



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

December 18, 2012

Cynthia A. Bianco, Superintendent
Niagara Falls City School District
630 66th Street
Niagara Falls, NY 14304

Dear Superintendent Bianco:

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: Clark J. Godshall

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 Friday, September 28, 2012

Updated Thursday, December 06, 2012

1

Disclaimers

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

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

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

1. SCHOOL DISTRICT INFORMATION

1.1) School District's BEDS Number : 400800010000

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

400800010000

1.2) School District Name: NIAGARA FALLS CITY SD

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

NIAGARA FALLS CITY SD

1.3) School Improvement Grant (SIG) Districts Only

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

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):

-
- Strengthening Teacher and Leader Effectiveness RFP (NYSED)
-

- Virtual AP Incentive Program (NYSESED)

1.5) Assurances

Please check all of the boxes below:

1.5) Assurances Assure that the content of this form represents the district/BOCES' entire APPR plan and that the APPR plan is in compliance with Education Law §3012-c and Subpart 30-2 of the Rules of the Board of Regents	Checked
---	---------

1.5) Assurances Assure that this APPR plan will be posted on the district or BOCES website by September 10, or within 10 days after approval, whichever is later	Checked
--	---------

1.5) Assurances Assure that it is understood that this district/BOCES' APPR plan will be posted in its entirety on the NYSED website following approval	Checked
---	---------

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

Re-submission to address deficiencies

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

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

Annual (2012-13)

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

Created Friday, September 28, 2012
Updated Monday, December 10, 2012

Page 1

STATE-PROVIDED MEASURES OF STUDENT GROWTH

(25 points with an approved value-added measure)

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

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

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

2.1) Assurances

Please check the boxes below:

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

STUDENT LEARNING OBJECTIVES AS COMPARABLE GROWTH MEASURES (20 points)

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

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

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

If no State assessment or Regents exam exists:

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

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

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

State assessments, *required if one exists*

List of State-approved 3rd party assessments

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

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

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

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

2.2) Grades K-3 ELA

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

	ELA	Assessment
K	State-approved 3rd party assessment	AIMSweb
1	State-approved 3rd party assessment	AIMSweb
2	State-approved 3rd party assessment	AIMSweb

	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	The 20 point distribution plan scoring chart for use with student learning objectives (SLOs) will be implemented as
---	---

this subcomponent. If needed, you may upload a table or graphic at 2.11, below.

follows:

A teacher will determine the number of students from his/her total students associated with a specific SLO and appropriate percentage target will be set by an individual teacher in agreement with his/her evaluator. Based on this percentage, the actual percent of his/her students who reach the SLO target at the end of the course based on pre to post assessment growth will define the number of points (out of 20) earned by the teacher. For example: For a teacher who has 90% of his/her students reach the target, he/she would earn 18 points. For a teacher who has 75% of his/her students reach the target, he/she would earn 15 points. For a teacher who had 58% of his/her students reach the target, he/she would earn 7 points. For a teacher who has 36% of his/her students reach the target, he/she would earn 2 points.

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

See 2.11

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

See 2.11

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

See 2.11

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

See 2.11

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	State-approved 3rd party assessment	NWEA Measures of Academic Progress (MAP) for Primary Grades (Math)
1	State-approved 3rd party assessment	NWEA Measures of Academic Progress (MAP) for Primary Grades (Math)
2	State-approved 3rd party assessment	NWEA Measures of Academic Progress (MAP)(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 20 point distribution plan scoring chart for use with student learning objectives (SLOs) will be implemented as follows:
A teacher will determine the number of students from

his/her total students associated with a specific SLO and appropriate percentage target will be set by an individual teacher in agreement with his/her evaluator. Based on this percentage, the actual percent of his/her students who reach the SLO target at the end of the course based on pre to post assessment growth will define the number of points (out of 20) earned by the teacher. For example: For a teacher who has 90% of his/her students reach the target, he/she would earn 18 points. For a teacher who has 75% of his/her students reach the target, he/she would earn 15 points. For a teacher who had 58% of his/her students reach the target, he/she would earn 11.6 points. For a teacher who has 36% of his/her students reach the target, he/she would earn 7.2 points.

Highly Effective (18 - 20 points) Results are well-above state average for similar students (or District goals if no state test). See 2.11

Effective (9 - 17 points) Results meet state average for similar students (or District goals if no state test). See 2.11

Developing (3 - 8 points) Results are below state average for similar students (or District goals if no state test). See 2.11

Ineffective (0 - 2 points) Results are well-below state average for similar students (or District goals if no state test). See 2.11

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	State-approved 3rd party assessment	NWEA Measures of Academic Progress (MAP) (Science)
7	District, regional or BOCES-developed assessment	Niagara Falls City School District Developed Grade 7 Science Assessment

	Science	Assessment
8	State assessment	8th Grade State Science Assessment

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

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

The 20 point distribution plan scoring chart for use with student learning objectives (SLOs) will be implemented as follows:
A teacher will determine the number of students from his/her total students associated with a specific SLO and appropriate percentage target will be set by an individual teacher in agreement with his/her evaluator. Based on this percentage, the actual percent of his/her students who reach the SLO target at the end of the course based on

pre to post assessment growth will define the number of points (out of 20) earned by the teacher. For example: For a teacher who has 90% of his/her students reach the target, he/she would earn 18 points. For a teacher who has 75% of his/her students reach the target, he/she would earn 15 points. For a teacher who had 58% of his/her students reach the target, he/she would earn 7 points. For a teacher who has 36% of his/her students reach the target, he/she would earn 2 points.

Highly Effective (18 - 20 points) Results are well-above state average for similar students (or District goals if no state test). See 2.11

Effective (9 - 17 points) Results meet state average for similar students (or District goals if no state test). See 2.11

Developing (3 - 8 points) Results are below state average for similar students (or District goals if no state test). See 2.11

Ineffective (0 - 2 points) Results are well-below state average for similar students (or District goals if no state test). See 2.11

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	Niagara Falls City School District Developed Grade 6 Social Studies Assessment
7	District, regional or BOCES-developed assessment	Niagara Falls City School District Developed Grade 7 Social Studies Assessment
8	District, regional or BOCES-developed assessment	Niagara Falls City School District Developed Grade 8 Social Studies Assessment

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

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

The 20 point distribution plan scoring chart for use with student learning objectives (SLOs) will be implemented as follows:

A teacher will determine the number of students from his/her total students associated with a specific SLO and appropriate percentage target will be set by an individual teacher in agreement with his/her evaluator. Based on this percentage, the actual percent of his/her students who reach the SLO target at the end of the course based on pre to post assessment growth will define the number of points (out of 20) earned by the teacher. For example: For a teacher who has 90% of his/her students reach the target, he/she would earn 18 points. For a teacher who has 75% of his/her students reach the target, he/she would earn 15 points. For a teacher who had 58% of his/her students reach the target, he/she would earn 7

	points. For a teacher who has 36% of his/her students reach the target, he/she would earn 2 points.
Highly Effective (18 - 20 points) Results are well-above District goals for similar students.	See 2.11
Effective (9 - 17 points) Results meet District goals for similar students.	See 2.11
Developing (3 - 8 points) Results are below District goals for similar students.	See 2.11
Ineffective (0 - 2 points) Results are well-below District goals for similar students.	See 2.11

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	Niagara Falls City School District Developed Global History and Geography Assessment

	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.	<p>The 20 point distribution plan scoring chart for use with student learning objectives (SLOs) will be implemented as follows:</p> <p>A teacher will determine the number of students from his/her total students associated with a specific SLO and appropriate percentage target will be set by an individual teacher in agreement with his/her evaluator. Based on this percentage, the actual percent of his/her students who reach the SLO target at the end of the course based on pre to post assessment growth will define the number of points (out of 20) earned by the teacher. For example: For a teacher who has 90% of his/her students reach the target, he/she would earn 18 points. For a teacher who has 75% of his/her students reach the target, he/she would earn 15 points. For a teacher who had 58% of his/her students reach the target, he/she would earn 7 points. For a teacher who has 36% of his/her students reach the target, he/she would earn 2 points.</p>
---	--

Highly Effective (18 - 20 points) Results are well-above District goals for similar students.	See 2.11
Effective (9 - 17 points) Results meet District goals for similar students.	See 2.11
Developing (3 - 8 points) Results are below District goals for similar students.	See 2.11
Ineffective (0 - 2 points) Results are well-below District goals for similar students.	See 2.11

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.	The 20 point distribution plan scoring chart for use with student learning objectives (SLOs) will be implemented as follows: A teacher will determine the number of students from his/her total students associated with a specific SLO and appropriate percentage target will be set by an individual teacher in agreement with his/her evaluator. Based on this percentage, the actual percent of his/her students who reach the SLO target at the end of the course based on pre to post assessment growth will define the number of points (out of 20) earned by the teacher. For example: For a teacher who has 90% of his/her students reach the target, he/she would earn 18 points. For a teacher who has 75% of his/her students reach the target, he/she would earn 15 points. For a teacher who had 58% of his/her students reach the target, he/she would earn 7 points. For a teacher who has 36% of his/her students reach the target, he/she would earn 2 points.
Highly Effective (18 - 20 points) Results are well-above District goals for similar students.	See 2.11
Effective (9 - 17 points) Results meet District goals for similar students.	See 2.11
Developing (3 - 8 points) Results are below District goals for similar students.	See 2.11

Ineffective (0 - 2 points) Results are well-below District goals for similar students.	See 2.11
--	----------

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.

The 20 point distribution plan scoring chart for use with student learning objectives (SLOs) will be implemented as follows:

A teacher will determine the number of students from his/her total students associated with a specific SLO and appropriate percentage target will be set by an individual teacher in agreement with his/her evaluator. Based on this percentage, the actual percent of his/her students who reach the SLO target at the end of the course based on pre to post assessment growth will define the number of points (out of 20) earned by the teacher. For example: For a teacher who has 90% of his/her students reach the target, he/she would earn 18 points. For a teacher who has 75% of his/her students reach the target, he/she would earn 15 points. For a teacher who had 58% of his/her students reach the target, he/she would earn 7 points. For a teacher who has 36% of his/her students reach the target, he/she would earn 2 points.

Highly Effective (18 - 20 points) Results are well-above District goals for similar students.	See 2.11
---	----------

Effective (9 - 17 points) Results meet District goals for similar students.	See 2.11
---	----------

Developing (3 - 8 points) Results are below District goals for similar students.	See 2.11
--	----------

Ineffective (0 - 2 points) Results are well-below District goals for similar students.	See 2.11
--	----------

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	State approved 3rd party assessment	NWEA Measures of Academic Progress (MAP) (ELA)
Grade 10 ELA	State approved 3rd party assessment	NWEA Measures of Academic Progress (MAP) (ELA)
Grade 11 ELA	Regents assessment	NYS Grade 11 ELA Comprehensive English Regents Assessment

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.	The 20 point distribution plan scoring chart for use with student learning objectives (SLOs) will be implemented as follows: A teacher will determine the number of students from his/her total students associated with a specific SLO and appropriate percentage target will be set by an individual teacher in agreement with his/her evaluator. Based on this percentage, the actual percent of his/her students who reach the SLO target at the end of the course based on pre to post assessment growth will define the number of points (out of 20) earned by the teacher. For example: For a teacher who has 90% of his/her students reach the target, he/she would earn 18 points. For a teacher who has 75% of his/her students reach the target, he/she would earn 15 points. For a teacher who had 58% of his/her students reach the target, he/she would earn 7 points. For a teacher who has 36% of his/her students reach the target, he/she would earn 2 points.
Highly Effective (18 - 20 points) Results are well-above District goals for similar students.	See 2.11
Effective (9 - 17 points) Results meet District goals for similar students.	See 2.11
Developing (3 - 8 points) Results are below District goals for similar students.	See 2.11
Ineffective (0 - 2 points) Results are well-below District goals for similar students.	See 2.11

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
-------------------------	--------	------------

Art K-8	District, Regional or BOCES-developed	Niagara Falls City School District Developed Grade Specific Art Assessment
Vocal Music K-8	District, Regional or BOCES-developed	Niagara Falls City School District Developed Grade Specific Vocal Music Assessment
Instrument Music 4-8	District, Regional or BOCES-developed	Niagara Falls City School District Developed Grade Specific Instrumental Music Assessment
General Music 7-8	District, Regional or BOCES-developed	Niagara Falls City School District Developed Grade Specific General Music Assessment
Physical Education K-12	District, Regional or BOCES-developed	Niagara Falls City School District Developed Grade Specific Physical Education Assessment
English Language Learners K-12	State Assessment	NYSESLAT
Special Education/Functional Life Skills	State Assessment	New York State Alternate Assessment (NYSAA) Datafolio
Strategic Reading K-6	State-approved 3rd party assessment	AIMSWEB ELA
Family Consumer Science 7-8	District, Regional or BOCES-developed	Niagara Falls City School District Developed Grade Specific Family and Consumer Science Assessment
Health Grade 7 Grade 11	District, Regional or BOCES-developed	Niagara Falls City School District Developed Grade Specific Health Assessment
LOTE 8-12	District, Regional or BOCES-developed	Orleans Niagara BOCES Consortium developed Grade Specific LOTE Assessment
Technology 8	District, Regional or BOCES-developed	Niagara Falls City School District Developed Grade 8 Technology Assessment
AIS English 7-8	State Assessment	New York State ELA Assessment
AIS Math 7-8	State Assessment	New York State Math Assessment
AP English Literature Composition	District, Regional or BOCES-developed	Niagara Falls City School District Developed AP English Literature Composition Assessment
Communication Gr. 12	District, Regional or BOCES-developed	Niagara Falls City School District Developed Communication Assessment
Writing Gr. 12	District, Regional or BOCES-developed	Niagara Falls City School District Developed Writing Assessment
Ap English and Language Composition	District, Regional or BOCES-developed	Niagara Falls City School District Developed AP English and Language Composition Assessment
English 12	District, Regional or BOCES-developed	Niagara Falls City School District Developed English 12 Assessment
AP Global/World History	District, Regional or BOCES-developed	Niagara Falls City School District Developed AP Global/World History Assessment

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.

The 20 point distribution plan scoring chart for use with student learning objectives (SLOs) will be implemented as follows:
A teacher will determine the number of students from his/her total students associated with a specific SLO and

appropriate percentage target will be set by an individual teacher in agreement with his/her evaluator. Based on this percentage, the actual percent of his/her students who reach the SLO target at the end of the course based on pre to post assessment growth will define the number of points (out of 20) earned by the teacher. For example: For a teacher who has 90% of his/her students reach the target, he/she would earn 18 points. For a teacher who has 75% of his/her students reach the target, he/she would earn 15 points. For a teacher who had 58% of his/her students reach the target, he/she would earn 7 points. For a teacher who has 36% of his/her students reach the target, he/she would earn 2 points.

Highly Effective (18 - 20 points) Results are well-above District goals for similar students.	See 2.11
Effective (9 - 17 points) Results meet District goals for similar students.	See 2.11
Developing (3 - 8 points) Results are below District goals for similar students.	See 2.11
Ineffective (0 - 2 points) Results are well-below District goals for similar students.	See 2.11

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/5364/183595-avH4IQNZMh/All other Courses 2.10 November 2012.doc

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/5364/183595-TXEttx9bQW/HEDI percentages 0-20 with narrative 2.11 December 2012.xlsx

2.12) Locally Developed Controls

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

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

(No response)

2.13) Teachers with more than one growth measure

If educators have more than one state-provided growth or value-added measure, those measures will be combined into one HEDI rating and score for the growth subcomponent according to a formula determined by the Commissioner. (Examples: Common branch teacher

with state-provided value-added measures for both ELA and Math in 4th grades; Middle school math teacher with both 7th and 8th grade math courses.)

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

2.14) Assurances

Please check all of the boxes below:

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 Friday, September 28, 2012

Updated Monday, December 17, 2012

Page 1

Locally Selected Measures of Student Achievement or Growth

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

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

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

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

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

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

Growth or achievement measure(s) from these options.

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

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

Measures based on:

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

3.1) Grades 4-8 ELA

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

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

6	4) State-approved 3rd party assessments	NWEA Measures of Academic Progress (MAP) (ELA)
7	4) State-approved 3rd party assessments	NWEA Measures of Academic Progress (MAP) (ELA)
8	4) State-approved 3rd party assessments	NWEA Measures of Academic Progress (MAP) (ELA)

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

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

Use this box, if needed, to describe the general process for assigning HEDI categories for these grades/subjects in this subcomponent. If needed, you may upload a table or graphic at 3.3, below.	The 15 point distribution plan scoring chart will be implemented as follows: For example: For a teacher who has 90% of his/her students reach the target, he/she would earn 14 points. For a teacher who has 75% of his/her students reach the target, he/she would earn 11 points. For a teacher who had 58% of his/her students reach the target, he/she would earn 6 points. For a teacher who has 36% of his/her students reach the target, he/she would earn 2 points.
Highly Effective (14 - 15 points) Results are well above District- or BOCES-adopted expectations for growth or achievement for grade/subject.	Teachers who have 86% or more of their students meeting the District established growth target criteria will receive a highly effective rating. See Chart at 3.3
Effective (8- 13 points) Results meet District- or BOCES-adopted expectations for growth or achievement for grade/subject.	Teachers who have between 62% and 85% of their students meeting the District established growth target criteria will receive an effective rating. See Charts at 3.3
Developing (3 - 7 points) Results are below District- or BOCES-adopted expectations for growth or achievement for grade/subject.	Teachers who have between 50% and 61% of their students meeting the District established growth target criteria will receive a developing rating. See Charts at 3.3
Ineffective (0 - 2 points) Results are well below District- or BOCES-adopted expectations for growth or achievement for grade/subject.	Teachers who have between 0% and 49% of their students meeting the District established growth target criteria will receive an ineffective rating. See Charts at 3.3

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	NWEA Measures of Academic Progress (MAP) (Math)
5	4) State-approved 3rd party assessments	NWEA Measures of Academic Progress (MAP) (Math)
6	4) State-approved 3rd party assessments	NWEA Measures of Academic Progress (MAP) (Math)

7	4) State-approved 3rd party assessments	NWEA Measures of Academic Progress (MAP) (Math))
8	4) State-approved 3rd party assessments	NWEA Measures of Academic Progress (MAP) (Math))

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

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

Use this box, if needed, to describe the general process for assigning HEDI categories for these grades/subjects in this subcomponent. If needed, you may upload a table or graphic at 3.3, below.	The 15 point distribution plan scoring chart will be implemented as follows: For example: For a teacher who has 90% of his/her students reach the target, he/she would earn 14 points. For a teacher who has 75% of his/her students reach the target, he/she would earn 11 points. For a teacher who had 58% of his/her students reach the target, he/she would earn 6 points. For a teacher who has 36% of his/her students reach the target, he/she would earn 2 points.
Highly Effective (14 - 15 points) Results are well above District- or BOCES-adopted expectations for growth or achievement for grade/subject.	Teachers who have 86% or more of their students meeting the District established growth target criteria will receive a highly effective rating. See Chart at 3.3
Effective (8- 13 points) Results meet District- or BOCES-adopted expectations for growth or achievement for grade/subject.	Teachers who have between 62% and 85% of their students meeting the District established growth target criteria will receive an effective rating. See Chart at 3.3
Developing (3 - 7 points) Results are below District- or BOCES-adopted expectations for growth or achievement for grade/subject.	Teachers who have between 50% and 61% of their students meeting the District established growth target criteria will receive a developing rating. See Chart at 3.3
Ineffective (0 - 2 points) Results are well below District- or BOCES-adopted expectations for growth or achievement for grade/subject.	Teachers who have between 0% and 49% of their students meeting the District established growth target criteria will receive an ineffective rating. See Chart at 3.3

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/5139/183688-rhJdBgDruP/HEDI percentages 0-15 with narrative 3.3 december 2012.xlsx](#)

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

Growth or achievement measure(s) from these options.

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

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

Measures based on:

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

3.4) Grades K-3 ELA

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

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

K	5) District, regional, or BOCES–developed assessments	Niagara Falls City School District Developed Kindergarten Writing Assessment
1	5) District, regional, or BOCES–developed assessments	Niagara Falls City School District Developed Grade 1 Writing Assessment
2	5) District, regional, or BOCES–developed assessments	Niagara Falls City School District Developed Grade 2 Writing Assessment
3	5) District, regional, or BOCES–developed assessments	Niagara Falls City School District Developed Grade 3 Writing Assessment

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

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

Use this box, if needed, to describe the general process for assigning HEDI categories for these grades/subjects in this subcomponent. If needed, you may upload a table or graphic at 3.13, below.	The 20 point distribution plan scoring chart for use with student learning objectives (SLOs) will be implemented as follows: A teacher will determine the aggregate achievement level that his or her students should reach associated with a specific SLO. The achievement target will be set by an individual teacher in agreement with his/her evaluator. Achievement goals will be determined by reviewing aggregate data for groups of students based on longitudinal historical data specific subject and educational types. Based on the then established achievement target, the actual percent of his/her class who reach the SLO achievement target at the end of the course based on the final assessment will define the number of points (out of 20) earned by the teacher. For example: For a teacher who has 90% of his/her class reach the target, such as 90% of all students passed with a score of 75% or above on the final exam, he/she would earn 18 points. For a teacher who has 75% of his/her class reach the target, he/she would earn 15 points. For a teacher who has 58% of his/her class reach the target, he/she would earn 7 points. For a teacher who has 36% of his/her class reach the target, he/she would earn 2 points.
Highly Effective (18-20 points) Results are well above District- or BOCES-adopted expectations for growth or achievement for grade/subject.	Teachers who have 86% or more of their class meeting the established achievement target will receive a highly effective rating. See Chart at 3.13
Effective (9-17 points) Results meet District- or BOCES-adopted expectations for growth or achievement for grade/subject.	Teachers who have between 62% and 85% of their class meeting the established achievement target will receive an effective rating. See Chart at 3.13
Developing (3 - 8 points) Results are below District- or BOCES-adopted expectations for growth or achievement for grade/subject.	Teachers who have between 50% and 61% of their class meeting the established achievement target will receive a developing rating. See Chart at 3.13
Ineffective (0 - 2 points) Results are well below District- or BOCES-adopted expectations for growth or achievement for grade/subject.	Teachers who have between 0% and 49% of their class meeting the established achievement target will receive an ineffective rating. See Chart at 3.13

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	NWEA Measures of Academic Progress (MAP) for Primary Grades (Math)
1	5) District, regional, or BOCES–developed assessments	NWEA Measures of Academic Progress (MAP) for Primary Grades (Math)
2	5) District, regional, or BOCES–developed assessments	NWEA Measures of Academic Progress (MAP) (Math)
3	5) District, regional, or BOCES–developed assessments	NWEA Measures of Academic Progress (MAP) (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.	<p>The 20 point distribution plan scoring chart for use with student learning objectives (SLOs) will be implemented as follows:</p> <p>A teacher will determine the aggregate achievement level that his or her students should reach associated with a specific SLO. The achievement target will be set by an individual teacher in agreement with his/her evaluator. Achievement goals will be determined by reviewing aggregate data for groups of students based on longitudinal historical data specific subject and educational types.</p> <p>Based on the then established achievement target, the actual percent of his/her class who reach the SLO achievement target at the end of the course based on the final assessment will define the number of points (out of 20) earned by the teacher. For example: For a teacher who has 90% of his/her class reach the target, such as 90% of all students passed with a score of 75% or above on the final exam, he/she would earn 18 points. For a teacher who has 75% of his/her class reach the target, he/she would earn 15 points. For a teacher who has 58% of his/her class reach the target, he/she would earn 7 points. For a teacher who has 36% of his/her class reach the target, he/she would earn 2 points.</p>
Highly Effective (18-20 points) Results are well above District- or BOCES-adopted expectations for growth or achievement for grade/subject.	Teachers who have 86% or more of their class meeting the established achievement target will receive a highly effective rating. See Chart at 3.13
Effective (9-17 points) Results meet District- or BOCES-adopted expectations for growth or achievement for grade/subject.	Teachers who have between 62% and 85% of their class meeting the established achievement target will receive an effective rating. See Chart at 3.13

Developing (3 - 8 points) Results are below District -or BOCES-adopted expectations for growth or achievement for grade/subject.	Teachers who have between 50% and 61% of their class meeting the established achievement target will receive a developing rating. See Chart at 3.13
Ineffective (0 - 2 points) Results are well below District- or BOCES-adopted expectations for growth or achievement for grade/subject.	Teachers who have between 0% and 49% of their class meeting the established achievement target will receive an ineffective rating. See Chart at 3.13

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	Niagara Falls City School District Developed Grade 6 Science Assessment
7	5) District, regional, or BOCES–developed assessments	Niagara Falls City School District Developed Grade 7 Science Assessment
8	1) Change in percentage of student performance level on State assessments	NYS Grade 8 Science Assessment

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

Use this box, if needed, to describe the general process for assigning HEDI categories for these grades/subjects in this subcomponent. If needed, you may upload a table or graphic at 3.13, below.	<p>The 20 point distribution plan scoring chart for use with student learning objectives (SLOs) will be implemented as follows:</p> <p>A teacher will determine the aggregate achievement level that his or her students should reach associated with a specific SLO. The achievement target will be set by an individual teacher in agreement with his/her evaluator. Achievement goals will be determined by reviewing aggregate data for groups of students based on longitudinal historical data specific subject and educational types.</p> <p>Based on the then established achievement target, the actual percent of his/her class who reach the SLO achievement target at the end of the course based on the final assessment will define the number of points (out of 20) earned by the teacher. For example: For a teacher who has 90% of his/her class reach the target, such as 90% of all students passed with a score of 75% or above on the final exam, he/she would earn 18 points. For a teacher who has 75% of his/her class reach the target, he/she would earn 15 points. For a teacher who has 58% of his/her class reach the target, he/she would earn 7 points. For a teacher who has 36% of his/her class reach the target, he/she would earn 2 points.</p>
---	---

Highly Effective (18 - 20 points) Results are well above District- or BOCES-adopted expectations for growth or achievement for grade/subject.	Teachers who have 86% or more of their class meeting the established achievement target will receive a highly effective rating. See Chart at 3.13
Effective (9 - 17 points) Results meet District- or BOCES-adopted expectations for growth or achievement	Teachers who have between 62% and 85% of their class meeting the established achievement target will receive an

for grade/subject.	effective rating. See Chart at 3.13
Developing (3 - 8 points) Results are below District- or BOCES-adopted expectations for growth or achievement for grade/subject.	Teachers who have between 50% and 61% of their class meeting the established achievement target will receive a developing rating. See Chart at 3.13
Ineffective (0 - 2 points) Results are well below District- or BOCES-adopted expectations for growth or achievement for grade/subject.	Teachers who have between 0% and 49% of their class meeting the established achievement target will receive an ineffective rating. See Chart at 3.13

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	Niagara Falls City School District Developed Grade 6 Social Studies Assessment
7	5) District, regional, or BOCES–developed assessments	Niagara Falls City School District Developed Grade 7 Social Studies Assessment
8	5) District, regional, or BOCES–developed assessments	Niagara Falls City School District Developed Grade 8 Social Studies Assessment

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

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

Use this box, if needed, to describe the general process for assigning HEDI categories for these grades/subjects in this subcomponent. If needed, you may upload a table or graphic at 3.13, below.	<p>The 20 point distribution plan scoring chart for use with student learning objectives (SLOs) will be implemented as follows:</p> <p>A teacher will determine the aggregate achievement level that his or her students should reach associated with a specific SLO. The achievement target will be set by an individual teacher in agreement with his/her evaluator. Achievement goals will be determined by reviewing aggregate data for groups of students based on longitudinal historical data specific subject and educational types.</p> <p>Based on the then established achievement target, the actual percent of his/her class who reach the SLO achievement target at the end of the course based on the final assessment will define the number of points (out of 20) earned by the teacher. For example: For a teacher who has 90% of his/her class reach the target, such as 90% of all students passed with a score of 75% or above on the final exam, he/she would earn 18 points. For a teacher who has 75% of his/her class reach the target, he/she would earn 15 points. For a teacher who has 58% of his/her class reach the target, he/she would earn 7 points. For a teacher who has 36% of his/her class reach</p>
---	---

	the target, he/she would earn 2 points.
Highly Effective (18 - 20 points) Results are well above District- or BOCES-adopted expectations for growth or achievement for grade/subject.	Teachers who have 86% or more of their class meeting the established achievement target will receive a highly effective rating. See Chart at 3.13
Effective (9 - 17 points) Results meet District- or BOCES-adopted expectations for growth or achievement for grade/subject.	Teachers who have between 62% and 85% of their class meeting the established achievement target will receive an effective rating. See Chart at 3.13
Developing (3 - 8 points) Results are below District- or BOCES-adopted expectations for growth or achievement for grade/subject.	Teachers who have between 50% and 61% of their class meeting the established achievement target will receive a developing rating. See Chart at 3.13
Ineffective (0 - 2 points) Results are well below District- or BOCES-adopted expectations for growth or achievement for grade/subject.	Teachers who have between 0% and 49% of their class meeting the established achievement target will receive an ineffective rating. See Chart at 3.13

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	5) District, regional, or BOCES–developed assessments	Niagara Falls City School District Developed Global History and Geography Assessment
Global 2	1) Change in percentage of student performance level on State assessments	New York State Global History and Geography Regents Exam
American History	1) Change in percentage of student performance level on State assessments	New York State US History Government Regents Exam

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

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

Use this box, if needed, to describe the general process for assigning HEDI categories for these grades/subjects in this subcomponent. If needed, you may upload a table or graphic at 3.13, below.	The 20 point distribution plan scoring chart for use with student learning objectives (SLOs) will be implemented as follows: A teacher will determine the aggregate achievement level that his or her students should reach associated with a specific SLO. The achievement target will be set by an individual teacher in agreement with his/her evaluator. Achievement goals will be determined by reviewing aggregate data for groups of students based on longitudinal historical data specific subject and educational types. Based on the then established achievement target, the
---	--

actual percent of his/her class who reach the SLO achievement target at the end of the course based on the final assessment will define the number of points (out of 20) earned by the teacher. For example: For a teacher who has 90% of his/her class reach the target, such as 90% of all students passed with a score of 75% or above on the final exam, he/she would earn 18 points. For a teacher who has 75% of his/her class reach the target, he/she would earn 15 points. For a teacher who has 58% of his/her class reach the target, he/she would earn 7 points. For a teacher who has 36% of his/her class reach the target, he/she would earn 2 points.

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

Teachers who have 86% or more of their class meeting the established achievement target will receive a highly effective rating. See Chart at 3.13

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

Teachers who have between 62% and 85% of their class meeting the established achievement target will receive an effective rating. See Chart at 3.13

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

Teachers who have between 50% and 61% of their class meeting the established achievement target will receive a developing rating. See Chart at 3.13

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

Teachers who have between 0% and 49% of their class meeting the established achievement target will receive an ineffective rating. See Chart at 3.13

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	1) Change in percentage of student performance level on State assessments	New York State Living Environment Regents Exam
Earth Science	1) Change in percentage of student performance level on State assessments	New York State Earth Science Regents Exam
Chemistry	1) Change in percentage of student performance level on State assessments	New York State Chemistry Regents Exam
Physics	1) Change in percentage of student performance level on State assessments	New York State 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.

The 20 point distribution plan scoring chart for use with student learning objectives (SLOs) will be implemented as follows:

A teacher will determine the aggregate achievement level that his or her students should reach associated with a specific SLO. The achievement target will be set by an individual teacher in agreement with his/her evaluator. Achievement goals will be determined by reviewing aggregate data for groups of students based on longitudinal historical data specific subject and educational types.

Based on the then established achievement target, the actual percent of his/her class who reach the SLO achievement target at the end of the course based on the final assessment will define the number of points (out of 20) earned by the teacher. For example: For a teacher who has 90% of his/her class reach the target, such as 90% of all students passed with a score of 75% or above on the final exam, he/she would earn 18 points. For a teacher who has 75% of his/her class reach the target, he/she would earn 15 points. For a teacher who has 58% of his/her class reach the target, he/she would earn 7 points. For a teacher who has 36% of his/her class reach the target, he/she would earn 2 points.

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

Teachers who have 86% or more of their class meeting the established achievement target will receive a highly effective rating. See Chart at 3.13

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

Teachers who have between 62% and 85% of their class meeting the established achievement target will receive an effective rating. See Chart at 3.13

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

Teachers who have between 50% and 61% of their class meeting the established achievement target will receive a developing rating. See Chart at 3.13

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

Teachers who have between 0% and 49% of their class meeting the established achievement target will receive an ineffective rating. See Chart at 3.13

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	1) Change in percentage of student performance level on State assessments	New York State Integrated Algebra Regents Exam
Geometry	1) Change in percentage of student performance level on State assessments	New York State Geometry Regents Exam
Algebra 2	1) Change in percentage of student performance level on State assessments	New York State Algebra II/Trigonometry 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.

<p>Use this box, if needed, to describe the general process for assigning HEDI categories for these grades/subjects in this subcomponent. If needed, you may upload a table or graphic at 3.13, below.</p>	<p>The 20 point distribution plan scoring chart for use with student learning objectives (SLOs) will be implemented as follows: A teacher will determine the aggregate achievement level that his or her students should reach associated with a specific SLO. The achievement target will be set by an individual teacher in agreement with his/her evaluator. Achievement goals will be determined by reviewing aggregate data for groups of students based on longitudinal historical data specific subject and educational types. Based on the then established achievement target, the actual percent of his/her class who reach the SLO achievement target at the end of the course based on the final assessment will define the number of points (out of 20) earned by the teacher. For example: For a teacher who has 90% of his/her class reach the target, such as 90% of all students passed with a score of 75% or above on the final exam, he/she would earn 18 points. For a teacher who has 75% of his/her class reach the target, he/she would earn 15 points. For a teacher who has 58% of his/her class reach the target, he/she would earn 7 points. For a teacher who has 36% of his/her class reach the target, he/she would earn 2 points.</p>
<p>Highly Effective (18 - 20 points) Results are well above District- or BOCES-adopted expectations for growth or achievement for grade/subject.</p>	<p>Teachers who have 86% or more of their class meeting the established achievement target will receive a highly effective rating. See Chart at 3.13</p>
<p>Effective (9 - 17 points) Results meet District- or BOCES-adopted expectations for growth or achievement for grade/subject.</p>	<p>Teachers who have between 62% and 85% of their class meeting the established achievement target will receive an effective rating. See Chart at 3.13</p>
<p>Developing (3 - 8 points) Results are below District- or BOCES-adopted expectations for growth or achievement for grade/subject.</p>	<p>Teachers who have between 50% and 61% of their class meeting the established achievement target will receive a developing rating. See Chart at 3.13</p>
<p>Ineffective (0 - 2 points) Results are well below District- or BOCES-adopted expectations for growth or achievement for grade/subject.</p>	<p>Teachers who have between 0% and 49% of their class meeting the established achievement target will receive an ineffective rating. See Chart at 3.13</p>

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	5) District, regional, or BOCES–developed assessments	Niagara Falls City School District Developed Grade 9 ELA Assessment
Grade 10 ELA	5) District, regional, or BOCES–developed assessments	Niagara Falls City School District Developed Grade 10 ELA Assessment
Grade 11 ELA	1) Change in percentage of student performance level on State assessments	New York State Comprehensive Grade 11 English Regents Exam

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

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

Use this box, if needed, to describe the general process for assigning HEDI categories for these grades/subjects in this subcomponent. If needed, you may upload a table or graphic at 3.13, below.	The 20 point distribution plan scoring chart for use with student learning objectives (SLOs) will be implemented as follows: A teacher will determine the aggregate achievement level that his or her students should reach associated with a specific SLO. The achievement target will be set by an individual teacher in agreement with his/her evaluator. Achievement goals will be determined by reviewing aggregate data for groups of students based on longitudinal historical data specific subject and educational types. Based on the then established achievement target, the actual percent of his/her class who reach the SLO achievement target at the end of the course based on the final assessment will define the number of points (out of 20) earned by the teacher. For example: For a teacher who has 90% of his/her class reach the target, such as 90% of all students passed with a score of 75% or above on the final exam, he/she would earn 18 points. For a teacher who has 75% of his/her class reach the target, he/she would earn 15 points. For a teacher who has 58% of his/her class reach the target, he/she would earn 7 points. For a teacher who has 36% of his/her class reach the target, he/she would earn 2 points.
Highly Effective (18 - 20 points) Results are well above District- or BOCES-adopted expectations for growth or achievement for grade/subject.	Teachers who have 86% or more of their class meeting the established achievement target will receive a highly effective rating. See Chart at 3.13
Effective (9 - 17 points) Results meet District- or BOCES-adopted expectations for growth or achievement for grade/subject.	Teachers who have between 62% and 85% of their class meeting the established achievement target will receive an effective rating. See Chart at 3.13
Developing (3 - 8 points) Results are below District- or BOCES-adopted expectations for growth or achievement for grade/subject.	Teachers who have between 50% and 61% of their class meeting the established achievement target will receive a developing rating. See Chart at 3.13
Ineffective (0 - 2 points) Results are well below District- or BOCES-adopted expectations for growth or achievement for grade/subject.	Teachers who have between 0% and 49% of their class meeting the established achievement target will receive an ineffective rating. See Chart at 3.13

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
Art K-8	7) Student Learning Objectives	Niagara Falls City School District Developed Grade Specific Art Assessment
Vocal Music K-8	7) Student Learning Objectives	Niagara Falls City School District Developed Grade Specific Vocal Music Assessment
Instrumental Music 4-8	7) Student Learning Objectives	Niagara Falls City School District Developed Grade Specific Instrumental Music Assessment
General Music 7-8	7) Student Learning Objectives	Niagara Falls City School District Developed Grade Specific General Music Assessment
Physical Education K-12	7) Student Learning Objectives	Niagara Falls City School District Developed Grade Specific Physical Education Assessment
English Language Learners K-12	7) Student Learning Objectives	Niagara Falls City School District Developed Grade Specific English Language Learners Assessment
Special Education/Functional Life skills	7) Student Learning Objectives	Niagara Falls City School District Developed Grade Specific Special Education/Functional Life Skills Assessment
Strategic Reading K-6	7) Student Learning Objectives	Niagara Falls City School District Developed Grade Specific Strategic Reading Assessment
Family Consumer Science 7-8	7) Student Learning Objectives	Niagara Falls City School District Developed Grade Specific Family and Consumer Science Assessment
Health Grade 7 Grade 11	7) Student Learning Objectives	Niagara Falls City School District Developed Grade Specific Health Assessment
LOTE 8-12	7) Student Learning Objectives	Niagara Falls City School District Developed Grade Specific LOTE Assessment
Technology 8	7) Student Learning Objectives	Niagara Falls City School District Developed Grade 8 Technology Assessment
AIS English 7-8	7) Student Learning Objectives	Niagara Falls City School District Developed Grade Specific AIS English Assessment
AIS Math 7-8	7) Student Learning Objectives	Niagara Falls City School District Developed Grade Specific AIS Math Assessment
All other courses 9-12	7) Student Learning Objectives	Niagara Falls City School District Developed Grade Specific Assessments

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

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

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

The 20 point distribution plan scoring chart for use with student learning objectives (SLOs) will be implemented as follows:

A teacher will determine the aggregate achievement level that his or her students should reach associated with a specific SLO. The achievement target will be set by an individual teacher in agreement with his/her evaluator. Achievement goals will be determined by reviewing aggregate data for groups of students based on longitudinal historical data specific subject and educational types.

Based on the then established achievement target, the actual percent of his/her class who reach the SLO achievement target at the end of the course based on the final assessment will define the number of points (out of 20) earned by the teacher. For example: For a teacher who has 90% of his/her class reach the target, such as 90% of all students passed with a score of 75% or above on the final exam, he/she would earn 18 points. For a teacher who has 75% of his/her class reach the target, he/she would earn 15 points. For a teacher who has 58% of his/her class reach the target, he/she would earn 7 points. For a teacher who has 36% of his/her class reach the target, he/she would earn 2 points.

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

Teachers who have 86% or more of their class meeting the established achievement target will receive a highly effective rating. See Chart at 3.13

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

Teachers who have between 62% and 85% of their class meeting the established achievement target will receive an effective rating. See Chart at 3.13

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

Teachers who have between 50% and 61% of their class meeting the established achievement target will receive a developing rating. See Chart at 3.13

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

Teachers who have between 0% and 49% of their class meeting the established achievement target will receive an ineffective rating. See Chart at 3.13

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

(No response)

3.13) HEDI Tables or Graphics

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

assets/survey-uploads/5139/183688-y92vNseFa4/HEDI percentages 0-20 with narrative 3.13 12 14 2012.xlsx

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.

Not Applicable

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.

In the case of multiple SLOs, weighting would apply based upon the number of students that the teacher has in each measure.

For example, if one measure has 20 students and a second measure has 40 students, the second measure would be weighted twice.

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 Friday, September 28, 2012

Updated Monday, December 10, 2012

Page 1

4.1) Teacher Practice Rubric

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

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

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

Danielson's Framework for Teaching (2011 Revised Edition)

Not Applicable

4.2) Points Within Other Measures

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

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

Is the following points assignment applicable to all teachers?

Yes

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

(No response)

Multiple (at least two) classroom observations by principal or other trained administrator, at least one of which must be unannounced [at least 31 points]	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.

See Conversion Chart and explanation uploaded below.

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/5091/183650-eka9yMJ855/60_Conversion Flow Chart for Danielson Rubric November 2012.xls

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.	Each year teachers will be rated based on all elements found in the Charlotte Danielson 2011 Revised framework for teaching scoring rubric. Those teachers that average between 3.5 and 4.0 for a total average rubric score which is converted to a 59-60 conversion composite score will be considered highly effective.
Effective: Overall performance and results meet NYS Teaching Standards.	Each year teachers will be rated based on all elements found in the Charlotte Danielson 2011 Revised framework for teaching scoring rubric. Those teachers that average between 2.5 and 3.4 for a total average rubric score which is converted to a 57-58 conversion composite score will be considered effective.
Developing: Overall performance and results need improvement in order to meet NYS Teaching Standards.	Each year teachers will be rated based on all elements found in the Charlotte Danielson 2011 Revised framework for teaching scoring rubric. Those teachers that average between 1.5 and 2.4 for a total average rubric score which is converted to a 50-56 conversion composite score will be considered developing.
Ineffective: Overall performance and results do not meet NYS Teaching Standards.	Each year teachers will be rated based on all elements found in the Charlotte Danielson 2011 Revised framework for teaching scoring rubric. Those teachers that average between 1-1.4 for a total average rubric score which is converted to a 0-49 conversion composite score will be considered ineffective.

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	0
4.6) Observations of Probationary Teachers Enter Total	2

By trained in-school peer teachers or other trained reviewers

Formal/Long	0
Informal/Short	0

Independent evaluators

Formal/Long	0
Informal/Short	0

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

-
- In Person
-

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

-
- Not Applicable
-

4.7) Observations of Tenured Teachers

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

By building principals or other trained administrators

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

By trained in-school peer teachers or other trained reviewers

Formal/Long	0
Informal/Short	0

Independent evaluators

Formal/Long	0
Informal/Short	0

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

-
- In Person
-

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

- Not Applicable
-

5. Composite Scoring (Teachers)

Created Friday, September 28, 2012
Updated Thursday, December 06, 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 Friday, September 28, 2012
Updated Monday, December 10, 2012

Page 1

6.1) Assurances -- Improvement Plans

Please check the boxes below:

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

6.2) Attachment: Teacher Improvement Plan Forms

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

assets/survey-uploads/5265/183606-Df0w3Xx5v6/Teacher Improvement Plan November 2012.doc

6.3) Appeals Process

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

(1) the substance of the annual professional performance review

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

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

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

The following appeals procedure shall apply and shall be the exclusive means for initiating, reviewing and resolving appeals related to an annual professional performance review (APPR) and or teacher improvement plan (TIP). A challenge or determination under this section shall be exempt from the grievance and arbitration provisions in the collective bargaining agreement between the parties, and an Annual Professional Performance review or Teacher Improvement Plan may not be challenged in any other forum.

1. Appeals for “Ineffective” Ratings or Three Consecutive “Developing” Ratings

Appeals of Annual Professional Performance Reviews shall be limited to only those which rate a classroom teacher as ineffective. A teacher receiving three consecutive developing ratings may also appeal in accordance with the process outlined herein. A unit member holding the position of classroom teacher may challenge only the substance of the Annual Professional Performance Review, the District’s compliance with its procedures for conducting the Annual Professional Performance Review, or its issuance and/or implementation of the terms of the Teacher Improvement Plan.

2. Post Evaluation meeting with Evaluator

When the evaluation is completed, the teacher will be notified by email that it is available in the office. Upon retrieving the evaluation, the teacher will sign a receipt. If the teacher does not retrieve the evaluation within one week, the ten (10) day time period referenced below will begin running automatically. Consideration will be given to teachers who are absent or on leave when notifications are sent. Should consideration of this sort be required for the distribution of an evaluation, the parties agree that the process will be handled timely and expeditiously as per Education Law 3012-c.

Any teacher who receives an “ineffective” rating or a third consecutive “developing” rating, may, within ten (10) calendar days of the issuance of the Annual Professional Performance Review or Teacher Improvement Plan, request a meeting with the principal to review all findings relating to the evaluation, including but not limited to any potential procedural or substantive disputes regarding the evaluation of TIP. The meeting, shall be held within ten (10) calendar days of the receipt of the request at a mutually agreed upon date and time.*

The teacher may have a NFT representative present if he/she chooses.

At the meeting, the teacher shall have the option of submitting written information to the principal, explaining the basis for the disagreement with the evaluation and providing any relevant supporting documentation concerning the teacher’s position.

The principal shall within ten (10) calendar days of the meeting have the option to take any of the following action: respond to the teacher in writing, modify the Annual Professional Performance Review or Teacher Improvement Plan, or return the Annual Professional Performance review or Teacher Improvement Plan to the Teacher.

3. Appeal to the Superintendent of Schools

Any teacher who receives an “ineffective” or third consecutive “developing” Annual Professional Performance Review or Teacher Improvement Plan who seeks to challenge the final determination of the principal, may submit a written appeal to the Superintendent of Schools.

Burden of Proof

A teacher choosing to appeal an “ineffective” or a third consecutive “developing” rating or Teacher Improvement Plan, bears the burden of demonstrating the relief requested and the burden of establishing the facts upon which such relief is sought. Only one appeal in relation to any particular Annual Professional Performance Review or Teacher Improvement Plan may be submitted.

Written Appeals to the Superintendent of Schools

All appeals shall be in writing and be filed with the Superintendent of Schools. Any grounds not raised in writing shall be deemed waived.

Time for Teacher Filing

Any appeal filed by a teacher receiving an “ineffective” rating, third consecutive “developing” rating or Teacher Improvement Plan, must be submitted in writing to the Superintendent of Schools no later than ten (10) calendar days from the date the teacher receives the final evaluation or plan from the principal.

In the event the teacher chooses to request a post evaluation meeting, the appeal to the Superintendent must be submitted no later than ten (10) calendar days from the principal’s action.

Any failure by the teacher to file an appeal within this timeframe shall be considered a waiver and abandonment of the right to appeal.

Content of Appeal

The teacher filing the appeal has the responsibility to submit a detailed written description of the specific areas of the evaluation and/or TIP in dispute together with a copy of the evaluation and or TIP presented to the teacher and any additional documents or materials the teacher believes relevant to the determination of the appeal. The teacher may present any mitigating circumstances that he/she believes are relevant to the appeal, (including but not limited to Class Size, Students and Classes Assigned, Student Attendance, Teacher Leave Time/Personal Life, New Initiatives/Requirements, Administrative support/Relationship and Physical Environment) which shall be considered by the District along with all other information submitted during the appeal. It is agreed that for appeals filed due to the receipt of a third consecutive "developing" rating, all three consecutive developing evaluations may be submitted for consideration as part of the Appeal.

The teacher shall have the right to NFT representation to assist with the drafting and filing of the appeal.

All documents submitted at the time of the filing of the appeal shall be considered the record of the appeal for consideration. Any information, documents and/or materials not submitted at the time of the filing of the appeal shall not be considered in making a final determination.

Evaluator Response

Within ten (10) calendar days from the receipt of an appeal, the Evaluator who issued the Annual Professional Performance review and/or TIP shall file a written response to the appeal with the Superintendent of Schools.

The response shall include any and all information documentation and material that is to be considered in support of the Annual Professional Performance Review and/or TIP and in response to the teacher's appeal.

All documents submitted at the time of the filing the response to the appeal shall be considered as part of the record of the appeal for consideration. Any information, documents and/or materials not submitted at the time of the filing of the response to the appeal shall not be considered in making a final determination.

The teacher shall be provided with a copy of the response filed by the evaluator together with all information documentation and material that is submitted in support of the APPR and/or TIP.

Meeting On Appeal

Within ten (10) calendar days of the receipt of the Evaluator response, the Superintendent shall meet with the teacher and his/her Union Representative.

Determination of Appeal

The Superintendent of Schools shall render a written decision on the merits of the appeal based solely upon the record submitted.

The written decision shall be rendered no later than fifteen (15) calendar days from the date upon which the meeting with the teacher and his/her Union Representative is held.

The written decision shall include the reasons and factual basis for each determination on each of the specific issues raised in the appeal.

The Superintendent may choose to do any one or a combination of the following:

Sustain the appeal

Sustain the appeal and set aside a rating

Sustain the appeal and modify a rating

Direct a new evaluation be conducted by the same or different evaluator.

Should the Superintendent choose to sustain the appeal and modify the rating, the decision regarding the modified rating shall be provided to the teacher no later than 15 calendar days from the date upon which the meeting with the teacher and his/her union rep is held.

Should the Superintendent direct that a new evaluation be conducted by the same or different evaluator, the evaluation must be completed and provided to the teacher and the Superintendent within ten (10) school days of the Superintendent's direction.

*Deny the appeal in total
Deny the appeal in part and request a modification
to the TIP*

*In the event an appeal for a second consecutive
ineffective evaluation is denied, the
Superintendent's decision shall
advise the teacher that he/she may be subject to
the commencement of an expedited 3020-a
proceeding as allowed by the regulations. The
District and NFT agree that
all evidence and information procured as part of the
record shall become part of the expedited 3020-a
proceeding*

4. Unit members receiving a mandated TIP will have the right to NFT representation during the development of said TIP.

5. Nothing raised by the teacher at any point in this Appeals procedure shall be construed to limit any evidence or arguments that the teacher may raise in a formal statutory disciplinary or legal proceeding for actions not specifically related to appealing an evaluation per this procedure.

**It is understood by the District and NFT that for the purposes of the timelines referenced in this Agreement, school holidays and vacation periods will be taken into consideration when counting 10 calendar days.*

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.

Lead Evaluator for the District was appointed by the Superintendent of Schools.

This Administrator attended New York State training as offered on the following dates:

August 1, 2, 3, 4, 5, 2011

November 2, 2011

January 17, 18, 19, 2012

March 12, 13, 2012

The Administrator was a member of the Consortium that was provided an opportunity to practice and receive feedback on the Charlotte Danielson model and rubric.

The Lead Evaluator underwent a series of training modules that rated his ability to rate teacher performance against the rubric and then was certified.

The Lead Evaluator then returned to District and trained all District Administrators in the components of APPR, including the Danielson Framework on the following dates:

January 25, 2012

February 1, 15, 29, 2012

April 25, 2012

May 9, 2012

July 9, 11, 20, 2012

The District purchased the Teachscape product with the Lead Evaluator using this as a tool to instruct and ensure inter-rater

reliability.

The Lead Evaluator will meet monthly with the evaluators to continuously assess and refine their skills.

An evaluator training manual was constructed to document and help guide evaluators in this work.

The District will work to ensure that evaluators maintain inter-rater reliability over time and that they are re-certified on an annual basis and receive updated training on any changes in the law, regulations or applicable collective bargaining agreements.

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 Friday, September 28, 2012
Updated Thursday, December 06, 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):

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

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

Please check the boxes below:

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

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

(No response)

7.4) Special Considerations for Comparable Growth Measures

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

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

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

(No response)

7.5) Principals with More Than One Growth Measure

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

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

7.6) Assurances -- Comparable Growth Measures

Please check all of the boxes below:

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

8. Local Measures (Principals)

Created Friday, September 28, 2012
Updated Thursday, December 06, 2012

Page 1

Locally-Selected Measures of Student Achievement or Growth

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

Grade Configuration	Locally-Selected Measure from List of Approved Measures	Assessment
K-6	(d) measures used by district for teacher evaluation	AIMSWEB (K-2 ELA); NWEA Measures of Academic Progress (MAP) (3-6 ELA); NWEA Measures of Academic Progress (MAP) for primary grades (K-1 Math); NWEA MEasures of Academic Progress (MAP) (2-6 Math)
7-8	(d) measures used by district for teacher evaluation	NWEA Measures of Academic Progress (MAP) ELA; NWEA Measures of Academic Progress (MAP) (Math)
9-12	(d) measures used by district for teacher evaluation	New York State Integrated Algebra I Regents Exam and New York State Comprehensive English Regents Exam

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

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

<p>Use this box, if needed, to describe the process for assigning HEDI categories. If needed, you may upload a table or graphic below.</p>	<p>The Niagara Falls City School District set a target that 70% of students will demonstrate growth as measured by the NWEA measure of academic progress for each area identified. K-2 will use AIMSweb for reading. At the high school level the 70% target will be based on Integrated Algebra and NYS Comprehensive Regents Examination in English. For example: For a principal who has 90% of his/her students reach the target, he/she would earn 14 points. For a principal who has 75% of his/her students reach the target, he/she would earn 11 points. For a principal who had 58% of his/her students reach the target, he/she would earn 6 points. For a principal who has 36% of his/her students reach the target, he/she would earn 2 points.</p>
--	---

Highly Effective (14 - 15 points) Results are well above District- or BOCES-adopted expectations for growth or achievement for grade/subject.	86 to 100 % of the students in a school building meet or exceed the target.
Effective (8- 13 points) Results meet District- or BOCES-adopted expectations for growth or achievement for grade/subject.	62 to 85% of the students in a school building meet or exceed the target.
Developing (3 - 7 points) Results are below District- or BOCES-adopted expectations for growth or achievement for grade/subject.	50-61% of the students in a school building meet or exceed the target.
Ineffective (0 - 2 points) Results are well below District- or BOCES-adopted expectations for growth or achievement for grade/subject.	0-49% of the students in a school building meet or exceed the target.

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/5366/183775-qBFVOWF7fC/HEDI percentages 0-15 for principals November 2012 rev 2.xlsx

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

Use this box, if needed, to describe the process for assigning HEDI categories. If needed, you may upload a table or graphic below.	(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.

Not Applicable.

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.

In the case of multiple measures, weighting would apply as based upon the number of students included in each individual locally selected measure.

For example, a principal who has 100 students in one measure, and 200 students in a second measure, will have the second measure weighted twice.

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, September 28, 2012
Updated Monday, December 10, 2012

Page 1

9.1) Principal Practice Rubric

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

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

Multidimensional Principal Performance Rubric

(No response)

9.2) Points Within Other Measures

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

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

Is the following points assignment for all principals?

Yes

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

(No response)

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

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

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

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

(No response)

9.3) Assurances -- Goals

Please check the boxes below (if applicable):

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

9.4) Sources of Evidence (if applicable)

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

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

9.5) Survey Tool(s) (if applicable)

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

(No response)

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

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

9.6) Assurances

Please check all of the boxes below:

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

9.7) Process for Assigning Points and Determining HEDI Ratings

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

See Multidimensional Principal Performance scoring chart uploaded below.

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/5143/183672-pMADJ4gk6R/ASC appr weighting grid december 2012.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.	Each year principals will be rated based on all elements found in the Multidimensional Principal Performance Rubric Those principals that attain between 51 and 60 points will be considered highly effective.
Effective: Overall performance and results meet standards.	Each year principals will be rated based on all elements found in the Multidimensional Principal Performance Rubric Those principals that attain between 37 and 50 points will be considered effective.
Developing: Overall performance and results need improvement in order to meet standards.	Each year principals will be rated based on all elements found in the Multidimensional Principal Performance Rubric Those principals that attain between 25 and 36 points will be considered developing.
Ineffective: Overall performance and results do not meet standards.	Each year principals will be rated based on all elements found in the Multidimensional Principal Performance Rubric Those principals that attain between 0 and 24 points will be considered ineffective.

Please provide the locally-negotiated 60 point scoring bands.

Highly Effective	51-60
Effective	37-50
Developing	25-36
Ineffective	0-24

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 Friday, September 28, 2012

Updated Tuesday, October 09, 2012

Page 1

Standards for Rating Categories

Growth or Comparable Measures

Locally-selected Measures of growth or achievement

Other Measures of Effectiveness

(Teacher and Leader standards)

Highly

Effective

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

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

Overall performance and results exceed ISLLC leadership standards.

Effective

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

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

Overall performance and results meet ISLLC leadership standards.

Developing

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

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

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

Ineffective

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

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

Overall performance and results do not meet ISLLC leadership standards.

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

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

2012-13 where there is no Value-Added measure

Growth or Comparable Measures

Locally-selected Measures of

growth or achievement

Other Measures of Effectiveness

(60 points)

Overall

Composite Score

Highly Effective

18-20

18-20

Ranges determined locally--see below

91-100

Effective

9-17

9-17

75-90

Developing

3-8

3-8

65-74

Ineffective

0-2

0-2

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

Highly Effective	51-60
Effective	37-50
Developing	25-36
Ineffective	0-24

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 Friday, September 28, 2012
Updated Monday, December 10, 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/5276/183629-Df0w3Xx5v6/ASC_appr_Principal_Improvement_Plan_November_2012.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:

The following appeals procedure shall apply and shall be the exclusive means for initiating, reviewing and resolving appeals related to an annual professional performance review (APPR) and or Principal Improvement Plan (PIP). A challenge or determination under this section shall be exempt from the grievance and arbitration provisions in the collective bargaining agreement between the parties, and an Annual Professional Performance review or Principal Improvement Plan may not be challenged in any other forum.

1. Appeals for “Ineffective” Ratings or Three Consecutive “Developing” Ratings

Appeals of Annual professional Performance Reviews shall be limited to only those which rate a principal as ineffective. A principal receiving three consecutive developing ratings may also appeal in accordance with the process outlined herein.

A principal may challenge only:

- a. The substance of the Annual Professional Performance Review;*
- b. The District’s compliance with agreed upon procedures for conducting the Annual Professional Performance Review;*
- c. The District’s issuance and/or implementation of the terms of the Principal Improvement Plan.*
- d. The District’s adherence to the standards, methodologies, and regulations required for such Annual Professional Performance Reviews pursuant to sections 3012-c of the Education Law and Regulations of the Commissioner of Education.*

2. Post Evaluation meeting with Evaluator

By June 30 or when the evaluation is completed, whichever is earlier, the principal will be notified by email that it is available in the Deputy Superintendent’s office. Upon retrieving the evaluation, the principal will sign a receipt. If the principal does not retrieve the evaluation within one week, the ten (10) day time period referenced below will begin running automatically. Consideration will be given to principals who are absent or on leave when notifications are sent. Should consideration of this sort be required for the distribution of an evaluation, the parties agree that the process will be handled timely and expeditiously as per Education Law 3012-c.

Any principal who receives an “ineffective” rating or a third consecutive “developing” rating, may, within ten (10) calendar days of the issuance of the Annual Professional Performance Review or Principal Improvement Plan, request a meeting with the Deputy Superintendent to review all findings relating to the evaluation, including but not limited to any potential procedural or substantive disputes regarding the evaluation or PIP. The meeting, shall be held within ten (10) calendar days of the receipt of the request at a mutually agreed upon date and time.*

The principal may have an ASC representative present if he/she chooses.

At the meeting, the principal shall have the option of submitting written information to the Deputy Superintendent, explaining the basis for the disagreement with the evaluation and providing any relevant supporting documentation concerning the principal’s position.

The Deputy Superintendent shall within ten (10) calendar days of the meeting have the option to take any of the following action: respond to the principal in writing, modify the Annual Professional Performance Review or Principal Improvement Plan, or return the Annual Professional Performance review or Principal Improvement Plan to the Principal.

3. Appeal to the Superintendent of Schools

Any principal who receives an “ineffective” or third consecutive “developing” Annual Professional Performance Review or Principal Improvement Plan, who seeks to challenge the final determination of the Deputy Superintendent, may submit a written appeal to the Superintendent of Schools.

Burden of Proof

A Principal choosing to appeal an “ineffective” or a third consecutive “developing” rating or Principal Improvement Plan, bears the burden of demonstrating the relief requested and the burden of establishing the facts upon which such relief is sought. Only one appeal in relation to any particular Annual Professional Performance Review or Principal Improvement Plan may be submitted.

Written Appeals to the Superintendent of Schools

All appeals shall be in writing and be filed with the Superintendent of Schools. Any grounds not raised in writing shall be deemed waived.

Time for Principal Filing

Any appeal filed by a principal receiving an “ineffective” rating, third consecutive “developing” rating or Principal Improvement Plan, must be submitted in writing to the Superintendent of Schools no later than fifteen (15) calendar days from the date the Principal receives the final evaluation or plan from the deputy Superintendent.

In the event the principal chooses to request a post evaluation meeting, the appeal to the Superintendent must be submitted no later than fifteen (15) calendar days from the Deputy Superintendent's action.

Any failure by the principal to file an appeal within this timeframe shall be considered a waiver and abandonment of the right to appeal.

Content of Appeal

The principal filing the appeal has the responsibility to submit a detailed written description of the specific areas of the evaluation and/or PIP in dispute together with a copy of the evaluation and or PIP presented to the principal and any additional documents or materials the principal believes relevant to the determination of the appeal. The principal may present any mitigating circumstances that he/she believes are relevant to the appeal, (including but not limited to building/class size, teachers and student population, teacher/student attendance, teacher leave. Personal leave/personal life, new initiatives/requirements, Central Office administrative support/relationship and physical environment) which shall be considered by the District along with all other information submitted during the appeal. It is agreed that for appeals filed due to the receipt of a third consecutive "developing" rating, all three consecutive developing evaluations may be submitted for consideration as part of the Appeal.

The principal shall have the right to ASC representation to assist with the drafting and filing of the appeal.

All documents submitted at the time of the filing of the appeal shall be considered the record of the appeal for consideration. Any information, documents and/or materials not submitted at the time of the filing of the appeal shall not be considered in making a final determination.

Evaluator Response

Within ten (10) calendar days from the receipt of an appeal, the Deputy Superintendent who issued the Annual Professional Performance Review and/or PIP shall file a written response to the appeal with the Superintendent of Schools.

The response shall include any and all information documentation and material that is to be considered in support of the Annual Professional Performance Review and/or PIP and in response to the principal's appeal.

All documents submitted at the time of the filing the response to the appeal shall be considered as part of the record of the appeal for consideration. Any information, documents and/or materials not submitted at the time of the filing of the response to the appeal shall not be considered in making a final determination.

The principal shall be provided with a copy of the response filed by the evaluator together with all information documentation and material that is submitted in support of the APPR and/or PIP.

Meeting On Appeal

Within ten (10) calendar days of the receipt of the Evaluator response, the Superintendent shall meet with the principal and his/her Union Representative.

Determination of Appeal

The Superintendent of Schools shall render a written decision on the merits of the appeal based solely upon the record submitted.

The written decision shall be rendered no later than fifteen (15) calendar days from the date upon which the meeting with the principal and his/her Union Representative is held.

The written decision shall include the reasons and factual basis for each determination on each of the specific issues raised in the appeal.

The Superintendent may choose to do any one or a combination of the following:

Sustain the appeal

Sustain the appeal and set aside a rating

Sustain the appeal and modify a rating

Direct a new evaluation be conducted by the same or different evaluator

Should the Superintendent choose to sustain the appeal and modify the rating, the decision regarding the modified rating shall be provided to the principal no later than 15 calendar days from the date upon which the meeting with the principal and his/her union rep is held.

Should the Superintendent direct that a new evaluation be conducted by the same or different evaluator, the evaluation must be completed and provided to the principal and the Superintendent within ten (10) school days of the Superintendent's direction.

Deny the appeal in total

Deny the appeal in part and request a modification to the PIP

In the event an appeal for a second consecutive ineffective evaluation is denied, the

Superintendent's decision shall

advise the administrator that he/she may be subject

to the commencement of an expedited 3020-a proceeding as allowed by the regulations. The

District and ASC agree that all evidence

and information procured as part of the

record shall become part of the expedited 3020-a

proceeding

**It is understood by the District and ASC that for the purposes of the timelines referenced in this Agreement, school holidays and vacation periods will be taken into consideration when counting 10 calendar days.*

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.

The Lead Evaluator for the principals was appointed by the Superintendent.

The Lead Evaluator was trained and certified by the Leadership for Educational Achievement Foundation, Inc., the New York State Council of School Superintendents, and the New York State Education Department.

The training met the requirements of the regulations outlined in 30-2.9 and was inclusive of all nine mandatory requirements. This training also included measures of ensuring inter-rater reliability.

The Lead Evaluator attended conferences hosted by the Leadership for Educational Achievement Foundation, Inc. and was facilitated by one of the developers of the Multi-dimensional Principal Performance Rubric which the District has selected as its evaluation tool.

Formal training and conference attendance was held on October 17 and 18, 2011, and March 13 and 14, 2012.

Continuous attendance at conferences and a subscription to the Leadership for Educational Achievement Foundation, Inc. monthly newsletter will keep the Lead Evaluator current regarding the information necessary to serve in this role.

The District will work to ensure that the Lead Evaluator is re-certified on an annual basis and also that the Lead Evaluator receives updated training on any changes in the law, regulations or applicable collective bargaining agreements.

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	Checked
---	---------

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.

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 Friday, September 28, 2012

Updated Monday, December 17, 2012

Page 1

12.1) Upload the Joint Certification of the APPR Plan

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

<assets/survey-uploads/5581/183636-3Uqgn5g9Iu/APPR Plan cert 12 17 12.pdf>

File types supported for uploads

PDF (preferred)

Microsoft Office (.doc, .ppt, .xls)

Microsoft Office 2007: Supported but not recommended (.docx, .pptx, .xlsx)

Open Office (.odt, .ott)

Images (.jpg, .gif)

Other Formats (.html, .xhtml, .txt, .rtf, .latex)

Please note that .docx, .pptx, and .xlsx formats are not entirely supported.

Please save your file types as .doc, .ppt or .xls respectively before uploading.

Form 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
Chorus 1	<input type="radio"/> State Assessment <input type="radio"/> State-approved 3rd party assessment <input checked="" type="radio"/> District, Regional or BOCES-developed <input type="radio"/> School/BOCES-wide/group/team results based on State	Niagara Falls City School District developed Chorus 1 assessment.
Chorus 2-4	<input type="radio"/> State Assessment <input type="radio"/> State-approved 3rd party assessment <input checked="" type="radio"/> District, Regional or BOCES-developed <input type="radio"/> School/BOCES-wide/group/team results based on State	Niagara Falls City School District developed Chorus 2-4 assessment.
Advanced Chorus 2-4	<input type="radio"/> State Assessment <input type="radio"/> State-approved 3rd party assessment <input checked="" type="radio"/> District, Regional or BOCES-developed <input type="radio"/> School/BOCES-wide/group/team results based on State	Niagara Falls City School District developed Advanced Chorus 2-4 assessment.
Band 1	<input type="radio"/> State Assessment <input type="radio"/> State-approved 3rd party assessment <input checked="" type="radio"/> District, Regional or BOCES-developed <input type="radio"/> School/BOCES-wide/group/team results based on State	Niagara Falls City School District developed Band 1 assessment.

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.

<p>Use this box, if needed, to describe the general process for assigning HEDI categories for these grades/subjects in this subcomponent. If needed, you may upload a table or graphic at 2.11.</p>	
<p>Highly Effective (18 - 20 points) Results are well-above District goals for similar students.</p>	
<p>Effective (9 - 17 points) Results meet District goals for similar students.</p>	
<p>Developing (3 - 8 points) Results are below District goals for similar students.</p>	
<p>Ineffective (0 - 2 points) Results are well-below District goals for similar students.</p>	

Form 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
Comprehensive Musicship 1	<input type="radio"/> State Assessment <input type="radio"/> State-approved 3rd party assessment <input checked="" type="radio"/> District, Regional or BOCES-developed <input type="radio"/> School/BOCES-wide/group/team results based on State	Niagara Falls City School District developed Comprehensive Musicship 1 assessment.
Wind Ensemble 1	<input type="radio"/> State Assessment <input type="radio"/> State-approved 3rd party assessment <input checked="" type="radio"/> District, Regional or BOCES-developed <input type="radio"/> School/BOCES-wide/group/team results based on State	Niagara Falls City School District developed Wind Ensemble 1 assessment.
Wind Ensemble 2-4	<input type="radio"/> State Assessment <input type="radio"/> State-approved 3rd party assessment <input checked="" type="radio"/> District, Regional or BOCES-developed <input type="radio"/> School/BOCES-wide/group/team results based on State	Niagara Falls City School District developed Wind Ensemble 2-4 assessment.
AP Music Theory	<input type="radio"/> State Assessment <input type="radio"/> State-approved 3rd party assessment <input checked="" type="radio"/> District, Regional or BOCES-developed <input type="radio"/> School/BOCES-wide/group/team results based on State	Niagara Falls City School District developed AP Music Theory assessment.

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.

<p>Use this box, if needed, to describe the general process for assigning HEDI categories for these grades/subjects in this subcomponent. If needed, you may upload a table or graphic at 2.11.</p>	
<p>Highly Effective (18 - 20 points) Results are well-above District goals for similar students.</p>	
<p>Effective (9 - 17 points) Results meet District goals for similar students.</p>	
<p>Developing (3 - 8 points) Results are below District goals for similar students.</p>	
<p>Ineffective (0 - 2 points) Results are well-below District goals for similar students.</p>	

Form 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
Jazz Ensemble 1	<input type="radio"/> State Assessment <input type="radio"/> State-approved 3rd party assessment <input checked="" type="radio"/> District, Regional or BOCES-developed <input type="radio"/> School/BOCES-wide/group/team results based on State	Niagara Falls City School District developed Jazz Ensemble 1 assessment.
Jazz Ensemble 2-4	<input type="radio"/> State Assessment <input type="radio"/> State-approved 3rd party assessment <input checked="" type="radio"/> District, Regional or BOCES-developed <input type="radio"/> School/BOCES-wide/group/team results based on State	Niagara Falls City School District developed Jazz Ensemble 2-4 assessment.
Jazz Choir 1	<input type="radio"/> State Assessment <input type="radio"/> State-approved 3rd party assessment <input checked="" type="radio"/> District, Regional or BOCES-developed <input type="radio"/> School/BOCES-wide/group/team results based on State	Niagara Falls City School District developed Jazz Choir 1 assessment.
Jazz Choir 2-4	<input type="radio"/> State Assessment <input type="radio"/> State-approved 3rd party assessment <input checked="" type="radio"/> District, Regional or BOCES-developed <input type="radio"/> School/BOCES-wide/group/team results based on State	Niagara Falls City School District developed Jazz Choir 2-4 assessment.

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.

<p>Use this box, if needed, to describe the general process for assigning HEDI categories for these grades/subjects in this subcomponent. If needed, you may upload a table or graphic at 2.11.</p>	
<p>Highly Effective (18 - 20 points) Results are well-above District goals for similar students.</p>	
<p>Effective (9 - 17 points) Results meet District goals for similar students.</p>	
<p>Developing (3 - 8 points) Results are below District goals for similar students.</p>	
<p>Ineffective (0 - 2 points) Results are well-below District goals for similar students.</p>	

Form 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
Symphonic Band 2-4	<input type="radio"/> State Assessment <input type="radio"/> State-approved 3rd party assessment <input checked="" type="radio"/> District, Regional or BOCES-developed <input type="radio"/> School/BOCES-wide/group/team results based on State	Niagara Falls City School District developed Symphonic Band 2-4 assessment.
Geometry AC	<input type="radio"/> State Assessment <input type="radio"/> State-approved 3rd party assessment <input checked="" type="radio"/> District, Regional or BOCES-developed <input type="radio"/> School/BOCES-wide/group/team results based on State	Niagara Falls City School District developed Geometry AC assessment.
Algebra II/Trig - NR	<input type="radio"/> State Assessment <input type="radio"/> State-approved 3rd party assessment <input checked="" type="radio"/> District, Regional or BOCES-developed <input type="radio"/> School/BOCES-wide/group/team results based on State	Niagara Falls City School District developed Algebra II/Trig – NR assessment.
Math Seminar	<input type="radio"/> State Assessment <input type="radio"/> State-approved 3rd party assessment <input checked="" type="radio"/> District, Regional or BOCES-developed <input type="radio"/> School/BOCES-wide/group/team results based on State	Niagara Falls City School District developed Math Seminar assessment.

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.

<p>Use this box, if needed, to describe the general process for assigning HEDI categories for these grades/subjects in this subcomponent. If needed, you may upload a table or graphic at 2.11.</p>	
<p>Highly Effective (18 - 20 points) Results are well-above District goals for similar students.</p>	
<p>Effective (9 - 17 points) Results meet District goals for similar students.</p>	
<p>Developing (3 - 8 points) Results are below District goals for similar students.</p>	
<p>Ineffective (0 - 2 points) Results are well-below District goals for similar students.</p>	

Form 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
Pre-Calculus	<input type="radio"/> State Assessment <input type="radio"/> State-approved 3rd party assessment <input checked="" type="radio"/> District, Regional or BOCES-developed <input type="radio"/> School/BOCES-wide/group/team results based on State	Niagara Falls City School District developed Pre-Calculus assessment.
Calculus	<input type="radio"/> State Assessment <input type="radio"/> State-approved 3rd party assessment <input checked="" type="radio"/> District, Regional or BOCES-developed <input type="radio"/> School/BOCES-wide/group/team results based on State	Niagara Falls City School District developed Calculus assessment.
AP Calculus AB	<input type="radio"/> State Assessment <input type="radio"/> State-approved 3rd party assessment <input checked="" type="radio"/> District, Regional or BOCES-developed <input type="radio"/> School/BOCES-wide/group/team results based on State	Niagara Falls City School District developed AP Calculus AB assessment.
AP Statistics	<input type="radio"/> State Assessment <input type="radio"/> State-approved 3rd party assessment <input checked="" type="radio"/> District, Regional or BOCES-developed <input type="radio"/> School/BOCES-wide/group/team results based on State	Niagara Falls City School District developed AP Statistics assessment.

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.

<p>Use this box, if needed, to describe the general process for assigning HEDI categories for these grades/subjects in this subcomponent. If needed, you may upload a table or graphic at 2.11.</p>	
<p>Highly Effective (18 - 20 points) Results are well-above District goals for similar students.</p>	
<p>Effective (9 - 17 points) Results meet District goals for similar students.</p>	
<p>Developing (3 - 8 points) Results are below District goals for similar students.</p>	
<p>Ineffective (0 - 2 points) Results are well-below District goals for similar students.</p>	

Form 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
Forensic Science	<input type="radio"/> State Assessment <input type="radio"/> State-approved 3rd party assessment <input checked="" type="radio"/> District, Regional or BOCES-developed <input type="radio"/> School/BOCES-wide/group/team results based on State	Niagara Falls City School District developed Forensic Science assessment.
Natural Disasters	<input type="radio"/> State Assessment <input type="radio"/> State-approved 3rd party assessment <input checked="" type="radio"/> District, Regional or BOCES-developed <input type="radio"/> School/BOCES-wide/group/team results based on State	Niagara Falls City School District developed Natural Disasters assessment.
Environmental Science	<input type="radio"/> State Assessment <input type="radio"/> State-approved 3rd party assessment <input checked="" type="radio"/> District, Regional or BOCES-developed <input type="radio"/> School/BOCES-wide/group/team results based on State	Niagara Falls City School District developed Environmental Science assessment.
Sports Medicine/ Anatomy	<input type="radio"/> State Assessment <input type="radio"/> State-approved 3rd party assessment <input checked="" type="radio"/> District, Regional or BOCES-developed <input type="radio"/> School/BOCES-wide/group/team results based on State	Niagara Falls City School District developed Sports Medicine/Anatomy assessment.

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.

<p>Use this box, if needed, to describe the general process for assigning HEDI categories for these grades/subjects in this subcomponent. If needed, you may upload a table or graphic at 2.11.</p>	
<p>Highly Effective (18 - 20 points) Results are well-above District goals for similar students.</p>	
<p>Effective (9 - 17 points) Results meet District goals for similar students.</p>	
<p>Developing (3 - 8 points) Results are below District goals for similar students.</p>	
<p>Ineffective (0 - 2 points) Results are well-below District goals for similar students.</p>	

Form 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
Science Seminar	<input type="radio"/> State Assessment <input type="radio"/> State-approved 3rd party assessment <input checked="" type="radio"/> District, Regional or BOCES-developed <input type="radio"/> School/BOCES-wide/group/team results based on State	Niagara Falls City School District developed Science Seminar assessment.
AP Biology	<input type="radio"/> State Assessment <input type="radio"/> State-approved 3rd party assessment <input checked="" type="radio"/> District, Regional or BOCES-developed <input type="radio"/> School/BOCES-wide/group/team results based on State	Niagara Falls City School District developed AP Biology assessment.
AP Chemistry	<input type="radio"/> State Assessment <input type="radio"/> State-approved 3rd party assessment <input checked="" type="radio"/> District, Regional or BOCES-developed <input type="radio"/> School/BOCES-wide/group/team results based on State	Niagara Falls City School District developed AP Chemistry assessment.
AP Environmental Science	<input type="radio"/> State Assessment <input type="radio"/> State-approved 3rd party assessment <input checked="" type="radio"/> District, Regional or BOCES-developed <input type="radio"/> School/BOCES-wide/group/team results based on State	Niagara Falls City School District developed AP Environmental Science assessment.

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.

<p>Use this box, if needed, to describe the general process for assigning HEDI categories for these grades/subjects in this subcomponent. If needed, you may upload a table or graphic at 2.11.</p>	
<p>Highly Effective (18 - 20 points) Results are well-above District goals for similar students.</p>	
<p>Effective (9 - 17 points) Results meet District goals for similar students.</p>	
<p>Developing (3 - 8 points) Results are below District goals for similar students.</p>	
<p>Ineffective (0 - 2 points) Results are well-below District goals for similar students.</p>	

Form 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
Art 1 Studio In Art	<input type="radio"/> State Assessment <input type="radio"/> State-approved 3rd party assessment <input checked="" type="radio"/> District, Regional or BOCES-developed <input type="radio"/> School/BOCES-wide/group/team results based on State	Niagara Falls City School District developed Art 1 Studio in Art assessment.
Art 2 Advanced Studio Art	<input type="radio"/> State Assessment <input type="radio"/> State-approved 3rd party assessment <input checked="" type="radio"/> District, Regional or BOCES-developed <input type="radio"/> School/BOCES-wide/group/team results based on State	Niagara Falls City School District developed Art 2 Advanced Studio Art assessment.
Art 3 Digital Art and Photography	<input type="radio"/> State Assessment <input type="radio"/> State-approved 3rd party assessment <input checked="" type="radio"/> District, Regional or BOCES-developed <input type="radio"/> School/BOCES-wide/group/team results based on State	Niagara Falls City School District developed Art 3 Digital Art and Photography assessment.
Art 4 Drawing and Painting	<input type="radio"/> State Assessment <input type="radio"/> State-approved 3rd party assessment <input checked="" type="radio"/> District, Regional or BOCES-developed <input type="radio"/> School/BOCES-wide/group/team results based on State	Niagara Falls City School District developed Art 4 Drawing and Painting assessment.

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.

<p>Use this box, if needed, to describe the general process for assigning HEDI categories for these grades/subjects in this subcomponent. If needed, you may upload a table or graphic at 2.11.</p>	
<p>Highly Effective (18 - 20 points) Results are well-above District goals for similar students.</p>	
<p>Effective (9 - 17 points) Results meet District goals for similar students.</p>	
<p>Developing (3 - 8 points) Results are below District goals for similar students.</p>	
<p>Ineffective (0 - 2 points) Results are well-below District goals for similar students.</p>	

Form 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
Art 5 Sculpture and Ceramics	<input type="radio"/> State Assessment <input type="radio"/> State-approved 3rd party assessment <input checked="" type="radio"/> District, Regional or BOCES-developed <input type="radio"/> School/BOCES-wide/group/team results based on State	Niagara Falls City School District developed Art 5 Sculpture and Ceramics assessment.
Art 6 (Media Productions) 1	<input type="radio"/> State Assessment <input type="radio"/> State-approved 3rd party assessment <input checked="" type="radio"/> District, Regional or BOCES-developed <input type="radio"/> School/BOCES-wide/group/team results based on State	Niagara Falls City School District developed Art 6 (Media Productions) 1 assessment.
Art 6 (Media Productions) 2	<input type="radio"/> State Assessment <input type="radio"/> State-approved 3rd party assessment <input checked="" type="radio"/> District, Regional or BOCES-developed <input type="radio"/> School/BOCES-wide/group/team results based on State	Niagara Falls City School District developed Art 6 (Media Productions) 2 assessment.
Art 6 (Media Productions) 3	<input type="radio"/> State Assessment <input type="radio"/> State-approved 3rd party assessment <input checked="" type="radio"/> District, Regional or BOCES-developed <input type="radio"/> School/BOCES-wide/group/team results based on State	Niagara Falls City School District developed Art 6 (Media Productions) 3 assessment.

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.

<p>Use this box, if needed, to describe the general process for assigning HEDI categories for these grades/subjects in this subcomponent. If needed, you may upload a table or graphic at 2.11.</p>	
<p>Highly Effective (18 - 20 points) Results are well-above District goals for similar students.</p>	
<p>Effective (9 - 17 points) Results meet District goals for similar students.</p>	
<p>Developing (3 - 8 points) Results are below District goals for similar students.</p>	
<p>Ineffective (0 - 2 points) Results are well-below District goals for similar students.</p>	

Form 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
Art 7 (Theater Arts) 1	<input type="radio"/> State Assessment <input type="radio"/> State-approved 3rd party assessment <input checked="" type="radio"/> District, Regional or BOCES-developed <input type="radio"/> School/BOCES-wide/group/team results based on State	Niagara Falls City School District developed Art 7 (Theater Arts) 1 assessment.
Art 7 (Theater Arts) 2	<input type="radio"/> State Assessment <input type="radio"/> State-approved 3rd party assessment <input checked="" type="radio"/> District, Regional or BOCES-developed <input type="radio"/> School/BOCES-wide/group/team results based on State	Niagara Falls City School District developed Art 7 (Theater Arts) 2 assessment.
AP Studio Art: Drawing	<input type="radio"/> State Assessment <input type="radio"/> State-approved 3rd party assessment <input checked="" type="radio"/> District, Regional or BOCES-developed <input type="radio"/> School/BOCES-wide/group/team results based on State	Niagara Falls City School District developed AP Studio Art: Drawing assessment.
Legislative Intern	<input type="radio"/> State Assessment <input type="radio"/> State-approved 3rd party assessment <input checked="" type="radio"/> District, Regional or BOCES-developed <input type="radio"/> School/BOCES-wide/group/team results based on State	Niagara Falls City School District developed Legislative Intern assessment.

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.

<p>Use this box, if needed, to describe the general process for assigning HEDI categories for these grades/subjects in this subcomponent. If needed, you may upload a table or graphic at 2.11.</p>	
<p>Highly Effective (18 - 20 points) Results are well-above District goals for similar students.</p>	
<p>Effective (9 - 17 points) Results meet District goals for similar students.</p>	
<p>Developing (3 - 8 points) Results are below District goals for similar students.</p>	
<p>Ineffective (0 - 2 points) Results are well-below District goals for similar students.</p>	

Form 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
MOS Word/ Power Point/ Excel	<input type="radio"/> State Assessment <input type="radio"/> State-approved 3rd party assessment <input checked="" type="radio"/> District, Regional or BOCES-developed <input type="radio"/> School/BOCES-wide/group/team results based on State	Niagara Falls City School District developed MOS Word/Power Point/Excel assessment.
Marketing Management	<input type="radio"/> State Assessment <input type="radio"/> State-approved 3rd party assessment <input checked="" type="radio"/> District, Regional or BOCES-developed <input type="radio"/> School/BOCES-wide/group/team results based on State	Niagara Falls City School District developed Marketing Management assessment.
Principles of Accounting	<input type="radio"/> State Assessment <input type="radio"/> State-approved 3rd party assessment <input checked="" type="radio"/> District, Regional or BOCES-developed <input type="radio"/> School/BOCES-wide/group/team results based on State	Niagara Falls City School District developed Principles of Accounting assessment.
Entrepreneurship	<input type="radio"/> State Assessment <input type="radio"/> State-approved 3rd party assessment <input checked="" type="radio"/> District, Regional or BOCES-developed <input type="radio"/> School/BOCES-wide/group/team results based on State	Niagara Falls City School District developed Entrepreneurship assessment.

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.

<p>Use this box, if needed, to describe the general process for assigning HEDI categories for these grades/subjects in this subcomponent. If needed, you may upload a table or graphic at 2.11.</p>	
<p>Highly Effective (18 - 20 points) Results are well-above District goals for similar students.</p>	
<p>Effective (9 - 17 points) Results meet District goals for similar students.</p>	
<p>Developing (3 - 8 points) Results are below District goals for similar students.</p>	
<p>Ineffective (0 - 2 points) Results are well-below District goals for similar students.</p>	

Form 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
Accounting for Finance	<input type="radio"/> State Assessment <input type="radio"/> State-approved 3rd party assessment <input checked="" type="radio"/> District, Regional or BOCES-developed <input type="radio"/> School/BOCES-wide/group/team results based on State	Niagara Falls City School District developed Accounting for Finance assessment.
Business Internship	<input type="radio"/> State Assessment <input type="radio"/> State-approved 3rd party assessment <input checked="" type="radio"/> District, Regional or BOCES-developed <input type="radio"/> School/BOCES-wide/group/team results based on State	Niagara Falls City School District developed Business Internship assessment.
Cyber Law/ E-Commerce	<input type="radio"/> State Assessment <input type="radio"/> State-approved 3rd party assessment <input checked="" type="radio"/> District, Regional or BOCES-developed <input type="radio"/> School/BOCES-wide/group/team results based on State	Niagara Falls City School District developed Cyber Law/ E-Commerce assessment.
CISCO I	<input type="radio"/> State Assessment <input type="radio"/> State-approved 3rd party assessment <input checked="" type="radio"/> District, Regional or BOCES-developed <input type="radio"/> School/BOCES-wide/group/team results based on State	Niagara Falls City School District developed CISCO I assessment.

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.

<p>Use this box, if needed, to describe the general process for assigning HEDI categories for these grades/subjects in this subcomponent. If needed, you may upload a table or graphic at 2.11.</p>	
<p>Highly Effective (18 - 20 points) Results are well-above District goals for similar students.</p>	
<p>Effective (9 - 17 points) Results meet District goals for similar students.</p>	
<p>Developing (3 - 8 points) Results are below District goals for similar students.</p>	
<p>Ineffective (0 - 2 points) Results are well-below District goals for similar students.</p>	

Form 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
CISCO II	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <input type="radio"/> State Assessment <input type="radio"/> State-approved 3rd party assessment <input checked="" type="radio"/> District, Regional or BOCES-developed <input type="radio"/> School/BOCES-wide/group/team results based on State 	Niagara Falls City School District developed CISCO II assessment.
Computer Science I	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <input type="radio"/> State Assessment <input type="radio"/> State-approved 3rd party assessment <input checked="" type="radio"/> District, Regional or BOCES-developed <input type="radio"/> School/BOCES-wide/group/team results based on State 	Niagara Falls City School District developed Computer Science I assessment.
AP Computer Science A	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <input type="radio"/> State Assessment <input type="radio"/> State-approved 3rd party assessment <input checked="" type="radio"/> District, Regional or BOCES-developed <input type="radio"/> School/BOCES-wide/group/team results based on State 	Niagara Falls City School District developed AP Computer Science A assessment.
	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <input type="radio"/> State Assessment <input type="radio"/> State-approved 3rd party assessment <input type="radio"/> District, Regional or BOCES-developed <input type="radio"/> School/BOCES-wide/group/team results based on State 	

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.

<p>Use this box, if needed, to describe the general process for assigning HEDI categories for these grades/subjects in this subcomponent. If needed, you may upload a table or graphic at 2.11.</p>	
<p>Highly Effective (18 - 20 points) Results are well-above District goals for similar students.</p>	
<p>Effective (9 - 17 points) Results meet District goals for similar students.</p>	
<p>Developing (3 - 8 points) Results are below District goals for similar students.</p>	
<p>Ineffective (0 - 2 points) Results are well-below District goals for similar students.</p>	

0-20 Range	20	19	18	17	16	15	14	13	12	11	10	9	8	7	6	5	4	3	2	1	0
Percentages	96-100	91-95	86-90	82-85	79-81	75-78	72-74	70-71	68-69	66-67	64-65	62-63	60-61	58-59	56-57	54-55	52-53	50-51	33-49	17-32	0-16
Distribution of scores	5	5	5	4	3	4	3	2	2	2	2	2	2	2	2	2	2	2	17	16	17
<p>The APPR committee agreed to the ranges attached. The district APPR committee aligned percentages with the designated NYS Band scores. The Northwest Evaluation Association (NWEA) measures of Academic Progress (MAP) will be the instrument used to measure growth where applicable. Scores are reported in measures of equal intervals called Rasch units (RIT) scores. The criteria used will be:</p>																					
<p>1. Students who score above the end of the year mean for their grade level based on national norms specific to NWEA will meet their target by maintaining their status as above grade level by the end of the year.</p>																					
<p>2. Students who score at or between the beginning and end of the year means for their grade level based on national norms specific to NWEA will meet their target by increasing their RIT score by one Rasch unit by the end of the year.</p>																					
<p>3. Students who score below the beginning of the year mean for their grade level based on national norms specific to NWEA will meet their target by increasing their RIT score by one Rasch unit by the end of the year.</p>																					
<p>4. Growth targets will be developed where applicable using District developed pre-assessments as well as reviewing past student achievement history to determine baseline in order to set growth targets using District developed post-assessments.</p>																					

Teacher Improvement Plan (TIP)

Teacher _____ Subject(s) _____

Tenured

Probationary

Regular Substitute

Location _____ TIP Conference Date _____

A. Specific behaviors to be changed

(Evaluation Reference)

(Required Behavior)

B. Suggested personnel support and resources. (Please respond in expandable box.)

C. Individuals to monitor progress. (Please respond in expandable box.)

D. Evidence of Achievement. (Please respond in expandable box.)

E. Timeframe for accomplishing change inclusive of intermediate benchmarks. (Please respond in expandable box.)

Statement of attestation by Teacher

I, _____ hereby affix my signature to this document indicating that the above mentioned items have been discussed with me and that I, having an understanding of such, hereby affirm that the changes as referenced to and required of me are understood and that furthermore I am in agreement with such requirements.

Teacher Signature

Date

Administrator Signature

Date

Principal Improvement Plan (PIP)

A PIP must be initiated whenever a principal receives a rating of developing or ineffective in a year-end evaluation. The PIP shall be designed by the Principal and the Deputy Superintendent.

The PIP must be in place no later than September 10 of the following school year. An initial conference shall be held at the beginning of the school year where the PIP is discussed, signed, and dated at the beginning of its implementation.

The Principal must be afforded the opportunity for a peer mentor of their choice from ASC. The Principal will select the mentor, subject to the approval of the Deputy Superintendent and ASC president. The Principal and mentor will collaborate during each quarter in meeting the goals stated in the PIP. All dealings between the mentor and the Principal shall remain confidential.

At the conclusion of the school year, if all PIP goals and objectives are met, it will terminate. If the goals in the PIP have not been fully met, the district may deem the PIP unsuccessful, modify, and continue the PIP, or evaluate other options. The culmination of the PIP will be communicated in writing to the Principal.

If the Principal is rated as developing or ineffective for any school year in which the PIP was in effect, a new plan will be developed by the Principal and the Deputy Superintendent in collaboration according to the component guidelines for the subsequent school year.

A PIP must consist of the following components:

1. **Specific Areas for Improvement:** Domains, SLOs and student achievement specific. Develop specific, behaviorally written goals for the principal to accomplish during the period of the plan.
2. **Expected Outcomes of the PIP:** Identify specific recommendations for what the Principal is expected to do to improve in identified areas. Delineate Domain specific, realistic, achievable activities for the Principal.
3. **Resources:** Identify specific resources available to assist the Principal to improve performance. i.e. colleagues, courses, workshops, mentoring, materials, etc.
4. **Responsibilities:** Identify steps to be taken by the Deputy Superintendent and the Principal through the duration of the PIP.
5. **Evidence of Achievement:** Identify how progress will be measured and assessed, Specify next steps to be taken based upon whether the Principal is successful, partially successful or unsuccessful in efforts to improve performance.
6. **Timeline:** Provide a specific timeline for implementation of the various components of the PIP and for the final completion of the PIP. Identify the dates for preparation of written documentation regarding completion of the plan.

SAMPLE COMPONENTS OF A PRINCIPAL IMPROVEMENT PLAN

1. **Targeted Goals:** Domains 1-6, Goal Setting Alignment to the Multidimensional Rubric.
2. **Expected Outcomes:** List of specific expectations related to target indicators.
3. **Recommended Activities:** List of specific activities.
4. **Recommended Resources:** Mutually agreed upon by Principal and Deputy Superintendent.
5. **Evidence of Achievement:** Identify how progress will be measured and assessed. Specify next steps to be taken based upon progress or lack thereof.
6. **Timeline for Measuring Achievement of Expected Outcomes:** Identify dates for school visitations consistent with APPR plan; Identify dates for progress meetings with Deputy Superintendent related to each identified targeted goal; Identify dates for assessment of overall progress.

PRINCIPAL IMPROVEMENT PLAN (PIP)

Administrator_____

Level_____

Tenured_____ Probationary_____

School_____

PIP Conference Date_____

A. Specific Behaviors to be changed; Targeted Goals

Evaluation Reference	Required Behavior

B. Expected Outcomes

Indicator	Specific Expectation

C. Recommended Activities/Resources

Activities	

D. Evidence of Achievement

Evidence	

E. Timeline for Measuring Achievement of Expected Outcomes

Date for School Visitation				
Date Progress Monitoring with Deputy Superintendent				
Dates Quarterly Overall Progress				

Statement of Attestation by Administrator (Principal)

I, _____ hereby affix my signature to this document indicating that the above mentioned items have been discussed with me and that I, having an understanding of such, hereby affirm that the changes as referenced to and required of me are understood and that furthermore I am in agreement with such agreements.

PIP Administrator

Date

Deputy Superintendent

Date

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

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

Multidimensional Rubric

Weighting

Domain 1: (5 pts) Shared Vision of Learning

Culture (4 pts)

Sustainability (1 pts)

Composite Score: Domain 1

Band	I	D	E	HE
Culture	1	2	3	4
Sustainability	.25	.5	.75	1
Domain Total	1.25	2.5	3.75	5

Domain 2: (16 pts) School Culture & Instructional Program

Culture (4 pts)

Instruction Program (4 pts)

Capacity Building (2 pts)

Sustainability (2 pts)

Strategic Planning (4 pts)

Composite Score: Domain 2

Band	I	D	E	HE
Culture	1	2	3	4
Instructional Program	1	2	3	4
Capacity Building	.5	1	1.5	2
Sustainability	.5	1	1.5	2
Strategic Planning	1	2	3	4
Domain Total	4	8	12	16

Domain 3: (14pts) Safe, Efficient, Effective Learning Environment

Capacity Building (4pts)

Culture (4pts)

Sustainability (2pts)

Instructional Program (4pts)

Composite Score: Domain 3

Band	I	D	E	HE
Capacity Building	1	2	3	4
Culture	1	2	3	4
Sustainability	.5	1	1.5	2
Instructional Program	1	2	3	4
Domain Total	3.5	7	10.5	14

Domain 4: (5 pts) Community

Strategic Planning (2 pts)

Culture (2 pt)

Sustainability (1 pts)

Composite Score: Domain 4

Band	I	D	E	HE
Strategic Planning	.5	1	1.5	2
Culture	.5	1	1.5	2
Sustainability	.25	.5	.75	1
Domain Total	1.25	2.5	3.75	5

Domain 5: (6 pts) Integrity, Fairness, Ethics

Sustainability (2pts)

Culture (4pts)

Composite Score: Domain 5

Band	I	D	E	HE
Sustainability	.5	1.0	1.5	2
Culture	1	2	3	4
Domain Total	1.5	3	4.5	6

Domain 6: (2 pts) Political, Social, Economic, Legal, and Cultural Context

Sustainability (0pts)

Culture (2pts)

Composite Score: Domain 6

Band	I	D	E	HE
Sustainability				
Culture	.5	1	1.5	2
Domain Total	.5	1	1.5	2

Goal Setting and Attainment (12 pts)

Uncovering Goals (4 pts)

Evaluating Attainment (2 pts)

Taking Action (2 pts)

Strategic Planning (2 pts)

Outside Source (2 pts)

Composite Score: Goal Setting

Band	I	D	E	HE
Uncovering Goals	1	2	3	4
Evaluating Attainment	.5	1	1.5	2
Taking Action	.5	1	1.5	2
Strategic Planning	.5	1	1.5	2
Outside Source	.5	1	1.5	2
Domain Total	3	6	9	12

*Please note that in the observation of the Lead Evaluator a principal who demonstrates no proficiencies on the Multidimensional Principal Performance Rubric a score of zero (0) may be obtained.

0-15 Range	15	14	13	12	11	10	9	8	7	6	5	4	3	2	1	0
Percentages	93-100	86-92	81-85	76-80	71-75	68-70	65-67	62-64	59-61	56-58	54-55	52-53	50-51	33-49	17-32	0-16
Distribution of scores	8	7	5	5	5	3	3	3	3	3	2	2	2	17	16	17

For each elementary principal (K-6) and Preparatory Principal, the following will apply. The State approved third party assessments (AIMSWEB –ELA, grades K-2; NWEA Measures of Academic Progress, ELA 3-8; NWEA Measures of Academic Progress, Math K-8) will be used across all classrooms in the designated grade levels as noted above. For AIMSWEB, the specific probes used will be:

Kindergarten- Letter Identification

Grades 1 – Nonsense Word Fluency

Grade 2- R-CBM

These State approved tests will be administered to all students in the fall. Students’ fall (pretest) scores will be the baseline. The State approved assessments (post-test) will be administered in the spring. Each individual student’s fall score will be compared to the post-test assessment score of that student to determine each individual student’s growth score. Principals shall receive scores based upon the percentage of students in their building demonstrating growth, in both the State Approved Reading and Math assessments administered.

Growth is defined for NWEA Measures of Academic Progress using the following criteria:

1. Students who score above the end of the year mean for their grade level based on national norms specific to NWEA will meet their target by maintain their status as above grade level.
2. Students who score at or between the beginning and end of the year means for their grade level based on national norms specific to NWEA will meet their target by increasing their RIT score by one Rasch unit by the end of the year.
3. Students who score below the beginning of the year mean for their grade level based on national norms specific to NWEA will meet their target by increasing their RIT score by one Rasch unit by the end of the year.

Growth is defined for AIMSWEB using the following criteria:

1. Students who score above the end of the year mean for their grade level based on national norms specific to AIMSWEB will meet their target by maintaining their status as above grade level.
2. Students who score at or between the beginning and end of the year means for their grade level based on national norms specific to AIMSWEB will meet their target by increasing their score by a minimum of one point by the end of the year.
3. Students who score below the beginning of the year mean for their grade level based on national norms specific to NWEA will meet their target by increasing their score by a minimum of one point by the end of the year.

The score will be computed by averaging equally the ELA/Reading and Math Scores of students in their building. This will then be converted to a HEDI score as per the attached chart. For the aggregate ELA/Reading score for Elementary Principals where both AIMSWEB and NWEA Measures of Academic Progress are used, AIMSWEB will make up 43% of the ELA/Reading score and NWEA Measures of Academic Progress will make up the remaining 57% of the ELA/Reading score.

The high school principal (9-12) will receive a score based on the total percentage of students achieving a 55 or greater on both the Integrated Algebra Regents and Comprehensive English Regents exam. The high school principal’s score shall be computed by averaging equally the Integrated Algebra Regents exam scores and the Comprehensive English Regents exam scores.

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

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

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

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

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

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

Signatures, dates

Superintendent Signature Date: 12/17/12

Cynthia Bianchi

Teachers Union President Signature Date: 12/17/12

Edward A. Casarato

Administrative Union President Signature Date: 12/17/12

Jeffrey P. Shumard

Board of Education President Signature Date: 12/17/12

Carmelitta Rotella