



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 21, 2012

Susan Kay Salvaggio, Superintendent
Niskayuna Central School District
1239 Van Antwerp Road
Niskayuna, New York 12309

Dear Superintendent Salvaggio:

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

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

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

Thank you again for your hard work.

Sincerely,



John B. King, Jr.
Commissioner

Attachment

c: Charles Dedrick

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

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

Annual Professional Performance Reviews: 2012-13

Created Monday, June 11, 2012

Updated Tuesday, October 02, 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 :

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

530301060000

1.2) School District Name:

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

NISKAYUNA CSD

1.3) School Improvement Grant (SIG) Districts Only

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

(No response)

1.4) Award Classification

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

(No response)

1.5) Assurances

Please check all of the boxes below:

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

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

Re-submission to address deficiencies

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

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

Annual (2012-13)

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

Created Monday, June 11, 2012

Updated Thursday, December 20, 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	Measures of Academic Progress Primary Grades (NWEA)
1	State-approved 3rd party assessment	Measures of Academic Progress Primary Grades (NWEA)
2	State-approved 3rd party assessment	Measures of Academic Progress ELA (NWEA)

	ELA	Assessment
3	State assessment	3rd Grade State Assessment

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

Use this box, if needed, to describe the general process for assigning HEDI categories for these grades/subjects in this subcomponent. If needed, you may upload a table or graphic at 2.11, below.	Student will be given a pretest at the beginning of the year to establish a baseline data will be used by the vendor to determine a individual growth targets for students. HEDI will be allocated to a teacher based upon the % of student s meeting or exceeding individual growth targets as set by the vendor.
Highly Effective (18 - 20 points) Results are well-above state average for similar students (or District goals if no state test).	97-100% = 20 points 93-96% = 19 points 89-92% = 18 points
Effective (9 - 17 points) Results meet state average for similar students (or District goals if no state test).	87-88% = 17 points 85-86% = 16 points 83-84% = 15 points 81-82% = 14 points 79-80% = 13 points 77-78% = 12 points 75-76% = 11 points 73-74% = 10 points 71-72% = 9 points
Developing (3 - 8 points) Results are below state average for similar students (or District goals if no state test).	69-70% = 8 points 67-68% = 7 points 65-66%= 6 points 63-64% = 5 point 61-62% = 4 points 59-60% = 3 points
Ineffective (0 - 2 points) Results are well-below state average for similar students (or District goals if no state test).	48=58% = 2 points 37-47% = 1 points 0-36% = 0 points

2.3) Grades K-3 Math

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

	Math	Assessment
K	State-approved 3rd party assessment	Measures of Academic Progress Primary Grades(NWEA)
1	State-approved 3rd party assessment	Measures of Academic Progress Primary Grades (NWEA)
2	State-approved 3rd party assessment	Measures of Academic Progress Math (NWEA)

	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	Student will be given a pretest at the beginning of the year to establish a baseline data will be used by the vendor to determine a individual growth targets for students. HEDI
---	--

graphic at 2.11, below.	will be allocated to a teacher based upon the % of students meeting or exceeding individual growth targets as set by the vendor.
Highly Effective (18 - 20 points) Results are well-above state average for similar students (or District goals if no state test).	97-100% = 20 points 93-96% = 19 points 89-92% = 18 points
Effective (9 - 17 points) Results meet state average for similar students (or District goals if no state test).	87-88% = 17 points 85-86% = 16 points 83-84% = 15 points 81-82% = 14 points 79-80% = 13 points 77-78% = 12 points 75-76% = 11 points 73-74% = 10 points 71-72% = 9 points
Developing (3 - 8 points) Results are below state average for similar students (or District goals if no state test).	69-70% = 8 points 67-68% = 7 points 65-66% = 6 points 63-64% = 5 point 61-62% of students meet RIT target = 4 points 59-60% of students meet RIT target = 3 points
Ineffective (0 - 2 points) Results are well-below state average for similar students (or District goals if no state test).	48-58% = 2 points 37-47% = 1 points 0-36% = 0 points

2.4) Grades 6-8 Science

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

	Science	Assessment
6	District, regional or BOCES-developed assessment	Niskayuna CSD developed grade 6 science assessments
7	District, regional or BOCES-developed assessment	Niskayuna CSD 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.	Targets are developed across grade/courses based on student scores on pre-assessment/baseline data and are correlated to expected student growth for all students in the same grade/course. Points are assigned within state regulations and are determined by the percentage of students who meet the target set. Expected growth will be set with teacher, principal (and director) input and will be based on district priorities, the
---	---

	most important learning content for the grade level, and historical data as available.
Highly Effective (18 - 20 points) Results are well-above state average for similar students (or District goals if no state test).	20 points 97-100% students meet target 19 points 93-96% students meet target 18 points 89-92% students meet target
Effective (9 - 17 points) Results meet state average for similar students (or District goals if no state test).	17 points 87-88% students meet target 16 points 85-86% students meet target 15 points 83-84% students meet target 14 points 81-82% students meet target 13 points 79-80% students meets target 12 points 77-78% students meets target 11 points 75-76% students meets target 10 points 73-74% students meets target 9 points 71-72% students meets target
Developing (3 - 8 points) Results are below state average for similar students (or District goals if no state test).	8 points 69-70% students meet target 7 points 67-68% students meet target 6 points 65-66% students meet target 5 points 63-64% students meet target 4 points 61-62% students meets target 3 points 59-60% students meets target
Ineffective (0 - 2 points) Results are well-below state average for similar students (or District goals if no state test).	2 points 48-58% students meet target 1 point 37-47% students meet target 0 points 0-36% students meet target

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	Niskayuna CSD developed grade 6 social studies grade level common assessments
7	District, regional or BOCES-developed assessment	Niskayuna CSD developed grade 7 social studies common assessments
8	District, regional or BOCES-developed assessment	Niskayuna CSD developed grade 8 social studies common assessments

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.	Targets are developed across grade/courses based on student scores on pre-assessment/baseline data and are correlated to expected student growth for all students in the same grade/course. Points are assigned within state regulations are determined by the percentage of students who meet the target set. Expected growth will be et with teacher, principal (and director) input and will be based on district priorities, the most important learning content for the grade level, and historical data as available.
---	---

Highly Effective (18 - 20 points) Results are well-above District goals for similar students.	20 points 97-100% students meets target 19 points 93-96% students meets target 18 points 89-92% students meets target
Effective (9 - 17 points) Results meet District goals for similar students.	17 points 87-88% students meets target 16 points 85-86% students meets target 15 points 83-84% students meets target 14 points 81-82% students meets target 13 points 79-80% students meets target 12 points 77-78% students meets target 11 points 75-76% students meets target 10 points 73-74% students meets target 9 points 71-72% students meets target
Developing (3 - 8 points) Results are below District goals for similar students.	8 points 69-70% students meets target 7 points 67-68% students meets target 6 points 65-66% students meets target 5 points 63-64% students meets target 4 points 61-62% students meets target 3 points 59-60% students meets target
Ineffective (0 - 2 points) Results are well-below District goals for similar students.	2 points 48-58% students meets target 1 point 37-47% students meets target 0 points 0-36% students meets target

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	Niskayuna CSD developed global 1 course common 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.	Targets are developed across grade/courses based on student scores on pre-assessment/baseline data and are correlated to expected student growth for all students in the same grade/course. Points are assigned within state regulations and are determined by the percentage of students who meet the target set. Expected growth will be set with teacher, principal (and director) input and will be based on district priorities, the most important
---	--

	learning content for the grade level, and historical data as available.
Highly Effective (18 - 20 points) Results are well-above District goals for similar students.	20 points 97-100% students meets target 19 points 93-96% students meets target 18 points 89-92% students meets target
Effective (9 - 17 points) Results meet District goals for similar students.	17 points 87-88% students meets target 16 points 85-86% students meets target 15 points 83-84% students meets target 14 points 81-82% students meets target 13 points 79-80% students meets target 12 points 77-78% students meets target 11 points 75-76% students meets target 10 points 73-74% students meets target 9 points 71-72% students meets target
Developing (3 - 8 points) Results are below District goals for similar students.	8 points 69-70% students meets target 7 points 67-68% students meets target 6 points 65-66% students meets target 5 points 63-64% students meets target 4 points 61-62% students meets target 3 points 59-60% students meets target
Ineffective (0 - 2 points) Results are well-below District goals for similar students.	2 points 48-58% students meets target 1 point 37-47% students meets target 0 points 0-36% students meets target

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.	Targets are developed across grade/courses based on student scores on pre-assessment/baseline data and are correlated to expected student growth for all students in the same grade/course. Points are assigned within state regulations and are determined by the percentage of students who meet the target set. Expected growth will be set with teacher, principal (and director) input and will be based on district priorities, the most important learning content for the grade level,
---	--

and historical data as available.

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

20 points 97-100% students meets target
19 points 93-96% students meets target
18 points 89-92% students meets target

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

17 points 87-88% students meets target
16 points 85-86% students meets target
15 points 83-84% students meets target
14 points 81-82% students meets target
13 points 79-80% students meets target
12 points 77-78% students meets target
11 points 75-76% students meets target
10 points 73-74% students meets target
9 points 71-72% students meets target

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

8 points 69-70% students meets target
7 points 67-68% students meets target
6 points 65-66% students meets target
5 points 63-64% students meets target
4 points 61-62% students meets target
3 points 59-60% students meets target

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

2 points 48-58% students meets target
1 point 37-47% students meets target
0 points 0-36% students meets target

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.

Targets are developed across grade/courses based on student scores on pre-assessment/baseline data and are correlated to expected student growth for all students in the same grade/course. Points are assigned within state regulations are determined by the percentage of students who meet the target set. Expected growth will be set with teacher, principal (and director) input and will be based on district priorities, the most important learning content for the grade level, and historical data as available.

Highly Effective (18 - 20 points) Results are well-above District goals for similar students.	20 points 97-100% students meets target 19 points 93-96% students meets target 18 points 89-92% students meets target
Effective (9 - 17 points) Results meet District goals for similar students.	17 points 87-88% students meets target 16 points 85-86% students meets target 15 points 83-84% students meets target 14 points 81-82% students meets target 13 points 79-80% students meets target 12 points 77-78% students meets target 11 points 75-76% students meets target 10 points 73-74% students meets target 9 points 71-72% students meets target
Developing (3 - 8 points) Results are below District goals for similar students.	8 points 69-70% students meets target 7 points 67-68% students meets target 6 points 65-66% students meets target 5 points 63-64% students meets target 4 points 61-62% students meets target 3 points 59-60% students meets target
Ineffective (0 - 2 points) Results are well-below District goals for similar students.	2 points 48-58% students meets target 1 point 37-47% students meets target 0 points 0-36% students meets target

2.9) High School English Language Arts

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

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

	High School English Courses	Assessment
Grade 9 ELA	District, regional or BOCES-developed assessment	Niskayuna CSD developed grade 9 ELA common assessments
Grade 10 ELA	District, regional or BOCES-developed assessment	Niskayuna CSD developed grade 10 ELA course specific common assessments
Grade 11 ELA	Regents assessment	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.	Targets are developed across grade/courses based on student scores on pre-assessment/baseline data and are correlated to expected student growth for all students in the same grade/course. Points are assigned within state regulations and are determined by the percentage of students who meet the target set. Expected growth will be set with teacher, principal (and director) input and will be based on district priorities, the most important learning content for the grade level, and historical data as available.
---	--

Highly Effective (18 - 20 points) Results are well-above District goals for similar students.	20 points 97-100% students meets target 19 points 93-96% students meets target 18 points 89-92% students meets target
Effective (9 - 17 points) Results meet District goals for similar students.	17 points 87-88% students meets target 16 points 85-86% students meets target 15 points 83-84% students meets target 14 points 81-82% students meets target 13 points 79-80% students meets target 12 points 77-78% students meets target 11 points 75-76% students meets target 10 points 73-74% students meets target 9 points 71-72% students meets target
Developing (3 - 8 points) Results are below District goals for similar students.	8 points 69-70% students meets target 7 points 67-68% students meets target 6 points 65-66% students meets target 5 points 63-64% students meets target 4 points 61-62% students meets target 3 points 59-60% students meets target
Ineffective (0 - 2 points) Results are well-below District goals for similar students.	2 points 48-58% students meets target 1 point 37-47% students meets target 0 points 0-36% students meets target

2.10) All Other Courses

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

Course(s) or Subject(s)	Option	Assessment
K-12 Music Teachers	District, Regional or BOCES-developed	Niskayuna CSD developed music pre/post common assessments by grade level
K-12 Art Teachers	District, Regional or BOCES-developed	Niskayuna CSD developed art pre/post common assessments by grade level
6-12 Technology Teachers	District, Regional or BOCES-developed	Niskayuna CSD developed technology pre/post common assessments by grade level/course
6-12 FACS Teachers	District, Regional or BOCES-developed	Niskayuna CSD developed FACS pre/post common assessments
K-12 Library Media	District, Regional or BOCES-developed	Niskayuna CSD developed library pre/post common assessments
6-12 Foreign Language	District, Regional or BOCES-developed	Niskayuna CSD developed foreign language pre/post common assessments
11-12 ELA electives	District, Regional or BOCES-developed	Niskayuna CSD developed course specific pre/post common assessments
11-12 Math electives	District, Regional or BOCES-developed	Niskayuna CSD developed math pre/post common assessments
11-12 Science electives	District, Regional or BOCES-developed	Niskayuna CSD developed science pre/post common assessments
11-12 Social Studies electives	District, Regional or BOCES-developed	Niskayuna CSD developed social studies pre/post common assessments
9-12 Business Teachers	District, Regional or BOCES-developed	Niskayuna CSD developed business pre/post common assessments

K-12 physical education teachers	District, Regional or BOCES-developed	Niskayuna CSD developed physical education pre/post common assessments
K-12 Special Education Teachers	State Assessment	NYS assessment, 4-8 and Regents course specific
K-8 Special education teachers	State-approved 3rd party assessment	Measures of Academic Progress (Primary, ELA and math)
K-12 Special Education Teachers	District, Regional or BOCES-developed	Niskayuna CSD developed course specific pre/post common assessments

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.	Targets are developed across grade/courses based on student scores on pre-assessment/baseline data and are correlated to expected student growth for all students in the same grade/course. Points are assigned within state regulations and are determined by the percentage of students who meet the target set. Expected growth will be set with teacher, principal (and director) input and will be based on district priorities, the most important learning content for the grade level, and historical data as available.
Highly Effective (18 - 20 points) Results are well-above District goals for similar students.	20 points 97-100% students meets target 19 points 93-96% students meets target 18 points 89-92% students meets target
Effective (9 - 17 points) Results meet District goals for similar students.	17 points 87-88% students meets target 16 points 85-86% students meets target 15 points 83-84% students meets target 14 points 81-82% students meets target 13 points 79-80% students meets target 12 points 77-78% students meets target 11 points 75-76% students meets target 10 points 73-74% students meets target 9 points 71-72% students meets target
Developing (3 - 8 points) Results are below District goals for similar students.	8 points 69-70% students meets target 7 points 67-68% students meets target 6 points 65-66% students meets target 5 points 63-64% students meets target 4 points 61-62% students meets target 3 points 59-60% students meets target
Ineffective (0 - 2 points) Results are well-below District goals for similar students.	2 points 48-58% students meets target 1 point 37-47% students meets target 0 points 0-36% students meets target

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

(No response)

2.11) HEDI Tables or Graphics

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

assets/survey-uploads/5364/141181-TXEttx9bQW/Nisky SLO template July 2012.doc

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.

Our district will be providing controls for SWD and ELL.

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 Monday, June 11, 2012

Updated Thursday, December 20, 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	5) District, regional, or BOCES–developed assessments	Niskayuna CSD developed 4th grade common math assessment
5	5) District, regional, or BOCES–developed assessments	Niskayuna CSD developed 5th grade math common math assessment
6	4) State-approved 3rd party assessments	Measures of Academic Progress ELA

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

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

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

Use this box, if needed, to describe the general process for assigning HEDI categories for these grades/subjects in this subcomponent. If needed, you may upload a table or graphic at 3.3, below.	Student will be given a pretest at the beginning of the year to establish baseline data. For NWEA, we will use growth projections as established by the vendor. For district developed math assessments, we have set 75% mastery as our benchmark. HEDI will be allocated to a teacher based upon the % of students meeting or exceeding individual growth targets as set by the Superintendent, director and principals, or NWEA vendor.
Highly Effective (14 - 15 points) Results are well above District- or BOCES-adopted expectations for growth or achievement for grade/subject.	89-94% of students meet target = 14 points 95-100% of students meet target = 15 points
Effective (8- 13 points) Results meet District- or BOCES-adopted expectations for growth or achievement for grade/subject.	86-88% of students meet target = 13 points 83-85% of students meet target = 12 points 80-82% of students meet target = 11 points 77-79% of students meet target = 10 points 74-76% of students meet target = 9 points 71-73% of students meet target = 8 points
Developing (3 - 7 points) Results are below District- or BOCES-adopted expectations for growth or achievement for grade/subject.	69-70% of students meet target= 7 points 67-68% of students meet target = 6 points 65-66% of students meet target = 5 points 63-64 % of students meet target = 4 points 59-62% of students meet target = 3 points
Ineffective (0 - 2 points) Results are well below District- or BOCES-adopted expectations for growth or achievement for grade/subject.	48-58% of students meet target = 2 points 37-47% of students meet target = 1 point 0-36% of students meet target = 0 points

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	5) District, regional, or BOCES–developed assessments	Niskayuna CSD developed grade 4 math common assessments
5	5) District, regional, or BOCES–developed assessments	Niskayuna CSD developed math common grade 5 assessments
6	5) District, regional, or BOCES–developed assessments	Niskayuna CSD developed grade 6 math common assessments

7	5) District, regional, or BOCES–developed assessments	Niskayuna CSD developed common grade 7 math assessments
8	5) District, regional, or BOCES–developed assessments	Niskayuna CSD developed grade 8 math common assessments

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

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

Use this box, if needed, to describe the general process for assigning HEDI categories for these grades/subjects in this subcomponent. If needed, you may upload a table or graphic at 3.3, below.	Student will be given a pretest at the beginning of the year to establish baseline data. For district developed math assessments, we have set 75% mastery as our benchmark. HEDI will be allocated to a teacher based upon the % of students meeting or exceeding individual growth targets as set by the Superintendent, director and principals.
Highly Effective (14 - 15 points) Results are well above District- or BOCES-adopted expectations for growth or achievement for grade/subject.	89-94% of students meet target = 14 points 95-100% of students meet target = 15 points
Effective (8- 13 points) Results meet District- or BOCES-adopted expectations for growth or achievement for grade/subject.	86-88% of students meet target = 13 points 83-85% of students meet target = 12 points 80-82% of students meet target = 11 points 77-79% of students meet target = 10 points 74-76% of students meet target = 9 points 71-73% of students meet target = 8 points
Developing (3 - 7 points) Results are below District- or BOCES-adopted expectations for growth or achievement for grade/subject.	69-70% of students meet target= 7 points 67-68% of students meet target = 6 points 65-66% of students meet target = 5 points 63-64 % of students meet target = 4 points 59-62% of students meet target = 3 points
Ineffective (0 - 2 points) Results are well below District- or BOCES-adopted expectations for growth or achievement for grade/subject.	48-58% of students meet target = 2 points 37-47% of students meet target = 1 point 0-36% of students meet target = 0 points

3.3) HEDI Tables or Graphics

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

(No response)

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

Growth or achievement measure(s) from these options.

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

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

Measures based on:

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

3.4) Grades K-3 ELA

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

	Locally-Selected Measure from List of Approved Measures	Assessment
K	5) District, regional, or BOCES–developed assessments	Niskayuna CSD developed grade kdg common math assessment
1	5) District, regional, or BOCES–developed assessments	Niskayuna CSD developed grade 1 common math assessment
2	5) District, regional, or BOCES–developed assessments	Niskayuna CSD developed common grade 2 math common assessments
3	4) State-approved 3rd party assessments	Measures of Academic Progress - math

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

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

Use this box, if needed, to describe the general process for assigning HEDI categories for these grades/subjects in this subcomponent. If needed, you may upload a table or graphic at 3.13, below.	For K-2, student will be given a common math pretest at the beginning of the year to establish a baseline. HEDI will be allocated to a teacher based upon the % of students meeting 75% or exceeding proficiency targets as set by the Superintendent in consultation with directors and principals. For grade 3, HEDI will be based upon the % of students reaching the proficiency target established by NWEA (vendor).
Highly Effective (18-20 points) Results are well above District- or BOCES-adopted expectations for growth or achievement for grade/subject.	20 points 97-100% of students meet targets 19 points 94-96% of students meet targets 18 points 89-93% of students meet targets
Effective (9-17 points) Results meet District- or BOCES-adopted expectations for growth or achievement for grade/subject.	17 points 87-88 % of students meet targets 16 points 85-86% of students meet targets 15 points 83-84% of students meet targets 14 points 81-82% of students meet targets 13 points 79-80% of students meet targets 12 points 77-78% of students meet targets 11 points 75-76% of students meet targets 10 points 73-74% of students meet targets 9 points 71-72% of students meet targets
Developing (3 - 8 points) Results are below District- or BOCES-adopted expectations for growth or achievement for grade/subject.	8 points 69-70% of students meet targets 7 points 67-68% of students meet targets 6 points 65-66% of students meet targets 5 points 63-64% of students meet targets 4 points 61-62% of students meet targets 3 points 59-60% of students meet targets
Ineffective (0 - 2 points) Results are well below District- or BOCES-adopted expectations for growth or achievement for grade/subject.	2 points 48-58% of students meet targets 1 point 37-47% of students meet targets 0 points 0-36% of students meet targets

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	Niskayuna CSD developed kindergarten math assessments
1	5) District, regional, or BOCES–developed assessments	Niskayuna CSD developed grade 1 math assessments
2	5) District, regional, or BOCES–developed assessments	Niskayuna CSD developed grade 2 math assessments
3	4) State-approved 3rd party assessments	Measures of Academic Progress Math (NWEA)

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

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

Use this box, if needed, to describe the general process for assigning HEDI categories for these grades/subjects in this subcomponent. If needed, you may upload a table or graphic at 3.13, below.	For K-2, student will be given a common math pretest at the beginning of the year to establish a baseline. HEDI will be allocated to a teacher based upon the % of students meeting 75% as set by the Superintendent in consultation with directors and principals. For grade 3, HEDI will be based upon the % of students reaching the proficiency target established by NWEA (vendor).
Highly Effective (18-20 points) Results are well above District- or BOCES-adopted expectations for growth or achievement for grade/subject.	20 points 97-100% of students meet targets 19 points 94-96% of students meet targets 18 points 89-93% of students meet targets
Effective (9-17 points) Results meet District- or BOCES-adopted expectations for growth or achievement for grade/subject.	17 points 87-88 % of students meet targets 16 points 85-86% of students meet targets 15 points 83-84% of students meet targets 14 points 81-82% of students meet targets 13 points 79-80% of students meet targets 12 points 77-78% of students meet targets 11 points 75-76% of students meet targets 10 points 73-74% of students meet targets 9 points 71-72% of students meet targets
Developing (3 - 8 points) Results are below District -or BOCES-adopted expectations for growth or achievement for grade/subject.	8 points 69-70% of students meet targets 7 points 67-68% of students meet targets 6 points 65-66% of students meet targets 5 points 63-64% of students meet targets 4 points 61-62% of students meet targets 3 points 59-60% of students meet targets
Ineffective (0 - 2 points) Results are well below District- or BOCES-adopted expectations for growth or achievement for grade/subject.	2 points 48-58% of students meet targets 1 point 37-47% of students meet targets 0 points 0-36% of students meet targets

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	Niskayuna CSD developed grade 6 science assessments
7	5) District, regional, or BOCES–developed assessments	Niskayuna CSD developed grade 7 science assessments
8	5) District, regional, or BOCES–developed assessments	Niskayuna CSD developed common grade 8 science assessments

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

Use this box, if needed, to describe the general process for assigning HEDI categories for these grades/subjects in this subcomponent. If needed, you may upload a table or graphic at 3.13, below.	Student will be given a common grade level departmental pretest at the beginning of the year to establish baseline data. HEDI will be allocated to a teacher based upon the % of students meeting or exceeding proficiency targets as set by the Superintendent in consultation with directors and principals.
Highly Effective (18 - 20 points) Results are well above District- or BOCES-adopted expectations for growth or achievement for grade/subject.	20 points 97-100% of students meet targets 19 points 94-96% of students meet targets 18 points 89-93% of students meet targets
Effective (9 - 17 points) Results meet District- or BOCES-adopted expectations for growth or achievement for grade/subject.	17 points 87-88 % of students meet targets 16 points 85-86% of students meet targets 15 points 83-84% of students meet targets 14 points 81-82% of students meet targets 13 points 79-80% of students meet targets 12 points 77-78% of students meet targets 11 points 75-76% of students meet targets 10 points 73-74% of students meet targets 9 points 71-72% of students meet targets
Developing (3 - 8 points) Results are below District- or BOCES-adopted expectations for growth or achievement for grade/subject.	8 points 69-70% of students meet targets 7 points 67-68% of students meet targets 6 points 65-66% of students meet targets 5 points 63-64% of students meet targets 4 points 61-62% of students meet targets 3 points 59-60% of students meet targets
Ineffective (0 - 2 points) Results are well below District- or BOCES-adopted expectations for growth or achievement for grade/subject.	2 points 48-58% of students meet targets 1 point 37-47% of students meet targets 0 points 0-36% of students meet targets

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	Niskayuna CSD developed grade 6 social studies common assessments
7	5) District, regional, or BOCES–developed assessments	Niskayuna CSD developed grade 7 social studies common assessments

8	5) District, regional, or BOCES–developed assessments	Niskayuna CSD developed grade 8 social studies assessments
---	---	--

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.	Student will be given a common grade level departmental pretest at the beginning of the year to establish baseline data. HEDI will be allocated to a teacher based upon the % of students meeting or exceeding proficiency targets as set by the Superintendent in consultation with directors and principals.
Highly Effective (18 - 20 points) Results are well above District- or BOCES-adopted expectations for growth or achievement for grade/subject.	20 points 97-100% of students meet targets 19 points 94-95% of students meet targets 18 points 89-92% of students meet targets
Effective (9 - 17 points) Results meet District- or BOCES-adopted expectations for growth or achievement for grade/subject.	17 points 87-88 % of students meet targets 16 points 85-86% of students meet targets 15 points 83-84% of students meet targets 14 points 81-82% of students meet targets 13 points 79-80% of students meet targets 12 points 77-78% of students meet targets 11 points 75-76% of students meet targets 10 points 73-74% of students meet targets 9 points 71-72% of students meet targets
Developing (3 - 8 points) Results are below District- or BOCES-adopted expectations for growth or achievement for grade/subject.	8 points 69-70% of students meet targets 7 points 67-68% of students meet targets 6 points 65-66% of students meet targets 5 points 63-64% of students meet targets 4 points 61-62% of students meet targets 3 points 59-60% of students meet targets
Ineffective (0 - 2 points) Results are well below District- or BOCES-adopted expectations for growth or achievement for grade/subject.	2 points 48-58% of students meet targets 1 point 37-47% of students meet targets 0 points 0-36% of students meet targets

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	Niskayuna CSD developed Global 1 assessments

Global 2	5) District, regional, or BOCES–developed assessments	Niskayuna CSD developed Global 2 common assessments
American History	5) District, regional, or BOCES–developed assessments	Niskayuna CSD developed American History assessments

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

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

Use this box, if needed, to describe the general process for assigning HEDI categories for these grades/subjects in this subcomponent. If needed, you may upload a table or graphic at 3.13, below.	Student will be given a common grade level departmental pretest at the beginning of the year to establish baseline data. HEDI will be allocated to a teacher based upon the % of students meeting or exceeding proficiency targets as set by the Superintendent in consultation with directors and principals.
Highly Effective (18 - 20 points) Results are well above District- or BOCES-adopted expectations for growth or achievement for grade/subject.	20 points 97-100% of students meet targets 19 points 94-96% of students meet targets 18 points 89-93% of students meet targets
Effective (9 - 17 points) Results meet District- or BOCES-adopted expectations for growth or achievement for grade/subject.	17 points 87-88 % of students meet targets 16 points 85-86% of students meet targets 15 points 83-84% of students meet targets 14 points 81-82% of students meet targets 13 points 79-80% of students meet targets 12 points 77-78% of students meet targets 11 points 75-76% of students meet targets 10 points 73-74% of students meet targets 9 points 71-72% of students meet targets
Developing (3 - 8 points) Results are below District- or BOCES-adopted expectations for growth or achievement for grade/subject.	8 points 69-70% of students meet targets 7 points 67-68% of students meet targets 6 points 65-66% of students meet targets 5 points 63-64% of students meet targets 4 points 61-62% of students meet targets 3 points 59-60% of students meet targets
Ineffective (0 - 2 points) Results are well below District- or BOCES-adopted expectations for growth or achievement for grade/subject.	2 points 48-58% of students meet targets 1 point 37-47% of students meet targets 0 points 0-36% of students meet targets

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	5) District, regional, or BOCES–developed assessments	Niskayuna CSD developed Living Environment specific common assessments
Earth Science	5) District, regional, or BOCES–developed assessments	Niskayuna CSD developed Earth Science common assessments
Chemistry	5) District, regional, or BOCES–developed assessments	Niskayuna CSD developed Chemistry common assessments
Physics	5) District, regional, or BOCES–developed assessments	Niskayuna CSD developed Physics common assessments

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

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

Use this box, if needed, to describe the general process for assigning HEDI categories for these grades/subjects in this subcomponent. If needed, you may upload a table or graphic at 3.13, below.	Student will be given a common grade level departmental pretest at the beginning of the year to establish baseline data. HEDI will be allocated to a teacher based upon the % of students meeting or exceeding proficiency targets as set by the Superintendent in consultation with directors and principals.
Highly Effective (18-20 points) Results are well above District- or BOCES-adopted expectations for growth or achievement for grade/subject.	20 points 97-100% of students meet targets 19 points 94-96% of students meet targets 18 points 89-93% of students meet targets
Developing (3 - 8 points) Results are below District- or BOCES-adopted expectations for growth or achievement for grade/subject.	17 points 87-88 % of students meet targets 16 points 85-86% of students meet targets 15 points 83-84% of students meet targets 14 points 81-82% of students meet targets 13 points 79-80% of students meet targets 12 points 77-78% of students meet targets 11 points 75-76% of students meet targets 10 points 73-74% of students meet targets 9 points 71-72% of students meet targets
Effective (9 - 17points) Results meet District- or BOCES-adopted expectations for growth or achievement for grade/subject.	8 points 69-70% of students meet targets 7 points 67-68% of students meet targets 6 points 65-66% of students meet targets 5 points 63-64% of students meet targets 4 points 61-62% of students meet targets 3 points 59-60% of students meet targets
Ineffective (0 - 2 points) Results are well below District- or BOCES-adopted expectations for growth or achievement for grade/subject.	2 points 48-58% of students meet targets 1 point 37-47% of students meet targets 0 points 0-36% of students meet targets

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	5) District, regional, or BOCES–developed assessments	Niskayuna CSD developed Algebra 1 assessments
Geometry	5) District, regional, or BOCES–developed assessments	Niskayuna CSD developed Geometry assessments
Algebra 2	5) District, regional, or BOCES–developed assessments	Niskayuna CSD developed Algebra 2 assessments

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

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

Use this box, if needed, to describe the general process for assigning HEDI categories for these grades/subjects in this subcomponent. If needed, you may upload a table or graphic at 3.13, below.	Student will be given a common grade level departmental pretest at the beginning of the year to establish baseline data. HEDI will be allocated to a teacher based upon the % of students meeting or exceeding proficiency targets as set by the Superintendent in consultation with directors and principals.
Highly Effective (18 - 20 points) Results are well above District- or BOCES-adopted expectations for growth or achievement for grade/subject.	20 points 97-100% of students meet targets 19 points 94-96% of students meet targets 18 points 89-93% of students meet targets
Effective (9 - 17 points) Results meet District- or BOCES-adopted expectations for growth or achievement for grade/subject.	17 points 87-88 % of students meet targets 16 points 85-86% of students meet targets 15 points 83-84% of students meet targets 14 points 81-82% of students meet targets 13 points 79-80% of students meet targets 12 points 77-78% of students meet targets 11 points 75-76% of students meet targets 10 points 73-74% of students meet targets 9 points 71-72% of students meet targets
Developing (3 - 8 points) Results are below District- or BOCES-adopted expectations for growth or achievement for grade/subject.	8 points 69-70% of students meet targets 7 points 67-68% of students meet targets 6 points 65-66% of students meet targets 5 points 63-64% of students meet targets 4 points 61-62% of students meet targets 3 points 59-60% of students meet targets
Ineffective (0 - 2 points) Results are well below District- or BOCES-adopted expectations for growth or achievement for grade/subject.	2 points 48-58% of students meet targets 1 point 37-47% of students meet targets 0 points 0-36% of students meet targets

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	Niskayuna CSD developed Grade 9 ELA assessments
Grade 10 ELA	5) District, regional, or BOCES–developed assessments	Niskayuna CSD developed Grade 10 assessments
Grade 11 ELA	5) District, regional, or BOCES–developed assessments	Niskayuna CSD developed Grade 11 ELA assessments

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

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

Use this box, if needed, to describe the general process for assigning HEDI categories for these grades/subjects in this subcomponent. If needed, you may upload a table or graphic at 3.13, below.	Student will be given a common grade level departmental pretest at the beginning of the year to establish baseline data. HEDI will be allocated to a teacher based upon the % of students meeting or exceeding proficiency targets as set by the Superintendent in consultation with directors and principals.
Highly Effective (18 - 20 points) Results are well above District- or BOCES-adopted expectations for growth or achievement for grade/subject.	20 points 97-100% of students meet targets 19 points 94-96% of students meet targets 18 points 89-93% of students meet targets
Effective (9 - 17 points) Results meet District- or BOCES-adopted expectations for growth or achievement for grade/subject.	17 points 87-88 % of students meet targets 16 points 85-86% of students meet targets 15 points 83-84% of students meet targets 14 points 81-82% of students meet targets 13 points 79-80% of students meet targets 12 points 77-78% of students meet targets 11 points 75-76% of students meet targets 10 points 73-74% of students meet targets 9 points 71-72% of students meet targets
Developing (3 - 8 points) Results are below District- or BOCES-adopted expectations for growth or achievement for grade/subject.	8 points 69-70% of students meet targets 7 points 67-68% of students meet targets 6 points 65-66% of students meet targets 5 points 63-64% of students meet targets 4 points 61-62% of students meet targets 3 points 59-60% of students meet targets
Ineffective (0 - 2 points) Results are well below District- or BOCES-adopted expectations for growth or achievement for grade/subject.	2 points 48-58% of students meet targets 1 point 37-47% of students meet targets 0 points 0-36% of students meet targets

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	Assessment
-------------------------	--	------------

	Measures	
K-12 Art	5) District/regional/BOCES–de veloped	Niskayuna CSD developed pre/post common art grade/course specific assessments
K-12 music	5) District/regional/BOCES–de veloped	Niskayuna CSD developed pre/post music grade/course specific common assessments
K-12 library media	5) District/regional/BOCES–de veloped	Niskayuna CSD developed pre/post library media common library assessments
k-12 physical educaiton	5) District/regional/BOCES–de veloped	Niskayuna CSD developed pre/post PE grade level/course specific common assessments
K-12 health	5) District/regional/BOCES–de veloped	Niskayuna CSD developed pre/post health grade/course specific common assessments
6-12 FACS	5) District/regional/BOCES–de veloped	Niskayuna CSD developed pre/post FACS grade/course specific common assessments
6-12 Technology	5) District/regional/BOCES–de veloped	Niskayuna CSD developed pre/post technology grade/course specific common assessments
6-12 Foreign Language	5) District/regional/BOCES–de veloped	Niskayuna CSD pre/post common foreign language grade/coure specific assessments
K-12 ESL teachers	5) District/regional/BOCES–de veloped	Niskayuna CSD developed pre/post ESL grade level common ELA assessments
9-10 AIS ELA	5) District/regional/BOCES–de veloped	Performance on grade level assessments in ELA grades 9-10, per district HEDI bands
K-8 AIS in ELA	4) State-approved 3rd party	Measures of Academic Progress (ELA)
K-5 special education	4) State-approved 3rd party	Measures of Academic Progress (ELA)
6-11 Special Education Teachers	1) Change in % of student performance level on State	Performance on NYS state grade level assessments/Regents per district HEDI band
9-12 Business	5) District/regional/BOCES–de veloped	Niskayuna CSD developed pre/post business course specific common assessments
Grade 11 Reading	1) Change in % of student performance level on State	performance on Regents, % of students who reach proficiency
HS Math-PreCalculus(intro,no AP,honors, accelerated)	5) District/regional/BOCES–de veloped	Niskayuna CSD developed pre/post Precalc specific assessments based on Common Core using TestWhiz, previous NYS assessments
AB/BC/multivariate Calculus	5) District/regional/BOCES–de veloped	Niskayuna CSD developed pre/post AB/BC Calc specific assessments
Analytic Geometry	5) District/regional/BOCES–de veloped	Niskayuna CSD developed pre/post Analytic geometry assessments
Statistics (plus AP)	5) District/regional/BOCES–de	Niskayuna CSD developed pre/post AP Stat assessments

	veloped	
AP/SUPA english 12 Honors	5) District/regional/BOCES–de veloped	Niskayuna CSD developed pre/post AP Supa English 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.	For courses without state assessments, student will be given a pretest at the beginning of the year to establish a baseline data. HEDI will be allocated to a teacher based upon the % of students meeting or exceeding proficiency targets as set by the Superintendent in consultation with directors and principals. For students in grade levels/courses with NYS assessment, HEDI will be determined based upon the % of students who meet a local proficiency target as established by the Superintendent, director and principals. For K-3 students, HEDI will be based on the % of students who met the vendor established proficiency score for each individual student.
Highly Effective (18 - 20 points) Results are well above District- or BOCES -adopted expectations for growth or achievement for grade/subject.	20 points 97-100% of students meet targets 19 points 94-96% of students meet targets 18 points 89-93% of students meet targets
Effective (9 - 17 points) Results meet District- or BOCES-adopted expectations for growth or achievement for grade/subject.	17 points 87-88 % of students meet targets 16 points 85-86% of students meet targets 15 points 83-84% of students meet targets 14 points 81-82% of students meet targets 13 points 79-80% of students meet targets 12 points 77-78% of students meet targets 11 points 75-76% of students meet targets 10 points 73-74% of students meet targets 9 points 71-72% of students meet targets
Developing (3 - 8 points) Results are below District- or BOCES-adopted expectations for growth or achievement for grade/subject.	8 points 69-70% of students meet targets 7 points 67-68% of students meet targets 6 points 65-66% of students meet targets 5 points 63-64% of students meet targets 4 points 61-62% of students meet targets 3 points 59-60% of students meet targets
Ineffective (0 - 2 points) Results are well below District- or BOCES-adopted expectations for growth or achievement for grade/subject.	2 points 48-58% of students meet targets 1 point 37-47% of students meet targets 0 points 0-36% of students meet targets

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/5139/141216-y92vNseFa4/uploaded local HEDI bands.docx

3.14) Locally Developed Controls

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

Targets for AIS and ELL studnets will be adjusted accordingly based on individ student data.

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.

For teachers with multiple measures, a weighted average will be computed based on the number of students within each measure.

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 Monday, June 11, 2012

Updated Friday, December 21, 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

(No response)

4.2) Points Within Other Measures

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

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

Is the following points assignment applicable to all teachers?

Yes

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

(No response)

Multiple (at least two) classroom observations by principal or other trained administrator, at least one of which must be unannounced [at least 31 points]	60
One or more observation(s) by trained independent evaluators	(No response)
Observations by trained in-school peer teachers	(No response)
Feedback from students using State-approved survey tool	(No response)
Feedback from parents/caregivers using State-approved survey tool	(No response)
Structured reviews of lesson plans, student portfolios and other teacher artifacts	(No response)

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

(No response)

4.3) Survey Tools (if applicable)

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

(No response)

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

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

4.4) Assurances

Please check all of the boxes below:

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

4.5) Process for Assigning Points and Determining HEDI Ratings

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

We have developed our own summative evaluation rating scale/form (uploaded below). It includes how the 60 points are broken out from the four Danielson domains. We weight each domain equally as 15 points (include subcategories). Each subcomponent is rated on a scale from 1-4, and added together to get the raw score for a domain which is then multiplied by the conversion factor to yield the HEDI point value out of 15 for a domain. Domains are added together to result in a score from 0-60. If a teacher is rated ineffective in each subcomponents for each domain, they will receive a zero.

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/5091/141238-eka9yMJ855/Teacher Rating Summary Dec 2012_1.docx

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

Highly Effective: Overall performance and results exceed NYS Teaching Standards.	Teachers must score a combined total of 55-60 points on the four Danielson domains.
Effective: Overall performance and results meet NYS Teaching Standards.	Teachers must score a combined total of 47-54 points on the four Danielson domains.
Developing: Overall performance and results need improvement in order to meet NYS Teaching Standards.	Teachers must score a combined total of 38-46 points on the four Danielson domains.
Ineffective: Overall performance and results do not meet NYS Teaching Standards.	Teachers must score a combined total of 0-37 points on the four Danielson domains.

Provide the ranges for the 60-point scoring bands.

Highly Effective	55-60
Effective	47-54
Developing	38-46
Ineffective	0-37

4.6) Observations of Probationary Teachers

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

By building principals or other trained administrators

4.6) Observations of Probationary Teachers Formal/Long	3
4.6) Observations of Probationary Teachers Informal/Short	4
4.6) Observations of Probationary Teachers Enter Total	7

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?

- Both

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

- In Person

4.7) Observations of Tenured Teachers

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

By building principals or other trained administrators

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

By trained in-school peer teachers or other trained reviewers

Formal/Long	0
Informal/Short	0

Independent evaluators

Formal/Long	0
Informal/Short	0

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

- In Person

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

- In Person

5. Composite Scoring (Teachers)

Created Sunday, July 15, 2012

Updated Thursday, October 04, 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	55-60
Effective	47-54
Developing	38-46
Ineffective	0-37

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 Sunday, July 15, 2012

Updated Thursday, December 20, 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/5265/152170-Df0w3Xx5v6/Tip Plan final_1.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:

Whereas, the NCSD and the NTA are required to implement a new APPR for teachers at NCSD specifically designed for the 2012-13 school year; and whereas, the parties desire to satisfactorily comply with this requirement; and whereas, the parties acknowledge that, in the event that NYS makes changes to the Education Law and/or regulations, the parties agree to bargain the impact of such changes to this agreement; and whereas, the parties agree that nothing within this MOA shall abrogate the collectively bargained rights of teachers, where applicable, or the rights of the NCSD, its BOE and Superintendent to discontinue the employment of a probationary

teachers in accordance with Education Law Section 3012 and Section 3031 or restrict or limit the discretion of the Superintendent and BOE in making a determination on the status of a probationary teacher, and/or deny tenure in compliance with Education Law 3012-c and the collective bargaining agreement; and whereas, the NCSD and the NTA agree that this agreement shall sunset upon approval of a new appr Plan. The APPR (as negotiated) will cover the first two elements as described below. The Appeals process will be detailed in this MOA. It is further agreed, that the provisions of this plan supersede the relevant sections of the current collective bargaining agreement for the teachers affected by this plan.

A. *Teacher Request for Supporting Documents.* Within 5 work days of receipt of the yearly summative evaluation, a teacher may request, in writing, that the administrator issuing the APPR provide to the teacher a copy of any and all documents and written materials upon which the APPR was based. The authoring administrator shall provide all such documents to the teacher and the Assistant Superintendent of Instruction within 5 work days of the request. Only materials provided in response to this request shall be considered in the deliberations as to the validity of the APPR.

B. *Right to Appeal.* Only tenured teachers who receive an APPR rating of "ineffective" or "developing" may appeal their APPR through the procedure described herein. A teacher may initiate a Level 1 appeal for any evaluation, and maintain the right to attach a rebuttal to the APPR. A teacher may file only one appeal from a single APPR evaluation. 2. Probationary teachers may not file appeals through the procedure established herein, but may file a written rebuttal which shall be attached to the APPR. 3. Appeals to the APPR shall follow in this order; Level 1 - Teacher and Administrator level-the teacher and the Admin shall meet and discuss components of APR and issues not agreeable to both parties. At this level, both Admin and teacher shall try to resolve the teacher's concern at this level. If not resolved, teacher may go to the next level. Level 2 - APPR Appeals Committee-teacher brings appeal to Assistant Superintendent, who will initiate the committee appeals process, as defined below. If the issue is resolved, then APPR for that year would be considered complete. If not, the teacher may bring the APPR to the third step as defined below. Level 3 - Superintendent Level-If the issue is not resolved by joint committee of teachers and admin's, the appeal goes to the Superintendent, who will issue a final determination (in consultation with the NTA President). That determination is considered final. The Superintendent shall issue a final ruling on the APPR.

C. *Filing of Appeal by Tenured Teacher.* A tenured teacher may file a written appeal of the APPR within 10 work days of the receipt of the requested supporting documents (detailed in A above). This appeal shall be sent to the Assistant Superintendent of Instruction and the evaluating admin. An appeal of an APPR must be based upon one or more of the following grounds: The substance of the APPR; the district's failure to adhere to the standards and methodologies required for the APPR that re set forth in Education Law 3012-c and applicable rules and regulations; The district's failure to comply with locally negotiated procedure; and the district's failure to issue and/or implement the terms of the TIP, where applicable, as required under Education Law 3012. The written appeal document must clearly identify the grounds for appeal, and shall explain, in detail, why the appealing teacher believes the APPR should be modified.

D. *Review by APPR Appeals Committee.* Appeals shall be referred for consideration by the APPR Appeals Committee, a standing committee made up of two tenured administrators, the ASI, and 2 tenured teachers taken from a pool within the district (1 elementary, 1 middle, 1 high school, 1 from a specials area and 1 at large) appointed by the president of the NTA. The committee composition for each appeal shall be appointed jointly by the NTA President and the ASI. All members of the committee shall be appointed for a term of three years, and all members shall be required to complete the training required of lead evaluators under the APPR regulations. The parties agree that in the event the work of the committee would required a member of the committee to consider an appeal from a member fo the Level 2 committee, the appealing teacher shall have the option of having the NTA President and the ASI appoint the committee to hear the appeal. The APPR Appeals Committee shall convene to consider the appeal within 15 calendar days of the filing of the appeal, and shall issue a decision within 15 calendar days within the filing of the appeal. It is the responsibility of the teacher to demonstrate the deficiency of the APPR in question and the evidence in support of the teacher's claim shall be limited to the evidence and/or testimony submitted.

E. *Determination of Appeal.* Upon the conclusion of its consideration of an appeal, each member of the committee shall vote to either uphold the APPR or modify the APPR. If the committee unanimously agrees on one of these choices, the committee shall give written notice of tits decision to the appealing teacher, the president of the NTA and the Superintendent of schools, and the decision of the committee shall be final. In the event the committee is not unanimous in its decision on an appeal, within three days each member of the committee shall write a brief statement setting forth and explaining his or her recommendation for disposition of the appeal. The committee members' written statements, together with the full record of the appeal, shall then be forwarded to the Superintendent of Schools-who in conjunction with the NTA president, shall issue a final decision on appeal.

F. *Exclusivity of Appeal Process.* The APPR process set forth herein shall be the sole method of appealing an APPR evaluation or at teacher improvement plan.

All steps and the resolution of the appeal will occur in a timely and expeditious manner in compliance law 3012-C.

6.4) Training and Certification of Lead Evaluators and Evaluators

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

Our district has used Danielson since 2000. Over the past four years, we have used our monthly leadership council meetings to do the following:

1. Study and compare proficient (effective) and distinguished (highly effective) categories and compare critical attributes using real observation narratives from members of our team
 2. Using actual narratives, leaders work in groups to identify the category of performance
 3. Practice evidence based observations using actual narratives
 4. Review sample narratives for opinion statements
- These practices will continue this year and include 2 hours/month of practice on rubrics and inter-rater reliability which will include review of SLO targets and local assessment targets.*

In addition, leaders will recalibrate using Teachscape (15 hours of training). The Superintendent will certify our administrators based upon their completion of this online course and will recertify annually.

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 Monday, June 11, 2012
Updated Friday, August 17, 2012

Page 1

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

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

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

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

K-5
6-8
9-12
(No response)
(No response)
(No response)
(No response)

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

Please check the boxes below:

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

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

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

State assessments, *required if one exists*

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

List of State-approved 3rd party assessments

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

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

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

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 Tuesday, July 24, 2012

Updated Monday, November 19, 2012

Page 1

Locally-Selected Measures of Student Achievement or Growth

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

Grade Configuration	Locally-Selected Measure from List of Approved Measures	Assessment
K-5	(a) achievement on State assessments	NYS assessment in math, grades 4-5
6-8	(a) achievement on State assessments	NYS assessment in math, grades 6-8
9-12	(g) % achieving specific level on Regents or alternatives	NYS Regents exams: Comp. English, Integrated Algebra, US History and Govt., Global History and Geography, and Living Environment

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>In conjunction with the superintendent, principals annually review student performance data. Further, the district Academic Council sets standards for academic achievement. The principals' Local 15 HEDI categories were developed using the council's standards. For grades K-8, the HEDI score is based upon the NYS State Assessment for Math, which will consist of an average of all students for each assessment in the elementary (Grades K-5) building and the average for each assessment in the middle school (Grades 6-8) building; for Grades 9-12 an average of all student results (best score achieved on each exam) on the following five regents exams: Comprehensive English, Integrated Algebra, US History and Government, Global History and Geography, and Living Environment from the graduating student cohort.</p>
--	--

Highly Effective (14 - 15 points) Results are well above District- or BOCES-adopted expectations for growth or achievement for grade/subject.	For grades K-8, 78% or more of students will earn a 3 or 4 on the NYS math exam. For grades 9-12,94% or more of the senior class cohort will earn a passing score (of 65 or better) on the average of the highest Regents scores on the five exams listed above.
Effective (8- 13 points) Results meet District- or BOCES-adopted expectations for growth or achievement for grade/subject.	For grades K-8, 60-77% of students will earn a 3 or a 4 on the NYS math exam. For grades 9-12,65-93% of the graduating senior cohort will earn a passing score (of 65 or better) on the average of the highest Regents scores on the five exams listed above.
Developing (3 - 7 points) Results are below District- or BOCES-adopted expectations for growth or achievement for grade/subject.	For grades K-8, 50-59% of students will earn a 3 or a 4 on the NYS math exam. For grades 9-12,30-64% of the graduating senior cohort will earn a passing score (of 65 or better) on the average of the highest Regents scores on the five exams listed above.
Ineffective (0 - 2 points) Results are well below District- or BOCES-adopted expectations for growth or achievement for grade/subject.	For grades K-8, 0-49% of students will earn a 3 or a 4 on the NYS math exam. For grades 9-12,0-29% of the graduating senior cohort will earn a passing score (of 65 or better) on the average of the highest Regents scores on the five exams listed above.

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

(No response)

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

(No response)

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

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

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

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

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

(b) student growth or achievement on State assessments in ELA and/or Math in Grades 4-8 for students in each specific performance

level (e.g., Level 1, Level 2)

- (c) student growth or achievement on State assessments in ELA and/or Math in Grades 4-8 for students with disabilities and English Language Learners in Grades 4-8
- (d) student performance on any or all of the district-wide locally selected measures approved for use in teacher evaluations
- (e) four, five and/or six-year high school graduation and/or dropout rates for principals employed in a school with high school grades
- (f) percentage of students who earn a Regents diploma with advanced designation and/or honors for principals employed in a school with high school grades
- (g) percentage of a cohort of students that achieve specified scores on Regents examinations and/or Department approved alternative examinations (including, but not limited to, Advanced Placement examinations, International Baccalaureate examinations, SAT II, etc.), for principals employed in a school with high school grades (e.g., the percentage of students in the 2009 cohort that scored at least a 3 on an Advanced Placement examination since entry into the ninth grade)
- (h) students' progress toward graduation in the school using strong predictive indicators, including but not limited to 9th and/or 10th grade credit accumulation and/or the percentage of students that pass 9th and/or 10th grade subjects most commonly associated with graduation and/or students' progress in passing the number of required Regents examinations for graduation, for principals employed in a school with high school grades
- (i) student learning objectives (only allowable for principals in programs/buildings without a Value-Added measure for the State Growth subcomponent). Used with one of the following assessments: State, State-approved 3rd party, or a District, regional, or BOCES-developed assessment that is rigorous and comparable across classrooms

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

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

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.	N/A
Highly Effective (18 - 20 points) Results are well above District- or BOCES-adopted expectations for growth or achievement for grade/subject.	N/A
Effective (9- 17 points) Results meet District- or BOCES-adopted expectations for growth or achievement for grade/subject.	N/A

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

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

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

assets/survey-uploads/5366/154913-pi29aiX4bL/Appendix C.xls

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.

*We are including all student subgroups in the calculation of targets and HEDI scores.
There are no special considerations.*

8.4) Principals with More Than One Locally Selected Measure

Describe the district's process for combining multiple locally selected measures where applicable for principals, each scored from 0-15 or 0-20 points as applicable, into a single subcomponent HEDI category and score.

For principals with multiple measures, a weighted average will be computed based on the number of students within each measure.

8.5) Assurances

Please check all of the boxes below:

8.5) Assurances Assure that the application of locally developed controls will be rigorous, fair, and transparent	Check
8.5) Assurances Assure that use of locally developed controls will not have a disparate impact on underrepresented students, in accordance with any applicable civil rights laws.	Check
8.5) Assurances Assure that enrolled students are included in accordance with policies for student assignment to schools and may not be excluded.	Check
8.5) Assurances Assure that procedures for ensuring data accuracy and integrity are being utilized.	Check
8.5) Assurances Assure that the process for assigning points for locally selected measures will use the narrative HEDI descriptions described in the regulations to effectively differentiate principals' performance in ways that improve student learning and instruction.	Check
8.5) Assurances Assure that it is possible for a principal to earn each point, including 0, for the locally selected measures subcomponent.	Check

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

9. Other Measures of Effectiveness (Principals)

Created Monday, June 11, 2012

Updated Monday, October 08, 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.

(No response)

(No response)

(No response)

9.6) Assurances

Please check all of the boxes below:

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

9.7) Process for Assigning Points and Determining HEDI Ratings

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

Principals will be assessed through the use of a Multidimensional Principal Practice Rubric. This rubric will be used by the Superintendent as an end of year evaluation to assign points to each component of each domain of the ISLCC standards. For each domain, the Superintendent will have a space to record the evidence supporting that domain, a rationale for any developing or ineffective rating and overall narrative comments. As part of the superintendent's evaluation, principals may receive 20 points towards the 60 for the end of year submission of two documents per domain that are free from substantial and material error and achieve their intended purpose. Points are assigned to each component and domain, contributing to the full 60. Point allocations are outlined in Appendix A of our APPR document.

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/5143/141239-pMADJ4gk6R/Admin merged documents.pdf>

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

Highly Effective: Overall performance and results exceed standards.	As outlined in the Principal Performance Evaluation Multidimensional Principal Practice Rubric (see attached), quantified in Appendix A (see attached), principals will receive an individual score for each component of each domain of the aforementioned rubric. The grand total must be between 59-60 points.
Effective: Overall performance and results meet standards.	As outlined in the Principal Performance Evaluation Multidimensional Principal Practice Rubric (see attached), quantified in Appendix A (see attached), principals will receive an individual score for each component of each domain of the aforementioned rubric. The grand total must be between 57-58 points.
Developing: Overall performance and results need improvement in order to meet standards.	As outlined in the Principal Performance Evaluation Multidimensional Principal Practice Rubric (see attached), quantified in Appendix A (see attached), principals will receive an individual score for each component of each domain of the aforementioned rubric. The grand total must be between 50-56 points.
Ineffective: Overall performance and results do not meet standards.	As outlined in the Principal Performance Evaluation Multidimensional Principal Practice Rubric (see attached), quantified in Appendix A (see attached), principals will receive an individual score for each component of each domain of the aforementioned rubric. The grand total must be between 0-49 points.

Please provide the locally-negotiated 60 point scoring bands.

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

9.8) School Visits

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

Probationary Principals

By supervisor	3
By trained administrator	0
By trained independent evaluator	0
Enter Total	3

Tenured Principals

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

10. Composite Scoring (Principals)

Created Friday, August 17, 2012

Page 1

Standards for Rating Categories

Growth or Comparable Measures

Locally-selected Measures of growth or achievement

Other Measures of Effectiveness (Teacher and Leader standards)

Highly

Effective

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

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

Overall performance and results exceed ISLLC leadership standards.

Effective

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

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

Overall performance and results meet ISLLC leadership standards.

Developing

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

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

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

Ineffective

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

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

Overall performance and results do not meet ISLLC leadership standards.

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

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

2012-13 where there is no Value-Added measure

Growth or Comparable Measures

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

Other Measures of Effectiveness

(60 points)

Overall

Composite Score

Highly Effective

18-20

18-20

Ranges determined locally--see below

91-100

Effective

9-17

9-17

75-90

Developing

3-8

3-8

65-74

Ineffective

0-2

0-2

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

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

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

2012-13 where Value-Added growth measure applies

Growth or Comparable Measures

Locally-selected Measures of growth or achievement

Other Measures of Effectiveness

(60 points)

Overall

Composite Score

Highly Effective

22-25

14-15

Ranges determined locally--see above

91-100

Effective

10-21

8-13

75-90

Developing

3-9

3-7

65-74

Ineffective

0-2

0-2

0-64

11. Additional Requirements - Principals

Created Monday, June 11, 2012

Updated Wednesday, October 03, 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/5276/141274-Df0w3Xx5v6/PIP documents combined_1.pdf](#)

11.3) Appeals Process

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

(1) the substance of the annual professional performance review

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

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

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

1. A tenured administrator/supervisor desiring to appeal their APPR composite summary score must, within 15 days of receipt of the formal evaluation, submit a statement with a rationale for the appeal, based on the above allowable parameters. The notice of appeal must include any documents relevant to the appeal. These are submitted to the Superintendent of Schools.
 2. Fifteen (15) calendar days after the receipt of the appeal the superintendent must submit a detailed written response of the appeal to the principal and the NAA.
 - 3.
- A. If not satisfied by the preliminary decision of the Superintendent the building principal shall within seven (7) school days request a

review be performed by a three-member panel comprised of one district administrator (the Administrator for Human Resources, the Assistant Superintendent for Business, or the Assistant Superintendent for Curriculum and Instruction) selected by the superintendent, and two members of the NAA selected by the appealing principal. The panel shall issue a decision upholding, reversing, or modifying the preliminary determination. If the appealing principal is not satisfied with the decision of the panel, he/she may request a review by a mutually agreed upon retired administrator. Within ten (10) calendar days from the request for review the parties shall examine a list of retired administrators willing to conduct a review from the New York State Retired Supervisors and Administrators Association or any other organization that may maintain such a list. The list of names shall also include resume and fees. The list will be provided by both the district and the NAA. The cost of the independent review shall be borne equally by the district and the NAA. If the parties within ten (10) business days cannot mutually agree upon the selection of the retired administrator the list shall be provided to the panel which issued the decision and the panel shall select the retired administrator to hear the further appeal within five (5) business days of receipt of the list.

B. The review shall consist of an assessment of the preliminary decision, the evidence underlying the observations/evaluations of the principal, and all other evidence submitted by the principal and/or the district. The evidence and arguments shall be presented to the retired administrator for review within forty-five (45) business days after his/her selection. Upon completion of the review the retired administrator shall render a written decision within ten (10) business days after receipt of the evidence and arguments from both sides. The decision may uphold, reverse, or modify the preliminary determination and shall be final and binding.

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.

Duration and nature of evaluator training Year 1: District has used Danielson since 2000, however, we have purchased Teachscape for the 2012-13 school year. Each administrator will complete the 15 hour training and become certified.

Process for certifying lead evaluators: Upon completion of Teachscape online course, Superintendent will make recommendation to the Board of Education.

Process for periodically re-certifying lead evaluators: District will seek opportunities from local BOCES for annual recertification.

Ensuring inter-rater reliability: As has been done over the past 5 years, samples and exemplars of teacher APPR narratives will be shared at monthly leadership council meetings to review and discuss use of evidence, minimization of bias, and adherence to the Danielson rubrics.

11.5) Assurances -- Evaluators

Please check the boxes below:

-
- Checked
-

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

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

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

(4) application and use of the State-approved teacher or principal rubric(s) selected by the district or BOCES for use in evaluations,

including training on the effective application of such rubrics to observe a teacher or principal's practice

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

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

(7) use of the Statewide Instructional Reporting System

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

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

• Checked

11.6) Assurances -- Principals

Please check all of the boxes below:

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

11.7) Assurances -- Data

Please check all of the boxes below:

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

12. Joint Certification of APPR Plan

Created Monday, June 11, 2012

Updated Friday, December 21, 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/5581/141280-3Uqgn5g9Iu/APPR Certification Form 12-21.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.

Niskayuna Central Schools
Student Learning Objective (SLO)
(October and June)

Population	<i>These are the students assigned to the course section(s) in this SLO - all students who are assigned to the course section(s) must be included in the SLO. (Full class rosters of all students must be provided for all included course sections.)</i>
Learning Content	<i>What is being taught over the instructional period covered? Common Core/National/State standards? Will this goal apply to all standards applicable to a course or just to specific priority standards?</i>
Interval of Instructional Time	<i>What is the instructional period covered (if not a year, rationale for semester/quarter/etc)?</i>
Evidence	<i>What specific assessment(s) will be used to measure this goal? The assessment must align to the learning content of the course.</i>
Baseline	<i>What is the starting level of students' knowledge of the learning content at the beginning of the instructional period?</i>

Target(s)	<i>What is the expected outcome (target) of students' level of knowledge of the learning content at the end of the instructional period?</i>																				
HEDI Scoring (Percentage of students that are meeting the target)	<i>How will evaluators determine what range of student performance "meets" the goal (effective) versus "well-below" (ineffective), "below" (developing), and "well-above" (highly effective)?</i>																				
	HIGHLY EFFECTIVE			EFFECTIVE									DEVELOPING					INEFFECTIVE			
	20	19	18	17	16	15	14	<u>13</u>	12	11	10	9	8	7	6	5	4	3	2	1	0
	97-100	93-96	89-92	87-88	85-86	83-84	81-82	79-80	77-78	75-76	73-74	71-72	69-70	67-68	65-66	63-64	61-62	59-60	48-58	37-47	0-36
Rationale	<i>Describe the reasoning behind the choices regarding learning content, evidence, and target and how they will be used together to prepare students for future growth and development in subsequent grades/courses, as well as college and career readiness.</i>																				

October Approval

Signature of Evaluator :

Date:

Signature of the teacher (s):

Date:

Final Review

End of year Teacher Comments:	End of Year Evaluator Comments:
--------------------------------------	--

Signature of Evaluator:

Date:

Signature of Teacher (s):

Date:

Local Proficiency Score for Teachers - grades 4-8 ELA and Math

(15 points)

Highly Effective		Effective						Developing					Ineffective		
15	14	13	12	11	10	9	8	7	6	5	4	3	2	1	0
95-100	89-94	86-88	83-85	80-82	77-79	74-76	71-73	69-70	67-68	65-66	63-64	59-62	48-58	37-47	0-36

The chart represents percentage of students who met the pre-established target in consultant with their administrator.

An SLO format can be used with current HEDI bands although another proficiency format can be substituted so long as the format can be deemed as rigorous and meaningful by the appropriate Director, Principal and eventually by the Assistant Superintendent of Schools and the Superintendent of Schools.

Local Proficiency Score for Teachers other than grades 4-8

(20 points)

Highly Effective			Effective									Developing					Ineffective			
20	19	18	17	16	15	14	13	12	11	10	9	8	7	6	5	4	3	2	1	0
97-100	93-96	89-92	87-88	85-86	83-84	81-82	79-80	77-78	75-76	73-74	71-72	69-70	67-68	65-66	63-64	61-62	59-60	48-58	37-47	0-36

The chart represents percentage of students who met the pre-established target in consultant with their administrator.

An SLO format can be used with current HEDI bands although another proficiency format can be substituted so long as the format can be deemed as rigorous and meaningful by the appropriate Director, Principal and eventually by the Assistant Superintendent of Schools and the Superintendent of Schools.

Niskayuna Central Schools
Summative Evaluation Rating Scale

Teacher name: _____ Evaluator Name: _____

Domain One : Planning and Preparation	Domain one raw scores times .625 (do not round) RS x .625 = _____	/15
Domain Two: Classroom Environment	Domain two raw scores times .75 (do not round) RS x .7500 = _____	/15
Domain Three: Instruction	Domain three raw scores times .500 (do not round) RS x.7500= _____	/15
Domain Four: Professional Responsibilities (remainder of activities not discussed during the year, noted at summative)	Domain four raw scores times .625 (do not round) RS x .625 = _____	/15
	Round to the nearest whole number.	Total: /60

Total:

Sum of the above Scores

/100

State Established Ranges: 0-64 Ineffective 65-74 Developing 75-90 Effective 91-100 Highly Effective

Additional evidence from unannounced (day-to-day work in classroom):

Participation beyond the classroom

Additional Comments from evaluator:

Evaluator

Date

Evaluator

Date

Teacher

Date

Note: Your signature denotes that you have received a copy of this report but it does not necessarily indicate agreement. If you believe any portion is not accurate, please state your concern in writing to the evaluator.

** The teacher has the option to submit a written response to the any of the parts of this rating guide to be placed in their file.

Teacher Improvement Plan Action Plan
September - May

Teacher:
Administrator (s):

Signature:
Signature:

Date:
Date:

Area of Improvement (growth promoting goals): <ul style="list-style-type: none">• specific• measurable• realistic	Action to be taken (strategies for resolution)	Person Responsible	Resources and Support Available:	Date(s) of Expected Completion:	Indicators of Progress towards goal (s) Measurable by:

APPENDIX A Page 1 of 2

Multidimensional Principal Performance Rubric	points 60	points 40
Domain 1: Shared Vision of Learning	<u>8</u>	<u>6</u>
a. Culture	4	3
b. Sustainability	4	3
Domain 2: School Culture and Instructional Program	<u>20</u>	<u>12</u>
a. Culture	4	2.4
b. Instructional Program	4	2.4
c. Capacity Building	4	2.4
d. Sustainability	4	2.4
e. Strategic Planning Process	4	2.4
Domain 3: Safe, Efficient, Effective Learning Environment	<u>16</u>	<u>10</u>
a. Capacity Building	4	2.5
b. Culture	4	2.5
c. Sustainability	4	2.5
d. Instructional Program	4	2.5
Domain 4: Community	<u>6.5</u>	<u>5</u>
a. Strategic Planning Process: Inquiry	3	2
b. Culture	1.5	1
c. Sustainability	2	2
Domain 5: Integrity, Fairness, Ethics	<u>7.5</u>	<u>6</u>
a. Sustainability	4	3
b. Culture	3.5	3
Domain 6: Political, Social, Economic, Legal, and Cultural Context:	<u>2</u>	<u>1</u>
a. Sustainability	1	0.5
b. Culture	1	0.5
Possible Points	60	40
Total Points Earned		

Appendix A Page 2 of 2

	Highly effective 60 40		Effective 60 40		Developing 60 40		Ineffective
Domain 1: Shared Vision of Learning							
a. Culture	4	3	3.8	2.8	3.5	2.5	0
b. Sustainability	4	3	3.8	2.8	3.5	2.5	0
Domain 2: School Culture and Instructional Program							
a. Culture	4	2.4	3.8	2.4	3.5	2.2	0
b. Instructional Program	4	2.4	3.8	2.4	3.5	2.2	
c. Capacity Building	4	2.4	3.8	2.4	3.5	2.2	
d. Sustainability	4	2.4	3.8	2.4	3.5	2.2	
e. Strategic Planning Process	4	2.4	3.8	2.4	3.5	2.2	
Domain 3: Safe, Efficient, Effective Learning Environment							
a. Capacity Building	4	2.5	3.8	2.4	3.5	2.2	0
b. Culture	4	2.5	3.8	2.4	3.5	2.2	
c. Sustainability	4	2.5	3.8	2.4	3.5	2.2	
d. Instructional Program	4	2.5	3.8	2.4	3.5	2.2	
Domain 4: Community							
a. Strategic Planning Process: Inquiry	3	2	2.8	2	3	1.75	0
b. Culture	1.5	1	1.25	1	1.25	1	
c. Sustainability	2	2	1.9	1	1.25	1	
Domain 5: Integrity, Fairness, Ethics							
a. Sustainability	4	3	3.85	3	3	2.2	0
b. Culture	3.5	3	3.4	3	2	2.2	
Domain 6: Political, Social, Economic, Legal, and Cultural Context:							
a. Sustainability							0
b. Culture	1	.5	1	.5	1	.4	
	1	.5	1	.5	1	.4	

Rating

point range (60):

point range (40):

Highly effective	59 - 60	39.5 - 40
Effective	57 - 58	38 - 39
Developing	50 - 56	33.5 - 37.5
Ineffective	0 - 49	0 - 33

APPENDIX B EVALUATION PROCEDURES

1. FORMAL OBSERVATIONS:

Any deficiency which is observed during the course of any observation must, within five school days, be documented in writing, along with constructive and specific ways in which the Building Principal may achieve improvement in regards to that specific perceived deficiency.

Non-tenured principals:

Three (3) formal observations (one unannounced) will be made during each probationary year.

Tenured principals:

Two (2) formal observations (one unannounced) will be conducted each year.

Conduct of Formal Observations:

Formal monitoring or observation of the work performance of a Principal shall be conducted openly and with full knowledge of the Principal;

Observations will be conducted only by the Superintendent and/or his/her designee as agreed upon by both parties;

The observation shall be at least thirty minutes in duration;

With the exception of the unannounced observations all formal observation must be scheduled fifteen school (15) days in advance;

Pre-observation meeting to be held at least one week prior to scheduled formal observation to discuss planned activities to be observed and the related practice rubric domains that will be the focus of the observation;

Post-observation meeting to be held no later than one week after the formal observation and a written summary, including any suggested guidance, which is to be delivered to principal within one week of the post-observation meeting on a form to be mutually agreed-upon by the parties;

Principal shall have one (1) week to submit a response to the observation including any supporting documentation;

There will be a formative mid-year evaluation completed by the Superintendent on a form to be mutually agreed-upon by the parties that will be provided to the Principal no later than January 15th. No composite points will be assigned to mid-year evaluation. The

mid-year evaluation is meant to provide the building principal with constructive feedback as to his/her progress on selected goals and on each domain of the Multi-Dimensional Rubric;

A single formal observation by an observer in any one (1) year shall not be considered as the sole basis for the termination of service;

Evaluations of Principals shall not be forwarded to any other agency or prospective employer without the written consent of the Principal.

2. END OF THE YEAR EVALUATION:

If the principal successfully submits, as part of his/her end of the year evaluation, two (2) supporting school documents, per domain, from a list of approved documents (Appendix E) and all are free from substantial and material error and effectively achieved intended purpose, the building principal will receive twenty (20) total composite points on the rubric. If any document that has been attached is determined by the Superintendent to contain a substantial and material error, or to be ineffective in its intended purpose, that document will result in the reduction of one (1) out of the twenty (20) assigned points. The Superintendent within his/her end of the year evaluation must provide factual basis for any document that is not accepted.

The Superintendent upon review of the submitted school documents, and observation summary and responses shall complete his/her end of the year evaluation on the form provided in Appendix D with assigned point total and deliver it to the building principal no later than June 15th. The Superintendent's evaluation shall consist of a total of forty (40) composite points as set forth in Appendix "C."

** An ineffective rating in any subcomponent within a domain must be supported by specific, complete, and accurate evidence and/or facts to be provided by the evaluator.

**PRINCIPAL PERFORMANCE EVALUATION
MULTIDIMENSIONAL PRINCIPAL PRACTICE RUBRIC**

PRINCIPAL:

SCHOOL:

DATE:

PERFORMANCE EVALUATION SCORING RUBRIC:

HIGHLY EFFECTIVE (HI)	Overall performance and results exceed standards
EFFECTIVE (E)	Overall performance and results meet standards
DEVELOPING (D)	Overall performance and results need improvement in order to meet standards
INEFFECTIVE (I)	Overall performance and results are well below standards

End of Year Evaluation Form

(60 Total Composite Points)

DOMAIN 1 – SHARED VISION OF LEARNING: An education leader promotes the success of every student by facilitating the development, articulation, implementation, and stewardship of a vision of learning that is shared and supported by all stakeholders.

	HI	E	D	I
Collaboratively develop and implement a shared vision and mission for learning				
Create and implement plans to achieve goals				
Promote continuous and sustainable improvement				
Collect and use data to identify goals, assess organizational effectiveness, and promote organizational learning				
Monitor and evaluate progress and revise plans				

Supervisor's Overall Evaluation/ Comments:

Evidence to be used to support Domain:

-
-
-
-
-
-
-
-
-

Detailed explanation for each "developing" or "ineffective" rating to include specific factual evidence / artifacts used to support such rating

POINTS ASSIGNED TO DOMAIN 1: _____

DOMAIN 1 SCORE: _____

DOMAIN 2 – SCHOOL CULTURE AND INSTRUCTIONAL PROGRAM: An education leader promotes the success of every student by advocating, nurturing, and sustaining a school culture and instructional program conducive to student learning and staff professional growth.

	HI	E	D	I
Nurture and sustain a culture of collaboration, trust, learning and high expectations				
Create a comprehensive, rigorous, and coherent curricular program				
Create a personalized and motivating learning environment for students				
Supervise instruction				
Develop assessment and accountability systems to monitor student progress				
Develop the instructional and leadership capacity of staff				
Maximize time spent on quality instruction				
Promote the use of effective and appropriate technologies to support teaching and learning				
Monitor and evaluate the impact of the instructional program				

Supervisor's Overall Evaluation/ Comments:

Evidence to be used to support Domain:

-
-
-
-
-
-

Detailed explanation for each "developing" or "ineffective" rating to include specific factual evidence / artifacts used to support such rating

POINTS ASSIGNED TO DOMAIN 2:

DOMAIN 2 SCORE: _____

DOMAIN 4 – COMMUNITY (*Determine Points*): An education leader promotes the success of every student by collaborating with faculty and community members, responding to diverse community interests and needs, and mobilizing community resources.

	HI	E	D	I
Collect and analyze data and information pertinent to the educational environment				
Promote understanding, appreciation, and use of the community's diverse cultural, social, and intellectual resources				
Build and sustain positive relationships with families, caregivers, and community partners				

Supervisor's Overall Evaluation/ Comments:

Evidence to be used to support Domain:

-
-
-
-
-
-

Detailed explanation for each "developing" or "ineffective" rating to include specific factual evidence / artifacts used to support such rating

POINTS ASSIGNED TO DOMAIN 4:

DOMAIN 4 SCORE: _____

DOMAIN 6 – POLITICAL, SOCIAL, ECONOMIC, LEGAL AND CULTURAL CONTEXT: An education leader promotes the success of every student by understanding, responding to and influencing the political, social, economic, legal and cultural context.

		HI	E	D	I
Advocate for children, families, and caregivers					
Assess, analyze, and anticipate emerging trends and initiatives in order to adapt leadership strategies					
Act to influence local, district, state, and national decisions affecting student learning					
Supervisor's Overall Evaluation/ Comments:		Evidence to be used to support Domain:			
Detailed explanation for each "developing" or "ineffective" rating to include specific factual evidence / artifacts used to support such rating					

POINTS ASSIGNED TO DOMAIN 6: _____

DOMAIN 6 SCORE: _____

Supervisors Signature/Date

Total Composite Points Awarded

Principal Signature / Date

Principal's signature represents only receipt of the evaluation form and not agreement with its content or score

NOTE: THIS IS BASED ON THE MULTI-DIMENSIONAL RUBRIC AND MUST BE ADAPTED IF ANOTHER RUBRIC IS SELECTED

APPENDIX E

Mutually Agreed Upon Administrative Artifacts / Evidence that may be Submitted in Support of the End of the Year Evaluation

Standard 1: A school administrator is an educational leader who promotes the success of all students by facilitating the development, articulation, implementation, and stewardship of a vision of learning that is shared and supported by the school community.

Examples of Evidence / Artifacts:

- Building goals
- School Improvement Plan
- Grade level goals
- Conference day programs
- Staff development plan
- Staff development calendar
- Staff development agendas and products
- Faculty meeting agendas
- Staff memos
- Parent letters
- Administrative council meeting agendas
- Department, grade level and/or team meeting agendas
- Scheduled collaboration and common planning time
- Mission/vision statement posters
- Instructional data compiled for staff
- Board presentations
- Advisory committee meeting agendas
- End-of-year report
- School newsletter
- Parent and student communication
- School website
- Strategic plan
- Monthly reports
- School report card
- Parent meeting agendas
- Building wide discipline plan
- Interscholastic academic eligibility policy

NOTE: THIS IS BASED ON THE MULTI-DIMENSIONAL RUBRIC AND MUST BE ADAPTED IF ANOTHER RUBRIC IS SELECTED

APPENDIX E

Mutually Agreed Upon Administrative Artifacts / Evidence that may be Submitted in Support of the End of the Year Evaluation

- Character education programs
- Guidance plan
- Student recognition programs
- Building tours
- Student orientation assemblies and lessons
- New entrant orientation program

Standard 2: A school administrator is an educational leader who promotes the success of all students by advocating, nurturing, and sustaining a school culture and instructional program conducive to student learning and staff professional growth.

Examples of Evidence / Artifacts:

- Recruiting, hiring and retaining quality staff
- New teacher orientation and induction programs
- Staff development plan
- Staff development calendar
- Staff development agendas and products
- Teacher mentor programs
- Administrative orientation and induction programs
- New administrator mentor programs
- Staff recognition programs
- Teacher and administrator observations and evaluations
- Teacher observation schedule
- Tenure recommendations
- Recommendations for continued employment
- Supervision of teacher APPR plans
- Observations and evaluations of non-certified staff (clerical, security, food service, teaching assistants, cafeteria aides, hall monitors, individual aides, etc.)
- Child study team meetings
- Motivational assemblies, speakers and programs
- Planning and development of teacher in-service programs

NOTE: THIS IS BASED ON THE MULTI-DIMENSIONAL RUBRIC AND MUST BE ADAPTED IF ANOTHER RUBRIC IS SELECTED

APPENDIX E

Mutually Agreed Upon Administrative Artifacts / Evidence that may be Submitted in Support of the End of the Year Evaluation

- Staff development plan and calendar
- Professional development program agendas and products
- Demonstration plans and lessons
- Provide teachers with opportunities to observe best practices
- Walk-through observation schedules
- Administrative council meeting agendas
- Faculty meeting agendas
- School climate surveys
- Administrative journal
- Administrative calendar
- Attend local, state and/or national professional conferences
- Professional reading library for staff
- Supportive notes from staff or community
- Student recognition for academics and athletics
- Art & music awards programs and competitions
- Examples of Evidence / Artifacts: (continued)
- Honor societies
- Student faculty communication committee
- Guidance plan and program
- Identification and placement of ELL and Students with Disabilities
- Annual review of Students with Disabilities
- Child Study Teams,
- Student agenda book
- Registration procedures
- Character education programs
- Records management procedures
- College application process
- Class ranking
- Honor roll
- Commencement exercise
- Student activities (homecoming, prom, dinners, dances, field trips, etc.)
- Interscholastic athletic programs
- Intramural athletic programs

NOTE: THIS IS BASED ON THE MULTI-DIMENSIONAL RUBRIC AND MUST BE ADAPTED IF ANOTHER RUBRIC IS SELECTED

APPENDIX E

Mutually Agreed Upon Administrative Artifacts / Evidence that may be Submitted in Support of the End of the Year Evaluation

- Extended day programs
- GED programs
- School newspaper
- Yearbooks
- Literary magazine
- Student media center
- School television and radio
- Student mentor program

Standard 3: A school administrator is an educational leader who promotes the success of all students by ensuring management of the organization, operations, and resources for a safe, efficient, and effective learning environment.

Examples of Evidence / Artifacts:

- Master schedule
- Duty rosters
- Class rosters
- Staff Memos
- Assessment preparation and planning
- Proctor schedules
- Administration, scoring and reporting of state assessments: Regents examinations, mid-term examinations, ACT, SAT, IB, AP and NYSESLAT
- Analyses of data and application to instruction

NOTE: THIS IS BASED ON THE MULTI-DIMENSIONAL RUBRIC AND MUST BE ADAPTED IF ANOTHER RUBRIC IS SELECTED

APPENDIX E

Mutually Agreed Upon Administrative Artifacts / Evidence that may be Submitted in Support of the End of the Year Evaluation

- Transportation schedule and rosters
- Class size report
- Staffing projections
- Calendar planning
- Budget development (equipment, supplies, technology, textbooks, shared services, etc.)
- BEDS Report
- VADIR Report
- AIS programs
- Substitute coverage
- Cabinet meetings
- Administrative council meeting agendas
- General faculty and staff meeting agendas
- Department meeting agendas
- Grade Level meeting agendas
- Team meeting agendas
- Faculty meeting agendas
- Monthly reports
- End-of-year report
- Building expectations / rules communicated and posted
- School safety and emergency plan
- Crisis management team meetings
- Phone log and email
- Fire Inspection report & insurance audit
- Ad hoc meetings and agendas
- School security plan
- School safety committee
- School attendance policy
- Staff memos
- Plant management walk through
- Student orientation documents
- Regular meetings with maintenance staff
- Safety survey data
- Teacher handbook

NOTE: THIS IS BASED ON THE MULTI-DIMENSIONAL RUBRIC AND MUST BE ADAPTED IF ANOTHER RUBRIC IS SELECTED

APPENDIX E

Mutually Agreed Upon Administrative Artifacts / Evidence that may be Submitted in Support of the End of the Year Evaluation

- Substitute handbook
- Student agenda book
- New teacher orientation and induction program
- Teacher/administrator mentor program
- District Code of Conduct
- 3214 Due Process procedures
- Student disciplinary hearings
- Suspension reports
- Immunization report
- School health report
- Infection prevention policy, MRSR, etc.
- Parent communication, letters, email, telephone
- Parent portal communication
- School report card
- Open school nights
- Meet the teacher nights
- Parent teacher conference days
- Progress reports
- Report cards
- Bi-lingual communication
- Emergency telephone system
- Emergency website information

NOTE: THIS IS BASED ON THE MULTI-DIMENSIONAL RUBRIC AND MUST BE ADAPTED IF ANOTHER RUBRIC IS SELECTED

APPENDIX E

Mutually Agreed Upon Administrative Artifacts / Evidence that may be Submitted in Support of the End of the Year Evaluation

Standard 4: A school administrator is an educational leader who promotes the success of all students by collaborating with families and community members, responding to diverse community interests and needs, and mobilizing community resources.

Examples of Evidence / Artifacts:

- Parent advisory committee agendas
- PTSA and/or PTA meeting agendas and programs
- Sports booster club meeting agendas and programs
- Band parent organization meeting agendas and programs
- Shared decision making team meetings and products
- Collaboration with higher education
- Career day programs
- Parent volunteer recognition program
- Teaming with the Cooperative Extension, YMCA, Key Club, Kiwanis, Rotary, Lions, etc.
- Boy Scout and Girl Scout programs and recognition
- Fire department
- Family night programs
- Class parent and support programs
- Social worker outreach programs
- School health services
- Mental health resource connections
- Drug abuse prevention programs
- School health fairs
- School newsletter articles
- School website information
- Hispanic History Month
- Black History Month
- Women’s History Month
- Veterans Month
- September 11 Heroes Day
- Presidents Day

NOTE: THIS IS BASED ON THE MULTI-DIMENSIONAL RUBRIC AND MUST BE ADAPTED IF ANOTHER RUBRIC IS SELECTED

APPENDIX E

Mutually Agreed Upon Administrative Artifacts / Evidence that may be Submitted in Support of the End of the Year Evaluation

-
- Thanksgiving and other culturally relevant civic celebrations
 - Recognition and celebration of important cultural events of all stakeholders

Standard 5: A school administrator is an educational leader who promotes the success of all students by acting with integrity, fairness, and in an ethical manner.

Examples of Evidence / Artifacts:

- Adherence to school conduct and discipline policy
- Attendance policy
- Student handbook policy and procedures
- Teacher handbook policy and procedures
- Interscholastic academic eligibility policy
- Child abuse and maltreatment prevention
- Bullying prevention programs
- Suicide prevention programs
- Sexual harassment prevention and reporting programs
- Timely notification of sex offenders
- Student recognition programs
- Character education recognition
- Academic awards
- Athletic awards
- Programs promoting tolerance and acceptance of all
- Character education assemblies and ongoing motivational programs
- Recognition and celebration of diversity

NOTE: THIS IS BASED ON THE MULTI-DIMENSIONAL RUBRIC AND MUST BE ADAPTED IF ANOTHER RUBRIC IS SELECTED

APPENDIX E

Mutually Agreed Upon Administrative Artifacts / Evidence that may be Submitted in Support of the End of the Year Evaluation

-
- Balanced team and/or class construction
 - Multi-lingual school to parent communication
 - Recognition and celebration of important cultural events of all stakeholders
 - Public recognition of diversity in newsletters and websites
 - Adherence to board of education policies

Standard 6: A school administrator is an educational leader who promotes the success of all students by understanding, responding to, and influencing the larger political, social, economic, legal, and cultural context.

Examples of Evidence / Artifacts:

- Guide staff disaggregating data
- Log community resources
- Work with local civic organizations
- District curriculum committee
- Staff development surveys
- Community and student surveys
- Demographic and academic data collection and review
- Superintendent’s administrative council
- Ad hoc committee participation
- Implement new Commissioner’s regulations and guidelines
- Attend district budget planning sessions

Appendix C

Niskayuna Administrator's Association

Local 20 Measure of Student Achievement

Based upon an average of the highest Regents scores on the exams listed in the local 15/20 MOA for the senior class cohort (grades 9-12).

<i>Percentage of Students</i>	<i>Highly Effective</i>	<i>Effective</i>	<i>Developing</i>	<i>Ineffective</i>
0-5				0
6-13				1
14-20				2
21-27			3	
28-32			4	
33-39			5	
40-45			6	
46-52			7	
53-59			8	
60-64		9		
65-69		10		
70-74		11		
75-79		12		
80-83		13		
84-88		14		
89-90		15		
90-91		16		
92-93		17		
94-95	18			
96-97	19			
98-100	20			

15 point rubric to be used in place of the 20 point rubric if the NYS Board of Regents adopts a 25 point growth measure.

Any lack of score or low score due to misadministration of the regents exam will not count against the principal.

Appendix C
Niskayuna Administrator's Association

Local 20 Measure of Student Achievement

Based upon an average of the highest Regents scores on the exams listed in the local 15/20 MOA for the senior class cohort (grades 9-12).

15 point rubric to be used in place of the 20 point rubric if the NYS Board of Regents adopts a 25 point growth measure.

Any lack of score or low score due to misadministration of the regents exam will not count against the principal.

MEMORANDUM OF AGREEMENT

BY AND BETWEEN THE SUPERINTENDENT OF SCHOOLS AND BOARD OF EDUCATION OF THE NISKAYUNA SCHOOL DISTRICT, hereinafter referred to as "The District" and THE NISKAYUNA ADMINISTRATORS' ASSOCIATION, hereinafter referred to as "the NAA";

WHEREAS, the parties have mutually agreed that for the 2012-13 school year, the following Principal Improvement Plan (PIP) procedure and form shall be incorporated into the District's APPR Plan Document for principals covered by Education Law § 3012-c and Part 30-2 Regents Rules;

Principal Improvement Plan

A. The Principal Improvement Plan for a principal who is rated ineffective or developing through an annual professional performance review (APPR) shall be comprised of the following elements:

1. The area or areas in need of improvement, drawn from the evaluation criteria of this APPR;
2. The time limit for achieving improvement, that shall be ten (10) months, a full school year (from September to June);
3. A statement of differentiated activities to support improvement; and
4. The manner of assessment of improvement: direct observation, review of materials (where applicable), review of behaviors (where applicable), attention to educational directives (where applicable), and student progress based upon the measure as determined by the state and locally under this APPR (where applicable).
5. PIP procedures shall be in accordance with PIP Exhibits A and B, annexed hereto.

This memorandum shall sunset and be of no further force or effect as of September 1, 2013.

SO AGREED this _____ day of _____, 2012

THE DISTRICT

THE ASSOCIATION

PIP Exhibit A

A PIP must be initiated whenever a principal receives a composite rating of *developing or ineffective* in a year-end evaluation. Both the principal and the superintendent shall meet for an evaluation conference no later than August 1 of the school year where the *developing or ineffective* evaluation is discussed. A PIP shall be designed by the principal, the superintendent, one or both co-presidents of the Niskayuna Administrator's Association (or another member of the NAA as selected by the administrator in receipt of the PIP), and one other member of the Superintendent's Cabinet – at her discretion. The PIP shall be consistent with the requirements and conditions set forth herein.

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. PIP Exhibit B will be the guiding document for this conference.

The principal who receives a rating of “developing” must be offered the opportunity for a peer mentor chosen from the NAA, or any Niskayuna Central School District administrator of the principal's choice. A principal who receives a rating of “ineffective” must be offered, at the cost and expense of the District, the opportunity for an internal peer mentor or an independent outside mentor mutually agreed upon between the District and Association. The mentor and the principal will collaborate biweekly during the first quarter in which the PIP is implemented. All dealings between the mentor and the principal will be confidential.

The Superintendent will meet with the principal and mentor to assess the effectiveness of the PIP and the level of improvement no less than once every ten weeks. Based on that assessment, the PIP will be adjusted as appropriate and meetings between the Superintendent, Mentor, and Principal will continue on a monthly basis throughout the school year. The principal must also during the school year be offered at least two professional development opportunities that are focused in specific areas of concern. These professional development opportunities can be internal or external, will be mutually approved by the superintendent and the NAA, and will be paid for by the District.

The Superintendent will provide the Principal with a mid-year evaluation, no later than January 15th. This evaluation will include, but will not be limited to, a second semester schedule with the Superintendent that must consist of at least four (4) supervisory meetings, as well as clear written direction and guidance in regards to areas of concern. Each supervisory meeting will result in written documentation from the Superintendent to the Principal, no later than two (2) school days after the meeting, detailing what was discussed and the guidance and suggestions offered, if any.

The culmination of the PIP will be communicated in writing to the principal, no later than August 1. If the PIP goals are met by August 1, or the administrator is rated “effective”, the PIP will terminate. Both parties will sign the PIP by August 1. If a principal is rated as *developing or ineffective* for any school year in which a PIP was in effect, a new plan will be developed by the principal and the Superintendent in collaboration with the Association according to these guidelines for the subsequent school year.

PIP Exhibit B

Principal Improvement Plan

Principal: _____

Evaluation Year: _____

Implementation Date: _____

A Principal Improvement Plan (PIP) must be initiated whenever a principal receives a rating of *developing or ineffective* in a year-end evaluation, based on a composite score out of 100. Both the principal and the superintendent shall meet for an evaluation conference no later than August 1 of the school year where the *developing or ineffective* evaluation is discussed. This PIP Exhibit B is the guided document for this process.

Domain	Critical Issues to be Addressed	Support to be provided by District	Principal Responsibilities	Timeline for Completion	Success Indicators	Documentation of Successful Improvements

Principal (Signature and Date)

NAA Representative (Signature and Date)

Superintendent (Signature and Date)

Additional Cabinet Member (Signature and Date)

PIP Exhibit B

Meeting Dates to Discuss Plan (no less than 1 per 10-week period)

<u>Topic of Discussion</u>	<u>Principal (Initial and Date)</u>	<u>AND</u>	<u>Supervisor (Initial and Date)</u>
<u>Topic of Discussion</u>	<u>Principal (Initial and Date)</u>	<u>AND</u>	<u>Supervisor (Initial and Date)</u>
<u>Topic of Discussion</u>	<u>Principal (Initial and Date)</u>	<u>AND</u>	<u>Supervisor (Initial and Date)</u>
<u>Topic of Discussion</u>	<u>Principal (Initial and Date)</u>	<u>AND</u>	<u>Supervisor (Initial and Date)</u>
<u>Topic of Discussion</u>	<u>Principal (Initial and Date)</u>	<u>AND</u>	<u>Supervisor (Initial and Date)</u>

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: 12-21-2012

Auson Kay Salvaggio

Teachers Union President Signature: Date: 12-21-12

Douma A. Baumgartner

Administrative Union President Signature: Date: 12-21-12

Luke Rakow, St. Fuscet

Board of Education President Signature: Date: 12-21-12

Deborah Oriola