
Developing+5	4		2	
Developing	2		1	
1-10% below Developing	1		0	
11-100% below Developing	0		0	
HEDI Categories				
Highly Effective	14-15 combined points			
Effective	8-13 combined points			
Developing	3-7 combined points			
Ineffective	0-2 combined points			
Determining Targets				
Targets for Regents courses determined by formulas using the NYS average and the NYS Low Need Schools average.	E3 = Average for NYS Low Need Schools E1 = (NYS Avg+Low Need Avg.)/2 E2 = (E1+E2)/2			
Targets for All Other Courses and Grade Levels	Long standing District targets for locally developed assessments.			

Table A: Derterming Individual Student Growth Targets

What student progress meets expectation?				
	End Level I	End Level 2	End Level 3	End Level 4
Start Level I	N	Y	Y	Y
Start Level 2	N	Y	Y	Y
Start Level 3	N	N	Y	Y
Start Level 4	N	N	Y	Y

Table B: District Growth HEDI Scale for Teachers Without an Approved Value Added Measure (20 pts)

Highly Effective	Effective	Developing	Ineffective
Results are well above district goals	Results meet district goals	Results are below district goals	Results are well below district goals
98-100% = 20 pts 94-97% = 19 pts 90-93% = 18 pts	87-89% = 17 pts 84-86% = 16 pts 80-83% = 15 pts 77-79% = 14 pts 74-76-% =13 pts 73% = 12 pts 72% = 11 pts 71% = 10 pts 70% = 9 pts	64-69% = 8 pts 56-63% = 7 pts 50-55% = 6 pts 44-49% = 5 pts 38-43% = 4 pts 35-37% = 3 pts	26-34% = 2 pts 11-25% = 1 pt 0-10% = 0 pts

Table C: Converting Scores from a 100 point scale to a four point scale, Grades 7-12 and Special Subject Areas

4 Point Scale	100 Point Scale
Level 1	0-54
Level 2	55-64
Level 3	65-84
Level 4	85-100

Table E: Determining Student Growth and HEDI Categories Using STAR Enterprise For Teachers Without a State Comparable Growth Measure

- **K: Math**
- **G1-3 ELA, Math**
- **Special Education G7-12 ELA**

Median SGP	HEDI Points	HEDI Category
60-100	20	Highly Effective
59	19	
58	18	
56-57	17	Effective
54-55	16	
52-53	15	
50-51	14	
48-49	13	
47	12	
46	11	
45	10	
44	11	
43	9	
41-42	8	Developing
39-40	7	
38	6	
37	5	
36	4	
35	3	
31-34	2	Ineffective
26-30	1	
0-25	0	

Table F: Determining Student Growth and HEDI Categories Using STAR Enterprise For Teachers With a State Comparable Growth Measure

G 4-6 ELA and Math		
Median SGP	HEDI Points	HEDI Category
60-100	15	Highly Effective
58-59	14	
56-57	13	Effective
54-55	12	
52-53	11	
49-51	10	
46-48	9	
43-45	8	
41-42	7	Developing
39-40	6	
37-38	5	
35-36	4	
34	3	
31-33	2	Ineffective
26-30	1	
0-25	0	

Locally Selected Measures of Student Achievement
2.10) All Other Courses
Fill in for additional grades/subjects, as applicable.

Bio Technology	School-wide measure computed locally	New Hartford District-developed Science Assessment, BioTech, Grades 10-12
Statistics	School-wide measure computed locally	New Hartford District-developed Mathematics Assessment, Statistics, Grades 10-12
Advanced Placement Statistics	School-wide measure computed locally	New Hartford District-developed Mathematics Assessment, AP Statistics, Grades 11-12
Advanced Placement Calculus AB and BC	School-wide measure computed locally	New Hartford District-developed Mathematics Assessment, AP Calc AB and BC, Grades 11-12
Geometry Prep	School-wide measure computed locally	New Hartford District-developed Mathematics Assessment, Geometry Prep, Grade 10-12
Intermediate Math	School-wide measure computed locally	New Hartford District-developed Mathematics Assessment, Intermediate Math, Grade 10-12
Algebra Prep	School-wide measure computed locally	New Hartford District-developed Mathematics Assessment, Algebra Prep, Grade 9
English 9	School-wide measure computed locally	New Hartford District-developed English Assessment, Grade 9
English 10	School-wide measure computed locally	New Hartford District-developed English Assessment, Grade 10
Senior English Electives: Journalism, American Film, Creative Writing, Contemporary Issues in Literature	School-wide measure computed locally	New Hartford District-developed English Assessment, Grade 12
Advanced Placement Literature	School-wide measure computed locally	New Hartford District-developed English Assessment, AP Literature, Grade 12

Advanced Placement Language and Composition	School-wide measure computed locally	Comprehensive Regents Exam
French, Spanish, Latin 1A	School-wide measure computed locally	New Hartford District-developed World Language Assessment, Level 1A, Grade 7
French, Spanish, Latin 1	School-wide measure computed locally	New Hartford District-developed World Language Assessment, Level 1, Grade 8
French, Spanish, Latin 2	School-wide measure computed locally	New Hartford District-developed World Language Assessment, Level 3, Grade 9-10
French, Spanish, Latin 3	School-wide measure computed locally	O-H-M BOCES-developed Checkpoint B Assessment
French, Spanish 4	School-wide measure computed locally	New Hartford District-developed World Language Assessment, Level 4, Grade 11-12
Advanced Placement Spanish and French	School-wide measure computed locally	New Hartford District-developed World Language Assessment, AP Spanish and French, Grade 11-12
Computer Applications	School-wide measure computed locally	New Hartford District-developed Occupational Education Assessment, Computer Applications, Grade 7-12
Business Law	School-wide measure computed locally	New Hartford District-developed Occupational Education Assessment, Business Law, Grade 10-12
Accounting	School-wide measure computed locally	New Hartford District-developed Occupational Education Assessment, Accounting, Grade 10-12
Design, Drawing and Production	School-wide measure computed locally	New Hartford District-developed Assessment for DDP
Computer Integrated Manufacturing	School-wide measure computed locally	New Hartford District-developed Assessment for CIM
Home and Careers	School-wide measure computed locally	New Hartford District-developed Occupational Education Assessment

		,Home and Careers, Grade 7.8
Technology 8	School-wide measure computed locally	New Hartford District-developed Occupational Education Assessment, Technology 8
Web Design	School-wide measure computed locally	New Hartford District-developed Occupational Education Assessment, Web Design, Grade 10-12
Video Production	School-wide measure computed locally	New Hartford District-developed Occupational Education Assessment, Video Production, Grade 10-12
Art 7	School-wide measure computed locally	New Hartford District-developed Art Assessment, Grade 7
Studio Art 1	School-wide measure computed locally	New Hartford District-developed Art Assessment, Studio Art
Computer Graphics	School-wide measure computed locally	New Hartford District-developed Art Assessment, Computer Graphics, Grade 9-12
Drawing	School-wide measure computed locally	New Hartford District-developed Art Assessment, Drawing, Grade 10-12
Ceramics	School-wide measure computed locally	New Hartford District-developed Art Assessment, Ceramics, Grade 10-12
Digital Photography	School-wide measure computed locally	New Hartford District-developed Art Assessment, Digital Photography, Grade 10-12
Art Workshop	School-wide measure computed locally	New Hartford District-developed Art Assessment, Art Workshop, Grade 10-12
Physical Education 7-9	School-wide measure computed locally	New Hartford District-developed Physical Ed/Health Assessment, Core Strength 7-9
Physical Education 10-12	School-wide measure computed locally	Program Participation Report, Grade 10-12
Health 7	School-wide measure computed locally	New Hartford District-developed Physical

		Ed/Health Assessment, Health 7
High School Health	School-wide measure computed locally	New Hartford District-developed Physical Ed/Health Assessment, Health, Grade 9-12
Physical Education K-6	School-wide measure computed locally	New Hartford District-developed Physical Ed/Health Assessment, Core Strength, K-6
Special Education G1,2 7-12	State Approved 3rd Party	STAR Enterprise Reading
Special Education 3-6	SLO	NYS ELA Assessment
Special Education K	Teacher specific growth or achievement score computed locally	New Hartford District-developed Early Literacy Assessment, K
ELL	State Approved 3rd Party Assessment	STAR Enterprise Reading

Table G: New Hartford Achievement Table for Teachers Without a State Provided Growth Score

Achievement Targets				
	NYS Avg	Target E1	Target E2	Target E3
English (All Students)	84	90	93	96
English (85-100)	35	50	58	65
Integrated Alg (All Students)	87	91	92	94
Integrated Alg (85-100)	17	30	37	43
Geometry (All Students)	75	83	87	91
Geometry (85-100)	23	32	37	41
Algebra II Trig (All Students)	65	72	76	79
Algebra II Trig (85-100)	25	30	33	35
Global History (All Students)	69	80	86	91
Global History (85-100)	29	41	46	52
US Hist and Govt (All Students)	80	88	91	95
US Hist and Govt (85-100)	44	58	64	71
Science 8 (All Students)	68	79	85	90
Science 8 (Level 4)	27	34	37	40
Living Environment (All Students)	81	89	93	97
Living Environment (85-100)	31	46	54	61
Earth Science (All Students)	72	82	87	92
Earth Science (85-100)	30	42	48	54
Chemistry (All Students)	78	85	88	91
Chemistry (85-100)	18	25	29	32
Physics (All Students)	79	83	84	86
Physics (85-100)	31	36	38	40
	Developing	Target E1	Target E2	Target E3
All Other Courses (All Students)	70	80	85	90
All Other Courses (85-100)	20	35	45	50

Determining HEDI Points		
	All Students	85-100
Above Target E3	14	6
Target E3	12	5
Target E2	9	4
Target E1	6	3
NYS Avg/Developing	5	2
1-20% below NYS Avg/Developing	2	1
21-100% below NYS Avg/Developing	0	0

HEDI Categories	
Highly Effective	18-20 combined points
Effective	9-17 combined points
Developing	3-8 combined points
Ineffective	0-2 combined points

Determining Targets	
Targets for Regents courses determined by formulas using the NYS average and the NYS Low Need Schools average.	E3 = Average for NYS Low Need Schools E1 = (NYS Avg+Low Need Avg.)/2 E2 = (E1+E2)/2
Targets for All Other Courses and Grade Levels	Long standing District targets for locally developed assessments.

Table H: New Hartford Achievement Table for Teachers With a State Provided Growth Score

Achievement Targets				
	Developing	Target E1	Target E2	Target E3
All Courses/Grade Level (All Students)	70	80	85	90
All Courses/Grade Level (85-100)	20	35	45	50
Determining HEDI Points				
	All Students		85-100	
Above Target E3	12		3	
Target E3	11		2	
Target E2	8		2	
Target E1	6		2	
Developing+5	4		2	
Developing	2		1	
1-10% below Developing	1		0	
11-100% below Developing	0		0	
HEDI Categories				
Highly Effective	14-15 combined points			
Effective	8-13 combined points			
Developing	3-7 combined points			
Ineffective	0-2 combined points			
Determining Targets				
Targets for Regents courses determined by formulas using the NYS average and the NYS Low Need Schools average.	E3 = Average for NYS Low Need Schools E1 = (NYS Avg+Low Need Avg.)/2 E2 = (E1+E2)/2			
Targets for All Other Courses and Grade Levels	Long standing District targets for locally developed assessments.			

Table A: Derterming Individual Student Growth Targets

What student progress meets expectation?				
	End Level I	End Level 2	End Level 3	End Level 4
Start Level I	N	Y	Y	Y
Start Level 2	N	Y	Y	Y
Start Level 3	N	N	Y	Y
Start Level 4	N	N	Y	Y

Table B: District Growth HEDI Scale for Teachers Without an Approved Value Added Measure (20 pts)

Highly Effective	Effective	Developing	Ineffective
Results are well above district goals	Results meet district goals	Results are below district goals	Results are well below district goals
98-100% = 20 pts 94-97% = 19 pts 90-93% = 18 pts	87-89% = 17 pts 84-86% = 16 pts 80-83% = 15 pts 77-79% = 14 pts 74-76-% =13 pts 73% = 12 pts 72% = 11 pts 71% = 10 pts 70% = 9 pts	64-69% = 8 pts 56-63% = 7 pts 50-55% = 6 pts 44-49% = 5 pts 38-43% = 4 pts 35-37% = 3 pts	26-34% = 2 pts 11-25% = 1 pt 0-10% = 0 pts

Table C: Converting Scores from a 100 point scale to a four point scale, Grades 7-12 and Special Subject Areas

4 Point Scale	100 Point Scale
Level 1	0-54
Level 2	55-64
Level 3	65-84
Level 4	85-100

Table E: Determining Student Growth and HEDI Categories Using STAR Enterprise for Teachers Without a State Comparable Growth Measure

Median SGP	HEDI Points	HEDI Category
61-100	20	Highly Effective
59-60	19	Highly Effective
57-58	18	Highly Effective
55-56	17	Effective
53-54	16	Effective
51-52	15	Effective
49-50	14	Effective
47-48	13	Effective
45-46	12	Effective
43-44	11	Effective
41-42	10	Effective
39-40	9	Effective
38	8	Developing
37	7	Developing
36	6	Developing
35	5	Developing
34	4	Developing
33	3	Ineffective
32	2	Ineffective
26-31	1	Ineffective
0-25	0	Ineffective

Table F: Determining Student Growth and HEDI Categories Using STAR Enterprise for Teachers With a State Comparable Growth Measure

Median SGP	HEDI Points	HEDI Category
61-100	15	Highly Effective
57-60	14	Highly Effective
55-56	13	Effective
53-54	12	Effective
51-52	11	Effective
47-50	10	Effective
43-46	9	Effective
39-42	8	Effective
38	7	Developing
37	6	Developing
36	5	Developing
35	4	Developing
34	3	Developing
32-33	2	Ineffective
26-31	1	Ineffective
0-25	0	Ineffective

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

A. The Multidimensional Principal Performance Rubric shall be used as the principal practice rubric.
B. The principal practice rubric will be assigned 60 points of the total sixty points for Other Measures.
C. The total number of assigned points shall be allocated to the domains/standards in the rubric as follows:
    1. Domain 1-Shared Vision of Learning: 10 points
    2. Domain 2-School Culture and Instructional Program: 20 points
    3. Domain 3-Safe, Efficient, Effective Learning Environment: 10 points
    4. Domain 4-Community: 5 points
    5. Domain 5-Integrity, Fairness, and Ethics: 10 points
    6. Domain 6-Policical, Social, Economic, Legal and Cultural Context: 5 points
D. The ASCI shall meet with each principal prior to the opening of school to discuss and share with the principal the expected evidence for each rating of each domain in the Rubric in accordance with the State issued Standards in E. of this section. The ASCI shall provide to each principal by September 30th of each school year a written description of expected evidence for each rating of each domain in the Rubric.
E. The 60 points assigned using the process above is then converted to a scale score for the purpose of assigning HEDI points and categories using the table below.

Rubric Score	Scale Score	HEDI Rating
57-60	60	Highly Effective Overall performance and results exceed standards.
53-56	59	
47-52	58	Effective Overall performance and results meets standards.
41-46	57	
37-40	56	Developing Overall performance and results need improvement to meet standards.
33-36	55	
29-32	54	
25-28	53	
22-24	52	
20-21	51	
18-19	50	
17	49	Ineffective Overall performance and results do not meet standards.
16	46	
15	43	
14	40	
13	37	
12	34	
11	31	
10	28	
9	25	
8	22	
7	19	
6	16	
5	13	
4	10	
3	7	
2	4	
1	2	
0	0	

Key Ideas

1. A Teacher Improvement Plan is intended to help teachers with professional performance.

2. The plan identifies a specific area(s) of the professional practice standards in which improved professional performance is warranted.

3. Teacher Improvement Plans are initiated by a principal (or other administrator with supervisory responsibility) and developed in collaboration with a teacher. A Teacher Improvement Plan is required for all teachers receiving a composite rating of "Ineffective" or "Developing." The plan must be implemented no later than 10 days after the date on which teacher are required to report prior to the opening of classes for the school year.

4. A Teacher Improvement Plan identifies expectations and resources to help the teacher improve performance.

5. Successful completion of the plan does not guarantee a higher rating. Standards of performance are described in the approved professional practice rubric.

DRAFT: New Hartford Teacher Improvement Plan

Teacher: School Year:

Principal: School:

1. Describe the area(s) of focus for improvement.

2. Describe the expected professional performance.

3. Describe the timeframe for expected improvement. Include the date of final assessment of the plan.

4. Describe the professional learning activities that the teacher must complete.

5. Describe what artifacts/evidence to be collected to serve as benchmarks for improvement determine improved performance.

6. Describe support and resources available to the teacher. Resources may include professional development, mentors, other peer assistance, performance feedback, employee assistance programs, release time, and others.

7. Describe how progress will be monitored.

This plan has been developed collaboratively between the teacher and administrator

_____ _____
Administrator Date

_____ _____
Teacher Date

DRAFT: New Hartford Teacher Improvement Plan

Teacher Initial	Below are required elements of the plan. An initial indicates completion.	Principal Initial
	Describe area(s) of focus for improvement.	
	Describe the expected professional performance.	
	Describe the timeframe for expected for expected improvement. Include date of final assessment of the plan.	
	Describe the professional learning activities that the teacher must complete.	
	Identify the artifacts/evidence to serve as benchmarks for improvement determine improved performance have been collected.	
	Identify the support and resources available to the teacher.	
	Describe how progress will be monitored.	
	The Improvement Plan was successful.	

Teacher Summary Statement:

Principal Summary Statement

This completed document is placed in the teacher's personnel file. A copy is provided to the teacher.

Table I: Determining Achievement Targets for Secondary Principals

Targets			
7-9 Principal[1] 10-12 Principal[2]	Target E1	Target E2	Target E3
Regents Exams Scored 65-100	86-89	90-93	94-97
Regents Exams Scored 85-100	44-49	50-56	57-60
Determining HEDI Points			
HEDI Points	Regent Exams Scored 65-100	Regent Exams Scored 85-100	
Greater than Target E3	12	3	
Met Target E3	11	2	
Met Target E2	8	2	
Met Target E1	5	2	
1-10% Below E1	4	1	
11-20% Below E1	2	0	
21-100% Below E1	0	0	
Determining HEDI Categories			
Highly Effective		14-15	
Effective		8-13	
Developing		3-7	
Ineffective		0-2	

[1] Regents exams considered: Earth Science, Living Environment, Algebra I and Geometry

[2] All Regents exams considered except Earth Science

Table J: Determining Achievement Targets for Elementary Principals

Targets[3]				
	Target E1	Target E2	Target E3	Target HE
Bradley ELA	65	70	75	79
Bradley Math	71	75	79	83
Bradley Combined	**69**	**73**	**77**	**81**
Hughes ELA	67	73	79	83
Hughes Math	71	75	80	84
Hughes Combined	**70**	**75**	**79**	**83**
Myles ELA	55	55	56	60
Myles Math	62	61	61	65
Myles Combined	**59**	**59**	**58**	**62**

Determining HEDI Points and Categories		
	HEDI Points	HEDI Category
Greater than Target HE	15	Highly Effective
Met Target HE	14	
Met Target E3	13	Effective
Met Target E2	10	
Met Target E1	8	
1-5% Below Target E1	7	Developing
6-10% Below Target E1	6	
11-15% Below Target E1	5	
16-20% Below Target E1	4	
21-25% Below Target E1	3	
26-30% Below Target E1	2	Ineffective
31-100% Below Target E1	0	

[3] Targets for elementary principals derive from past academic performance.

New Hartford Central School District: Principal Improvement Plan

Principal's Name:

Lead Evaluator's Name:

Date:

Directions: Upon a rating a principal ineffective or developing, a Principal Improvement Plan (PIP) designed to rectify perceived or demonstrated deficiencies shall be developed and commenced no later than ten (10) days after the start of the school year. The lead evaluator, in collaboration with the principal, shall develop the following:

1. Clearly describe the deficiencies that resulted in the ineffective or developing rating.

2. Describe specific improvement goals/outcomes.

3. Describe specific improvement action steps/activities.

4. Describe the timeline for achieving improvement. The timeline should not exceed June 1 of the current school year.

5. Describe the required and accessible resources to achieve goal(s).

6. The principal and the lead evaluator shall meet monthly throughout the year to monitor and document progress. List the dates of the monthly meeting.

7. Describe the manner in which improvement efforts will be assessed, including evidence demonstrating improvement.

8. A formal, final written summative assessment shall be completed and attached to this form and reviewed with the principal no later than June 1. Successful completion of this plan does not guarantee a higher rating on the annual performance rating.

_____ _____

Principal Date

_____ _____

Lead Evaluator Date

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

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

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

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

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

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

Signatures, dates

Superintendent Signature: Date:

5/6/13

Teachers Union President Signature: Date:

05/06/13

Administrative Union President Signature: Date:

5/6/13

Board of Education President Signature: Date: 5.6.13