



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

January 7, 2013

Dr. Patrick Brimstein, Superintendent  
Peru Central School District  
17 School Street  
Peru, NY 12972

Dear Superintendent Brimstein:

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

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

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

Thank you again for your hard work.

Sincerely,



John B. King, Jr.  
Commissioner

Attachment

c: Craig L. King

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

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

# Annual Professional Performance Reviews: 2012-13

Created Friday, October 12, 2012

Updated Thursday, December 20, 2012

---

## 1

### Disclaimers

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

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

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

### 1. SCHOOL DISTRICT INFORMATION

#### 1.1) School District's BEDS Number : 091101060000

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

*091101060000*

#### 1.2) School District Name: Peru CSD

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

*Peru 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.*

*Annual (2012-13)*

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

Created Friday, October 12, 2012  
Updated Thursday, December 20, 2012

---

### Page 1

#### STATE-PROVIDED MEASURES OF STUDENT GROWTH

(25 points with an approved value-added measure)

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

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

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

#### 2.1) Assurances

Please check the boxes below:

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

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

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

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

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

If no State assessment or Regents exam exists:

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

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

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

State assessments, *required if one exists*

List of State-approved 3rd party assessments

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

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

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

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

## 2.2) Grades K-3 ELA

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

	ELA	Assessment
K	District, regional, or BOCES-developed assessment	Peru Central School District locally developed assessment for Kindergarten ELA
1	State-approved 3rd party assessment	Terra Nova 3
2	State-approved 3rd party assessment	Terra Nova 3

	ELA	Assessment
3	State assessment	3rd Grade State Assessment

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

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

A pre-test or baseline assessment is administered at the beginning of each course and a local final examination or parallel State Assessment is administered at the conclusion of each corresponding course.

The same assessment will be administered across all classrooms in the same grade level and/or across all similarly titled courses. Teachers develop SLOs using pre-test data.

Raw score data from all pre-tests is translated into performance levels in the following manner: 0-54 = Level 1, 55-69 = Level 2, 70-84 = Level 3, 85-100 = Level 4.

At the conclusion of each course, a final examination (post test) is administered to all students and scored. Raw score data from all post-tests is translated onto the same performance level scale used for pre-tests. In this manner raw score data are compared to raw score data and correspond to parallel assessments.

Movement in student performance from Level 1 to 2, 2 to 3, 3 to 4, and 4 to 4 defines growth. The percentage of students who achieve growth is then used to determine the degree of teacher effectiveness using the following HEDI score bands: 0-54 = Ineffective, 55-64 = Developing, 65-84 = Effective, and 85-100 = Highly Effective.

Visual representation of both scales have been uploaded to this application under 2.11) HEDI Table or Graphics.

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

85-100% of students meet growth target (see 2.11)

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

65-84% of students meet growth target (see 2.11)

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

55-64% of students meet growth target (see 2.11)

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

0-54% of students meet growth target (see 2.11)

## 2.3) Grades K-3 Math

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

	Math	Assessment
K	District, regional, or BOCES-developed assessment	Peru Central School District locally developed assessment for Kindergarten Math
1	State-approved 3rd party assessment	Terra Nova 3
2	State-approved 3rd party assessment	Terra Nova 3

	Math	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.

A pre-test or baseline assessment is administered at the beginning of each course and a local final examination or parallel State Assessment is administered at the conclusion of each corresponding course.

The same assessment will be administered across all classrooms in the same grade level and/or across all similarly titled courses. Teachers develop SLOs using pre-test data.

Raw score data from all pre-tests is translated into performance levels in the following manner: 0-54 = Level 1, 55-69 = Level 2, 70-84 = Level 3, 85-100 = Level 4.

At the conclusion of each course, a final examination (post test) is administered to all students and scored. Raw score data from all post-tests is translated onto the same performance level scale used for pre-tests. In this manner raw score data are compared to raw score data and correspond to parallel assessments.

Movement in student performance from Level 1 to 2, 2 to 3, 3 to 4, and 4 to 4 defines growth. The percentage of students who achieve growth is then used to determine the degree of teacher effectiveness using the following HEDI score bands: 0-54 = Ineffective, 55-64 = Developing, 65-84 = Effective, and 85-100 = Highly Effective.

Visual representation of both scales have been uploaded to this application under 2.11) HEDI Table or Graphics.

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

85-100% of students meet growth target (see 2.11)

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

65-84% of students meet growth target (see 2.11)

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

55-64% of students meet growth target (see 2.11)

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

0-54% of students meet growth target (see 2.11)

## 2.4) Grades 6-8 Science

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

Science

Assessment

6	District, regional or BOCES-developed assessment	Peru Central School District locally developed assessment for Grade 6 Science
7	District, regional or BOCES-developed assessment	Peru Central School District locally developed assessment for Grade 7 Science
<b>Science</b>		
<b>Science</b>		<b>Assessment</b>
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.

<p>Use this box, if needed, to describe the general process for assigning HEDI categories for these grades/subjects in this subcomponent. If needed, you may upload a table or graphic at 2.11, below.</p>	<p>A pre-test or baseline assessment is administered at the beginning of each course and a local final examination or parallel State Assessment is administered at the conclusion of each corresponding course.</p> <p>The same assessment will be administered across all classrooms in the same grade level and/or across all similarly titled courses. Teachers develop SLOs using pre-test data.</p> <p>Raw score data from all pre-tests is translated into performance levels in the following manner: 0-54 = Level 1, 55-69 = Level 2, 70-84 = Level 3, 85-100 = Level 4.</p> <p>At the conclusion of each course, a final examination (post test) is administered to all students and scored. Raw score data from all post-tests is translated onto the same performance level scale used for pre-tests. In this manner raw score data are compared to raw score data and correspond to parallel assessments.</p> <p>Movement in student performance from Level 1 to 2, 2 to 3, 3 to 4, and 4 to 4 defines growth. The percentage of students who achieve growth is then used to determine the degree of teacher effectiveness using the following HEDI score bands: 0-54 = Ineffective, 55-64 = Developing, 65-84 = Effective, and 85-100 = Highly Effective.</p> <p>Visual representation of both scales have been uploaded to this application under 2.11) HEDI Table or Graphics.</p>
Highly Effective (18 - 20 points) Results are well-above state average for similar students (or District goals if no state test).	85-100% of students meet growth target (see 2.11)
Effective (9 - 17 points) Results meet state average for similar students (or District goals if no state test).	65-84% of students meet growth target (see 2.11)
Developing (3 - 8 points) Results are below state average for similar students (or District goals if no state test).	55-64% of students meet growth target (see 2.11)
Ineffective (0 - 2 points) Results are well-below state average for similar students (or District goals if no state test).	0-54% of students meet growth target (see 2.11)

## 2.5) Grades 6-8 Social Studies

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

	Social Studies	Assessment
6	District, regional or BOCES-developed assessment	Peru Central School District locally developed assessment for Grade 6 Social Studies
7	District, regional or BOCES-developed assessment	Peru Central School District locally developed assessment for Grade 7 Social Studies
8	District, regional or BOCES-developed assessment	Peru Central School District locally developed assessment for Grade 8 Social Studies

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

Use this box, if needed, to describe the general process for assigning HEDI categories for these grades/subjects in this subcomponent. If needed, you may upload a table or graphic at 2.11, below.	<p>A pre-test or baseline assessment is administered at the beginning of each course and a local final examination or parallel State Assessment is administered at the conclusion of each corresponding course.</p> <p>The same assessment will be administered across all classrooms in the same grade level and/or across all similarly titled courses. Teachers develop SLOs using pre-test data.</p> <p>Raw score data from all pre-tests is translated into performance levels in the following manner: 0-54 = Level 1, 55-69 = Level 2, 70-84 = Level 3, 85-100 = Level 4.</p> <p>At the conclusion of each course, a final examination (post test) is administered to all students and scored. Raw score data from all post-tests is translated onto the same performance level scale used for pre-tests. In this manner raw score data are compared to raw score data and correspond to parallel assessments.</p> <p>Movement in student performance from Level 1 to 2, 2 to 3, 3 to 4, and 4 to 4 defines growth. The percentage of students who achieve growth is then used to determine the degree of teacher effectiveness using the following HEDI score bands: 0-54 = Ineffective, 55-64 = Developing, 65-84 = Effective, and 85-100 = Highly Effective.</p> <p>Visual representation of both scales have been uploaded to this application under 2.11) HEDI Table or Graphics.</p>
Highly Effective (18 - 20 points) Results are well-above District goals for similar students.	85-100% of students meet growth target (see 2.11)
Effective (9 - 17 points) Results meet District goals for similar students.	65-84% of students meet growth target (see 2.11)
Developing (3 - 8 points) Results are below District goals for similar students.	55-64% of students meet growth target (see 2.11)
Ineffective (0 - 2 points) Results are well-below District goals for similar students.	0-54% of students meet growth target (see 2.11)

## 2.6) High School Social Studies Regents Courses

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

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

		Assessment
Global 1	District, regional, or BOCES-developed assessment	Peru Central School District locally developed assessment for Global I

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

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

<p>Use this box, if needed, to describe the general process for assigning HEDI categories for these grades/subjects in this subcomponent. If needed, you may upload a table or graphic at 2.11, below.</p>	<p>A pre-test or baseline assessment is administered at the beginning of each course and a local final examination or parallel State Assessment is administered at the conclusion of each corresponding course.</p> <p>The same assessment will be administered across all classrooms in the same grade level and/or across all similarly titled courses. Teachers develop SLOs using pre-test data.</p> <p>Raw score data from all pre-tests is translated into performance levels in the following manner: 0-54 = Level 1, 55-69 = Level 2, 70-84 = Level 3, 85-100 = Level 4.</p> <p>At the conclusion of each course, a final examination (post test) is administered to all students and scored. Raw score data from all post-tests is translated onto the same performance level scale used for pre-tests. In this manner raw score data are compared to raw score data and correspond to parallel assessments.</p> <p>Movement in student performance from Level 1 to 2, 2 to 3, 3 to 4, and 4 to 4 defines growth. The percentage of students who achieve growth is then used to determine the degree of teacher effectiveness using the following HEDI score bands: 0-54 = Ineffective, 55-64 = Developing, 65-84 = Effective, and 85-100 = Highly Effective.</p> <p>Visual representation of both scales have been uploaded to this application under 2.11) HEDI Table or Graphics.</p>
<p>Highly Effective (18 - 20 points) Results are well-above District goals for similar students.</p>	<p>85-100% of students meet growth target (see 2.11)</p>

Effective (9 - 17 points) Results meet District goals for similar students.	65-84% of students meet growth target (see 2.11)
Developing (3 - 8 points) Results are below District goals for similar students.	55-64% of students meet growth target (see 2.11)
Ineffective (0 - 2 points) Results are well-below District goals for similar students.	0-54% of students meet growth target (see 2.11)

## 2.7) High School Science Regents Courses

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

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

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

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

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

A pre-test or baseline assessment is administered at the beginning of each course and a local final examination or parallel State Assessment is administered at the conclusion of each corresponding course.

The same assessment will be administered across all classrooms in the same grade level and/or across all similarly titled courses. Teachers develop SLOs using pre-test data.

Raw score data from all pre-tests is translated into performance levels in the following manner: 0-54 = Level 1, 55-69 = Level 2, 70-84 = Level 3, 85-100 = Level 4.

At the conclusion of each course, a final examination (post test) is administered to all students and scored. Raw score data from all post-tests is translated onto the same performance level scale used for pre-tests. In this manner raw score data are compared to raw score data and correspond to parallel assessments.

Movement in student performance from Level 1 to 2, 2 to 3, 3 to 4, and 4 to 4 defines growth. The percentage of students who achieve growth is then used to determine the degree of teacher effectiveness using the following HEDI score bands: 0-54 = Ineffective, 55-64 = Developing, 65-84 = Effective, and 85-100 = Highly Effective.

Visual representation of both scales have been uploaded to this application under 2.11) HEDI Table or Graphics.

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

85-100% of students meet growth target (see 2.11)

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

65-84% of students meet growth target (see 2.11)

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

55-64% of students meet growth target (see 2.11)

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

0-54% of students meet growth target (see 2.11)

## 2.8) High School Math Regents Courses

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

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

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

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

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

A pre-test or baseline assessment is administered at the beginning of each course and a local final examination or parallel State Assessment is administered at the conclusion of each corresponding course.

The same assessment will be administered across all classrooms in the same grade level and/or across all similarly titled courses. Teachers develop SLOs using pre-test data.

Raw score data from all pre-tests is translated into performance levels in the following manner: 0-54 = Level 1, 55-69 = Level 2, 70-84 = Level 3, 85-100 = Level 4.

At the conclusion of each course, a final examination (post test) is administered to all students and scored. Raw score data from all post-tests is translated onto the same performance level scale used for pre-tests. In this manner raw score data are compared to raw score data and correspond to parallel assessments.

Movement in student performance from Level 1 to 2, 2 to 3, 3 to 4, and 4 to 4 defines growth. The percentage of students who achieve growth is then used to determine

the degree of teacher effectiveness using the following HEDI score bands: 0-54 = Ineffective, 55-64 = Developing, 65-84 = Effective, and 85-100 = Highly Effective.

Visual representation of both scales have been uploaded to this application under 2.11) HEDI Table or Graphics.

Highly Effective (18 - 20 points) Results are well-above District goals for similar students.	85-100% of students meet growth target (see 2.11)
Effective (9 - 17 points) Results meet District goals for similar students.	65-84% of students meet growth target (see 2.11)
Developing (3 - 8 points) Results are below District goals for similar students.	55-64% of students meet growth target (see 2.11)
Ineffective (0 - 2 points) Results are well-below District goals for similar students.	0-54% of students meet growth target (see 2.11)

## 2.9) High School English Language Arts

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

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

	High School English Courses	Assessment
Grade 9 ELA	District, regional or BOCES-developed assessment	Peru Central School District locally developed assessment for ELA 9
Grade 10 ELA	District, regional or BOCES-developed assessment	Peru Central School District locally developed assessment for ELA 10
Grade 11 ELA	Regents assessment	NYS Regents Exam: Comprehensive English

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.

A pre-test or baseline assessment is administered at the beginning of each course and a local final examination or parallel State Assessment is administered at the conclusion of each corresponding course.

The same assessment will be administered across all classrooms in the same grade level and/or across all similarly titled courses. Teachers develop SLOs using pre-test data.

Raw score data from all pre-tests is translated into performance levels in the following manner: 0-54 = Level 1, 55-69 = Level 2, 70-84 = Level 3, 85-100 = Level 4.

At the conclusion of each course, a final examination (post test) is administered to all students and scored. Raw score data from all post-tests is translated onto the same



pre-test data.

Raw score data from all pre-tests is translated into performance levels in the following manner: 0-54 = Level 1, 55-69 = Level 2, 70-84 = Level 3, 85-100 = Level 4.

At the conclusion of each course, a final examination (post test) is administered to all students and scored. Raw score data from all post-tests is translated onto the same performance level scale used for pre-tests. In this manner raw score data are compared to raw score data and correspond to parallel assessments.

Movement in student performance from Level 1 to 2, 2 to 3, 3 to 4, and 4 to 4 defines growth. The percentage of students who achieve growth is then used to determine the degree of teacher effectiveness using the following HEDI score bands: 0-54 = Ineffective, 55-64 = Developing, 65-84 = Effective, and 85-100 = Highly Effective.

Visual representation of both scales have been uploaded to this application under 2.11) HEDI Table or Graphics.

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

85-100% of students meet growth target (see 2.11)

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

65-84% of students meet growth target (see 2.11)

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

55-64% of students meet growth target (see 2.11)

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

0-54% of students meet growth target (see 2.11)

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

*(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/5364/194806-TXEttx9bQW/HEDI Scoring Bands\_Peru CSD\_Growth.docx*

## 2.12) Locally Developed Controls

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

Note: The only allowable controls or adjustments for Comparable Growth Measures are those used in State Growth measures, which include: student prior academic history, students with disabilities, English language learners, students in poverty, and, in the future, any

other student-, classroom-, and school-level characteristics approved by the Board of Regents.

*No locally developed adjustments or controls will be used in setting targets for comparable growth measures.*

## 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: <a href="http://usny.nysed.gov/rttt/teachers-leaders/slo/home.html">http://usny.nysed.gov/rttt/teachers-leaders/slo/home.html</a> ).	Checked
2.14) Assurances   Assure that past academic performance and/or baseline academic data of students will be taken into account when developing an SLO.	Checked
2.14) Assurances   Assure that the process for assigning points for SLOs for the Growth Subcomponent will use the narrative HEDI descriptions described in the regulations to effectively differentiate educators in ways that improve student learning and instruction.	Checked
2.14) Assurances   Assure that it is possible for an educator to earn each point, including 0, for SLOs in the Growth subcomponent scoring range.	Checked
2.14) Assurances   Assure that processes are in place to monitor SLOs to ensure rigor and comparability across classrooms.	Checked

### 3. Local Measures (Teachers)

Created Friday, October 12, 2012

Updated Wednesday, January 02, 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	6(ii) School wide measure computed locally	STAR Reading Enterprise
5	6(ii) School wide measure computed locally	STAR Reading Enterprise
6	6(ii) School wide measure computed locally	STAR Reading Enterprise
7	6(ii) School wide measure computed locally	STAR Reading Enterprise
8	6(ii) School wide measure computed locally	STAR Reading Enterprise

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.*

<p>Use this box, if needed, to describe the general process for assigning HEDI categories for these grades/subjects in this subcomponent. If needed, you may upload a table or graphic at 3.3, below.</p>	<p>The district will provide a target setting process to produce annual Local Achievement Targets (LATs). This plan shall include what approved assessment measures will be utilized, what expectations will be set, and how points will be earned regarding achievement in relation to the targets.</p> <p>LATs will be consistent with established district goals. The superintendent shall verify comparability and rigor in the utilization of this achievement target-setting process as required by regulation.</p> <p>For the 2012-2013 School year, the parties have agreed to utilize the NYSED approved STAR Enterprise assessments to measure building-wide achievement in literacy and numeracy based on overall achievement of every student in the building meeting the target.</p> <p>The percentage of all students meeting or exceeding the building target of achievement will then be placed on the HEDI scoring Bands for Local Achievement to establish a building-wide achievement score.</p> <p>This building achievement score will be used for both teachers and principals.</p>
<p>Highly Effective (14 - 15 points) Results are well above District- or BOCES-adopted expectations for growth or achievement for grade/subject.</p>	<p>85-100% of students meet target (see 3.3)</p>
<p>Effective (8- 13 points) Results meet District- or BOCES-adopted expectations for growth or achievement for grade/subject.</p>	<p>65-84% of students meet target (see 3.3)</p>
<p>Developing (3 - 7 points) Results are below District- or BOCES-adopted expectations for growth or achievement for grade/subject.</p>	<p>55-64% of students meet target (see 3.3)</p>
<p>Ineffective (0 - 2 points) Results are well below District- or BOCES-adopted expectations for growth or achievement for grade/subject.</p>	<p>0-54% of students meet target (see 3.3)</p>

### 3.2) Grades 4-8 Math

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

	Locally-Selected Measure from List of Approved Measures	Assessment
4	6(ii) School wide measure computed locally	STAR Math Enterprise
5	6(ii) School wide measure computed locally	STAR Math Enterprise

6	6(ii) School wide measure computed locally	STAR Math Enterprise
7	6(ii) School wide measure computed locally	STAR Math Enterprise
8	6(ii) School wide measure computed locally	STAR Math Enterprise

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.*

<p>Use this box, if needed, to describe the general process for assigning HEDI categories for these grades/subjects in this subcomponent. If needed, you may upload a table or graphic at 3.3, below.</p>	<p>The district will provide a target setting process to produce annual Local Achievement Targets (LATs). This plan shall include what approved assessment measures will be utilized, what expectations will be set, and how points will be earned regarding achievement in relation to the targets.</p>
	<p>LATs will be consistent with established district goals. The superintendent shall verify comparability and rigor in the utilization of this achievement target-setting process as required by regulation.</p>
	<p>For the 2012-2013 School year, the parties have agreed to utilize the NYSED approved STAR Enterprise assessments to measure building-wide achievement in literacy and numeracy based on overall achievement of every student in the building meeting the target.</p>
	<p>The percentage of all students meeting or exceeding the building target of achievement will then be placed on the HEDI scoring Bands for Local Achievement to establish a building-wide achievement score.</p>
	<p>This building achievement score will be used for both teachers and principals.</p>
<p>Highly Effective (14 - 15 points) Results are well above District- or BOCES-adopted expectations for growth or achievement for grade/subject.</p>	<p>85-100% of students meet target (see 3.3)</p>
<p>Effective (8- 13 points) Results meet District- or BOCES-adopted expectations for growth or achievement for grade/subject.</p>	<p>65-84% of students meet target (see 3.3)</p>
<p>Developing (3 - 7 points) Results are below District- or BOCES-adopted expectations for growth or achievement for grade/subject.</p>	<p>55-64% of students meet target (see 3.3)</p>
<p>Ineffective (0 - 2 points) Results are well below District- or BOCES-adopted expectations for growth or achievement for grade/subject.</p>	<p>0-54% of students meet target (see 3.3)</p>

### 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/5139/194869-rhJdBgDruP/HEDI Scoring Bands\_Peru CSD\_15pts\_Achievement\_v2.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	6(ii) School-wide measure computed locally	STAR Early Literacy Enterprise
1	6(ii) School-wide measure computed locally	STAR Early Literacy Enterprise
2	6(ii) School-wide measure computed locally	STAR Early Literacy Enterprise
3	6(ii) School-wide measure computed locally	STAR Reading Enterprise

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 district will provide a target setting process to produce annual Local Achievement Targets (LATs). This plan shall include what approved assessment measures will be utilized, what expectations will be set, and how points will be earned regarding achievement in relation to the targets.

LATs will be consistent with established district goals. The superintendent shall verify comparability and rigor in the utilization of this achievement target-setting process as required by regulation.

For the 2012-2013 School year, the parties have agreed to utilize the NYSED approved STAR Enterprise assessments to measure building-wide achievement in literacy and numeracy based on overall achievement of every student in the building meeting the target.

The percentage of all students meeting or exceeding the building target of achievement will then be placed on the HEDI scoring Bands for Local Achievement to establish a building-wide achievement score.

Where required, the parties will convert the HEDI scale score by a multiplier of 0.75 to correspond with the value-added measurement, 15-point scale.

This building achievement score will be used for both teachers and principals.

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

85-100% of students meet target (see 3.13)

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

65-84% of students meet target (see 3.13)

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

55-64% of students meet target (see 3.13)

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

0-54% of students meet target (see 3.13)

### 3.5) Grades K-3 Math

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

	Locally-Selected Measure from List of Approved Measures	Assessment
K	6(ii) School-wide measure computed locally	STAR Early Literacy Enterprise
1	6(ii) School-wide measure computed locally	STAR Early Literacy Enterprise
2	6(ii) School-wide measure computed locally	STAR Early Literacy Enterprise
3	6(ii) School-wide measure computed locally	STAR Math Enterprise

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 district will provide a target setting process to produce annual Local Achievement Targets (LATs). This plan shall include what approved assessment measures will be utilized, what expectations will be set, and how points will be earned regarding achievement in relation to the targets.

LATs will be consistent with established district goals. The superintendent shall verify comparability and rigor in the utilization of this achievement target-setting process as required by regulation.

For the 2012-2013 School year, the parties have agreed to utilize the NYSED approved STAR Enterprise assessments to measure building-wide achievement in

literacy and numeracy based on overall achievement of every student in the building meeting the target.

The percentage of all students meeting or exceeding the building target of achievement will then be placed on the HEDI scoring Bands for Local Achievement to establish a building-wide achievement score.

Where required, the parties will convert the HEDI scale score by a multiplier of 0.75 to correspond with the value-added measurement, 15-point scale.

This building achievement score will be used for both teachers and principals.

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

85-100% of students meet target (see 3.13)

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

65-84% of students meet target (see 3.13)

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

55-64% of students meet target (see 3.13)

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

0-54% of students meet target (see 3.13)

### 3.6) Grades 6-8 Science

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

	Locally-Selected Measure from List of Approved Measures	Assessment
6	6(ii) School wide measure computed locally	STAR Math Enterprise
7	6(ii) School wide measure computed locally	STAR Math Enterprise
8	6(ii) School wide measure computed locally	STAR Math Enterprise

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 district will provide a target setting process to produce annual Local Achievement Targets (LATs). This plan shall include what approved assessment measures will be utilized, what expectations will be set, and how points will be earned regarding achievement in relation to the targets.

LATs will be consistent with established district goals. The superintendent shall verify comparability and rigor in the utilization of this achievement target-setting process as required by regulation.

For the 2012-2013 School year, the parties have agreed to utilize the NYSED approved STAR Enterprise assessments to measure building-wide achievement in literacy and numeracy based on overall achievement of every student in the building meeting the target.

The percentage of all students meeting or exceeding the building target of achievement will then be placed on the HEDI scoring Bands for Local Achievement to establish a building-wide achievement score.

Where required, the parties will convert the HEDI scale score by a multiplier of 0.75 to correspond with the value-added measurement, 15-point scale.

This building achievement score will be used for both teachers and principals.

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

85-100% of students meet target (see 3.13)

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

65-84% of students meet target (see 3.13)

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

55-64% of students meet target (see 3.13)

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

0-54% of students meet target (see 3.13)

### 3.7) Grades 6-8 Social Studies

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

	Locally-Selected Measure from List of Approved Measures	Assessment
6	6(ii) School wide measure computed locally	STAR Reading Enterprise
7	6(ii) School wide measure computed locally	STAR Reading Enterprise
8	6(ii) School wide measure computed locally	STAR Reading Enterprise

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 district will provide a target setting process to produce annual Local Achievement Targets (LATs). This plan shall include what approved assessment measures will be utilized, what expectations will be set, and how points will

be earned regarding achievement in relation to the targets.

LATs will be consistent with established district goals. The superintendent shall verify comparability and rigor in the utilization of this achievement target-setting process as required by regulation.

For the 2012-2013 School year, the parties have agreed to utilize the NYSED approved STAR Enterprise assessments to measure building-wide achievement in literacy and numeracy based on overall achievement of every student in the building meeting the target.

The percentage of all students meeting or exceeding the building target of achievement will then be placed on the HEDI scoring Bands for Local Achievement to establish a building-wide achievement score.

Where required, the parties will convert the HEDI scale score by a multiplier of 0.75 to correspond with the value-added measurement, 15-point scale.

This building achievement score will be used for both teachers and principals.

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

85-100% of students meet target (see 3.13)

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

65-84% of students meet target (see 3.13)

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

55-64% of students meet target (see 3.13)

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

0-54% of students meet target (see 3.13)

### 3.8) High School Social Studies

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

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

	Locally-Selected Measure from List of Approved Measures	Assessment
Global 1	6(ii) School wide measure computed locally	STAR Reading Enterprise
Global 2	6(ii) School wide measure computed locally	STAR Reading Enterprise
American History	6(ii) School wide measure computed locally	STAR Reading Enterprise

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.*

<p>Use this box, if needed, to describe the general process for assigning HEDI categories for these grades/subjects in this subcomponent. If needed, you may upload a table or graphic at 3.13, below.</p>	<p>The district will provide a target setting process to produce annual Local Achievement Targets (LATs). This plan shall include what approved assessment measures will be utilized, what expectations will be set, and how points will be earned regarding achievement in relation to the targets.</p>
	<p>LATs will be consistent with established district goals. The superintendent shall verify comparability and rigor in the utilization of this achievement target-setting process as required by regulation.</p>
	<p>For the 2012-2013 School year, the parties have agreed to utilize the NYSED approved STAR Enterprise assessments to measure building-wide achievement in literacy and numeracy based on overall achievement of every student in the building meeting the target.</p>
	<p>The percentage of all students meeting or exceeding the building target of achievement will then be placed on the HEDI scoring Bands for Local Achievement to establish a building-wide achievement score.</p>
	<p>Where required, the parties will convert the HEDI scale score by a multiplier of 0.75 to correspond with the value-added measurement, 15-point scale.</p>
	<p>This building achievement score will be used for both teachers and principals.</p>
<p>Highly Effective (18 - 20 points) Results are well above District- or BOCES-adopted expectations for growth or achievement for grade/subject.</p>	<p>85-100% of students meet target (see 3.13)</p>
<p>Effective (9 - 17 points) Results meet District- or BOCES-adopted expectations for growth or achievement for grade/subject.</p>	<p>65-84% of students meet target (see 3.13)</p>
<p>Developing (3 - 8 points) Results are below District- or BOCES-adopted expectations for growth or achievement for grade/subject.</p>	<p>55-64% of students meet target (see 3.13)</p>
<p>Ineffective (0 - 2 points) Results are well below District- or BOCES-adopted expectations for growth or achievement for grade/subject.</p>	<p>0-54% of students meet target (see 3.13)</p>

### 3.9) High School Science

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

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

	Locally-Selected Measure from List of Approved Measures	Assessment
Living Environment	6(ii) School wide measure computed locally	STAR Math Enterprise
Earth Science	6(ii) School wide measure computed locally	STAR Math Enterprise
Chemistry	6(ii) School wide measure computed locally	STAR Math Enterprise
Physics	6(ii) School wide measure computed locally	STAR Math Enterprise

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 district will provide a target setting process to produce annual Local Achievement Targets (LATs). This plan shall include what approved assessment measures will be utilized, what expectations will be set, and how points will be earned regarding achievement in relation to the targets.
	LATs will be consistent with established district goals. The superintendent shall verify comparability and rigor in the utilization of this achievement target-setting process as required by regulation.
	For the 2012-2013 School year, the parties have agreed to utilize the NYSED approved STAR Enterprise assessments to measure building-wide achievement in literacy and numeracy based on overall achievement of every student in the building meeting the target.
	The percentage of all students meeting or exceeding the building target of achievement will then be placed on the HEDI scoring Bands for Local Achievement to establish a building-wide achievement score.
	Where required, the parties will convert the HEDI scale score by a multiplier of 0.75 to correspond with the value-added measurement, 15-point scale.
	This building achievement score will be used for both teachers and principals.
Highly Effective (18-20 points) Results are well above District- or BOCES-adopted expectations for growth or achievement for grade/subject.	85-100% of students meet target (see 3.13)
Developing (3 - 8 points) Results are below District- or BOCES-adopted expectations for growth or achievement for grade/subject.	65-84% of students meet target (see 3.13)
Effective (9 - 17points) Results meet District- or BOCES-adopted expectations for growth or achievement for grade/subject.	55-64% of students meet target (see 3.13)

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

0-54% of students meet target (see 3.13)

### 3.10) High School Math

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

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

	Locally-Selected Measure from List of Approved Measures	Assessment
Algebra 1	6(ii) School wide measure computed locally	STAR Math Enterprise
Geometry	6(ii) School wide measure computed locally	STAR Math Enterprise
Algebra 2	6(ii) School wide measure computed locally	STAR Math Enterprise

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 district will provide a target setting process to produce annual Local Achievement Targets (LATs). This plan shall include what approved assessment measures will be utilized, what expectations will be set, and how points will be earned regarding achievement in relation to the targets.

LATs will be consistent with established district goals. The superintendent shall verify comparability and rigor in the utilization of this achievement target-setting process as required by regulation.

For the 2012-2013 School year, the parties have agreed to utilize the NYSED approved STAR Enterprise assessments to measure building-wide achievement in literacy and numeracy based on overall achievement of every student in the building meeting the target.

The percentage of all students meeting or exceeding the building target of achievement will then be placed on the HEDI scoring Bands for Local Achievement to establish a building-wide achievement score.

Where required, the parties will convert the HEDI scale score by a multiplier of 0.75 to correspond with the value-added measurement, 15-point scale.

This building achievement score will be used for both

	teachers and principals.
Highly Effective (18 - 20 points) Results are well above District- or BOCES-adopted expectations for growth or achievement for grade/subject.	85-100% of students meet target (see 3.13)
Effective (9 - 17 points) Results meet District- or BOCES-adopted expectations for growth or achievement for grade/subject.	65-84% of students meet target (see 3.13)
Developing (3 - 8 points) Results are below District- or BOCES-adopted expectations for growth or achievement for grade/subject.	55-64% of students meet target (see 3.13)
Ineffective (0 - 2 points) Results are well below District- or BOCES-adopted expectations for growth or achievement for grade/subject.	0-54% of students meet target (see 3.13)

### 3.11) High School English Language Arts

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

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

	Locally-Selected Measure from List of Approved Measures	Assessment
Grade 9 ELA	6(ii) School wide measure computed locally	STAR Reading Enterprise
Grade 10 ELA	6(ii) School wide measure computed locally	STAR Reading Enterprise
Grade 11 ELA	6(ii) School wide measure computed locally	STAR Reading Enterprise

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.	<p>The district will provide a target setting process to produce annual Local Achievement Targets (LATs). This plan shall include what approved assessment measures will be utilized, what expectations will be set, and how points will be earned regarding achievement in relation to the targets.</p> <p>LATs will be consistent with established district goals. The superintendent shall verify comparability and rigor in the utilization of this achievement target-setting process as required by regulation.</p> <p>For the 2012-2013 School year, the parties have agreed to utilize the NYSED approved STAR Enterprise assessments to measure building-wide achievement in literacy and numeracy based on overall achievement of</p>
---	---



assurances listed to the left of each box.

<p>Use this box, if needed, to describe the general process for assigning HEDI categories for these grades/subjects in this subcomponent. If needed, you may upload a table or graphic at 3.13, below.</p>	<p>The district will provide a target setting process to produce annual Local Achievement Targets (LATs). This plan shall include what approved assessment measures will be utilized, what expectations will be set, and how points will be earned regarding achievement in relation to the targets.</p> <p>LATs will be consistent with established district goals. The superintendent shall verify comparability and rigor in the utilization of this achievement target-setting process as required by regulation.</p> <p>For the 2012-2013 School year, the parties have agreed to utilize the NYSED approved STAR Enterprise assessments to measure building-wide achievement in literacy and numeracy based on overall achievement of every student in the building meeting the target.</p> <p>The percentage of all students meeting or exceeding the building target of achievement will then be placed on the HEDI scoring Bands for Local Achievement to establish a building-wide achievement score.</p> <p>Where required, the parties will convert the HEDI scale score by a multiplier of 0.75 to correspond with the value-added measurement, 15-point scale.</p> <p>This building achievement score will be used for both teachers and principals.</p>
<p>Highly Effective (18 - 20 points) Results are well above District- or BOCES -adopted expectations for growth or achievement for grade/subject.</p>	<p>85-100% of students meet target (see 3.13)</p>
<p>Effective (9 - 17 points) Results meet District- or BOCES-adopted expectations for growth or achievement for grade/subject.</p>	<p>65-84% of students meet target (see 3.13)</p>
<p>Developing (3 - 8 points) Results are below District- or BOCES-adopted expectations for growth or achievement for grade/subject.</p>	<p>55-64% of students meet target (see 3.13)</p>
<p>Ineffective (0 - 2 points) Results are well below District- or BOCES-adopted expectations for growth or achievement for grade/subject.</p>	<p>0-54% of students meet target (see 3.13)</p>

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.

### 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 locally developed adjustments or controls will be used in setting targets for achievement.*

### 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.

*The District will utilize a local selected measure for Literacy and for Math. Teachers across content areas and grade levels will address district priorities for increasing literacy and numeracy skills.*

*Building-wide targets in Literacy and for Numeracy will be established to promote the integration of literacy and numeracy for all students across content areas.*

*The literacy measure will correspond to teachers of all students in grades K-2 and for students in ELA, Social Studies, and some Elective areas across the District, grades 3-12.*

*The numeracy measure will apply to teachers of all students in Math, Science and some Elective areas across the District, grades 3-12.*

*A single building-wide local achievement score will be formulated by averaging all student performance data corresponding to the summative administration of the STAR assessment. The percentage of students meeting or exceeding the building target of achievement will then be placed on the HEDI scoring Bands for Local Achievement to establish a building-wide achievement score. This score will be applied equally to all teachers and principals.*

*See the attachment at 3.13 for more information.*

### 3.16) Assurances

Please check all of the boxes below:

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

3.16) Assurances   Assure that locally-selected measures are rigorous and comparable across all classrooms in the same grade/subject in the district.	Checked
3.16) Assurances   If more than one type of locally-selected measure is used for different groups of teachers within a grade/subject, certify that the measures are comparable based on the Standards of Educational and Psychological Testing.	Checked
3.16) Assurances   Assure that all locally-selected measures for a teacher are different than any measures used for the State assessment or other comparable measures subcomponent.	Checked

## 4. Other Measures of Effectiveness (Teachers)

Created Friday, October 12, 2012

Updated Wednesday, January 02, 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.)

*NYSUT Teacher Practice Rubric*

*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"):

*n/a*

Multiple (at least two) classroom observations by principal or other trained administrator, at least one of which must be unannounced [at least 31 points]	31
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	29

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.

*Teacher's performance will be assessed using multiple measures. Evidence for evaluation of teachers will come from formal classroom observations, unannounced observations, walk-throughs, self-reflection, and other materials provided by the teacher.*

*Each component will be scored from 1-4 and will be averaged to get a corresponding domain scores. Domain scores will be averaged to get an overall rubric score.*

*All observations will be performed by Board approved Peru Central School District administrators. Each teacher will receive a final average score using a 1-4 rubric rating scale. This score is converted to a HEDI rating. The HEDI rating categories are:*

- 1.0– 1.4 □ Ineffective
- 1.5 – 2.4 – Developing
- 2.5 – 3.4 – Effective
- 3.5 – 4.0 – Highly Effective

This final score will then be converted to a 60 point score using the chart below. We understand that the composite score must be reported in whole numbers.

The rubric value listed on the chart is the minimum score necessary to achieve the corresponding HEDI point value.

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

[assets/survey-uploads/5091/194916-eka9yMJ855/HEDI Scoring Band\\_OtherMeasures\\_60 Points conversion\\_corrected.docx](#)

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

Highly Effective: Overall performance and results exceed NYS Teaching Standards.	A score is calculated for each teaching standard. These scores are combined for a total score. A total score of 59-60 is highly effective.
Effective: Overall performance and results meet NYS Teaching Standards.	A score is calculated for each teaching standard. These scores are combined for a total score. A total score of 57-58 is effective.
Developing: Overall performance and results need improvement in order to meet NYS Teaching Standards.	A score is calculated for each teaching standard. These scores are combined for a total score. A total score of 50-56 is developing.
Ineffective: Overall performance and results do not meet NYS Teaching Standards.	A score is calculated for each teaching standard. These scores are combined for a total score. A total score of 0-49 is ineffective.

Provide the ranges for the 60-point scoring bands.

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

## 4.6) Observations of Probationary Teachers

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

By building principals or other trained administrators

4.6) Observations of Probationary Teachers   Informal/Short	1
4.6) Observations of Probationary Teachers   Enter Total	3

By trained in-school peer teachers or other trained reviewers

Formal/Long	0
Informal/Short	0

Independent evaluators

Formal/Long	0
Informal/Short	0

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

- 
- In Person
- 

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

- 
- In Person
- 

## 4.7) Observations of Tenured Teachers

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

By building principals or other trained administrators

4.7) Observations of Tenured Teachers   Formal/Long	2
4.7) Observations of Tenured Teachers   Informal/Short	1
4.7) Observations of Tenured Teachers   Total	3

By trained in-school peer teachers or other trained reviewers

Formal/Long	0
Informal/Short	0

Independent evaluators

Formal/Long	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 Friday, October 12, 2012

---

## Page 1

### **Standards for Rating Categories**

#### **Growth or Comparable Measures**

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

#### **Other Measures of Effectiveness (Teacher and Leader standards)**

#### **Highly**

#### **Effective**

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

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

Overall performance and results exceed NYS Teaching Standards.

#### **Effective**

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

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

Overall performance and results meet NYS Teaching Standards.

#### **Developing**

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

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

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

#### **Ineffective**

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

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

Overall performance and results do not meet NYS Teaching Standards.

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

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

**2012-13 where there is no Value-Added measure**

**Growth or Comparable Measures**

**Locally-selected Measures of**

**growth or achievement**

**Other Measures of Effectiveness**

**(60 points)**

**Overall**

**Composite Score**

**Highly Effective**

**18-20**

**18-20**

**Ranges determined locally--see below**

**91-100**

**Effective**

**9-17**

**9-17**

**75-90**

**Developing**

**3-8**

**3-8**

**65-74**

**Ineffective**

**0-2**

**0-2**

**0-64**

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

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

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

**2012-13 where Value-Added growth measure applies**

**Growth or Comparable Measures**

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

**Other Measures of Effectiveness**

**(60 points)**

**Overall**

**Composite Score**

**Highly Effective**

**22-25**

**14-15**

**Ranges determined locally--see above**

**91-100**

**Effective**

**10-21**

**8-13**

**75-90**

**Developing**

**3-9**

**3-7**

**65-74**

**Ineffective**

**0-2**

**0-2**

**0-64**

# 6. Additional Requirements - Teachers

Created Friday, October 12, 2012  
Updated Wednesday, January 02, 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/5265/194940-Df0w3Xx5v6/TIP Plan PAT Association 2012\\_1.pdf](#)

### 6.3) Appeals Process

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

- (1) the substance of the annual professional performance review
- (2) the school district's or BOCES' adherence to the standards and methodologies required for such reviews, pursuant to Education Law section 3012-c
- (3) the adherence to the regulations of the Commissioner and compliance with any applicable locally negotiated procedures, as well as the school district's or BOCES' issuance and/or implementation of the terms of the teacher or principal improvement plan, as required under Education Law section 3012-c

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

*Peru CSD*

#### *APPEALS OF INEFFECTIVE AND DEVELOPING RATINGS*

*Any unit member aggrieved of an annual professional performance review with an ineffective or developing APPR component score*

where agreement cannot be reached, may use the following procedure. The appeals process will be carried out in a timely and expeditious manner.

#### *WHAT MAY BE CHALLENGED IN AN APPEAL*

*Appeal procedures in connection with an ineffective or developing rating will limit the scope of appeals under Education Law §3012-c to the following subjects:*

- (1) the substance of the annual professional review*
- (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 negotiated procedures applicable to annual professional performance reviews or improvement plans; and*
- (5) the school district's issuance and/or implementation of the terms of the teacher improvement plan in connection with an ineffective or development rating under Education Law §3012-c.*

#### *PROHIBITION AGAINST MORE THAN ONE APPEAL*

*A teacher may not file multiple appeals regarding the same performance review OR Teacher Improvement Plan. All grounds for appeal must be raised with specificity within one appeal.*

#### *TIMEFRAME FOR FILING APPEAL*

*All appeals must be submitted to the evaluator, who issued the performance review, in writing no later than 15 calendar days from the date when the teacher acknowledges receipt of his/her annual professional performance review rating.*

*All APPR's sent to teachers over the summer will be sent by certified mail to the teacher's home address. Timeframes listed above will begin upon the District's receipt of the signed return mailing slip. The failure to file an appeal within these timeframes shall be deemed a waiver of the right to appeal and the appeal shall be deemed abandoned unless extended by mutual written agreement signed by both parties. Any extension made will be timely and expeditious in compliance with Education Law 3012-c.*

*When filing an appeal, the teacher must submit to the evaluator:*

- (1) a detailed written description of the specific area(s) of his/her performance review which may include the terms of his/her teacher improvement plan that is being challenged; and*
- (2) any additional documents or materials relevant to the appeal; and*
- (3) the performance review and the teacher improvement plan being challenged*

#### *TIMEFRAME FOR EVALUATOR RESPONSE*

*Within 15 calendar days of receipt of an appeal, the evaluator who issued the performance review must submit a detailed written response to the appeal.*

*The evaluator's response must include:*

- (1) a detailed written response to the appeal addressing the specific area(s) being challenged; and*
- (2) any and all additional documents or written materials specific to the point(s) being challenged that support the evaluator's response and are relevant to the resolution of the appeal*
- (3) any modifications to the Teacher Improvement Plan*

*The teacher initiating the appeal shall receive a copy of the response filed by the evaluator, and any and all additional information submitted with the response.*

#### *PANEL APPEAL*

*If the teacher is not satisfied with the response from the evaluator and the matter has not been resolved to his/her satisfaction, within 15 calendar days of acknowledging the receipt of the decision of the evaluator, the teacher may request an appeal to a three person panel as described herein.*

*The parties agree to formulate a three□person panel to hear the appeal. The three□person panel will consist of:*

*(1) the Superintendent (or his/her designee)*

*(2) the PAT President (or his/her designee)*

*(3) third panel member to be mutually chosen and agreed upon by the Association and the District from a list to be updated annually.*

*The costs associated with the services of the panel, including expenses, will be shared equally by the parties.*

*The third party panel member must be chosen within three calendar days of the teacher requesting the appeal to the panel.*

*The decision/deliberations of the three□person panel shall be based on a written record which is comprised of:*

*(1) the teacher's appeal papers and any documentary evidence accompanying the appeal;*

*(2) the evaluator's response to the appeal and any documentary evidence accompanying the response*

*A written recommendation of the three person panel shall set forth the reasons and factual basis for each determination on each of the specific issues raised in the teacher's appeal. Within 5 calendar days of receipt of the appeal, the panel will issue a written recommendation for resolution to the Appellant, Teachers' Association President and the Superintendent of Schools. The recommendation may be to deny the appeal, to sustain the appeal and grant remedy sought, or to sustain the appeal and modify the remedy: further, the reasoning for the recommendation, as well as dissenting opinions, if any, will be included with the recommendation.*

*For a Developing rating, the Panel's decision will be final and binding and not subject to any further appeal.*

#### *DECISION*

*A written decision from the Superintendent of Schools based on the merits of the appeal shall be rendered no later than 45 calendar days from the date upon which the teacher filed his/her appeal. The decision may be to deny the appeal, to sustain the appeal and grant remedy sought, or to sustain the appeal and modify the remedy*

*The determination of the appeal by the Superintendent pursuant to the above process is final and binding and not subject to any further appeal through the grievance process except as otherwise authorized by law.*

*Nothing in this appeals procedure will restrict the right of the district or the obligation of the teacher to proceed in accordance with otherwise standard practice, e.g., implementation of an improvement plan, while an appeal is pending. Nothing in this appeal process shall be construed as not being in compliance with Education Law 3012-c.*

## **6.4) Training and Certification of Lead Evaluators and Evaluators**

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

#### *EVALUATOR TRAINING*

*The Peru CSD Superintendent will ensure that all evaluators have been trained and that all lead evaluators have been trained and certified in accordance with regulation. The district will utilize CEWW BOCES Network Team evaluator training and lead evaluator training and certification in accordance with SED procedures and processes. Lead evaluator training will include training on:*

*(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;*

*(4) Application and use of the teacher rubric, including training on the effective application of such rubrics to observe a teacher's practice;*

*(5) Application and use of any assessment tools that the school district or BOCES utilizes to evaluate its classroom teachers, 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 locally selected measures of student achievement used by the district evaluate its teachers;*

*(7) Use of the Statewide Instructional Reporting System;*

*(8) The scoring methodology 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 overall rating and their subcomponent ratings; and*

*(9) Specific considerations in evaluating teachers of English language learners and students with disabilities.*

*The Peru CSD Superintendent will ensure that lead evaluators participate in annual training and are re-certified on an annual basis. The CEWW BOCES Network Team will be utilized to provide the training and recertification. Any individual who fails to achieve required training or certification or re-certification, as applicable, shall not conduct or complete evaluations. All Peru CSD administrators have been participating in ongoing inter-rater reliability training as provided by the CEWW BOCES network team and schedules are already in place for continued training throughout the 2012-13 school year.*

## 6.5) Assurances -- Evaluators

Please check the boxes below:

- 
- Checked
- 

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

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

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

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

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

growth goals and school improvement goals, etc.

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

(7) use of the Statewide Instructional Reporting System

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

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

- 
- Checked
- 

## 6.6) Assurances -- Teachers

Please check all of the boxes below:

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

## 6.7) Assurances -- Data

Please check all of the boxes below:

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

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

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

Created Friday, November 30, 2012  
Updated Thursday, December 20, 2012

## Page 1

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

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

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

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

3-6
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
Elementary K-2	State-approved 3rd party assessment	Terra Nova 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.

<p>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.</p>	<p>A pre-test or baseline assessment is administered at the beginning of each course and a local final examination or parallel State Assessment is administered at the conclusion of each corresponding course.</p> <p>The same assessment will be administered across all classrooms in the same grade level and/or across all similarly titled courses. Principals develop SLOs using pre-test data.</p> <p>Raw score data from all pre-tests is translated into performance levels in the following manner: 0-54 = Level 1, 55-69 = Level 2, 70-84 = Level 3, 85-100 = Level 4.</p> <p>At the conclusion of each course, a final examination (post test) is administered to all students and scored. Raw score data from all post-tests is translated onto the same performance level scale used for pre-tests. In this manner raw score data are compared to raw score data and correspond to parallel assessments.</p> <p>Movement in student performance from Level 1 to 2, 2 to 3, 3 to 4, and 4 to 4 defines growth. The percentage of students who achieve growth is then used to determine the degree of principal effectiveness using the following HEDI score bands: 0-54 = Ineffective, 55-64 = Developing, 65-84 = Effective, and 85-100 = Highly Effective.</p> <p>Visual representation of both scales have been uploaded</p>
---	---

	to this application under 7.3 (HEDI Table or Graphics).
Highly Effective (18 - 20 points) Results are well above state average for similar students (or District goals if no state test).	The principal will be rated highly effective if 85% or higher of his/her students meet the growth target. See scale at 7.3
Effective (9 - 17 points) Results meet state average for similar students (or District goals if no state test).	The principal will be rated effective if 65%-84% greater of his/her students meet the growth target. See scale at 7.3
Developing (3 - 8 points) Results are below state average for similar students (or District goals if no state test).	The principal will be rated effective if 55%-64% greater of his/her students meet the growth target. See scale at 7.3
Ineffective (0 - 2 points) Results are well below state average for similar students (or District goals if no state test).	The principal will be rated effective if 0%-54% greater of his/her students meet the growth target. See scale at 7.3

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/5365/258696-lha0DogRNw/HEDI Scoring Bands\\_Peru CSD\\_Growth.docx](#)

## 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 locally developed adjustments or controls will be used in setting targets for comparable growth measures.*

## 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	Checked

rights laws.	
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: <a href="http://usny.nysed.gov/rttt/teachers-leaders/slo/home.html">http://usny.nysed.gov/rttt/teachers-leaders/slo/home.html</a> .	Checked
7.6) Assurances -- Comparable Growth Measures   Assure that the process for assigning points for SLOs for the Growth Subcomponent will use the narrative HEDI descriptions described in the regulations to effectively differentiate educator performance in ways that improve student learning and instruction.	Checked
7.6) Assurances -- Comparable Growth Measures   Assure that it is possible for a principal to earn each point, including 0, for SLOs in the Growth subcomponent scoring range.	Checked
7.6) Assurances -- Comparable Growth Measures   Assure that processes are in place to monitor SLOs to ensure rigor and comparability across classrooms.	Checked

# 8. Local Measures (Principals)

Created Friday, November 30, 2012

Updated Wednesday, January 02, 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
3-6	(d) measures used by district for teacher evaluation	STAR Enterprise Reading and Math
7-8	(d) measures used by district for teacher evaluation	STAR Enterprise Reading and Math
9-12	(d) measures used by district for teacher evaluation	STAR Enterprise Reading and Math

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

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

<p>Use this box, if needed, to describe the process for assigning HEDI categories. If needed, you may upload a table or graphic below.</p>	<p>The district will provide a target setting process to produce annual Local Achievement Targets (LATs). This plan shall include what approved assessment measures will be utilized, what expectations will be set, and how points will be earned regarding achievement in relation to the targets.</p> <p>LATs will be consistent with established district goals. The superintendent shall verify comparability and rigor in the utilization of this achievement target-setting process as required by regulation.</p> <p>For the 2012-2013 School year, the parties have agreed to utilize the NYSED approved STAR Enterprise assessments to measure building-wide achievement in literacy and numeracy based on overall achievement of every student in the building meeting the target.</p>
--	---

The percentage of all students meeting or exceeding the building target of achievement will then be placed on the HEDI scoring Bands for Local Achievement to establish a building-wide achievement score.

This building achievement score will be used for both teachers and principals.

Highly Effective (14 - 15 points) Results are well above District- or BOCES-adopted expectations for growth or achievement for grade/subject.

85-100% of students meet target (see attached file)

Effective (8- 13 points) Results meet District- or BOCES-adopted expectations for growth or achievement for grade/subject.

65-84% of students meet target (see attached file)

Developing (3 - 7 points) Results are below District- or BOCES-adopted expectations for growth or achievement for grade/subject.

55-64% of students meet target (see attached file)

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

0-54% of students meet target (see attached file)

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

*(No response)*

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

*(No response)*

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

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

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

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

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

- (b) student growth or achievement on State assessments in ELA and/or Math in Grades 4-8 for students in each specific performance level (e.g., Level 1, Level 2)
- (c) student growth or achievement on State assessments in ELA and/or Math in Grades 4-8 for students with disabilities and English Language Learners in Grades 4-8
- (d) student performance on any or all of the district-wide locally selected measures approved for use in teacher evaluations
- (e) four, five and/or six-year high school graduation and/or dropout rates for principals employed in a school with high school grades
- (f) percentage of students who earn a Regents diploma with advanced designation and/or honors for principals employed in a school with high school grades
- (g) percentage of a cohort of students that achieve specified scores on Regents examinations and/or Department approved alternative examinations (including, but not limited to, Advanced Placement examinations, International Baccalaureate examinations, SAT II, etc.), for principals employed in a school with high school grades (e.g., the percentage of students in the 2009 cohort that scored at least a 3 on an Advanced Placement examination since entry into the ninth grade)
- (h) students' progress toward graduation in the school using strong predictive indicators, including but not limited to 9th and/or 10th grade credit accumulation and/or the percentage of students that pass 9th and/or 10th grade subjects most commonly associated with graduation and/or students' progress in passing the number of required Regents examinations for graduation, for principals employed in a school with high school grades
- (i) student learning objectives (only allowable for principals in programs/buildings without a Value-Added measure for the State Growth subcomponent). Used with one of the following assessments: State, State-approved 3rd party, or a District, regional, or BOCES-developed assessment that is rigorous and comparable across classrooms

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

Grade Configuration	Locally-Selected Measure from List of Approved Measures	Assessment
K-2	(d) measures used by district for teacher evaluation	STAR Enterprise Early Literacy

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 district will provide a target setting process to produce annual Local Achievement Targets (LATs). This plan shall include what approved assessment measures will be utilized, what expectations will be set, and how points will
---	---

be earned regarding achievement in relation to the targets.

LATs will be consistent with established district goals. The superintendent shall verify comparability and rigor in the utilization of this achievement target-setting process as required by regulation.

For the 2012-2013 School year, the parties have agreed to utilize the NYSED approved STAR Enterprise assessments to measure building-wide achievement in literacy and numeracy based on overall achievement of every student in the building meeting the target.

The percentage of all students meeting or exceeding the building target of achievement will then be placed on the HEDI scoring Bands for Local Achievement to establish a building-wide achievement score.

This building achievement score will be used for both teachers and principals.

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

85-100% of students meet target (see attached file)

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

65-84% of students meet target (see attached file)

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

55-64% of students meet target (see attached file)

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

0-54% of students meet target (see attached file)

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/5366/258729-T8MIGWUVm1/HEDI Scoring Bands\_Peru CSD\_15pts\_Achievement\_v2.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 locally developed adjustments or controls will be used in setting targets for achievement.*

## 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.

*The District will utilize a local selected measure for Literacy and for Math. Teachers across content areas and grade levels will address district priorities for increasing literacy and numeracy skills.*

*Building-wide targets in Literacy and for Numeracy will be established to promote the integration of literacy and numeracy for all students across content areas.*

*The literacy measure will correspond to teachers of all students in grades K-2 and for students in ELA, Social Studies, and some Elective areas across the District, grades 3-12.*

*The numeracy measure will apply to teachers of all students in Math, Science and some Elective areas across the District, grades 3-12.*

*A single building-wide local achievement score will be formulated by averaging all student performance data corresponding to the summative administration of the STAR assessment. The percentage of students meeting or exceeding the building target of achievement will then be placed on the HEDI scoring Bands for Local Achievement to establish a building-wide achievement score. This score will be applied equally to all teachers and principals.*

*See the attachment at 8.2 for more information.*

## 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 Saturday, December 01, 2012

Updated Wednesday, January 02, 2013

## Page 1

### 9.1) Principal Practice Rubric

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

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

*Multidimensional Principal Performance Rubric*

*(No response)*

### 9.2) Points Within Other Measures

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

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

Is the following points assignment for all principals?

*Yes*

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

*(No response)*

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

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

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

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

(No response)

### 9.3) Assurances -- Goals

Please check the boxes below (if applicable):

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

### 9.4) Sources of Evidence (if applicable)

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

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

### 9.5) Survey Tool(s) (if applicable)

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

(No response)

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

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

## 9.6) Assurances

Please check all of the boxes below:

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

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

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

*Principals' performance will be assessed using multiple measures. Evidence for evaluation of principals will come from formal observations, unannounced observations, self-reflection, and other materials provided by the principal.*

*Each component will be scored from 1-4 and will be averaged to get a corresponding domain score. Domain scores will be averaged to get an overall rubric score according to the attached chart.*

*All observations will be performed by Board approved Peru Central School District administrators. Each principal will receive a final average score using a 1-4 rubric rating scale. This score is converted to a HEDI rating. The HEDI rating categories are:*

- 1.0– 1.4 □ Ineffective*
- 1.5 – 2.4 – Developing*
- 2.5 – 3.4 – Effective*
- 3.5 – 4.0 – Highly Effective*

*This final score will then be converted to a 60 point score using the chart below. We understand that the composite score must be reported in whole numbers.*

*The rubric value listed on the chart is the minimum score necessary to achieve the corresponding HEDI point value.*

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

[assets/survey-uploads/5143/258778-pMADJ4gk6R/HEDI Scoring Process\\_60 Pts\\_Administrators\\_Peru CSD-sans paragraph.docx](assets/survey-uploads/5143/258778-pMADJ4gk6R/HEDI Scoring Process_60 Pts_Administrators_Peru CSD-sans paragraph.docx)

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

Highly Effective: Overall performance and results exceed standards.	A score is calculated for each standard area. These scores are combined for a total score. A total score of 59-60 is highly effective.
Effective: Overall performance and results meet standards.	A score is calculated for each standard area. These scores are combined for a total score. A total score of 57-58 is effective.

Developing: Overall performance and results need improvement in order to meet standards.	A score is calculated for each standard area. These scores are combined for a total score. A total score of 50-56 is developing.
Ineffective: Overall performance and results do not meet standards.	A score is calculated for each standard area <sup>3</sup> . These scores are combined for a total score. A total score of 0-49 is ineffective.

Please provide the locally-negotiated 60 point scoring bands.

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

## 9.8) School Visits

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

### **Probationary Principals**

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

### **Tenured Principals**

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

# 10. Composite Scoring (Principals)

Created Saturday, December 01, 2012

---

## Page 1

### **Standards for Rating Categories**

#### **Growth or Comparable Measures**

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

#### **Other Measures of Effectiveness (Teacher and Leader standards)**

#### **Highly**

##### **Effective**

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

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

Overall performance and results exceed ISLLC leadership standards.

##### **Effective**

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

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

Overall performance and results meet ISLLC leadership standards.

##### **Developing**

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

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

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

##### **Ineffective**

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

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

Overall performance and results do not meet ISLLC leadership standards.

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

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

**2012-13 where there is no Value-Added measure**

**Growth or Comparable Measures**

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

**Other Measures of Effectiveness**

**(60 points)**

**Overall**

**Composite Score**

**Highly Effective**

**18-20**

**18-20**

**Ranges determined locally--see below**

**91-100**

**Effective**

**9-17**

**9-17**

**75-90**

**Developing**

**3-8**

**3-8**

**65-74**

**Ineffective**

**0-2**

**0-2**

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

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

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

**2012-13 where Value-Added growth measure applies**

**Growth or Comparable Measures**

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

**Other Measures of Effectiveness**

**(60 points)**

**Overall**

**Composite Score**

**Highly Effective**

22-25

14-15

Ranges determined locally--see above

91-100

**Effective**

10-21

8-13

75-90

**Developing**

3-9

3-7

**65-74**

**Ineffective**

**0-2**

**0-2**

**0-64**

# 11. Additional Requirements - Principals

Created Saturday, December 01, 2012  
Updated Thursday, December 20, 2012

---

## Page 1

### 11.1) Assurances -- Improvement Plans

Please check the boxes below.

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

### 11.2) Attachment: Principal Improvement Plan Forms

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

[assets/survey-uploads/5276/258818-Df0w3Xx5v6/Peru CSD PIP.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:

#### *Appeal Process*

*To the extent that a Principal wishes to issue an appeal, the principal will submit an appeal request form {Appendix F}. All appeals will be timely expeditious and follow the procedures outline in this agreement (A-E and 1-3).*

*A. Appeals will be limited to the following situations:*

a. A Principal completing the first year of a three year probationary appointment may appeal only an ineffective APPR composite rating; any other Principal will be able to appeal an ineffective or developing rating.

B. The scope of any appeal will be limited to the following subjects:

a. The substance of the individual's annual professional performance review;

b. The District's adherence to the standards and methodologies required for such reviews, pursuant to Education Law 3012-c;

c. The adherence to the Commissioner's regulations, as applicable to such reviews:

d. Compliance with any applicable locally negotiated procedures regarding annual professional performance reviews as limited by Section A, above.

e. The entire appeals record will be part of the Principal's APPR.

f. The appeals procedure constitutes the exclusive means for initiating, reviewing, and resolving any and all appeals. A Principal may not resort to any other contractual grievance procedure for the resolution of these appeals, except as otherwise authorized by law.

g. Nothing in the appeals procedure will restrict the right of the district or the obligation of the Principal to proceed in accordance with otherwise standard practice, e.g., implementation of an improvement plan or denial/granting of tenure, while an appeal is pending for statutorily and constitutionally permissible reasons other than the principal's performance that is subject to appeal.

C. A Principal may not file multiple appeals regarding the same performance review. All grounds for appeal must be raised with specificity within one appeal. Any grounds not raised at the time the appeal is filed shall be deemed waived, unless the parties agree that new information may impact the overall appeal.

D. In an appeal, the Principal has the burden of demonstrating a right to relief requested and the burden of establishing the facts upon which petitioner seeks relief.

E. The time line in Levels 1, 2 3 of the appeal process will be strictly adhered to. Failure of the petitioner to meet a timeline will nullify the appeal; failure of the respondent to meet a timeline will allow movement of the appeal to the next level.

#### LEVEL 1- LEAD EVALUATOR (SUPERINTENDENT)

a. (Informal) Following receipt of a Principal's annual evaluation, the Principal is encouraged to immediately schedule a follow up meeting to informally discuss with the Superintendent any and all related issues. If the Principal has additional supporting evidence to share with the Superintendent regarding a particular element(s) of the evaluation, the Principal is encouraged to do so at this level.

b. (Formal) If the Principal chooses to submit a formal appeal {Appendix F}, the Principal may request, in writing, a review by the Superintendent of Schools. The written appeal shall articulate in detail the basis of the appeal to the Superintendent of Schools. Failure to articulate a particular basis for the appeal in the aforesaid appeal writing shall be deemed a waiver of that claim. The evaluated Principal may only challenge the substance, rating and/or adherence to the parties' Annual Professional Performance Review Plan adopted pursuant to 8 NYCRR 30-2 and Education Law 3012-c and the scope listed in B.

Upon receipt of the formal written documentation, the Principal will schedule a meeting for the parties to meet to review and discuss the documentation that is submitted in the written appeal.

Level 1 (a) and (b) shall take place within ten (10) business days, occurring during the school year including summer recess, of the receipt of a Principal's annual evaluation.

c. Ten (10) business days following the issuance of the Principal Evaluation, the Superintendent and Principal will meet to generate a draft Principal Improvement Plan. The plan will be finalized within 5 days and issued to the Principal. If a Principal is challenging the issuance or implementation of a Principal Improvement Plan, the appeal must be submitted in writing within ten (10) business days of the issuance of the plan.

d. When filing an appeal, the Principal must submit a detailed written description of the specific grounds for the appeal of the performance review being challenged. Along with the appeal, all supporting documentation must be submitted, or specifically noted if pending. Any grounds for appeals or any supporting documentation/information not submitted or noted at the time the appeal is filed shall not be considered, unless it is mutually agreed upon by the parties to consider the new documentation/information.

*e. Within ten (10) business days of receipt of an appeal, the Superintendent must submit a detailed written response to the appeal. Along with the response, all supporting documentation must be submitted, or specifically noted if pending, as well as any additional documents or materials relevant to the response. Any supporting documentation/information not submitted or noted at the time the response is issued shall not be considered in deliberations related to the resolution of the appeal. The Principal initiating the appeal, and at the discretion of the Principal the Principal's Association President(s), shall receive copies of the response and any and all additional information submitted with the response.*

#### *LEVEL 2 – PANEL*

*a. Within five (5) business days of receipt of the Level 1 determination, if a Principal is not satisfied with such determination the Principal must submit the appeal to a bipartisan panel comprised of (2) panelists from retired Superintendent or Principal ranks. The individuals chosen will be mutually agreed upon by the Association and the District. The panel will be provided the entire appeals record. These panelists must be trained in the APPR process. The anonymity of the panelists and appellant will be protected to the greatest extent possible.*

*b. Within five (5) business days of receipt of the Level 1 determination of the Principal's appeal, the panel will jointly conduct a paper review and deliberation of the matter, and issue a written recommendation for resolution to the Principal' Association President and the Superintendent of Schools. The recommendation may be to deny the appeal, to sustain the appeal and grant remedy; further reasoning for the recommendation, as well as dissenting opinions, if any, will be final and binding for all appeals on developing ratings. Appeals of ineffective ratings and split decisions on an appeal of developing rating will proceed to level 3 below.*

*c. All costs associated with the panel including expenses will be born equally between the parties.*

#### *LEVEL 3 – SUPERINTENDENT*

*a. Within five (5) business days of receipt of the Level 2 recommendation for resolution, the Superintendent of School will give due consideration to the panel's recommendation and issue a final and binding decision, in writing, to the appellant, to the Principal' Association, and to the panel members. Whether the appeal is denied, sustained, the Superintendent may set aside or modify a rating or improvement plan or order a new evaluation or improvement plan if procedures have been violated. The determination of the Superintendent will be final and shall not be grieved, arbitral, nor reviewable in any other form; however, the failure of either party to abide by the above agreed upon process shall be subject to the grievance procedure.*

*If personal or vacation leave with either party interfere with the timeline of the appeal process, the parties agree to meet and revise this schedule to an alternate agreeable timeline, but in all cases the appeal will be timely and expeditious.*

## 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.

#### *EVALUATOR TRAINING*

*The Peru CSD Superintendent will ensure that all evaluators have been trained and that all lead evaluators have been trained and certified in accordance with regulation. The district will utilize CEWW BOCES Network Team evaluator training and lead evaluator training and certification in accordance with SED procedures and processes. Lead evaluator training will include training on:*

- (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;*
- (4) Application and use of the teacher rubric, including training on the effective application of such rubrics to observe a teacher's practice;*
- (5) Application and use of any assessment tools that the school district or BOCES utilizes to evaluate its classroom teachers, 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 locally selected measures of student achievement used by the district evaluate its teachers;

(7) Use of the Statewide Instructional Reporting System;

(8) The scoring methodology 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 overall rating and their subcomponent ratings; and

(9) Specific considerations in evaluating teachers of English language learners and students with disabilities.

*The Peru CSD Superintendent will ensure that lead evaluators participate in annual training and are re-certified on an annual basis. The CEWW BOCES Network Team will be utilized to provide the training and recertification. Any individual who fails to achieve required training or certification or re-certification, as applicable, shall not conduct or complete evaluations. All Peru CSD administrators have been participating in ongoing inter-rater reliability training as provided by the CEWW BOCES network team and schedules are already in place for continued training throughout the 2012-13 school 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 Thursday, November 29, 2012

Updated Friday, January 04, 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/5581/255632-3Uqgn5g9Iu/JCF Peru CSD 04Jan13.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.

# Peru CSD

HEDI Scoring Bands - State Provided Score **or** Growth SLO (K-12 Staff)\*

HIGHLY EFFECTIVE			EFFECTIVE									DEVELOPING					INEFFECTIVE			
20	19	18	17	16	15	14	<u>13</u>	12	11	10	9	8	7	6	5	4	3	2	1	0
97%+	96-92%	91-85%	84%	83-81%	80-79%	78-76%	75-74%	73-72%	71-69%	68-67%	66-65%	64%	63-62%	61-60%	59-58%	57-56%	55%	54%	53-27%	26-0%

\*Indicates percentage of students achieving growth as measured from Pre to Post-Test target level performance defined in Target Score Scale table (below):

Target Score Scale			
Pre-Test Score	Pre-Test Level	Target Level	Target Score
0 - 54	Level 1	Level 2	55 - 69
55 - 69	Level 2	Level 3	70 - 84
70 - 84	Level 3	Level 4	85 - 100
85 - 100	Level 4	Level 4	85 - 100

# Peru CSD

HEDI Scoring Bands - Local Achievement – Literacy and Numeracy

## **20 Point Scale**

HIGHLY EFFECTIVE			EFFECTIVE									DEVELOPING					INEFFECTIVE			
20	19	18	17	16	15	14	<u>13</u>	12	11	10	9	8	7	6	5	4	3	2	1	0
97%+	96-92%	91-85%	84%	83-81%	80-79%	78-76%	75-74%	73-72%	71-69%	68-67%	66-65%	64%	63-62%	61-60%	59-58%	57-56%	55%	54%	53-27%	26-0%

\*Indicates percentage of students across the District who meet the target performance level on the summative assessment of the nationally normed STAR Early Literacy, STAR Reading, and STAR Math

## **15 Point Scale**

HIGHLY EFFECTIVE		EFFECTIVE						DEVELOPING					INEFFECTIVE		
15	14	13	12	11	10	9	<u>8</u>	7	6	5	4	3	2	1	0
92%+	91-85%	84%	83-80%	79-77%	76-73%	72-69%	68-65%	64%	63-62%	61-59%	68-57%	56-55%	54-50%	49-27%	26-0%

# Peru CSD

HEDI Scoring Bands - Local Achievement – Literacy and Numeracy (Same Score all K-12 Staff)\*

**20 Point Scale**

HIGHLY EFFECTIVE			EFFECTIVE									DEVELOPING					INEFFECTIVE			
20	19	18	17	16	15	14	<u>13</u>	12	11	10	9	8	7	6	5	4	3	2	1	0
97%+	96-92%	91-85%	84%	83-81%	80-79%	78-76%	75-74%	73-72%	71-69%	68-67%	66-65%	64%	63-62%	61-60%	59-58%	57-56%	55%	54%	53-27%	26-0%

\*Indicates percentage of students across the District who meet the target performance level on the summative assessment of the nationally normed STAR Early Literacy, STAR Reading, and STAR Math

# Peru CSD HEDI Scoring

For Other Measures of Effectiveness (60 Points)

*Rubric Score to Sub-Component Conversion Chart*

Total Average Rubric Score	Category	Conversion score for composite
Ineffective 0-49		
1.000		0
1.008		1
1.017		2
1.025		3
1.033		4
1.042		5
1.050		6
1.058		7
1.067		8
1.075		9
1.083		10
1.092		11
1.100		12
1.108		13
1.115		14
1.123		15
1.131		16
1.138		17
1.146		18
1.154		19
1.162		20
1.169		21
1.177		22
1.185		23
1.192		24
1.200		25
1.208		26
1.217		27
1.225		28
1.233		29
1.242		30
1.250		31
1.258		32
1.267		33
1.275		34
1.283		35
1.292		36
1.300		37
1.308		38
1.317		39
1.325		40
1.333		41
1.342		42
1.350		43
1.358		44
1.367		45

1.375		46
1.383		47
1.392		48
1.400		49
<b>Developing 50-56</b>		
1.5		50
1.6		50.7
1.7		51.4
1.8		52.1
1.9		52.8
2		53.5
2.1		54.2
2.2		54.9
2.3		55.6
2.4		56.3
<b>Effective 57-58</b>		
2.5		57
2.6		57.2
2.7		57.4
2.8		57.6
2.9		57.8
3		58
3.1		58.2
3.2		58.4
3.3		58.6
3.4		58.8
<b>Highly Effective 59-60</b>		
3.5		59
3.6		59.3
3.7		59.5
3.8		59.8
3.9		60
4		60.25 (round to 60)

Appendix \_\_\_\_\_

### Peru Central Teacher Improvement Plan (TIP)

The sole purpose of the TIP is the improvement of teaching practice. The goal is to provide resources and support for teachers who have been rated as “developing” or “ineffective”. The evaluator and teacher will jointly determine the strategies to be undertaken to correct the deficiencies.

**Teacher:** \_\_\_\_\_

**Grade/Subject:** \_\_\_\_\_

**Evaluator:** \_\_\_\_\_

**PAT President (or designee):** \_\_\_\_\_

I waive my right to Association Representation

\_\_\_\_\_  
Teacher

\_\_\_\_\_  
PAT Rep

List the area(s) needed improvement. If there are several, indicate the order of priority

Priority	Area needing improvement	Performance goal

**Describe the plan for improvement with specific, measurable objectives, timelines and process the teacher must meet in order to achieve an effective rating.**

**Describe the professional development opportunities, materials, resources and supports the District will make available.**

Assignment of a mentor teacher  Yes  No

Name of Mentor \_\_\_\_\_

The Teacher, evaluator, mentor (if applicable) and Association representative (if requested by the teacher) shall meet to assess the effectiveness and appropriateness of the TIP in assisting the teacher to achieve the goals set forth in the TIP. Based on the outcome of this assessment, the TIP shall be modified accordingly.

Evaluator's Signature: \_\_\_\_\_ Date \_\_\_\_\_

Teacher's Signature: \_\_\_\_\_ Date \_\_\_\_\_

**Peru Central Teacher Improvement Plan Cont...**

**Meeting Notes:**

<p><b>Evaluator Comments:</b></p> <p><b>Teacher Comments:</b></p> <p style="text-align: right;"><b>Meeting Date</b></p>
<p><b>Evaluator Comments:</b></p> <p><b>Teacher Comments:</b></p> <p style="text-align: right;"><b>Meeting Date</b></p>
<p><b>Evaluator Comments:</b></p> <p><b>Teacher Comments:</b></p> <p style="text-align: right;"><b>Meeting Date</b></p>

**Recommendation for Results of TIP**

- Teacher has met the performance goals identified through the TIP.**
- Teacher has not met the performance goals.**

**Next Steps:**

**Evaluator's Signature** \_\_\_\_\_ **Date** \_\_\_\_\_

**Teacher's Signature** \_\_\_\_\_ **Date** \_\_\_\_\_

*Teacher's signature does not constitute agreement but merely signifies he/she has examined and discussed the material with the evaluator. Teacher shall have the right to insert written explanation or response to written feedback of the evaluator within ten (10) school days, which may be considered during the Appeals process.*



# Peru CSD

HEDI Scoring Bands - State Provided Score **or** Growth SLO (K-12 Staff)\*

HIGHLY EFFECTIVE			EFFECTIVE									DEVELOPING					INEFFECTIVE			
20	19	18	17	16	15	14	<u>13</u>	12	11	10	9	8	7	6	5	4	3	2	1	0
97%+	96-92%	91-85%	84%	83-81%	80-79%	78-76%	75-74%	73-72%	71-69%	68-67%	66-65%	64%	63-62%	61-60%	59-58%	57-56%	55%	54%	53-27%	26-0%

\*Indicates percentage of students achieving growth as measured from Pre to Post-Test target level performance defined in Target Score Scale table (below):

Target Score Scale			
Pre-Test Score	Pre-Test Level	Target Level	Target Score
0 - 54	Level 1	Level 2	55 - 69
55 - 69	Level 2	Level 3	70 - 84
70 - 84	Level 3	Level 4	85 - 100
85 - 100	Level 4	Level 4	85 - 100

# Peru CSD

HEDI Scoring Bands - Local Achievement – Literacy and Numeracy

## **20 Point Scale**

HIGHLY EFFECTIVE			EFFECTIVE									DEVELOPING					INEFFECTIVE			
20	19	18	17	16	15	14	<u>13</u>	12	11	10	9	8	7	6	5	4	3	2	1	0
97%+	96-92%	91-85%	84%	83-81%	80-79%	78-76%	75-74%	73-72%	71-69%	68-67%	66-65%	64%	63-62%	61-60%	59-58%	57-56%	55%	54%	53-27%	26-0%

\*Indicates percentage of students across the District who meet the target performance level on the summative assessment of the nationally normed STAR Early Literacy, STAR Reading, and STAR Math

## **15 Point Scale**

HIGHLY EFFECTIVE		EFFECTIVE						DEVELOPING					INEFFECTIVE		
15	14	13	12	11	10	9	<u>8</u>	7	6	5	4	3	2	1	0
92%+	91-85%	84%	83-80%	79-77%	76-73%	72-69%	68-65%	64%	63-62%	61-59%	68-57%	56-55%	54-50%	49-27%	26-0%

# Peru CSD

## Other Measures of Effectiveness Principal Leadership and Management

### Assessment Summary: LCI Multidimensional Rubric

Name of Principal \_\_\_\_\_ School Year \_\_\_\_\_

Domain	Highly Effective	Effective	Developing	Ineffective
Shared Vision and Learning				
School Culture and Instructional Program				
Safe, Efficient, Effective Learning Environment				
Community				
Integrity, Fairness, Ethics				
Political, Social, Economics, Legal and Cultural Context				
Other: Uncovering Goals				
Other: Strategic Planning				
Other: Taking Action				
Other: Evidence Attainment				

**Other: 2 point maximum** (2 of 4 to be completed)

**Overall Rating: will be converted to a 1-4 point scale**

Level	Overall rubric average score	60 point distribution for composite
Ineffective	1-1.4	0-49
Developing	1.5-2.4	50-56
Effective	2.5-3.4	57-58
Highly Effective	3.5-4	59-60

The detailed conversion chart below allows districts to convert any average rubric score to a specific conversion score for that sub-component.

### Rubric Score to Sub-Component Conversion Chart

Total Average Rubric Score	Category	Conversion score for composite
<b>Ineffective 0-49</b>		
1.0		0
1.1		12
1.2		25
1.3		37
1.4		49
<b>Developing 50-56</b>		
1.5		50
1.6		50.7
1.7		51.4
1.8		52.1
1.9		52.8
2		53.5
2.1		54.2
2.2		54.9
2.3		55.6
2.4		56.3
<b>Effective 57-58</b>		
2.5		57
2.6		57.2
2.7		57.4
2.8		57.6
2.9		57.8
3		58
3.1		58.2
3.2		58.4
3.3		58.6
3.4		58.8
<b>Highly Effective 59-60</b>		
3.5		59
3.6		59.3
3.7		59.5
3.8		59.8
3.9		60
4		60.25 (round to 60)

<b>Rubric Performance Levels and Score Scale</b>	
Performance Level	Point ranges negotiated (subject to negotiated revision should NYSED range change)
Highly Effective	59-60
Effective	57-58
Developing	50-56
Ineffective	0-49

## **Peru CSD**

### **PRINCIPAL IMPROVEMENT PLAN (PIP)**

Upon rating a principal as “ineffective” or “developing”, an improvement plan designed to rectify perceived or demonstrated deficiencies must be developed and commenced no later than ten (10) days after the start of a school year. The Superintendent, in cooperation with the Principal, must develop an improvement plan that contains:

1. A clear delineation of the deficiencies that promulgated the ineffective or developing assessment.
2. Specific improvement goal/outcome statements.
3. Specific improvement action steps/activities.
4. A reasonable time line for achieving improvement.
5. Required and accessible resources to achieve the goal.
6. A formative evaluation process documenting meetings strategically scheduled throughout the year to assess progress.
7. A clear manner in which improvement efforts will be assessed, including evidence that demonstrates improvement.
8. A formal, written summative assessment delineating progress made.

# **Peru CSD**

## PRINCIPAL IMPROVEMENT PLAN (PIP)

Name of Principal \_\_\_\_\_

School Building \_\_\_\_\_ Academic Year \_\_\_\_\_

Deficiency that promulgated the “ineffective” or “developing” performance rating:

Improvement Goal/Outcome:

Action Steps/Activities:

Timeline:

Required and Accessible Resources:

Date(s) of formative evaluation:

Evidence of goal achievement:

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

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

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

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

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


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

**Signatures, dates**


Superintendent Signature:      Date:

 6/29/13


Teachers Union President Signature:      Date:

 1/4/13

Administrative Union President Signature:      Date:

 6/7/13

Board of Education President Signature:      Date:

 1/3/13