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

January 17, 2013

Phyllis McGill, Superintendent
Onteora Central School District
4166 State Route 28
Boiceville, NY 12142

Dear Superintendent McGill:

Congratulations. I am pleased to inform you that your multi-year (2012-2014) 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. 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 Khoury

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

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

Annual Professional Performance Reviews: 2012-13

Created Wednesday, December 26, 2012
Updated Sunday, January 13, 2013

1

Disclaimers

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

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

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

1. SCHOOL DISTRICT INFORMATION

1.1) School District's BEDS Number : 621201060000

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

621201060000

1.2) School District Name: ONTEORA CSD

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

ONTEORA CSD

1.3) School Improvement Grant (SIG) Districts Only

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

Not applicable

1.4) Award Classification

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

(No response)

1.5) Assurances

Please check all of the boxes below:

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

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

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.

2012-2014

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

Created Wednesday, December 26, 2012
Updated Thursday, January 17, 2013

Page 1

STATE-PROVIDED MEASURES OF STUDENT GROWTH

(25 points with an approved value-added measure)

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

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

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

2.1) Assurances

Please check the boxes below:

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

STUDENT LEARNING OBJECTIVES AS COMPARABLE GROWTH MEASURES (20 points)

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

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

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

If no State assessment or Regents exam exists:

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

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

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

State assessments, *required if one exists*

List of State-approved 3rd party assessments

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

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

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

2.2) Grades K-3 ELA

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

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

	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	Each teacher will develop SLOS with pre and post assessments. The assessments will have an expected

this subcomponent. If needed, you may upload a table or graphic at 2.11, below.	level of performance. The teacher in collaboration with the Principal will establish class average growth targets based on pre-assessment baseline data and the overall % of students who meet the class average growth target will result in a 0-20 HEDI using the 2.11 upload.
Highly Effective (18 - 20 points) Results are well-above state average for similar students (or District goals if no state test).	See uploaded 2.11 attachment.
Effective (9 - 17 points) Results meet state average for similar students (or District goals if no state test).	See uploaded 2.11 attachment.
Developing (3 - 8 points) Results are below state average for similar students (or District goals if no state test).	See uploaded 2.11 attachment.
Ineffective (0 - 2 points) Results are well-below state average for similar students (or District goals if no state test).	See uploaded 2.11 attachment.

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

	Math	Assessment
3	State assessment	3rd Grade State Assessment

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

Use this box, if needed, to describe the general process for assigning HEDI categories for these grades/subjects in this subcomponent. If needed, you may upload a table or graphic at 2.11, below.	Each teacher will develop SLOS with pre and post assessments. The assessments will have an expected level of performance. The teacher in collaboration with the Principal will establish class average growth targets based on pre-assessment baseline data and the overall % of students who meet the class average growth target will result in a 0-20 HEDI using the 2.11 upload.
Highly Effective (18 - 20 points) Results are well-above state average for similar students (or District goals if no state test).	See uploaded 2.11 attachment.
Effective (9 - 17 points) Results meet state average for similar students (or District goals if no state test).	See uploaded 2.11 attachment.
Developing (3 - 8 points) Results are below state average for similar students (or District goals if no state test).	See uploaded 2.11 attachment.
Ineffective (0 - 2 points) Results are well-below state average for similar students (or District goals if no state	See uploaded 2.11 attachment.

test).

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	Onteora developed Grade 6 Science Assessment
7	District, regional or BOCES-developed assessment	Onteora 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.	Each teacher will develop SLOS with pre and post assessments. The assessments will have an expected level of performance. The teacher in collaboration with the Principal will establish class average growth targets based on pre-assessment baseline data and the overall % of students who meet the class average growth target will result in a 0-20 HEDI using the 2.11 upload.
Highly Effective (18 - 20 points) Results are well-above state average for similar students (or District goals if no state test).	See uploaded 2.11 attachment.
Effective (9 - 17 points) Results meet state average for similar students (or District goals if no state test).	See uploaded 2.11 attachment.
Developing (3 - 8 points) Results are below state average for similar students (or District goals if no state test).	See uploaded 2.11 attachment.
Ineffective (0 - 2 points) Results are well-below state average for similar students (or District goals if no state test).	See uploaded 2.11 attachment.

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	Onteora developed Grade 6 Social Studies Assessment
7	District, regional or BOCES-developed assessment	Onteora developed Grade 7 Social Studies Assessment

8	District, regional or BOCES-developed assessment	Onteora developed Grade 8 Social Studies Assessment

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

Use this box, if needed, to describe the general process for assigning HEDI categories for these grades/subjects in this subcomponent. If needed, you may upload a table or graphic at 2.11, below.	Each teacher will develop SLOS with pre and post assessments. The assessments will have an expected level of performance. The teacher in collaboration with the Principal will establish class average growth targets based on pre-assessment baseline data and the overall % of students who meet the class average growth target will result in a 0-20 HEDI using the 2.11 upload.
Highly Effective (18 - 20 points) Results are well-above District goals for similar students.	See uploaded 2.11 attachment.
Effective (9 - 17 points) Results meet District goals for similar students.	See uploaded 2.11 attachment.
Developing (3 - 8 points) Results are below District goals for similar students.	See uploaded 2.11 attachment.
Ineffective (0 - 2 points) Results are well-below District goals for similar students.	See uploaded 2.11 attachment.

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	Onteora developed Grade 9 Global 1 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.	Each teacher will develop SLOS with pre and post assessments. The assessments will have an expected level of performance. The teacher in collaboration with the Principal will establish class average growth targets based on pre-assessment baseline data and the overall % of

	students who meet the class average growth target will result in a 0-20 HEDI using the 2.11 upload.
Highly Effective (18 - 20 points) Results are well-above District goals for similar students.	See uploaded 2.11 attachment.
Effective (9 - 17 points) Results meet District goals for similar students.	See uploaded 2.11 attachment.
Developing (3 - 8 points) Results are below District goals for similar students.	See uploaded 2.11 attachment.
Ineffective (0 - 2 points) Results are well-below District goals for similar students.	See uploaded 2.11 attachment.

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.	Each teacher will develop SLOS with pre and post assessments. The assessments will have an expected level of performance. The teacher in collaboration with the Principal will establish class average growth targets based on pre-assessment baseline data and the overall % of students who meet the class average growth target will result in a 0-20 HEDI using the 2.11 upload.
Highly Effective (18 - 20 points) Results are well-above District goals for similar students.	See uploaded 2.11 attachment.
Effective (9 - 17 points) Results meet District goals for similar students.	See uploaded 2.11 attachment.
Developing (3 - 8 points) Results are below District goals for similar students.	See uploaded 2.11 attachment.
Ineffective (0 - 2 points) Results are well-below District goals for similar students.	See uploaded 2.11 attachment.

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.	Each teacher will develop SLOS with pre and post assessments. The assessments will have an expected level of performance. The teacher in collaboration with the Principal will establish class average growth targets based on pre-assessment baseline data and the overall % of students who meet the class average growth target will result in a 0-20 HEDI using the 2.11 upload.
Highly Effective (18 - 20 points) Results are well-above District goals for similar students.	See uploaded 2.11 attachment.
Effective (9 - 17 points) Results meet District goals for similar students.	See uploaded 2.11 attachment.
Developing (3 - 8 points) Results are below District goals for similar students.	See uploaded 2.11 attachment.
Ineffective (0 - 2 points) Results are well-below District goals for similar students.	See uploaded 2.11 attachment.

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	Onteora developed Grade 9 ELA Assessment
Grade 10 ELA	District, regional or BOCES-developed assessment	Onteora developed Grade 10 ELA Assessment
Grade 11 ELA	Regents assessment	NYS ELA 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.	Each teacher will develop SLOS with pre and post assessments. The assessments will have an expected level of performance. The teacher in collaboration with the Principal will establish class average growth targets based on pre-assessment baseline data and the overall % of students who meet the class average growth target will result in a 0-20 HEDI using the 2.11 upload.
Highly Effective (18 - 20 points) Results are well-above District goals for similar students.	See uploaded 2.11 attachment.
Effective (9 - 17 points) Results meet District goals for similar students.	See uploaded 2.11 attachment.
Developing (3 - 8 points) Results are below District goals for similar students.	See uploaded 2.11 attachment.
Ineffective (0 - 2 points) Results are well-below District goals for similar students.	See uploaded 2.11 attachment.

2.10) All Other Courses

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

Course(s) or Subject(s)	Option	Assessment
All other courses not named above	District, Regional or BOCES-developed	Onteora developed Course/Grade Specific Assessments
ESL	State Assessment	NYSESLAT
Special Education	State Assessment	NYSAA

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.	Each teacher will develop SLOS with pre and post assessments. The assessments will have an expected level of performance. The teacher in collaboration with the Principal will establish class average growth targets based on pre-assessment baseline data and the overall % of students who meet the class average growth target will result in a 0-20 HEDI using the 2.11 upload.
Highly Effective (18 - 20 points) Results are well-above District goals for similar students.	See uploaded 2.11 attachment.
Effective (9 - 17 points) Results meet District goals for similar students.	See uploaded 2.11 attachment.

Developing (3 - 8 points) Results are below District goals for similar students.	See uploaded 2.11 attachment.
Ineffective (0 - 2 points) Results are well-below District goals for similar students.	See uploaded 2.11 attachment.

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/5364/291666-TXEtxx9bQW/2.11.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.

(No response)

2.13) Teachers with more than one growth measure

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

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

2.14) Assurances

Please check all of the boxes below:

2.14) Assurances | Assure the application of locally developed controls will be rigorous, fair, and transparent and only those used for State Growth will be used for Comparable Growth Measures.	Checked
2.14) Assurances | Assure that use of locally developed controls will not have a disparate impact on underrepresented students in accordance with applicable civil rights laws.	Checked

2.14) Assurances | Assure that enrolled students in accordance with teacher of record policies are included and may not be excluded.	Checked
2.14) Assurances | Assure that procedures for ensuring data accuracy and integrity are being utilized.	Checked
2.14) Assurances | Assure that district will develop SLOs according to the rules established by SED (see: http://usny.nysed.gov/rttt/teachers-leaders/slo/home.html).	Checked
2.14) Assurances | Assure that past academic performance and/or baseline academic data of students will be taken into account when developing an SLO.	Checked
2.14) Assurances | Assure that the process for assigning points for SLOs for the Growth Subcomponent will use the narrative HEDI descriptions described in the regulations to effectively differentiate educators in ways that improve student learning and instruction.	Checked
2.14) Assurances | Assure that it is possible for an educator to earn each point, including 0, for SLOs in the Growth subcomponent scoring range.	Checked
2.14) Assurances | Assure that processes are in place to monitor SLOs to ensure rigor and comparability across classrooms.	Checked

3. Local Measures (Teachers)

Created Wednesday, December 26, 2012
Updated Thursday, January 17, 2013

Page 1

Locally Selected Measures of Student Achievement or Growth

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

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

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

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

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

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

Growth or achievement measure(s) from these options.

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

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

Measures based on:

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

3.1) Grades 4-8 ELA

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

	Locally-Selected Measure from List of Approved Measures	Assessment
4	5) District, regional, or BOCES–developed assessments	Onteora developed Grade 4 ELA Assessment
5	5) District, regional, or BOCES–developed assessments	Onteora developed Grade 5 ELA Assessment

6	5) District, regional, or BOCES–developed assessments	Onteora developed Grade 6 ELA Assessment
7	5) District, regional, or BOCES–developed assessments	Onteora developed Grade 7 ELA Assessment
8	5) District, regional, or BOCES–developed assessments	Onteora developed Grade 8 ELA Assessment

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

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

Use this box, if needed, to describe the general process for assigning HEDI categories for these grades/subjects in this subcomponent. If needed, you may upload a table or graphic at 3.3, below.	The average students' score of all the teacher's students on the local performance assessment (measure of student achievement) will be used to calculate teacher effectiveness ratings. This average student achievement score will be converted to a scale score of 0-15 using the uploaded 3.3 conversion chart.
Highly Effective (14 - 15 points) Results are well above District- or BOCES-adopted expectations for growth or achievement for grade/subject.	The average student achievement score falls between 81 - 100% for the 15 point conversion, per the uploaded 3.3 conversion chart.
Effective (8- 13 points) Results meet District- or BOCES-adopted expectations for growth or achievement for grade/subject.	The average student achievement score falls between 57 - 80% for the 15 point conversion, per the uploaded 3.3 conversion chart.
Developing (3 - 7 points) Results are below District- or BOCES-adopted expectations for growth or achievement for grade/subject.	The average student achievement score falls between 49 - 56% for the 15 point conversion, per the uploaded 3.3 conversion chart.
Ineffective (0 - 2 points) Results are well below District- or BOCES-adopted expectations for growth or achievement for grade/subject.	The average student achievement score falls between 0 - 48% for the 15 point conversion, per the uploaded 3.3 conversion chart.

3.2) Grades 4-8 Math

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

	Locally-Selected Measure from List of Approved Measures	Assessment
4	5) District, regional, or BOCES–developed assessments	Onteora developed Grade 4 Math Assessment
5	5) District, regional, or BOCES–developed assessments	Onteora developed Grade 5 Math Assessment
6	5) District, regional, or BOCES–developed assessments	Onteora developed Grade 6 Math Assessment
7	5) District, regional, or BOCES–developed assessments	Onteora developed Grade 7 Math Assessment

8	5) District, regional, or BOCES–developed assessments	Onteora developed Grade 8 Math Assessment

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

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

Use this box, if needed, to describe the general process for assigning HEDI categories for these grades/subjects in this subcomponent. If needed, you may upload a table or graphic at 3.3, below.	The average students' score of all the teacher's students on the local performance assessment (measure of student achievement) will be used to calculate teacher effectiveness ratings. This average student achievement score will be converted to a scale score of 0-15 using the uploaded 3.3 conversion chart.
Highly Effective (14 - 15 points) Results are well above District- or BOCES-adopted expectations for growth or achievement for grade/subject.	The average student achievement score falls between 81 - 100% for the 15 point conversion, per the uploaded 3.3 conversion chart.
Effective (8- 13 points) Results meet District- or BOCES-adopted expectations for growth or achievement for grade/subject.	The average student achievement score falls between 57 - 80% for the 15 point conversion, per the uploaded 3.3 conversion chart.
Developing (3 - 7 points) Results are below District- or BOCES-adopted expectations for growth or achievement for grade/subject.	The average student achievement score falls between 49 - 56% for the 15 point conversion, per the uploaded 3.3 conversion chart.
Ineffective (0 - 2 points) Results are well below District- or BOCES-adopted expectations for growth or achievement for grade/subject.	The average student achievement score falls between 0 - 48% for the 15 point conversion, per the uploaded 3.3 conversion chart.

3.3) HEDI Tables or Graphics

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

assets/survey-uploads/5139/291702-rhJdBgDruP/3.3-2.docx

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

Growth or achievement measure(s) from these options.

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

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

Measures based on:

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

3.4) Grades K-3 ELA

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

	Locally-Selected Measure from List of Approved Measures	Assessment
K	5) District, regional, or BOCES–developed assessments	Onteora developed Grade K ELA Assessment
1	5) District, regional, or BOCES–developed assessments	Onteora developed Grade 1 ELA Assessment

2	5) District, regional, or BOCES–developed assessments	Onteora developed Grade 2 ELA Assessment
3	5) District, regional, or BOCES–developed assessments	Onteora developed Grade 3 ELA Assessment

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

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

Use this box, if needed, to describe the general process for assigning HEDI categories for these grades/subjects in this subcomponent. If needed, you may upload a table or graphic at 3.13, below.	The average students' score of all the teacher's students on the local performance assessment (measure of student achievement) will be used to calculate teacher effectiveness ratings. This average students score will be converted to a scale score of 0-20 using the uploaded 3.13 conversion chart.
Highly Effective (18-20 points) Results are well above District- or BOCES-adopted expectations for growth or achievement for grade/subject.	The average student achievement score falls between 82 - 100% for the 20 point conversion per the uploaded 3.13 conversion chart.
Effective (9-17 points) Results meet District- or BOCES-adopted expectations for growth or achievement for grade/subject.	The average student achievement score falls between 55 - 81% for the 20 point conversion, per the uploaded 3.13 conversion chart.
Developing (3 - 8 points) Results are below District- or BOCES-adopted expectations for growth or achievement for grade/subject.	The average student achievement score falls between 49 - 54% for the 20 point conversion,per the uploaded 3.13 conversion chart.
Ineffective (0 - 2 points) Results are well below District- or BOCES-adopted expectations for growth or achievement for grade/subject.	The average student achievement score falls between 0 - 48% for the 20 point conversion, per the uploaded 3.13 conversion chart.

3.5) Grades K-3 Math

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

	Locally-Selected Measure from List of Approved Measures	Assessment
K	5) District, regional, or BOCES–developed assessments	Onteora developed Grade K Math Assessment
1	5) District, regional, or BOCES–developed assessments	Onteora developed Grade 1 Math Assessment
2	5) District, regional, or BOCES–developed assessments	Onteora developed Grade 2 Math Assessment
3	5) District, regional, or BOCES–developed assessments	Onteora developed Grade 3 Math Assessment

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

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

Use this box, if needed, to describe the general process for assigning HEDI categories for these grades/subjects in this subcomponent. If needed, you may upload a table or graphic at 3.13, below.	The average students' score of all the teacher's students on the local performance assessment (measure of student achievement) will be used to calculate teacher effectiveness ratings. This average students score will be converted to a scale score of 0-20 using the uploaded 3.13 conversion chart.
Highly Effective (18-20 points) Results are well above District- or BOCES-adopted expectations for growth or achievement for grade/subject.	The average student achievement score falls between 82 - 100% for the 20 point conversion per the uploaded 3.13 conversion chart.
Effective (9-17 points) Results meet District- or BOCES-adopted expectations for growth or achievement for grade/subject.	The average student achievement score falls between 55 - 81% for the 20 point conversion, per the uploaded 3.13 conversion chart.
Developing (3 - 8 points) Results are below District -or BOCES-adopted expectations for growth or achievement for grade/subject.	The average student achievement score falls between 49 - 54% for the 20 point conversion,per the uploaded 3.13 conversion chart.
Ineffective (0 - 2 points) Results are well below District- or BOCES-adopted expectations for growth or achievement for grade/subject.	The average student achievement score falls between 0 - 48% for the 20 point conversion, per the uploaded 3.13 conversion chart

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	Onteora developed Grade 6 Science Assessment
7	5) District, regional, or BOCES–developed assessments	Onteora developed Grade 7 Science Assessment
8	5) District, regional, or BOCES–developed assessments	Onteora developed Grade 8 Science Assessment

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

Use this box, if needed, to describe the general process for assigning HEDI categories for these grades/subjects in this subcomponent. If needed, you may upload a table or graphic at 3.13, below.	The average students' score of all the teacher's students on the local performance assessment (measure of student achievement) will be used to calculate teacher effectiveness ratings. This average students score will be converted to a scale score of 0-20 using the uploaded 3.13 conversion chart.

Highly Effective (18 - 20 points) Results are well above District- or BOCES-adopted expectations for growth or achievement for grade/subject.	The average student achievement score falls between 82 - 100% for the 20 point conversion per the uploaded 3.13 conversion chart.
Effective (9 - 17 points) Results meet District- or BOCES-adopted expectations for growth or achievement for grade/subject.	The average student achievement score falls between 55 - 81% for the 20 point conversion, per the uploaded 3.13 conversion chart.
Developing (3 - 8 points) Results are below District- or BOCES-adopted expectations for growth or achievement for grade/subject.	The average student achievement score falls between 49 - 54% for the 20 point conversion,per the uploaded 3.13 conversion chart.
Ineffective (0 - 2 points) Results are well below District- or BOCES-adopted expectations for growth or achievement for grade/subject.	The average student achievement score falls between 0 - 48% for the 20 point conversion, per the uploaded 3.13 conversion chart

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	Onteora developed Grade 6 Social Studies Assessment
7	5) District, regional, or BOCES–developed assessments	Onteora developed Grade 7 Social Studies Assessment
8	5) District, regional, or BOCES–developed assessments	Onteora developed Grade 8 Social Studies Assessment

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

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

Use this box, if needed, to describe the general process for assigning HEDI categories for these grades/subjects in this subcomponent. If needed, you may upload a table or graphic at 3.13, below.	The average students' score of all the teacher's students on the local performance assessment (measure of student achievement) will be used to calculate teacher effectiveness ratings. This average students score will be converted to a scale score of 0-20 using the uploaded 3.13 conversion chart.
Highly Effective (18 - 20 points) Results are well above District- or BOCES-adopted expectations for growth or achievement for grade/subject.	The average student achievement score falls between 82 - 100% for the 20 point conversion per the uploaded 3.13 conversion chart.
Effective (9 - 17 points) Results meet District- or BOCES-adopted expectations for growth or achievement for grade/subject.	The average student achievement score falls between 55 - 81% for the 20 point conversion, per the uploaded 3.13 conversion chart.
Developing (3 - 8 points) Results are below District- or BOCES-adopted expectations for growth or achievement for grade/subject.	The average student achievement score falls between 49 - 54% for the 20 point conversion,per the uploaded 3.13 conversion chart.

Ineffective (0 - 2 points) Results are well below District- or BOCES-adopted expectations for growth or achievement for grade/subject.	The average student achievement score falls between 0 - 48% for the 20 point conversion, per the uploaded 3.13 conversion chart

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	Onteora developed Grade 9 Global 1 Assessment
Global 2	5) District, regional, or BOCES–developed assessments	Onteora developed Grade 10 Global 2 Assessment
American History	5) District, regional, or BOCES–developed assessments	Onteora developed Grade 11 American History Assessment

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

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

Use this box, if needed, to describe the general process for assigning HEDI categories for these grades/subjects in this subcomponent. If needed, you may upload a table or graphic at 3.13, below.	The average students' score of all the teacher's students on the local performance assessment (measure of student achievement) will be used to calculate teacher effectiveness ratings. This average students score will be converted to a scale score of 0-20 using the uploaded 3.13 conversion chart.
Highly Effective (18 - 20 points) Results are well above District- or BOCES-adopted expectations for growth or achievement for grade/subject.	The average student achievement score falls between 82 - 100% for the 20 point conversion per the uploaded 3.13 conversion chart.
Effective (9 - 17 points) Results meet District- or BOCES-adopted expectations for growth or achievement for grade/subject.	The average student achievement score falls between 55 - 81% for the 20 point conversion, per the uploaded 3.13 conversion chart.
Developing (3 - 8 points) Results are below District- or BOCES-adopted expectations for growth or achievement for grade/subject.	The average student achievement score falls between 49 - 54% for the 20 point conversion,per the uploaded 3.13 conversion chart.
Ineffective (0 - 2 points) Results are well below District- or BOCES-adopted expectations for growth or achievement for grade/subject.	The average student achievement score falls between 0 - 48% for the 20 point conversion, per the uploaded 3.13 conversion chart

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	Onteora developed Grade 9 Living Environment Assessment
Earth Science	5) District, regional, or BOCES–developed assessments	Onteora developed Grade 10 Earth Science Assessment
Chemistry	5) District, regional, or BOCES–developed assessments	Onteora developed Grade 11 Chemistry Assessment
Physics	5) District, regional, or BOCES–developed assessments	Onteora developed Grade 12 Physics Assessment

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

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

Use this box, if needed, to describe the general process for assigning HEDI categories for these grades/subjects in this subcomponent. If needed, you may upload a table or graphic at 3.13, below.	The average students' score of all the teacher's students on the local performance assessment (measure of student achievement) will be used to calculate teacher effectiveness ratings. This average students score will be converted to a scale score of 0-20 using the uploaded 3.13 conversion chart.
Highly Effective (18-20 points) Results are well above District- or BOCES-adopted expectations for growth or achievement for grade/subject.	The average student achievement score falls between 82 - 100% for the 20 point conversion per the uploaded 3.13 conversion chart.
Developing (3 - 8 points) Results are below District- or BOCES-adopted expectations for growth or achievement for grade/subject.	The average student achievement score falls between 55 - 81% for the 20 point conversion, per the uploaded 3.13 conversion chart.
Effective (9 - 17points) Results meet District- or BOCES-adopted expectations for growth or achievement for grade/subject.	The average student achievement score falls between 49 - 54% for the 20 point conversion,per the uploaded 3.13 conversion chart.
Ineffective (0 - 2 points) Results are well below District- or BOCES-adopted expectations for growth or achievement for grade/subject.	The average student achievement score falls between 0 - 48% for the 20 point conversion, per the uploaded 3.13 conversion chart

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	Onteora developed Grade 9 Algebra 1 Assessment
Geometry	5) District, regional, or BOCES–developed assessments	Onteora developed Grade 10 Geometry Assessment
Algebra 2	5) District, regional, or BOCES–developed assessments	Onteora developed Algebra 2 Assessment

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

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

Use this box, if needed, to describe the general process for assigning HEDI categories for these grades/subjects in this subcomponent. If needed, you may upload a table or graphic at 3.13, below.	The average students' score of all the teacher's students on the local performance assessment (measure of student achievement) will be used to calculate teacher effectiveness ratings. This average students score will be converted to a scale score of 0-20 using the uploaded 3.13 conversion chart.
Highly Effective (18 - 20 points) Results are well above District- or BOCES-adopted expectations for growth or achievement for grade/subject.	The average student achievement score falls between 82 - 100% for the 20 point conversion per the uploaded 3.13 conversion chart.
Effective (9 - 17 points) Results meet District- or BOCES-adopted expectations for growth or achievement for grade/subject.	The average student achievement score falls between 55 - 81% for the 20 point conversion, per the uploaded 3.13 conversion chart.
Developing (3 - 8 points) Results are below District- or BOCES-adopted expectations for growth or achievement for grade/subject.	The average student achievement score falls between 49 - 54% for the 20 point conversion,per the uploaded 3.13 conversion chart.
Ineffective (0 - 2 points) Results are well below District- or BOCES-adopted expectations for growth or achievement for grade/subject.	The average student achievement score falls between 0 - 48% for the 20 point conversion, per the uploaded 3.13 conversion chart

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	Onteora developed Grade 9 ELA Assessment

Grade 10 ELA	5) District, regional, or BOCES–developed assessments	Onteora developed Grade 10 ELA Assessment
Grade 11 ELA	5) District, regional, or BOCES–developed assessments	Onteora developed Grade 11 ELA Assessment

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

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

Use this box, if needed, to describe the general process for assigning HEDI categories for these grades/subjects in this subcomponent. If needed, you may upload a table or graphic at 3.13, below.	The average students' score of all the teacher's students on the local performance assessment (measure of student achievement) will be used to calculate teacher effectiveness ratings. This average students score will be converted to a scale score of 0-20 using the uploaded 3.13 conversion chart.
Highly Effective (18 - 20 points) Results are well above District- or BOCES-adopted expectations for growth or achievement for grade/subject.	The average student achievement score falls between 82 - 100% for the 20 point conversion per the uploaded 3.13 conversion chart.
Effective (9 - 17 points) Results meet District- or BOCES-adopted expectations for growth or achievement for grade/subject.	The average student achievement score falls between 55 - 81% for the 20 point conversion, per the uploaded 3.13 conversion chart.
Developing (3 - 8 points) Results are below District- or BOCES-adopted expectations for growth or achievement for grade/subject.	The average student achievement score falls between 49 - 54% for the 20 point conversion,per the uploaded 3.13 conversion chart.
Ineffective (0 - 2 points) Results are well below District- or BOCES-adopted expectations for growth or achievement for grade/subject.	The average student achievement score falls between 0 - 48% for the 20 point conversion, per the uploaded 3.13 conversion chart

3.12) All Other Courses

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

	Course(s) or Subject(s)	Locally-Selected Measure from List of Approved Measures	Assessment
	All other courses	5) District/regional/BOCES–developed	Onteora developed course/Grade specific assessments

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

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

Use this box, if needed, to describe the general process for assigning HEDI categories for these grades/subjects in this subcomponent. If needed, you may upload a table or graphic at 3.13, below.	The average students' score of all the teacher's students on the local performance assessment (measure of student achievement) will be used to calculate teacher effectiveness ratings. This average students score will be converted to a scale score of 0-20 using the uploaded 3.13 conversion chart.
Highly Effective (18 - 20 points) Results are well above District- or BOCES -adopted expectations for growth or achievement for grade/subject.	The average student achievement score falls between 82 - 100% for the 20 point conversion per the uploaded 3.13 conversion chart.
Effective (9 - 17 points) Results meet District- or BOCES-adopted expectations for growth or achievement for grade/subject.	The average student achievement score falls between 55 - 81% for the 20 point conversion, per the uploaded 3.13 conversion chart.
Developing (3 - 8 points) Results are below District- or BOCES-adopted expectations for growth or achievement for grade/subject.	The average student achievement score falls between 49 - 54% for the 20 point conversion,per the uploaded 3.13 conversion chart.
Ineffective (0 - 2 points) Results are well below District- or BOCES-adopted expectations for growth or achievement for grade/subject.	The average student achievement score falls between 0 - 48% for the 20 point conversion, per the uploaded 3.13 conversion chart

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

(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/5139/291702-y92vNseFa4/3.13.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.

(No response)

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 locally selected measures, all students' scores across all measures will be averaged. The resulting score will be used to assign points, using the Local Measure Point Allocation Chart (see 3.13 upload).

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 Wednesday, December 26, 2012
Updated Wednesday, January 16, 2013

Page 1

4.1) Teacher Practice Rubric

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

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

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

Danielson's Framework for Teaching

Not Applicable

4.2) Points Within Other Measures

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

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

Is the following points assignment applicable to all teachers?

Yes

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

(No response)

Multiple (at least two) classroom observations by principal or other trained administrator, at least one of which must be unannounced [at least 31 points]	40
One or more observation(s) by trained independent evaluators	0
Observations by trained in-school peer teachers	0
Feedback from students using State-approved survey tool	0
Feedback from parents/caregivers using State-approved survey tool	0
Structured reviews of lesson plans, student portfolios and other teacher artifacts	20

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

(No response)

4.3) Survey Tools (if applicable)

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

(No response)

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

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

4.4) Assurances

Please check all of the boxes below:

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

4.5) Process for Assigning Points and Determining HEDI Ratings

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

Onteora CSD - Teacher APPR Executive Summary
MULTIPLE MEASURES: 60 POINTS
Points will be allocated for each item on the forms below using the follow HEDI bands:
Highly Effective rating for that item = 100% of points awarded
Effective rating for that item = 95% of points awarded
Developing rating for that item = 80% of points awarded
Ineffective rating for that item = 0% of points awarded

OBSERVATION: 0-40 POINTS -

Pre-Observation: 10 points for Announced observation/Domain 1
Observation: 20 Points = The Average Number of Points Earned from One Unannounced Observation and One Announced Observation., The average of the 20 points earned for Domains 2 and 3 for the Announced Observation and the 20 points earned for the Unannounced/Domains 2 3 totaling up to 40 points, then divided by 2.
Post-Observation: 10 points for Announced Observation/Domain 4

ALTERNATIVE PROJECT or EVIDENCE BINDER: 0-20 POINTS

OBSERVATION: 0-40 POINTS - Danielson Rubric Overview
The APPR evaluation plan for the Onteora Central School District is directly based on the Danielson Model from the book The Framework for Teaching. The guiding principles of this model identify various aspects of effective teaching and appropriate and worthwhile contributions to an academic community. The Danielson Model, which directly aligns to the New York State Teaching Standards, identifies and categorizes these aspects into four domains: Planning and Preparation; The Classroom Environment; Instruction; and Professional Responsibilities. Each domain is defined into components and subcategorized into elements.

The domain names and their respective components are:

• Domain #1 – Planning and Preparation
o Component 1a: Demonstrating Knowledge of Content and Pedagogy
o Component 1b: Demonstrating Knowledge of Students
o Component 1c: Selecting Instructional Outcomes
o Component 1d: Demonstrating Knowledge of Resources
o Component 1e: Designing Coherent Instruction
o Component 1f: Designing Student Assessment

• Domain #2 – The Classroom Environment
o Component 2a: Creating an Environment of Respect and Rapport
o Component 2b: Establishing a Culture for Learning
o Component 2c: Managing Classroom Procedures
o Component 2d: Managing Student Behavior
o Component 2e: Organizing Physical Space

• Domain #3 – Instruction
o Component 3a: Communicating with Students
o Component 3b: Using Questioning and Discussion Techniques
o Component 3c: Engaging Students in Learning
o Component 3d: Using Assessment in Instruction
o Component 3e: Demonstrating Flexibility and Responsiveness

• Domain #4 – Professional Responsibilities
o Component 4a: Reflecting on Teaching
o Component 4b: Maintaining Accurate Records
o Component 4c: Communicating with Families
o Component 4d: Participating in a Professional Community
o Component 4e: Growing and Developing Professionally
o Component 4f: Showing Professionalism

These aforementioned domains and components are designed to provide teachers with a plethora of opportunities to demonstrate competency in various pedagogical, communicative, and management aspects pertaining to their professional performance.

The overall observation process is based on multiple measures as identified by the Danielson model. These points are earned through an announced observation using a three-tier observation process (a pre-observation conference, a formal observation, and a post observation conference) for 30 points and an unannounced observation (a formal observation) for 10 points. These scores will be combined to equal 40 observation points.

ALTERNATIVE PROJECT or EVIDENCE BINDER: 20 POINTS - The remaining 20 points are earned through the completion of either an Evidence Binder or an Alternative Project that is rigorous and representative of exemplary pedagogical performance. The teacher and their building principal or supervisor, collaboratively select which of these measures he/she will complete.

Additional Details of Observation
Part 1: Pre-observation Conference / Form (0-10 points)

The pre-observation structure is aligned with Domain #1 of the Danielson Framework for Teaching.
Each tenured teacher will receive one formal announced observation and one unannounced mini-observations per school year. Each non-tenured teacher will receive three formal observations and one mini-observation.
Prior to a formal observation a teacher will complete a pre-observation form and schedule a meeting with his / her evaluator. The teacher will bring the completed form and written lesson plan to the conference. During this conference, the teacher and evaluator will discuss the lesson plan format and objectives of the lesson. This is a required document of the APPR formal observation process.

The pre-observation structure is aligned with Domain 1 of Danielson's Framework for Teaching.
Each question in the pre-observation component of the process aligns with the Framework for Teaching, as follows:

Question 1: Component 1a
Question 2: Component 1a
Question 3: Components 1a and 1c
Question 4: Components 1b and 1d
Question 5: Component 1f
Question 6: Components 1d, 1e, and 1f

During the pre-observation conference, the teacher and evaluator will discuss the lesson plan format, and what students will learn and be able to do as a result of the lesson. A written lesson plan will be submitted to the evaluator at the pre-observation conference. One lesson plan format will be utilized by the district at all grade levels and across all content areas. The teacher and evaluator will determine the time and location of the formal observation.

Pre-Observation Form

Name _____ Assignment_____
Building _____ Date _____
Observation Date _____
Time _____
Evaluator _____

1. Which two components from Domain 2 of Danielson's Framework for Teaching will be the focus for this observation? (1 point)

2. Which two additional components from Domain 3 of Danielson's Framework for Teaching will be the focus for this observation? (1 point)

3. What will the students be able to know and do at the conclusion of your lesson? (2 points)

4. Describe any modifications/differentiations you will make to accommodate individual or groups of students in the classroom environment, and/or observational situation for this lesson. (2 points)

5. How and when will you monitor student progress and determine whether the students have learned what you intended, during the lesson? (2 points)

6. A written lesson plan referencing the Common Core Learning Standards (CCLS) should be handed in prior to or on the day of the observation. (2 points)

Total Points out of 10: _____

Part 2: Formal Observations - Announced and Unannounced (0-20 points)

The pedagogical focus of the observation will be based on pre-determined components of Domains 2 and 3 in the Danielson model. Tenured teachers will be formally observed twice each school year (one announced/one unannounced) and non-tenured teachers will be formally observed four times each school year (three announced/one unannounced). The announced observation is pre-scheduled

between the teacher and the evaluator and is held within a week following the pre-observation conference between the two parties. The observation will be approximately forty minutes in length. The announced and unannounced observations are equally weighted. The average of the two observations will be used to score the teacher.

The evaluator provides evidence aligning the classroom observation with the Danielson Rubric. The rubric is scored for each of the five components in Domains 2 and 3, as follows:
The Classroom Environment (Domain 2)
Creating an Environment of Respect and Rapport (2 pts)
Establishing a Culture of Learning (2 pts)
Managing Classroom Procedures (2 pts)
Managing Student Behavior (2 pts)
Organizing Physical Space (1 pt)
Instruction (Domain 3)
Communicating with Students (2 pts)
Using Questioning/Discussion Techniques (2 pts)
Engaging Students in Learning (3 pts)
Using Assessment in Instruction (2 pts)
Demonstrating Flexibility and Responsiveness (2 pts)

Part 3: Post Observation Conference / Form (0-10 points)

The post conference will be conducted within 10 school days of the Formal Observation. Teachers shall complete the Post Observation form which consists of self-reflection and provision of evidence of student learning and submit it to the evaluator at the post-observation conference. This is a required document of the APPR Formal Observation. A post observation conference will be conducted within five school days of the observation unless extenuating circumstances occur. The evaluator's feedback will be targeted and specific to the pre-determined components.

The post-observation question structure is aligned with the Domains/Components of Danielson's Framework for Teaching, as follows:

Question 1: Components 1a, 1c and 1f
Question 2: Components 1a, 1b and 1c
Question 3: Components 2a, 2b, 2c, 2d, and 2e
Question 4: Component 4a
Question 5: Component 4a

Post-Observation Form

Staff Name _____ Assignment_____
Building _____ Date _____

1. How successful was your lesson? Did the students learn what you intended by the conclusion of your lesson? How do you know? (2 points)

2. Based on evidence of student learning, what does the evidence show about students' levels of learning, engagement, and understanding? (2 points)

3. Comment on your classroom procedures, student conduct, and/or use of physical space. To what extent did these contribute to student learning? (2 points)

4. Were there any adjustments you needed to make throughout the lesson to better meet the students' needs? (2 points)

5. If you had an opportunity to teach this lesson again to the same group of students, what would you do differently? (2 points)

Total Points out of 10 _____

The remaining 20 points are allocated based on teachers completing an "Alternative Project" OR an "Evidence Binder", as described

below.

Alternative Project (0-20 points)
The Alternative Project is a teacher directed initiative designed to help improve teaching and learning. Teachers, in collaboration with their respective evaluator, will identify a focus research question that addresses two or more components of Domain #4, Professional Responsibility. Teachers may select from a variety of activities to support their project. The teacher will develop a plan that aligns with the goals of their particular school and/or the overall District. Teachers must submit their proposals to and meet with their respective evaluators by October 1st. In the event that a teacher and administrator do not agree on the focus of the Alternative Project, the teacher maintains the option to opt out of the alternate project and select the professional evidence binder (see below), but they must notify their evaluator of this change by December 1st (will need a different date for this year or no date for this year). The alternate project must be completed by May 1st. Any subsequent revisions are due to the evaluator on date determined collaboratively.

Faculty may choose from the following activities as part of their Alternative Project:
• Workshop presentation
• Committee work
• Study group
• Piloting a program
• Professional (staff) development
• Technology integration
• Data analysis
• Other (specify)

The alternate project must adhere to and provide evidence of the six components of Domain #4 of the Danielson Model.

Onteora Central School District
Alternate Project Submission Form

Name of Teacher: _____
Grade and subject assignment: _____
School: _____
Date: _____

1. What is the goal of your project? (2 points)
2. What activity will you undertake? What is your timeline for successfully completing this activity? What is your action plan for successfully completing this activity? (3 points)
3. Identify which domain components of Domain 4 does this project complies with. (2 points)
4. Identify the type of support you might need to complete the project (i.e. materials, time, staff, development, funding, etc.). (2 points)
5. How will you determine that your project goal has been achieved? (2 points)

Onteora Central School District
Alternate Project Evaluation Form

Name of Teacher: _____
Grade and subject assignment: _____
School: _____
Date: _____

1. Describe the progression of your alternate project and any adjustments that needed to be made. (3 points)
2. Describe the specific evidence you will provide that demonstrates you accomplished the goal of your alternate project. (3 points)
3. What did you learn from this professional experience? What are the professional implications for you moving forward? (3 points)

Onteora Central School District
Alternate Project Evaluation Form

Summary:
Submission Form _____ points
Evaluation Form _____ points
Total _____

Evaluator Comments:

Teacher Comments:

Evaluator signature: _____ Date:_____
Teacher signature: _____ Date: _____

Evidence Binder (20 points)

The Evidence Binder will be a self-reflective document consisting of materials that demonstrate professional growth. A teacher must include one example, artifact or sample to represent the 6 Components of Domain 4. For each component the teacher must compose a brief paragraph explaining the importance of their selected piece demonstrating its relevance to the component. One artifact maybe used for more than one component. Four selected components will have a value of four points and two selected components will have the value of two points toward the Evidence Binder total of 20 points. Timelines for approval and Evidence Binder submission will be the same as those timelines described for the Alternative Project (above).

Onteora Central School District
Evidence Binder Evaluation Form

Name of Teacher: _____ School Year: _____

Name of Evaluator:_____

Component Description Point Values Possible Point Values Earned
Component 4a Reflecting on Teaching _____ _____
Component 4b Maintaining Accurate Records _____ _____
Component 4c Communicating with Families _____ _____
Component 4d Participating in Professional Community _____ _____
Component 4e Growing and Developing Professionally _____ _____
Component 4f Demonstrating Professionalism _____ _____
Total 20 points _____

Please select two components for 2 points and select four components for 4 points.

Evaluator's Comments:
_____
_____
_____
_____
_____

Teacher's Comments:
_____
_____
_____
_____
_____

____ *Satisfactory*

____ *Request for Revisions*

_____ _____ _____ _____
Evaluator's Signature Date Teacher's Signature Date

**All decimals will be rounded to whole numbers for the Composite Score using standard rules of math.*

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.

(No response)

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.	Teacher performance and results on other measures exceed the NYS Teaching Standards: 59-60 points
Effective: Overall performance and results meet NYS Teaching Standards.	Teacher performance and results on other measures meet the NYS Teaching Standards: 57-58 points
Developing: Overall performance and results need improvement in order to meet NYS Teaching Standards.	Teacher performance and results on other measures are below the NYS Teaching Standards: 47-56 points
Ineffective: Overall performance and results do not meet NYS Teaching Standards.	Teacher performance and results on other measures are well-below the NYS Teaching Standards: 46 points or below

Provide the ranges for the 60-point scoring bands.

Highly Effective	59-60
Effective	57-58
Developing	47-56
Ineffective	46 or below

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	1
4.6) Observations of Probationary Teachers | Enter Total	4

By trained in-school peer teachers or other trained reviewers

Formal/Long	0
Informal/Short	0

Independent evaluators

Formal/Long	0
Informal/Short	0

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

- In Person

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

- In Person

4.7) Observations of Tenured Teachers

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

By building principals or other trained administrators

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

By trained in-school peer teachers or other trained reviewers

Formal/Long	0
Informal/Short	0

Independent evaluators

Formal/Long	0
Informal/Short	0

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

- In Person

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

- In Person

5. Composite Scoring (Teachers)

Created Wednesday, December 26, 2012
Updated Friday, January 11, 2013

Page 1

Standards for Rating Categories

Growth or Comparable Measures

Locally-selected Measures of

growth or achievement

Other Measures of Effectiveness

(Teacher and Leader standards)

Highly

Effective

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

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

Overall performance and results exceed NYS Teaching Standards.

Effective

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

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

Overall performance and results meet NYS Teaching Standards.

Developing

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

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

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

Ineffective

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

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

Overall performance and results do not meet NYS Teaching Standards.

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

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

2012-13 where there is no Value-Added measure

Growth or Comparable Measures

Locally-selected Measures of

growth or achievement

Other Measures of Effectiveness

(60 points)

Overall

Composite Score

Highly Effective

18-20

18-20

Ranges determined locally--see below

91-100

Effective

9-17

9-17

75-90

Developing

3-8

3-8

65-74

Ineffective

0-2

0-2

0-64

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

Highly Effective	59-60
Effective	57-58
Developing	47-56
Ineffective	0-46

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

2012-13 where Value-Added growth measure applies

Growth or Comparable Measures

Locally-selected Measures of

growth or achievement

Other Measures of Effectiveness

(60 points)

Overall

Composite Score

Highly Effective

22-25

14-15

Ranges determined locally--see above

91-100

Effective

10-21

8-13

75-90

Developing

3-9

3-7

65-74

Ineffective

0-2

0-2

0-64

6. Additional Requirements - Teachers

Created Wednesday, December 26, 2012
Updated Wednesday, January 16, 2013

Page 1

6.1) Assurances -- Improvement Plans

Please check the boxes below:

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

6.2) Attachment: Teacher Improvement Plan Forms

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

assets/survey-uploads/5265/291776-Df0w3Xx5v6/Teacher Improvement Plan.docx

6.3) Appeals Process

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

(1) the substance of the annual professional performance review

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

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

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

A tenured teacher who receives an effectiveness composite score rating of "ineffective" or "developing" may appeal his or her performance review. Ratings of "highly effective" or "effective" cannot be appealed by tenured teachers. A probationary teacher may only appeal a composite score of "ineffective."

What may be challenged in an appeal: Appeal procedures should limit the scope of appeals under Education Law §3012-c to the

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

A teacher may not file multiple appeals regarding the same performance review. All grounds for appealing a particular performance review must be raised within the same appeal. Any grounds not raised at the time the appeal is filed shall be deemed waived. All timelines listed will be timely and expeditious according to statute.

Appeals concerning a teacher's performance review must be filed no later than fourteen (14) school days of the date when the teacher receives his/her final composite rating. If an educator receives his/her composite effectiveness score over summer vacation, the educator will have until the fourteenth (14th) working day of the new school year to file an appeal.

A teacher wishing to initiate an appeal, must submit, in writing, to the Superintendent, a detailed description of the precise point(s) of disagreement over his/her performance review, along with any and all documents or written materials that he or she believes are relevant to the resolution of the appeal. Any such additional information not submitted at the time the appeal is filed shall not be considered in the deliberations related to the resolution of the appeal.

A recommendation will be rendered by a three person review panel for an appeal concerning a teacher's performance review. Working jointly, the Superintendent and the OTA president will appoint a panel comprised of the superintendent's designee, one panelist chosen by the OTA, and one mutually agreed upon panelist. No member of the panel shall be from the same building as the appellant. The panel shall be identified within 5 days upon receipt of the written formal appeal to the Superintendent. The panel shall meet and issue a written recommendation of the merits of the appeal within ten (10) days of being identified, no later than fifteen (15) calendar days from the date when the teacher filed his/her appeal.

The review panel's written recommendation shall be forwarded to the Superintendent. The Superintendent will have five (5) calendar days from receipt of the panels'written recommendation to render a decision based on the written recommendation of the review panel. The determination of the Superintendent shall be final. However, the failure of either party to abide by the above-agreed upon process shall be subject to the grievance procedure.

All steps and the resolution of all appeals will occur in a timely and expeditious manner.

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.

A. The duration and nature of the training Onteora Central School District will provide to evaluators will be on-going:
1.All Onteora Central School District evaluators will be trained as lead evaluators.
B.The duration and nature of the training Onteora Central School District will provide to lead evaluators:
1. Positions trained as lead evaluators: Onteora Central School District Superintendent of Schools, Building Principals, Building Assistant Principals, Director of Pupil Personnel Services, and any other certified Onteora CSD administrator designated by the Superintendent.
2. Ulster County BOCES or other approved provider will provide training of lead evaluators in compliance with all state regulations. The nature of the training will consist of the 9 required elements outlined in 30-2.9 of the Regents Regulations (see assurances in section 6.5 below).
3. The Onteora Central School District will ensure the training and certification of its lead evaluators in accordance with the requirements prescribed in the Regents Regulations 30-2.9 (see assurances in section 6.5 below). Furthermore, the Onteora Central School District will further ensure that lead evaluators maintain inter-rater reliability over time and that they are recertified on an annual basis.

6.5) Assurances -- Evaluators

Please check the boxes below:

- Checked

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

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

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

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

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

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

(7) use of the Statewide Instructional Reporting System

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

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

- Checked

6.6) Assurances -- Teachers

Please check all of the boxes below:

6.6) Assurances -- Teachers | Assure the entire APPR plan will be completed for each teacher as soon as practicable, but in no case later than September 1 of the school year next following the	Checked

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

6.7) Assurances -- Data

Please check all of the boxes below:

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

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

Created Thursday, December 27, 2012
Updated Thursday, January 17, 2013

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):

4-6
7-8
9-12
(No response)
(No response)
(No response)
(No response)

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

Please check the boxes below:

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

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

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

State assessments, *required if one exists*

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

List of State-approved 3rd party assessments

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

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

School or Program Type	SLO with Assessment Option	Name of the Assessment
K-3	District, regional, or BOCES-developed	Onteora developed Grade K-2 ELA and Math Assessments
K-3	State assessment	NYS ELA and Math Grade 3

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.	The Principal in collaboration with the Superintendent, will establish class average growth targets based on pre-assessment baseline data and the overall % of students meeting the class average growth target will result in a 0-20 HEDI using the 7.3 uploaded attachment.
Highly Effective (18 - 20 points) Results are well above state average for similar students (or District goals if no state test).	See uploaded 7.3 attachment.
Effective (9 - 17 points) Results meet state average for similar students (or District goals if no state test).	See uploaded 7.3 attachment.
Developing (3 - 8 points) Results are below state average for similar students (or District goals if no state test).	See uploaded 7.3 attachment.
Ineffective (0 - 2 points) Results are well below state average for similar students (or District goals if no state test).	See uploaded 7.3 attachment.

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

assets/survey-uploads/5365/292328-lha0DogRNw/7.3.doc

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 Thursday, December 27, 2012
Updated Thursday, January 17, 2013

Page 1

Locally-Selected Measures of Student Achievement or Growth

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

Grade Configuration	Locally-Selected Measure from List of Approved Measures	Assessment
4-6	(a) achievement on State assessments	ELA and Math Grade 4 State Assessments
7-8	(a) achievement on State assessments	ELA and Math Grade 8 State Assessments
9-12	(d) measures used by district for teacher evaluation	NYS Comprehensive ELA Regents and NYS Algebra Regents

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.	The percentage of students achieving proficiency, defined as level 3 or above/65 or above, on the applicable assessments will be used to calculate principals' effectiveness ratings. These average scores will be combined to obtain a scale score of 0-15, using the 8.1 uploaded conversion chart. Any resulting score with a decimal will be rounded using standard rules of math.
Highly Effective (14 - 15 points) Results are well above District- or BOCES-adopted expectations for growth or achievement for grade/subject.	See uploaded 8.1 conversion chart.
Effective (8- 13 points) Results meet District- or BOCES-adopted expectations for growth or achievement for grade/subject.	See uploaded 8.1 conversion chart.
Developing (3 - 7 points) Results are below District- or BOCES-adopted expectations for growth or achievement	See uploaded 8.1 conversion chart.

for grade/subject.	
Ineffective (0 - 2 points) Results are well below District- or BOCES-adopted expectations for growth or achievement for grade/subject.	See uploaded 8.1 conversion chart.

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

(No response)

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

assets/survey-uploads/5366/292596-qBFVOWF7fC/15 point HEDI for Locally Selected Measures Principals.docx

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

Grade Configuration	Locally-Selected Measure from List of Approved Measures	Assessment
K-3	(d) measures used by district for teacher evaluation	NYS ELA and Math Grades 3

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.	The percentage of students achieving proficiency, defined as level 3 or above/65 or above, on the applicable assessments will be used to calculate principals' effectiveness ratings. These average scores will be combined to obtain a scale score of 0-20, using the 8.2 uploaded conversion chart.
Highly Effective (18 - 20 points) Results are well above District- or BOCES-adopted expectations for growth or achievement for grade/subject.	See uploaded 8.2 conversion chart.
Effective (9- 17 points) Results meet District- or BOCES-adopted expectations for growth or achievement for grade/subject.	See uploaded 8.2 conversion chart.
Developing (3 - 8 points) Results are below District- or BOCES-adopted expectations for growth or achievement for grade/subject.	See uploaded 8.2 conversion chart.
Ineffective (0 - 2 points) Results are well below District- or BOCES-adopted expectations for growth or achievement for grade/subject.	See uploaded 8.2 conversion chart.

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

(No response)

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

assets/survey-uploads/5366/292596-T8MlGWUVm1/HEDI for Locally Selected Measures Principals_1.docx

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.

(No response)

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 locally selected measures, the scores of all students across applicable assessments will be considered when determining the percentage of students achieving proficiency, defined by level 3 and above/65 and above. The resulting score (% proficient) will be used assign points, using the 8.1/8.2 Local Measure Point Allocation. chart.

8.5) Assurances

Please check all of the boxes below:

8.5) Assurances | Assure that the application of locally developed controls will be rigorous, fair, and transparent	Check
8.5) Assurances | Assure that use of locally developed controls will not have a disparate impact on underrepresented students, in accordance with any applicable civil rights laws.	Check
8.5) Assurances | Assure that enrolled students are included in accordance with policies for student assignment to schools and may not be excluded.	Check
8.5) Assurances | Assure that procedures for ensuring data accuracy and integrity are being utilized.	Check
8.5) Assurances | Assure that the process for assigning points for locally selected measures will use the narrative HEDI descriptions described in the regulations to effectively differentiate principals' performance in ways that improve student learning and instruction.	Check
8.5) Assurances | Assure that it is possible for a principal to earn each point, including 0, for the locally selected measures subcomponent.	Check
8.5) Assurances | Assure that locally-selected measures are rigorous and comparable across all principals in the same or similar programs or grade configurations across the district.	Check
8.5) Assurances | If more than one type of locally-selected measure is used for different groups of principals in the same or similar grade configuration or program, certify that the measures are comparable based on the Standards of Educational and Psychological Testing.	Check

8.5) Assurances | Assure that all locally-selected measures for a principal are different than any measures used for the State assessment or other comparable measures subcomponent.	Check

9. Other Measures of Effectiveness (Principals)

Created Thursday, December 27, 2012
Updated Thursday, January 17, 2013

Page 1

9.1) Principal Practice Rubric

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

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

Vanderbilt Assessment of Leadership in Education (VAL-ED)

(No response)

9.2) Points Within Other Measures

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

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

Is the following points assignment for all principals?

Yes

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

(No response)

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

Broad assessment of principal leadership and management actions based on the practice rubric by the supervisor, a trained administrator or a trained independent evaluator. This must incorporate multiple school visits by supervisor, trained administrator, or trained independent evaluator, at least one of which must be from a supervisor, and at least one of which must be unannounced. [At least 31 points]	36
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.	24

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.	Checked
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).	Checked

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	Checked
9.4) Sources of Evidence (if applicable) | Review of school documents, records, and/or State accountability processes (all count as one source)	Checked

9.5) Survey Tool(s) (if applicable)

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

(No response)

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

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

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

9.6) Assurances

Please check all of the boxes below:

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

9.7) Process for Assigning Points and Determining HEDI Ratings

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

The Vanderbilt Assessment of Leadership in Education (VAL-ED) will used in its entirety and shall account for 36 of the 60 points assigned to this subcomponent for all building principals. The core components (n=6) and key processes (n=6) of the rubric shall be equally weighted at 5 points each and combined will yield a raw score of 60 points. Using the rating scale of 1-5 for these 12 items, the evaluator will assess the principal rating each item of 1-5 based on the evidence provided. The raw score shall be converted to a final composite score, which will be used to address the 36 points allotted to this measure, as follows:

Raw Score HEDI APPR Conversion Points
60 Highly Effective 36
59 Highly Effective 35.8
58 Highly Effective 35.6
57 Highly Effective 35.4
56 Highly Effective 35.2
55 Highly Effective 35
54 Effective 34.8
53 Effective 34.6
52 Effective 34.4
51 Effective 34.2
50 Effective 34
49 Effective 33.8
48 Effective 33.6
47 Effective 33.4
46 Effective 33.2
45 Effective 33
44 Developing 32
43 Developing 31
42 Developing 30
41 Developing 29
40 Developing 28
39 Developing 27
38 Developing 26
37 Developing 25
36 Developing 24
35 Developing 23

34 Developing 22
33 Developing 21
32 Ineffective 20
31 Ineffective 19
30 Ineffective 18
29 Ineffective 17
28 Ineffective 16
27 Ineffective 15
26 Ineffective 14
25 Ineffective 13
24 Ineffective 12
23 Ineffective 11
22 Ineffective 10
21 Ineffective 9
20 Ineffective 8
19 Ineffective 7
18 Ineffective 6
17 Ineffective 5
16 Ineffective 4
15 Ineffective 3
14 Ineffective 2
1-13 Ineffective 0

The remaining twenty-four (24) points shall be assigned based on the results of ambitious and measurable goals set collaboratively with principals and their superintendents or his/her designee as follows:
(a) scoring of goals: The evaluator will assign the following percentage of points using the HEDI rating below:
Highly Effective: 100% of points
Effective: 95% of points
Developing: 80% of points
Ineffective: 0% of points
(b) up to 6 points shall be assigned based upon a principal's achievement of one goal which must address the principal's contribution to improving teacher effectiveness. Achievement of the goal will be based on an examination of data, and will include actions/strategies the principal will undertake to achieve the goal. Progress on the goal will be reviewed at the end-of-year annual APPR conference; and
(c) up to 18 points may be earned based upon a principal's meeting one or more additional goals which shall address quantifiable and verifiable improvements in academic results or the school's learning environment resulting from the principal's leadership and commitment to their own professional growth. The 18 points shall be divided equally among the other established goals. Achievement of the goal(s) will be based on an examination of data, and will include actions/strategies the principal will undertake to achieve the goal. Progress on the goal will be reviewed at the end-of-year annual APPR conference. HEDI allocations are as follows:

Combine Rubric Score and Goal Score to obtain from 0 to 60 HEDI points. All composite scores will be rounded to whole numbers using standard rules of math.

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.

(No response)

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.	Results are well-above District expectations.
Effective: Overall performance and results meet standards.	Results meet District expectations.

Developing: Overall performance and results need improvement in order to meet standards.	Results are below District expectations.
Ineffective: Overall performance and results do not meet standards.	Results are well-below District expectations.

Please provide the locally-negotiated 60 point scoring bands.

Highly Effective	55-60
Effective	45-54
Developing	33-44
Ineffective	0-32

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	1
By trained independent evaluator	0
Enter Total	4

Tenured Principals

By supervisor	2
By trained administrator	1
By trained independent evaluator	0
Enter Total	3

10. Composite Scoring (Principals)

Created Friday, December 28, 2012
Updated Friday, January 11, 2013

Page 1

Standards for Rating Categories

Growth or Comparable Measures

Locally-selected Measures of

growth or achievement

Other Measures of Effectiveness

(Teacher and Leader standards)

Highly

Effective

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

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

Overall performance and results exceed ISLLC leadership standards.

Effective

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

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

Overall performance and results meet ISLLC leadership standards.

Developing

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

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

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

Ineffective

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

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

Overall performance and results do not meet ISLLC leadership standards.

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

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

2012-13 where there is no Value-Added measure

Growth or Comparable Measures

Locally-selected Measures of

growth or achievement

Other Measures of Effectiveness

(60 points)

Overall

Composite Score

Highly Effective

18-20

18-20

Ranges determined locally--see below

91-100

Effective

9-17

9-17

75-90

Developing

3-8

3-8

65-74

Ineffective

0-2

0-2

0-64

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

Highly Effective	55-60
Effective	45-54
Developing	33-44
Ineffective	0-32

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

2012-13 where Value-Added growth measure applies

Growth or Comparable Measures

Locally-selected Measures of

growth or achievement

Other Measures of Effectiveness

(60 points)

Overall

Composite Score

Highly Effective

22-25

14-15

Ranges determined locally--see above

91-100

Effective

10-21

8-13

75-90

Developing

3-9

3-7

65-74

Ineffective

0-2

0-2

0-64

11. Additional Requirements - Principals

Created Friday, December 28, 2012
Updated Tuesday, January 15, 2013

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/5276/293358-Df0w3Xx5v6/APPR Principal Improvement Plan Onteora.docx

11.3) Appeals Process

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

(1) the substance of the annual professional performance review

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

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

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

V. Appeals Process

A. A principal who receives a composite score of "ineffective" on his/her APPR shall be entitled to appeal his/her annual APPR rating, based upon a paper submission to the individual identified in Paragraph D, who shall be trained in accordance with the requirements of statute and regulations and also possesses a district-wide administrative certification.

B. The appeal must be brought in writing, specifying the area(s) of concern, but limited to those matters that may be appealed as prescribed in Section 3012-c of the Education Law. Section 3012-c limits appeals to the following areas: 1)the substance of the evaluation provided the principal received a composite score of "ineffective" on his/her APPR; 2) the school district's adherence to the standards and methodologies required for such reviews pursuant to Education Law 3012-c; 3) the adherence to the Commissioner's Regulations, as applicable to such reviews; 4) compliance with any applicable locally negotiable procedures applicable to APPRs or improvement plans; and 5) the school district's issuance and/or implementation of the terms of the principal improvement plan under Education Law 3012-c. Except for appeals brought pursuant to Paragraph E below, all appeals under this section shall be processed in accordance with Paragraphs C and D below.

C. Except for an appeal filed under Paragraph E below, an appeal of an APPR must be commenced by submitting an appeal to the Superintendent's designee within 10 calendar days (exclusive of the principal's vacation days) of the principal's receipt of his/her total composite score or else the right to appeal shall be deemed waived in all regards.

D. The Superintendent's designee (who may be a sitting superintendent from a different school district, a BOCES superintendent, or a retired administrator who is certified as a lead evaluator) shall respond to the appeal with a written answer. The Superintendent shall consult with the OAA prior to making the designation. The designee shall have the right to grant or deny the appeal in whole or in part. Such decision shall be made within 30 calendar days of the receipt of the appeal. The decision of the Superintendent's designee, so long as the decision is made within the timeframe set forth in this paragraph, shall be final and binding in all regards and shall not be subject to review at arbitration, before any administrative agency or in any court of law. The cost of the designee shall be borne by the District.

E. A tenured Principal who receives 2 consecutive "ineffective" shall have the option to appeal the second ineffective rating directly to an independent arbitrator agreed to by the District and the OAA. The sole issue before the arbitrator shall be whether or not the second consecutive ineffective rating accurately reflected the principal's performance during the period it covered. The tenured principal shall have 10 calendar days (exclusive of the principal's vacation days) from receipt of the APPR to file a demand for arbitration. The tenured principal may elect to proceed under section D, i.e. to the Superintendent's designee, in lieu of proceeding to an independent arbitrator under this clause. In such event, the decision of the Superintendent's designee shall be final and binding in all regards and shall not be subject to review at arbitration, before any administrative agency or in any court of law. The cost of the designee shall be borne by the District. The decision of the Superintendent's designee will be rendered within thirty (30) calendar days of the demand for arbitration.

F. The agreed upon list of arbitrators shall be as follows: James Markowitz, Louis Patack, Howard Edelman, Jay Siegel, Thomas Rinaldo. If none of the arbitrators are available to schedule the hearing within sixty (60) calendar days from the date the demand is filed, then either party may process the demand for arbitration with the American Arbitration Association. Alternatively, the parties may agree to the selection of another arbitrator. The cost of the arbitrator shall be equally shared by the parties. The arbitration will be concluded within thirty (30) calendar days of the hearing.

VI. Principal Improvement Plan

A. The Principal Improvement Plan (PIP) for a principal who is rated "ineffective" or "developing" 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 determined by the evaluator in consultation with the building principal. PIP will be implemented within 10 school days from the start of the next school year

3. A statement of differentiated activities to support improvement that may include: observing other professional educators, modeling by administrators or other educators, in-service training, educational conferences and reference to pedagogical writing based upon scientific research, working with mentors; and

4. The manner of assessment of improvement that shall be in the nature of direct observation, review of educational 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).

B. The principal shall have the option of submitting a rebuttal to the PIP, provided that it is submitted within 10 calendar days (excluding principal's vacation days) from receipt of the PIP.

C. Both the principal and the superintendent shall meet for an evaluation conference prior to the implementation of the PIP where the "developing" or "ineffective" evaluation is discussed. A PIP shall be designed by the superintendent in consultation with the principal consistent with the requirements and conditions set forth herein. The PIP shall be signed and dated at the beginning of its

implementation.

D. The Superintendent shall consult with the principal who has been rated as "developing" or "ineffective" to determine what, if any, remedial action should be taken. Remedial action may include, but not be limited to, coursework, training, or mentoring.

E. After the first quarter, the Superintendent will assess the progress, if any, that the principal made towards achieving the needed areas of improvement. Based on that assessment, the PIP may be adjusted appropriately and meetings between the Superintendent and principal. There will be two follow up meetings between the Superintendent and the principal to monitor the progress, as well as a year-end meeting to discuss whether or not the needed areas of improvement have been addressed appropriately.

All above steps and the resolution of all appeals will occur in a timely and expeditious manner.

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.

To initially certify each evaluator, each evaluatorwill participat in training on the Danielson Model, NYS Teaching Standards and evidence based-observation practices delivered by a Danielson consultant and/or a Danielson-based fully calibrated observer. Evaluators will be trained on the application of the district's newly revised APPR, including the application of all assessment tools, locally selected measures of student achievement, and agreed upon scoring methodologies. Evaluators will also receive trainings in growth and value-added, considerations for evaluating teachers of special needs populations (SWDs and ELLs) provided by a RTTT Network Team member. Evaluators will also receive training on data analysis and the SIRS provided by a RTTT Network Team member and/or the Ulster BOCES Regional Information Center. The duration of the initial training for lead evaluators is a minimum of three full-day training sessions.

To recertify each evaluator, evaluators will participate in ongoing professional development by a Danielson-based fully calibrated observer to practice evidence collection and scoring of teacher practice against the Danielson Framework. This recertification includes ensuring that lead evaluators maintain inter-rater reliability over time. Minimally, these sessions will be conducted in a one day session, one-time per year.

11.5) Assurances -- Evaluators

Please check the boxes below:

- Checked

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

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

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

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

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

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

(7) use of the Statewide Instructional Reporting System

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

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

- Checked

11.6) Assurances -- Principals

Please check all of the boxes below:

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

11.7) Assurances -- Data

Please check all of the boxes below:

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

12. Joint Certification of APPR Plan

Created Tuesday, January 08, 2013
Updated Thursday, January 17, 2013

Page 1

12.1)Upload the Joint Certification of the APPR Plan

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

assets/survey-uploads/5581/308902-3Uqgn5g9Iu/APPR_DISTRICT_CERTIFICATION_FORM_1[1]-16.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.

New York State Student Learning Objective Template

All SLOs MUST include the following basic components:	
Population	*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.)*
Learning Content	*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?*
Interval of Instructional Time	*What is the instructional period covered (if not a year, rationale for semester/quarter/etc)?*
Evidence	*What specific assessment(s) will be used to measure this goal? The assessment must align to the learning content of the course.* Offers accommodations that are legally required and appropriate? Yes, students' IEPs and 504 plans will be followed. Ensures that those with a vested interest are not scoring summative assessments? Yes, I will be participating in our district's scoring sessions to meet this requirement.

Baseline	*What is the starting level of students' knowledge of the learning content at the beginning of the instructional period?*
Target(s)	*What is the expected outcome (target) of students' level of knowledge of the learning content at the end of the instructional period?* 80% of students will meet or exceed target _____.
HEDI Scoring	*How will evaluators determine what range of student performance "meets" the goal (effective) versus "well-below" (ineffective), "below" (developing), and "well-above" (highly effective)?*

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
95-100%	90-94%	85-89%	84%	83%	82%	81%	80%	79%	78%	77%	76%	74-75%	72-73%	69-71%	66-68%	63-65%	60-62%	40-59%	20-39%	0-19%

Rationale	*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.*

HEDI Ratings for ALL Teachers of All Course/Content Areas

LOCALLY SELECTED MEASURES OF STUDENT ACHIEVEMENT: 0 – 15 POINT CONVERSION CHART

HEDI Scoring	*How will evaluators determine what range of student performance "meets" the goal (effective) versus "well-below" (ineffective), "below" (developing), and "well-above" (highly effective)?*															
	HIGHLY EFFECTIVE		EFFECTIVE						DEVELOPING					INEFFECTIVE		
	15	14	13	12	11	10	**9**	8	7	6	5	4	3	2	1	0
	85-100%	81-84%	77-80%	73-76%	69-72%	65-68%	61-64%	57-60%	53-56%	52%	51%	50%	49%	48%	47%	0-46%

HEDI Ratings for ALL Teachers of All Course/Content Areas

LOCALLY SELECTED MEASURES OF STUDENT ACHIEVEMENT: 0 – 20 POINT CONVERSION CHART

HEDI Scoring	*How will evaluators determine what range of student performance "meets" the goal (effective) versus "well-below" (ineffective), "below" (developing), and "well-above" (highly effective)?*																				
	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
	88-100 %	85-87%	82-84%	79-81%	76-78%	73-75%	70-72%	67-69%	64-66%	61-63%	58-60%	55-57%	54%	53%	52%	51%	50%	49%	48%	47%	0-46%

New York State Student Learning Objective Template

All SLOs MUST include the following basic components:	
Population	*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.)*
Learning Content	*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?*
Interval of Instructional Time	*What is the instructional period covered (if not a year, rationale for semester/quarter/etc)?*
Evidence	*What specific assessment(s) will be used to measure this goal? The assessment must align to the learning content of the course.* Offers accommodations that are legally required and appropriate? Yes, students' IEPs and 504 plans will be followed. Ensures that those with a vested interest are not scoring summative assessments? Yes, I will be participating in our district's scoring sessions to meet this requirement.

Baseline	*What is the starting level of students' knowledge of the learning content at the beginning of the instructional period?*
Target(s)	*What is the expected outcome (target) of students' level of knowledge of the learning content at the end of the instructional period?* 80% of students will meet or exceed target _____.
HEDI Scoring	*How will evaluators determine what range of student performance "meets" the goal (effective) versus "well-below" (ineffective), "below" (developing), and "well-above" (highly effective)?*

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
95-100 %	90-94%	85-89%	84%	83%	82%	81%	80%	79%	78%	77%	76%	74-75%	72-73%	69-71%	66-68%	63-65%	60-62%	40-59%	20-39%	0-19%

Rationale	*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.*

Teacher Improvement Plan

(Completed Jointly by Teacher and Lead Evaluator / Designee

Name: School: Current School Year:

Date of related APPR/Evaluation: Date of TIP conference:

Area(s) Needing Improvement	Action Plan (Steps to be taken)	Timeline for Completion	Evidence to be Collected	Satisfactory Progress	Plan Completed
1.	1.			Yes ☐ N o ☐ Date:	Yes ☐ No ☐ Date:
2.	2.			Yes ☐ N o ☐ Date:	Yes ☐ No ☐ Date:
3.	3.			Yes ☐ N o ☐ Date:	Yes ☐ No ☐ Date:

Teacher's Comments:

Lead Evaluator's Comments:

TIP Satisfied? Yes☐ Date:

No☐

Teacher's Signature: Lead Evaluator Signature:

D a t e : D a t e :

Principals Assigned to K-3 Buildings

Grade 3 Math	% Proficient	Score (based on 10pts)	Score (based on 7.5pts)
	>79	10	7.5
	75-79	9	7
	65-74	8	6.5
	60-64	7	6
	50-59	6	5
	45-49	5	4
	35-44	4	3.0
	30-34	3	2
	25-29	2	1.5
	20-24	1	1
	<20	0	0

Grade 3 ELA	% Proficient	Score (based on 10pts)	Score (based on 7.5pts)
	>79	10	7.5
	75-79	9	7
	65-74	8	6.5
	60-64	7	6
	50-59	6	5
	45-49	5	4
	35-44	4	3.0
	30-34	3	2
	25-29	2	1.5
	20-24	1	1
	<20	0	0

Principal Assigned to the 4-6 Building

Grade 4 Math	% Proficient	Score (based on 10pts)	Score (based on 7.5pts)
	>79	10	7.5
	75-79	9	7
	65-74	8	6.5
	60-64	7	6
	50-59	6	5
	45-49	5	4
	35-44	4	3.0
	30-34	3	2
	25-29	2	1.5
	20-24	1	1
	<20	0	0

Grade 4 ELA	% Proficient	Score (based on 10pts)	Score (based on 7.5pts)
	>79	10	7.5
	75-79	9	7
	65-74	8	6.5
	60-64	7	6
	50-59	6	5
	45-49	5	4
	35-44	4	3.0
	30-34	3	2
	25-29	2	1.5
	20-24	1	1
	<20	0	0

Principal Assigned to the Middle School Building

Grade 8 Math	% Proficient	Score (based on 10pts)	Score (based on 7.5pts)
	>79	10	7.5
	75-79	9	7
	65-74	8	6.5
	60-64	7	6
	50-59	6	5
	45-49	5	4
	35-44	4	3.0
	30-34	3	2
	25-29	2	1.5
	20-24	1	1
	<20	0	0

Grade 8 ELA	% Proficient	Score (based on 10pts)	Score (based on 7.5pts)
	>79	10	7.5
	75-79	9	7
	65-74	8	6.5
	60-64	7	6
	50-59	6	5
	45-49	5	4
	35-44	4	3.0
	30-34	3	2
	25-29	2	1.5
	20-24	1	1
	<20	0	0

Principal Assigned to the High School Building

Math: Algebra Regents	% Proficient	Score (based on 10pts)	Score (based on 7.5pts)
	>84	10	7.5
	80-84	9	7
	70-79	8	6.5
	65-69	7	6
	55-64	6	5
	50-54	5	4
	40-49	4	3.0
	35-39	3	2
	30-34	2	1.5
	25-29	1	1
	<25	0	0

ELA: 11th Grade Regents	% Proficient	Score (based on 10pts)	Score (based on 7.5pts)
	>84	10	7.5
	80-84	9	7
	70-79	8	6.5
	65-69	7	6
	55-64	6	5
	50-54	5	4
	40-49	4	3.0
	35-39	3	2
	30-34	2	1.5
	25-29	1	1
	<25	0	0

HEDI Ratings for Principals

LOCALLY SELECTED MEASURES OF STUDENT ACHIEVEMENT OR GROWTH: 0 – 20 POINT CONVERSION CHART

HEDI Scoring	*How will evaluators determine what range of student performance "meets" the goal (effective) versus "well-below" (ineffective), "below" (developing), and "well-above" (highly effective)?*																			
	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
	20 pts	19 pts	18 pts	17 pts	16 pts	15 pts	14 pts	13 pts	12 pts	11 pts	10 pts	9 pts	8 pts	7 pts	6 pts	5 pts	4 pts	3 pts	2 pts	1 pt	0 pts

LOCALLY SELECTED MEASURES OF STUDENT ACHIEVEMENT OR GROWTH: 0 – 15 POINT CONVERSION CHART

HEDI Scoring	*How will evaluators determine what range of student performance "meets" the goal (effective) versus "well-below" (ineffective), "below" (developing), and "well-above" (highly effective)?*														
	HIGHLY EFFECTIVE		EFFECTIVE						DEVELOPING					INEFFECTIVE	
	15	14	13	12	11	10	**9**	8	7	6	5	4	3	2	1	0
	15 pts	14 pts	13 pts	12 pts	11 pts	10 pts	9 pts	8 pts	7 pts	6 pts	5 pts	4 pts	3 pts	2 pts	1 pt	0 pts

Principals Assigned to K-3 Buildings

Grade 3 Math	% Proficient	Score (based on 10pts)	Score (based on 7.5pts)
	>79	10	7.5
	75-79	9	7
	65-74	8	6.5
	60-64	7	6
	50-59	6	5
	45-49	5	4
	35-44	4	3.0
	30-34	3	2
	25-29	2	1.5
	20-24	1	1
	<20	0	0

Grade 3 ELA	% Proficient	Score (based on 10pts)	Score (based on 7.5pts)
	>79	10	7.5
	75-79	9	7
	65-74	8	6.5
	60-64	7	6
	50-59	6	5
	45-49	5	4
	35-44	4	3.0
	30-34	3	2
	25-29	2	1.5
	20-24	1	1
	<20	0	0

Principal Assigned to the 4-6 Building

Grade 4 Math	% Proficient	Score (based on 10pts)	Score (based on 7.5pts)
	>79	10	7.5
	75-79	9	7
	65-74	8	6.5
	60-64	7	6
	50-59	6	5
	45-49	5	4
	35-44	4	3.0
	30-34	3	2
	25-29	2	1.5
	20-24	1	1
	<20	0	0

Grade 4 ELA	% Proficient	Score (based on 10pts)	Score (based on 7.5pts)
	>79	10	7.5
	75-79	9	7
	65-74	8	6.5
	60-64	7	6
	50-59	6	5
	45-49	5	4
	35-44	4	3.0
	30-34	3	2
	25-29	2	1.5
	20-24	1	1
	<20	0	0

Principal Assigned to the Middle School Building

Grade 8 Math	% Proficient	Score (based on 10pts)	Score (based on 7.5pts)
	>79	10	7.5
	75-79	9	7
	65-74	8	6.5
	60-64	7	6
	50-59	6	5
	45-49	5	4
	35-44	4	3.0
	30-34	3	2
	25-29	2	1.5
	20-24	1	1
	<20	0	0

Grade 8 ELA	% Proficient	Score (based on 10pts)	Score (based on 7.5pts)
	>79	10	7.5
	75-79	9	7
	65-74	8	6.5
	60-64	7	6
	50-59	6	5
	45-49	5	4
	35-44	4	3.0
	30-34	3	2
	25-29	2	1.5
	20-24	1	1
	<20	0	0

Principal Assigned to the High School Building

Math: Algebra Regents	% Proficient	Score (based on 10pts)	Score (based on 7.5pts)
	>84	10	7.5
	80-84	9	7
	70-79	8	6.5
	65-69	7	6
	55-64	6	5
	50-54	5	4
	40-49	4	3.0
	35-39	3	2
	30-34	2	1.5
	25-29	1	1
	<25	0	0

ELA: 11th Grade Regents	% Proficient	Score (based on 10pts)	Score (based on 7.5pts)
	>84	10	7.5
	80-84	9	7
	70-79	8	6.5
	65-69	7	6
	55-64	6	5
	50-54	5	4
	40-49	4	3.0
	35-39	3	2
	30-34	2	1.5
	25-29	1	1
	<25	0	0

Principal Improvement Plan
(Completed Jointly by Principal and Superintendent of Schools/Designee)

Name: School: Current School Year:

Date of Related APPR/Evaluation: Date of PIP Conference:

Area(s) Needing Improvement	Action Plan (Steps to be Taken)	Timeline for Completion	Evidence to be Collected	Satisfactory Progress	Plan Completed
1.	1.			☐ Yes ☐ No Date:	☐ Yes ☐ No Date:
2.	2.			☐ Yes ☐ No Date:	☐ Yes ☐ No Date:
3.	3.			☐ Yes ☐ No Date:	☐ Yes ☐ No Date:

Principal's Comments:

Superintendent/Designee's Comments:

PIP Satisfied? ☐ Yes ☐ No

Principal's Signature: _____ Date: _____

Superintendent/Designee Signature: _____ Date: _____

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

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

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

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

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

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

Signatures, dates

Superintendent Signature: Date: 1/16/13

Teachers Union President Signature: Date: 1/16/13

Administrative Union President Signature: Date: 1/16/13

Board of Education President Signature: Date: 1/16/13