



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

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

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

January 4, 2013

Dr. Kathleen A. Mooney, Superintendent
Port Washington Union Free School District
100 Campus Drive
Port Washington, NY 11050

Dear Superintendent Mooney:

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: Thomas Rogers

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

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

Annual Professional Performance Reviews: 2012-13

Created Friday, May 11, 2012

Updated Wednesday, January 02, 2013

1

Disclaimers

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

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

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

1. SCHOOL DISTRICT INFORMATION

1.1) School District's BEDS Number :

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

28040430000

1.2) School District Name:

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

Port Washington Union Free School District

1.3) School Improvement Grant (SIG) Districts Only

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

Not applicable

1.4) Award Classification

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

(No response)

1.5) Assurances

Please check all of the boxes below:

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

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

Re-submission to address deficiencies

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

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

Annual (2012-13)

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

Created Friday, May 11, 2012

Updated Friday, January 04, 2013

Page 1

STATE-PROVIDED MEASURES OF STUDENT GROWTH

(25 points with an approved value-added measure)

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

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

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

2.1) Assurances

Please check the boxes below:

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

STUDENT LEARNING OBJECTIVES AS COMPARABLE GROWTH MEASURES (20 points)

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

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

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

If no State assessment or Regents exam exists:

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

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

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

State assessments, *required if one exists*

List of State-approved 3rd party assessments

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

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

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

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

2.2) Grades K-3 ELA

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

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

	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.

<p>Use this box, if needed, to describe the general process for assigning HEDI categories for these grades/subjects in this subcomponent. If needed, you may upload a table or graphic at 2.11, below.</p>	<p>We are using historical ELA data from Grades 3,4,5 to determine school-wide growth to passing/proficiency targets and assign HEDI categories to K-3 teachers. (Please see adopted tables contained in section 2.11 for District-adopted percentages/expectations aligned to HEDI bands). Grade K-2 teachers, in collaboration with principals, will use historical ELA data from Grades 4-5 to establish school-wide growth targets. For third grade, teachers in collaboration with principals, will use historical ELA data from Grade 3 to establish growth targets. A HEDI score will be assigned based on the percentage of students meeting that goal.</p>
<p>Highly Effective (18 - 20 points) Results are well-above state average for similar students (or District goals if no state test).</p>	<p>We are using historical ELA data from Grades 3,4,5 to determine school-wide growth to passing/proficiency targets and assign HEDI categories to K-3 teachers. (Please see adopted tables contained in section 2.11 for District-adopted percentages/expectations aligned to HEDI bands). Teachers in collaboration with principals will establish growth targets based on historical data. The range for Highly Effective is 79%-100%.</p>
<p>Effective (9 - 17 points) Results meet state average for similar students (or District goals if no state test).</p>	<p>We are using historical ELA data from Grades 3,4,5 to determine school-wide growth to passing/proficiency targets and assign HEDI categories to K-3 teachers. (Please see adopted tables contained in section 2.11 for District-adopted percentages/expectations aligned to HEDI bands). Teachers in collaboration with principals will establish growth targets based on historical data. The range for Effective is 70%-78%.</p>
<p>Developing (3 - 8 points) Results are below state average for similar students (or District goals if no state test).</p>	<p>We are using historical ELA data from Grades 3,4,5 to determine school-wide growth to passing/proficiency targets and assign HEDI categories to K-3 teachers. (Please see adopted tables contained in section 2.11 for District-adopted percentages/expectations aligned to HEDI bands). Teachers in collaboration with principals will establish growth targets based on historical data. The range for Developing is 55%-69%.</p>
<p>Ineffective (0 - 2 points) Results are well-below state average for similar students (or District goals if no state test).</p>	<p>We are using historical ELA data from Grades 3,4,5 to determine school-wide growth to passing/proficiency targets and assign HEDI categories to K-3 teachers. (Please see adopted tables contained in section 2.11 for District-adopted percentages/expectations aligned to HEDI bands). Teachers in collaboration with principals will establish growth targets based on historical data. The range for Ineffective is 0%-54%.</p>

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	New York State Math 4-5
1	School-or BOCES-wide, group or team results based on State assessments	New York State Math 4-5

2	School-or BOCES-wide, group or team results based on State assessments	New York State Math 4-5
---	--	-------------------------

	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.	We are using historical Math data from Grades 3,4,5 to determine school-wide growth to passing/proficiency targets and assign HEDI categories to K-3 teachers. (Please see adopted tables contained in section 2.11 for District-adopted percentages/expectations aligned to HEDI bands). K-2 teachers, in collaboration with principals, will use historical Math data from Grades 4-5 to establish school-wide growth targets. For third grade, teachers in collaboration with principals, will use historical Math data from Grade 3 to establish growth targets. A HEDI score will be assigned based on the percentage of students meeting that goal.
Highly Effective (18 - 20 points) Results are well-above state average for similar students (or District goals if no state test).	We are using historical Math data from Grades 3,4,5 to determine school-wide growth to passing/proficiency targets and assign HEDI categories to K-3 teachers. (Please see adopted tables contained in section 2.11 for District-adopted percentages/expectations aligned to HEDI bands). Teachers in collaboration with principals will establish growth targets based on historical data. The range for Highly Effective is 79%-100%.
Effective (9 - 17 points) Results meet state average for similar students (or District goals if no state test).	We are using historical Math data from Grades 3,4,5 to determine school-wide growth to passing/proficiency targets and assign HEDI categories to K-3 teachers. (Please see adopted tables contained in section 2.11 for District-adopted percentages/expectations aligned to HEDI bands). Teachers in collaboration with principals will establish growth targets based on historical data. The range for Effective is 70%-78%.
Developing (3 - 8 points) Results are below state average for similar students (or District goals if no state test).	We are using historical Math data from Grades 3,4,5 to determine school-wide growth to passing/proficiency targets and assign HEDI categories to K-3 teachers. (Please see adopted tables contained in section 2.11 for District-adopted percentages/expectations aligned to HEDI bands). Teachers in collaboration with principals will establish growth targets based on historical data. The range for Developing is 55%-69%.
Ineffective (0 - 2 points) Results are well-below state average for similar students (or District goals if no state test).	We are using historical Math data from Grades 3,4,5 to determine school-wide growth to passing/proficiency targets and assign HEDI categories to K-3 teachers. (Please see adopted tables contained in section 2.11 for District-adopted percentages/expectations aligned to HEDI bands). Teachers in collaboration with principals will establish growth targets based on historical data. The range for Ineffective is 0%-54%.

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 Washington District developed assessments for Science-6 aligned to State Science Standards.
7	District, regional or BOCES-developed assessment	Port Washington District developed assessment for Science-7 aligned to State Science Standards.
	Science	Assessment
8	State assessment	8th Grade State Science Assessment

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

Use this box, if needed, to describe the general process for assigning HEDI categories for these grades/subjects in this subcomponent. If needed, you may upload a table or graphic at 2.11, below.	Targets will be developed for each student based on baseline information established through historical data and pre-assessments for applicable courses. Teachers in collaboration with principals will establish growth targets based on historical data.
Highly Effective (18 - 20 points) Results are well-above state average for similar students (or District goals if no state test).	Teachers whose students exceed the established targets for similar students in the district and/or state based on the evidence for the SLO. (Please see adopted tables contained in section 2.11 for District-adopted percentages/expectations aligned to HEDI bands). The range for Highly Effective is 79%-100%.
Effective (9 - 17 points) Results meet state average for similar students (or District goals if no state test).	Teachers whose students meet the established targets for similar students in the district and/or state based on the evidence for the SLO. (Please see adopted tables contained in section 2.11 for District-adopted percentages/expectations aligned to HEDI bands). The range for Effective is 70%-78%.
Developing (3 - 8 points) Results are below state average for similar students (or District goals if no state test).	Teachers whose students approach the established targets for similar students in the district and/or state based on the evidence for the SLO. (Please see adopted tables contained in section 2.11 for District-adopted percentages/expectations aligned to HEDI bands). The range for Developing is 55%-69%.
Ineffective (0 - 2 points) Results are well-below state average for similar students (or District goals if no state test).	Teachers whose students are far below the established targets for similar students in the district and/or state based on the evidence for the SLO. (Please see adopted tables contained in section 2.11 for District-adopted percentages/expectations aligned to HEDI bands). The range for Ineffective is 0%-54%.

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 Washington District developed assessment for Social Studies -6 aligned to State Social Studies Standards.
7	District, regional or BOCES-developed assessment	Port Washington District developed assessment for Social Studies-7 aligned to State Social Studies Standards.
8	District, regional or BOCES-developed assessment	Nassau County Regional Social Studies-8 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.	Targets will be developed for each student based on baseline information established through historical data and pre-assessments for applicable courses. Teachers in collaboration with principals will establish growth targets based on historical data.
Highly Effective (18 - 20 points) Results are well-above District goals for similar students.	Teachers whose students exceed the established targets for similar students in the district and/or state based on the evidence for the SLO. (Please see adopted tables contained in section 2.11 for District-adopted percentages/expectations aligned to HEDI bands). The range for Highly Effective is 79%-100%.
Effective (9 - 17 points) Results meet District goals for similar students.	Teachers whose students meet the established targets for similar students in the district and/or state based on the evidence for the SLO. (Please see adopted tables contained in section 2.11 for District-adopted percentages/expectations aligned to HEDI bands). The range for Effective is 70%-78%.
Developing (3 - 8 points) Results are below District goals for similar students.	Teachers whose students approach the established targets for similar students in the district and/or state based on the evidence for the SLO. (Please see adopted tables contained in section 2.11 for District-adopted percentages/expectations aligned to HEDI bands). The range for Developing is 55%-69%.
Ineffective (0 - 2 points) Results are well-below District goals for similar students.	Teachers whose students are far below the established targets for similar students in the district and/or state based on the evidence for the SLO. (Please see adopted tables contained in section 2.11 for District-adopted percentages/expectations aligned to HEDI bands). the range for Ineffective is 0%-54%.

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 Washington District developed summative assessment for Global 1.
----------	---	---

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

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

Use this box, if needed, to describe the general process for assigning HEDI categories for these grades/subjects in this subcomponent. If needed, you may upload a table or graphic at 2.11, below.	Targets will be developed for each student based on baseline information established through historical data and pre-assessments for applicable courses. Teachers in collaboration with principals will establish growth targets based on historical data.
Highly Effective (18 - 20 points) Results are well-above District goals for similar students.	Teachers whose students exceed the established targets for similar students in the district and/or state based the District Developed Assessment or Regents Examination. (Please see adopted tables contained in section 2.11 for District-adopted percentages/expectations aligned to HEDI bands). The range for Highly Effective is 79%-100%
Effective (9 - 17 points) Results meet District goals for similar students.	Teachers whose students meet the established targets for similar students in the district and/or state based on the District Developed Assessment or Regents Examination. (Please see adopted tables contained in section 2.11 for District-adopted percentages/expectations aligned to HEDI bands). The range for Effective is 70%-78%.
Developing (3 - 8 points) Results are below District goals for similar students.	Teachers whose students approach the established targets for similar students in the district and/or state based on the District Developed Assessment or Regents Examination. (Please see adopted tables contained in section 2.11 for District-adopted percentages/expectations aligned to HEDI bands). The range for Developing is 55%-69%
Ineffective (0 - 2 points) Results are well-below District goals for similar students.	Teachers whose students are far below the established targets for similar students in the district and/or state based on the District Developed Assessment or Regents Examination. (Please see adopted tables contained in section 2.11 for District-adopted percentages/expectations aligned to HEDI bands). The range for Ineffective is 0%-54%.

2.7) High School Science Regents Courses

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

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

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

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

Use this box, if needed, to describe the general process for assigning HEDI categories for these grades/subjects in this subcomponent. If needed, you may upload a table or graphic at 2.11, below.	Targets will be developed for each student based on baseline information established through historical data and pre-assessments for applicable courses. Teachers in collaboration with principals will establish growth targets based on historical data.
Highly Effective (18 - 20 points) Results are well-above District goals for similar students.	Teachers whose students exceed the established targets for similar students in the district and/or state based on the District Developed Assessment or Regents Examination. (Please see adopted tables contained in section 2.11 for District-adopted percentages/expectations aligned to HEDI bands). The range for Highly Effective is 79%-100%.
Effective (9 - 17 points) Results meet District goals for similar students.	Teachers whose students meet the established targets for similar students in the district and/or state based on the District Developed Assessment or Regents Examination. (Please see adopted tables contained in section 2.11 for District-adopted percentages/expectations aligned to HEDI bands). The range for Effective is 70%-78%.
Developing (3 - 8 points) Results are below District goals for similar students.	Teachers whose students approach the established targets for similar students in the district and/or state based on the District Developed Assessment or Regents Examination. (Please see adopted tables contained in section 2.11 for District-adopted percentages/expectations aligned to HEDI bands). The range for Developing is 55%-69%.
Ineffective (0 - 2 points) Results are well-below District goals for similar students.	Teachers whose students are far below the established targets for similar students in the district and/or state based on the evidence for the District Developed Assessment or Regents Examination. (Please see adopted tables contained in section 2.11 for District-adopted percentages/expectations aligned to HEDI bands). The range for Ineffective is 0%-49%.

2.8) High School Math Regents Courses

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

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

Math Regents Courses	Assessment
----------------------	------------

Algebra 1	Regents assessment	Regents assessment
Geometry	Regents assessment	Regents assessment
Algebra 2	Regents assessment	Regents assessment

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

Use this box, if needed, to describe the general process for assigning HEDI categories for these grades/subjects in this subcomponent. If needed, you may upload a table or graphic at 2.11, below.	Targets will be developed for each student based on baseline information established through historical data and pre-assessments for applicable courses. Teachers in collaboration with principals will establish growth targets based on historical data.
Highly Effective (18 - 20 points) Results are well-above District goals for similar students.	Teachers whose students exceed the established targets for similar students in the district and/or state based on the District Developed Assessment or Regents Examination. (Please see adopted tables contained in section 2.11 for District-adopted percentages/expectations aligned to HEDI bands). The range for Highly Effective is 79%-100%.
Effective (9 - 17 points) Results meet District goals for similar students.	Teachers whose students meet the established targets for similar students in the district and/or state based on the District Developed Assessment or Regents Examination. (Please see adopted tables contained in section 2.11 for District-adopted percentages/expectations aligned to HEDI bands). The range for Effective is 70%-78%.
Developing (3 - 8 points) Results are below District goals for similar students.	Teachers whose students approach the established targets for similar students in the district and/or state based on the District Developed Assessment or Regents Examination. (Please see adopted tables contained in section 2.11 for District-adopted percentages/expectations aligned to HEDI bands). The range for Developing is 55%-69%.
Ineffective (0 - 2 points) Results are well-below District goals for similar students.	Teachers whose students are far below the established targets for similar students in the district and/or state based on the District Developed Assessment or Regents Examination. (Please see adopted tables contained in section 2.11 for District-adopted percentages/expectations aligned to HEDI bands). The range for Ineffective is 0%-54%.

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 Washington District developed summative assessment for ELA-9

Grade 10 ELA	District, regional or BOCES-developed assessment	Port Washington District developed summative assessment for ELA-10
Grade 11 ELA	Regents assessment	ELA-11 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.	Targets will be developed for each student based on baseline information established through historical data and pre-assessments for applicable courses. Teachers in collaboration with principals will establish growth targets based on historical data.
Highly Effective (18 - 20 points) Results are well-above District goals for similar students.	Teachers whose students exceed the established targets for similar students in the district and/or state based on the District Developed Assessment or Regents Examination. (Please see adopted tables contained in section 2.11 for District-adopted percentages/expectations aligned to HEDI bands). The range for Highly Effective is 79%-100%.
Effective (9 - 17 points) Results meet District goals for similar students.	Teachers whose students meet the established targets for similar students in the district and/or state based on the District Developed Assessment or Regents Examination. (Please see adopted tables contained in section 2.11 for District-adopted percentages/expectations aligned to HEDI bands). The range for Effective is 70%-78%.
Developing (3 - 8 points) Results are below District goals for similar students.	Teachers whose students approach the established targets for similar students in the district and/or state based on the District Developed Assessment or Regents Examination. (Please see adopted tables contained in section 2.11 for District-adopted percentages/expectations aligned to HEDI bands). The range for Developing is 55%-69%.
Ineffective (0 - 2 points) Results are well-below District goals for similar students.	Teachers whose students are far below the established targets for similar students in the district and/or state based on the District Developed Assessment or Regents Examination. (Please see adopted tables contained in section 2.11 for District-adopted percentages/expectations aligned to HEDI bands). The range for Ineffective is 0%-54%.

2.10) All Other Courses

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

Course(s) or Subject(s)	Option	Assessment
All Other ELA	District, Regional or BOCES-developed	Port Washington District developed grade and subject specific summative assessment.
All Other Math	District, Regional or BOCES-developed	Port Washington District developed grade and subject specific summative assessment.
All Other Social Studies	District, Regional or BOCES-developed	Port Washington District developed grade and subject specific summative assessment.

All Other Science	District, Regional or BOCES-developed	Port Washington District developed grade and subject specific summative assessment.
All World Languages/LOTE	District, Regional or BOCES-developed	Port Washington District developed grade and subject specific summative assessment.
All Business	District, Regional or BOCES-developed	Port Washington District developed grade and subject specific summative assessment.
All Technology	District, Regional or BOCES-developed	Port Washington District developed grade and subject specific summative assessment.
All Art (9-12)	District, Regional or BOCES-developed	Port Washington District developed grade and subject specific summative assessment.
All Music (9-12)	District, Regional or BOCES-developed	Port Washington District developed grade and subject specific summative assessment.
All Physical Education Health (9-12)	District, Regional or BOCES-developed	Port Washington District developed grade and subject specific summative assessment.
All Family Consumer Sciences (9-12)	District, Regional or BOCES-developed	District developed grade and subject specific summative assessment.
K-5 Reading, Resource Room, Library Media Specialists	State Assessment	NYS Combined ELA and Math 3, 4, 5 Assessment.
All ESL/ELL	State Assessment	NYSESLAT
6-8 Reading, Resource Room, Library Media Specialists	State Assessment	NYS Combined ELA and Math 6-8 State Assessments.
All Special Education (Life Skills)	State Assessment	NYSAA
9-12 Reading, Resource Room, Library Media Specialists	State Assessment	NYS Combined ELA 11 and Algebra I Regents.

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

Use this box, if needed, to describe the general process for assigning HEDI categories for these grades/subjects in this subcomponent. If needed, you may upload a table or graphic at 2.11, below.	Targets will be developed for each student based on baseline information established through historical data and pre-assessments for applicable courses. Teachers in collaboration with principals will establish growth targets based on historical data.
Highly Effective (18 - 20 points) Results are well-above District goals for similar students.	Teachers whose students exceed the established targets for similar students in the district and/or state based on the District Developed Assessment or State Examination. (Please see adopted tables contained in section 2.11 for District-adopted percentages/expectations aligned to HEDI bands). The range for Highly Effective is 79%-100%.
Effective (9 - 17 points) Results meet District goals for similar students.	Teachers whose students meet the established targets for similar students in the district and/or state based on the District Developed Assessment or State Examination. (Please see adopted tables contained in section 2.11 for District-adopted percentages/expectations aligned to HEDI bands). The range for Effective is 70%-78%.
Developing (3 - 8 points) Results are below District goals for similar students.	Teachers whose students approach the established targets for similar students in the district and/or state

based on the District Developed Assessment or State Examination. (Please see adopted tables contained in section 2.11 for District-adopted percentages/expectations aligned to HEDI bands). The range for Developing is 55%-69%.

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

Teachers whose students are far below the established targets for similar students in the district and/or state based on the District Developed Assessment or State Examination. (Please see adopted tables contained in section 2.11 for District-adopted percentages/expectations aligned to HEDI bands). The range for Ineffective is 0%-54%.

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/5364/128464-TXEttx9bQW/PW Growth 20 HEDI conversion chart 2.pdf

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.

The District is fully aware of the guidelines established by the New York State education Department and has instituted procedures to ensure the integrity of all assessments. All final assessments will be scored by an educator with no vested interest in the score.

Targets will be established based on the profile of the class. The measures that will be taken into consideration will include: the percentage of students with indicators of poverty, ELL students, students with a disability and prior academic history.

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 Thursday, May 24, 2012

Updated Friday, January 04, 2013

Page 1

Locally Selected Measures of Student Achievement or Growth

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

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

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

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

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

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

Growth or achievement measure(s) from these options.

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

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

Measures based on:

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

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

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

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

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

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

3.1) Grades 4-8 ELA

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

	Locally-Selected Measure from List of Approved Measures	Assessment
4	6(ii) School wide measure computed locally	NYS ELA Grades 4-5
5	6(ii) School wide measure computed locally	NYS ELA Grades 4-5
6	6(ii) School wide measure computed locally	NYS ELA Grades 6-8
7	6(ii) School wide measure computed locally	NYS ELA Grades 6-8
8	6(ii) School wide measure computed locally	NYS ELA Grades 6-8

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

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

Use this box, if needed, to describe the general process for assigning HEDI categories for these grades/subjects in this subcomponent. If needed, you may upload a table or graphic at 3.3, below.	The HEDI point bands were created based on a percentage of students achieving mastery or proficient levels (3 and 4) on the state exams.
Highly Effective (14 - 15 points) Results are well above District- or BOCES-adopted expectations for growth or achievement for grade/subject.	The District expectation is that 79%-100% of the students will score a 3 or 4 on the NYS ELA assessments in order for a teacher to be rated Highly Effective.
Effective (8- 13 points) Results meet District- or BOCES-adopted expectations for growth or achievement for grade/subject.	The District expectation is that 70%-78% of the students will score a 3 or 4 on the NYS ELA assessments in order for a teacher to be rated Effective.
Developing (3 - 7 points) Results are below District- or BOCES-adopted expectations for growth or achievement for grade/subject.	The District expectation is that 55%-69% of the students will score a 3 or 4 on the NYS ELA assessments in order for a teacher to be rated Developing.
Ineffective (0 - 2 points) Results are well below District- or BOCES-adopted expectations for growth or achievement for grade/subject.	The District expectation is that 0%-54% of the students will score a 3 or 4 on the NYS ELA assessments in order for a teacher to be rated Ineffective.

3.2) Grades 4-8 Math

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

	Locally-Selected Measure from List of Approved Measures	Assessment
4	6(ii) School wide measure computed locally	NYS Math Grades 4-5
5	6(ii) School wide measure computed locally	NYS Math Grades 4-5
6	6(ii) School wide measure computed locally	NYS Math Grades 6-8
7	6(ii) School wide measure computed locally	NYS Math Grades 6-8
8	6(ii) School wide measure computed locally	NYS Math Grades 6-8

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

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

Use this box, if needed, to describe the general process for assigning HEDI categories for these grades/subjects in this subcomponent. If needed, you may upload a table or graphic at 3.3, below.	The HEDI point bands were created based on a percentage of students achieving mastery or proficient levels (3 and 4) on the state exams.
--	--

Highly Effective (14 - 15 points) Results are well above District- or BOCES-adopted expectations for growth or achievement for grade/subject.	The District expectation is that 79%-100% of the students will score a 3 or 4 on the NYS ELA assessments in order for a teacher to be rated Highly Effective.
Effective (8- 13 points) Results meet District- or BOCES-adopted expectations for growth or achievement for grade/subject.	The District expectation is that 70%-78% of the students will score a 3 or 4 on the NYS ELA assessments in order for a teacher to be rated Effective.
Developing (3 - 7 points) Results are below District- or BOCES-adopted expectations for growth or achievement for grade/subject.	The District expectation is that 55%-69% of the students will score a 3 or 4 on the NYS ELA assessments in order for a teacher to be rated Developing.
Ineffective (0 - 2 points) Results are well below District- or BOCES-adopted expectations for growth or achievement for grade/subject.	The District expectation is that 0%-54% of the students will score a 3 or 4 on the NYS ELA assessments in order for a teacher to be rated Ineffective.

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/5139/132894-rhJdBgDruP/PW Local 20 HEDI conversion chart 2.pdf>

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	NYS ELA Grades 3-5
1	6(ii) School-wide measure computed locally	NYS ELA Grades 3-5
2	6(ii) School-wide measure computed locally	NYS ELA Grades 3-5
3	6(ii) School-wide measure computed locally	NYS ELA Grades 3-5

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.

We are using 2012 ELA NY State Assessment data from Grades 3, 4, 5 in order to target District-wide achievement levels compared to the State achievement average and assigning HEDI categories to K-3 teachers.(See HEDI tables contained in Section 3.13 for specific HEDI bands). The HEDI point bands were created based on a percentage of students achieving mastery or proficient levels (3 and 4) on the state exams.

Highly Effective (18-20 points) Results are well above District- or BOCES-adopted expectations for growth or achievement for grade/subject.	We are using 2012 ELA NY State Assessment data from Grades 3, 4, 5 in order to target District-wide achievement levels compared to the State achievement average and assigning HEDI categories to K-3 teachers.(See HEDI tables contained in Section 3.13 for specific HEDI bands). The District expectation is that 79%-100% of the students will score a 3 or 4 on the NYS ELA assessments in order for a teacher to be rated Highly Effective.
Effective (9-17 points) Results meet District- or BOCES-adopted expectations for growth or achievement for grade/subject.	We are using 2012 ELA NY State Assessment data from Grades 3, 4, 5 in order to target District-wide achievement levels compared to the State achievement average and assigning HEDI categories to K-3 teachers.(See HEDI tables contained in Section 3.13 for specific HEDI bands). The District expectation is that 70%-78% of the students will score a 3 or 4 on the NYS ELA assessments in order for a teacher to be rated Effective.
Developing (3 - 8 points) Results are below District- or BOCES-adopted expectations for growth or achievement for grade/subject.	We are using 2012 ELA NY State Assessment data from Grades 3, 4, 5 in order to target District-wide achievement levels compared to the State achievement average and assigning HEDI categories to K-3 teachers.(See HEDI tables contained in Section 3.13 for specific HEDI bands). The District expectation is that 55%-69% of the students will score a 3 or 4 on the NYS ELA assessments in order for a teacher to be rated Developing.
Ineffective (0 - 2 points) Results are well below District- or BOCES-adopted expectations for growth or achievement for grade/subject.	We are using 2012 ELA NY State Assessment data from Grades 3, 4, 5 in order to target District-wide achievement levels compared to the State achievement average and assigning HEDI categories to K-3 teachers.(See HEDI tables contained in Section 3.13 for specific HEDI bands). The District expectation is that 0%-54% of the students will score a 3 or 4 on the NYS ELA assessments in order for a teacher to be rated Ineffective.

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	NYS Math Grades 3-5
1	6(ii) School-wide measure computed locally	NYS Math Grades 3-5
2	6(ii) School-wide measure computed locally	NYS Math Grades 3-5
3	6(ii) School-wide measure computed locally	NYS Math Grades 3-5

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.	We are using 2012 NYS Math State Assessment data from Grades 3, 4, 5 in order to target District-wide achievement levels compared to the State achievement average and assigning HEDI categories to K-3 teachers.(See HEDI tables contained in Section 3.13 for specific HEDI bands). The HEDI point bands were created based on a percentage of students achieving mastery or proficient levels (3 and 4) on the state exams.
Highly Effective (18-20 points) Results are well above District- or BOCES-adopted expectations for growth or achievement for grade/subject.	We are using 2012 NYS Math State Assessment data from Grades 3, 4, 5 in order to target District-wide achievement levels compared to the State achievement average and assigning HEDI categories to K-3 teachers.(See HEDI tables contained in Section 3.13 for specific HEDI bands). The District expectation is that 79%-100% of the students will score a 3 or 4 on the NYS Math assessments in order for a teacher to be rated Highly Effective.
Effective (9-17 points) Results meet District- or BOCES-adopted expectations for growth or achievement for grade/subject.	We are using 2012 NYS Math State Assessment data from Grades 3, 4, 5 in order to target District-wide achievement levels compared to the State achievement average and assigning HEDI categories to K-3 teachers.(See HEDI tables contained in Section 3.13 for specific HEDI bands). The District expectation is that 70%-78% of the students will score a 3 or 4 on the NYS Math assessments in order for a teacher to be rated Effective.
Developing (3 - 8 points) Results are below District -or BOCES-adopted expectations for growth or achievement for grade/subject.	We are using 2012 NYS Math State Assessment data from Grades 3, 4, 5 in order to target District-wide achievement levels compared to the State achievement average and assigning HEDI categories to K-3 teachers.(See HEDI tables contained in Section 3.13 for specific HEDI bands). The District expectation is that 55%-69% of the students will score a 3 or 4 on the NYS Math assessments in order for a teacher to be rated Developing.
Ineffective (0 - 2 points) Results are well below District- or BOCES-adopted expectations for growth or achievement for grade/subject.	We are using 2012 NYS Math State Assessment data from Grades 3, 4, 5 in order to target District-wide achievement levels compared to the State achievement average and assigning HEDI categories to K-3 teachers.(See HEDI tables contained in Section 3.13 for specific HEDI bands). The District expectation is that 0%-54% of the students will score a 3 or 4 on the NYS Math assessments in order for a teacher to be rated Ineffective.

3.6) Grades 6-8 Science

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

	Locally-Selected Measure from List of Approved Measures	Assessment
6	5) District, regional, or BOCES–developed assessments	Port Washington District Developed Science Final Exam Grade 6
7	5) District, regional, or BOCES–developed assessments	Port Washington District Developed Science Final Exam Grade 7

8	5) District, regional, or BOCES–developed assessments	Port Washington District Developed Science Final Exam Grade 8
---	---	---

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.	District developed assessments will measure student achievement, be rigorous, comparable across classrooms and the same assessment will be used for the grade level/subject area. The achievement target is set at 65%.
Highly Effective (18 - 20 points) Results are well above District- or BOCES-adopted expectations for growth or achievement for grade/subject.	Highly Effective 79%-100% of the teacher's students reach the achievement target of 65% or better on the summative assessment.
Effective (9 - 17 points) Results meet District- or BOCES-adopted expectations for growth or achievement for grade/subject.	Effective 70%-78% of the teacher's students reach the achievement target of 65% or better on the summative assessment.
Developing (3 - 8 points) Results are below District- or BOCES-adopted expectations for growth or achievement for grade/subject.	Developing 55-69% of the teacher's students reach the achievement target of 65% or better on the summative assessment.
Ineffective (0 - 2 points) Results are well below District- or BOCES-adopted expectations for growth or achievement for grade/subject.	Ineffective 0-54% of the teacher's students reach the achievement target of 65% or better on the summative assessment.

3.7) Grades 6-8 Social Studies

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

	Locally-Selected Measure from List of Approved Measures	Assessment
6	5) District, regional, or BOCES–developed assessments	Port Washington District Developed Social Studies Final Exam Grade 6
7	5) District, regional, or BOCES–developed assessments	Port Washington Developed Social Studies Final Exam Grade 7
8	5) District, regional, or BOCES–developed assessments	Port Washington District Developed Social Studies Final Exam Grade 8

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.	District developed assessments will measure student achievement, be rigorous, comparable across classrooms and the same assessment will be used for the grade level/subject area. The achievement target is set at 65%.
---	---

Highly Effective (18 - 20 points) Results are well above District- or BOCES-adopted expectations for growth or achievement for grade/subject.	Highly Effective 79%-100% of the teacher's students reach the achievement target of 65% or better on the summative assessment.
Effective (9 - 17 points) Results meet District- or BOCES-adopted expectations for growth or achievement for grade/subject.	Effective 70-78% of the teacher's students reach the achievement target of 65% or better on the summative assessment.
Developing (3 - 8 points) Results are below District- or BOCES-adopted expectations for growth or achievement for grade/subject.	Developing 55-69% of the teacher's students reach the achievement target of 65% or better on the summative assessment.
Ineffective (0 - 2 points) Results are well below District- or BOCES-adopted expectations for growth or achievement for grade/subject.	Ineffective 0-54% of the teacher's students reach the achievement target of 65% or better on the summative assessment.

3.8) High School Social Studies

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

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

	Locally-Selected Measure from List of Approved Measures	Assessment
Global 1	5) District, regional, or BOCES-developed assessments	Port Washington District Developed Final - Global I
Global 2	3) Teacher specific achievement or growth score computed locally	Global Regents Exam
American History	3) Teacher specific achievement or growth score computed locally	American History Regents Exam

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.	NYS Regents Examination or District Developed Assessment
Highly Effective (18 - 20 points) Results are well above District- or BOCES-adopted expectations for growth or achievement for grade/subject.	Highly Effective 79%-100% of the teacher's students reach the achievement target of 65 points or better on the summative assessment.
Effective (9 - 17 points) Results meet District- or BOCES-adopted expectations for growth or achievement for grade/subject.	Effective 70%-78% of the teacher's students reach the achievement target of 65 points or better on the summative assessment.
Developing (3 - 8 points) Results are below District- or BOCES-adopted expectations for growth or achievement	Developing 55-69% of the teacher's students reach the achievement target of 65 points or better on the

for grade/subject. Ineffective (0 - 2 points) Results are well below District- or BOCES-adopted expectations for growth or achievement for grade/subject.	summative assessment. Ineffective 0-54% of the teacher's students reach the achievement target of 65 points or better on the summative assessment.
--	---

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	3) Teacher specific achievement or growth score computed locally	Living Environment Regents Exam
Earth Science	3) Teacher specific achievement or growth score computed locally	Earth Science Regents Exam
Chemistry	3) Teacher specific achievement or growth score computed locally	Chemistry Regents Exam
Physics	3) Teacher specific achievement or growth score computed locally	Physics 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.	NYS Regents Examination
Highly Effective (18-20 points) Results are well above District- or BOCES-adopted expectations for growth or achievement for grade/subject.	Highly Effective 79%-100% of the teacher's students reach the achievement target of 65 points or better on the summative assessment.
Developing (3 - 8 points) Results are below District- or BOCES-adopted expectations for growth or achievement for grade/subject.	Developing 55%-69% of the teacher's students reach the achievement target of 65 points or better on the summative assessment.
Effective (9 - 17points) Results meet District- or BOCES-adopted expectations for growth or achievement for grade/subject.	Effective 70%-78% of the teacher's students reach the achievement target of 65 points or better on the summative assessment.
Ineffective (0 - 2 points) Results are well below District- or BOCES-adopted expectations for growth or achievement for grade/subject.	Ineffective 0-54% of the teacher's students reach the achievement target of 65 points or better on the summative assessment.

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	3) Teacher specific achievement or growth score computed locally	Algebra I Regents Exam
Geometry	3) Teacher specific achievement or growth score computed locally	Geometry Regents Exam
Algebra 2	3) Teacher specific achievement or growth score computed locally	Algebra 2 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.	NYS Regents Examination
Highly Effective (18 - 20 points) Results are well above District- or BOCES-adopted expectations for growth or achievement for grade/subject.	Highly Effective 79%-100% of the teacher's students reach the achievement target of 65 points or better on the summative assessment.
Effective (9 - 17 points) Results meet District- or BOCES-adopted expectations for growth or achievement for grade/subject.	Effective 70%-78% of the teacher's students reach the achievement target of 65 point or better on the summative assessment.
Developing (3 - 8 points) Results are below District- or BOCES-adopted expectations for growth or achievement for grade/subject.	Developing 55%-69% of the teacher's students reach the achievement target of 65 points or better on the summative assessment.
Ineffective (0 - 2 points) Results are well below District- or BOCES-adopted expectations for growth or achievement for grade/subject.	Ineffective 0-54% of the teacher's students reach the achievement target of 65 points or better on the summative assessment.

3.11) High School English Language Arts

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

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

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

Grade 9 ELA	5) District, regional, or BOCES–developed assessments	Port Washington District Developed ELA Final Exam Grade 9
Grade 10 ELA	5) District, regional, or BOCES–developed assessments	Port Washington District Developed ELA Final Exam Grade 10
Grade 11 ELA	3) Teacher specific achievement or growth score computed locally	ELA 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.	District developed assessments will measure student achievement, be rigorous, comparable across classrooms and the same assessment will be used for the grade level/subject area.
Highly Effective (18 - 20 points) Results are well above District- or BOCES-adopted expectations for growth or achievement for grade/subject.	Highly Effective 79-100% of the teacher's students reach the achievement target of 65% or better on the summative assessment or 65 points on the Regents exam as appropriate.
Effective (9 - 17 points) Results meet District- or BOCES-adopted expectations for growth or achievement for grade/subject.	Effective 70-78% of the teacher's students reach the achievement target of 65% or better on the summative assessment or 65 points on the Regents exam, as appropriate.
Developing (3 - 8 points) Results are below District- or BOCES-adopted expectations for growth or achievement for grade/subject.	Developing 55-69% of the teacher's students reach the achievement target of 65% or better on the summative assessment or 65 points on the Regents Exam as appropriate.
Ineffective (0 - 2 points) Results are well below District- or BOCES-adopted expectations for growth or achievement for grade/subject.	Ineffective 0-54% of the teacher's students reach the achievement target of 65% or better on the summative assessment or 65 points on the Regents exam as appropriate.

3.12) All Other Courses

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

Course(s) or Subject(s)	Locally-Selected Measure from List of Approved Measures	Assessment
All Other HS ELA Courses	6(ii) School wide measure computed locally	NYS Combined ELA 11 Regents and Algebra I Regents
All Other HS Math Courses	6(ii) School wide measure computed locally	NYS Combined ELA 11 Regents and Algebra I Regents
All Other HS Social Studies Courses	6(ii) School wide measure computed locally	NYS Combined ELA 11 Regents and Algebra I Regents
All Other HS Science Courses	6(ii) School wide measure computed locally	NYS Combined ELA 11 Regents and Algebra I Regents

All World Languages/LOTE	6(ii) School wide measure computed locally	NYS Combined ELA 11 Regents and Algebra I Regents
All Business	6(ii) School wide measure computed locally	NYS Combined ELA 11 Regents and Algebra I Regents
All Technology	6(ii) School wide measure computed locally	NYS Combined ELA 11 Regents and Algebra I Regents
All Art (9-12)	6(ii) School wide measure computed locally	NYS Combined ELA 11 Regents and Algebra I Regents
All Music (9-12)	6(ii) School wide measure computed locally	NYS Combined ELA 11 Regents and Algebra I Regents
All Physical Education/Health (9-12)	6(ii) School wide measure computed locally	NYS Combined ELA 11 Regents and Algebra I Regents
All Family and Consumer Science 9-12	6(ii) School wide measure computed locally	NYS Combined ELA 11 Regents and Algebra I Regents
9-12 Reading, Resource Room, Library Media Specialist	6(ii) School wide measure computed locally	NYS Combined ELA 11 Regents and Algebra I Regents
K-5 ESL/ELL, Resource Room, Library Media Specialists	6(ii) School wide measure computed locally	NYS Combined Aggregate Mean Score ELA and Math 3-5
6-8 Reading, Resource Room, Library Media Specialists	6(ii) School wide measure computed locally	NYS Combined Aggregate Mean Score ELA and Math 6-8
All Special Education (Life Skills)	6(ii) School wide measure computed locally	NYSAA
K-5 ESL/ELL	6(ii) School wide measure computed locally	NYS Combined Aggregate Mean Score ELA and Math 4-5
9-12 ESL/ELL	6(ii) School wide measure computed locally	NYS Combined ELA 11 Regents and Algebra I Regents
6-8 ESL/ELL	6(ii) School wide measure computed locally	ate Mean Score ELA and Math 6-8

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

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

Use this box, if needed, to describe the general process for assigning HEDI categories for these grades/subjects in this subcomponent. If needed, you may upload a table or graphic at 3.13, below.	District developed assessments will measure student achievement, be rigorous, comparable across classrooms and the same assessment will be used for the grade level/subject area.
Highly Effective (18 - 20 points) Results are well above District- or BOCES -adopted expectations for growth or achievement for grade/subject.	Highly Effective 79%-100% of the teacher's students reach the achievement target of 65% or better on the summative assessment or 65 points on the Regents/State Exam as appropriate.
Effective (9 - 17 points) Results meet District- or BOCES-adopted expectations for growth or achievement for grade/subject.	Effective 70-78% of the teacher's students reach the achievement target of 65% or better on the summative assessment or 65 points on the Regents/State Exam as appropriate. .

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

Developing 55-69% of the teacher's students reach the achievement target of 65% or better on the summative assessment or 65 points on the Regents/State Exam as appropriate. .

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

Ineffective 0-54% of the teacher's students reach the achievement target of 65% or better on the summative assessment or 65 points on the Regents/State Exam as appropriate. .

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/5139/132894-y92vNseFa4/PW Local 20 HEDI conversion chart 2.pdf

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 controls

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.

In a case where a teacher has multiple locally selected measures, a single subcomponent HEDI score will be developed using a weighted average based on student enrollment for the courses tied to the assessments.

3.16) Assurances

Please check all of the boxes below:

3.16) Assurances Assure the application of locally-developed controls will be rigorous, fair, and transparent.	Checked
3.16) Assurances Assure that use of locally-developed controls will not have a disparate impact on underrepresented students in accordance with any applicable civil rights laws.	Checked
3.16) Assurances Assure that enrolled students in accordance with teacher of record policies are included and may not be excluded.	Checked
3.16) Assurances Assure that procedures for ensuring data accuracy and integrity are being utilized.	Checked

3.16) Assurances Assure that the process for assigning points for locally selected measures will use the narrative HEDI descriptions described in the regulations to effectively differentiate educators' performance in ways that improve student learning and instruction.	Checked
3.16) Assurances Assure that it is possible for an educator to earn each point, including 0, for the locally-selected measures subcomponent.	Checked
3.16) Assurances Assure that locally-selected measures are rigorous and comparable across all classrooms in the same grade/subject in the district.	Checked
3.16) Assurances If more than one type of locally-selected measure is used for different groups of teachers within a grade/subject, certify that the measures are comparable based on the Standards of Educational and Psychological Testing.	Checked
3.16) Assurances Assure that all locally-selected measures for a teacher are different than any measures used for the State assessment or other comparable measures subcomponent.	Checked

4. Other Measures of Effectiveness (Teachers)

Created Friday, May 11, 2012

Updated Friday, December 21, 2012

Page 1

4.1) Teacher Practice Rubric

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

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

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

Danielson's Framework for Teaching

(No response)

4.2) Points Within Other Measures

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

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

Is the following points assignment applicable to all teachers?

No

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

Teachers who choose Option A

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

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

assets/survey-uploads/5091/128468-2UoxI2HPmn/Form 4.2 Port Washington.pdf

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.

Teachers will choose between Option A (40% Observations, 20% Professional Artifact Collection) and Option B (60% Observations). Teachers were presented with an explanation of the Options by the Superintendent of Schools and Teacher Association Officers in December, 2012. For the 2012-2013 school year, teachers must notify their principals of their choice by January 2, 2013. The Principals will document each teacher's choice in writing.

Teachers will receive a score based on the average points calculated using the Danielson 2007 Framework (ranging from 1-4), based on an average of all components of the four domains. The average of those scores will be converted to a 60 point scale, which is attached below. Highly Effective = 59-60, Effective = 57-58.8, Developing = 50-56.3, Ineffective = 0-49. The District recognizes that the overall composite score is a whole number and rules of rounding will apply.

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/5091/128468-eka9yMJ855/PW 60 point conversion.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.	Evidence indicates exceptional student learning gain that is well-above District expectations. This includes special populations.
Effective: Overall performance and results meet NYS Teaching Standards.	Evidence indicates significant student learning gain that meets District expectations. This includes special populations.
Developing: Overall performance and results need improvement in order to meet NYS Teaching Standards.	The educator may have had some impact on student learning; however, evidence indicates that expectations approach, but do not fully meet District expectations. This includes special populations.
Ineffective: Overall performance and results do not meet NYS Teaching Standards.	Evidence indicates little to no student learning; are well-below District expectations. This includes special populations.

Provide the ranges for the 60-point scoring bands.

Highly Effective	59-60
Effective	57-58.8
Developing	50-56.3
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	2
4.6) Observations of Probationary Teachers Informal/Short	1
4.6) Observations of Probationary Teachers Enter Total	3

By trained in-school peer teachers or other trained reviewers

Formal/Long	0
Informal/Short	0

Independent evaluators

Formal/Long	0
Informal/Short	0

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

- In Person

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

- In Person

4.7) Observations of Tenured Teachers

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

By building principals or other trained administrators

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

By trained in-school peer teachers or other trained reviewers

Formal/Long	0
Informal/Short	0

Independent evaluators

Formal/Long	0
Informal/Short	0

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

- In Person

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

5. Composite Scoring (Teachers)

Created Thursday, May 24, 2012

Updated Wednesday, January 02, 2013

Page 1

Standards for Rating Categories

Growth or Comparable Measures

Locally-selected Measures of

growth or achievement

Other Measures of Effectiveness

(Teacher and Leader standards)

Highly

Effective

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

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

Overall performance and results exceed NYS Teaching Standards.

Effective

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

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

Overall performance and results meet NYS Teaching Standards.

Developing

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

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

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

Ineffective

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

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

Overall performance and results do not meet NYS Teaching Standards.

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

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

2012-13 where there is no Value-Added measure

Growth or Comparable Measures

Locally-selected Measures of

growth or achievement

Other Measures of Effectiveness

(60 points)

Overall

Composite Score

Highly Effective

18-20

18-20

Ranges determined locally--see below

91-100

Effective

9-17

9-17

75-90

Developing

3-8

3-8

65-74

Ineffective

0-2

0-2

0-64

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

Highly Effective	59-60
Effective	57-58.8
Developing	50-56.3
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 Tuesday, October 16, 2012

Updated Friday, December 21, 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/5265/197974-Df0w3Xx5v6/PW 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:

PORT WASHINGTON SCHOOL DISTRICT TEACHER APPEAL PLAN AND PROCEDURES

1. Appeals shall be limited exclusively to those evaluations that have resulted in a rating of Developing or Ineffective. However, any probationary or tenured teacher may elect to submit a written response to their overall rating within ten (10) school days of the

teacher's receipt of the APPR evaluation. This response shall be appended to the APPR evaluation and filed in the teacher's personnel file.

2. A teacher receiving a rating of Developing or Ineffective may appeal his/her annual evaluation. Ratings of "Effective" or "Highly Effective" cannot be appealed.

3. All appeals regarding a teacher's annual professional performance review rating shall be submitted to the Superintendent of Schools within ten (10) school days of its receipt. Appeals concerning the issuance of a TIP must be filed within ten (10) school days of the teacher's receipt of a TIP. Appeals concerning the implementation of the terms of the TIP must be filed within ten (10) school days from the date of the District's alleged failure to comply with the terms of the TIP in whole or in part.

4. Appeals shall be in writing and shall articulate in detail the basis for the appeal. Along with the detailed description of the precise points of disagreement, the teacher must include any and all additional documents or written materials specific to the points of the disagreement that support the teacher's appeal and are relevant to the resolution of the appeal within ten school days.

5. A teacher bringing an appeal bears the burden of proving the merits of his or her appeal.

6. Appeals shall be limited to:

- The substance, rating and/or adherence to the parties' annual professional performance review plan adopted pursuant to Section 3012-c of the Education Law*
- The District's compliance with applicable regulations of the Commissioner of Education*
- The District's compliance with the procedures and methodologies of this APPR plan, including but not limited to the issuance and/or implementation of the terms of a Teacher Improvement Plan (TIP)*

7. A teacher may not file multiple appeals regarding the same performance review. All grounds for appeal must be raised within one appeal, provided that the teacher knew the grounds existed at the time the appeal was initiated. Otherwise, a further appeal may be filed but only based upon such previously unknown grounds.

8. The Superintendent of Schools shall issue a written determination in response to the appeal within ten (10) school days of its receipt.

9. The determination of the Superintendent of Schools as to the substance of the teacher's APPR shall be final.

10. Nothing in the above shall prevent a teacher from challenging the substance of an evaluation within the context of a proceeding pursuant to section 3020-a of Education Law.

11. All time frames referred to herein may be extended by mutual written agreement of the District and the Association. The District assures that these extensions will be timely and expeditious in compliance with Education Law 3012-c.

12. This appeal procedure shall not in any way restrict or affect the District's prerogative to terminate the appointment of, or deny tenure to, a probationary teacher for statutorily and constitutionally permissible reasons.

13. The fact that a performance review is under appeal shall not delay or otherwise affect the process of developing and implementing a TIP.

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.

All district administrators have been, and will continue to be, trained in effective observation techniques supervision strategies and in our teacher evaluation rubric, the Danielson 2007 Rubric.

These training sessions focused on the nine required elements as defined by the Board of Regents through a combination of BOCES and State Education approved trainer, Joan Daly Lewis.

In addition, Joan Daly Lewis has been providing numerous sessions of training on implementation of the Danielson 2007 teacher rubric including instruction and practice in inter-rater reliability.

All district administrators will continue their professional development in order to be certified for the following school year. This professional development requirement for recertification will include all of the aforementioned elements and will take place on site through administrative meetings designed specifically for this purpose.

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 Thursday, May 24, 2012

Updated Wednesday, January 02, 2013

Page 1

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

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

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

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

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

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

Please check the boxes below:

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

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

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

State assessments, *required if one exists*

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

List of State-approved 3rd party assessments

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

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

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

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

Use this box, if needed, to describe the process for assigning HEDI categories in this subcomponent. If needed, you may upload a table or graphic below.	(No response)
Highly Effective (18 - 20 points) Results are well above state average for similar students (or District goals if no state test).	N/A
Effective (9 - 17 points) Results meet state average for similar students (or District goals if no state test).	N/A
Developing (3 - 8 points) Results are below state average for similar students (or District goals if no state test).	N/A
Ineffective (0 - 2 points) Results are well below state average for similar students (or District goals if no state test).	N/A

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 Saturday, July 07, 2012

Updated Friday, January 04, 2013

Page 1

Locally-Selected Measures of Student Achievement or Growth

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

Grade Configuration	Locally-Selected Measure from List of Approved Measures	Assessment
K-5	(d) measures used by district for teacher evaluation	NYS 3-5 Combined ELA and Math State Assessments
6-8	(a) achievement on State assessments	NYS 6-8 Combined ELA and Math State Assessments
9-12	(d) measures used by district for teacher evaluation	NYS Combined ELA 11 Regents and Algebra I 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.

<p>Use this box, if needed, to describe the process for assigning HEDI categories. If needed, you may upload a table or graphic below.</p>	<p>Elementary Principals will receive combined mean scores from the ELA and Math Assessment Data from grades 3, 4, and 5 in order to set schoolwide achievement to passing/proficiency targets and assign HEDI categories to the Elementary Principals.</p> <p>The Middle School Principal will receive combined mean scores from the ELA and Math Assessment Data from grades 6, 7, and 8 in order to set schoolwide achievement to passing/proficiency targets and assign HEDI categories to the Middle School Principal.</p> <p>The High School Principal will receive combined mean scores from the ELA Grade 11 Regents and Algebra 1 Regents Grade 9 Data in order to set schoolwide achievement to passing/proficiency targets and assign HEDI categories to the High School Principal.</p> <p>(See HEDI tables contained in section 8.1 for specific principal HEDI bands). Principals and the Superintendent</p>
--	---

will collaboratively set these targets and ranges for each appropriate level.

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

The District expectation is that students will score 6%-7% above the State average for elementary and middle school principals to be rated Highly Effective, and 11%-12% of students will score above the State average for the high school principal to be rated Highly Effective.

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

The District expectation is that students will score 0%-5% above the State average for elementary and middle school principals to be rated Effective, and 5%-10% of students will score above the State average for the high school principal to be rated Effective.

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

The District expectation is that students will score 1%-5% below the State average for elementary and middle school principals to be rated Developing, and 0%-4% of students will score above the State average for the high school principal to be rated Developing.

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

The District expectation is that students will score 6%-8% below the State average for elementary and middle school principals to be rated Ineffective, and 1%-3% of students will score below the State average for the high school principal to be rated Ineffective.

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/5366/149504-qBFVOWF7fC/PW Principal Local Assessment Scoring 1.2.13.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. N/A

Highly Effective (18 - 20 points) Results are well above District- or BOCES-adopted expectations for growth or achievement for grade/subject.	N/A
Effective (9- 17 points) Results meet District- or BOCES-adopted expectations for growth or achievement for grade/subject.	N/A
Developing (3 - 8 points) Results are below District- or BOCES-adopted expectations for growth or achievement for grade/subject.	N/A
Ineffective (0 - 2 points) Results are well below District- or BOCES-adopted expectations for growth or achievement for grade/subject.	N/A

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

(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 controls.

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.

We have no principals with more than one locally selected measure.

8.5) Assurances

Please check all of the boxes below:

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

8.5) Assurances Assure that it is possible for a principal to earn each point, including 0, for the locally selected measures subcomponent.	Check
8.5) Assurances Assure that locally-selected measures are rigorous and comparable across all principals in the same or similar programs or grade configurations across the district.	Check
8.5) Assurances If more than one type of locally-selected measure is used for different groups of principals in the same or similar grade configuration or program, certify that the measures are comparable based on the Standards of Educational and Psychological Testing.	Check
8.5) Assurances Assure that all locally-selected measures for a principal are different than any measures used for the State assessment or other comparable measures subcomponent.	Check

9. Other Measures of Effectiveness (Principals)

Created Thursday, May 24, 2012
Updated Friday, January 04, 2013

Page 1

9.1) Principal Practice Rubric

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

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

Multidimensional Principal Performance Rubric

(No response)

9.2) Points Within Other Measures

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

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

Is the following points assignment for all principals?

Yes

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

(No response)

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

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

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

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

(No response)

9.3) Assurances -- Goals

Please check the boxes below (if applicable):

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

9.4) Sources of Evidence (if applicable)

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

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

9.5) Survey Tool(s) (if applicable)

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

(No response)

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

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

9.6) Assurances

Please check all of the boxes below:

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

9.7) Process for Assigning Points and Determining HEDI Ratings

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

Principals will be observed multiple times throughout the year, including a minimum of one announced and one unannounced observation, as well as other interactions between the certified Superintendent and the principal. A progress review will occur mid year. Evidence will be reviewed at the end of the year and point values assigned to the principal based on performance in their role based on the Multidimensional Rubric. The average score earned by the principal at each of the elements of the Multidimensional Rubric will be converted to 0-60 points by utilizing the chart attached below. The District recognizes that the overall composite score is a whole number and rules of rounding will apply.

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/5143/133046-pMADJ4gk6R/Other Measures of Principal Effectiveness 1.3.13.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.	The principals' performance exceeds District Standards and Expectations as measured by the Multidimensional Principal's Performance Rubric.
Effective: Overall performance and results meet standards.	The principals' performance meets District Standards and Expectations as measured by the Multidimensional Principal's Performance Rubric.
Developing: Overall performance and results need improvement in order to meet standards.	The principals' performance is approaching District Standards and Expectations as measured by the Multidimensional Principal's Performance Rubric.
Ineffective: Overall performance and results do not meet standards.	The principals' performance is below District Standards and Expectations as measured by the Multidimensional Principal's Performance Rubric.

Please provide the locally-negotiated 60 point scoring bands.

Highly Effective	51-60
Effective	38-50
Developing	25-37
Ineffective	0-24

9.8) School Visits

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

Probationary Principals

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

Tenured Principals

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

10. Composite Scoring (Principals)

Created Tuesday, October 02, 2012

Updated Wednesday, January 02, 2013

Page 1

Standards for Rating Categories

Growth or Comparable Measures

Locally-selected Measures of growth or achievement

Other Measures of Effectiveness (Teacher and Leader standards)

Highly

Effective

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

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

Overall performance and results exceed ISLLC leadership standards.

Effective

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

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

Overall performance and results meet ISLLC leadership standards.

Developing

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

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

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

Ineffective

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

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

Overall performance and results do not meet ISLLC leadership standards.

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

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

2012-13 where there is no Value-Added measure

Growth or Comparable Measures

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

Other Measures of Effectiveness

(60 points)

Overall

Composite Score

Highly Effective

18-20

18-20

Ranges determined locally--see below

91-100

Effective

9-17

9-17

75-90

Developing

3-8

3-8

65-74

Ineffective

0-2

0-2

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	51-60
Effective	38-50
Developing	25-37
Ineffective	0-24

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

2012-13 where Value-Added growth measure applies

Growth or Comparable Measures

Locally-selected Measures of growth or achievement

Other Measures of Effectiveness

(60 points)

Overall

Composite Score

Highly Effective

22-25

14-15

Ranges determined locally--see above

91-100

Effective

10-21

8-13

75-90

Developing

3-9

3-7

65-74

Ineffective

0-2

0-2

0-64

11. Additional Requirements - Principals

Created Friday, May 11, 2012

Updated Friday, December 21, 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/5276/128548-Df0w3Xx5v6/Principal Improvement Plan Form.pdf](assets/survey-uploads/5276/128548-Df0w3Xx5v6/Principal%20Improvement%20Plan%20Form.pdf)

11.3) Appeals Process

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

(1) the substance of the annual professional performance review

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

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

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

1. Appeals shall be limited to those evaluations that have resulted in a rating of Ineffective or Developing.

2. The draft annual evaluation shall be presented to the Building Principal at a meeting between the administrator and the Superintendent of Schools in June of each school year.

3. Within ten (10) business days of the receipt of a draft of a building principal's annual evaluation from the Superintendent of Schools

the administrator may present information and materials relevant to the evaluation, in writing to the Superintendent of Schools.

4. Within five (5) business days of the receipt of the materials, the Superintendent shall issue the final evaluation.

5. Within five (5) school days of the receipt of a final annual evaluation providing a rating as set forth in Subparagraph (1) above, a principal improvement plan (PIP), or a final PIP report, a principal may appeal the annual evaluation, principal improvement plan, or the final PIP report to the Superintendent of Schools. The appeal shall be in writing and shall articulate in detail the basis of the appeal. Along with the detailed description of the precise points of disagreement, the principal must include any and all additional documents or written materials specific to the points of disagreement that support the principal's appeal and are relevant to the resolution of the appeal. Any such additional information not submitted at the time the appeal is filed shall not be considered in the deliberations related to the resolution of the appeal

Appeals shall be limited to:

- a. the substance of the annual professional performance review;*
- b. the District's adherence to the standards and methodologies required for such reviews pursuant to Section 3012(c) of the Education law;*
- c. the District's adherence to the Regulations of the Commissioner and compliance with any applicable locally negotiated procedure; and*
- d. the District's issuance and/or implementation of the terms of the principal's improvement plan (i.e., final PIP report).*

6. Any issue not raised in the written appeal shall be deemed waived.

7. Notwithstanding any other provisions of this Appeals process, the Superintendent of Schools and the principal will each provide evidence to support their proposed APPR rating, and will make every effort to resolve the differences and come to a collaborative decision as to what the final rating shall be. In the event they cannot agree, the Superintendent of School shall decide the principal's final rating.

8. Within twenty (20) school days of receipt of the appeal, the Superintendent of Schools shall render a written determination with respect thereto.

9. The determination of the Superintendent of Schools as to the substance of the annual professional performance review shall be final and binding. Procedural issues that will be set forth in this Article shall be raised as a part of the appeal to the Superintendent.

10. Notwithstanding the above, in the event that a principal has received a second ineffective and/or developmental rating the evaluated principal will have the right to a committee review by requesting such a review within 10 business days of receipt of the rating. The Superintendent of Schools shall choose two committee members and the Association shall choose two committee members on behalf of the principal. The committee may recommend modification of the PIP and/or of the rating. The review shall be completed within ten (10) business days of delivery of the written request for review. The principal shall have the opportunity to speak to the committee and discuss supporting evidence.

The committee shall reach its findings using a consensus model. The committee's written recommendation shall be transmitted to the Superintendent and the unit member upon completion. If consensus is not reached, the committee shall submit the opposing viewpoints in writing to the Superintendent, the principal, and the APSA co-presidents. The Superintendent shall consider the written recommendation of the committee and issue a written decision within ten (10) business days thereof. The determination of the Superintendent will be final and binding.

11. The time frames referred to herein may be extended by mutual written agreement of the parties. The District assures that these extensions will be timely and expeditious in accordance with Education Law 3012-c.

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.

All district lead evaluators have been, and will continue to be, trained in effective observation techniques supervision strategies and in our teacher evaluation rubric, the Danielson 2007 Rubric.

These training sessions focused on the nine required elements as defined by the Board of Regents through a combination of BOCES and State Education approved trainer, Joan Daly Lewis.

In addition, Joan Daly Lewis has been providing numerous sessions of training on implementation of the Danielson 2007 teacher rubric including instruction and practice in inter-rater reliability.

All principal lead evaluators will continue their professional development in order to be certified for the following school year. This professional development requirement for recertification will include all of the aforementioned elements and will take place on site through administrative meetings designed specifically for this purpose.

11.5) Assurances -- Evaluators

Please check the boxes below:

-
- Checked
-

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

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

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

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

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

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

(7) use of the Statewide Instructional Reporting System

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

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

-
- Checked
-

11.6) Assurances -- Principals

Please check all of the boxes below:

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

11.7) Assurances -- Data

Please check all of the boxes below:

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

12. Joint Certification of APPR Plan

Created Thursday, May 24, 2012

Updated Friday, January 04, 2013

Page 1

12.1) Upload the Joint Certification of the APPR Plan

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

[assets/survey-uploads/5581/133072-3Uqgn5g9Iu/APPR Signature Page.010413.pdf](assets/survey-uploads/5581/133072-3Uqgn5g9Iu/APPR%20Signature%20Page.010413.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 Washington School District
“OTHER” MEASURES OF EFFECTIVENESS (60 POINTS)
Principal’s Leadership and Management

The district shall utilize the LCI Multidimensional Rubric for principal evaluation as the basis of all 60 points of the 60 "Other" points allocated to measures of leadership and management according to the two scoring systems attached below. Twenty-six (26) of the 60 points will be awarded for "Evaluation of School Records, Artifacts and Written Attainment of Progress" under each Domain as per the *Artifact Rubric* attached. The remaining thirty-four (34) points will be awarded from the six Domains as per the *MPPR Scoring System* (also attached below) with the evaluator rating each of the 18 components (e.g. Culture) on a scale of 0-3 points, 0-2 points or 0-1 point as follows:

For components with a value of 3 points: 0 for Ineffective, 1 for Developing, 2 for Effective, and 3 for Highly Effective.

For components with a value of 2 points: 0 for Ineffective, 1 for Developing, 1.5 for Effective, and 2 for Highly Effective.

For components with a value of 1 point: 0 for Ineffective, .5 for Developing, .75 for Effective, and 1 for Highly Effective.

Name of Principal _____
 School Year 2012-13

MPPR Scoring System Domain 1- Domain 6

Domain 1: Shared Vision of Learning (11 points)	
a. Culture	3
b. Sustainability	2
Evaluation of School Record, Artifacts, and Written Attainment of Progress*	6
Domain 2: School Culture & Instructional Program (20 points)	
a. Culture	3
b. Instructional Program	3
c. Capacity Building	2
d. Sustainability	3
e. Strategic Planning Process	2
Evaluation of School Records, Artifacts, and written Attainment of Progress*	7

Domain 3: Safe, Efficient, Effective Learning Environment (11 Points)	
a. Capacity Building	1
b. Culture	3
c. Sustainability	1
d. Instructional Program	2
Evaluation of School Records, Artifacts, and Written Attainment of Progress*	4
Domain 4: Community (8 Points)	
a. Strategic Planning Process: Inquiry	1
b. Culture	2
c. Sustainability	1
Evaluation of School Records, Artifacts and Written Attainment of Progress*	4
Domain 5: Integrity, Fairness, Ethics (6 Points)	
a. Sustainability	1
b. Culture	2
Evaluation of School Records, Artifacts and Written Attainment of Progress*	3
Domain 6: Political, Social, Economic, Legal & Cultural Context (4 Points)	
a. Sustainability	1
b. Culture	1
Evaluation of School Records, Artifacts and Written Attainment of Progress*	2
TOTAL POINTS	60

Rubric Performance Levels and Score Scale	
Rules of rounding will apply as the overall composite score is a whole number. In the event of a decimal value, standard rules of rounding(.5 or higher round up) will apply.	
<u>Performance Level</u>	<u>Points ranges negotiated</u>
Highly Effective	51-60
Effective	38-50
Developing	25-37
Ineffective	0-24

Points Awarded 0-60: _____

Overall Rating: Highly Effective Effective Developing Ineffective

Scoring Methodology for the 60% Teacher Effects

Converting points to a rating

The teacher's rating will drive how many points the teacher will receive toward the composite score. In this subcomponent, the teacher should first be rated according to the rubric, that rating would determine where the teacher falls in the HEDI categories, and then the points are applied. For example, a teacher that scores 3.0 on the rubric would translate to a score in the "effective" range. The teacher would then receive 58 points toward the composite score.

Teacher Effects Conversion Scale

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

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

Rubric Score to Sub-Component Conversion Chart

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

1.358		44
1.367		45
1.375		46
1.383		47
1.392		48
1.400		49
Developing 50-56		
1.5		50
1.6		50.7
1.7		51.4
1.8		52.1
1.9		52.8
2		53.5
2.1		54.2
2.2		54.9
2.3		55.6
2.4		56.3
Effective 57-58		
2.5		57
2.6		57.2
2.7		57.4
2.8		57.6
2.9		57.8
3		58
3.1		58.2
3.2		58.4
3.3		58.6
3.4		58.8
Highly Effective 59-60		
3.5		59
3.6		59.3
3.7		59.5
3.8		59.8
3.9		60
4		60.25 (round to 60)

Port Washington School District
"OTHER" MEASURES OF EFFECTIVENESS (60 POINTS)
Principal's Leadership and Management

The district shall utilize the LCI Multidimensional Rubric for principal evaluation as the basis of all 60 points of the 60 "Other" points allocated to measures of leadership and management according to the two scoring systems attached below. Twenty-six (26) of the 60 points will be awarded for "Evaluation of School Records, Artifacts and Written Attainment of Progress" under each Domain as per the *Artifact Rubric* attached. The remaining thirty-four (34) points will be awarded from the six Domains as per the *MPPR Scoring System* (also attached below) with the evaluator rating each of the 18 components (e.g. Culture) on a scale of 0-3 points, 0-2 points or 0-1 point as follows:

For components with a value of 3 points: 0 for Ineffective, 1 for Developing, 2 for Effective, and 3 for Highly Effective.

For components with a value of 2 points: 0 for Ineffective, 1 for Developing, 1.5 for Effective, and 2 for Highly Effective.

For components with a value of 1 point: 0 for Ineffective, .5 for Developing, .75 for Effective, and 1 for Highly Effective.

Name of Principal _____
 School Year 2012-13

MPPR Scoring System Domain 1- Domain 6

Domain 1: Shared Vision of Learning (11 points)	
a. Culture	3
b. Sustainability	2
Evaluation of School Record, Artifacts, and Written Attainment of Progress*	6
Domain 2: School Culture & Instructional Program (20 points)	
a. Culture	3
b. Instructional Program	3
c. Capacity Building	2
d. Sustainability	3
e. Strategic Planning Process	2
Evaluation of School Records, Artifacts, and written Attainment of Progress*	7

Domain 3: Safe, Efficient, Effective Learning Environment (11 Points)	
a. Capacity Building	1
b. Culture	3
c. Sustainability	1
d. Instructional Program	2
Evaluation of School Records, Artifacts, and Written Attainment of Progress*	4
Domain 4: Community (8 Points)	
a. Strategic Planning Process: Inquiry	1
b. Culture	2
c. Sustainability	1
Evaluation of School Records, Artifacts and Written Attainment of Progress*	4
Domain 5: Integrity, Fairness, Ethics (6 Points)	
a. Sustainability	1
b. Culture	2
Evaluation of School Records, Artifacts and Written Attainment of Progress*	3
Domain 6: Political, Social, Economic, Legal & Cultural Context (4 Points)	
a. Sustainability	1
b. Culture	1
Evaluation of School Records, Artifacts and Written Attainment of Progress*	2
TOTAL POINTS	60

Rubric Performance Levels and Score Scale	
Rules of rounding will apply as the overall composite score is a whole number. In the event of a decimal value, standard rules of rounding(.5 or higher round up) will apply.	
<u>Performance Level</u>	<u>Points ranges negotiated</u>
Highly Effective	51-60
Effective	38-50
Developing	25-37
Ineffective	0-24

Points Awarded 0-60: _____

Overall Rating: Highly Effective Effective Developing Ineffective

Assignment of HEDI points for teacher growth - 20 points

Points (0-20)	Results	HEDI
Highly Effective 18-20		
20	91%-100%	Highly Effective
19	85%-90%	Highly Effective
18	79%-84%	Highly Effective
Effective 9-17		
17	78%	Effective
16	77%	Effective
15	76%	Effective
14	75%	Effective
13	74%	Effective
12	73%	Effective
11	72%	Effective
10	71%	Effective
9	70%	Effective
Developing 3-8		
8	68%-69%	Developing
7	66%-67%	Developing
6	64%-65%	Developing
5	60%-63%	Developing
4	58%-59%	Developing
3	55%-57%	Developing
Ineffective 0-2		
2	53%-54%	Ineffective
1	50%-52%	Ineffective
0	Below 50%	Ineffective

Port Washington Union Free School District

Teacher Improvement Plan			
Teacher:		School(s):	
Department:		Grade(s):	
Status (Nontenured/Tenured)		Overall Rating: (Developing or Ineffective)	
(1) What does the teacher need to change?			
(2) What evidence will demonstrate that the teacher has changed?			
(3) What is the time frame in which the change should occur?			
(4) Are there intermediate benchmarks that will indicate progress? If so, when should these occur?			
(5) Recommendations and/or requirements provided to the teacher in order to facilitate change:			
(6) Resources, guidance, follow-up provided and planned for the teacher:			

**Port Washington Union Free School District
Principal Improvement Plan (PIP)**

Principal _____ Building _____ School Year _____

Targeted Goals- Areas Needing Improvement	Expected Outcomes	Recommended Activities	Recommended Resources	Evidence of Achievement	Timeline
Student Performance and/or Engagement					
Supervision of Staff					
Fiscal Management					
Communication with Parents					
Community Relations					

Principal _____ Date _____

APSA Co-President _____ Date _____

Superintendent of Schools _____ Date _____

**SECTION II: LOCAL MEASURES OF STUDENT ACHIEVEMENT (15 OR 20 POINTS)
PORT WASHINGTON UNION FREE SCHOOL DISTRICT**

PRINCIPAL: _____ **YEAR:** 2012-13 **CHECK ONE TOTAL:** ___15
PTS. Or ___20 PTS.

The Locally Selected Measure(s) of Student Achievement shall be:

Elementary: Aggregate Combined grades 3-5 District Wide ELA and Math Scores compared with state scores

Weber Middle School: Aggregate Combined grades 6-8 ELA and Math Scores compared with state scores

Schreiber High School: Annual Graduation Rate compared with the state average.

Scoring Methodology:

Elementary and Middle School (no value added measure: 20 points)

<i>% Points below/above state average</i>	<i>Points towards Local Achievement Measure</i>
-11 or less	0
-10	1
-9	2
-8	3
-7	4
-6	5
-5	6
-4	7
-3	8
-2	9
-1	10
0	11
1	12
2	13
3	14
4	15
5	16
6	17
7	18
8	19
9 or greater	20

Elementary and Middle School (WITH value added measure: 15 points)

<i>% Points below/above state average</i>	<i>Points towards Local Achievement Measure</i>
-8 or less	0
-7	1
-6	2
-5	3
-4	4
-3	5
-2	6
-1	7
0	8
1	9
2	10
3	11
4	12
5	13
6	14
7 or greater	15

High School (no value added measure: 20 points)

<i>% Points below/above state average</i>	<i>Points towards Local Achievement Measure</i>
-6 or less	0
-5	1
-4	2
-3	3
-2	4
-1	5
0	6
1	7
2	8
3	9
4	10
5	11
6	12
7	13
8	14
9	15
10	16
11	17
12	18
13	19
14 or greater	20

High School (WITH value added measure: 15 points)

<i>% Points below/above state average</i>	<i>Points towards Local Achievement Measure</i>
-3 or less	0
-2	1
-1	2
0	3
1	4
2	5
3	6
4	7
5	8
6	9
7	10
8	11
9	12
10	13
11	14
12 or greater	15

PLAN AGREEMENT:

Superintendent Signature/Date

Principal Signature/Date

FINAL RATING/SCORE FOR MEASURE: _____ / _____

Assignment of HEDI points for locally selected measures of student achievement for all other teachers - 20 points

Points (0-20)	Results	HEDI
Highly Effective 18-20		
20	91%-100%	Highly Effective
19	85%-90%	Highly Effective
18	79%-84%	Highly Effective
Effective 9-17		
17	78%	Effective
16	77%	Effective
15	76%	Effective
14	75%	Effective
13	74%	Effective
12	73%	Effective
11	72%	Effective
10	71%	Effective
9	70%	Effective
Developing 3-8		
8	68%-69%	Developing
7	66%-67%	Developing
6	64%-65%	Developing
5	60%-63%	Developing
4	58%-59%	Developing
3	55%-57%	Developing
Ineffective 0-2		
2	53%-54%	Ineffective
1	50%-52%	Ineffective
0	Below 50%	Ineffective

Assignment of HEDI points for locally selected measures of student achievement for all other teachers – 15 points

Points (0-15)	Results	HEDI
Highly Effective 14-15		
15	85%-100%	Highly Effective
14	79%-84%	Highly Effective
Effective 8-13		
13	78%	Effective
12	76%-77%	Effective
11	75%	Effective
10	74%	Effective
9	72%-73%	Effective
8	70%-71%	Effective
Developing 3-7		
7	69%	Developing
6	66%-68%	Developing
5	64%-65%	Developing
4	60%-63%	Developing
3	55%-59%	Developing
Ineffective 0-2		
2	53%-54%	Ineffective
1	50%-52%	Ineffective
0	Below 50%	Ineffective

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:

Kathleen A. Mooney, Ed.D. 1/4/13

Teachers Union President Signature: Date:

Chris David 1/4/13

Administrative Union President Signature: Date:

B.S. Win 1/4/13

Board of Education President Signature: Date:

Karen Sloan 1/4/13

Form 4.2) Points within Other Measures – Port Washington

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.

Fill in the group of teachers covered (e.g., "probationary teachers"):

Teachers who choose Option B

Multiple (at least two) classroom observations by principal or other trained administrator, at least one of which must be unannounced [at least 31 points]	60
One or more observation(s) by trained independent evaluators	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	0

Scoring Methodology for the 60% Teacher Effects

Converting points to a rating

The teacher's rating will drive how many points the teacher will receive toward the composite score. In this subcomponent, the teacher should first be rated according to the rubric, that rating would determine where the teacher falls in the HEDI categories, and then the points are applied. For example, a teacher that scores 3.0 on the rubric would translate to a score in the "effective" range. The teacher would then receive 58 points toward the composite score.

Teacher Effects Conversion Scale

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

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

Rubric Score to Sub-Component Conversion Chart

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

1.358		44
1.367		45
1.375		46
1.383		47
1.392		48
1.400		49
Developing 50-56		
1.5		50
1.6		50.7
1.7		51.4
1.8		52.1
1.9		52.8
2		53.5
2.1		54.2
2.2		54.9
2.3		55.6
2.4		56.3
Effective 57-58		
2.5		57
2.6		57.2
2.7		57.4
2.8		57.6
2.9		57.8
3		58
3.1		58.2
3.2		58.4
3.3		58.6
3.4		58.8
Highly Effective 59-60		
3.5		59
3.6		59.3
3.7		59.5
3.8		59.8
3.9		60
4		60.25 (round to 60)

Assignment of HEDI points for teacher growth - 20 points

Points (0-20)	Results	HEDI
Highly Effective 18-20		
20	91%-100%	Highly Effective
19	85%-90%	Highly Effective
18	79%-84%	Highly Effective
Effective 9-17		
17	78%	Effective
16	77%	Effective
15	76%	Effective
14	75%	Effective
13	74%	Effective
12	73%	Effective
11	72%	Effective
10	71%	Effective
9	70%	Effective
Developing 3-8		
8	68%-69%	Developing
7	66%-67%	Developing
6	64%-65%	Developing
5	60%-63%	Developing
4	58%-59%	Developing
3	55%-57%	Developing
Ineffective 0-2		
2	53%-54%	Ineffective
1	50%-52%	Ineffective
0	Below 50%	Ineffective

SECTION II: LOCAL MEASURES OF STUDENT ACHIEVEMENT (15 OR 20 POINTS)
PORT WASHINGTON UNION FREE SCHOOL DISTRICT

PRINCIPAL: _____ **YEAR:** 2012-13 **CHECK ONE TOTAL:** ___15
PTS. Or ___20 PTS.

The Locally Selected Measure(s) of Student Achievement shall be:

Elementary: Aggregate Combined grades 3-5 District Wide ELA and Math Scores compared with state scores

Weber Middle School: Aggregate Combined grades 6-8 ELA and Math Scores compared with state scores

Schreiber High School: Annual Graduation Rate compared with the state average.

Scoring Methodology:

Elementary and Middle School (no value added measure: 20 points)

<i>% Points below/above state average</i>	<i>Points towards Local Achievement Measure</i>
-11 or less	0
-10	1
-9	2
-8	3
-7	4
-6	5
-5	6
-4	7
-3	8
-2	9
-1	10
0	11
1	12
2	13
3	14
4	15
5	16
6	17
7	18
8	19
9 or greater	20

Elementary and Middle School (WITH value added measure: 15 points)

<i>% Points below/above state average</i>	<i>Points towards Local Achievement Measure</i>
-8 or less	0
-7	1
-6	2
-5	3
-4	4
-3	5
-2	6
-1	7
0	8
1	9
2	10
3	11
4	12
5	13
6	14
7 or greater	15

High School (no value added measure: 20 points)

<i>% Points below/above state average</i>	<i>Points towards Local Achievement Measure</i>
-6 or less	0
-5	1
-4	2
-3	3
-2	4
-1	5
0	6
1	7
2	8
3	9
4	10
5	11
6	12
7	13
8	14
9	15
10	16
11	17
12	18
13	19
14 or greater	20

High School (WITH value added measure: 15 points)

% Points below/above state average

*Points towards Local
Achievement Measure*

-3 or less	0
-2	1
-1	2
0	3
1	4
2	5
3	6
4	7
5	8
6	9
7	10
8	11
9	12
10	13
11	14
12 or greater	15

PLAN AGREEMENT:

Superintendent Signature/Date

Principal Signature/Date

FINAL RATING/SCORE FOR MEASURE: _____ / _____

**Port Washington Union Free School District
Principal Improvement Plan (PIP)**

Principal _____ Building _____ School Year _____

Targeted Goals- Areas Needing Improvement	Expected Outcomes	Recommended Activities	Recommended Resources	Evidence of Achievement	Timeline
Student Performance and/or Engagement					
Supervision of Staff					
Fiscal Management					
Communication with Parents					
Community Relations					

Principal _____ Date _____

APSA Co-President _____ Date _____

Superintendent of Schools _____ Date _____

Assignment of HEDI points for locally selected measures of student achievement for all other teachers - 20 points

Points (0-20)	Results	HEDI
Highly Effective 18-20		
20	91%-100%	Highly Effective
19	85%-90%	Highly Effective
18	79%-84%	Highly Effective
Effective 9-17		
17	78%	Effective
16	77%	Effective
15	76%	Effective
14	75%	Effective
13	74%	Effective
12	73%	Effective
11	72%	Effective
10	71%	Effective
9	70%	Effective
Developing 3-8		
8	68%-69%	Developing
7	66%-67%	Developing
6	64%-65%	Developing
5	60%-63%	Developing
4	58%-59%	Developing
3	55%-57%	Developing
Ineffective 0-2		
2	53%-54%	Ineffective
1	50%-52%	Ineffective
0	Below 50%	Ineffective

Assignment of HEDI points for locally selected measures of student achievement for all other teachers – 15 points

Points (0-15)	Results	HEDI
Highly Effective 14-15		
15	85%-100%	Highly Effective
14	79%-84%	Highly Effective
Effective 8-13		
13	78%	Effective
12	76%-77%	Effective
11	75%	Effective
10	74%	Effective
9	72%-73%	Effective
8	70%-71%	Effective
Developing 3-7		
7	69%	Developing
6	66%-68%	Developing
5	64%-65%	Developing
4	60%-63%	Developing
3	55%-59%	Developing
Ineffective 0-2		
2	53%-54%	Ineffective
1	50%-52%	Ineffective
0	Below 50%	Ineffective

Assignment of HEDI points for locally selected measures of student achievement for all other teachers - 20 points

Points (0-20)	Results	HEDI
Highly Effective 18-20		
20	91%-100%	Highly Effective
19	85%-90%	Highly Effective
18	79%-84%	Highly Effective
Effective 9-17		
17	78%	Effective
16	77%	Effective
15	76%	Effective
14	75%	Effective
13	74%	Effective
12	73%	Effective
11	72%	Effective
10	71%	Effective
9	70%	Effective
Developing 3-8		
8	68%-69%	Developing
7	66%-67%	Developing
6	64%-65%	Developing
5	60%-63%	Developing
4	58%-59%	Developing
3	55%-57%	Developing
Ineffective 0-2		
2	53%-54%	Ineffective
1	50%-52%	Ineffective
0	Below 50%	Ineffective

Assignment of HEDI points for locally selected measures of student achievement for all other teachers – 15 points

Points (0-15)	Results	HEDI
Highly Effective 14-15		
15	85%-100%	Highly Effective
14	79%-84%	Highly Effective
Effective 8-13		
13	78%	Effective
12	76%-77%	Effective
11	75%	Effective
10	74%	Effective
9	72%-73%	Effective
8	70%-71%	Effective
Developing 3-7		
7	69%	Developing
6	66%-68%	Developing
5	64%-65%	Developing
4	60%-63%	Developing
3	55%-59%	Developing
Ineffective 0-2		
2	53%-54%	Ineffective
1	50%-52%	Ineffective
0	Below 50%	Ineffective

Port Washington Union Free School District
TEACHER IMPROVEMENT PLAN (TIP) GUIDELINES

A Teacher Improvement Plan (TIP) is a jointly developed program of support and intervention designed to help instructional personnel who have been identified as either Ineffective or Developing by their Annual Professional Performance Review (APPR) rating or who have been identified by the District as needing improvement. The exclusive purpose of a TIP shall be to promote the professional growth of the teacher. A TIP is not considered to be a disciplinary instrument.

The Teacher Improvement Plan team will be responsible for assisting, advising, and monitoring the teacher's performance during the school year. This team will be formed and charged to guide the effort of the TIP in support of the teacher.

The TIP shall specifically state the following:

- Areas in need of improvement, related to the evaluation rubric used for APPR
- Statement of the goals of the TIP
- Differentiated activities to be implemented in order to facilitate the teacher's improvement
- Actions to be taken by the supervisor in support of the teacher's progress toward fulfilling the goals of the TIP
- Resources/training/professional development to be made available to the teacher
- Observable/measurable indicators that the teacher will have succeeded in fulfilling the goals of the TIP
- Timeline for review of the teacher's progress in fulfilling the goals of the TIP

Teacher Improvement Plan Team Members:

- Teacher
- Principal or Principal's designee
- PWTA President or President's designee
- Others mutually agreed upon by all parties

Team Responsibilities:

- Together, the team will design a Teacher Improvement Plan (TIP) to address the areas in need of improvement. The plan will be implemented within ten (10) school days after the notification to the teacher and the Association of the need for a TIP. In the case of the need for a TIP as the result of an *Ineffective* or *Developing* APPR rating, the plan will be implemented within 10 school days of the start of school the following year.
- The team will develop improvement activities appropriate to the designated areas. These may include participation in a professional development course or opportunity provided or paid for by the district.
- The team will determine the criteria for measurement of progress.
- The TIP team will meet in January and May to review information regarding the degree to which the plan has led to improvement in the designated areas of performance.
- The TIP team will hold all meetings and documents related to the TIP in strict confidence.
- All communication (written and verbal) among members of the TIP team should be characterized by respect and professionalism.

The plan for improvement derived from the consultation with the TIP team may include classroom visitations, training conferences coursework, selected readings, and supervisory conferences.

After the TIP is in place, the teacher, administrator, and Association representative shall meet, according to the schedule identified in the TIP, to assess the effectiveness and appropriateness of the TIP, for the purpose of assisting the teacher to achieve the goals set forth in the TIP. Based on the outcome of such assessment(s), the TIP shall be modified accordingly. A log of these meetings including date, time, and activities will be maintained by the teacher and supervisor.

Port Washington Union Free School District

Teacher Improvement Plan			
Teacher:		School(s):	
Department:		Grade(s):	
Status (Nontenured/Tenured)		Overall Rating: (Developing or Ineffective)	
(1) What does the teacher need to change?			
(2) What evidence will demonstrate that the teacher has changed?			
(3) What is the time frame in which the change should occur?			
(4) Are there intermediate benchmarks that will indicate progress? If so, when should these occur?			
(5) Recommendations and/or requirements provided to the teacher in order to facilitate change:			
(6) Resources, guidance, follow-up provided and planned for the teacher:			

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:

Kathleen A. Mooney, Ed.D. 1/4/13

Teachers Union President Signature: Date:

Christy Flavel 1/4/13

Administrative Union President Signature: Date:

G.S. Win 1/4/13

Board of Education President Signature: Date:

Karen Sloan 1/4/13