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

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

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

February 26, 2014

Revised

Mary Fox-Alter, Superintendent
Pleasantville Union Free School District
60 Romer Avenue
Pleasantville, NY 10570

Dear Superintendent Fox-Alter:

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. 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: Harold Coles

NOTE:
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

Created Tuesday, April 30, 2013
Updated Friday, December 06, 2013

1

Disclaimers

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

The Department will not review any attachments other than those required in the online form. Any additional attachments supplied by the school district or BOCES are for informational purposes only for the teachers and principals reviewed under this APPR plan. Statements and/or materials in such additional attachments have not been approved and/or endorsed by the Department. However, the Department considers void any other signed agreements between and among parties in any form that prevent, conflict, or interfere with full implementation of the APPR Plan approved by the Department. The Department also 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 : 660809030000

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

660809030000

1.2) School District Name: PLEASANTVILLE UFSD

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

PLEASANTVILLE UFSD

1.3) Assurances

Please check all of the boxes below:

1.3) 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
1.3) 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

1.3) 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

1.4) Submission Status

For BOCES or charter schools that did not have an approved APPR plan for the 2012-13 school year only, is this a first-time submission, a re-submission, or a submission of material changes to an approved APPR plan? For districts, BOCES or charter schools that did have an approved APPR plan for the 2012-13 school year, this must be listed as a submission of material changes to the approved APPR plan.

Submission of material changes to an approved APPR plan

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

Created Tuesday, April 30, 2013
Updated Sunday, February 09, 2014

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, 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.	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 in the following format: "[Name of your District/Region/BOCES] developed [Grade] [Subject] Assessment." For example, a BOCES-developed 7th grade Social Studies assessment would be written as follows: "GVEP-Developed Grade 7 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	SWBOCES Regionally developed Kindergarten ELA Assessment
1	District, regional, or BOCES-developed assessment	SWBOCES Regionally developed Grade 1 ELA Assessment
2	District, regional, or BOCES-developed assessment	SWBOCES Regionally developed Grade 2 ELA Assessment

	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 measuring student growth on the assessments listed for this Task.

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.	Utilizing student baseline data gathered from a regionally developed pre-assessment and the learning content as outlined in the Common Core and the NYS standards for ELA and the 6 shifts in literacy, the building principal for each teacher of record shall develop a growth target for the class. Points (0-20) shall be earned by each teacher of record based upon the percentage of students belonging to the teacher of record who meet or exceed the growth target when comparing student performance on the baseline assessment to their performance on the summative assessment. See APPR SLO Growth Chart in Section 2.11 for HEDI point earning.
Highly Effective (18 - 20 points) Results are well-above state average for similar students (or District goals if no state test).	86-100% of the students scoring at or above the specific level of acceptable growth. Please see chart labeled APPR SLO Growth

	in Section 2.11.
Effective (9 - 17 points) Results meet state average for similar students (or District goals if no state test).	55-85% of the students scoring at or above the specific level of acceptable growth. Please see chart labeled APPR SLO Growth in Section 2.11.
Developing (3 - 8 points) Results are below state average for similar students (or District goals if no state test).	30-54% of the students scoring at or above the specific level of acceptable growth. Please see chart labeled APPR SLO Growth in Section 2.11.
Ineffective (0 - 2 points) Results are well-below state average for similar students (or District goals if no state test).	0-29% of the students scoring at or above the specific level of acceptable growth. Please see chart labeled APPR SLO Growth in Section 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	SWBOCES Regionally developed Kindergarten Math Assessment
1	District, regional, or BOCES-developed assessment	SWBOCES Regionally developed Grade 1 Math Assessment
2	District, regional, or BOCES-developed assessment	SWBOCES Regionally developed Grade 2 Math Assessment

	Math	Assessment
3	State assessment	3rd Grade State Assessment

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

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.	Utilizing student baseline data gathered from a regionally developed pre-assessment and the learning content as outlined in the Common Core and the NYS standards for Math, the building principal for each teacher of record shall develop a growth target for the class. Points (0-20) shall be earned by each teacher of record based upon the percentage of students belonging to the teacher of record who meet or exceed the growth target when comparing student performance on the baseline assessment to their performance on the summative assessment. See APPR SLO Growth Chart in Section 2.11 for HEDI point earning.
Highly Effective (18 - 20 points) Results are well-above state average for similar students (or District goals if no state test).	86-100% of the students scoring at or above the specific level of acceptable growth. Please see chart labeled APPR SLO Growth in Section 2.11.
Effective (9 - 17 points) Results meet state average for similar students (or District goals if no state test).	55-85% of the students scoring at or above the specific level of acceptable growth. Please see chart labeled APPR SLO Growth in Section 2.11.

Developing (3 - 8 points) Results are below state average for similar students (or District goals if no state test).	30-54% of the students scoring at or above the specific level of acceptable growth. Please see chart labeled APPR SLO Growth in Section 2.11.
Ineffective (0 - 2 points) Results are well-below state average for similar students (or District goals if no state test).	0-29% of the students scoring at or above the specific level of acceptable growth. Please see chart labeled APPR SLO Growth in Section 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	SWBOCES Regionally developed Grade 6 Science Assessment
7	District, regional or BOCES-developed assessment	SWBOCES Regionally developed Grade 7 Science Assessment

	Science	Assessment
8	State assessment	8th Grade State Science Assessment

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

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.	Utilizing student baseline data gathered from NYS and BOCES regionally developed assessments and the learning content as outlined in the Common Core and the NYS science standards, the building principal shall develop a growth target for each teacher of record for the class. Points (0-20) shall be earned by each teacher of record based upon the percentage of students belonging to the teacher of record who meet or exceed the growth target when comparing student performance on the baseline assessment to their performance on the summative assessment. See APPR SLO Growth Chart for HEDI point earning in Section 2.11.
Highly Effective (18 - 20 points) Results are well-above state average for similar students (or District goals if no state test).	86-100% of the students scoring at or above the specific level of acceptable growth. Please see chart labeled APPR SLO Growth in Section 2.11.
Effective (9 - 17 points) Results meet state average for similar students (or District goals if no state test).	55-85% of the students scoring at or above the specific level of acceptable growth. Please see chart labeled APPR SLO Growth in Section 2.11.
Developing (3 - 8 points) Results are below state average for similar students (or District goals if no state test).	30-54% of the students scoring at or above the specific level of acceptable growth. Please see chart labeled APPR SLO Growth in Section 2.11.
Ineffective (0 - 2 points) Results are well-below state average for similar students (or District goals if no state test).	0-29% of the students scoring at or above the specific level of acceptable growth. Please see chart labeled APPR SLO Growth in Section 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	SWBOCES Regionally developed Grade 6 Social Studies Assessment
7	District, regional or BOCES-developed assessment	SWBOCES Regionally developed Grade 7 Social Studies Assessment
8	District, regional or BOCES-developed assessment	Pleasantville UFSD developed Grade 8 Social Studies Assessment

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

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.	Utilizing student baseline data gathered from NYS and District and BOCES regionally developed assessments and the learning content as outlined in the Common Core and the NYS social studies standards, the building principal shall develop a growth target for each teacher of record for the class. Points (0-20) shall be earned by each teacher of record based upon the percentage of students belonging to the teacher of record who meet or exceed the growth target when comparing student performance on the baseline assessment to their performance on the summative assessment. See APPR SLO Growth Chart in Section 2.11 for HEDI point earning.
Highly Effective (18 - 20 points) Results are well-above District goals for similar students.	86-100% of the students scoring at or above the specific level of acceptable growth. Please see chart labeled APPR SLO Growth in Section 2.11.
Effective (9 - 17 points) Results meet District goals for similar students.	55-85% of the students scoring at or above the specific level of acceptable growth. Please see chart labeled APPR SLO Growth in Section 2.11.
Developing (3 - 8 points) Results are below District goals for similar students.	30-54% of the students scoring at or above the specific level of acceptable growth. Please see chart labeled APPR SLO Growth in Section 2.11.
Ineffective (0 - 2 points) Results are well-below District goals for similar students.	0-29% of the students scoring at or above the specific level of acceptable growth. Please see chart labeled APPR SLO Growth in Section 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	School-/BOCES-wide group/team results based on State assessments	NYS Global History and Geography Regents Assessment

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

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

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.	Utilizing student baseline data gathered from NYS Regents Assessments and District developed assessments and the learning content as outlined in the Common Core and the NYS social studies standards, the building principal shall develop a growth target for each teacher of record for the class for the teachers of Global 2 and American History Regents courses. Points (0-20) shall be earned by each Global 2 and American History teacher of record based upon the percentage of students belonging to the teacher of record who meet or exceed the growth target when comparing student performance on the baseline assessment to their performance on the summative assessment. A school-wide score (0-20 points) shall be provided to all Global 1 teachers of record based upon the percentage of students who take the NYS Global History and Geography Regents Assessment that meet or exceed their growth targets on the Global 2 Regents. See APPR SLO Growth Chart in Section 2.11 for HEDI point earning.
Highly Effective (18 - 20 points) Results are well-above District goals for similar students.	86-100% of the students scoring at or above the specific level of acceptable growth. Please see chart labeled APPR SLO Growth in Section 2.11.
Effective (9 - 17 points) Results meet District goals for similar students.	55-85% of the students scoring at or above the specific level of acceptable growth. Please see chart labeled APPR SLO Growth in Section 2.11.
Developing (3 - 8 points) Results are below District goals for similar students.	30-54% of the students scoring at or above the specific level of acceptable growth. Please see chart labeled APPR SLO Growth in Section 2.11.
Ineffective (0 - 2 points) Results are well-below District goals for similar students.	0-29% of the students scoring at or above the specific level of acceptable growth. Please see chart labeled APPR SLO Growth in Section 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	Not applicable	Not applicable

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 measuring student growth on the assessments listed for this Task.

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.	Utilizing student baseline data gathered from NYS Regents Assessments and the learning content as outlined in the Common Core and the NYS science standards, the building principal shall develop a growth target for each teacher of record for the class. Points (0-20) shall be earned by each teacher of record based upon the percentage of students belonging to the teacher of record who meet or exceed the growth target when comparing student performance on the baseline assessment to their performance on the summative assessment. See APPR SLO Growth Chart in Section 2.11 for HEDI point earning. Please note 2.7 Physics Pleasantville does not give the NYS Regents Exam in Physics.
Highly Effective (18 - 20 points) Results are well-above District goals for similar students.	86-100% of the students scoring at or above the specific level of acceptable growth. Please see chart labeled APPR SLO Growth in Section 2.11.
Effective (9 - 17 points) Results meet District goals for similar students.	55-85% of the students scoring at or above the specific level of acceptable growth. Please see chart labeled APPR SLO Growth in Section 2.11.
Developing (3 - 8 points) Results are below District goals for similar students.	30-54% of the students scoring at or above the specific level of acceptable growth. Please see chart labeled APPR SLO Growth in Section 2.11.
Ineffective (0 - 2 points) Results are well-below District goals for similar students.	0-29% of the students scoring at or above the specific level of acceptable growth. Please see chart labeled APPR SLO Growth in Section 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 measuring student growth on the assessments listed for this Task.

NOTE: For Algebra 1, please specify whether your district will be offering the Integrated Algebra Regents, the Common Core Algebra Regents, or both and how the HEDI process will be adjusted accordingly.

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.	Utilizing student baseline data gathered from NYS Regents Assessments and the learning content as outlined in the Common Core and the NYS math standards, the building principal shall develop a growth target for each teacher of record for the class. Points (0-20) shall be earned by each teacher of record based upon the percentage of students belonging to the teacher of record who meet or exceed the growth target when comparing student performance on the baseline assessment to their performance on the summative assessment. See APPR SLO Growth Chart in Section 2.11 for HEDI point earning. Note: Both the NYS Common Core Algebra Regents and the NYS Integrated Algebra Regents will be offered to students enrolled in Common Core classes. The higher of the two scores will be used to determine the teacher of record's HEDI rating in accordance with SED Guidance.
Highly Effective (18 - 20 points) Results are well-above District goals for similar students.	86-100% of the students scoring at or above the specific level of acceptable growth. Please see chart labeled APPR SLO Growth in Section 2.11.
Effective (9 - 17 points) Results meet District goals for similar students.	55-85% of the students scoring at or above the specific level of acceptable growth. Please see chart labeled APPR SLO Growth in Section 2.11.
Developing (3 - 8 points) Results are below District goals for similar students.	30-54% of the students scoring at or above the specific level of acceptable growth. Please see chart labeled APPR SLO Growth in Section 2.11.
Ineffective (0 - 2 points) Results are well-below District goals for similar students.	0-29% of the students scoring at or above the specific level of acceptable growth. Please see chart labeled APPR SLO Growth in Section 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	School-/BOCES-wide group/team results based on State assessments	NYS Comprehensive English Regents Assessment/NYS Common Core English Regents Assessment
Grade 10 ELA	School-/BOCES-wide group/team results based on State assessments	NYS Comprehensive English Regents Assessment/NYS Common Core English Regents Assessment

Grade 11 ELA	Regents assessment	NYS Comprehensive English Regents Assessment/NYS Common Core English Regents Assessment

For High School English Language Arts: describe the district-adopted expectations for the level of performance required for each HEDI rating category and the process for assigning points to teachers based on SLO results consistent with regulations and assurances in the Comparable Growth Measures subcomponent. Include any district-determined expectations for measuring student growth on the assessments listed for this Task.

NOTE: For Grade 11 ELA, please specify whether your district will be offering the Comprehensive English Regents, the Common Core English Regents, or both and how the HEDI process will be adjusted accordingly.

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.	Utilizing student baseline data gathered from NYS Regents Assessments and the learning content as outlined in the Common Core and the NYS ELA standards, the building principal shall develop a growth target for each 11th Grade ELA teacher of record for the class. Points (0-20) shall be earned by each 11th Grade teacher of record based upon the percentage of students belonging to the teacher of record who meet or exceed the growth target when comparing student performance on the baseline assessment to their performance on the summative assessment. A unitary score (0-20 points) shall be provided to all 9th and 10th Grade ELA teachers of record based upon the percentage of 11th Grade students that meet or exceed the school-wide growth target on the NYS Comprehensive English Regents Assessment and/or the NYS Common Core English Regents Assessment. See APPR SLO Growth Chart in Section 2.11 for HEDI point earning. Note: Both the NYS Common Core English Regents and the NYS Comprehensive English Regents will be offered to students enrolled in Common Core classes. The higher of the two scores will be used to determine the teacher of record's HEDI rating in accordance with SED Guidance.
Highly Effective (18 - 20 points) Results are well-above District goals for similar students.	86-100% of the students scoring at or above the specific level of acceptable growth. Please see chart labeled APPR SLO Growth in Section 2.11.
Effective (9 - 17 points) Results meet District goals for similar students.	55-85% of the students scoring at or above the specific level of acceptable growth. Please see chart labeled APPR SLO Growth in Section 2.11.
Developing (3 - 8 points) Results are below District goals for similar students.	30-54% of the students scoring at or above the specific level of acceptable growth. Please see chart labeled APPR SLO Growth in Section 2.11.
Ineffective (0 - 2 points) Results are well-below District goals for similar students.	0-29% of the students scoring at or above the specific level of acceptable growth. Please see chart labeled APPR SLO Growth in Section 2.11.

2.10) All Other Courses

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

Course(s) or Subject(s)	Option	Assessment

	Non-Regents English	School/BOCES-wide/group/team results based on State	NYS Comprehensive English Regents Assessment/NYS Common Core English Regents Assessment
	Non-Regents Science	School/BOCES-wide/group/team results based on State	NYS Living Environment Regents Assessment
	Non-Regents Math	School/BOCES-wide/group/team results based on State	NYS Comprehensive English Regents Assessment/NYS Common Core English Regents Assessment
	Non-Regents Social Studies	School/BOCES-wide/group/team results based on State	NYS American History Regents Assessment
	All other Grades 9-12 courses/subjects not listed above	School/BOCES-wide/group/team results based on State	NYS Comprehensive English Regents Assessment/NYS Common Core English Regents Assessment
	All other Grades 5-8 courses/subjects not listed above	School/BOCES-wide/group/team results based on State	Grade 8 ELA NYS Assessment
	All other Grades K-4 courses/subjects not listed above	School/BOCES-wide/group/team results based on State	Grade 4 ELA NYS Assessment
	LOTE Classes	District, Regional or BOCES-developed	Westchster regionally developed FLACS course and/or grade specific assessments

For all other courses, as applicable: describe the district-adopted expectations for the level of performance required for each HEDI rating category and the process for assigning points to teachers based on SLO results consistent with regulations and assurances in the Comparable Growth Measures subcomponent. Include any district-determined expectations for measuring student growth on the assessments listed for this Task.

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.	For all other Grades K-4 teachers of record, using student's prior academic history, the building principal will set a school-wide growth target for students taking the Grade 4 NYS ELA Assessment. Based upon the percentage of students who meet or exceed the school-wide growth target, points (0-20) shall be allocated to all other Grades K-4 teachers of record. For all other Grades 5-8 teachers of record, using student's prior academic history, the building principal will set a school-wide growth target for students taking the Grade 8 NYS ELA Assessment. Based upon the percentage of students who meet or exceed the school wide growth target, points (0-20) shall be allocated to all other Grades 5-8 teachers of record. For all non-Regents English and non-Regents Math teachers of record and any other Grades 9-12 teacher not specifically delineated in the paragraph below (related arts, physical education, etc.), using student's prior academic history, the building principal will set a school-wide growth target for students taking the NYS Comprehensive English Regents Assessment and/or the NYS Common Core English Regents Assessment. Based upon the percentage of students who meet or exceed the school wide growth target, points (0-20) shall be allocated to all other Grades 9-12 teachers not covered in the paragraph below and non-Regents English and non-Regents Math teachers of record. Note: Both the NYS Common Core English Regents and the

	NYS Comprehensive English Regents will be offered to students enrolled in Common Core courses. The higher of the two scores will be used to determine the school wide HEDI rating for these teachers in accordance with SED Guidance. For all Grades 9-12 non-Regents Science, and non-Regents Social Studies, using student's prior academic history, the building principal will set a school-wide growth target for students taking the Living Environment and American History Regents examinations. Based upon the percentage of students who meet or exceed the school-wide growth target, points (0-20) shall be allocated to each respective group of teachers record delineated in this paragraph based upon the assessments aligned to their curricular areas. For all LOTE teachers of record, utilizing student baseline data gathered from language-specific pre-assessments based upon prior year's language proficiency examinations and the learning content as outlined the NYS standards for LOTE, the building principal for each teacher of record shall develop a growth target for the class. Points (0-20) shall be earned by each teacher of record based upon the percentage of students belonging to the teacher of record who meet or exceed the growth target when comparing student performance on the baseline assessment to their performance on the summative assessment. See APPR SLO Growth Chart in Section 2.11 for HEDI point earnings for all cohorts of teachers set forth above.
Highly Effective (18 - 20 points) Results are well-above District goals for similar students.	86-100% of the students scoring at or above the specific level of acceptable growth. Please see chart labeled APPR SLO Growth in Section 2.11.
Effective (9 - 17 points) Results meet District goals for similar students.	55-85% of the students scoring at or above the specific level of acceptable growth. Please see chart labeled APPR SLO Growth in Section 2.11.
Developing (3 - 8 points) Results are below District goals for similar students.	30-54% of the students scoring at or above the specific level of acceptable growth. Please see chart labeled APPR SLO Growth in Section 2.11.
Ineffective (0 - 2 points) Results are well-below District goals for similar students.	0-29% of the students scoring at or above the specific level of acceptable growth. Please see chart labeled APPR SLO Growth in Section 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/12186/573508-TXEtxx9bQW/18582893-APPR SLO Growth Charts.pdf

2.12) Locally Developed Controls

Describe any adjustments, controls, or other special considerations that will be used assigning points to a teacher's score for this subcomponent, 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 the following: student prior academic history, students with disabilities, English language learners, and students in poverty.

none

2.13) Teachers with more than one growth measure

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

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

2.14) Assurances

Please check all of the boxes below:

2.14) Assurances | Assure the application of locally developed controls will be rigorous, fair, and transparent and only those used for State Growth will be used for Comparable Growth Measures.	Checked
2.14) Assurances | Assure that use of locally developed controls will not have a disparate impact on underrepresented students in accordance with applicable civil rights laws.	Checked
2.14) Assurances | Assure that enrolled students in accordance with teacher of record policies are included and may not be excluded.	Checked
2.14) Assurances | Assure that procedures for ensuring data accuracy and integrity are being utilized.	Checked
2.14) Assurances | Assure that district will develop SLOs according to the rules established by SED (see: http://www.engageny.org/resource/student-learning-objectives-guidance-document).	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 Tuesday, April 30, 2013
Updated Sunday, February 09, 2014

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. Additionally, please provide a brief explanation in the HEDI general description box of why you have listed the grade/course as “Not Applicable” (e.g., district/BOCES does not offer this grade/subject; common branch teacher).

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 in the following format: “[Name of your District/Region/BOCES] developed [Grade] [Subject] Assessment.” For example, a BOCES-developed 7th grade Social Studies assessment would be written as follows: “GVEP-Developed Grade 7 Social Studies Assessment.”

NOTE: If your district/BOCES is using the same assessment for both the State growth and other comparable measures subcomponent and the locally-selected measures subcomponent, be sure that a *different* measure of student performance is being used with the assessment (e.g., achievement rather than growth; growth measured in a different manner).

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 measure that will be used as the locally-selected measure of student achievement. Then name the specific assessment that will be used with the locally-selected measure, listing the full name of the assessment.

	Locally-Selected Measure from List of Approved Measures	Assessment
4	6(ii) School wide measure computed locally	AIMSWEB
5	6(ii) School wide measure computed locally	AIMSWEB
6	6(ii) School wide measure computed locally	Pleasantville UFSD developed 8th Grade ELA Assessment
7	6(ii) School wide measure computed locally	Pleasantville UFSD developed 8th Grade ELA Assessment

8	6(ii) School wide measure computed locally	Pleasantville UFSD developed 8th Grade ELA Assessment

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

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

Use this box, if needed, to describe the general process for assigning HEDI categories for these grades/subjects in this subcomponent. If needed, you may upload a table or graphic at 3.3, below.	The parties agree to administer AIMSWEB to all students in Grades 4 and 5 as a grade level measure of student achievement for Grades 4 and 5 ELA teachers of record, respectively. Points shall be assigned (0-15) based upon the school-wide percentage of students that score at or above the national mean on AIMSWEB, in the respective Grade Levels of instruction (see the Table in Section 3.3). Until a value-added growth measure is implemented, the Table set forth in section 3.13 shall be used to allocate points (0-20) for Grades 4 and 5 ELA teachers. For the 6th, 7th and 8th Grade ELA teachers of record, the parties agree to use a building wide measure based upon student achievement of all 8th Grade students on a locally developed 8th Grade ELA Assessment aligned with the Common Core. Annually, an achievement target shall be established, based upon analysis of data from prior school years by Grade 6-8 ELA teachers of record, subject to building principal approval, and points shall be allocated (0-15) based upon the school-wide percentage of 8th Grade students who meet the achievement target (see the Table in Section 3.3). Until a value-added growth measure is implemented, the Table set forth in section 3.13 shall be used to allocate points (0-20) for Grades 6-8 ELA teachers of record.
Highly Effective (14 - 15 points) Results are well above District- or BOCES-adopted expectations for growth or achievement for grade/subject.	Grades 4 and 5 teachers: 84-100% of students score at or above the national mean on AIMSWEB. Grades 6-8 teachers: 84-100% of 8th Grade students meet or exceed the achievement target. See Table in Section 3.3.
Effective (8- 13 points) Results meet District- or BOCES-adopted expectations for growth or achievement for grade/subject.	Grades 4 and 5 teachers: 50-83% of students score at or above the national mean on AIMSWEB. Grades 6-8 teachers: 50-83% of 8th Grade students meet or exceed the achievement target. See Table in Section 3.3.
Developing (3 - 7 points) Results are below District- or BOCES-adopted expectations for growth or achievement for grade/subject.	Grades 4 and 5 teachers: 24-49% of students score at or above the national mean on AIMSWEB. Grades 6-8 teachers: 24-49% of 8th Grade students meet or exceed the achievement target. See Table in Section 3.3.

Ineffective (0 - 2 points) Results are well below District- or BOCES-adopted expectations for growth or achievement for grade/subject.	Grades 4 and 5 teachers: 0-23% of students score at or above the national mean on AIMSWEB. Grades 6-8 teachers: 0-23% of 8th Grade students meet or exceed the achievement target. See Table in Section 3.3.

3.2) Grades 4-8 Math

Using the drop-down boxes below, select the measure that will be used as the locally-selected measure of student achievement. Then name the specific assessment that will be used with the locally-selected measure, listing the full name of the assessment.

	Locally-Selected Measure from List of Approved Measures	Assessment
4	6(ii) School wide measure computed locally	AIMSWEB
5	6(ii) School wide measure computed locally	AIMSWEB
6	6(ii) School wide measure computed locally	Pleasantville UFSD developed 8th Grade Math Assessment
7	6(ii) School wide measure computed locally	Pleasantville UFSD developed 8th Grade Math Assessment
8	6(ii) School wide measure computed locally	Pleasantville UFSD developed 8th Grade Math Assessment

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

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

Use this box, if needed, to describe the general process for assigning HEDI categories for these grades/subjects in this subcomponent. If needed, you may upload a table or graphic at 3.3, below.	The parties agree to administer AIMSWEB to all students in Grades 4 and 5 as a grade level measure of student achievement for Grades 4 and 5 Math teachers of record, respectively. Points shall be assigned (0-15) based upon the school-wide percentage of students that score at or above the national mean on AIMSWEB, in the respective Grade Levels of instruction (see the Table in Section 3.3). Until a value-added growth measure is implemented, the Table set forth in section 3.13 shall be used to allocate points (0-20) for Grades 4 and 5 Math teachers. For the 6th, 7th and 8th Grade Math teachers of record, the parties agree to use a building wide measure based upon student achievement of all 8th Grade students on a locally developed 8th Grade Math Assessment aligned with the Common Core. Annually, an achievement target shall be established, based upon analysis of data from prior school years by Grade 6-8 Math teachers of record, subject to building principal approval, and points shall be allocated (0-15) based upon the school-wide percentage of 8th Grade students who meet the achievement target (see the Table in Section 3.3). Until a value-added growth measure is implemented, the Table set forth in section 3.13 shall

	be used to allocate points (0-20) for Grades 6-8 Math teachers of record.
Highly Effective (14 - 15 points) Results are well above District- or BOCES-adopted expectations for growth or achievement for grade/subject.	Grades 4 and 5 teachers: 84-100% of students score at or above the national mean on AIMSWEB. Grades 6-8 teachers: 84-100% of 8th Grade students meet or exceed the achievement target. See Table in Section 3.3.
Effective (8- 13 points) Results meet District- or BOCES-adopted expectations for growth or achievement for grade/subject.	Grades 4 and 5 teachers: 50-83% of students score at or above the national mean on AIMSWEB. Grades 6-8 teachers: 50-83% of 8th Grade students meet or exceed the achievement target. See Table in Section 3.3.
Developing (3 - 7 points) Results are below District- or BOCES-adopted expectations for growth or achievement for grade/subject.	Grades 4 and 5 teachers: 24-49% of students score at or above the national mean on AIMSWEB. Grades 6-8 teachers: 24-49% of 8th Grade students meet or exceed the achievement target. See Table in Section 3.3.
Ineffective (0 - 2 points) Results are well below District- or BOCES-adopted expectations for growth or achievement for grade/subject.	Grades 4 and 5 teachers: 0-23% of students score at or above the national mean on AIMSWEB. Grades 6-8 teachers: 0-23% of 8th Grade students meet or exceed the achievement target. See Table in Section 3.3.

3.3) HEDI Tables or Graphics

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

assets/survey-uploads/12149/573509-rhJdBgDruP/18582688-Local 15 Point Measure of Student Achievement for Section 3.3 1.8.14.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 measure that will be used as the locally-selected measure of student achievement. Then name the specific assessment that will be used with the locally-selected measure, listing the full name of the assessment.

	Locally-Selected Measure from List of Approved Measures	Assessment
K	6(ii) School-wide measure computed locally	AIMSWEB
1	6(ii) School-wide measure computed locally	AIMSWEB
2	6(ii) School-wide measure computed locally	AIMSWEB
3	6(ii) School-wide measure computed locally	AIMSWEB

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 parties agree to administer AIMSWEB to all students in Grades K, 1, 2 and 3 as a grade level measure of student achievement for Grades K, 1, 2 and 3 ELA teachers of record, respectively. Points shall be assigned (0-20) based upon the school-wide percentage of students that score at or above the national mean on AIMSWEB, in the respective Grade Levels of instruction (see the Table in Section 3.13).
Highly Effective (18-20 points) Results are well above District- or BOCES-adopted expectations for growth or achievement for grade/subject.	84-100% of students score at or above the national mean on AIMSWEB (by grade level) - See Table in Section 3.13.
Effective (9-17 points) Results meet District- or BOCES-adopted expectations for growth or achievement for grade/subject.	50-83% of students score at or above the national mean on AIMSWEB (by grade level) - See Table in Section 3.13.
Developing (3 - 8 points) Results are below District- or BOCES-adopted expectations for growth or achievement for grade/subject.	24-49% of students score at or above the national mean on AIMSWEB (by grade level) - See Table in Section 3.13.
Ineffective (0 - 2 points) Results are well below District- or BOCES-adopted expectations for growth or achievement for grade/subject.	0-23% of students score at or above the national mean on AIMSWEB (by grade level) - See Table in Section 3.13.

3.5) Grades K-3 Math

Using the drop-down boxes below, select the measure that will be used as the locally-selected measure of student achievement. Then name the specific assessment that will be used with the locally-selected measure, listing the full name of the assessment.

	Locally-Selected Measure from List of Approved Measures	Assessment
K	6(ii) School-wide measure computed locally	AIMSWEB
1	6(ii) School-wide measure computed locally	AIMSWEB
2	6(ii) School-wide measure computed locally	AIMSWEB
3	6(ii) School-wide measure computed locally	AIMSWEB

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 parties agree to administer AIMSWEB to all students in Grades K, 1, 2 and 3 as a grade level measure of student achievement for Grades K, 1, 2 and 3 Math teachers of record, respectively. Points shall be assigned (0-20) based upon the school-wide percentage of students that score at or above the national mean on AIMSWEB, in the respective Grade Levels of instruction (see the Table in Section 3.13).

Highly Effective (18-20 points) Results are well above District- or BOCES-adopted expectations for growth or achievement for grade/subject.	84-100% of students score at or above the national mean on AIMSWEB (by grade level) - See Table in Section 3.13.
Effective (9-17 points) Results meet District- or BOCES-adopted expectations for growth or achievement for grade/subject.	50-83% of students score at or above the national mean on AIMSWEB (by grade level) - See Table in Section 3.13.
Developing (3 - 8 points) Results are below District -or BOCES-adopted expectations for growth or achievement for grade/subject.	24-49% of students score at or above the national mean on AIMSWEB (by grade level) - See Table in Section 3.13.
Ineffective (0 - 2 points) Results are well below District- or BOCES-adopted expectations for growth or achievement for grade/subject.	0-23% of students score at or above the national mean on AIMSWEB (by grade level) - See Table in Section 3.13.

3.6) Grades 6-8 Science

Using the drop-down boxes below, select the measure that will be used as the locally-selected measure of student achievement. Then name the specific assessment that will be used with the locally-selected measure, listing the full name of the assessment.

	Locally-Selected Measure from List of Approved Measures	Assessment
6	6(ii) School wide measure computed locally	NYS Grade 8 Science Test
7	6(ii) School wide measure computed locally	NYS Grade 8 Science Test
8	6(ii) School wide measure computed locally	NYS Grade 8 Science Test

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 6th through 8th Grade Science teachers of record shall receive a unitary achievement score based upon the school-wide percentage of students scoring at or above proficiency (a 3 or higher) on the 8th Grade Science State Assessment. Points (0-20) shall be assigned in accordance with the Table set forth in Section 3.13.
Highly Effective (18 - 20 points) Results are well above District- or BOCES-adopted expectations for growth or achievement for grade/subject.	84 -100% of students meet or exceed the achievement target (a 3 or higher). See the Table in Section 3.13.
Effective (9 - 17 points) Results meet District- or BOCES-adopted expectations for growth or achievement for grade/subject.	50-83% of students meet or exceed the achievement target (a 3 or higher). See the Table in Section 3.13.
Developing (3 - 8 points) Results are below District- or BOCES-adopted expectations for growth or achievement for grade/subject.	24-49% of students meet or exceed the achievement target (a 3 or higher). See the Table in Section 3.13.
Ineffective (0 - 2 points) Results are well below District- or BOCES-adopted expectations for growth or achievement for grade/subject.	0-23% of students meet or exceed the achievement target (a 3 or higher). See the Table in Section 3.13.

3.7) Grades 6-8 Social Studies

Using the drop-down boxes below, select the measure that will be used as the locally-selected measure of student achievement. Then name the specific assessment that will be used with the locally-selected measure, listing the full name of the assessment.

	Locally-Selected Measure from List of Approved Measures	Assessment
6	6(ii) School wide measure computed locally	Pleasantville UFSD developed Grade 8 Social Studies Assessment
7	6(ii) School wide measure computed locally	Pleasantville UFSD developed Grade 8 Social Studies Assessment
8	6(ii) School wide measure computed locally	Pleasantville UFSD developed Grade 8 Social Studies Assessment

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

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

Use this box, if needed, to describe the general process for assigning HEDI categories for these grades/subjects in this subcomponent. If needed, you may upload a table or graphic at 3.13, below.	For 6th, 7th and 8th Grade Social Studies teachers of record, the parties agree to use a building wide measure based upon student achievement of all 8th Grade students on a District developed 8th Grade Social Studies Assessment aligned with the Common Core. Annually, an achievement target shall be established, based upon analysis of data from prior school years by Grade 6-8 Social Studies teachers of record, subject to building principal approval. Points (0-20) shall be assigned based upon the school-wide percentage of students who meet or exceed the achievement target in accordance in accordance with the Table set forth in Section 3.13.
Highly Effective (18 - 20 points) Results are well above District- or BOCES-adopted expectations for growth or achievement for grade/subject.	84 -100% of students meet or exceed the achievement target. See the Table in Section 3.13.
Effective (9 - 17 points) Results meet District- or BOCES-adopted expectations for growth or achievement for grade/subject.	50-83% of students meet or exceed the achievement target. See the Table in Section 3.13.
Developing (3 - 8 points) Results are below District- or BOCES-adopted expectations for growth or achievement for grade/subject.	24-49% of students meet or exceed the achievement target. See the Table in Section 3.13.
Ineffective (0 - 2 points) Results are well below District- or BOCES-adopted expectations for growth or achievement for grade/subject.	0-23% of students meet or exceed the achievement target. See the Table in Section 3.13.

3.8) High School Social Studies

Using the drop-down boxes below, select the measure that will be used as the locally-selected measure of student achievement. Then name the specific assessment that will be used with the locally-selected measure, listing the full name of the assessment.

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

	Locally-Selected Measure from List of Approved Measures	Assessment

Global 1	5) District, regional, or BOCES–developed assessments	Pleasantville UFSD developed Global 1 Assessment
Global 2	3) Teacher specific achievement or growth score computed locally	NYS Global History and Geography Regents Assessments
American History	3) Teacher specific achievement or growth score computed locally	NYS American History Regents

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

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

Use this box, if needed, to describe the general process for assigning HEDI categories for these grades/subjects in this subcomponent. If needed, you may upload a table or graphic at 3.13, below.	For Global 1 teachers of record, student achievement shall be measured based upon the performance of the students belonging to the teacher of record on a District developed Global 1 final summative assessment. Annually, an achievement target shall be established, based upon analysis of data from prior school years by each Global 1 teacher of record, subject to building principal approval. Points (0-20) shall be assigned based upon the percentage of students who meet or exceed the achievement target in accordance in accordance with the Table set forth in Section 3.13. For Global 2 and American History teachers of record, student achievement shall be measured based upon the percentage of students belonging to each teacher of record who receive scores at or above 65 on the respective Regents Examinations. Points (0-20) shall be assigned based upon the percentage of students who meet or exceed the achievement target (a 65 or higher) in accordance in accordance with the Table set forth in Section 3.13.
Highly Effective (18 - 20 points) Results are well above District- or BOCES-adopted expectations for growth or achievement for grade/subject.	Global 1 teachers: 84-100% of students meet or exceed the achievement target. Global 2 and American History teachers: 84-100% of students meet or exceed the achievement target of 65. See Table in Section 3.13.
Effective (9 - 17 points) Results meet District- or BOCES-adopted expectations for growth or achievement for grade/subject.	Global 1 teachers: 50-83% of students meet or exceed the achievement target. Global 2 and American History teachers: 50-83% of students meet or exceed the achievement target of 65. See Table in Section 3.13.
Developing (3 - 8 points) Results are below District- or BOCES-adopted expectations for growth or achievement for grade/subject.	Global 1 teachers: 24-49% of students meet or exceed the achievement target. Global 2 and American History teachers: 24-49% of students meet or exceed the achievement target of 65. See Table in Section 3.13.

Ineffective (0 - 2 points) Results are well below District- or BOCES-adopted expectations for growth or achievement for grade/subject.	Global 1 teachers: 0-23% of students meet or exceed the achievement target. Global 2 and American History teachers: 0-23% of students meet or exceed the achievement target of 65. See Table in Section 3.13.

3.9) High School Science

Using the drop-down boxes below, select the measure that will be used as the locally-selected measure of student achievement. Then name the specific assessment that will be used with the locally-selected measure, 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	3) Teacher specific achievement or growth score computed locally	NYS Living Environment Regents
Earth Science	3) Teacher specific achievement or growth score computed locally	NYS Earth Science Regents
Chemistry	3) Teacher specific achievement or growth score computed locally	NYS Chemistry Regents
Physics	Not applicable	Pleasantville Does not offer the Physics Regents

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

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

Use this box, if needed, to describe the general process for assigning HEDI categories for these grades/subjects in this subcomponent. If needed, you may upload a table or graphic at 3.13, below.	For Science teachers of record whose courses end in a Regents assessment, student achievement shall be measured based upon the percentage of students belonging to each teacher of record who receive scores at or above 65 on the respective Regents Examinations. Points (0-20) shall be assigned based upon the percentage of students who meet or exceed the achievement target (a 65 or higher) in accordance in accordance with the Table set forth in Section 3.13.
Highly Effective (18-20 points) Results are well above District- or BOCES-adopted expectations for growth or achievement for grade/subject.	84-100% of students meet or exceed the achievement target of 65. . See Table in Section 3.13.
Developing (3 - 8 points) Results are below District- or BOCES-adopted expectations for growth or achievement for grade/subject.	50-83% of students meet or exceed the achievement target of 65. See Table in Section 3.13.
Effective (9 - 17points) Results meet District- or BOCES-adopted expectations for growth or achievement for	24-49% of students meet or exceed the achievement target of 65. See Table in Section 3.13.

grade/subject.	
Ineffective (0 - 2 points) Results are well below District- or BOCES-adopted expectations for growth or achievement for grade/subject.	0-23% of students meet or exceed the achievement target of 65. See Table in Section 3.13.

3.10) High School Math

Using the drop-down boxes below, select the measure that will be used as the locally-selected measure of student achievement. Then name the specific assessment that will be used with the locally-selected measure, 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	3) Teacher specific achievement or growth score computed locally	NYS Integrated Algebra Regents/NYS Common Core Algebra Regents
Geometry	3) Teacher specific achievement or growth score computed locally	NYS Geometry Regents
Algebra 2	3) Teacher specific achievement or growth score computed locally	NYS Algebra 2/Trig Regents

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.

NOTE: As applicable, please specify whether your district will be offering the Integrated Algebra Regents, the Common Core Algebra Regents, or both and how the HEDI process will be adjusted accordingly.

Use this box, if needed, to describe the general process for assigning HEDI categories for these grades/subjects in this subcomponent. If needed, you may upload a table or graphic at 3.13, below.	For High School Math teachers, student achievement shall be measured based upon the percentage of students belonging to each teacher of record who receive scores at or above 65 on the respective Math Regents Examinations. Points (0-20) shall be assigned based upon the percentage of students who meet or exceed the achievement target (a 65 or higher) in accordance in accordance with the Table set forth in Section 3.13. Note: Both the Common Core Algebra Regents and the NYS Integrated Algebra Regents will be offered to students enrolled in Common Core courses. The higher of the two scores will be used to determine the teacher of record's HEDI rating in accordance with SED Guidance.
Highly Effective (18 - 20 points) Results are well above District- or BOCES-adopted expectations for growth or achievement for grade/subject.	84-100% of students meet or exceed the achievement target of 65. See Table in Section 3.13.

Effective (9 - 17 points) Results meet District- or BOCES-adopted expectations for growth or achievement for grade/subject.	50-83% of students meet or exceed the achievement target of 65. See Table in Section 3.13.
Developing (3 - 8 points) Results are below District- or BOCES-adopted expectations for growth or achievement for grade/subject.	24-49% of students meet or exceed the achievement target of 65. See Table in Section 3.13.
Ineffective (0 - 2 points) Results are well below District- or BOCES-adopted expectations for growth or achievement for grade/subject.	0-23% of students meet or exceed the achievement target of 65. See Table in Section 3.13.

3.11) High School English Language Arts

Using the drop-down boxes below, select the measure that will be used as the locally-selected measure of student achievement. Then name the specific assessment that will be used with the locally-selected measure, listing the full name of the assessment.

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

	Locally-Selected Measure from List of Approved Measures	Assessment
Grade 9 ELA	5) District, regional, or BOCES–developed assessments	Pleasantville UFSD developed Grade 9 ELA Assessment
Grade 10 ELA	5) District, regional, or BOCES–developed assessments	Pleasantville UFSD developed Grade 10 ELA Assessment
Grade 11 ELA	3) Teacher specific achievement or growth score computed locally	NYS Comprehensive English Regents/NYS Common Core English Regents

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

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

NOTE: As applicable, please specify whether your district will be offering the Comprehensive English Regents, the Common Core English Regents, or both and how the HEDI process will be adjusted accordingly.

Use this box, if needed, to describe the general process for assigning HEDI categories for these grades/subjects in this subcomponent. If needed, you may upload a table or graphic at 3.13, below.	For Grades 9 and 10 ELA teachers of record, student achievement shall be measured based upon the performance of the students belonging to each teacher of record on a District developed final summative Grade level specific ELA assessment. Annually, an achievement target shall be established, based upon analysis of data from prior school years by each Grade 9 and 10 ELA teacher of record, subject to building principal approval. Points (0-20) shall be assigned based upon the percentage of students who meet or exceed the achievement target in accordance in accordance with the Table set forth in Section 3.13.

	For Grade 11 ELA teachers of record, student achievement shall be measured based upon the percentage of students belonging to each teacher of record who receive scores at or above 65 on the on the NYS Comprehensive English Regents Assessment and/or the NYS Common Core English Regents Assessment. Points (0-20) shall be assigned based upon the percentage of students who meet or exceed the achievement target (a 65 or higher) in accordance in accordance with the Table set forth in Section 3.13. Note: Both the NYS Common Core English Regents and the NYS Comprehensive English Regents will be offered to students enrolled in Common Core courses. The higher of the two scores will be used to determine the teacher of record's HEDI rating in accordance with SED Guidance.
Highly Effective (18 - 20 points) Results are well above District- or BOCES-adopted expectations for growth or achievement for grade/subject.	Grades 9 and 10 ELA teachers: 84-100% of students meet or exceed the achievement target. Grade 11 ELA teachers: 84-100% of students meet or exceed the achievement target of 65. See Table in Section 3.13.
Effective (9 - 17 points) Results meet District- or BOCES-adopted expectations for growth or achievement for grade/subject.	Grades 9 and 10 ELA teachers: 50-83% of students meet or exceed the achievement target. Grade 11 ELA teachers: 50-83% of students meet or exceed the achievement target of 65. See Table in Section 3.13.
Developing (3 - 8 points) Results are below District- or BOCES-adopted expectations for growth or achievement for grade/subject.	Grades 9 and 10 ELA teachers: 24-49% of students meet or exceed the achievement target. Grade 11 ELA teachers: 24-49% of students meet or exceed the achievement target of 65. See Table in Section 3.13.
Ineffective (0 - 2 points) Results are well below District- or BOCES-adopted expectations for growth or achievement for grade/subject.	Grades 9 and 10 ELA teachers: 0-23% of students meet or exceed the achievement target. Grade 11 ELA teachers: 0-23% of students meet or exceed the achievement target of 65. See Table in Section 3.13.

3.12) All Other Courses

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

Course(s) or Subject(s)	Locally-Selected Measure from List of Approved Measures	Assessment
Grades K-5 Special Education	6(ii) School wide measure computed locally	AIMSWEB
Math Skills	6(ii) School wide measure computed locally	AIMSWEB

Grades 3-4 Science	6(ii) School wide measure computed locally	AIMSWEB
5th Grade Science	6(ii) School wide measure computed locally	NYS Grade 8 Science Test
Grades K-4 Art, Music, Library and Physical Education	6(ii) School wide measure computed locally	Pleasantville UFSD developed 4th Grade course specific Department Assessment
STEM	6(ii) School wide measure computed locally	Pleasantville UFSD developed 8th Grade Math Assessment
6-8 Grade Special Education, 5-8 Grade ELA Skills/Resource Room and Grades 5-8 ELL/Special Education	6(ii) School wide measure computed locally	Pleasantville UFSD developed 8th Grade ELA Assessment
6-8 Grade LOTE	6(ii) School wide measure computed locally	Westchester regionally developed 8th Grade course specific FLACS Assessment
Grades 5-8 Art, Music, Health, Library and Physical Education	6(ii) School wide measure computed locally	Pleasantville UFSD developed 8th Grade course specific Department Assessment
Home Skills	6(ii) School wide measure computed locally	Pleasantville UFSD developed 7th Grade Home Skills Assessment
All other non-Regents High School Courses	5) District/regional/BOCES–developed	Pleasantville UFSD developed course specific Assessment

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

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

Use this box, if needed, to describe the general process for assigning HEDI categories for these grades/subjects in this subcomponent. If needed, you may upload a table or graphic at 3.13, below.	Grades K-5 Special Education teachers: The parties agree to administer AIMSWEB to all students in Grades K, 1, 2, 3, 4 and 5 as a grade level measure of student achievement for Grades K-5 Special Education teachers of record, respectively. Points shall be assigned (0-20) based upon the school-wide percentage of students that score at or above the national mean on AIMSWEB, in the respective Grade Levels of instruction (see the Table in Section 3.13). Grades 2-4 Math Skills teacher: For the Grades 2-4 Math Skills teacher of record, there shall be an achievement score based upon the percentage of all students in Grades 2-4 who score at or above the national mean on AIMSWEB. Points shall be assigned - based upon a school wide measure - (0-20) in accordance with the Table set forth in Section 3.13. 3rd and 4th Grade Science teacher: The 3rd and 4th Grade Science teacher of record shall receive an achievement score based upon the percentage of students in Grades 3 and 4 who score at or above the national mean on

AIMSWEB. Points shall be assigned (0-20) based upon a school wide measure in accordance with the Table set forth in Section 3.13.

5th Grade Science teacher:
The 5th Grade Science teachers of record shall receive a building wide achievement score based upon the percentage of students scoring at or above proficiency (a 3 or higher) on the 8th Grade Science State Assessment. Points (0-20) shall be assigned in accordance with the Table set forth in Section 3.13.

Grades K-4 Art, Music, Library and Physical Education:
For Grades K-4 Art, Music, Library and Physical Education, a score shall be received by each teacher of record based upon the achievement of all 4th Grade students on a course-specific locally developed final summative assessment. Annually, an achievement target shall be established, based upon analysis of data from prior school years by the Grades K-4 teachers of record who instruct in the respective subject areas set forth above, subject to building principal approval. Points shall be assigned based upon the school-wide percentage of 4th Grade students who meet or exceed the achievement target in accordance with the Table set forth in Section 3.13.

STEM teacher:
For the Middle School STEM teacher of record, the parties agree to use a building wide measure based upon student achievement of all 8th Grade students on a District developed 8th Grade Math Assessment aligned with the Common Core. Annually, an achievement target shall be established, based upon analysis of data from prior school years by Grade 6-8 Math and the STEM teachers of record, subject to building principal approval, and points shall be allocated based upon a school wide measure (0-20) based upon the percentage of 8th Grade students who meet or exceed the achievement target (see the Table in Section 3.13).

6-8 Grade Special Education, 5-8 Grade ELA Skills/Resource Room and Grades 5-8 ELL/Special Education teachers:
For 6-8th Grade Special Education teachers of records, the 5-8 Grade ELA Skills/Resource Room teachers of record and the Grades 5-8 ELL/Special Education teacher of record, the parties agree to use a building wide measure based upon student achievement of all 8th Grade students on a locally developed 8th Grade ELA Assessment aligned with the Common Core. Annually, an achievement target shall be established using a school wide measure, based upon analysis of data from prior school years by Grade 6-8 ELA teachers of record along with the cohort of teachers described above, subject to building principal approval, and points shall be allocated (0-20) based upon the school-wide percentage of 8th Grade students who meet or exceed the achievement target (see the Table in Section 3.13).

6-8 Grade LOTE teachers:
6-8 Grade LOTE teachers of record shall receive an achievement score based upon the performance of 8th Grade students on the Westchester regionally developed FLACS final summative assessment in the respective language(s) in which the teacher instructs. Annually, an achievement target shall be

	established, using a school wide measure, based upon analysis of data from prior school years by Grades 6-8 LOTE teachers of record who instruct in the same language, subject to building principal approval, and points shall be allocated (0-20) based upon the percentage of 8th Grade students who meet or exceed the achievement target using a school wide measure (see the Table in Section 3.13). Grades 5-8 Art, Music, Health, Library and Physical Education teachers: For Grades 5-8 Art, Music, Health, Library and Physical Education, a building wide score shall be received by each teacher of record who instructs in the same subject area based upon the achievement of all 8th Grade students on a subject-specific District developed final summative assessment. Annually, an achievement target shall be established, based upon analysis of data from prior school years by the teachers of record who instruct in the same subject area, subject to building principal approval. Points shall be allocated (0-20) to teachers in each subject area based upon the school wide percentage of 8th Grade students who meet or exceed the achievement target (see the Table in Section 3.13). Grades 6-7 Home Skills: For the Grades 6-7 Home Skills teacher of record, a score shall be received based upon the achievement of all 7th Grade students on a District developed final summative Home Skills Assessment. Annually, an achievement target shall be established, based upon analysis of data from prior school years by the Home Skills teachers of record, subject to building principal approval. Points shall be allocated (0-20) to the teacher of record based upon the school-wide percentage of 7th Grade students who meet or exceed the achievement target (see the Table in Section 3.13). All other non-Regents High School Courses: For teachers of all other non-Regents High School courses, student achievement shall be measured based upon the performance of the students belonging to the teacher of record on a District developed course-specific final summative assessment. Annually, an achievement target shall be established, based upon analysis of data from prior school years by each respective teacher of record, subject to building principal approval. Points (0-20) shall be assigned based upon the percentage of students belonging to each teacher of record who meet or exceed the achievement target in accordance in accordance with the Table set forth in Section 3.13.
Highly Effective (18 - 20 points) Results are well above District- or BOCES -adopted expectations for growth or achievement for grade/subject.	84-100% of students meet or exceed the achievement target. See Table in Section 3.13.
Effective (9 - 17 points) Results meet District- or BOCES-adopted expectations for growth or achievement for grade/subject.	50-83% of students meet or exceed the achievement target. See Table in Section 3.13.
Developing (3 - 8 points) Results are below District- or BOCES-adopted expectations for growth or achievement for grade/subject.	24-49% of students meet or exceed the achievement target. See Table in Section 3.13.
Ineffective (0 - 2 points) Results are well below District- or BOCES-adopted expectations for growth or achievement for	0-23% of students meet or exceed the achievement target. See Table in Section 3.13.

grade/subject.

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

(No response)

3.13) HEDI Tables or Graphics

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

assets/survey-uploads/12149/573509-y92vNseFa4/Local 20 Point Measure of Student Achievement for Section 3.13 9.20.13.docx

3.14) Locally Developed Controls

Describe any adjustments, controls, or other special considerations that will be used in assigning points to a teacher's score for this subcomponent, the rationale for including such factors, and the processes that will be used to mitigate potentially problematic incentives associated with the controls or adjustments.

none

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.

Results of multiple selected measures must translate into one overall score. Therefore each score must be weighted proportionally based on the number of students in each class where there is an individualized measure for a teacher of record. There will be a HEDI rating generated for each measure and each teacher shall receive a score based upon the weighted average of the HEDI ratings for each measure based upon the number of students tested. Normal rounding rules will apply; provided, however, rounding will not allow a teacher to move between different HEDI rating categories.

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 Tuesday, April 30, 2013
Updated Wednesday, February 26, 2014

Page 1

4.1) Teacher Practice Rubric

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

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

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

Danielson's Framework for Teaching (2011 Revised Edition)

(No response)

4.2) Points Within Other Measures

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

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

Is the following points assignment applicable to all teachers?

Yes

If you checked "no" above, fill in the group of teachers covered by the points assignment indicated immediately below (e.g., "probationary teachers"):

(No response)

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

Structured reviews of lesson plans, student portfolios and other teacher artifacts	20

If the above points assignment is not for "all teachers," fill out an additional copy of "Form 4.2: Points Within Other Measures" for each group of teachers, label accordingly, and 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.

Classroom Observation Procedure:

1. Multiple classroom observations shall be performed for both tenured and probationary teachers.
2. All teachers shall have a formal observation prior to any unannounced visit, unless otherwise mutually agreed.
3. Probationary teachers shall have a minimum of two formal observations and tenured teachers shall have a minimum of one formal

observation.
4. For formal classroom observations (announced visits), there shall be a pre and a post-observation conference within a timeframe mutually agreed upon by the teacher and the administrator. On or before the day of the formal classroom observation, the teacher and the evaluator shall mutually agree upon a time to meet for the post-observation conference. The pre and post-observation forms for formal classroom observations as agreed upon by the District and the Association are available at the District Office.
5. Administrators shall also perform one or more unannounced observation during the school year. For unannounced observations, informal feedback shall be provided within ten school days following the observation, absent exigent circumstances or unless otherwise mutually agreed.
6. In the event that the administrator identifies areas in need of improvement during an announced or unannounced observation, recommendations for improvement shall be conveyed to the teacher.
7. Artifacts of evidence (preferably via electronic submission) shall be presented by the teacher to his/her respective building principal by the first Monday in June.

Process for Assigning the Local 60 Points & Determining HEDI Ratings:
The parties have weighted Domains 2 and 3 to be worth 2/3rds of the local 60 Points, due to great emphasis being placed upon classroom instruction and the classroom environment. This model is compliant with Education Section 3012-c, in that it attributes a majority of the Local 60 points to measures observable in the classroom. The parties' have valued the relative weights of the Domain subcomponents to account for the areas that the School District values the most. The parties are utilizing the conversion chart uploaded in Section 4.5 below to ensure that all points (0-60) are obtainable within the rubric. The rubric scores listed in the conversion chart are the minimum scores necessary to achieve the corresponding HEDI Point Value.

To assign points to the teacher, the evaluator provides a 1, 2, 3 or 4 for each subcomponent in the teacher practice rubric, which corresponds with the quality ratings of "ineffective", "developing", "effective" and "highly effective". The subcomponent score is then multiplied by the locally negotiated weighting the parties agreed to attribute to that subcomponent. Where there are multiple ratings within a subcomponent, the lead evaluator shall determine the rating to be received (1, 2, 3 or 4) within the subcomponent based upon a preponderance of the evidence observed throughout the school year. In order to obtain the local 60 point rubric rating, weighted subcomponent scores are converted into a final rubric score of 1 through 4 (with 1 equaling 0 points out 60), and the rubric score conversion table uploaded in Section 4.5 will determine the teacher's local 60 point rubric score, and the corresponding negotiated quality effectiveness rating. In no instance will rounding rules cause a teacher to move into a difference performance category. The Overall rubric scores listed on the rubric score conversion table uploaded in Section 4.5 are the minimum scores necessary to achieve the corresponding HEDI point value.

The following table summarizes the negotiated cut scores corresponding to the HEDI ratings necessary to obtain the four performance categories (See appendix "A" for all points that may be earned (0-60):

HEDI Rating Overall Rubric Local 60
Category Score Range Point Range

Highly Effective 3.5-4.0 58-60
Effective 2.6-3.4 55-57
Developing 1.71-2.5 41-54
Ineffective 1-1.7 0-40

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/12179/573510-eka9yMJ855/APPR LOCAL 60 POINTS WITH CONVERSION CHART_1.xlsx

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.	Overall teacher performance is rated at a distinguished/highly effective level using the 4 domains of the rubric. Knowledge of content and pedagogy is extensive, there is a high level of quality of questions and discussion techniques; an in-depth knowledge of

	students' special needs; high expectations are set for learning and achievement and highly responsive to students interests and questions; and the teacher's involvement in professional development activities is high quality, focused on continual improvement. In no instance will rounding rules cause a teacher to move into another performance category.
Effective: Overall performance and results meet NYS Teaching Standards.	Overall teacher performance is rated at a proficient level/effective level using the 4 domains of the rubric. Knowledge of content and pedagogy is solid, there is a solid level of quality of questions and discussion techniques; and thorough knowledge of students' special needs; strong expectations are set for learning and achievement and different approaches are used to ensure successful learning for all students, and the teacher is actively involved in professional development activities that support school improvement efforts. In no instance will rounding rules cause a teacher to move into another performance category.
Developing: Overall performance and results need improvement in order to meet NYS Teaching Standards.	Overall teacher performance is rated at a basic/developing level using the 4 domains of the rubric. Knowledge of content and pedagogy is represented by basic understanding, there is a partial level of quality questioning and discussion techniques; and there is partial knowledge of students' special needs; expectations for learning and achievement are moderate and a limited number of different approaches are used to ensure successful learning for all students, and the teacher is partially involved in professional development activities that support school improvement efforts. In no instance will rounding rules cause a teacher to move into another performance category.
Ineffective: Overall performance and results do not meet NYS Teaching Standards.	Overall teacher performance is rated at an unsatisfactory/ineffective level using the 4 domains of the rubric. Teacher displays little knowledge of content and pedagogy, there is a partial level of quality questioning and discussion techniques; and knowledge of students' special needs is limited or lacking; expectations for learning and achievement are trivial and the level of different approaches is unsuitable to ensure successful learning for all students, and the teacher has little or no involvement in professional development activities. In no instance will rounding rules cause a teacher to move into another performance category.

Provide the ranges for the 60-point scoring bands.

Highly Effective	58-60
Effective	55-57
Developing	41-54
Ineffective	0-40

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

Formal/Long	2
Informal/Short	1
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

Formal/Long	1
Informal/Short	1
Total	2

By trained in-school peer teachers or other trained reviewers

Formal/Long	0
Informal/Short	0

Independent evaluators

Formal/Long	0
Informal/Short	0

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

- In Person

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

- In Person

5. Composite Scoring (Teachers)

Created Tuesday, April 30, 2013
Updated Friday, December 06, 2013

Page 1

Standards for Rating Categories

Growth or Comparable Measures

Locally-selected Measures of growth or achievement

Other Measures of Effectiveness (Teacher and Leader standards)

Highly Effective

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

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

Overall performance and results exceed NYS Teaching Standards.

Effective

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

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

Overall performance and results meet NYS Teaching Standards.

Developing

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

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

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

Ineffective

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

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

Overall performance and results do not meet NYS Teaching Standards.

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 scoring ranges for educators for whom there is no approved Value-Added measure of student growth will be:

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	58-60
Effective	55-57
Developing	41-54
Ineffective	0-40

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

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 Tuesday, April 30, 2013
Updated Sunday, February 09, 2014

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. All TIP plans must include: 1) identification of needed areas of improvement, 2) a timeline for achieving improvement, 3) the manner in which the improvement will be assessed, and, where appropriate, 4) differentiated activities to support a teacher's improvement in those areas. For a list of supported file types, go to the Resources folder (above) and click Technical Tips. Please be sure to update a document with a form layout, with fillable spaces and not just a narrative.

assets/survey-uploads/12193/573512-Df0w3Xx5v6/18582852-TAP TIP Procedures and Chart 1.22.14docx.docx

6.3) Appeals Process

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

(1) the substance of the annual professional performance review

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

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

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

APPEALS PROCESS - PLEASANTVILLE

WHEREAS, the parties have mutually agreed to the following appeals process to be incorporated into the District's APPR Plan Document for teachers covered by education law § 3012-c and part 30-2 regents rules:

1. Appeals Process:

A. Any teacher who receives an ineffective composite APPR rating shall be entitled to appeal his/her annual APPR rating, based upon a paper submission (including email) to the Superintendent of Schools or her designated Administrator, who shall be adequately trained and certified, in the evaluation rubric, trained in accordance with the requirements of statute and regulations and who possesses either an SDA or SDL Certification.

B. The appeal must be brought in writing (including email), specifying the area(s) of concern, but limited to those matters that may be appealed as prescribed in Section 3012-c of the Education Law. A copy of the appeal shall be sent to the TAP President, unless the unit member objects to the same.

The areas of concern as referenced above for which a teacher who is rated ineffective on his/her APPR may bring an appeal are:
1. The substance of the annual professional performance review;
2. The District's adherence to the standards and methodologies required for the APPR;
3. The adherence to the Part 30 Regents Rules; and/or
4. Compliance with the locally negotiated procedures that govern the APPR.

Further, a teacher who is placed on a Teacher Improvement Plan (TIP) shall have a corresponding right to appeal concerns regarding the TIP upon the District's issuance and/or implementation of a TIP (where applicable), in accordance with the requirements of Section 3012-c of the Education Law.

C. An appeal of a composite APPR rating or a TIP must be commenced within ten (10) school days from the start of the school year following the performance year of the teacher or else the right to appeal shall be deemed waived in all regards.

D. The Superintendent or her designated Administrator shall respond to the appeal with a written answer granting the appeal and directing further administrative action or denying the appeal. The Superintendent or her designated Administrator shall review the evidence underlying the observations of the teacher along with all other evidence submitted by the teacher prior to rendering a decision. Such decision shall be made within ten (10) school days of the receipt of the appeal.

E. The decision of the Superintendent or her designated Administrator, so long as the decision is made within the timeframe set forth in paragraph D, shall be final and binding in all regards and shall not be subject to review at arbitration, before any administrative agency or in any court of law. In the event that the decision is not made within the timeframe set forth in this paragraph, the appeal shall be sustained.

F. 1. Notwithstanding the above, in the event that a tenured teacher has received two consecutive ineffective APPR evaluation ratings, the appeal shall be made, within the timeframe set forth in Paragraph "C" above, to an agreed upon arbitrator [see Note 1 Below] selected on a rotating basis from the following list, based on order and reasonable timeframe of availability, who shall make a final and binding decision upon the appeal of the APPR evaluation and/or the teacher improvement plan, within forty-five (45) calendar days of the filing of the written appeal. The documentation to be furnished to the Arbitrator on behalf of the tenured teacher and by the District shall be exchanged between the tenured teacher and the administration on an immediate basis at the time of submission to the Arbitrator. In the event that either party has a question regarding the authenticity of such documentation, the same shall be presented in writing within 48 hours to the arbitrator and copied to the other party for the arbitrator's review and consideration.

G. The provisions set forth above, shall neither be construed to alter or affect the rights of probationary teachers pursuant to Section 3031 of the New York State Education Law.

Note 1: The agreed upon arbitrators are: Sheila Cole, Jeffrey Selchick, Ira Lobel and Howard Edelman. In the event any of the agreed upon arbitrators are no longer serving in such capacity or are otherwise unavailable, the parties shall mutually agree upon on or more alternate arbitrators.

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

Describe the process for training lead evaluators and evaluators. Your description must include 1) the process for training lead evaluators and evaluators, 2) the process for the certification and re-certification of lead evaluators, 3) the process for ensuring inter-rater reliability, 4) the nature (content) and the duration (how many hours, days) of such training.

The District participates in the Southern Westchester BOCES Lead Evaluator Training and are certified as per state authorization. To ensure inter-rater reliability, all evalutors will attend the annual re-certification courses at SWBOCES . SWBOCES has been authorized by NYSED to provide the re-certification courses to ensure inter-rater reliability. In addition, District has recently purchase the Danielson 2011 model - Teachscape - Framework for Teaching Proficiency. This model provides 15 hours of training. The nature of the training will cover all 9 elements contained in 30-2.9(b) of the Rules of the Board of Regents.

We also use our BOCES as our Network Team.

Training summary from SWBOCES, 20 hours. Monitoring of attendance is done through the superintendent's office. All documentation is kept with the Huamn Resources. Courses have included - NYS Teaching Standards and Evidenced Based Observations, Creating Continuous Improvement Cycles, Creating a Framework for Developing Effectives SLOs, Evidenced Based Observations Protocols and Exploration of the growth value added model, Writing Quality Student Learning Objectives. Additional training - LHRIC - Danielson's Framework for Teaching, NYSSBA's The New APPR, WPSBA's - Implementing the APPR. District resources have been set aside in the Pleasantville district budget and enrollment for all appropriate co-sers have been a part of the budgeting process and will be in each subsequent budget cycle. Approval of all appropriate workshop forms is done at the district office level. A Board resolution certifying the training is part of the process. In addition to the Lead Evaluator Training from SWBOCES, During the last school year, the district purchased the Framework for Teaching texts and has had extensive faculty PD sessions on the model. An annual recertification resolution will be part of a Board of Education agenda.

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 Tuesday, April 30, 2013
Updated Wednesday, January 22, 2014

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.

Please list the grade configurations of the school(s)/program(s) in your district/BOCES where it is expected that 30-100% of a principal's students are taking assessments with a State-provided growth or value-added measure, (e.g., K-5, PK-6, 6-8, 6-12, 9-12, etc.).

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):

Grades 5-8 Pleasantville Middle School
Grades 9-12 Pleasantville High School
(No response)
(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(s) 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	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 assessments 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. The district must select the type of assessment that will be used with the SLO from the options below.

If any grade/course in the building has a State-provided growth measure AND the principal must have SLOs because fewer than 30% of students in the building are covered, then the SLOs will begin first with the SGP/VA results.
Additional SLOs will then be set based on grades/subjects with State assessments, where applicable.
If additional SLOs are necessary, principals must begin with the grade(s)/courses(s) that have the largest number of students using school-wide student results from one of the following assessment options: State-approved 3rd party or district/regional/BOCES-developed assessments that are rigorous and comparable across classrooms.
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 grade configuration of the school or program the SLO applies to. Then, using the drop-down boxes below, please select the type of 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 in the following format: "[Name of your District/Region/BOCES] developed [Grade] [Subject] Assessment." For example, a BOCES-developed 7th grade Social Studies assessment would be written as follows: "GVEP-Developed Grade 7 Social Studies Assessment." For State-approved 3rd party assessments, please include the name of the assessment exactly as it appears in RED on the State-approved list. For State assessments or Regents examinations, please indicate as such in the assessment name.

	School or Program Type	SLO with Assessment Option	Name of the Assessment
	Grades K-4	State assessment	NYS Grades 3 and 4 ELA and Math assessments

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. Please describe the process your district is using to measure student growth on the assessments listed for this Task. If applicable, please also include a description of the process for combining the State-provided growth score with the SLO(s) for this Task.

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.	SLO Growth Targets will be set by the Superintendent and the Principal based upon a review of baseline data from the Grades 3 ELA and Math pre-assessments. The pre-assessments are district developed. Results will be at or above the expectations for acceptable individualized student growth, based upon the baseline data for students grade 3 in ELA and Math. HEDI Rating Bands are based upon the percentage of students who meet or exceed their individualized growth targets. Points shall be assigned in accordance with the SLO Growth Chart set forth below. Grade 4 will have a NYS provided growth score for ELA and Math. The SGP/VA results from the NYS 4th Grade ELA and Math assessments will be weighted proportionately with the SLOs for the 3rd grade ELA and Math measure when calculating the Principal's HEDI score. Standard rounding rules will apply.
Highly Effective (18 - 20 points) Results are well above state average for similar students (or District goals if no state test).	86-100% of students meet their growth targets. Please see chart labeled SLO Growth.

Effective (9 - 17 points) Results meet state average for similar students (or District goals if no state test).	55-85% of students meet their growth targets. Please see chart labeled SLO Growth.
Developing (3 - 8 points) Results are below state average for similar students (or District goals if no state test).	30-54% of students meet their growth targets. Please see chart labeled SLO Growth.
Ineffective (0 - 2 points) Results are well below state average for similar students (or District goals if no state test).	0-29% of students meet their growth targets. Please see chart labeled SLO Growth.

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/5365/161236-lha0DogRNw/APPR SLO Growth Charts.pdf

7.4) Special Considerations for Comparable Growth Measures

Describe any adjustments, controls, or other special considerations that will be used in assigning points to a principal's score for this subcomponent, 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 the following: prior student achievement results, students with disabilities, English language learners, and students in poverty.

(No response)

7.5) Principals with More Than One Growth Measure

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

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

7.6) Assurances -- Comparable Growth Measures

Please check all of the boxes below:

7.6) Assurances -- Comparable Growth Measures | Assure the application of locally developed controls will be rigorous, fair, and transparent and only those used for State Growth will be used for Comparable Growth Measures.	Checked
7.6) Assurances -- Comparable Growth Measures | Assure that use of locally developed controls will not have a disparate impact on underrepresented students in accordance with applicable civil rights laws.	Checked
7.6) Assurances -- Comparable Growth Measures | Assure that procedures for ensuring data accuracy and integrity are being utilized.	Checked
7.6) Assurances -- Comparable Growth Measures | Assure that district will develop SLOs according to the rules established by NYSED for principal SLOs: http://www.engageny.org/resource/student-learning-objectives-guidance-document.	Checked

7.6) Assurances -- Comparable Growth Measures | Assure that the process for assigning points for SLOs for the Growth Subcomponent will use the narrative HEDI descriptions described in the regulations to effectively differentiate educator performance in ways that improve student learning and instruction.	Checked
7.6) Assurances -- Comparable Growth Measures | Assure that it is possible for a principal to earn each point, including 0, for SLOs in the Growth subcomponent scoring range.	Checked
7.6) Assurances -- Comparable Growth Measures | Assure that processes are in place to monitor SLOs to ensure rigor and comparability across classrooms.	Checked

8. Local Measures (Principals)

Created Tuesday, April 30, 2013
Updated Sunday, February 09, 2014

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.

Districts or BOCES that intend to use a district, regional, or BOCES-developed assessment must include the name, grade, and subject of the assessment in the following format: "[Name of your District/Region/BOCES] developed [Grade] [Subject] Assessment." For example, a BOCES-developed 7th grade Social Studies assessment would be written as follows: "GVEP-Developed Grade 7 Social Studies Assessment."

Also note: if your district/BOCES is using the same assessment for both the State growth or other comparable measures subcomponent and the locally-selected measures subcomponents, be sure that a *different* measure of student performance is being used with the assessment (e.g., achievement rather than growth; growth measured in a different manner).

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

In the table below, please list the grade configurations of the school(s)/program(s) in your district/BOCES where it is expected that 30-100% of a principal's students are taking assessments with a State-provided growth or value-added measure (e.g., K-5, 6-8, 9-12). Then for each grade configuration, select a measure of growoth or achievement from the drop-down menu. As a reminder, the grade configurations/programs listed in Task 8.1 should be the same as those listed in Task 7.1.
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/Program	Locally-Selected Measure from List of Approved Measures	Assessment
	Grades 5-8	(d) measures used by district for teacher evaluation	NYS Grades 5-8 ELA and Math Assessments and the NYS Grade 8 Science Assessment
	Grades 9-12	(e) 4, 5, and/or 6-year high school grad and/or dropout rates	6-year Graduation Rate

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 Pleasantville UFSD APPR committee decided to use student achievement on the NYS Grades 5-8 ELA and Math assessments and the NYS Grade 8 Science assessments as the locally selected measure of student achievement for the Grades 5-8 principal. The parties have agreed upon the achievement target of proficiency (a 3 or higher) on the State assessments listed above. Points shall be assigned (0-15) based upon the overall percentage of students that meet the achievement target of proficiency (a 3 or higher) for each respective State assessment (see Table 1 below in Section 8.1). In the event that there is no approved value-added growth measure for the school year, Table 1 set forth in section 8.2 shall be used to allocate points (0-20) for the Grades 5-8 Building Principal. The locally selected measure of student achievement for the Grades 9-12 High School Principal is based upon the 6-year High School Graduation rate. Please see Table 2 in Section 8.1 for assignment of points (0-15). Until the value-added growth measure is implemented, Table 2 set forth in section 8.2 shall be used to allocate points (0-20) for the Grades 9-12 Building

	Principal.
Highly Effective (14 - 15 points) Results are well above District- or BOCES-adopted expectations for growth or achievement for grade/subject.	Grades 5-8 Middle School Principal: 76-100% of students have met the respective achievement targets (See Table 1). Grades 9-12 Principal: The High School Graduation rate is 91-100% (See Table 2).
Effective (8- 13 points) Results meet District- or BOCES-adopted expectations for growth or achievement for grade/subject.	Grades 5-8 Middle School Principal: 43-75% of students have met the respective achievement targets (See Table 1). Grades 9-12 Principal: The High School Graduation rate is 56-90% (See Table 2).
Developing (3 - 7 points) Results are below District- or BOCES-adopted expectations for growth or achievement for grade/subject.	Grades 5-8 Middle School Principal: 24-42% of students have met the respective achievement targets (See Table 1). Grades 9-12 Principal: The High School Graduation rate is 29-55% (See Table 2).
Ineffective (0 - 2 points) Results are well below District- or BOCES-adopted expectations for growth or achievement for grade/subject.	Grades 5-8 Middle School Principal: 0-23% of students have met the respective achievement targets (See Table 1). Grades 9-12 Principal: The High School Graduation rate is 0-28% (See Table 2).

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

(No response)

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

assets/survey-uploads/12190/573514-qBFVOWF7fC/18582933-Local 15 Point Measures of Student Achievement - PAA Section 8.1 revised 1.8.14.docx

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

In the table below, list all of the grade configurations/programs used in your district or BOCES in which the district/BOCES expects that fewer than 30% of students will receive a State-provided growth score (e.g., K-2, K-3, CTE). Then for each grade configuration, select a measure from the drop-down menu. As a reminder, the grade configurations/programs listed in Task 8.2 should be the same as those listed in Task 7.3.
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:<strong

(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-4	(d) measures used by district for teacher evaluation	NYS Grades 3 and 4 ELA and Math assessments and NYS Grade 4 Science assessments

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 Pleasantville UFSD APPR committee decided to use student achievement on the NYS Grades 3 and 4 ELA and Math assessments and the NYS Grade 4 Science assessment as the locally selected measure of student achievement for the Grades K-4 Elementary School Principal. The parties have agreed upon the achievement target of proficiency (a 3 or higher) on the State assessments listed above. Points shall be assigned (0-20) based upon the overall percentage of students that meet the achievement target of proficiency (a 3 or higher) for each respective State assessment (see Table 1 below in Section 8.2).
Highly Effective (18 - 20 points) Results are well above District- or BOCES-adopted expectations for growth or achievement for grade/subject.	Grades K-4 Elementary School Principal: 76-100% of students have met the respective achievement targets (See Table 1 in Section 8.2).
Effective (9- 17 points) Results meet District- or BOCES-adopted expectations for growth or achievement for	Grades K-4 Elementary School Principal: 43-75% of students have met the respective achievement targets (See Table 1 in

grade/subject.	Section 8.2).
Developing (3 - 8 points) Results are below District- or BOCES-adopted expectations for growth or achievement for grade/subject.	Grades K-4 Elementary School Principal: 24-42% of students have met the respective achievement targets (See Table 1 in Section 8.2).
Ineffective (0 - 2 points) Results are well below District- or BOCES-adopted expectations for growth or achievement for grade/subject.	Grades K-4 Elementary School Principal: 0-23% of students have met the respective achievement targets (See Table 1 in Section 8.2).

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/12190/573514-T8MlGWUVm1/18582944-Local 20 Point Measures of Student Achievement - PAA Section 8.2 revised 1.22.14.docx

8.3) Locally Developed Controls

Describe any adjustments, controls, or other special considerations that will be used in assigning points to a teacher's score for this subcomponent, the rationale for including such factors, and the processes that will be used to mitigate potentially problematic incentives associated with the controls or adjustments.

While it is expected that proficiency (a 3 or higher) will be the achievement target for student performance on State assessments, in the event that there is a strong basis, justifiable based upon a student's disability that would warrant a target below proficiency, then upon agreement of the Principal and the Superintendent of Schools, a student's achievement target may be set lower.

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.

If Principals have more than one locally selected measure, those measures will be combined into one HEDI rating and score for the locally selected measure of student achievement.

Each measure will earn a score from 0-20 (or 0-15 if a value added growth measure is approved by the State, where applicable) which will be weighted proportionately based on the number of students covered by each measure. Normal rounding rules will apply; provided, however, rounding will not allow a principal to move between HEDI rating categories.

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 Tuesday, April 30, 2013
Updated Thursday, January 09, 2014

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 point 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 point 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, label accordingly, 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 assigning any points to "ambitious and measurable goals":

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 updated, this list will be updated within the drop-down menu of approved survey tools.

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

District variance	(No response)
Principal Evaluation Tripod School Perception Survey (Combined Parent Survey)	(No response)
Principal Evaluation Tripod School Perception Survey (Combined Student Surveys)	(No response)
NYC School Survey-2012 Parent Survey	(No response)
NYC School Survey-2012 Student Survey	(No response)
NYC School Survey-2012 Teacher Survey	(No response)

9.6) Assurances

Please check all of the boxes below:

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

9.7) Process for Assigning Points and Determining HEDI Ratings

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

The district chose the MPPR because it has been designed to support principals and superintendents as they work to make explicit connections between the actions, decisions and learning of school leaders and the improvements to teaching and learning in the schools they lead. The MPPR supports the use of the Educational Leadership Policy Standards: ISLLC 2008. This component is organized by ISLLC domain, with five dimensions, culled by clustering and categorizing the ISLLC “functions.” These dimensions (Culture, Sustainability, Instructional Program, Capacity Building and Strategic Planning Process) are consistent throughout this component, though not all.
appear in every domain. Descriptors are specific to each domain. The second component of the MPPR supports Goal Setting and Attainment and has dimensions that are arranged to scaffold the goal setting process, from the initial defining of goals, through action planning, implementation and
monitoring and evaluation. The MPPR will allow the superintendent of schools to evaluate the principals:
- document baseline observations about principal practice
- support principals in setting and attaining goals
- uncover entry points for collaboration, influence and intervention
- support differentiation by aligning professional development opportunities and resources with needs
- monitor connections to and progress toward the district’s vision, goals, improved teacher practice and student learning
- support diagnostic, formative and summative assessments
- provide purpose and context for evidence gathering and the use of data

HEDI Bands:
Highly Effective 58-60
Effective 53-57
Developing 44-52
Ineffective 0-43

The attached APPR Admin chart for the 60 points of the principals evaluation details the 60 point calculation and how each point can be assigned given a HEDI (an H, an E, a D or an I) score for each of the sub-components of each domain. The decimal point will be rounded - see note at bottom of the Chart

Multidimensional Principal Performance Rubric Points
Domain 1: Shared Vision of Learning (9 points)
a. Culture 5
b. Sustainability 4
Domain 2: School Culture & Instructional Program 17
a. Culture 3
b. Instructional Program 6
c. Capacity Building 2
d. Sustainability 3
e. Strategic Planning Process 3
Domain 3: Safe, Efficient, Effective Learning Environment (15 points)
a. Capacity Building 5
b. Culture 4
c. Sustainability 3
d. Instructional Program 3
Domain 4: Community (9 points)
a. Strategic Planning Process: Inquiry 5
b. Culture 2
c. Sustainability 2
Domain 5: Integrity, Fairness, Ethics (6 points)
a. Sustainability 4
b. Culture 2
Domain 6: Political, Social, Economic, Legal & Cultural Context (4 points)
a. Sustainability 2
b. Culture 2
TOTAL POINTS: 60

Observations of a principal's performance are on-going throughout the year as principals engage in a constant process of interacting both formally and informally with their staff and stakeholders - parents, students, community members. Using such a lens and a shared understanding as well as the guidance documents of the 3012c Law, the points distributed within the domains of the MPPR were assigned through a collaborative process.

The parties have negotiated the points allocation within each of the domains, taking into account the elements of each domain, to the extent necessary to account for each of the six ISLLC Standards on an annual basis. The APPR composite effectiveness rating is on the 0-100 point scale.

The local 60 Points will be computed for the purposes of the Final Summative Evaluation for Building Principals based upon the following methodology:
* A Highly Effective rating shall receive 100% of the total point value for the sub-domain
* An Effective Rating shall receive 96% of the total point value for the sub-domain
* A Developing Rating shall receive 82.5% of the total point value for the sub-domain
* An Ineffective Rating shall receive no points; provided, however, at the sole discretion of the Lead Evaluator, if it appears that a building principal is employing techniques intended to generate outcomes that were reasonably anticipated to form the evidence-basis for sound pedagogy, but the techniques are not achieving the desired end, then the Lead Evaluator may allocate points to the building principal to a building principal who is observed as “ineffective” in a domain, between 0% and 64% of the total possible points available. If a principal receives an ineffective rating for each subcomponent of the entire rubric, the overall rubric score will be zero.

For principals who are observed within a dimension on more than one school visit, points will be assigned at the end of the school year based upon the quality of the preponderance of the evidence observed throughout the school year.

This methodology ensures that all points 0-60, are obtainable on the local measure, in accordance with the provisions of Education Law Section 3012-c. The relative weights attributed to the sub-domain values for the receipt of the respective ratings as set forth above and on the HEDI bands below and above were locally negotiated in order to ensure the likelihood that a building principal who receives an "effective rating" on the Local 20, the State 20 and the Local 60 would receive a composite effectiveness rating within the regulated "effective" range of 75-90.

A sample points allocation pursuant to this local 60 points calculation methodology is attached hereto.

OBSERVATIONS:
Observations of a Principal’s performance are understood to be ongoing throughout each year. Principals engage in a constant process

of interacting both formally and informally with their staff and stakeholders, planning for their responsibilities, implementing and completing specific tasks, undertaking research, engaging in or promoting school-community functions, participating in shared administrative meetings and a variety of collaborative administrative work. It is further understood that the Superintendent may be privy to and/or observe each Principal's performance in any or all these ongoing activities during the normal course of business and in the routine interactions with the Principal and those persons with whom the Principal interacts. As such, the Superintendent's observations of the Principal and the patterns and/or results of the Principal's performance may be drawn from a variety of ongoing sources and ongoing interactions. That notwithstanding, the following framework and minimum expectations for the observation and evaluation of Administrator performance are outlined below.

The Superintendent, as part of the following observation process, shall ensure that any observed deficiency is documented in writing, along with constructive and specific ways in which the Administrator may achieve improvement in regards to that specific deficiency.

Observation Procedures for Building Principals: The Superintendent shall perform building visits on at least two (2) occasions annually, with at least one such occasion being unannounced.

During the mid-term of an evaluative period, the Superintendent shall meet with the Principal to advise him/her of any areas to be evaluated under the rubric for which the Principal is exhibiting performance that is below the "effective" level. In such event, the Superintendent shall give constructive feedback regarding the areas noted as such.

The mid-term status conference for tenured building principals and for probationary building principals, if applicable to the latter, shall be comprised of an in-person conference with the Superintendent where suggestions for areas of growth within the domains will be addressed as well as the building principal's strength and weaknesses, ultimately culminating in written feedback to the building principal.

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/5143/158804-pMADJ4gk6R/APPR Pleasantville Administrators 7.12.12_1.pdf

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

Highly Effective: Overall performance and results exceed standards.	Overall performance and results exceed the ISLLC leadership standards and 58-60 points will be earned in this subcomponent. In no instance will rounding rules cause a principal to move into another performance category.
Effective: Overall performance and results meet standards.	Overall performance and results meets the ISLLC leadership standards and 53-57 points will be earned in this subcomponent. In no instance will rounding rules cause a principal to move into another performance category.
Developing: Overall performance and results need improvement in order to meet standards.	Overall performance and results need improvement in order to meet the ISLLC leadership standards and 44-52 points will be earned in this subcomponent. In no instance will rounding rules cause a principal to move into another performance category.
Ineffective: Overall performance and results do not meet standards.	Overall performance and results do not meet the ISLLC leadership standards and 0-43 points will be earned in this subcomponent. In no instance will rounding rules cause a principal to move into another performance category.

Please provide the locally-negotiated 60 point scoring bands.

Highly Effective	58-60

Effective	53-57
Developing	44-52
Ineffective	0-43

9.8) School Visits

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

Probationary Principals

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

Tenured Principals

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

10. Composite Scoring (Principals)

Created Tuesday, April 30, 2013
Updated Friday, December 06, 2013

Page 1

Standards for Rating Categories

Growth or Comparable Measures

Locally-selected Measures of growth or achievement

Other Measures of Effectiveness (Teacher and Leader standards)

Highly Effective

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

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

Overall performance and results exceed ISLLC leadership standards.

Effective

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

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

Overall performance and results meet ISLLC leadership standards.

Developing

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

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

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

Ineffective

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

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

Overall performance and results do not meet ISLLC leadership standards.

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 scoring ranges for principals for whom there is no approved Value-Added measure of student growth will be:

Where there is no Value-Added measure

Growth or Comparable Measures
Locally-selected Measures of growth or achievement
Other Measures of Effectiveness (60 points)

Overall Composite Score
Highly Effective
18-20
18-20
Ranges determined locally--see below
91-100
Effective
9-17
9-17
75-90
Developing
3-8
3-8
65-74
Ineffective
0-2
0-2
0-64

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

Highly Effective	58-60
Effective	53-57
Developing	44-52
Ineffective	0-43

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

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 Tuesday, April 30, 2013
Updated Wednesday, January 22, 2014

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 the school district or BOCES. All PIP plans must include: 1) identification of needed areas of improvement, 2) a timeline for achieving improvement, 3) the manner in which the improvement will be assessed, and, where appropriate, 4) differentiated activities to support a principal's improvement in those areas.

For a list of supported file types, go to the Resources folder (above) and click Technical Tips. Please be sure to update a document with a form layout, with fillable spaces and not just a narrative.

assets/survey-uploads/12168/573517-Df0w3Xx5v6/18583035-18583035-APPR PIP Procedures and Form revised 1.22.14.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:

WHEREAS, the parties have mutually agreed to the following appeals process to be incorporated into the District's APPR Plan Document for principals covered by Education Law §3012-c and Part 30-2 Regents Rules;

1. Appeals Process:

A. Any principal who receives an "ineffective" rating on his/her annual composite APPR or a tenured principal who receives a "developing" composite APPR rating, having also received a rating at or below "developing" on the Local 60 Points, shall be entitled to appeal his/her annual APPR rating, based upon a paper submission to the Superintendent's administrative designee, who shall be trained in accordance with the requirements of the statute and regulations and also possesses either an appropriate district-wide administrative Certification.

B. The appeal must be brought in writing, specifying the area(s) of concern, but limited to those matters that may be appealed as prescribed in Section 3012-c of the Education Law. Further, a principal who is placed on a Principal Improvement Plan ("PIP") shall have a corresponding right to appeal concerns regarding the PIP in accordance with the requirements set forth in Section 3012-c of the Education Law.

C. An appeal of an APPR evaluation or a PIP must be commenced within ten (10) business days of the presentation of the final document to the principal or else the right to appeal shall be deemed waived in all regards. This period shall be tolled for any days during said ten (10) business day period that the principal is on a planned vacation. In the case of a PIP appeal, there shall be a second ten (10) business day period for a PIP appeal following the end date of the PIP, and in the event that an appeal is not timely filed by the tenth business day following the end date of the PIP, the right to such an appeal shall be deemed waived in all regards. This period shall be tolled for any days during said ten (10) working day period that the principal is on a planned vacation, not to exceed two (2) weeks in duration.

D. The Superintendent's administrative designee shall respond to the appeal with a written answer granting the appeal and directing further administrative action, or a written answer denying the appeal. The Superintendent's administrative designee shall review the evidence underlying the observations of the principal along with all other evidence submitted by the principal prior to rendering a decision. Such decision shall be made within ten (10) business days of the receipt of the appeal. This period shall be tolled for any days during said ten (10) business day period that the Superintendent's administrative designee is on a planned vacation, not to exceed two (2) weeks in duration. So long as the decision is made within the timeframe set forth in this paragraph, the decision of the Superintendent's administrative designee shall be final and binding in all regards and shall not be subject to review at arbitration, before any administrative agency or in any court of law. In the event that the decision is not made within the timeframe set forth in this paragraph, the appeal shall be sustained.

E. 1. Notwithstanding the above, in the event that a tenured principal has received two consecutive ineffective APPR evaluation ratings, the appeal shall be made, within the timeframe set forth in Paragraph "C" above, to an arbitrator selected on a rotating basis from the agreed upon list [see Note 1 below], based on order and reasonable timeframe of availability, who shall make a final and binding decision upon the appeal of the APPR evaluation and/or the PIP within forty-five (45) calendar days of the filing of the written appeal. The documentation to be furnished to the arbitrator on behalf of the tenured principal and by the District shall be exchanged between the tenured principal and the administration on an immediate basis at the time of submission to the arbitrator. In the event that either party has a question regarding the authenticity of such documentation, the same shall be presented in writing immediately to the arbitrator and copied to the other party for the arbitrator's review and consideration. The Arbitrator shall review the evidence underlying the observations of the principal along with all other evidence submitted by the principal prior to rendering a decision.

Note 1: The agreed upon arbitrators are: Bonnie Siber-Weinstock, Ira Lobel and Carol Wittenberg. In the event any of the agreed upon arbitrators are no longer serving in such capacity or are otherwise unavailable, the parties shall mutually agree upon on or more alternate arbitrators.

11.4) Training of Lead Evaluators and Evaluators and Certification of Lead Evaluators

Describe the process for training lead evaluators and evaluators. Your description must include 1) the process for training lead evaluators and evaluators, 2) the process for the certification and re-certification of lead evaluators, 3) the process for ensuring inter-rater reliability, 4) the nature (content) and the duration (how many hours, days) of such training.

The district participates in the SWBOCES Lead Evaluator Turnkey training sessions. My Learning Plan documents each training session and district conference and workshop forms are used internally for accountability purposes. The Board of Education will pass a resolution certifying the evaluator's attendance upon submission of the dates by the Supt of Schools. The District has budgeted for the SWBOCES co-ser for Network Training. Annual re-certification sessions will be budgeted for and attendance mandated and monitored. The training received shall cover all 9 requirements set forth in 30-2.9(b) of the rules of the Board of Regents.

Inter-rater reliability will be ensured by completion of the 15 hours of certification done through training in the Danielson 2011 model Teachscape.

Training Summary from SWBOCES, 20 Hours
NY Teaching standards and evidenced based observations
Creating continuous improvement cycles
Creating a framework for developing effective SLOs
Evidenced based observation protocols and exploration of the growth value added model
Writing quality student learning objectives

Lead Evaluator Training on the MPPR and the ISLLC standards - an additional 8 hours.

11.5) Assurances -- Evaluators

Please check the boxes below:

- Checked

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

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

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

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

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

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

(7) use of the Statewide Instructional Reporting System

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

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

- Checked

11.6) Assurances -- Principals

Please check all of the boxes below:

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

11.7) Assurances -- Data

Please check all of the boxes below:

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

12. Joint Certification of APPR Plan

Created Tuesday, April 30, 2013
Updated Wednesday, February 26, 2014

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. Please note that Review Room timestamps each revision and signatures cannot be dated earlier than the last revision.

assets/survey-uploads/12158/573518-3Uqgn5g9Iu/APPR Certification Form Feb 26 2014.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.

HEDI Ratings	Points	**Pleasantville UFSD SLO Growth Chart**
Highly Effective	20	96-100
	19	91-95
	18	86-90
Effective	17	81-85
	16	77-80
	15	74-76
	14	71-73
	13	67-70
	12	64-66
	11	61-63
	10	59-60
	9	55-58
Developing	8	50-54
	7	46-49
	6	41-45
	5	39-40
	4	35-38
	3	30-34
Ineffective	2	25-29
	1	1-24
	0	0

Table for Section 3.3

Local 15 Point Measure of Student Achievement

(To be used upon the State's introduction of its Value-Added Growth Model)

Points	Percentage of students who meet or exceed the Achievement Target on Locally Developed Assessments or Percentage of students who score at or above the national mean on AIMSWEB
15	91-100
14	84-90
13	79-83
12	73-78
11	66-72
10	60-65
9	55-59
8	50-54
7	47-49
6	43-46
5	38-42
4	33-37
3	24-32
2	18-23
1	9-17
0	0-8

Table for Section 3.13

Local 20 Point Measure of Student Achievement

Points	Percentage of students who meet or exceed the Achievement Target on State Assessments, Regents Exams, or Locally or Regionally Developed Assessments or Percentage of students who score at or above the national mean on AIMSWEB
20	94-100
19	90-93
18	84-89
17	80-83
16	74-79
15	68-73
14	63-67
13	59-62
12	56-58
11	54-55
10	52-53
9	50-51
8	45-49
7	40-44
6	36-39
5	32-35
4	28-31
3	24-27
2	18-23
1	9-17
0	0-8

	A	B	C	D	E	F	G	H	I	J	K	L	M
1	**APPENDIX A**												Total
2					average	rubric score				scaled			NYS APPR
3		s d weight	teacher	sd weght	rubric scor	conversion table		State	Local	rubric	composite	composite	Composite
4			score	score								Scaled	Effective
5	1. Planning and Preparation				3.32	3.30		1	20	57.1	78.1		
6	A. Knowledge of Content and Pedagogy	1	3	0.75		1	0						
7	B. Knowledge of Students	2	3	1.5		1.02	1						
8	C. Setting Instructional Outcomes	2	3	1.5		1.03	2						
9	D. Knowledge of Resources	1	3	0.75		1.05	3						
10	E. Designing Coherent Instruction	2	3	1.5		1.08	4				Highly Eff	91-100	
11	F. Designing Student Assessments	2	4	2		1.1	5				Effective	75-90	
12		10.00		8		1.12	6				Developing	65-74	
13	2. The Classroom Environment					1.13	7				Ineffective	0-64	
14	A. Respect and Rapport	4	4	4		1.15	8						
15	B. Culture for Learning	4	3	3		1.18	9						
16	C. Managing Classroom Procedures	4	3	3		1.2	10				Local 60 pts		
17	D. Managing Student Behavior	4	3	3		1.21	11				H	60-58	
18	E. Organizing Physical Spaces	4	3	3		1.22	12				E	55-57	
19		20.00		16		1.23	13				D	41-54	
20	3. Instruction					1.25	14				I	40-0	
21	A. Communicating with Students	4	3	3		1.3	15						
22	B. Questioning/Prompts and Discussion	4	3	3		1.31	16						
23	C. Engaging Students in Learning	4	3	3		1.32	17			* note - if a number contains a decimal of .5			
24	D. Using Assessment in Instruction	4	4	4		1.35	18			or greater it will be rounded up to the nearest			
25	E. Using Flexibility and Responsiveness	4	4	4		1.38	19			whole number to obtain the unit member's			
26		20.00		17		1.4	20			local 60 Point score. A decimal of less than			
27	4. Professional Responsibilites					1.41	21			.5 will be rounded down to the nearest whole			
28	A. Reflecting on Teaching	0.8	4	0.8		1.42	22			number to obtain the unit member's Local 60			
29	B. Maintaining Accurate Records	2.5	3	1.875		1.43	23			Point score.			
30	C. Communicating with Families	0.8	3	0.6		1.45	24						
31	D. Participating in a Professional Community	1.7	4	1.7		1.5	25						
32	E. Growing and Developing Professionally	1.7	3	1.275		1.51	26						
33	F. Showing Professionalism	2.5	4	2.5		1.52	27						
34		10.00		8.75		1.53	28						
35						1.55	29						

	A	B	C	D	E	F	G	H	I	J	K	L	M
36	Total	60.00		49.75		1.6	30						
37						1.61	31						
38	Note 1: Remember: The evaluation component must be at least 31 of the 60 points, or 50% of the rubric					1.62	32						
39						1.63	33						
40						1.64	34						
41						1.65	35						
42						1.66	36						
43						1.67	37						
44						1.68	38						
45						1.69	39						
46						1.7	40						
47						1.71	41						
48						1.72	42						
49						1.73	43						
50						1.75	44						
51						1.8	45						
52						1.82	46						
53						1.83	47						
54						1.85	48						
55						1.9	49						
56						2	50						
57						2.01	50.5						
58						2.04	51						
59						2.05	52						
60						2.1	53						
61						2.2	54						
62						2.3	54.3						
63						2.4	54.6						
64						2.5	54.9						
65						2.6	55						
66						2.7	55.5						
67						2.8	56						
68						2.9	56.5						
69						3	57.1						
70						3.1	57.3						
71						3.2	57.4						

	A	B	C	D	E	F	G	H	I	J	K	L	M
72						3.3	57.7						
73						3.4	57.8						
74						3.5	58						
75						3.6	58.5						
76						3.7	59						
77						3.8	59.3						
78						3.9	59.8						
79						4	60						

Teacher Improvement Plan:

The parties have agreed upon the following Teacher Improvement Plan (TIP) Procedure and Form for teachers covered under Education Law § 3012-c and Part 30-2 of the Regents Rules who receive a developing or ineffective rating on their composite APPR.

Upon receiving a composite effectiveness rating of "developing" or "ineffective", a teacher shall be provided with a Teacher Improvement Plan (TIP).

Purpose: The parties understand and agree that the sole and exclusive purpose of a TIP is the improvement of teaching practice and that the issuance of a TIP is not a disciplinary action.

Process:

I. The TIP shall be developed in consultation with the teacher. The Association President shall be informed of the District's intent to provide a TIP to a teacher within ten (10) school days of the teacher's receipt of a "developing" or "ineffective" APPR Composite score.

II. If the teacher has been assigned a mentor, at the option of the teacher, he/she shall be permitted to bring the mentor during any meeting associated with the TIP.

Duration: The length of a TIP for a probationary teacher shall be between three (3) and five (5) months in duration, as determined by the District. The length of a TIP shall be between five (5) and ten (10) months in duration for a tenured faculty member, as determined by the District. Notwithstanding the above, the length of a TIP may be shortened by mutual agreement of the District and the unit member who is on the TIP. In the case of a probationary teacher, the length of a TIP may be extended if the District determines the need to do so.

Contents: A TIP shall clearly specify:

(i) the area(s) in need of improvement;
(ii) the performance goals, expectations, benchmarks, standards and timeliness the teacher must meet in order to achieve an effective rating;
(iii) how improvement will be measured and monitored, and provide for periodic reviews of progress and goal achievement;
(iv) the anticipated frequency and duration of meetings of the teacher, administrator, and mentor (if one is assigned); and
(v) the appropriate differentiated professional development opportunities, materials, resources and supports the District will make available to assist the teacher, including, where appropriate, the assignment of a mentor teacher.

In the event that the administrator recommends coursework, any tuition costs or registration fees shall be borne by the District in their entirety; provided, however, in the event

that the teacher submits an application for in-service or graduate credits attendant to any coursework recommended by the District and the same is approved by the Superintendent, then he/she shall bear the cost of the course(s) if he/she elects to receive the in-service or graduate credits. No disciplinary action predicated upon ineffective performance shall be taken by the District against a teacher until a TIP has been fully implemented. However, nothing herein shall prevent the District from introducing into evidence an evaluation or a TIP in a subsequent disciplinary action.

Timing: The TIP shall be provided as soon as practicable, but in no case later than ten (10) school days after the opening of classes for the school year.

APPENDIX "C"
TEACHER IMPROVEMENT PLAN

Name:_____ **Building:_____** **Date:_____**

☐ **Probationary Year 1** ☐ **Probationary Year 2** ☐ **Probationary Year 3** ☐ **Tenured**

Area(s) for Improvement	**Goals & Objectives** ***Teacher will…***	**Strategies & Supports**	**Anticipated Outcomes**	**Completion Date (if applicable)**

Progress Monitoring Meetings

Dates	Summary	Next Steps

Upon final evaluation at the terminal date of the TIP, the following has been determined:

[ ] TIP Completed **Date of TIP Completion (if applicable)**

[ ] TIP Not Completed

_____ _____

Teacher's Signature* **Date**

_____ _____

Administrator's Signature **Date**

* Signature acknowledges receipt of this document, not necessarily agreement with the contents thereof.

HEDI Ratings	Points	**Pleasantville UFSD SLO Growth Chart**
Highly Effective	20	96-100
	19	91-95
	18	86-90
Effective	17	81-85
	16	77-80
	15	74-76
	14	71-73
	13	67-70
	12	64-66
	11	61-63
	10	59-60
	9	55-58
Developing	8	50-54
	7	46-49
	6	41-45
	5	39-40
	4	35-38
	3	30-34
Ineffective	2	25-29
	1	1-24
	0	0

Table 1 – Section 8.1
Local 15 Point Measure of Student Achievement – Middle School Principal

(To be used upon the State's introduction of its Value-Added Growth Measure)

HEDI Rating	Local 15 Points	Percentage of Students in the Building meeting or exceeding the Achievement Target on the NYS ELA, NYS Math and NYS Science Assessments
Highly Effective	15	86-100
	14	76-85
Effective	13	66-75
	12	62-65
	11	58-61
	10	53-57
	9	48-52
	8	43-47
Developing	7	40-42
	6	36-39
	5	32-35-
	4	28-31
	3	24-27
Ineffective	2	18-23
	1	9-17
	0	0-8

In the event that the State does not have an approved value added growth measure for the Middle School Principal for the School Year, the Table in Section 8.2 shall be used instead of this 15 Point Table.

Table 2 – Section 8.1

Local 15 Point Measure of Student Achievement

High School Principal

HEDI Rating	Local 15 Points	Percentage of Students Graduating
Highly Effective	15	96-100
	14	91-95
Effective	13	85-90
	12	80-84
	11	75-79
	10	69-74
	9	62-68
	8	56-61
Developing	7	51-55
	6	46-50
	5	41-45
	4	35-40
	3	29-34
Ineffective	2	27-28
	1	11-26
	0	0-10

In the event that the State does not have an approved value added growth measure for the High School Principal for the School Year, the Table in Section 8.2 shall be used instead of this 15 Point Table.

Table 1 – Section 8.2

20 Point Measure of Student Achievement – Elementary and Middle School Principals*

HEDI Ratings	Local 20 Points	Percentage of Students in the Building meeting or exceeding the Achievement Target on the NYS ELA, NYS Math and NYS Science Assessments
Highly Effective	20	91-100
	19	83-90
	18	76-82
Effective	17	72-75
	16	68-71
	15	64-67
	14	60-63
	13	56-59
	12	52-55
	11	49-51
	10	46-48
	9	43-45
Developing	8	40-42
	7	37-39
	6	34-36
	5	31-33
	4	27-30
	3	24-26
Ineffective	2	18-23
	1	9-17
	0	0-8

*In the event that the State does not have an approved value added growth measure for the Middle School Principal for the School Year, this Table shall be used instead of the 15 Point Table uploaded in Section 8.1.

Table 2 – Section 8.2

20 Point Measure of Student Achievement

High School Principal*

HEDI Ratings	Local 20 Points	Percentage of students graduating
Highly Effective	20	98-100
	19	95-97
	18	91-94
Effective	17	86-90
	16	80-85
	15	75-79
	14	71-74
	13	67-70
	12	64-66
	11	61-63
	10	59-60
	9	56-58
Developing	8	51-55
	7	46-50
	6	41-45
	5	36-40
	4	32-35
	3	29-31
Ineffective	2	27-28
	1	25-26
	0	0-24

*In the event that the State does not have an approved value added growth measure for the High School Principal for the School Year, this Table shall be used instead of the 15 Point Table uploaded in Section 8.1.

APPR - Principal Evaluation

Local 60 Points Calculation Spreadsheet - Pleasantville Union Free School District

	Entry by Administrator = H,E,D,I	=Points assigned	Total Possible Points = 100%	Sub-totals		Highly Effective = 100%	Effective = 96.0%	Developing= 82.5%	Ineffective = 0%
1a	E	4.80	5.00		*56%*	5.00	4.80	4.13	0.00
1b	E	3.84	4.00		*44%*	4.00	3.84	3.30	0.00
Discretionary Points iff "I"									
				9	*15%*				
2a	E	2.88	3.00		*18%*	3.00	2.88	2.48	0.00
2b	E	5.76	6.00		*35%*	6.00	5.76	4.95	0.00
2c	D	1.65	2.00		*12%*	2.00	1.92	1.65	0.00
2d	H	3.00	3.00		*18%*	3.00	2.88	2.48	0.00
2e	E	2.88	3.00		*18%*	3.00	2.88	2.48	0.00
Discretionary Points iff "I"									
				17	*28%*				
3a	E	4.80	5.00		*33%*	5.00	4.80	4.13	0.00
3b	E	3.84	4.00		*27%*	4.00	3.84	3.30	0.00
3c	E	2.88	3.00		*20%*	3.00	2.88	2.48	0.00
3d	D	2.48	3.00		*20%*	3.00	2.88	2.48	0.00
Discretionary Points iff "I"									
				15	*25%*				
4a	E	4.80	5.00		*56%*	5.00	4.80	4.13	0.00
4b	E	1.92	2.00		*22%*	2.00	1.92	1.65	0.00
4c	D	1.65	2.00		*22%*	2.00	1.92	1.65	0.00
Discretionary Points iff "I"									
				9.00	*15%*				
5a	E	3.84	4.00		*67%*	4.00	3.84	3.30	0.00
5b	D	1.65	2.00		*33%*	2.00	1.92	1.65	0.00
Discretionary Points iff "I"									
				6.00	*10%*				
6a	E	1.92	2.00		*50%*	2.00	1.92	1.65	0.00
6b	E	1.92	2.00		*50%*	2.00	1.92	1.65	0.00
Discretionary Points iff "I"									
Raw Score		**56.51**		*4.00*	*7%*				
Final Total	**E**	**57.00**	**60.00**	***60***	***100%***	**60.00**	**57.60**	**49.50**	0-44

HEDI BANDS		
0-43	0.00	I
	43.00	I
44-52	44.00	D
	52.00	D
53-57	53.00	E
	57.00	E
58-60	58.00	H
	60.00	H

Note: If a number contains a decimal of .5 or greater it will be rounded up to the nearest whole number, and a decimal of less than .5 it will be rounded down to the nearest whole number to obtain the unit member's Local 60 Point score.

This spreadsheet and the formula underlying the computations herein are subject to Copyright Law Protection and cannot be duplicated, disseminated or modified without the permission of Julie Shaw. This is a confidential document, intended for internal use only, for the purpose of implementing APPR.
Copyright © June 2012. All Rights Reserved.

Principal Improvement Plan

A. The Principal Improvement Plan for a principal who receives a "developing" or "ineffective" composite APPR rating shall be comprised of the following elements:

1. The area or areas in need of improvement, drawn from the evaluation criteria (set forth in the MPPR Rubric) of this APPR;

2. The length of a PIP for a probationary principal shall range between three (3) months and a semester in duration, as determined by the Superintendent. The length of a PIP for a tenured building principal, as determined by the Superintendent, shall be between five (5) months and ten (10) months in duration, or through the end of the fiscal year, whichever is less. Notwithstanding the above, the length of a PIP may be shortened by mutual agreement of the Superintendent and the unit member who is on the PIP. In the case of a probationary building principal, the length of a PIP may only be extended at the sole discretion of the Superintendent.

3. After the issuance of the PIP, the Superintendent shall meet periodically with the building principal to review his or her progress regarding the areas identified in the PIP. At the conclusion of the PIP the Superintendent shall issue a written statement that reflects upon the quality of the artifacts shared by the principal in the areas in need of improvement and the observational information viewed by the Superintendent in such areas, if applicable.

4. A statement of differentiated activities to support improvement shall be developed on a collaborative basis with the principal, based upon the areas in the rubric that were deemed in need of support. The supports shall be reasonable in nature.

5. The manner of assessment of improvement that shall be in the nature of direct observation, review of materials (where applicable), review of behaviors (where applicable), attention to educational directives (where applicable).

6. Timing: The PIP shall be provided as soon as practicable, but in no case later than ten (10) school days after the opening of classes for the school year.

PRINCIPAL IMPROVEMENT PLAN FORM
(Uploaded in Section 11.2 of the Review Room)

(1) AREA(S) IN NEED OF IMPROVEMENT	(2) TIME LIMIT FOR ACHIEVING IMPROVEMENT	(3) DIFFERENTIATED ACTIVITIES TO SUPPORT IMPROVEMENT	(4) MANNER OF ASSESSMENT OF IMPROVEMENT

Upon final evaluation at the terminal date of the PIP, the following has been determined:

[ ] PIP Completed **Date of PIP Completion (if applicable)**

[ ] PIP Not Completed

_____ _____
Principal's Signature **Date**

_____ _____
Evaluator's Signature **Date**

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

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

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

The school district or BOCES and its collective bargaining agent(s), where applicable, also certify that this APPR plan is the district's or BOCES' complete APPR plan and that such plan will be fully implemented by the school district or BOCES; that there are no collective bargaining agreements, memoranda of understanding or any other agreements in any form that prevent, conflict or interfere with full implementation of the APPR Plan; and that no material changes will be made to the plan through collective bargaining or otherwise except with the approval of the Commissioner in accordance with Subpart 30-2 of the Rules of the Board of Regents.

The school district and its collective bargaining agent(s), where applicable, also acknowledge that if approval of this APPR plan is rejected or rescinded for any reason, any State aid increases received as a result of the Commissioner's approval of this APPR plan will be returned or forfeited to the State pursuant to Chapter 57 of the Laws of 2012 and/or 2013, as applicable.

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, 2013, assure that this was the result of unresolved collective bargaining negotiations

Signatures, dates

Superintendent Signature: Date:

2-26-14

Teachers Union President Signature: Date:

2-26-14

Administrative Union President Signature: Date:

2/26/14

Board of Education President Signature: Date:

2/26/14