



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

September 27, 2012

Dr. Kenneth R. Bossert, Superintendent
Port Jefferson School District
550 Scraggy Hill Road
Port Jefferson, NY 11777

Dear Superintendent Bossert:

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

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

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

Thank you again for your hard work.

Sincerely,


John B. King, Jr.
Commissioner

Attachment

c: Dean Lucera

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

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

Annual Professional Performance Reviews: 2012-13

Created Wednesday, May 09, 2012

Updated Monday, September 24, 2012

1

Disclaimers

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

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

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

1. SCHOOL DISTRICT INFORMATION

1.1) School District's BEDS Number :

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

580206020000

1.2) School District Name:

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

PORT JEFFERSON UFSD

1.3) School Improvement Grant (SIG) Districts Only

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

(No response)

1.4) Award Classification

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

(No response)

1.5) Assurances

Please check all of the boxes below:

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

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

Re-submission to address deficiencies

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

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

Annual (2012-13)

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

Created Wednesday, May 09, 2012

Updated Tuesday, September 25, 2012

Page 1

STATE-PROVIDED MEASURES OF STUDENT GROWTH

(25 points with an approved value-added measure)

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

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

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

2.1) Assurances

Please check the boxes below:

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

STUDENT LEARNING OBJECTIVES AS COMPARABLE GROWTH MEASURES (20 points)

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

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

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

If no State assessment or Regents exam exists:

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

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

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

State assessments, *required if one exists*

List of State-approved 3rd party assessments

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

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

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

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

2.2) Grades K-3 ELA

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

	ELA	Assessment
K	School-or BOCES-wide, group or team results based on State assessments	4/5 NYS ELA
1	School-or BOCES-wide, group or team results based on State assessments	4/5 NYS ELA
2	School-or BOCES-wide, group or team results based on State assessments	4/5 NYS ELA

	ELA	Assessment
3	State assessment	3rd Grade State Assessment

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

Use this box, if needed, to describe the general process for assigning HEDI categories for these grades/subjects in this

K - 2: Use school-wide growth score as determined by NYSED based on grades 4 and 5 NYS ELA.

subcomponent. If needed, you may upload a table or graphic at 2.11, below.	Grade 3: Using the pre-assessment and historical data, growth targets will be established for the 3rd grade NYS ELA. The same pre-assessment will be given in all 3rd grade classes. The percentage of students meeting the growth target on the 3rd grade NYS ELA will be converted to a scale score using Table 2.11, B. Combined with the results of math in 2.3, will result in a total Growth Score. Teachers can achieve all points.
Highly Effective (18 - 20 points) Results are well-above state average for similar students (or District goals if no state test).	K-2: Determined by NYS Grade 3: A teacher will be rated highly effective if 82% or greater of his/her students meet the growth target. The scale is shown in Table 2.11, B.
Effective (9 - 17 points) Results meet state average for similar students (or District goals if no state test).	K-2: Determined by NYS Grade 3: A teacher will be rated effective if 65% to 81% of his/her students meet the growth target. The scale is shown in Table 2.11 B.
Developing (3 - 8 points) Results are below state average for similar students (or District goals if no state test).	K-2: Determined by NYS Grade 3: A teacher will be rated developing if 50% to 64% of his/her students meet the growth target. The scale is shown in Table 2.11 B.
Ineffective (0 - 2 points) Results are well-below state average for similar students (or District goals if no state test).	K-2: Determined by NYS Grade 3: A teacher will be rated ineffective if 0% to 49% of his/her students meet the growth target. The scale is shown in Table 2.11 B.

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	School-or BOCES-wide, group or team results based on State assessments	4/5 NYS Math
1	School-or BOCES-wide, group or team results based on State assessments	4/5 NYS Math
2	School-or BOCES-wide, group or team results based on State assessments	4/5 NYS Math

	Math	Assessment
3	State assessment	3rd Grade State Assessment

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

Use this box, if needed, to describe the general process for assigning HEDI categories for these grades/subjects in this subcomponent. If needed, you may upload a table or graphic at 2.11, below.	K-2: Use school-wide growth score as determined by NYSED based on grades 4 and 5 Math Assessment. Grade 3: Using the pre-assessment and historical data, growth targets will be established for the 3rd grade NYS Math assessment. The same pre-assessment will be given in all 3rd grade classes. The percentage of students meeting the growth target on the 3rd grade NYS Math assessment will be converted to a scale score using Table 2.11, C. Combined with the results of ELA in 2.2, will result in a total Growth Score. Teachers can achieve all scale points.
---	--

Highly Effective (18 - 20 points) Results are well-above state average for similar students (or District goals if no state test).	K-2: Determined by NYS Grade 3: A teacher will be rated highly effective if 82% or greater of his/her students meet the growth target. The scale is shown in Table 2.11, C.
Effective (9 - 17 points) Results meet state average for similar students (or District goals if no state test).	K-2: Determined by NYS Grade 3: A teacher will be rated effective if 65% to 81% of his/her students meet the growth target. The scale is shown in Table 2.11 C.
Developing (3 - 8 points) Results are below state average for similar students (or District goals if no state test).	K-2: Determined by NYS Grade 3: A teacher will be rated developing if 50% to 64% of his/her students meet the growth target. The scale is shown in Table 2.11 C.
Ineffective (0 - 2 points) Results are well-below state average for similar students (or District goals if no state test).	K-2: Determined by NYS Grade 3: A teacher will be rated ineffective if 0% to 49% of his/her students meet the growth target. The scale is shown in Table 2.11 C.

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	Port Jefferson Developed 6th Grade Science Assessment
7	District, regional or BOCES-developed assessment	Port Jefferson Developed 7th Grade Science Assessment
	Science	Assessment
8	State assessment	8th Grade State Science Assessment

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

Use this box, if needed, to describe the general process for assigning HEDI categories for these grades/subjects in this subcomponent. If needed, you may upload a table or graphic at 2.11, below.	The SLOs for Grades 6 and 7 Science will utilize the Port Jefferson Developed Science Assessments. The SLO for 8th grade Science will utilize the 8th Grade NYS Science assessment. Using historical data and the results of a pre-assessment, growth targets will be set. The same pre-assessments and either the Port Jefferson Developed 6th Grade Assessment, the Port Jefferson Developed 7th Grade Assessment, or the NYS 8th Grade Science Assessment, will be used across all classrooms in the same grade level. The percentage of students meeting the growth target will be converted to a scale score of 0 to 20. The scale is shown in Table 2.11 A. Teachers can achieve all scale points from 0 to 20.
Highly Effective (18 - 20 points) Results are well-above state average for similar students (or District goals if no state test).	A teacher will be rated as Highly Effective if 85% or greater of his/her students meet the growth target. The scale is shown in Table 2.11, A.
Effective (9 - 17 points) Results meet state average for similar students (or District goals if no state test).	A teacher will be rated as Effective if 65% to 84% of his/her students meet the growth target. The scale is shown in Table

2.11 A.

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

A teacher will be rated as Developing if 50% to 64% of his/her students meet the growth target. The scale is shown in Table 2.11 A.

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

A teacher will be rated as Ineffective if 0% to 49% of his/her students meet the growth target. The scale is shown in Table 2.11 A.

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	Port Jefferson Developed 6th Grade Social Studies Assessment
7	District, regional or BOCES-developed assessment	Port Jefferson Developed 7th Grade Social Studies Assessment
8	District, regional or BOCES-developed assessment	Port Jefferson Developed 8th Grade Social Studies Assessment

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

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

The SLOs for Grades 6, 7, and 8th grade Social Studies will utilize the Port Jefferson Developed Social Studies Assessments. Using historical data and the results of a pre-assessment, growth targets will be set. The same pre-assessments and either Port Jefferson Developed 6th Grade Social Studies Assessment, or Port Jefferson Developed 7th Grade Social Studies Assessment, or Port Jefferson Developed 8th Grade Social Studies Assessment will be used across all classrooms in the same grade level. The percentage of students meeting the growth target will be converted to a scale score of 0 to 20. The scale is shown in Table 2.11 A. Teachers can achieve all scale points from 0 to 20.

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

A teacher will be rated as Highly Effective if 85% or greater of his/her students meet the growth target. The scale is shown in Table 2.11, A.

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

A teacher will be rated as Effective if 65% to 84% of his/her students meet the growth target. The scale is shown in Table 2.11 A.

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

A teacher will be rated as Developing if 50% to 64% of his/her students meet the growth target. The scale is shown in Table 2.11 A.

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

A teacher will be rated as Ineffective if 0% to 49% of his/her students meet the growth target. The scale is shown in Table 2.11 A.

2.6) High School Social Studies Regents Courses

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

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

		Assessment
Global 1	District, regional, or BOCES-developed assessment	Port Jefferson Developed 9th Grade Social Studies Assessment
Social Studies Regents Courses		Assessment
Global 2	Regents assessment	Regents assessment
American History	Regents assessment	Regents assessment

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

Use this box, if needed, to describe the general process for assigning HEDI categories for these grades/subjects in this subcomponent. If needed, you may upload a table or graphic at 2.11, below.	The SLOs for High School Social Studies Global 1, Global 2, and American History will be rigorous and comparable. All students in the same course, including all sections of that course, will take the same pre-assessment, and either the Port Jefferson Developed Global 1 post assessment or the NYS Regents for Global 2 or American History post-assessment. Growth targets will be set based on historical data and pre-assessment results. The percentage of students meeting the growth target will be converted to a scale score of 0 to 20. The scale is shown in 2.11 A. Teachers can achieve all scale points from 0 to 20.
Highly Effective (18 - 20 points) Results are well-above District goals for similar students.	A teacher will be rated as Highly Effective if 85% or greater of his/her students meet the growth target. The scale is shown in Table 2.11, A.
Effective (9 - 17 points) Results meet District goals for similar students.	A teacher will be rated as Effective if 65% to 84% of his/her students meet the growth target. The scale is shown in Table 2.11 A.
Developing (3 - 8 points) Results are below District goals for similar students.	A teacher will be rated as Developing if 50% to 64% of his/her students meet the growth target. The scale is shown in Table 2.11 A.
Ineffective (0 - 2 points) Results are well-below District goals for similar students.	A teacher will be rated as Ineffective if 0% to 49% of his/her students meet the growth target. The scale is shown in Table 2.11 A.

2.7) High School Science Regents Courses

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

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

Science Regents Courses	Assessment
-------------------------	------------

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

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

Use this box, if needed, to describe the general process for assigning HEDI categories for these grades/subjects in this subcomponent. If needed, you may upload a table or graphic at 2.11, below.	The SLOs for High School Science classes that include a NYS Regents will be rigorous and comparable. All students in the same course, in all sections of that course, will take the same pre-assessment, and the appropriate NYS Science Regents exam for that course as the post-assessment. Growth targets will be set based on historical data and pre-assessment results. The percentage of students meeting the growth target will be converted to a scale score of 0 to 20. The scale is shown in 2.11 A. Teachers can achieve all scale points from 0 to 20.
Highly Effective (18 - 20 points) Results are well-above District goals for similar students.	A teacher will be rated as Highly Effective if 85% or greater of his/her students meet the growth target. The scale is shown in Table 2.11, A.
Effective (9 - 17 points) Results meet District goals for similar students.	A teacher will be rated as Effective if 65% to 84% of his/her students meet the growth target. The scale is shown in Table 2.11 A.
Developing (3 - 8 points) Results are below District goals for similar students.	A teacher will be rated as Developing if 50% to 64% of his/her students meet the growth target. The scale is shown in Table 2.11 A.
Ineffective (0 - 2 points) Results are well-below District goals for similar students.	A teacher will be rated as Ineffective if 0% to 49% of his/her students meet the growth target. The scale is shown in Table 2.11 A.

2.8) High School Math Regents Courses

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

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

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

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

Use this box, if needed, to describe the general process for assigning HEDI categories for these grades/subjects in this subcomponent. If needed, you may upload a table or graphic at 2.11, below.	The SLOs for High School math classes that include a NYS Regents will be rigorous and comparable. All students in the same course, in all sections of that course, will take the same pre-assessment, and NYS Math Regents exam for that course as the post-assessment. Growth targets will be set based on historical data and pre-assessment results. The percentage of students meeting the growth target will be converted to a scale score of 0 to 20. The scale is shown in 2.11 A. Teachers can achieve all scale points from 0 to 20.
Highly Effective (18 - 20 points) Results are well-above District goals for similar students.	A teacher will be rated as Highly Effective if 85% or greater of his/her students meet the growth target. The scale is shown in Table 2.11, A.
Effective (9 - 17 points) Results meet District goals for similar students.	A teacher will be rated as Effective if 65% to 84% of his/her students meet the growth target. The scale is shown in Table 2.11 A.
Developing (3 - 8 points) Results are below District goals for similar students.	A teacher will be rated as Developing if 50% to 64% of his/her students meet the growth target. The scale is shown in Table 2.11 A.
Ineffective (0 - 2 points) Results are well-below District goals for similar students.	A teacher will be rated as Ineffective if 0% to 49% of his/her students meet the growth target. The scale is shown in Table 2.11 A.

2.9) High School English Language Arts

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

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

	High School English Courses	Assessment
Grade 9 ELA	District, regional or BOCES-developed assessment	Port Jefferson Developed 9th Grade English Assessment
Grade 10 ELA	District, regional or BOCES-developed assessment	Port Jefferson Developed 10th Grade English Assessment
Grade 11 ELA	Regents assessment	NYS English Regents

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

Use this box, if needed, to describe the general process for assigning HEDI categories for these grades/subjects in this subcomponent. If needed, you may upload a table or graphic at 2.11, below.	The SLOs for High School English 9, English 10, and English 11 will be rigorous and comparable. All students in the same course, including all sections of that course, will take the same pre-assessment, and either the English 9 Port Jefferson developed post assessment, Port Jefferson Developed English 9 Assessment or the Port Jefferson Developed English 10 Assessment, or the NYS Regents in English 11 as the post-assessment. Growth targets will be set based on historical data and pre-assessment results. The percentage of students meeting the growth target will be converted to a scale score of 0
---	--

A. Teachers can achieve all scale points from 0 to 20.

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

Teachers will be rated as Highly Effective if:
All Other Subjects, Grades K - 5: as determined by NYSED, based on the 4-5 ELA Growth Score.
All Other Subjects, Grades 6-8: as determined by NYSED, based on the 6-8 ELA Growth Score.
All Other Subjects, Grades 9-12: A teacher will be rated as Highly Effective if 85% or greater of the students in English 11 meet the growth target. The scale is shown in Table 2.11, A. Teachers can achieve all scale points from 0 to 20.

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

Teachers will be rated as Effective if:
All Other Subjects, Grades K - 5: as determined by NYSED, based on the 4-5 ELA Growth Score.
All Other Subjects, Grades 6-8: as determined by NYSED, based on the 6-8 ELA Growth Score.
All Other Subjects, Grades 9-12: A teacher will be rated as Effective if 65% to 84% of his/her students meet the growth target. The scale is shown in Table 2.11 A.

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

Teachers will be rated as Developing if:
All Other Subjects, Grades K - 5: as determined by NYSED, based on the 4-5 ELA Growth Score.
All Other Subjects, Grades 6-8: as determined by NYSED, based on the 6-8 ELA Growth Score.
All Other Subjects, Grades 9-12: A teacher will be rated as

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

Teachers will be rated as Ineffective if:
All Other Subjects, Grades K - 5: as determined by NYSED, based on the 4-5 ELA Growth Score.
All Other Subjects, Grades 6-8: as determined by NYSED, based on the 6-8 ELA Growth Score.
All Other Subjects, Grades 9-12: A teacher will be rated as Ineffective if 0% to 49% of his/her students meet the growth target. The scale is shown in Table 2.11 A.

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

(No response)

2.11) HEDI Tables or Graphics

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

assets/survey-uploads/5364/127503-TXEttx9bQW/2.11 - Tables A to C for Port Jefferson.docx

2.12) Locally Developed Controls

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

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

(No response)

2.13) Teachers with more than one growth measure

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

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

2.14) Assurances

Please check all of the boxes below:

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

3. Local Measures (Teachers)

Created Monday, May 14, 2012

Updated Tuesday, September 25, 2012

Page 1

Locally Selected Measures of Student Achievement or Growth

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

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

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

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

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

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

Growth or achievement measure(s) from these options.

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

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

Measures based on:

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

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

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

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

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

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

3.1) Grades 4-8 ELA

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

	Locally-Selected Measure from List of Approved Measures	Assessment
4	6(i) School-wide measure based on State-provided measure	Grades 3-5 NYS ELA Assessments
5	6(i) School-wide measure based on State-provided measure	Grades 3-5 NYS ELA Assessments
6	6(i) School-wide measure based on State-provided measure	Grades 6-8 NYS ELA Assessments
7	6(i) School-wide measure based on State-provided measure	Grades 6-8 NYS ELA Assessments
8	6(i) School-wide measure based on State-provided measure	Grades 6-8 NYS ELA Assessments

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

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

<p>Use this box, if needed, to describe the general process for assigning HEDI categories for these grades/subjects in this subcomponent. If needed, you may upload a table or graphic at 3.3, below.</p>	<p>Grades 4 & 5: Teachers of ELA, Grades 4-5, will be evaluated based on an achievement target for the combined results of the 3-5 ELA assessment . The target will be based on pre-assessment and historical data. The same pre-assessment will be administered to all students in the same grade level, and the NYS ELA in grades 3, 4, and 5 will be the post-assessment. The percentage of students meeting the achievement target will be converted to a scale score using the table at 3.13 E. This ELA score will be combined with the math Local score to provide the final Local Component score of 0 - 15 (Value-Added model). With the combined ELA & Math score, teachers can achieve all points from 0 - 15.</p> <p>Grades 6 - 8: Teachers of ELA, Grades 6-8, will be evaluated based on an achievement target for the combined results of the 6-8 ELA assessment . The target will be based on pre-assessment and historical data. The same pre-assessment will be administered to all students in the same grade level, and the NYS ELA in grades 6, 7, and 8 will be the post-assessment. The percentage of students meeting the achievement target will be converted to a scale score using the table at 3.13 D, Teachers can achieve all points from 0 - 15 (Value-Added Model).</p>
<p>Highly Effective (14 - 15 points) Results are well above District- or BOCES-adopted expectations for growth or achievement for grade/subject.</p>	<p>Grades 4 -5: A teacher will be rated as Highly Effective for the ELA portion if 81% or more of the students meet the achievement target. (Both the ELA and math HEDI results are combined from Tables 3.13 E and F for the overall Local score.)</p> <p>Grades 6-8: A teacher will be rated as Highly Effective if 85% or more of the students meet the achievement target (Table D).</p>
<p>Effective (8- 13 points) Results meet District- or BOCES-adopted expectations for growth or achievement for grade/subject.</p>	<p>Grades 4 -5: A teacher will be rated as Effective for the ELA portion if 65% - 80% of the students meet the achievement target. (Both the ELA and math HEDI results are combined from Tables 3.13 E and F for the overall Local score.)</p> <p>Grades 6-8: A teacher will be rated as Effective if 65% - 84% of the students meet the achievement target,</p>
<p>Developing (3 - 7 points) Results are below District- or BOCES-adopted expectations for growth or achievement for grade/subject.</p>	<p>Grades 4 -5: A teacher will be rated as Developing for the ELA portion if 50% - 64% of the students meet the achievement target. (Both the ELA and math HEDI results are combined from Tables 3.13 E and F for the overall Local score.)</p> <p>Grades 6-8: A teacher will be rated as Developing if 50% -64% of the students meet the achievement target.</p>
<p>Ineffective (0 - 2 points) Results are well below District- or BOCES-adopted expectations for growth or achievement for grade/subject.</p>	<p>Grades 4 -5: A teacher will be rated as Ineffective for the ELA portion if 0% to 49% of the students meet the achievement target. (Both the ELA and math HEDI results are combined from Tables 3.13 E and F for the overall Local score.)</p> <p>Grades 6-8: A teacher will be rated as Ineffective if 0% - 49% of the students meet the achievement target.</p>

3.2) Grades 4-8 Math

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

	Locally-Selected Measure from List of Approved Measures	Assessment
4	6(i) School-wide measure based on State-provided measure	Grade 4/5 NYS Math Assessments
5	6(i) School-wide measure based on State-provided measure	Grade 4/5 NYS Math Assessments
6	6(i) School-wide measure based on State-provided measure	Grade 6-8 NYS Math Assessments
7	6(i) School-wide measure based on State-provided measure	Grade 6-8 NYS Math Assessments
8	6(i) School-wide measure based on State-provided measure	Grade 6-8 NYS Math Assessments

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

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

<p>Use this box, if needed, to describe the general process for assigning HEDI categories for these grades/subjects in this subcomponent. If needed, you may upload a table or graphic at 3.3, below.</p>	<p>Grades 4 & 5: Teachers of Math, Grades 4-5, will be evaluated based on an achievement target for the combined results of the 3-5 NYS Math assessment . The target will be based on pre-assessment and historical data. The same pre-assessment will be administered to all students in the same grade level, and the NYS Math Assessment in grades 3, 4, and 5 will be the post-assessment. The percentage of students meeting the achievement target will be converted to a scale score using the table at 3.13 F. This Math score will be combined with the ELA Local score to provide the final Local Component score of 0 - 15 (Value-Added model). With the combined ELA & Math score, teachers can achieve all points from 0 - 15.</p> <p>Grades 6 - 8: Teachers of Math, Grades 6-8, will be evaluated based on an achievement target for the combined results of the 6-8 Math assessment . The target will be based on pre-assessment and historical data. The same pre-assessment will be administered to all students in the same grade level, and the NYS Math Assessment in grades 6, 7, and 8 will be the post-assessment. The percentage of students meeting the achievement target will be converted to a scale score using the table at 3.13 D, Teachers can achieve all points from 0 - 15 (Value-Added Model).</p>
<p>Highly Effective (14 - 15 points) Results are well above District- or BOCES-adopted expectations for growth or achievement for grade/subject.</p>	<p>Grades 4 -5: A teacher will be rated as Highly Effective for math if 81% or more of the students meet the achievement target. (Both the ELA and math HEDI results are combined from Tables 3.13 E and F for the overall Local score.)</p> <p>Grades 6-8: A teacher will be rated as Highly Effective if 85% or more of the students meet or exceed the achievement target (Table D),</p>
<p>Effective (8- 13 points) Results meet District- or BOCES-adopted expectations for growth or achievement for grade/subject.</p>	<p>Grades 4 -5: A teacher will be rated as Effective for math if 65% - 80% of the students meet the achievement target. (Both the ELA and math HEDI results are combined from Tables 3.13 E and F for the overall Local score.)</p> <p>Grades 6-8: A teacher will be rated as Effective if 65% - 84% of the students meet or exceed the achievement target,</p>

Developing (3 - 7 points) Results are below District- or BOCES-adopted expectations for growth or achievement for grade/subject.	Grades 4 -5: A teacher will be rated as Developing for math if 50% - 64% of the students meet the achievement target. (Both the ELA and math HEDI results are combined from Tables 3.13 E and F for the overall Local score.) Grades 6-8: A teacher will be rated as Developing if 50% - 64% of the students meet or exceed the achievement target.
Ineffective (0 - 2 points) Results are well below District- or BOCES-adopted expectations for growth or achievement for grade/subject.	Grades 4 -5: A teacher will be rated as Ineffective for Math if 0% to 49% of the students meet the achievement target. (Both the ELA and math HEDI results are combined from Tables 3.13 E and F for the overall Local score.) Grades 6-8: A teacher will be rated as Ineffective if 0% - 49% of the students meet the achievement target.

3.3) HEDI Tables or Graphics

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

<assets/survey-uploads/5139/129195-rhJdBgDruP/3.3 HEDI Tables D - F for Port Jefferson.docx>

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

Growth or achievement measure(s) from these options.

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

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

Measures based on:

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

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

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

- 4) Student growth or achievement computed in a manner determined locally based on a State-approved 3rd party assessment
- 5) Student growth or achievement computed in a manner determined locally based on a district, regional or BOCES-developed assessment that is rigorous and comparable across classrooms
- 6) A school-wide measure of either student growth or achievement based on either:
- (i) A State-provided student growth score covering all students in the school that took the State assessment in ELA or Math in Grades 4-8; or
 - (ii) A school-wide measure of student growth or achievement computed in a manner determined locally based on a State, State-approved 3rd party, or district, regional or BOCES developed assessment that is rigorous and comparable across classrooms
- 7) Student Learning Objectives (only allowable for teachers in grades/subjects without a Value-Added measure for the State Growth subcomponent). Used with one of the following assessments: State, State-approved 3rd party, or a district, regional or BOCES-developed assessment that is rigorous and comparable across classrooms

3.4) Grades K-3 ELA

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

	Locally-Selected Measure from List of Approved Measures	Assessment
K	6(ii) School-wide measure computed locally	Grades 3-5 NYS ELA
1	6(ii) School-wide measure computed locally	Grades 3-5 NYS ELA
2	6(ii) School-wide measure computed locally	Grades 3-5 NYS ELA
3	6(ii) School-wide measure computed locally	Grades 3-5 NYS ELA

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.	Teachers of ELA, Grades K - 3, will be evaluated based on an achievement target for the combined results of the 3-5 NYS ELA assessment . The target will be based on pre-assessment and historical data. The same pre-assessment will be administered to all students in the same grade level, and the NYS ELA in grades 3, 4, and 5 will be the post-assessment. The percentage of students meeting the achievement target will be converted to a scale score using the table at 3.13 B. This ELA score will be combined with the math Local score to provide the
---	--

	final Local Component score of 0 - 20. With the combined ELA & Math score, teachers can achieve all points from 0 - 20.
Highly Effective (18-20 points) Results are well above District- or BOCES-adopted expectations for growth or achievement for grade/subject.	Grades K-3: A teacher will be rated as Highly Effective for ELA if 82% or more of the students meet the achievement target. (Both the ELA and math HEDI results are combined from Tables 3.13 B and C for the overall Local score.)
Effective (9-17 points) Results meet District- or BOCES-adopted expectations for growth or achievement for grade/subject.	Grades K-3: A teacher will be rated as Effective for ELA if 65% - 81% of the students meet the achievement target. (Both the ELA and math HEDI results are combined from Tables 3.13 B and C for the overall Local score.)
Developing (3 - 8 points) Results are below District- or BOCES-adopted expectations for growth or achievement for grade/subject.	Grades K-3: A teacher will be rated as Developing for ELA if 50% - 64% of the students meet the achievement target. (Both the ELA and math HEDI results are combined from Tables 3.13 B and C for the overall Local score.)
Ineffective (0 - 2 points) Results are well below District- or BOCES-adopted expectations for growth or achievement for grade/subject.	Grades K-3: A teacher will be rated as Ineffective for ELA if 0% - 49% of the students meet the achievement target. (Both the ELA and math HEDI results are combined from Tables 3.13 B and C for the overall Local score.)

3.5) Grades K-3 Math

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

	Locally-Selected Measure from List of Approved Measures	Assessment
K	6(ii) School-wide measure computed locally	Grades 3-5 NYS Math Assessment
1	6(ii) School-wide measure computed locally	Grades 3-5 NYS Math Assessment
2	6(ii) School-wide measure computed locally	Grades 3-5 NYS Math Assessment
3	6(ii) School-wide measure computed locally	Grades 3-5 NYS Math Assessment

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

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

Use this box, if needed, to describe the general process for assigning HEDI categories for these grades/subjects in this subcomponent. If needed, you may upload a table or graphic at 3.13, below.	Teachers of Math, Grades K - 3, will be evaluated based on an achievement target for the combined results of the 3-5 NYS Math assessment . The target will be based on pre-assessment and historical data. The same pre-assessment will be administered to all students in the same grade level, and the NYS Math Assessment in grades 3, 4, and 5 will be the post-assessment. The percentage of students meeting the achievement target will be converted to a scale score using the table at 3.13 C. This Math score will be combined with the ELA Local score to provide the final Local Component score of 0 - 20. With the combined ELA & Math score, teachers can achieve all points from 0 - 20.
---	--

Highly Effective (18-20 points) Results are well above District- or BOCES-adopted expectations for growth or achievement for grade/subject.	Grades K - 3: A teacher will be rated as Highly Effective for math if 82% or more of the students meet the achievement target. (Both the ELA and math HEDI results are combined from Tables 3.13 B and C for the overall Local score.)
Effective (9-17 points) Results meet District- or BOCES-adopted expectations for growth or achievement for grade/subject.	Grades K-3: A teacher will be rated as Effective for math if 65% - 81% of the students meet the achievement target. (Both the ELA and math HEDI results are combined from Tables 3.13 B and C for the overall Local score.)
Developing (3 - 8 points) Results are below District -or BOCES-adopted expectations for growth or achievement for grade/subject.	Grades K-3: A teacher will be rated as Developing for math if 50% - 64%% of the students meet the achievement target. (Both the ELA and math HEDI results are combined from Tables 3.13 B and C for the overall Local score.)
Ineffective (0 - 2 points) Results are well below District- or BOCES-adopted expectations for growth or achievement for grade/subject.	Grades K-3: A teacher will be rated as Ineffective for math if 0% - 49% of the students meet the achievement target. (Both the ELA and math HEDI results are combined from Tables 3.13 B and C for the overall Local score.)

3.6) Grades 6-8 Science

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

	Locally-Selected Measure from List of Approved Measures	Assessment
6	6(i) School-wide measure based on State-provided measure	Grades 6-8 NYS ELA
7	6(i) School-wide measure based on State-provided measure	Grades 6-8 NYS ELA
8	6(i) School-wide measure based on State-provided measure	Grades 6-8 NYS ELA

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.	Grades 6 - 8: Teachers of Science, Grades 6-8, will be evaluated based on an achievement target for the combined results of the 6-8 ELA assessment . The target will be based on pre-assessment and historical data. The same pre-assessment will be administered to all students in the same grade level, and the NYS ELA in grades 6, 7, and 8 will be the post-assessment. The percentage of students meeting the achievement target will be converted to a scale score using the table at 3.13 A, Teachers can achieve all points from 0 - 20.
Highly Effective (18 - 20 points) Results are well above District- or BOCES-adopted expectations for growth or achievement for grade/subject.	A teacher will be rated as Highly Effective if 85% or more of the students meet or exceed the achievement target,
Effective (9 - 17 points) Results meet District- or BOCES-adopted expectations for growth or achievement for grade/subject.	A teacher will be rated as Effective if 65% - 84% of the students meet or exceed the achievement target,
Developing (3 - 8 points) Results are below District- or BOCES-adopted expectations for growth or achievement for grade/subject.	A teacher will be rated as Developing if 50% - 64% of the students meet or exceed the achievement target.
Ineffective (0 - 2 points) Results are well below District- or BOCES-adopted expectations for growth or achievement for grade/subject.	A teacher will be rated as Ineffective if 0% - 49% of the students meet the achievement target.

3.7) Grades 6-8 Social Studies

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

	Locally-Selected Measure from List of Approved Measures	Assessment
6	6(i) School-wide measure based on State-provided measure	Grades 6-8 NYS ELA
7	6(i) School-wide measure based on State-provided measure	Grades 6-8 NYS ELA
8	6(i) School-wide measure based on State-provided measure	Grades 6-8 NYS ELA

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.	Grades 6 - 8: Teachers of Social Studies, Grades 6-8, will be evaluated based on an achievement target for the combined results of the 6-8 ELA assessment . The target will be based on pre-assessment and historical data. The same pre-assessment will be administered to all students in the same grade level, and the NYS ELA in grades 6, 7, and 8 will be the post-assessment. The percentage of students meeting the achievement target will be converted to a scale score using the table at 3.13 A, Teachers can achieve all points from 0 - 20.
Highly Effective (18 - 20 points) Results are well above District- or BOCES-adopted expectations for growth or achievement for grade/subject.	A teacher will be rated as Highly Effective if 85% or more of the students meet or exceed the achievement target,
Effective (9 - 17 points) Results meet District- or BOCES-adopted expectations for growth or achievement for grade/subject.	A teacher will be rated as Effective if 65% - 84% of the students meet or exceed the achievement target,
Developing (3 - 8 points) Results are below District- or BOCES-adopted expectations for growth or achievement for grade/subject.	A teacher will be rated as Developing if 50% - 64% of the students meet or exceed the achievement target.
Ineffective (0 - 2 points) Results are well below District- or BOCES-adopted expectations for growth or achievement for grade/subject.	A teacher will be rated as Ineffective if 0% - 49% of the students meet the achievement target.

3.8) High School Social Studies

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

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

	Locally-Selected Measure from List of Approved Measures	Assessment
Global 1	6(ii) School wide measure computed locally	English Regents

Global 2	6(ii) School wide measure computed locally	English Regents
American History	6(ii) School wide measure computed locally	English 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.	Teachers of Social Studies courses in Global 1, Global 2, and American History will be will be evaluated based on an achievement target for the English 11 Regents exam. The target will be based on pre-assessment and historical data. The same pre-assessment will be administered to all students in the course, and the NYS English Regents in grade 11 will be the post-assessment. The percentage of students meeting the achievement target will be converted to a scale score using the table at 3.13 A, Teachers can achieve all points from 0 - 20.
Highly Effective (18 - 20 points) Results are well above District- or BOCES-adopted expectations for growth or achievement for grade/subject.	A teacher will be rated as Highly Effective if 85% or more of the students meet or exceed the achievement target,
Effective (9 - 17 points) Results meet District- or BOCES-adopted expectations for growth or achievement for grade/subject.	A teacher will be rated as Effective if 65% - 84% of the students meet or exceed the achievement target,
Developing (3 - 8 points) Results are below District- or BOCES-adopted expectations for growth or achievement for grade/subject.	A teacher will be rated as Developing if 50% - 64% of the students meet or exceed the achievement target.
Ineffective (0 - 2 points) Results are well below District- or BOCES-adopted expectations for growth or achievement for grade/subject.	A teacher will be rated as Ineffective if 0% - 49% of the students meet the achievement target.

3.9) High School Science

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

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

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

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

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

Use this box, if needed, to describe the general process for assigning HEDI categories for these grades/subjects in this subcomponent. If needed, you may upload a table or graphic at 3.13, below.	Teachers of Science courses ending in a Regents, Living Environment, Earth Science, Chemistry, and Physics will be evaluated based on an achievement target for the English 11 Regents exam. The target will be based on pre-assessment and historical data. The same pre-assessment will be administered to all students in the course, and the NYS English Regents in grade 11 will be the post-assessment. The percentage of students meeting the achievement target will be converted to a scale score using the table at 3.13 A, Teachers can achieve all points from 0 - 20.
Highly Effective (18-20 points) Results are well above District- or BOCES-adopted expectations for growth or achievement for grade/subject.	A teacher will be rated as Highly Effective if 85% or more of the students meet or exceed the achievement target,
Developing (3 - 8 points) Results are below District- or BOCES-adopted expectations for growth or achievement for grade/subject.	A teacher will be rated as Developing if 50% - 64% of the students meet or exceed the achievement target.
Effective (9 - 17points) Results meet District- or BOCES-adopted expectations for growth or achievement for grade/subject.	A teacher will be rated as Effective if 65% - 84% of the students meet or exceed the achievement target,
Ineffective (0 - 2 points) Results are well below District- or BOCES-adopted expectations for growth or achievement for grade/subject.	A teacher will be rated as Ineffective if 0% - 49% of the students meet the achievement target.

3.10) High School Math

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

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

	Locally-Selected Measure from List of Approved Measures	Assessment
Algebra 1	6(ii) School wide measure computed locally	English Regents Exam
Geometry	6(ii) School wide measure computed locally	English Regents Exam
Algebra 2	6(ii) School wide measure computed locally	English Regents Exam

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

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

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.	Teachers of Math courses ending in a Regents, Algebra 1, Geometry, and Algebra 2, will be evaluated based on an achievement target for the English 11 Regents exam. The target will be based on pre-assessment and historical data. The same pre-assessment will be administered to all students in the course, and the NYS English Regents in grade 11 will be the post-assessment. The percentage of students meeting the achievement target will be converted to a scale score using the table at 3.13 A, Teachers can achieve all points from 0 - 20.
Highly Effective (18 - 20 points) Results are well above District- or BOCES-adopted expectations for growth or achievement for grade/subject.	A teacher will be rated as Highly Effective if 85% or more of the students meet or exceed the achievement target,
Effective (9 - 17 points) Results meet District- or BOCES-adopted expectations for growth or achievement for grade/subject.	A teacher will be rated as Effective if 65% - 84% of the students meet or exceed the achievement target,
Developing (3 - 8 points) Results are below District- or BOCES-adopted expectations for growth or achievement for grade/subject.	A teacher will be rated as Developing if 50% - 64% of the students meet or exceed the achievement target.
Ineffective (0 - 2 points) Results are well below District- or BOCES-adopted expectations for growth or achievement for grade/subject.	A teacher will be rated as Ineffective if 0% - 49% of the students meet the achievement target.

3.11) High School English Language Arts

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

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

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

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

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

Use this box, if needed, to describe the general process for assigning HEDI categories for these grades/subjects in this subcomponent. If needed, you may upload a table or graphic at 3.13, below.	Teachers of English 9, English 10, and English 11, will be evaluated based on an achievement target for the English 11 Regents exam. The target will be based on pre-assessment and historical data. The same pre-assessment will be administered to all students in the course, and the NYS English Regents in grade 11 will be the post-assessment. The percentage of students meeting the achievement target will be converted to a scale score using the table at 3.13 A, Teachers can achieve all points
---	---

6-8 ELA assessment . The target will be based on pre-assessment and historical data. The same pre-assessment will be administered to all students in the same grade level, and the NYS ELA in grades 6, 7, and 8 will be the post-assessment. The percentage of students meeting the achievement target will be converted to a scale score using the table at 3.13 A, Teachers can achieve all points from 0 - 20.

Teachers of all other High School Courses will be evaluated based on an achievement target for the English 11 Regents exam. The target will be based on pre-assessment and historical data. The same pre-assessment will be administered to all students in the course, and the NYS English Regents in grade 11 will be the post-assessment. The percentage of students meeting the achievement target will be converted to a scale score using the table at 3.13 A, Teachers can achieve all points from 0 - 20.

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

A teacher will be rated as Highly Effective if 85% or more of the students meet or exceed the achievement target,

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

A teacher will be rated as Effective if 65% - 84% of the students meet or exceed the achievement target,

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

A teacher will be rated as Developing if 50% - 64% of the students meet or exceed the achievement target.

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

A teacher will be rated as Ineffective if 0% - 49% of the students meet the achievement target.

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

(No response)

3.13) HEDI Tables or Graphics

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

assets/survey-uploads/5139/129195-y92vNseFa4/3.13 HEDI Tables A to C for Port Jefferson.docx

3.14) Locally Developed Controls

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

(No response)

3.15) Teachers with More Than One Locally Selected Measure

Describe the district's process for combining multiple locally selected measures, each scored from 0-15 or 0-20 points as applicable, into a single subcomponent HEDI category and score. Examples may include: 4th grade teacher with locally-selected measures for

both ELA and Math; High School teacher with more than 1 SLO.

During the 2012-2013 school year all teachers will be evaluated using a school-wide measure for the Local Measure. For teachers who will have an ELA and a Math score, HEDI tables D and E at 3.3 have been specified that reflect half the HEDI score. The two HEDI scores will be added together to arrive at the Local Component Score.

3.16) Assurances

Please check all of the boxes below:

3.16) Assurances Assure the application of locally-developed controls will be rigorous, fair, and transparent.	Checked
3.16) Assurances Assure that use of locally-developed controls will not have a disparate impact on underrepresented students in accordance with any applicable civil rights laws.	Checked
3.16) Assurances Assure that enrolled students in accordance with teacher of record policies are included and may not be excluded.	Checked
3.16) Assurances Assure that procedures for ensuring data accuracy and integrity are being utilized.	Checked
3.16) Assurances Assure that the process for assigning points for locally selected measures will use the narrative HEDI descriptions described in the regulations to effectively differentiate educators' performance in ways that improve student learning and instruction.	Checked
3.16) Assurances Assure that it is possible for an educator to earn each point, including 0, for the locally-selected measures subcomponent.	Checked
3.16) Assurances Assure that locally-selected measures are rigorous and comparable across all classrooms in the same grade/subject in the district.	Checked
3.16) Assurances If more than one type of locally-selected measure is used for different groups of teachers within a grade/subject, certify that the measures are comparable based on the Standards of Educational and Psychological Testing.	Checked
3.16) Assurances Assure that all locally-selected measures for a teacher are different than any measures used for the State assessment or other comparable measures subcomponent.	Checked

4. Other Measures of Effectiveness (Teachers)

Created Monday, May 14, 2012

Updated Tuesday, September 25, 2012

Page 1

4.1) Teacher Practice Rubric

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

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

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

Danielson's Framework for Teaching (2011 Revised Edition)

(No response)

4.2) Points Within Other Measures

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

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

Is the following points assignment applicable to all teachers?

Yes

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

(No response)

Multiple (at least two) classroom observations by principal or other trained administrator, at least one of which must be unannounced [at least 31 points]	50
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	10

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

(No response)

4.3) Survey Tools (if applicable)

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

(No response)

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

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

4.4) Assurances

Please check all of the boxes below:

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

4.5) Process for Assigning Points and Determining HEDI Ratings

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

A Performance Level for Multiple Classroom Observations using HEDI classifications shall be determined for each of the 22 elements of the Danielson 2011 rubric based on the teacher observation process. The scores for each element shall be given a numeric value based on the rubric as follows: one credit for each rating of Ineffective, four credits for each rating of Developing, five credits for each rating of Effective and six credits for each rating of Highly Effective. The credits assigned for each of the items in each domain shall be summed to arrive at a total number of credits. Points are assigned (on a scale from 0-50 points) using the Conversion Table, uploaded below.

A structured review of artifacts shall be used as another measure of Teacher Effectiveness. The artifacts presented should represent the teacher's focus on student learning and reflective practice. An exemplary collection of artifacts should contain at least nine documents, and include at least six different types of artifacts representing all four domains. Points are assigned (on a scale of 0-10

points) using the Rubric, uploaded below.

The combined points from the Multiple Classroom Observations and the Structured Review of Artifacts will result in a score of 0-60, which results in a HEDI rating according to the table below.

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

assets/survey-uploads/5091/129197-eka9yMJ855/PJ Table 4.5, Artifacts Rubric and Conversion Table.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 NYS Teaching Standards.	The level of performance for Highly Effective exceeds the attributes identified in the effective category of the Danielson Rubric 2011. The score from multiple classroom observations (raw points converted to HEDI points using the Conversion Table) and the points from the Structured Review of Artifacts rubric, will be combined to determine a HEDI rating. A HEDI score of 59 or 60 will be rated as Highly Effective.
Effective: Overall performance and results meet NYS Teaching Standards.	The level of performance for Effective will meet the attributes identified in the effective category of the Danielson Rubric 2011. The score from multiple classroom observations (raw points converted to HEDI points using the Conversion Table) and the points from the Structured Review of Artifacts rubric, will be combined to determine a HEDI rating. A HEDI score of 57 or 58 will be rated as Effective.
Developing: Overall performance and results need improvement in order to meet NYS Teaching Standards.	The level of performance for Developing will need improvement to meet the attributes identified in the effective category of the Danielson Rubric 2011. The score from multiple classroom observations (raw points converted to HEDI points using the Conversion Table) and the points from the Structured Review of Artifacts rubric, will be combined to determine a HEDI rating. A HEDI score of 50-56 will be rated as Developing.
Ineffective: Overall performance and results do not meet NYS Teaching Standards.	The level of performance for Ineffective will not meet the attributes identified in the effective category of the Danielson Rubric 2011. The score from multiple classroom observations (raw points converted to HEDI points using the Conversion Table) and the points from the Structured Review of Artifacts rubric, will be combined to determine a HEDI rating. A HEDI score of 0 - 49 will be rated as Ineffective.

Provide the ranges for the 60-point scoring bands.

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

4.6) Observations of Probationary Teachers

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

By building principals or other trained administrators

4.6) Observations of Probationary Teachers Formal/Long	3
4.6) Observations of Probationary Teachers Informal/Short	0
4.6) Observations of Probationary Teachers Enter Total	3

By trained in-school peer teachers or other trained reviewers

Formal/Long	0
Informal/Short	0

Independent evaluators

Formal/Long	0
Informal/Short	0

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

-
- In Person
-

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

-
- Not Applicable
-

4.7) Observations of Tenured Teachers

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

By building principals or other trained administrators

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

By trained in-school peer teachers or other trained reviewers

Formal/Long	0
-------------	---

Informal/Short	0
----------------	---

Independent evaluators

Formal/Long	0
Informal/Short	0

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

-
- In Person
-

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

-
- Not Applicable
-

5. Composite Scoring (Teachers)

Created Monday, May 14, 2012
Updated Tuesday, June 26, 2012

Page 1

Standards for Rating Categories

Growth or Comparable Measures

Locally-selected Measures of growth or achievement

Other Measures of Effectiveness (Teacher and Leader standards)

Highly

Effective

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

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

Overall performance and results exceed NYS Teaching Standards.

Effective

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

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

Overall performance and results meet NYS Teaching Standards.

Developing

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

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

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

Ineffective

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

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

Overall performance and results do not meet NYS Teaching Standards.

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

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

2012-13 where there is no Value-Added measure

Growth or Comparable Measures

Locally-selected Measures of

growth or achievement

Other Measures of Effectiveness

(60 points)

Overall

Composite Score

Highly Effective

18-20

18-20

Ranges determined locally--see below

91-100

Effective

9-17

9-17

75-90

Developing

3-8

3-8

65-74

Ineffective

0-2

0-2

0-64

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

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

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

2012-13 where Value-Added growth measure applies

Growth or Comparable Measures

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

Other Measures of Effectiveness

(60 points)

Overall

Composite Score

Highly Effective

22-25

14-15

Ranges determined locally--see above

91-100

Effective

10-21

8-13

75-90

Developing

3-9

3-7

65-74

Ineffective

0-2

0-2

0-64

6. Additional Requirements - Teachers

Created Monday, May 14, 2012

Updated Tuesday, September 25, 2012

Page 1

6.1) Assurances -- Improvement Plans

Please check the boxes below:

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

6.2) Attachment: Teacher Improvement Plan Forms

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

<assets/survey-uploads/5265/129201-Df0w3Xx5v6/PJ Teacher Improvement Plan.pdf>

6.3) Appeals Process

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

(1) the substance of the annual professional performance review

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

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

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

1. All appeals must be submitted in writing to the Superintendent no later than fourteen (14) calendar days from the date when the teacher receives the Annual Professional Performance Review.

2. All appeals shall be resolved based on the written record, although the Superintendent shall reserve the right to meet with the teacher prior to rendering a final decision. When filing an appeal, the teacher shall submit a detailed written description of the basis

for the appeal, along with any and all additional documents or written materials that support the appeal. A copy of the performance review and/or improvement plan(s) being challenged shall be submitted with the appeal. All preparation for an appeal shall be the responsibility of the person filing the appeal.

3. A written decision on the merits of the appeal shall be rendered by the District's Superintendent of Schools no later than twenty-eight (28) calendar days from the date when the appeal was filed.

6.4) Training and Certification of Lead Evaluators and Evaluators

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

During the 2011-2012 school year, district administrators, including the Superintendent of Schools, attended all training modules at Eastern Suffolk Boces for Evaluator Training. The Executive Director will be turnkey training evaluators on an ongoing basis, and attending ES Boces workshops, Curriculum Council, and CIO meetings for continued updates.

Turn-key, in-district training has been provided to all evaluators and lead evaluators on the New York State Teaching Standards; the application and use of assessment tools that the Port Jefferson School District uses to evaluate teachers; the application and use of locally selected measures of student achievement; the scoring methodology used to evaluate teachers; the use of the Statewide Instructional Reporting System; specific considerations in evaluating teachers of English Language Learners and students with disabilities; and the application and use of the Student Growth Percentile model and the Value-Added Growth Model.

The Port Jefferson School District has selected and received agreement from the Port Jefferson Teachers Association to utilize the Danielson 2011 Framework for Teaching rubric. Training has been provided on the application and use of this state-approved rubric, including training on the effective application of such rubrics to observe a teacher's practice. Further, all evaluators and lead evaluators have completed the Teachscape, Framework for Teaching Proficiency System course and Proficiency Assessment. All evaluators and lead evaluators have been trained in evidence-based observation techniques, grounded in research

All evaluators and lead evaluators, will continue to meet for training purposes throughout the year, including continued training on all aspects of teacher evaluation, updates from NYSED, and to continue to focus on inter-rater reliability. Ongoing training on inter-rater reliability will be conducted by the use of videos from the Teachscape system for rating and the evaluation of ratings, discussion of observations and the methodology for evaluating teacher practice, the evaluation of artifacts, the completion of each component of the Composite Score, and other aspects of the tasks of the evaluators.

The Superintendent or his designee will certify lead evaluators upon receipt of proper documentation that the individual has fully completed training. The Superintendent will maintain records of certification of evaluators. The Board of Education for the Port Jefferson School District will certify all evaluators and lead evaluators, after reviewing the ongoing training they have received. The Board of Education will re-certify evaluators and lead evaluators annually, after reviewing the ongoing training they have received.

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 Wednesday, May 09, 2012
Updated Tuesday, September 25, 2012

Page 1

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

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

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

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

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

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

Please check the boxes below:

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

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

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

State assessments, *required if one exists*

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

List of State-approved 3rd party assessments

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

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

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

Describe the district-adopted expectations for the level of performance required for each HEDI rating category and the process for assigning points to principals based on SLO results, consistent with regulations and assurances in the Comparable Growth Measures subcomponent. Include any district-determined expectations for student performance.

Use this box, if needed, to describe the process for assigning HEDI categories in this subcomponent. If needed, you may upload a table or graphic below.	For the 2012-2013 school year, all Principals will have at least 30% of their students enrolled in courses that have a NYS assessment and they will receive a HEDI subcomponent rating from NYSED.
Highly Effective (18 - 20 points) Results are well above state average for similar students (or District goals if no state test).	For the 2012-2013 school year, all Principals will have at least 30% of their students enrolled in courses that have a NYS assessment and they will receive a HEDI subcomponent rating from NYSED.
Effective (9 - 17 points) Results meet state average for similar students (or District goals if no state test).	For the 2012-2013 school year, all Principals will have at least 30% of their students enrolled in courses that have a NYS assessment and they will receive a HEDI subcomponent rating from NYSED.
Developing (3 - 8 points) Results are below state average for similar students (or District goals if no state test).	For the 2012-2013 school year, all Principals will have at least 30% of their students enrolled in courses that have a NYS assessment and they will receive a HEDI subcomponent rating from NYSED.
Ineffective (0 - 2 points) Results are well below state average for similar students (or District goals if no state test).	For the 2012-2013 school year, all Principals will have at least 30% of their students enrolled in courses that have a NYS assessment and they will receive a HEDI subcomponent rating from NYSED.

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

(No response)

7.4) Special Considerations for Comparable Growth Measures

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

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

(No response)

7.5) Principals with More Than One Growth Measure

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

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

7.6) Assurances -- Comparable Growth Measures

Please check all of the boxes below:

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

8. Local Measures (Principals)

Created Wednesday, May 09, 2012

Updated Tuesday, September 25, 2012

Page 1

Locally-Selected Measures of Student Achievement or Growth

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

Grade Configuration	Locally-Selected Measure from List of Approved Measures	Assessment
PK-5	(d) measures used by district for teacher evaluation	Grades NYS 3-5 ELA
6-8	(d) measures used by district for teacher evaluation	Grades NYS 6-8 ELA
9-12	(d) measures used by district for teacher evaluation	Grade 11 NYS English Regents

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

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

Use this box, if needed, to describe the process for assigning HEDI categories. If needed, you may upload a table or graphic below.	There is one school with each of the grade configurations listed in section 8.1, above. The same assessment will be used in all classrooms in the same grade level and course. The percentage of students meeting the achievement target will be converted to a scale score using the Table 8.1 DD. The Principals can earn all points from 0-15.
Highly Effective (14 - 15 points) Results are well above District- or BOCES-adopted expectations for growth or achievement for grade/subject.	A Principal will be rated as Highly Effective if 85% or more of his/her students meet the target.
Effective (8- 13 points) Results meet District- or BOCES-adopted expectations for growth or achievement for grade/subject.	A Principal will be rated as Effective if 65% - 84% of his/her students meet the target.
Developing (3 - 7 points) Results are below District- or BOCES-adopted expectations for growth or achievement for grade/subject.	A Principal will be rated as Developing if 50% - 64% of his/her students meet the target.
Ineffective (0 - 2 points) Results are well below District- or BOCES-adopted expectations for growth or achievement for grade/subject.	A Principal will be rated as Ineffective if 0% - 49% of his/her students meet the target.

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

(No response)

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

assets/survey-uploads/5366/127506-qBFVOWF7fC/8.1 HEDI Table DD for Port Jefferson.pdf

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

(i) student learning objectives (only allowable for principals in programs/buildings without a Value-Added measure for the State

Growth subcomponent). Used with one of the following assessments: State, State-approved 3rd party, or a District, regional, or BOCES-developed assessment that is rigorous and comparable across classrooms

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

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

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

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

Use this box, if needed, to describe the process for assigning HEDI categories. If needed, you may upload a table or graphic below.	There are no Principals in this category.
Highly Effective (18 - 20 points) Results are well above District- or BOCES-adopted expectations for growth or achievement for grade/subject.	There are no Principals in this category.
Effective (9- 17 points) Results meet District- or BOCES-adopted expectations for growth or achievement for grade/subject.	There are no Principals in this category.
Developing (3 - 8 points) Results are below District- or BOCES-adopted expectations for growth or achievement for grade/subject.	There are no Principals in this category.
Ineffective (0 - 2 points) Results are well below District- or BOCES-adopted expectations for growth or achievement for grade/subject.	There are no Principals in this category.

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

(No response)

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

(No response)

8.3) Locally Developed Controls

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

(No response)

8.4) Principals with More Than One Locally Selected Measure

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

(No response)

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 Wednesday, May 09, 2012

Updated Thursday, June 28, 2012

Page 1

9.1) Principal Practice Rubric

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

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

Marshall's Principal Evaluation Rubric

(No response)

9.2) Points Within Other Measures

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

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

Is the following points assignment for all principals?

Yes

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

(No response)

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

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

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

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

(No response)

9.3) Assurances -- Goals

Please check the boxes below (if applicable):

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

9.4) Sources of Evidence (if applicable)

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

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

9.5) Survey Tool(s) (if applicable)

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

(No response)

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

(No response)

(No response)

(No response)

9.6) Assurances

Please check all of the boxes below:

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

9.7) Process for Assigning Points and Determining HEDI Ratings

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

Principals will be evaluated using the Kim Marshall Principal Evaluation Rubric, which has 60 sub-domains, that can result in a maximum raw score of 240. A Structured Review of Artifacts conducted using a rubric can result in an additional maximum of 30 raw points, for a total possible raw score of 270. The 270 raw score scale has been converted to a 60 point scale, modeled after the cutpoints established by NYSED.

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/5143/127507-pMADJ4gk6R/Appendix E Principal Conversion Chart for Other Measures.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.	Highly Effective: 54 - 60 Points, with a raw score of 241-270
Effective: Overall performance and results meet standards.	Effective: 45 - 53 Points, with a raw score of 201-240
Developing: Overall performance and results need improvement in order to meet standards.	Deveoping: 39 - 44 Points, with a raw score of 174-200
Ineffective: Overall performance and results do not meet standards.	Ineffective: 0 - 38 Points, with a raw score of 0-173

Please provide the locally-negotiated 60 point scoring bands.

Highly Effective	54-60
Effective	45-53
Developing	39-44
Ineffective	0-38

9.8) School Visits

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

Probationary Principals

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

Tenured Principals

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

10. Composite Scoring (Principals)

Created Wednesday, May 09, 2012

Updated Thursday, June 28, 2012

Page 1

Standards for Rating Categories

Growth or Comparable Measures

Locally-selected Measures of growth or achievement

Other Measures of Effectiveness

(Teacher and Leader standards)

Highly

Effective

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

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

Overall performance and results exceed ISLLC leadership standards.

Effective

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

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

Overall performance and results meet ISLLC leadership standards.

Developing

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

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

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

Ineffective

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

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

Overall performance and results do not meet ISLLC leadership standards.

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

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

2012-13 where there is no Value-Added measure

Growth or Comparable Measures

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

Other Measures of Effectiveness

(60 points)

Overall

Composite Score

Highly Effective

18-20

18-20

Ranges determined locally--see below

91-100

Effective

9-17

9-17

75-90

Developing

3-8

3-8

65-74

Ineffective

0-2

0-2

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

Highly Effective	54-60
Effective	45-53
Developing	39-44
Ineffective	0-38

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

2012-13 where Value-Added growth measure applies

Growth or Comparable Measures

Locally-selected Measures of growth or achievement

Other Measures of Effectiveness

(60 points)

Overall

Composite Score

Highly Effective

22-25

14-15

Ranges determined locally--see above

91-100

Effective

10-21

8-13

75-90

Developing

3-9

3-7

65-74

Ineffective

0-2

0-2

0-64

11. Additional Requirements - Principals

Created Wednesday, May 09, 2012

Updated Tuesday, September 25, 2012

Page 1

11.1) Assurances -- Improvement Plans

Please check the boxes below.

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

11.2) Attachment: Principal Improvement Plan Forms

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

[assets/survey-uploads/5276/127509-Df0w3Xx5v6/Port Jeff Principal Improvement Plan.pdf](#)

11.3) Appeals Process

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

(1) the substance of the annual professional performance review

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

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

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

Appeal procedures shall provide for the timely and expeditious resolution of any appeal.

All appeals must be submitted in writing to the Superintendent no later than ten (10) business days from the date when the principal receives the Annual Professional Performance Review.

The Superintendent shall respond to the appeal with a written answer granting the appeal and directing further administrative action, or a written answer denying the appeal that must include explanation and rationale behind that decision. The Superintendent 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 fifteen (15) business days of the receipt of the appeal.

11.4) Training and Certification of Lead Evaluators and Evaluators

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

During the 2011-2012 school year, the Superintendent, Executive Director of Curriculum & Instruction, and the Port Jefferson Administrators Association President attended Principal APPR training sessions at ES Boces.

The Superintendent of Schools and the Executive Director will be the evaluator and lead evaluator of the Principals for the 2012-2013 school year. In addition to the training they attended at ES Boces, they continue in-district training on each of the elements.

The Executive Director also attended training at Western Suffolk Boces on the Kim Marshall Rubric, which will be used in the Port Jefferson School District, as agreed upon with the Port Jefferson Administrators Association. The Executive Director has provided turn-key training on the application and use of the rubric, including the use of evidence based observation techniques grounded in research,

The Executive Director and the Superintendent will continue with ongoing training on the use of the Kim Marshall Rubric, the observation process, and the practice of aligning evidence to the rubric to strengthen inter-rater reliability. The Principals have been attending in-district training on the Kim Marshall Rubric and all elements of Principal APPR, as well.

Training has also included the ISLLC Standards; the application and use of the student growth percentile model and the value-added growth model; the application and use of the assessment tools utilized to evaluate principals in the Port Jefferson School District, the use of the Statewide Instructional Reporting System, and the scoring methodology utilized to evaluate a principal, including how scores are generated for each subcomponents and the composite effectiveness score; and the application and the use the scoring ranges prescribed by the Commissioner for the four designated rating categories used for the principal's overall rating and their subcomponent ratings.

The Port Jefferson Board of Education shall certify the Executive Director and Superintendent of Schools as highly-qualified lead evaluators, upon the presentation of the evidence of training. The Board of Education shall re-certify the lead evaluators annually, after reviewing the training they have received.

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 Wednesday, May 09, 2012

Updated Tuesday, September 25, 2012

Page 1

12.1) Upload the Joint Certification of the APPR Plan

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

<assets/survey-uploads/5581/127510-3Uqgn5g9Iu/Certification Form.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.

Port Jefferson School District Point Scale Conversion for Growth Measures
(HEDI Tables A, B, C for insertion in 2.11)

Table A: HEDI Scoring based on 20-point scale

	HIGHLY EFFECTIVE			EFFECTIVE									DEVELOPING					INEFFECTIVE			
	20	19	18	17	16	15	<u>14</u>	13	12	11	10	9	8	7	6	5	4	3	2	1	0
% of Students Meeting Target	96-100	91-95	85-90	82-84	79-81	77-78	74-76	72-73	70-71	68-69	66-67	65	63-64	60-62	57-59	54-56	52-53	50-51	36-49	21-35	0-20

Table B: HEDI Scoring based on 10-point scale - ELA

(for those classroom teachers responsible for both ELA and Math instruction; total points credited is sum of ELA and Math scores)

	HIGHLY EFFECTIVE		EFFECTIVE				DEVELOPING			INEFFECTIVE	
	10	9	8	<u>7</u>	6	5	4	3	4	1	0
% of Students Meeting Target in ELA	91-100	82-90	77-81	72-76	68-71	65-67	60-64	54-59	50-53	31-49	0-30

Table C: HEDI Scoring based on 10-point scale - Math

(for those classroom teachers responsible for both ELA and Math instruction; total points credited is sum of ELA and Math scores)

	HIGHLY EFFECTIVE		EFFECTIVE				DEVELOPING			INEFFECTIVE	
	10	9	8	<u>7</u>	6	5	4	3	4	1	0
% of Students Meeting Target in Math	91-100	82-90	77-81	72-76	68-71	65-67	60-64	54-59	50-53	31-49	0-30

Port Jefferson School District Point Scale Conversion for Local Measures for those with State Provided Value-Added Growth Measures (15 points)

(HEDI Tables D, E, F for insertion in 3.3)

Table D: HEDI Scoring based on 15-point scale																
for those with Value-Added Score on State Growth Measure (teachers responsible for <u>either</u> ELA or Math)																
	HIGHLY EFFECTIVE		EFFECTIVE						DEVELOPING					INEFFECTIVE		
	15	14	13	12	11	10	9	8	7	6	5	4	3	2	1	0
% of Students Meeting Target	93-100	85-92	81-84	77-80	74-76	71-73	68-70	65-67	62-64	59-61	56-58	53-55	50-52	36-49	21-35	0-20

Table E ELA: HEDI Scoring based on 7.5-point scale									
for those with Value-Added Score on State Growth Measure (teachers responsible for both ELA and Math instruction; total points credited is sum of ELA and Math scores)									
	HIGHLY EFFECTIVE		EFFECTIVE			DEVELOPING		INEFFECTIVE	
	7.5	7	6	5	4	3	2	1	0
% of Students Meeting Target in ELA	93-100	81-92	74-80	68-73	65-67	56-64	50-55	30-49	0-29

Table F Math: HEDI Scoring based on 7.5-point scale									
for those with Value-Added Score on State Growth Measure (teachers responsible for both ELA and Math instruction; total points credited is sum of ELA and Math scores)									
	HIGHLY EFFECTIVE		EFFECTIVE			DEVELOPING		INEFFECTIVE	
	7.5	7	6	5	4	3	2	1	0
% of Students Meeting Target in Math	93-100	81-92	74-80	68-73	65-67	56-64	50-55	30-49	0-29

Port Jefferson School District Point Scale Conversion for Local Measures of Achievement
(HEDI Tables A - C for insertion in 3.13)

Table A: HEDI Scoring based on 20-point scale

	HIGHLY EFFECTIVE			EFFECTIVE									DEVELOPING					INEFFECTIVE			
	20	19	18	17	16	15	<u>14</u>	13	12	11	10	9	8	7	6	5	4	3	2	1	0
% of Students Meeting Target	96-100	91-95	85-90	82-84	79-81	77-78	74-76	72-73	70-71	68-69	66-67	65	63-64	60-62	57-59	54-56	52-53	50-51	36-49	21-35	0-20

Table B: HEDI Scoring based on 10-point scale - ELA

(for those classroom teachers responsible for both ELA and Math instruction; total points credited is sum of ELA and Math scores)

	HIGHLY EFFECTIVE		EFFECTIVE				DEVELOPING			INEFFECTIVE	
	10	9	8	<u>7</u>	6	5	4	3	4	1	0
% of Students Meeting Target in ELA	91-100	82-90	77-81	72-76	68-71	65-67	60-64	54-59	50-53	31-49	0-30

Table C: HEDI Scoring based on 10-point scale - Math

(for those classroom teachers responsible for both ELA and Math instruction; total points credited is sum of ELA and Math scores)

	HIGHLY EFFECTIVE		EFFECTIVE				DEVELOPING			INEFFECTIVE	
	10	9	8	<u>7</u>	6	5	4	3	4	1	0
% of Students Meeting Target in Math	91-100	82-90	77-81	72-76	68-71	65-67	60-64	54-59	50-53	31-49	0-30

Structured Review of Artifacts

Each teacher shall bring a collection of artifacts to the spring conference meeting with the administrator. The teacher's choice of artifacts shall be designed to demonstrate the teacher's effectiveness based on the New York State Teaching Standards. Probationary teachers can use the current year's additions to their Tenure Portfolio in lieu of individual artifacts.

The artifacts presented should represent the teacher's focus on student learning and reflective practice. An exemplary collection of artifacts should contain at least nine artifacts, and include at least six different types of artifacts representing all four domains. The collection shall be scored using the rubric on the Structured Review of Artifacts form.

Some examples of artifacts that represent the various domains of teaching practice are listed below.

PLANNING AND PREPARATION:

- Long range plans
- Unit Plans
- Lesson Plans
- Substitute Plans
- Examples of teacher developed activities
- Examples of student work (projects, presentations, etc.)
- Sample assessments
- Rubrics/grading systems
- Graded work samples across ability levels
- Use of assessment data

THE CLASSROOM ENVIRONMENT:

- Group-building strategies
- Cooperative learning activities
- Student reflections
- Classroom layout
- Seating arrangements
- Classroom rules/routines
- Daily/weekly schedules
- Management forms/Behavioral plans

INSTRUCTION:

- Modifications/differentiations to meet individual needs
- Examples of teacher developed activities
- Examples of student work
- Extension/enrichment/remediation activities
- Flexible grouping plans
- Examples of multi-modality instruction
- Annotated photographs of students at work

PROFESSIONAL RESPONSIBILITIES:

- Parent communication
- Record-keeping strategies
- Evidence of teaming with other adults in the classroom

Structured Review of Artifacts

(this form should be attached to the Assessment of Component 3)

Teacher's Name _____

Grade/Subject _____

Rubric for Assigning Points

	# artifacts	Quality of Artifacts
10	At least 9	set of artifacts from at least 4 domains that represent teacher's focus on student learning <u>and</u> reflective practice, at least 6 different types
9	At least 9	set of artifacts from at least 4 domains that represent teacher's focus on student learning <u>and</u> reflective practice, at least 5 different types
8	At least 7	set of artifacts from at least 3 domains that represent teacher's focus on student learning <u>and</u> reflective practice, at least 5 different types
7	At least 7	set of artifacts from at least 3 domains that represent teacher's focus on student learning, at least 5 different types
6	At least 5	set of artifacts from at least 2 domains that demonstrate teacher's focus on student learning with some evidence of reflective practice, at least 4 different types
5	At least 5	set of artifacts from at least 2 domains that demonstrate teacher's focus on student learning, at least 4 different types
4	At least 4	set of artifacts
3	3	set of artifacts
2	2	set of artifacts
1	1	1 artifact
0	0	no artifacts submitted

Total Points: _____

Administrator's Signature _____ Date _____

Teacher's Signature* _____ Date _____

* The signature of the teacher acknowledges that the teacher received a copy of the report and was notified that the completed APPR report would be placed in the teacher's file.

50-point Conversion Chart for Danielson Rubric		
Points	Total Rubric Credits	Average Rubric Score
0	22	1.00
1	25	1.14
2	26	1.18
3	27	1.23
4	28	1.27
5	29	1.32
6	30	1.36
7	31	1.41
8	32	1.45
9	33	1.50
10	34	1.55
11	35	1.59
12	36	1.64
13	37	1.68
14	38	1.73
15	39	1.77
16	40	1.82
17	41	1.86
18	42	1.91
19	43	1.95
20	44	2.00
21	45	2.05
22	46	2.09
23	47	2.14
24	48	2.18
25	49	2.23
26	50	2.27
27	51	2.32
28	52	2.36
29	53	2.41
30	54	2.45
31	55	2.50
32	56	2.55
33	57	2.59
34	58	2.64
35	59	2.68
36	60	2.73
37	61	2.77
38	62	2.82
39	63	2.86
40	64 - 71	2.91 - 3.26
41	72 - 79	3.27 - 3.63
42	80 - 86	3.64 - 3.94
43	87 - 90	3.95 - 4.17
44	91 - 94	4.18 - 4.31
45	95 - 98	4.32 - 4.49
46	99 - 102	4.50 - 4.67
47	103 - 109	4.68 - 4.99
48	110 - 116	5.00 - 5.27
49	117 - 120	5.28 - 5.44
50	121 - 132	5.45 - 6.00

Port Jefferson School District Point Scale Conversion for Local Measures for 8.1

(HEDI Table DD for insertion in 3.1)

Table DD: HEDI Scoring based on 15-point scale for those with Value-Added Score on State Growth Measure																
	HIGHLY EFFECTIVE			EFFECTIVE						DEVELOPING			INEFFECTIVE			
	15	14	13	12	11	10	9	8	7	6	5	4	3	2	1	0
% of Students Meeting Target	93-100	85-92	81-84	77-80	74-76	71-73	68-70	65-67	62-64	59-61	56-58	53-55	50-52	36-49	21-35	0-20

Appendix E
Principal Conversion Chart for Other Measures

PJ Raw	NYS Rounded	Rating
1	0	Ineffective
2	0	Ineffective
3	1	Ineffective
4	1	Ineffective
5	1	Ineffective
6	1	Ineffective
7	2	Ineffective
8	2	Ineffective
9	2	Ineffective
10	2	Ineffective
11	2	Ineffective
12	3	Ineffective
13	3	Ineffective
14	3	Ineffective
15	3	Ineffective
16	4	Ineffective
17	4	Ineffective
18	4	Ineffective
19	4	Ineffective
20	4	Ineffective
21	5	Ineffective
22	5	Ineffective
23	5	Ineffective
24	5	Ineffective
25	6	Ineffective
26	6	Ineffective
27	6	Ineffective
28	6	Ineffective
29	6	Ineffective
30	7	Ineffective
31	7	Ineffective
32	7	Ineffective
33	7	Ineffective
34	8	Ineffective
35	8	Ineffective
36	8	Ineffective
37	8	Ineffective
38	8	Ineffective
39	9	Ineffective
40	9	Ineffective
41	9	Ineffective
42	9	Ineffective
43	10	Ineffective
44	10	Ineffective
45	10	Ineffective

Appendix E
Principal Conversion Chart for Other Measures

PJ Raw	NYS Rounded	Rating
46	10	Ineffective
47	10	Ineffective
48	11	Ineffective
49	11	Ineffective
50	11	Ineffective
51	11	Ineffective
52	12	Ineffective
53	12	Ineffective
54	12	Ineffective
55	12	Ineffective
56	12	Ineffective
57	13	Ineffective
58	13	Ineffective
59	13	Ineffective
60	13	Ineffective
61	14	Ineffective
62	14	Ineffective
63	14	Ineffective
64	14	Ineffective
65	14	Ineffective
66	15	Ineffective
67	15	Ineffective
68	15	Ineffective
69	15	Ineffective
70	16	Ineffective
71	16	Ineffective
72	16	Ineffective
73	16	Ineffective
74	16	Ineffective
75	17	Ineffective
76	17	Ineffective
77	17	Ineffective
78	17	Ineffective
79	18	Ineffective
80	18	Ineffective
81	18	Ineffective
82	18	Ineffective
83	18	Ineffective
84	19	Ineffective
85	19	Ineffective
86	19	Ineffective
87	19	Ineffective
88	20	Ineffective
89	20	Ineffective
90	20	Ineffective

Appendix E
Principal Conversion Chart for Other Measures

PJ Raw	NYS Rounded	Rating
91	20	Ineffective
92	20	Ineffective
93	21	Ineffective
94	21	Ineffective
95	21	Ineffective
96	21	Ineffective
97	22	Ineffective
98	22	Ineffective
99	22	Ineffective
100	22	Ineffective
101	22	Ineffective
102	23	Ineffective
103	23	Ineffective
104	23	Ineffective
105	23	Ineffective
106	24	Ineffective
107	24	Ineffective
108	24	Ineffective
109	24	Ineffective
110	24	Ineffective
111	25	Ineffective
112	25	Ineffective
113	25	Ineffective
114	25	Ineffective
115	26	Ineffective
116	26	Ineffective
117	26	Ineffective
118	26	Ineffective
119	26	Ineffective
120	27	Ineffective
121	27	Ineffective
122	27	Ineffective
123	27	Ineffective
124	28	Ineffective
125	28	Ineffective
126	28	Ineffective
127	28	Ineffective
128	28	Ineffective
129	29	Ineffective
130	29	Ineffective
131	29	Ineffective
132	29	Ineffective
133	30	Ineffective
134	30	Ineffective
135	30	Ineffective

Appendix E
Principal Conversion Chart for Other Measures

PJ Raw	NYS Rounded	Rating
136	30	Ineffective
137	30	Ineffective
138	31	Ineffective
139	31	Ineffective
140	31	Ineffective
141	31	Ineffective
142	32	Ineffective
143	32	Ineffective
144	32	Ineffective
145	32	Ineffective
146	32	Ineffective
147	33	Ineffective
148	33	Ineffective
149	33	Ineffective
150	33	Ineffective
151	34	Ineffective
152	34	Ineffective
153	34	Ineffective
154	34	Ineffective
155	34	Ineffective
156	35	Ineffective
157	35	Ineffective
158	35	Ineffective
159	35	Ineffective
160	36	Ineffective
161	36	Ineffective
162	36	Ineffective
163	36	Ineffective
164	36	Ineffective
165	37	Ineffective
166	37	Ineffective
167	37	Ineffective
168	37	Ineffective
169	38	Ineffective
170	38	Ineffective
171	38	Ineffective
172	38	Ineffective
173	38	Ineffective
174	39	Developing
175	39	Developing
176	39	Developing
177	39	Developing
178	40	Developing
179	40	Developing
180	40	Developing

Appendix E
Principal Conversion Chart for Other Measures

PJ Raw	NYS Rounded	Rating
181	40	Developing
182	40	Developing
183	41	Developing
184	41	Developing
185	41	Developing
186	41	Developing
187	42	Developing
188	42	Developing
189	42	Developing
190	42	Developing
191	42	Developing
192	43	Developing
193	43	Developing
194	43	Developing
195	43	Developing
196	44	Developing
197	44	Developing
198	44	Developing
199	44	Developing
200	44	Developing
201	45	Effective
202	45	Effective
203	45	Effective
204	45	Effective
205	46	Effective
206	46	Effective
207	46	Effective
208	46	Effective
209	46	Effective
210	47	Effective
211	47	Effective
212	47	Effective
213	47	Effective
214	48	Effective
215	48	Effective
216	48	Effective
217	48	Effective
218	48	Effective
219	49	Effective
220	49	Effective
221	49	Effective
222	49	Effective
223	50	Effective
224	50	Effective
225	50	Effective

Appendix E
Principal Conversion Chart for Other Measures

PJ Raw	NYS Rounded	Rating
226	50	Effective
227	50	Effective
228	51	Effective
229	51	Effective
230	51	Effective
231	51	Effective
232	52	Effective
233	52	Effective
234	52	Effective
235	52	Effective
236	52	Effective
237	53	Effective
238	53	Effective
239	53	Effective
240	53	Effective
241	54	Highly Effective
242	54	Highly Effective
243	54	Highly Effective
244	54	Highly Effective
245	54	Highly Effective
246	55	Highly Effective
247	55	Highly Effective
248	55	Highly Effective
249	55	Highly Effective
250	56	Highly Effective
251	56	Highly Effective
252	56	Highly Effective
253	56	Highly Effective
254	56	Highly Effective
255	57	Highly Effective
256	57	Highly Effective
257	57	Highly Effective
258	57	Highly Effective
259	58	Highly Effective
260	58	Highly Effective
261	58	Highly Effective
262	58	Highly Effective
263	58	Highly Effective
264	59	Highly Effective
265	59	Highly Effective
266	59	Highly Effective
267	59	Highly Effective
268	60	Highly Effective
269	60	Highly Effective
270	60	Highly Effective

APPENDIX E

**Port Jefferson Union Free School District
Port Jefferson, NY**

Plan of Improvement for Principals

NAME:	DATE:
POSITION:	EVALUATOR:

I. Focus of Plan - Performance Area/Domain (Marshall Rubric) – select Domains (maximums of 2):

- Diagnosis and Planning
- Curriculum and Data
- Discipline and Parent Involvement
- Supervision, Evaluation, and Professional Development
- Priority Management and Communication
- Management and External Relations

SPECIFIC AREAS FOR IMPROVEMENT WITHIN THE DOMAIN: Identify specific areas in need of improvement; maximum of two goals per Domain. Develop specific, behaviorally written goals for the principal to accomplish during the period of the Plan.

Domain: _____ Goal I:

Goal II:

Domain: _____ Goal I:

Goal II:

EXPECTED OUTCOMES OF THE PIP: Identify specific recommendations for what the principal is expected to do to improve in the identified areas. Delineate specific, realistic, achievable activities for the principal.

Domain: _____ Goal I:

Goal II:

Domain: _____ Goal I:

Goal II:

RESPONSIBILITIES: Identify specific steps to be taken by Superintendent or his/her designee or his/her designee and the principal throughout the Plan, without specific dates. Examples: school visits by the Superintendent or his/her designee every three weeks; supervisory conferences between the principal and Superintendent or his/her designee every other week; written reports and/or evaluations, etc.

RESOURCES/ACTIVITIES: Identify specific resources available to assist the principal to improve performance. Examples: colleagues; recommended courses; recommended workshops; peer visits; specific materials; etc. Note – all resources to be provided at the expense of the school district.

List specific activities related to targeted goals identified in Section I, ex:

1. List specific materials, people, workshop to be used to support the PIP
2. Identify the instrument or rubrics used to monitor progress
3. List specific resources, Danielson video or online PD

EVIDENCE OF ACHIEVEMENT: Identify how progress will be measured and assessed. Specify next steps to be taken based upon whether the principal is successful, partially successful or unsuccessful in efforts to improve performance. Identify specific artifacts to be reviewed by the Superintendent or his/her designee.

1. Identify how progress will be measured and assessed
2. Specify next steps to be taken based upon progress or lack thereof

Goal I:

Goal II:

TIMELINE: Provide a specific Timeline for implementation of the various components of the PIP and for the final completion of the PIP. Identify the dates for preparation of written documentation regarding the completion of the Plan and finalize the dates as to required meetings and/or school visits, and/or workshops, etc.

1. Identify dates for school visitations consistent with APPR Plan
2. Identify dates for progress meetings with Superintendent or his/her designee related to each identified targeted goal
3. Identify dates for quarterly assessment of overall progress

Goal I:

Goal II:

Superintendent or his/her Designee

Date

Principal

Date

PJAA Representative

Date

**Port Jefferson Union Free School District #6
TEACHER IMPROVEMENT PLAN**

Name _____ Subject/Grade _____

Building _____ Date _____

Administrator Responsible for Plan: _____

Timeline for Achieving Improvement: _____ *(meeting to be held following week)*

1. DOMAIN NEEDING IMPROVEMENT (based on Annual Professional Performance Review)::

- _____ Planning and Preparation
- _____ The Classroom Environment
- _____ Instruction
- _____ Professional Responsibilities

(Administrator selects lowest-rated area; additional areas may be addressed in subsequent plans.)

2. STANDARDS-BASED GOALS:

*(Administrator identifies specific element(s) from the targeted domain that require improvement to the effective level;
e.g. for Area 2, The Classroom Environment, "2d. Managing Student Behavior; 2e. Organizing Physical Space")*

3. MANNER IN WHICH IMPROVEMENT WILL BE ASSESSED:

*(Team collaboratively agrees on the specific evidence that will demonstrate improvement,
including the description of any artifacts the teacher will produce)*

4. PROFESSIONAL LEARNING ACTIVITIES
(developed collaboratively by team)

Timeline

5. ADDITIONAL SUPPORT AND ASSISTANCE TO BE RECEIVED
(developed collaboratively by team)

Timeline

Signature of Administrator
Responsible for Plan /Date

Teacher's Signature/Date

Signature of PJTA Representative/Date

Other Administrator (when applicable)

Signature of Peer Assistance Teacher/Date

ASSESSMENT OF PERFORMANCE *(upon completion of plan):*

Targeted DOMAIN (listed in #1)	Assessment of Performance (HEDI)	# points
--------------------------------	----------------------------------	----------

- Performance rated as **Effective - no other domains targeted** – add domain-specific observations to current year’s file for use in this year’s APPR and return to regular evaluation cycle
- Performance rated as **Effective** – add domain-specific observations to current year’s file for use in this year’s APPR and develop plan for next targeted area
- Performance rated as **Developing** – extend plan for ____ more weeks and re-evaluate on _____
- Little or no progress made: develop alternative plan for targeted area**
- Little or no progress made: develop plan for next targeted area**
- Little or no progress made: anticipate letter of termination on or before April 1**
(probationary teacher)

Signature of Administrator
Responsible for Plan /Date

Teacher’s Signature*/Date

PJTA Representative’s Signature*/Date

*The signatures of the teacher and PJTA representative acknowledge that they attended the meeting held to assess the teacher’s performance on the TIP, received a copy of the report, and were notified that the completed Teacher Improvement Plan would be placed in the teacher’s file.

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

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

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

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

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

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

Signatures, dates

Superintendent Signature: Date: 9/21/12

Kathy [Signature] Ed.D.

Teachers Union President Signature: Date: 9/21

Brian [Signature]

Administrative Union President Signature: Date:

Debra [Signature] 9/21/12

Board of Education President Signature: Date:

Kathleen Brennan 9/24/12