



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

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

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

September 19, 2013

Revised

Kimberly Moritz, Superintendent
Randolph Central School District
18 Main Street
Randolph, NY 14772

Dear Superintendent Moritz:

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

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

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

Thank you again for your hard work.

Sincerely,



John B. King, Jr.
Commissioner

Attachment

c: Lynda Quick

NOTE:

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

Annual Professional Performance Reviews

Created Tuesday, April 30, 2013

Updated Wednesday, August 21, 2013

1

Disclaimers

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

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

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

1. SCHOOL DISTRICT INFORMATION

1.1) School District's BEDS Number : 043001040000

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

043001040000

1.2) School District Name: RANDOLPH CSD

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

RANDOLPH CSD

1.3) Assurances

Please check all of the boxes below:

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

1.3) Assurances | Assure that it is understood that this district/BOCES' APPR plan will be posted in its entirety on the NYSED website following approval Checked

1.4) Submission Status

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

Submission of material changes to an approved APPR plan

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

Created Tuesday, April 30, 2013

Updated Wednesday, August 21, 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, the State-provided growth measure will be used for 20 points in this subcomponent. NYSED will provide a HEDI subcomponent rating category and score from 0 to 20 points.

2.1) Assurances

Please check the boxes below:

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

STUDENT LEARNING OBJECTIVES AS COMPARABLE GROWTH MEASURES (20 points)

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

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

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

If no State assessment or Regents exam exists:

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

District, regional or BOCES-developed assessments provided that it is rigorous and comparable across classrooms
For other grades/subjects: district-determined assessments from options below may be used as evidence of student learning within the SLO:

State assessments, *required if one exists*

List of State-approved 3rd party assessments

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

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

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

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

2.2) Grades K-3 ELA

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

	ELA	Assessment
K	State-approved 3rd party assessment	iReady Diagnostic Assessment
1	State-approved 3rd party assessment	iReady Diagnostic Assessment
2	State-approved 3rd party assessment	iReady Diagnostic Assessment

	ELA	Assessment
3	State assessment	3rd Grade State Assessment

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

Use this box, if needed, to describe the general process for assigning HEDI categories for these grades/subjects in this subcomponent. If needed, you may upload a table or graphic at 2.11, below.	Based on the baseline data of the pre-assessment, targeted growth goals will be set by building principals in collaboration with affected teachers for bands of students. Goals are approved by the Administrative Team, including the superintendent of schools. The student goals are individually set for each student. The teacher's HEDI score is converted by the principal according to the points as delineated below in collaboration with the curriculum coordinator based on the results of the summative assessment as scored by an independent teacher who is not affected by the results.
Highly Effective (18 - 20 points) Results are well-above state average for similar students (or District goals if no state test).	89% of students or more will meet or exceed their individual target goal on the summative assessment. 95-100% of students who meet their target will result in 20 points; 92-94%=19 points; 89-91%=18 points.

Effective (9 - 17 points) Results meet state average for similar students (or District goals if no state test).	80-88% of students will meet or exceed their individual target goal on the summative assessment. 88%=17 pts; 87%=16 pts; 86%=15 pts; 85%=14 pts; 84%=13 pts; 83%=12 pts; 82%=11 pts; 81%=10 pts; 80%=9 pts.
Developing (3 - 8 points) Results are below state average for similar students (or District goals if no state test).	68-79% of students will meet or exceed their individual target goal on the summative assessment. 78-79%=8 pts; 76-77%=7 pts; 74-75%=6 pts; 72-73%=5 pts; 70-71%=4 pts; 68-69%=3 pts.
Ineffective (0 - 2 points) Results are well-below state average for similar students (or District goals if no state test).	67% or fewer students will meet or exceed their individual target goal on the summative assessment. 60-67%=2 pts; 51-59%=1 pt; 50% and below = 0 pts.

2.3) Grades K-3 Math

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

	Math	Assessment
K	State-approved 3rd party assessment	iReady Diagnostic Assessment
1	State-approved 3rd party assessment	iReady Diagnostic Assessment
2	State-approved 3rd party assessment	iReady Diagnostic Assessment

	Math	Assessment
3	State assessment	3rd Grade State Assessment

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

Use this box, if needed, to describe the general process for assigning HEDI categories for these grades/subjects in this subcomponent. If needed, you may upload a table or graphic at 2.11, below.	Based on the baseline data of the pre-assessment, targeted growth goals will be set by building principals in collaboration with affected teachers for bands of students. Goals are approved by the Administrative Team, including the superintendent of schools. The student goals are individually set for each student. The teacher's HEDI score is converted by the principal according to the points as delineated below in collaboration with the curriculum coordinator based on the results of the summative assessment as scored by an independent teacher who is not affected by the results.
Highly Effective (18 - 20 points) Results are well-above state average for similar students (or District goals if no state test).	89% of students or more will meet or exceed their individual target goal on the summative assessment. 95-100% of students who meet their target will result in 20 points; 92-94%=19 points; 89-91%=18 points.
Effective (9 - 17 points) Results meet state average for similar students (or District goals if no state test).	80-88% of students will meet or exceed their individual target goal on the summative assessment. 88%=17 pts; 87%=16 pts; 86%=15 pts; 85%=14 pts; 84%=13 pts; 83%=12 pts; 82%=11 pts; 81%=10 pts; 80%=9 pts.

Developing (3 - 8 points) Results are below state average for similar students (or District goals if no state test).	68-79% of students will meet or exceed their individual target goal on the summative assessment 78-79%=8 pts; 76-77%=7 pts; 74-75%=6 pts; 72-73%=5 pts; 70-71%=4 pts; 68-69%=3 pts.
Ineffective (0 - 2 points) Results are well-below state average for similar students (or District goals if no state test).	67% or fewer students will meet or exceed their individual target goal on the summative assessment. 60-67%=2 pts; 51-59%=1 pt; 50% and below = 0 pts.

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	Randolph Developed Grade 6 Science Course Specific Assessment
7	District, regional or BOCES-developed assessment	Randolph Developed Grade 7 Science Course Specific Assessment
	Science	Assessment
8	State assessment	8th Grade State Science Assessment

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

Use this box, if needed, to describe the general process for assigning HEDI categories for these grades/subjects in this subcomponent. If needed, you may upload a table or graphic at 2.11, below.	Based on the baseline data of the pre-assessment, targeted growth goals will be set by building principals in collaboration with affected teachers for bands of students. Goals are approved by the Administrative Team, including the superintendent of schools. The student goals are individually set for each student. The teacher's HEDI score is converted by the principal according to the points as delineated below in collaboration with the curriculum coordinator based on the results of the summative assessment as scored by an independent teacher who is not affected by the results.
Highly Effective (18 - 20 points) Results are well-above state average for similar students (or District goals if no state test).	89% of students or more will meet or exceed their individual target goal on the summative assessment. 95-100% of students who meet their target will result in 20 points; 92-94%=19 points; 89-91%=18 points.
Effective (9 - 17 points) Results meet state average for similar students (or District goals if no state test).	80-88% of students will meet or exceed their individual target goal on the summative assessment. 88%=17 pts; 87%=16 pts; 86%=15 pts; 85%=14 pts; 84%=13 pts; 83%=12 pts; 82%=11 pts; 81%=10 pts; 80%=9 pts.
Developing (3 - 8 points) Results are below state average for similar students (or District goals if no state test).	68-79% of students will meet or exceed their individual target goal on the summative assessment. 78-79%=8 pts; 76-77%=7 pts; 74-75%=6 pts; 72-73%=5 pts; 70-71%=4 pts; 68-69%=3 pts.

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

67% or fewer students will meet or exceed their individual target goal on the summative assessment.
60-67%=2 pts; 51-59%=1 pt; 50% and below = 0 pts.

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	Randolph Developed Grade 6 SS Course Specific Assessment
7	District, regional or BOCES-developed assessment	Randolph Developed Grade 7 SS Course Specific Assessment
8	District, regional or BOCES-developed assessment	Randolph Developed Grade 8 SS Course Specific Assessment

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

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

Based on the baseline data of the pre-assessment, targeted growth goals will be set by building principals in collaboration with affected teachers for bands of students. Goals are approved by the Administrative Team, including the superintendent of schools. The student goals are individually set for each student.

The teacher's HEDI score is converted by the principal according to the points as delineated below in collaboration with the curriculum coordinator based on the results of the summative assessment as scored by an independent teacher who is not affected by the results.

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

89% of students or more will meet or exceed their individual target goal on the summative assessment.
95-100% of students who meet their target will result in 20 points; 92-94%=19 points; 89-91%=18 points.

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

80-88% of students will meet or exceed their individual target goal on the summative assessment.
88%=17 pts; 87%=16 pts; 86%=15 pts; 85%=14 pts; 84%=13 pts; 83%=12 pts; 82%=11 pts; 81%=10 pts; 80%=9 pts.

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

68-79% of students will meet or exceed their individual target goal on the summative assessment.
78-79%=8 pts; 76-77%=7 pts; 74-75%=6 pts; 72-73%=5 pts; 70-71%=4 pts; 68-69%=3 pts.

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

67% or fewer students will meet or exceed their individual target goal on the summative assessment.
60-67%=2 pts; 51-59%=1 pt; 50% and below = 0 pts.

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	Randolph Developed Global 1 Course Specific Assessment

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

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

Use this box, if needed, to describe the general process for assigning HEDI categories for these grades/subjects in this subcomponent. If needed, you may upload a table or graphic at 2.11, below.	Based on the baseline data of the pre-assessment, targeted growth goals will be set by building principals in collaboration with affected teachers for bands of students. Goals are approved by the Administrative Team, including the superintendent of schools. The student goals are individually set for each student. The teacher's HEDI score is converted by the principal according to the points as delineated below in collaboration with the curriculum coordinator based on the results of the summative assessment as scored by an independent teacher who is not affected by the results.
Highly Effective (18 - 20 points) Results are well-above District goals for similar students.	89% of students or more will meet or exceed their individual target goal on the summative assessment. 95-100% of students who meet their target will result in 20 points; 92-94%=19 points; 89-91%=18 points.
Effective (9 - 17 points) Results meet District goals for similar students.	80-88% of students will meet or exceed their individual target goal on the summative assessment. 88%=17 pts; 87%=16 pts; 86%=15 pts; 85%=14 pts; 84%=13 pts; 83%=12 pts; 82%=11 pts; 81%=10 pts; 80%=9 pts.
Developing (3 - 8 points) Results are below District goals for similar students.	68-79% of students will meet or exceed their individual target goal on the summative assessment. 78-79%=8 pts; 76-77%=7 pts; 74-75%=6 pts; 72-73%=5 pts; 70-71%=4 pts; 68-69%=3 pts.
Ineffective (0 - 2 points) Results are well-below District goals for similar students.	67% or fewer students will meet or exceed their individual target goal on the summative assessment. 60-67%=2 pts; 51-59%=1 pt; 50% and below = 0 pts.

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 measuring student growth on the assessments listed for this Task.

Use this box, if needed, to describe the general process for assigning HEDI categories for these grades/subjects in this subcomponent. If needed, you may upload a table or graphic at 2.11, below.	Based on the baseline data of the pre-assessment, targeted growth goals will be set by building principals in collaboration with affected teachers for bands of students. Goals are approved by the Administrative Team, including the superintendent of schools. The student goals are individually set for each student. The teacher's HEDI score is converted by the principal according to the points as delineated below in collaboration with the curriculum coordinator based on the results of the summative assessment as scored by an independent teacher who is not affected by the results.
Highly Effective (18 - 20 points) Results are well-above District goals for similar students.	89% of students or more will meet or exceed their individual target goal on the summative assessment. 95-100% of students who meet their target will result in 20 points; 92-94%=19 points; 89-91%=18 points.
Effective (9 - 17 points) Results meet District goals for similar students.	80-88% of students will meet or exceed their individual target goal on the summative assessment. 88%=17 pts; 87%=16 pts; 86%=15 pts; 85%=14 pts; 84%=13 pts; 83%=12 pts; 82%=11 pts; 81%=10 pts; 80%=9 pts.
Developing (3 - 8 points) Results are below District goals for similar students.	68-79% of students will meet or exceed their individual target goal on the summative assessment. 78-79%=8 pts; 76-77%=7 pts; 74-75%=6 pts; 72-73%=5 pts; 70-71%=4 pts; 68-69%=3 pts.
Ineffective (0 - 2 points) Results are well-below District goals for similar students.	67% or fewer students will meet or exceed their individual target goal on the summative assessment. 60-67%=2 pts; 51-59%=1 pt; 50% and below = 0 pts.

2.8) High School Math Regents Courses

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

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

	Math Regents Courses	Assessment
Algebra 1	Regents assessment	Regents assessment

Geometry	Regents assessment	Regents assessment
Algebra 2	Regents assessment	Regents assessment

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

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

Use this box, if needed, to describe the general process for assigning HEDI categories for these grades/subjects in this subcomponent. If needed, you may upload a table or graphic at 2.11, below.	<p>Based on the baseline data of the pre-assessment, targeted growth goals will be set by building principals in collaboration with affected teachers for bands of students. Goals are approved by the Administrative Team, including the superintendent of schools. The student goals are individually set for each student.</p> <p>The teacher's HEDI score is converted by the principal according to the points as delineated below in collaboration with the curriculum coordinator based on the results of the summative assessment as scored by an independent teacher who is not affected by the results.</p> <p>The District will be administering both the NYS Integrated Algebra and NYS Common Core Algebra Regents exams. We will use the higher of the two scores.</p>
Highly Effective (18 - 20 points) Results are well-above District goals for similar students.	89% of students or more will meet or exceed their individual target goal on the summative assessment. 95-100% of students who meet their target will result in 20 points; 92-94%=19 points; 89-91%=18 points.
Effective (9 - 17 points) Results meet District goals for similar students.	80-88% of students will meet or exceed their individual target goal on the summative assessment. 88%=17 pts; 87%=16 pts; 86%=15 pts; 85%=14 pts; 84%=13 pts; 83%=12 pts; 82%=11 pts; 81%=10 pts; 80%=9 pts.
Developing (3 - 8 points) Results are below District goals for similar students.	68-79% of students will meet or exceed their individual target goal on the summative assessment. 78-79%=8 pts; 76-77%=7 pts; 74-75%=6 pts; 72-73%=5 pts; 70-71%=4 pts; 68-69%=3 pts.
Ineffective (0 - 2 points) Results are well-below District goals for similar students.	67% or fewer students will meet or exceed their individual target goal on the summative assessment. 60-67%=2 pts; 51-59%=1 pt; 50% and below = 0 pts.

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	Randolph Developed Grade 9 ELA Course Specific Assessment
Grade 10 ELA	District, regional or BOCES-developed assessment	Randolph Developed Grade 10 ELA Course Specific Assessment
Grade 11 ELA	Regents assessment	NYS Comprehensive English Regents Assessment

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

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

Use this box, if needed, to describe the general process for assigning HEDI categories for these grades/subjects in this subcomponent. If needed, you may upload a table or graphic at 2.11, below.	Based on the baseline data of the pre-assessment, targeted growth goals will be set by building principals in collaboration with affected teachers for bands of students. Goals are approved by the Administrative Team, including the superintendent of schools. The student goals are individually set for each student. The teacher's HEDI score is converted by the principal according to the points as delineated below in collaboration with the curriculum coordinator based on the results of the summative assessment as scored by an independent teacher who is not affected by the results.
Highly Effective (18 - 20 points) Results are well-above District goals for similar students.	89% of students or more will meet or exceed their individual target goal on the summative assessment. 95-100% of students who meet their target will result in 20 points; 92-94%=19 points; 89-91%=18 points.
Effective (9 - 17 points) Results meet District goals for similar students.	80-88% of students will meet or exceed their individual target goal on the summative assessment. 88%=17 pts; 87%=16 pts; 86%=15 pts; 85%=14 pts; 84%=13 pts; 83%=12 pts; 82%=11 pts; 81%=10 pts; 80%=9 pts.
Developing (3 - 8 points) Results are below District goals for similar students.	68-79% of students will meet or exceed their individual target goal on the summative assessment. 78-79%=8 pts; 76-77%=7 pts; 74-75%=6 pts; 72-73%=5 pts; 70-71%=4 pts; 68-69%=3 pts.
Ineffective (0 - 2 points) Results are well-below District goals for similar students.	67% or fewer students will meet or exceed their individual target goal on the summative assessment. 60-67%=2 pts; 51-59%=1 pt; 50% and below = 0 pts.

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 teachers not named above	District, Regional or BOCES-developed	RCS Developed Course Specific Assessment

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

<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>Based on the baseline data of the pre-assessment, targeted growth goals will be set by building principals in collaboration with affected teachers for bands of students. Goals are approved by the Administrative Team, including the superintendent of schools. The student goals are individually set for each student.</p> <p>The teacher's HEDI score is converted by the principal according to the points as delineated below in collaboration with the curriculum coordinator based on the results of the summative assessment as scored by an independent teacher who is not affected by the results.</p> <p>All ESL and SPED students take the same assessments as everyone else.</p>
<p>Highly Effective (18 - 20 points) Results are well-above District goals for similar students.</p>	<p>89% of students or more will meet or exceed their individual target goal on the summative assessment. 95-100% of students who meet their target will result in 20 points; 92-94%=19 points; 89-91%=18 points.</p>
<p>Effective (9 - 17 points) Results meet District goals for similar students.</p>	<p>80-88% of students will meet or exceed their individual target goal on the summative assessment. 88%=17 pts; 87%=16 pts; 86%=15 pts; 85%=14 pts; 84%=13 pts; 83%=12 pts; 82%=11 pts; 81%=10 pts; 80%=9 pts.</p>
<p>Developing (3 - 8 points) Results are below District goals for similar students.</p>	<p>68-79% of students will meet or exceed their individual target goal on the summative assessment. 78-79%=8 pts; 76-77%=7 pts; 74-75%=6 pts; 72-73%=5 pts; 70-71%=4 pts; 68-69%=3 pts.</p>
<p>Ineffective (0 - 2 points) Results are well-below District goals for similar students.</p>	<p>67% or fewer students will meet or exceed their individual target goal on the summative assessment. 60-67%=2 pts; 51-59%=1 pt; 50% and below = 0 pts.</p>

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.

(No response)

2.12) Locally Developed Controls

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

Note: The only allowable controls or adjustments for Comparable Growth Measures are the following: student prior academic history, students with disabilities, English language learners, and students in poverty.

NONE

2.13) Teachers with more than one growth measure

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

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

2.14) Assurances

Please check all of the boxes below:

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

3. Local Measures (Teachers)

Created Tuesday, April 30, 2013

Updated Wednesday, August 21, 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. Additionally, please provide a brief explanation in the HEDI general description box of why you have listed the grade/course as "Not Applicable" (e.g., district/BOCES does not offer this grade/subject; common branch teacher).

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

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

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

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

Growth or achievement measure(s) from these options.

One or more of the following types of local measures of student growth or achievement may be used for the evaluation of teachers. The options in the drop-down menus below are abbreviated from the following list:

Measures based on:

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

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

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

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

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

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

3.1) Grades 4-8 ELA

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

	Locally-Selected Measure from List of Approved Measures	Assessment
4	4) State-approved 3rd party assessments	iReady Diagnostic Assessment
5	4) State-approved 3rd party assessments	iReady Diagnostic Assessment
6	4) State-approved 3rd party assessments	iReady Diagnostic Assessment
7	4) State-approved 3rd party assessments	iReady Diagnostic Assessment
8	4) State-approved 3rd party assessments	iReady Diagnostic Assessment

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

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

<p>Use this box, if needed, to describe the general process for assigning HEDI categories for these grades/subjects in this subcomponent. If needed, you may upload a table or graphic at 3.3, below.</p>	<p>The target goals set throughout the local measures will be based on this year's achievement results on each assessment. The achievement targets will be based on consideration of prior academic history on these assessments. The achievement target, based on the overall percentage of students who meet the achievement target, is developed by teams of teachers and then sent to the Administrative Team for approval. The % corresponds to a HEDI score as detailed below and converted by the building principal.</p> <p>When iReady diagnostic is used as the assessment, the individual students have targets set (as described above) for on grade level or above.</p> <p>With no value added model, we will use the same scale as delineated in 3.4.</p>
<p>Highly Effective (14 - 15 points) Results are well above District- or BOCES-adopted expectations for growth or achievement for grade/subject.</p>	<p>89% of students or more will meet or exceed their target goal on the summative assessment. 93-100% of students who meet their target will result in 15 points; 89-92%=14 points.</p>
<p>Effective (8- 13 points) Results meet District- or BOCES-adopted expectations for growth or achievement for grade/subject.</p>	<p>80-88% of students will meet or exceed their target goal on the summative assessment. 87-88%=13 pts; 85-86%=12 pts; 83-84%=11 pts; 82%=10 pts; 81%=9 pts; 80%=8 pts.</p>
<p>Developing (3 - 7 points) Results are below District- or BOCES-adopted expectations for growth or achievement for grade/subject.</p>	<p>68-79% of students will meet or exceed their target goal on the summative assessment. 77-79%=7 pts; 74-76%=6 pts; 72-73%=5 pts; 70-71%=4 pts; 68-69%=3 pts.</p>
<p>Ineffective (0 - 2 points) Results are well below District- or BOCES-adopted expectations for growth or achievement for grade/subject.</p>	<p>67% or fewer students will meet or exceed their target goal on the summative assessment. 60-67%=2 pts; 51-59%=1 pt; 50% and below = 0 pts.</p>

3.2) Grades 4-8 Math

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

	Locally-Selected Measure from List of Approved Measures	Assessment
4	4) State-approved 3rd party assessments	iReady Diagnostic Assessment
5	4) State-approved 3rd party assessments	iReady Diagnostic Assessment
6	4) State-approved 3rd party assessments	iReady Diagnostic Assessment
7	4) State-approved 3rd party assessments	iReady Diagnostic Assessment
8	4) State-approved 3rd party assessments	iReady Diagnostic Assessment

For Grades 4-8 Math: describe the district-adopted expectations for the level of growth or achievement needed for a teacher to earn each of the four HEDI rating categories and the process for assigning points within rating categories that ensures it is possible for a

teacher to earn any of the points in a scoring range, consistent with regulations and assurances.

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

<p>Use this box, if needed, to describe the general process for assigning HEDI categories for these grades/subjects in this subcomponent. If needed, you may upload a table or graphic at 3.3, below.</p>	<p>The target goals set throughout the local measures will be based on this year's achievement results on each assessment. The achievement targets will be based on consideration of prior academic history on these assessments. The achievement target, based on the overall percentage of students who meet the achievement target, is developed by teams of teachers and then sent to the Administrative Team for approval. The % corresponds to a HEDI score as detailed below and converted by the building principal. When iReady diagnostic is used as the assessment, the individual students have targets set (as described above) for on grade level or above. With no value added model, we will use the same scale as delineated in 3.4.</p>
<p>Highly Effective (14 - 15 points) Results are well above District- or BOCES-adopted expectations for growth or achievement for grade/subject.</p>	<p>89% of students or more will meet or exceed their target goal on the summative assessment. 93-100% of students who meet their target will result in 15 points; 89-92%=14 points.</p>
<p>Effective (8- 13 points) Results meet District- or BOCES-adopted expectations for growth or achievement for grade/subject.</p>	<p>80-88% of students will meet or exceed their target goal on the summative assessment. 87-88%=13 pts; 85-86%=12 pts; 83-84%=11 pts; 82%=10 pts; 81%=9 pts; 80%=8 pts.</p>
<p>Developing (3 - 7 points) Results are below District- or BOCES-adopted expectations for growth or achievement for grade/subject.</p>	<p>68-79% of students will meet or exceed their target goal on the summative assessment. 77-79%=7 pts; 74-76%=6 pts; 72-73%=5 pts; 70-71%=4 pts; 68-69%=3 pts.</p>
<p>Ineffective (0 - 2 points) Results are well below District- or BOCES-adopted expectations for growth or achievement for grade/subject.</p>	<p>67% or fewer students will meet or exceed their target goal on the summative assessment. 60-67%=2 pts; 51-59%=1 pt; 50% and below = 0 pts.</p>

3.3) HEDI Tables or Graphics

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

(No response)

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

Growth or achievement measure(s) from these options.

One or more of the following types of local measures of student growth or achievement may be used for the evaluation of teachers. The options in the drop-down menus below are abbreviated from the following list:

Measures based on:

- 1) The change in percentage of a teacher's students who achieve a specific level of performance as determined locally, on such

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

3.4) Grades K-3 ELA

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

	Locally-Selected Measure from List of Approved Measures	Assessment
K	4) State-approved 3rd party assessments	iReady Diagnostic Assessment
1	4) State-approved 3rd party assessments	iReady Diagnostic Assessment
2	4) State-approved 3rd party assessments	iReady Diagnostic Assessment
3	4) State-approved 3rd party assessments	iReady Diagnostic Assessment

For Grades K-3 ELA: describe the district-adopted expectations for the level of growth or achievement needed for a teacher to earn each of the four HEDI rating categories and the process for assigning points within rating categories that ensures it is possible for a

teacher to earn any of the points in a scoring range, consistent with regulations and assurances.

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

<p>Use this box, if needed, to describe the general process for assigning HEDI categories for these grades/subjects in this subcomponent. If needed, you may upload a table or graphic at 3.13, below.</p>	<p>The target goals set throughout the local measures will be based on this year's achievement results on each assessment. The achievement targets will be based on consideration of prior academic history on these assessments. The achievement target, based on the overall percentage of students who meet the achievement target, is developed by teams of teachers and then sent to the Administrative Team for approval. The % corresponds to a HEDI score as detailed below and converted by the building principal.</p> <p>When iReady diagnostic is used as the assessment, the individual students have targets set (as described above) for on grade level or above.</p>
<p>Highly Effective (18-20 points) Results are well above District- or BOCES-adopted expectations for growth or achievement for grade/subject.</p>	<p>89% of students or more will meet or exceed their target goal on the summative assessment. 95-100% of students who meet their target will result in 20 points; 92-94%=19 points; 89-91%=18 points.</p>
<p>Effective (9-17 points) Results meet District- or BOCES-adopted expectations for growth or achievement for grade/subject.</p>	<p>80-88% of students will meet or exceed their target goal on the summative assessment. 88%=17 pts; 87%=16 pts; 86%=15 pts; 85%=14 pts; 84%=13 pts; 83%=12 pts; 82%=11 pts; 81%=10 pts; 80%=9 pts.</p>
<p>Developing (3 - 8 points) Results are below District- or BOCES-adopted expectations for growth or achievement for grade/subject.</p>	<p>68-79% of students will meet or exceed their target goal on the summative assessment. 78-79%=8 pts; 76-77%=7 pts; 74-75%=6 pts; 72-73%=5 pts; 70-71%=4 pts; 68-69%=3 pts.</p>
<p>Ineffective (0 - 2 points) Results are well below District- or BOCES-adopted expectations for growth or achievement for grade/subject.</p>	<p>67% or fewer students will meet or exceed their target goal on the summative assessment. 60-67%=2 pts; 51-59%=1 pt; 50% and below = 0 pts.</p>

3.5) Grades K-3 Math

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

	Locally-Selected Measure from List of Approved Measures	Assessment
K	4) State-approved 3rd party assessments	iReady Diagnostic Assessment
1	4) State-approved 3rd party assessments	iReady Diagnostic Assessment
2	4) State-approved 3rd party assessments	iReady Diagnostic Assessment
3	4) State-approved 3rd party assessments	iReady Diagnostic Assessment

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

Note: when completing the HEDI boxes below, it is not acceptable to just repeat the text descriptions from the regulations and/or

assurances listed to the left of each box.

<p>Use this box, if needed, to describe the general process for assigning HEDI categories for these grades/subjects in this subcomponent. If needed, you may upload a table or graphic at 3.13, below.</p>	<p>The target goals set throughout the local measures will be based on this year's achievement results on each assessment. The achievement targets will be based on consideration of prior academic history on these assessments. The achievement target, based on the overall percentage of students who meet the achievement target, is developed by teams of teachers and then sent to the Administrative Team for approval. The % corresponds to a HEDI score as detailed below and converted by the building principal.</p>
<p>Highly Effective (18-20 points) Results are well above District- or BOCES-adopted expectations for growth or achievement for grade/subject.</p>	<p>When iReady diagnostic is used as the assessment, the individual students have targets set (as described above) for on grade level or above.</p>
<p>Effective (9-17 points) Results meet District- or BOCES-adopted expectations for growth or achievement for grade/subject.</p>	<p>89% of students or more will meet or exceed their target goal on the summative assessment. 95-100% of students who meet their target will result in 20 points; 92-94%=19 points; 89-91%=18 points.</p>
<p>Developing (3 - 8 points) Results are below District -or BOCES-adopted expectations for growth or achievement for grade/subject.</p>	<p>80-88% of students will meet or exceed their target goal on the summative assessment. 88%=17 pts; 87%=16 pts; 86%=15 pts; 85%=14 pts; 84%=13 pts; 83%=12 pts; 82%=11 pts; 81%=10 pts; 80%=9 pts.</p>
<p>Ineffective (0 - 2 points) Results are well below District- or BOCES-adopted expectations for growth or achievement for grade/subject.</p>	<p>68-79% of students will meet or exceed their target goal on the summative assessment. 78-79%=8 pts; 76-77%=7 pts; 74-75%=6 pts; 72-73%=5 pts; 70-71%=4 pts; 68-69%=3 pts.</p>
<p>Ineffective (0 - 2 points) Results are well below District- or BOCES-adopted expectations for growth or achievement for grade/subject.</p>	<p>67% or fewer students will meet or exceed their target goal on the summative assessment. 60-67%=2 pts; 51-59%=1 pt; 50% and below = 0 pts.</p>

3.6) Grades 6-8 Science

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

	Locally-Selected Measure from List of Approved Measures	Assessment
6	5) District, regional, or BOCES–developed assessments	Randolph District Developed Grade 6 Science Assessment
7	5) District, regional, or BOCES–developed assessments	Randolph District Developed Grade 7 Science Assessment
8	5) District, regional, or BOCES–developed assessments	Randolph District Developed Grade 8 Science Assessment

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

<p>Use this box, if needed, to describe the general process for assigning HEDI categories for these grades/subjects in this subcomponent. If needed, you may upload a table or graphic at 3.13, below.</p>	<p>The target goals set throughout the local measures will be based on this year's achievement results on each assessment. The achievement targets will be based on consideration of prior academic history on these assessments. The achievement target, based on the overall percentage of students who meet the</p>
--	--

	achievement target, is developed by teams of teachers and then sent to the Administrative Team for approval. The % corresponds to a HEDI score as detailed below and converted by the building principal.
Highly Effective (18 - 20 points) Results are well above District- or BOCES-adopted expectations for growth or achievement for grade/subject.	89% of students or more will meet or exceed their target goal on the summative assessment. 95-100% of students who meet their target will result in 20 points; 92-94%=19 points; 89-91%=18 points.
Effective (9 - 17 points) Results meet District- or BOCES-adopted expectations for growth or achievement for grade/subject.	80-88% of students will meet or exceed their target goal on the summative assessment. 88%=17 pts; 87%=16 pts; 86%=15 pts; 85%=14 pts; 84%=13 pts; 83%=12 pts; 82%=11 pts; 81%=10 pts; 80%=9 pts.
Developing (3 - 8 points) Results are below District- or BOCES-adopted expectations for growth or achievement for grade/subject.	68-79% of students will meet or exceed their target goal on the summative assessment. 78-79%=8 pts; 76-77%=7 pts; 74-75%=6 pts; 72-73%=5 pts; 70-71%=4 pts; 68-69%=3 pts.
Ineffective (0 - 2 points) Results are well below District- or BOCES-adopted expectations for growth or achievement for grade/subject.	67% or fewer students will meet or exceed their target goal on the summative assessment. 60-67%=2 pts; 51-59%=1 pt; 50% and below = 0 pts.

3.7) Grades 6-8 Social Studies

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

	Locally-Selected Measure from List of Approved Measures	Assessment
6	5) District, regional, or BOCES–developed assessments	RCS District Developed Grade 6 SS Assessment
7	5) District, regional, or BOCES–developed assessments	RCS District Developed Grade 7 SS Assessment
8	5) District, regional, or BOCES–developed assessments	RCS District Developed Grade 8 SS Assessment

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

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

Use this box, if needed, to describe the general process for assigning HEDI categories for these grades/subjects in this subcomponent. If needed, you may upload a table or graphic at 3.13, below.	The target goals set throughout the local measures will be based on this year's achievement results on each assessment. The achievement targets will be based on consideration of prior academic history on these assessments. The achievement target, based on the overall percentage of students who meet the achievement target, is developed by teams of teachers and then sent to the Administrative Team for approval. The % corresponds to a HEDI score as detailed below and converted by the building principal.
Highly Effective (18 - 20 points) Results are well above District- or BOCES-adopted expectations for growth or achievement for grade/subject.	89% of students or more will meet or exceed their target goal on the summative assessment. 95-100% of students who meet their target will result in 20 points; 92-94%=19 points; 89-91%=18 points.

Effective (9 - 17 points) Results meet District- or BOCES-adopted expectations for growth or achievement for grade/subject.	80-88% of students will meet or exceed their target goal on the summative assessment. 88%=17 pts; 87%=16 pts; 86%=15 pts; 85%=14 pts; 84%=13 pts; 83%=12 pts; 82%=11 pts; 81%=10 pts; 80%=9 pts.
Developing (3 - 8 points) Results are below District- or BOCES-adopted expectations for growth or achievement for grade/subject.	68-79% of students will meet or exceed their target goal on the summative assessment. 78-79%=8 pts; 76-77%=7 pts; 74-75%=6 pts; 72-73%=5 pts; 70-71%=4 pts; 68-69%=3 pts.
Ineffective (0 - 2 points) Results are well below District- or BOCES-adopted expectations for growth or achievement for grade/subject.	67% or fewer students will meet or exceed their target goal on the summative assessment. 60-67%=2 pts; 51-59%=1 pt; 50% and below = 0 pts.

3.8) High School Social Studies

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

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

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

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

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

Use this box, if needed, to describe the general process for assigning HEDI categories for these grades/subjects in this subcomponent. If needed, you may upload a table or graphic at 3.13, below.	The target goals set throughout the local measures will be based on this year's achievement results on each assessment. The achievement targets will be based on consideration of prior academic history on these assessments. The achievement target, based on the overall percentage of students who meet the achievement target, is developed by teams of teachers and then sent to the Administrative Team for approval. The % corresponds to a HEDI score as detailed below and converted by the building principal.
Highly Effective (18 - 20 points) Results are well above District- or BOCES-adopted expectations for growth or achievement for grade/subject.	89% of students or more will meet or exceed their target goal on the summative assessment. 95-100% of students who meet their target will result in 20 points; 92-94%=19 points; 89-91%=18 points.
Effective (9 - 17 points) Results meet District- or BOCES-adopted expectations for growth or achievement for	80-88% of students will meet or exceed their target goal on the summative assessment. 88%=17 pts; 87%=16 pts; 86%=15 pts;

grade/subject.	85%=14 pts; 84%=13 pts; 83%=12 pts; 82%=11 pts; 81%=10 pts; 80%=9 pts.
Developing (3 - 8 points) Results are below District- or BOCES-adopted expectations for growth or achievement for grade/subject.	68-79% of students will meet or exceed their target goal on the summative assessment. 78-79%=8 pts; 76-77%=7 pts; 74-75%=6 pts; 72-73%=5 pts; 70-71%=4 pts; 68-69%=3 pts.
Ineffective (0 - 2 points) Results are well below District- or BOCES-adopted expectations for growth or achievement for grade/subject.	67% or fewer students will meet or exceed their target goal on the summative assessment. 60-67%=2 pts; 51-59%=1 pt; 50% and below = 0 pts.

3.9) High School Science

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

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

	Locally-Selected Measure from List of Approved Measures	Assessment
Living Environment	3) Teacher specific achievement or growth score computed locally	NYS Living Environment Regents Assessment
Earth Science	3) Teacher specific achievement or growth score computed locally	NYS Earth Science Regents Assessment
Chemistry	3) Teacher specific achievement or growth score computed locally	NYS Chemistry Regents Assessment
Physics	3) Teacher specific achievement or growth score computed locally	NYS Physics Regents Assessment

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

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

Use this box, if needed, to describe the general process for assigning HEDI categories for these grades/subjects in this subcomponent. If needed, you may upload a table or graphic at 3.13, below.	The target goals set throughout the local measures will be based on this year's achievement results on each assessment. The achievement targets will be based on consideration of prior academic history on these assessments. The achievement target, based on the overall percentage of students who meet the achievement target, is developed by teams of teachers and then sent to the Administrative Team for approval. The % corresponds to a HEDI score as detailed below and converted by the building principal.
Highly Effective (18-20 points) Results are well above District- or BOCES-adopted expectations for growth or achievement for grade/subject.	89% of students or more will meet or exceed their target goal on the summative assessment. 95-100% of students who meet their target will result in 20 points; 92-94%=19 points; 89-91%=18 points.
Developing (3 - 8 points) Results are below District- or BOCES-adopted expectations for growth or achievement for	80-88% of students will meet or exceed their target goal on the summative assessment. 88%=17 pts; 87%=16 pts; 86%=15 pts;

grade/subject.	85%=14 pts; 84%=13 pts; 83%=12 pts; 82%=11 pts; 81%=10 pts; 80%=9 pts.
Effective (9 - 17points) Results meet District- or BOCES-adopted expectations for growth or achievement for grade/subject.	68-79% of students will meet or exceed their target goal on the summative assessment. 78-79%=8 pts; 76-77%=7 pts; 74-75%=6 pts; 72-73%=5 pts; 70-71%=4 pts; 68-69%=3 pts.
Ineffective (0 - 2 points) Results are well below District- or BOCES-adopted expectations for growth or achievement for grade/subject.	67% or fewer students will meet or exceed their target goal on the summative assessment. 60-67%=2 pts; 51-59%=1 pt; 50% and below = 0 pts.

3.10) High School Math

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

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

	Locally-Selected Measure from List of Approved Measures	Assessment
Algebra 1	3) Teacher specific achievement or growth score computed locally	NYS Common Core Algebra Regents Assessment
Geometry	3) Teacher specific achievement or growth score computed locally	NYS Geometry Regents Assessment
Algebra 2	3) Teacher specific achievement or growth score computed locally	NYS Algebra 2 Regents Assessment

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

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

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

Use this box, if needed, to describe the general process for assigning HEDI categories for these grades/subjects in this subcomponent. If needed, you may upload a table or graphic at 3.13, below.	The target goals set throughout the local measures will be based on this year's achievement results on each assessment. The achievement targets will be based on consideration of prior academic history on these assessments. The achievement target, based on the overall percentage of students who meet the achievement target, is developed by teams of teachers and then sent to the Administrative Team for approval. The % corresponds to a HEDI score as detailed below and converted by the building principal.
Highly Effective (18 - 20 points) Results are well above District- or BOCES-adopted expectations for growth or achievement for grade/subject.	89% of students or more will meet or exceed their target goal on the summative assessment. 95-100% of students who meet their target will result in 20 points; 92-94%=19 points; 89-91%=18 points.

Effective (9 - 17 points) Results meet District- or BOCES-adopted expectations for growth or achievement for grade/subject.	80-88% of students will meet or exceed their target goal on the summative assessment. 88%=17 pts; 87%=16 pts; 86%=15 pts; 85%=14 pts; 84%=13 pts; 83%=12 pts; 82%=11 pts; 81%=10 pts; 80%=9 pts.
Developing (3 - 8 points) Results are below District- or BOCES-adopted expectations for growth or achievement for grade/subject.	68-79% of students will meet or exceed their target goal on the summative assessment. 78-79%=8 pts; 76-77%=7 pts; 74-75%=6 pts; 72-73%=5 pts; 70-71%=4 pts; 68-69%=3 pts.
Ineffective (0 - 2 points) Results are well below District- or BOCES-adopted expectations for growth or achievement for grade/subject.	67% or fewer students will meet or exceed their target goal on the summative assessment. 60-67%=2 pts; 51-59%=1 pt; 50% and below = 0 pts.

3.11) High School English Language Arts

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

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

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

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

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

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

Use this box, if needed, to describe the general process for assigning HEDI categories for these grades/subjects in this subcomponent. If needed, you may upload a table or graphic at 3.13, below.	The target goals set throughout the local measures will be based on this year's achievement results on each assessment. The achievement targets will be based on consideration of prior academic history on these assessments. The achievement target, based on the overall percentage of students who meet the achievement target, is developed by teams of teachers and then sent to the Administrative Team for approval. The % corresponds to a HEDI score as detailed below and converted by the building principal.
Highly Effective (18 - 20 points) Results are well above District- or BOCES-adopted expectations for growth or	89% of students or more will meet or exceed their target goal on the summative assessment. 95-100% of students who meet their

Effective (9 - 17 points) Results meet District- or BOCES-adopted expectations for growth or achievement for grade/subject.	80-88% of students will meet or exceed their target goal on the summative assessment. 88%=17 pts; 87%=16 pts; 86%=15 pts; 85%=14 pts; 84%=13 pts; 83%=12 pts; 82%=11 pts; 81%=10 pts; 80%=9 pts.
Developing (3 - 8 points) Results are below District- or BOCES-adopted expectations for growth or achievement for grade/subject.	68-79% of students will meet or exceed their target goal on the summative assessment. 78-79%=8 pts; 76-77%=7 pts; 74-75%=6 pts; 72-73%=5 pts; 70-71%=4 pts; 68-69%=3 pts.
Ineffective (0 - 2 points) Results are well below District- or BOCES-adopted expectations for growth or achievement for grade/subject.	67% or fewer students will meet or exceed their target goal on the summative assessment. 60-67%=2 pts; 51-59%=1 pt; 50% and below = 0 pts.

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.

(No response)

3.14) Locally Developed Controls

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

The following methodology will be used to adjust teacher scores based on student attendance as reported by period in PowerSchool. The steps are:

1. Multiply each students' assessment score by the number of days they were in attendance
2. Sum step 1 scores for an all student number
3. Sum all days attended by student group
4. Divide step 2 by step 3
5. If the difference between the quotient from step #4 and the average test score is greater than 5, the HEDI score will be increased 2 points. If the difference between the quotient from step #4 and the average test score is between 1-4, the HEDI score will be increased by 1 point. If the difference between the quotient from step #4 and the average test score is less than 1 point, the HEDI score will remain the same.

For example: Student Name Score Days Attended Product

Geoff 95 160 15,200
 Jamie 90 160 14,400
 Kimberly 88 170 14,960
 Laurie 86 150 12,900
 Jerry 85 165 14,025
 Steve 70 150 10,500
 Lauren 60 140 8,400
 Barbie 60 130 7,800
 John 50 125 6,250
 Ken 50 135 6,750
 Avg Test Score 73.4
 Totals 1485 111,185
 111,185/1485=74.87%

Because the difference between the average test score and the quotient is between 1-5, this would result in an increase to the HEDI score of 1 point.

The District negotiated this attendance control factor with our local NYSUT bargaining group to mitigate problems for those teacher scores seriously affected by any student(s) with extreme attendance problems. We had no occasion on which to use this control from the 2012-13 school year. We have multiple methods of working with families to increase attendance, including parent contact each quarter by teacher and administrator; letters home; counselor meetings with student; principal hearings; positive incentives to attend with a school wide behavioral management program. Our overall District attendance rate is annually 94-96%.

This will NOT result in an adjustment to a teacher's HEDI score of more than two (2) points and is not applied to every teacher's score. It will be considered by a committee including two administrators and a union representative only in the event that a teacher's score is adversely affected to the point where a teacher's overall composite score results in an ineffective or developing range. The local assessments are administered with make-up days and students are not excluded from a post assessment due to poor attendance or any other factor.

Past academic history is taken into account when setting achievement targets.

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.

Any time there is more than one locally selected measure, each locally selected measure will be counted as a proportion of the students it represents. For example, with an elementary music teacher who has her greatest count of students at the third, fourth, and fifth grade levels, we convert grade level results to a HEDI score and then weight it proportionally toward an overall HEDI score.

3.16) Assurances

Please check all of the boxes below:

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

4. Other Measures of Effectiveness (Teachers)

Created Tuesday, April 30, 2013

Updated Wednesday, August 21, 2013

Page 1

4.1) Teacher Practice Rubric

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

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

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

Danielson's Framework for Teaching (2011 Revised Edition)

(No response)

4.2) Points Within Other Measures

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

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

Is the following points assignment applicable to all teachers?

Yes

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

(No response)

Multiple (at least two) classroom observations by principal or other trained administrator, at least one of which must be unannounced [at least 31 points]	45
One or more observation(s) by trained independent evaluators	(No response)
Observations by trained in-school peer teachers	(No response)
Feedback from students using State-approved survey tool	(No response)
Feedback from parents/caregivers using State-approved survey tool	(No response)

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

(No response)

4.3) Survey Tools (if applicable)

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

(No response)

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

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

4.4) Assurances

Please check all of the boxes below:

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

4.5) Process for Assigning Points and Determining HEDI Ratings

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

The Danielson 2011 Rubric will be used for all 60 points. Domains 1, 2 & 3 will be assessed using the Danielson Rubric during the multiple classroom observations, with pre and post observation meetings, and the scores averaged together to result in a total of up to 45 HEDI points. Domain 4 will be assessed using the Danielson Rubric during an end of the year 1:1 portfolio review between the administrator and the teacher to result in a total of up to 15 HEDI points. Normal rounding rules apply. The rubric score listed on the chart is the minimum score necessary to achieve a corresponding HEDI point value.

The multiple observation scores are averaged together by Domain and Element. For example, if on the formal evaluation a teacher is found to need more attention on Domain 2c, the evaluator may choose to go in and evaluate just that Domain in an unannounced, informal observation. This may happen across several domains and elements and may occur multiple times. Each score obtained within an element of a domain is averaged together to arrive at a score for that element that is then averaged with all of the other elements of the four domains of the Danielson rubric to arrive at an overall rubric score for the year. There is no preobservation for an unannounced observation. Elements are scored from 1-4, 4 equals highly effective and 1 equals ineffective.

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

assets/survey-uploads/12179/542107-eka9yMJ855/Evaluation score sheet (1).xlsx

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

Highly Effective: Overall performance and results exceed NYS Teaching Standards.	3.5 to 4.0 on Danielson 2011 Rubric: 3.8-4.0=60 pts; 3.5-3.7=59 pts.
Effective: Overall performance and results meet NYS Teaching Standards.	2.5-3.4 on Danielson 2011 Rubric: 3.0-3.4=58 pts; 2.5-2.9=57 pts.
Developing: Overall performance and results need improvement in order to meet NYS Teaching Standards.	2.08-2.4 on Danielson 2011 Rubric: 2.4=56 pts; 2.38=55; 2.36=54; 2.34=53; 2.32=52; 2.3=51 pts; 2.28=50; 2.26=49; 2.24=48; 2.22=47; 2.2=46 pts; 2.18=45; 2.16=44; 2.14=43; 2.12=42; 2.1=41 pts; 2.08=40
Ineffective: Overall performance and results do not meet NYS Teaching Standards.	1.0-2.06 on Danielson 2011 Rubric: 2.06=39; 2.04=38; 2.02=37; 2.0=36 pts; 1.98=35; 1.96=34; 1.94=33; 1.92=32; 1.9=31 pts; 1.88=30; 1.86=29; 1.84=28; 1.82=27; 1.8=26 pts; 1.78=25; 1.76=24; 1.74=23; 1.72=22; 1.7=21 pts; 1.68=20; 1.66=19; 1.64=18; 1.62=17; 1.6=16 pts; 1.58=15; 1.56=14; 1.55=13; 1.54=12; 1.53=11; 1.52=10; 1.51=9; 1.5=8 pts. 1.4=7 pts, 1.35=6 pts, 1.3=5 pts, 1.25=4 pts, 1.2=3 pts, 1.15=2 pts, 1.1=1 pt, 1.0=0 pts

Provide the ranges for the 60-point scoring bands.

Highly Effective	59-60
Effective	57-58
Developing	40-56
Ineffective	0-39

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?

-
- In Person
-

5. Composite Scoring (Teachers)

Created Tuesday, April 30, 2013

Updated Wednesday, July 31, 2013

Page 1

Standards for Rating Categories

Growth or Comparable Measures

Locally-selected Measures of growth or achievement

Other Measures of Effectiveness (Teacher and Leader standards)

Highly Effective

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

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

Overall performance and results exceed NYS Teaching Standards.

Effective

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

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

Overall performance and results meet NYS Teaching Standards.

Developing

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

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

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

Ineffective

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

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

Overall performance and results do not meet NYS Teaching Standards.

The Commissioner shall review the specific scoring ranges for each of the rating categories annually before the start of each school year and shall recommend any changes to the Board of Regents for consideration.

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

Where there is no Value-Added measure

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

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

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

Highly Effective	59-60
Effective	57-58
Developing	40-56
Ineffective	0-39

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

Where Value-Added growth measure applies
Growth or Comparable Measures
Locally-selected Measures of growth or achievement
Other Measures of Effectiveness
(60 points)

Overall Composite Score
Highly Effective
22-25
14-15
Ranges determined locally--see above

91-100
Effective
10-21
8-13
75-90
Developing
3-9
3-7
65-74
Ineffective
0-2
0-2
0-64

6. Additional Requirements - Teachers

Created Tuesday, April 30, 2013

Updated Wednesday, August 21, 2013

Page 1

6.1) Assurances -- Improvement Plans

Please check the boxes below:

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

6.2) Attachment: Teacher Improvement Plan Forms

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

assets/survey-uploads/12193/542109-Df0w3Xx5v6/Status Report for TIP.docx

6.3) Appeals Process

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

(1) the substance of the annual professional performance review

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

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

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

Appeals of Annual Professional Performance Reviews shall be limited to only those which rate a classroom teacher as ineffective or developing. A unit member may challenge only the substance of the Annual Professional Performance Review, the District's

adherence to the standards and methodologies required for such Annual Professional Performance Review, the District's compliance with its procedures for conducting the Annual Professional Performance Review, or its issuance and/or implementation of the terms of the Teacher Improvement Plan.

Such challenge must be submitted in writing to the Administrator performing the Annual Professional Performance Review or Teacher Improvement Plan. There may be only one appeal submitted in relation to any particular Annual Professional Performance Review or Teacher Improvement Plan. The writing must explain in detail the specific basis for the challenge, and must provide any relevant supporting documentation. Any grounds not raised in the appeal shall be deemed waived. The appeal must be submitted within fifteen (15) calendar days of the issuance of the Annual Professional Performance Review or Teacher Improvement Plan or it is deemed waived. The teacher has the burden of demonstrating a clear legal right to the relief requested and the burden of establishing the facts upon which such relief is sought.

Within ten (10) calendar days of receipt of the challenge, the Administrator conducting the Annual Professional Performance Review or Teacher Improvement Plan shall submit a written determination. If the teacher received an "ineffective" rating and disagrees with the determination, the teacher may submit a copy of the challenge, the determination, and a written statement explaining in detail the basis for disagreement with the determination, with any relevant supporting documentation, to the Superintendent of Schools. Upon receipt of a challenge, the Superintendent then has ten (10) calendar days in which to convene a Third Party Panel consisting of one representative chosen by the Association, one representative chosen by the Superintendent and the third representative to be mutually chosen by the parties. If the third representative cannot be mutually chosen, then each party will submit three (3) names from which one will be randomly selected. The parties further agree that such panel (a) shall hear appeals within fifteen (15) work days after the appeal is made, (b) shall issue a decision regarding the appeal within ten (10) week days after the appeal meeting. If the Third Party Panel does not reach a unanimous decision, the appeal is moved to the Superintendent of Schools for a final decision issued within ten (10) week days. A challenge or determination under this section shall be exempt from the grievance and arbitration provisions in the collective negotiations agreement between the Parties, and may not be challenged in any other forum.

Where and to the extent applicable, the Annual Professional Performance Review of classroom teachers shall be a significant factor for employment decisions and teacher development as determined by the District, and will be subject to any procedures which may in the future be negotiated by the District and the Association in compliance with Ed Law 3012-c.

Nothing in this Memorandum of Agreement shall in any way restrict or affect the District's non-reviewable authority to terminate the appointment of or deny tenure to a probationary teacher, in compliance with the requirements of Education Law 3012-c and any such termination or denial shall not in any way be subject to challenge through the grievance and arbitration provisions of the collective negotiations agreement between the Parties or in any other forum.

The following form/process will also be used for notification of composite scores:

Randolph Central School Composite Score Notification

To be completed and signed prior to the last day of the school year.

As a result of classroom observation and evidence collection it has been determined that your rating is _____ out of 60 points for the Danielson Evaluation portion of the composite score.

Teacher Date Administrator Date

Once your total composite score is determined* with the inclusion of the remaining 40 points, there is a possibility of the creation of a Teacher Improvement Plan for next school year if your overall composite score is in the ineffective or developing range. The final determination of your overall rating and the implementation of a TIP will be after the District has received and distributed your composite score. An appeal may not be initiated until the teacher receives his or her final composite score. The language contained within the SED approved District APPR Plan and the TIP as included here and contained within the RCSTA contract specify the appeals process in detail.

(Optional to be included on low scores) Based on your score out of 60 points which indicates it's likely you'll be overall ineffective or developing, at this time the District is recommending the following staff development courses be taken during the summer recess:

*If composite scores are not received from NYSED preceding the end of the school year, TOTAL composite scores will not be delivered from the District until the first day of school or September 1, whichever is earlier, so that timelines may be adhered to in a possible appeal process without the difficulties presented in bringing parties together in July and August.

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

Describe the process for training lead evaluators and evaluators. Your description must include 1) the process for training lead evaluators and evaluators, 2) the process for the certification and re-certification of lead evaluators, 3) the process for ensuring

inter-rater reliability, 4) the nature (content) and the duration (how many hours, days) of such training.

In addition to the ten+ full days per year of training received from the Catt/Alle BOCES Network Team, we use the Teachscape program and all evaluators complete the Teachscape training and testing for certification.

Our lead evaluators are certified at the conclusion of training and are tested through Teachscape so that those who successfully complete the testing will be certified. Re-certification will occur in the same manner. Certification using Teachscape training modules and testing allows us to insure inter-rater reliability.

6.5) Assurances -- Evaluators

Please check the boxes below:

-
- Checked
-

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

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

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

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

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

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

(7) use of the Statewide Instructional Reporting System

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

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

• Checked

6.6) Assurances -- Teachers

Please check all of the boxes below:

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

6.7) Assurances -- Data

Please check all of the boxes below:

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

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

Created Tuesday, April 30, 2013

Updated Wednesday, July 17, 2013

Page 1

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

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

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

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

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

PK-6
7-12
(No response)

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

Please check the boxes below:

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

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

Student Learning Objectives will be the other comparable growth measures for principals in buildings or programs in which fewer than 30% of students take Grades 4-8 ELA, Math, and/or High School courses with State or Regents assessments. SLOs will be developed

using the assessments covering the most students in the school or program and continuing until at least 30% of students in the school or program are covered by SLOs. The district must select the type of assessment that will be used with the SLO from the options below.

If any grade/course in the building has a State-provided growth measure AND the principal must have SLOs because fewer than 30% of students in the building are covered, then the SLOs will begin first with the SGP/VA results.

Additional SLOs will then be set based on grades/subjects with State assessments, where applicable.

If additional SLOs are necessary, principals must begin with the grade(s)/course(s) that have the largest number of students using school-wide student results from one of the following assessment options: State-approved 3rd party or district/regional/BOCES-developed assessments that are rigorous and comparable across classrooms.

State assessments, *required if one exists*

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

List of State-approved 3rd party assessments

First, list the grade configuration of the school or program the SLO applies to. Then, using the drop-down boxes below, please select the type of assessment that will be used for SLOs for the school/program listed. Finally, name the specific assessment listing the full name of the assessment. Districts or BOCES that intend to use a district, regional, or BOCES-developed assessment must include the name, grade, and subject of the assessment in the following format: “[Name of your District/Region/BOCES] developed [Grade] [Subject] Assessment.” For example, a BOCES-developed 7th grade Social Studies assessment would be written as follows: “GVEP-Developed Grade 7 Social Studies Assessment.” For State-approved 3rd party assessments, please include the name of the assessment exactly as it appears in RED on the State-approved list. For State assessments or Regents examinations, please indicate as such in the assessment name.

School or Program Type	SLO with Assessment Option	Name of the Assessment
Not Applicable		

Describe the district-adopted expectations for the level of performance required for each HEDI rating category and the process for assigning points to principals based on SLO results, consistent with regulations and assurances in the Comparable Growth Measures subcomponent. Include any district-determined expectations for student performance. Please describe the process your district is using to measure student growth on the assessments listed for this Task. If applicable, please also include a description of the process for combining the State-provided growth score with the SLO(s) for this Task.

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

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

Note: The only allowable controls or adjustments for Comparable Growth Measures are the following: prior student achievement results, students with disabilities, English language learners, and students in poverty.

NONE

7.5) Principals with More Than One Growth Measure

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

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

7.6) Assurances -- Comparable Growth Measures

Please check all of the boxes below:

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

8. Local Measures (Principals)

Created Tuesday, April 30, 2013

Updated Wednesday, August 21, 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.

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

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

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

In the table below, please list the grade configurations of the school(s)/program(s) in your district/BOCES where it is expected that 30-100% of a principal’s students are taking assessments with a State-provided growth or value-added measure (e.g., K-5, 6-8, 9-12). Then for each grade configuration, select a measure of growth or achievement from the drop-down menu. As a reminder, the grade configurations/programs listed in Task 8.1 should be the same as those listed in Task 7.1.

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

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

- (a) student achievement levels on State assessments in ELA and/or Math in Grades 4-8 (e.g., percentage of students in the school whose performance levels on State assessments are proficient or advanced)
- (b) student growth or achievement on State assessments in ELA and/or Math in Grades 4-8 for students in each specific performance level (e.g., Level 1, Level 2)
- (c) student growth or achievement on State assessments in ELA and/or Math in Grades 4-8 for students with disabilities and English Language Learners in Grades 4-8
- (d) student performance on any or all of the district-wide locally selected measures approved for use in teacher evaluations
- (e) four, five and/or six-year high school graduation and/or dropout rates for principals employed in a school with high school grades
- (f) percentage of students who earn a Regents diploma with advanced designation and/or honors for principals employed in a school with high school grades
- (g) percentage of a cohort of students that achieve specified scores on Regents examinations and/or Department approved alternative examinations (including, but not limited to, Advanced Placement examinations, International Baccalaureate examinations, SAT II, etc.), for principals employed in a school with high school grades (e.g., the percentage of students in the 2009 cohort that scored at least a 3 on an Advanced Placement examination since entry into the ninth grade)
- (h) students' progress toward graduation in the school using strong predictive indicators, including but not limited to 9th and/or 10th grade credit accumulation and/or the percentage of students that pass 9th and/or 10th grade subjects most commonly associated with graduation and/or students' progress in passing the number of required Regents examinations for graduation, for principals employed in a school with high school grades

Grade Configuration/Program	Locally-Selected Measure from List of Approved Measures	Assessment
PK-6	(b) results for students in specific performance levels	NYS ELA and Math State Assessments, grades 4-6
7-12	(b) results for students in specific performance levels	NYS ELA and Math State Assessments, grades 7-8
7-12	(g) % achieving specific level on Regents or alternatives	NYS Common Core Algebra Regents Assessment and NYS Comprehensive English Regents 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.	The target goals set throughout the local measures will be based on this year's achievement results on each assessment. The achievement targets will be set by the principal and approved by the superintendent based on consideration of prior academic history on these assessments. HEDI points are awarded based on the number of students meeting or exceeding their targets.
Highly Effective (14 - 15 points) Results are well above District- or BOCES-adopted expectations for growth or achievement for grade/subject.	89% of students or more will meet or exceed their target goal on the summative assessment. 93-100% of students who meet their target will result in 15 points; 89-92%=14 points.
Effective (8- 13 points) Results meet District- or BOCES-adopted expectations for growth or achievement for grade/subject.	80-88% of students will meet or exceed their target goal on the summative assessment. 87-88%=13 pts; 85-86%=12 pts; 83-84%=11 pts; 82%=10 pts; 81%=9 pts; 80%=8 pts.

Developing (3 - 7 points) Results are below District- or BOCES-adopted expectations for growth or achievement for grade/subject.	68-79% of students will meet or exceed their target goal on the summative assessment. 77-79%=7 pts; 74-76%=6 pts; 72-73%=5 pts; 70-71%=4 pts; 68-69%=3 pts.
Ineffective (0 - 2 points) Results are well below District- or BOCES-adopted expectations for growth or achievement for grade/subject.	67% or fewer students will meet or exceed their target goal on the summative assessment. 60-67%=2 pts; 51-59%=1 pt; 50% and below = 0 pts.

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

(No response)

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

assets/survey-uploads/12190/542111-qBFVOWF7fC/8.docx

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

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

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

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

- (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.	Not Applicable
Highly Effective (18 - 20 points) Results are well above District- or BOCES-adopted expectations for growth or achievement for grade/subject.	Not Applicable
Effective (9- 17 points) Results meet District- or BOCES-adopted expectations for growth or achievement for grade/subject.	Not Applicable
Developing (3 - 8 points) Results are below District- or BOCES-adopted expectations for growth or achievement for grade/subject.	Not Applicable
Ineffective (0 - 2 points) Results are well below District- or BOCES-adopted expectations for growth or achievement for grade/subject.	Not Applicable

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

NONE

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.

Any time there is more than one locally selected measure, each locally selected measure will be counted as a proportion of the students it represents.

8.5) Assurances

Please check all of the boxes below:

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

9. Other Measures of Effectiveness (Principals)

Created Tuesday, April 30, 2013

Updated Tuesday, September 17, 2013

Page 1

9.1) Principal Practice Rubric

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

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

Multidimensional Principal Performance Rubric

(No response)

9.2) Points Within Other Measures

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

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

Is the following point assignment for all principals?

Yes

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

(No response)

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

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

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

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

(No response)

9.3) Assurances -- Goals

Please check the boxes below if assigning any points to "ambitious and measurable goals":

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

9.3) Assurances -- Goals Assure that any other goals, if applicable, shall address quantifiable and verifiable improvements in academic results or the school's learning environment (e.g. student or teacher attendance).	(No response)
--	---------------

9.4) Sources of Evidence (if applicable)

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

9.4) Sources of Evidence (if applicable) Structured feedback from teachers using a State-approved tool	(No response)
--	---------------

9.4) Sources of Evidence (if applicable) Structured feedback from students using a State-approved tool	(No response)
--	---------------

9.4) Sources of Evidence (if applicable) Structured feedback from families using a State-approved tool	(No response)
--	---------------

9.4) Sources of Evidence (if applicable) School visits by other trained evaluators	(No response)
--	---------------

9.4) Sources of Evidence (if applicable) Review of school documents, records, and/or State accountability processes (all count as one source)	(No response)
---	---------------

9.5) Survey Tool(s) (if applicable)

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

(No response)

Note: When the State-approved survey list is updated, this list will be updated within the drop-down menu of approved survey tools.

Principal Evaluation Tripod School Perception Survey for Teachers	(No response)
---	---------------

K12 Insight Student Survey (Grades 3-5) for Principal Evaluation in New York	(No response)
--	---------------

K12 Insight Student Survey (Grades 6-12) for Principal Evaluation in New York	(No response)
---	---------------

K12 Insight Parent Survey for Principal Evaluation in New York	(No response)
--	---------------

K12 Insight Teacher/Staff Survey for Principal Evaluation in New York	(No response)
---	---------------

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

9.6) Assurances

Please check all of the boxes below:

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

9.7) Process for Assigning Points and Determining HEDI Ratings

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

The MPPR will be used for all 60 points. Domains 1-6 will be assessed using the MPPR during the multiple school site visits and through a formative portfolio review that includes:

1. Building Administrators Self-Assessment/Evaluator baseline assessment
2. Conversation and Goal Setting Based on results of June baseline/diagnostic
3. Formative Review of Goals/MPPR Rubric/Portfolio pieces 1-3 times during year
4. Summative Review of MPPR Rubric with Scores/Assignment of HEDI

Subcomponents within each domain will be scored from 1-4 and will be aligned to both visits and the portfolio. The rubric scoring from multiple site visits and the portfolio review will be averaged together to result in an average rubric score 1.0-4.0 and then converted to 60 HEDI points. The rubric score listed on the chart is the minimum score necessary to achieve the corresponding HEDI point value.

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

(No response)

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

Highly Effective: Overall performance and results exceed standards.	3.5 to 4.0 on MPPR: 3.8-4.0=60 pts; 3.5-3.7=59 pts.
---	---

Effective: Overall performance and results meet standards.	2.5-3.4 on MPPR: 3.0-3.4=58 pts; 2.5-2.9=57 pts.
Developing: Overall performance and results need improvement in order to meet standards.	2.08-2.4 on MPPR: 2.4=56 pts; 2.38=55; 2.36=54; 2.34=53; 2.32=52; 2.3=51 pts; 2.28=50; 2.26=49; 2.24=48; 2.22=47; 2.2=46 pts; 2.18=45; 2.16=44; 2.14=43; 2.12=42; 2.1=41 pts; 2.08=40
Ineffective: Overall performance and results do not meet standards.	1.0-2.06 on MPPR: 2.06=39; 2.04=38; 2.02=37; 2.0=36 pts; 1.98=35; 1.96=34; 1.94=33; 1.92=32; 1.9=31 pts; 1.88=30; 1.86=29; 1.84=28; 1.82=27; 1.8=26 pts; 1.78=25; 1.76=24; 1.74=23; 1.72=22; 1.7=21 pts; 1.68=20; 1.66=19; 1.64=18; 1.62=17; 1.6=16 pts; 1.58=15; 1.56=14; 1.55=13; 1.54=12; 1.53=11; 1.52=10; 1.51=9; 1.5=8 pts. 1.4=7 pts, 1.35=6 pts, 1.3=5 pts, 1.25=4 pts, 1.2=3 pts, 1.15=2 pts, 1.1=1 pt, 1.0=0 pts

Please provide the locally-negotiated 60 point scoring bands.

Highly Effective	59-60
Effective	57-58
Developing	40-56
Ineffective	0-39

9.8) School Visits

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

Probationary Principals

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

Tenured Principals

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

10. Composite Scoring (Principals)

Created Tuesday, April 30, 2013

Updated Wednesday, June 19, 2013

Page 1

Standards for Rating Categories

Growth or Comparable Measures

Locally-selected Measures of growth or achievement

Other Measures of Effectiveness (Teacher and Leader standards)

Highly Effective

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

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

Overall performance and results exceed ISLLC leadership standards.

Effective

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

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

Overall performance and results meet ISLLC leadership standards.

Developing

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

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

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

Ineffective

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

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

Overall performance and results do not meet ISLLC leadership standards.

The Commissioner shall review the specific scoring ranges for each of the rating categories annually before the start of each school year and shall recommend any changes to the Board of Regents for consideration.

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

Where there is no Value-Added measure

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

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

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

Highly Effective	59-60
Effective	57-58
Developing	40-56
Ineffective	0-39

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

Where Value-Added growth measure applies
Growth or Comparable Measures
Locally-selected Measures of growth or achievement
Other Measures of Effectiveness
(60 points)

Overall Composite Score
Highly Effective
22-25

14-15

Ranges determined locally--see above

91-100

Effective

10-21

8-13

75-90

Developing

3-9

3-7

65-74

Ineffective

0-2

0-2

0-64

11. Additional Requirements - Principals

Created Tuesday, April 30, 2013

Updated Wednesday, June 19, 2013

Page 1

11.1) Assurances -- Improvement Plans

Please check the boxes below.

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

11.2) Attachment: Principal Improvement Plan Forms

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

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

[assets/survey-uploads/5276/139029-Df0w3Xx5v6/PIP.docx](#)

11.3) Appeals Process

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

(1) the substance of the annual professional performance review

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

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

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

Building Administrator Appeals Process:

Appeals of Annual Professional Performance Reviews shall be limited to only those which rate a Building Administrator as ineffective or developing. A Building Administrator may challenge only the substance of the Annual Professional Performance Review, the District's adherence to the standards and methodologies required for such Annual Professional Performance Review, the District's compliance with its procedures for conducting the Annual Professional Performance Review, or its issuance and/or implementation of the terms of the Administrator Improvement Plan.

Such challenge must be submitted in writing to the Superintendent performing the Annual Professional Performance Review or Administrator Improvement Plan. There may be only one appeal submitted in relation to any particular Annual Professional Performance Review or Administrator Improvement Plan. The writing must explain in detail the specific basis for the challenge, and must provide any relevant supporting documentation. Any grounds not raised in the appeal shall be deemed waived. The appeal must be submitted within fifteen (15) calendar days of the issuance of the Annual Professional Performance Review or Administrator Improvement Plan or it is deemed waived. The administrator has the burden of demonstrating a clear legal right to the relief requested and the burden of establishing the facts upon which such relief is sought.

Within fifteen (15) calendar days of receipt of the challenge, the Superintendent conducting the Annual Professional Performance Review or Administrator Improvement Plan shall submit a written determination. If the administrator received an "ineffective" rating and disagrees with the determination, the administrator may submit a copy of the challenge, the determination, and a written statement explaining in detail the basis for disagreement with the determination, with any relevant supporting documentation, to a Third Party Panel consisting of one representative chosen by the Administrator, one representative chosen by the District and the third representative to be mutually chosen by the parties within fifteen (15) calendar days. Should the parties be unable to agree on the 3rd panel member, then one shall be chosen randomly from a list of names (not to exceed 3 each) provided by each of the first two panel members. The parties further agree that such panel (a) shall hear appeals in a timely manner after the appeal is made, (b) shall issue a decision regarding the appeal within five (5) week days after the appeal meeting.

The Superintendent of Schools retains the authority to accept or reject the Third Party Panel's recommendation and the District may commence expedited 3020-a charges as allowed by the regulations. The parties agree that all evidence and information produced through the steps are admissible and challengeable in the 3020-a proceeding. A challenge or determination under this section shall be exempt from the grievance and arbitration provisions in the collective negotiations agreement between the Parties, and may not be challenged in any other forum.

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

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

In addition to the ten+ full days per year of training received from the Catt/Alle BOCES Network Team, we have the Teachscape program and all evaluators complete the Teachscape training and testing for certification. Mandatory participation in the Teachscape training and testing for certification is our process for periodically re-certifying lead evaluators and for ensuring inter-rater reliability.

In addition to the Network Team training on the Principal Evaluation, the Superintendent attends sessions with Joanne Picone Zocchia, LCI through the Erie 2 and Catt/Alle BOCES. In the 2013-14 school year, the Superintendent has enrolled in the Communities for Learning (LCI) Fellowship full year program to further study and develop leadership personally and within the Administrative, BOE, and Teacher Leader teams.

11.5) Assurances -- Evaluators

Please check the boxes below:

-
- Checked
-

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

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

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

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

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

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

(7) use of the Statewide Instructional Reporting System

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

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

• Checked

11.6) Assurances -- Principals

Please check all of the boxes below:

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

11.6) Assurances -- Principals Assure the district has appeal procedures that are consistent with the regulations and that they provide for the timely and expeditious resolution of an appeal.	Checked
---	---------

11.7) Assurances -- Data

Please check all of the boxes below:

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

11.7) Assurances -- Data Certify that the district provides an opportunity for every classroom teacher to verify the subjects and/or student rosters assigned to them.	Checked
--	---------

11.7) Assurances -- Data Assure scores for all principals will be reported to NYSED for each subcomponent, as well as the composite rating, as per NYSED requirements.	Checked
--	---------

12. Joint Certification of APPR Plan

Created Tuesday, April 30, 2013

Updated Tuesday, September 17, 2013

Page 1

12.1) Upload the Joint Certification of the APPR Plan

Please obtain the required signatures, create a PDF file, and upload your joint certification of the APPR Plan using this form: APPR District Certification Form. Please note that Review Room timestamps each revision and signatures cannot be dated earlier than the last revision.

assets/survey-uploads/12158/542115-3Uqgn5g9Iu/APPR_091713.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.

Name

School Year

Observation average (x .75)

Portfolio average (x .25)

#DIV/0!

#DIV/0!

#DIV/0!

#DIV/0!

Total

#DIV/0!

Local Point total

(60 pts)

State Growth Score

(20 pts)

Local Achievement Score

(20 pts)

Score out of 100

0

Overall Rating

HEDI

HEDI conversion chart

91-100	Highly Effective
75-90	Effective
65-74	Developing
0-64	Ineffective

Local Points conversion chart

3.8-4.0	60	1.88	30
3.5-3.7	59	1.86	29
3.0-3.4	58	1.84	28
2.5-2.9	57	1.82	27
2.4	56	1.8	26
2.38	55	1.78	25
2.36	54	1.76	24
2.34	53	1.74	23
2.32	52	1.72	22
2.3	51	1.7	21
2.28	50	1.68	20
2.26	49	1.66	19
2.24	48	1.64	18
2.22	47	1.62	17
2.2	46	1.6	16
2.18	45	1.58	15
2.16	44	1.56	14
2.14	43	1.55	13
2.12	42	1.54	12
2.1	41	1.53	11
2.08	40	1.52	10
2.06	39	1.51	9
2.04	38	1.5	8
2.02	37	1.4	7
2	36	1.35	6
1.98	35	1.3	5
1.96	34	1.25	4
1.94	33	1.2	3
1.92	32	1.15	2
1.9	31	1.1	1
		1	0

Observations

Date:				Component Average
1a: Content and Pedagogy				#DIV/0!
1b: Knowledge of Students				#DIV/0!
1c: Instructional Outcomes				#DIV/0!
1d: Knowledge of Resources				#DIV/0!
1e: Coherent Instruction				#DIV/0!
1f: Student Assessments				#DIV/0!
2A - Environment				#DIV/0!
2B - Culture				#DIV/0!
2C -Procedures				#DIV/0!
2D - Behavior				#DIV/0!
2E - Physical Space				#DIV/0!
3A - Communicating				#DIV/0!
3B - Questioning				#DIV/0!
3C - Engaging				#DIV/0!
3D - Assessment				#DIV/0!
3E - Flexibility				#DIV/0!
Overall Observation Average				#DIV/0!

	Score
Portfolio	
4a: Reflecting on Teaching	
4b: Accurate Records	
4c: Communicating / Families	
4d: Participating Professional Community	
4e: Growing /Developing Professionally	
4f: Showing Professionalism	
Average	#DIV/0!

Status Report for Member Improvement Plan

Name _____ Date _____

Evaluator _____

Identified area of improvement

Timeline for Achieving Improvement: _____

Areas of demonstrated improvement:

- _____ Content knowledge
- _____ Curriculum preparation
- _____ Instructional delivery skills
- _____ Learning environment
- _____ Knowledge of student development and diversity
- _____ Student assessment techniques
- _____ Collaborative relationships
- _____ Reflective response

Comments:

Methods implemented to demonstrate improvement:

- A. _____
- B. _____
- C. _____
- D. _____

Measurable performance (student work, student achievement, personal accomplishments, etc.):

Evaluation:

Member response:

Member completing the Member Improvement Plan

Date

Evaluator of the Improvement Plan

Date

(8.1) Twenty Point Chart for Use When Value Added Model is Not in Place

89% of students or more will meet or exceed their target goal on the summative assessment. 95-100% of students who meet their target will result in 20 points; 92-94%=19 points; 89-91%=18 points.

80-88% of students will meet or exceed their target goal on the summative assessment. 88%=17 pts; 87%=16 pts; 86%=15 pts; 85%=14 pts; 84%=13 pts; 83%=12 pts; 82%=11 pts; 81%=10 pts; 80%=9 pts.

68-79% of students will meet or exceed their target goal on the summative assessment. 78-79%=8 pts; 76-77%=7 pts; 74-75%=6 pts; 72-73%=5 pts; 70-71%=4 pts; 68-69%=3 pts.

67% or fewer students will meet or exceed their target goal on the summative assessment. 60-67%=2 pts; 51-59%=1 pt; 50% and below = 0 pts.

Status Report for Principal Improvement Plan

Name _____ Date _____

Evaluator _____

Identified area of improvement

Timeline for Achieving Improvement: _____

Areas of demonstrated improvement:

Comments:

Methods implemented to demonstrate improvement:

A. _____

B. _____

C. _____

D. _____

Measurable performance:

Evaluation:

Principal response:

Principal completing the Principal Improvement Plan

Date

Evaluator of the Improvement Plan

Date

12. Joint Certification of APPR Plan

Created Tuesday, April 30, 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. Please note that Review Room timestamps each revision and signatures cannot be dated earlier than the last revision.

[assets/survey-uploads/5581/139486-3Uqgn5g9Iu/APPR October 3, 2012.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.

4. Other Measures of Effectiveness (Teachers)

Created Tuesday, June 05, 2012

Updated Wednesday, June 20, 2012

Page 1

4.1) Teacher Practice Rubric

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

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

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

Danielson's Framework for Teaching (2011 Revised Edition)

(No response)

4.2) Points Within Other Measures

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

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

Is the following points assignment applicable to all teachers?

Yes

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

(No response)

Multiple (at least two) classroom observations by principal or other trained administrator, at least one of which must be unannounced [at least 31 points]	31
One or more observation(s) by trained independent evaluators	(No response)
Observations by trained in-school peer teachers	(No response)
Feedback from students using State-approved survey tool	(No response)
Feedback from parents/caregivers using State-approved survey tool	(No response)
Structured reviews of lesson plans, student portfolios and other teacher artifacts	29

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

(No response)

4.3) Survey Tools (if applicable)

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

(No response)

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

(No response)

(No response)

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.

The Danielson 2011 Rubric will be used for all 60 points. Domains 2 & 3 will be assessed using the Danielson Rubric during the multiple classroom observations and the scores averaged together to result in a total of up to 31 HEDI points. Domains 1 & 4 will be assessed using the Danielson Rubric during an end of the year 1:1 portfolio review between the administrator and the teacher to result in a total of up to 29 HEDI points.

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

(No response)

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

Highly Effective: Overall performance and results exceed NYS Teaching Standards.	3.5 to 4.0 on Danielson 2011 Rubric: 3.8-4.0=60 pts; 3.5-3.7=59 pts.
Effective: Overall performance and results meet NYS Teaching Standards.	2.5-3.4 on Danielson 2011 Rubric: 3.0-3.4=58 pts; 2.5-2.9=57 pts.
Developing: Overall performance and results need improvement in order to meet NYS Teaching Standards.	1.5-2.4 on Danielson 2011 Rubric: 2.4=56 pts; 2.38=55; 2.36=54; 2.34=53; 2.32=52; 2.3=51 pts; 2.28=50; 2.26=49; 2.24=48; 2.22=47; 2.2=46 pts; 2.18=45; 2.16=44; 2.14=43; 2.12=42; 2.1=41 pts; 2.08=40; 2.06=39; 2.04=38; 2.02=37; 2.0=36 pts; 1.98=35; 1.96=34; 1.94=33; 1.92=32; 1.9=31 pts; 1.88=30; 1.86=29; 1.84=28; 1.82=27; 1.8=26 pts; 1.78=25; 1.76=24; 1.74=23; 1.72=22; 1.7=21 pts; 1.68=20; 1.66=19; 1.64=18; 1.62=17; 1.6=16 pts; 1.58=15; 1.56=14; 1.55=13; 1.54=12; 1.53=11; 1.52=10; 1.51=9; 1.5=8 pts.
Ineffective: Overall performance and results do not meet NYS Teaching Standards.	1.0-1.4 on Danielson 2011 Rubric: 1.4=7 pts, 1.35=6 pts, 1.3=5 pts, 1.25=4 pts, 1.2=3 pts, 1.1=2 pts, 1.15=1 pt, 1.0=0 pts

Provide the ranges for the 60-point scoring bands.

Highly Effective	59-60
Effective	57-58
Developing	8-56
Ineffective	0-7

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?

-
- In Person
-

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

Created Thursday, May 24, 2012

Updated Wednesday, June 20, 2012

Page 1

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

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

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

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

	Gail N. Chapman Elementary PK-6
	Randolph Jr./Sr. HS 7-12
	(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
Gail N. Champman Elementary	State assessment	(No response)
Randolph Jr/Sr High School	State assessment	(No response)
(No response)	(No response)	(No response)
(No response)	(No response)	(No response)
(No response)	(No response)	(No response)

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).	89% or more of students will meet or exceed their target goal on the summative assessment.
Effective (9 - 17 points) Results meet state average for similar students (or District goals if no state test).	80-88% of students will meet or exceed their target goal on the summative assessment.
Developing (3 - 8 points) Results are below state average for similar students (or District goals if no state test).	68-79% of students will meet or exceed their target goal on the summative assessment.
Ineffective (0 - 2 points) Results are well below state average for similar students (or District goals if no state test).	67% or fewer of students will meet or exceed their target goal on the summative assessment.

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.

NONE

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

9. Other Measures of Effectiveness (Principals)

Created Tuesday, June 05, 2012

Updated Tuesday, October 02, 2012

Page 1

9.1) Principal Practice Rubric

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

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

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.

(No response)

(No response)

(No response)

9.6) Assurances

Please check all of the boxes below:

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

9.7) Process for Assigning Points and Determining HEDI Ratings

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

*The MPPR will be used for all 60 points. Domains 1-6 will be assessed using the MPPR during the multiple school site visits and through a formative portfolio review that follows the following schedule:
 June, 2012 Building Administrators Self-Assessment/Evaluator baseline assessment
 July, 2012 Conversation and Goal Setting Based on results of June baseline/diagnostic
 October, 2012 Formative Review of Goal s/MPPR Rubric/Portfolio pieces
 January, 2013 Formative Review of Goal s/MPPR Rubric/Portfolio pieces
 Spring Break, 2013 Formative Review of Goal s/MPPR Rubric/Portfolio pieces
 June, 2013 Summative Review of MPPR Rubric with Scores/Assignment of HEDI
 The rubric scoring from multiple site visits and the portfolio review will be averaged together to result in an average rubric score 1.0-4.0 and then converted to 60 HEDI points.*

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

(No response)

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

Highly Effective: Overall performance and results exceed standards.	3.5 to 4.0 on MPPR: 3.8-4.0=60 pts; 3.5-3.7=59 pts.
Effective: Overall performance and results meet standards.	2.5-3.4 on MPPR: 3.0-3.4=58 pts; 2.5-2.9=57 pts.
Developing: Overall performance and results need improvement in order to meet standards.	1.5-2.4 on MPPR: 2.4=56 pts; 2.38=55; 2.36=54; 2.34=53; 2.32=52; 2.3=51 pts; 2.28=50; 2.26=49; 2.24=48; 2.22=47; 2.2=46 pts; 2.18=45; 2.16=44; 2.14=43; 2.12=42; 2.1=41 pts; 2.08=40; 2.06=39; 2.04=38; 2.02=37; 2.0=36 pts; 1.98=35; 1.96=34; 1.94=33; 1.92=32; 1.9=31 pts; 1.88=30; 1.86=29; 1.84=28; 1.82=27; 1.8=26 pts; 1.78=25; 1.76=24; 1.74=23; 1.72=22; 1.7=21 pts; 1.68=20; 1.66=19; 1.64=18; 1.62=17; 1.6=16 pts; 1.58=15; 1.56=14; 1.55=13; 1.54=12; 1.53=11; 1.52=10; 1.51=9; 1.5=8 pts.
Ineffective: Overall performance and results do not meet standards.	1.0-1.4 on MPPR: 1.4=7 pts, 1.35=6 pts, 1.3=5 pts, 1.25=4 pts, 1.2=3 pts, 1.1=2 pts, 1.15=1 pt, 1.0=0 pts

Please provide the locally-negotiated 60 point scoring bands.

Highly Effective	59-60
Effective	57-58
Developing	8-56
Ineffective	0-7

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

8. Local Measures (Principals)

Created Tuesday, April 30, 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
PK-6	(b) results for students in specific performance levels	4-6 ELA and Math State Assessments
7-12	(b) results for students in specific performance levels	7-8 ELA and Math State Assessments
7-12	(g) % achieving specific level on Regents or alternatives	Integrated Algebra and Comprehensive English

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

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

Use this box, if needed, to describe the process for assigning HEDI categories. If needed, you may upload a table or graphic below.	The target goals set throughout the local measures will be based on this year's achievement results on each assessment. The achievement targets will be based on consideration of prior academic history on these assessments.
Highly Effective (14 - 15 points) Results are well above District- or BOCES-adopted expectations for growth or achievement for grade/subject.	89% of students or more will meet or exceed their target goal on the summative assessment. 93-100% of students who meet their target will result in 15 points; 89-92%=14 points.
Effective (8- 13 points) Results meet District- or BOCES-adopted expectations for growth or achievement for grade/subject.	80-88% of students will meet or exceed their target goal on the summative assessment. 87-88%=13 pts; 85-86%=12 pts; 83-84%=11 pts; 82%=10 pts; 81%=9 pts; 80%=8 pts.
Developing (3 - 7 points) Results are below District- or BOCES-adopted expectations for growth or achievement for grade/subject.	68-79% of students will meet or exceed their target goal on the summative assessment. 77-79%=7 pts; 74-76%=6 pts; 72-73%=5 pts; 70-71%=4 pts; 68-69%=3 pts.
Ineffective (0 - 2 points) Results are well below District- or BOCES-adopted expectations for growth or achievement for	67% or fewer students will meet or exceed their target goal on the summative assessment. 60-67%=2 pts; 51-59%=1 pt; 50%

grade/subject.

and below = 0 pts.

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

(No response)

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

(No response)

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

in a school with high school grades

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

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

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

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.	Not Applicable
Highly Effective (18 - 20 points) Results are well above District- or BOCES-adopted expectations for growth or achievement for grade/subject.	Not Applicable
Effective (9- 17 points) Results meet District- or BOCES-adopted expectations for growth or achievement for grade/subject.	Not Applicable
Developing (3 - 8 points) Results are below District- or BOCES-adopted expectations for growth or achievement for grade/subject.	Not Applicable
Ineffective (0 - 2 points) Results are well below District- or BOCES-adopted expectations for growth or achievement for grade/subject.	Not Applicable

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.

The following methodology will be used to adjust principal scores based on student attendance as reported by period in PowerSchool. The steps are:

1. Multiply each students' assessment score by the number of days they were in attendance
2. Sum step 1 scores for an all student number
3. Sum all days attended by student group
4. Divide step 2 by step 3

In no case will a principal's score be adjusted by more than two (2) points.

In addition the District follows Policy #7110 Comprehensive Student Attendance Policy for its plan to improve student attendance.

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.

Any time there is more than one locally selected measure, each locally selected measure will be counted as a proportion of the students it represents.

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

11. Additional Requirements - Principals

Created Tuesday, June 05, 2012

Updated Tuesday, August 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/5276/139029-Df0w3Xx5v6/PRINCIPAL IMPROVEMENT PLAN.docx](#)

11.3) Appeals Process

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

(1) the substance of the annual professional performance review

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

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

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

Building Administrator Appeals Process:

Appeals of Annual Professional Performance Reviews shall be limited to only those which rate a Building Administrator as ineffective or developing. A Building Administrator may challenge only the substance of the Annual Professional Performance Review, the District's adherence to the standards and methodologies required for such Annual Professional Performance Review, the District's compliance with its procedures for conducting the Annual Professional Performance Review, or its issuance and/or implementation of the terms of the Administrator Improvement Plan.

Such challenge must be submitted in writing to the Superintendent performing the Annual Professional Performance Review or

Administrator Improvement Plan. There may be only one appeal submitted in relation to any particular Annual Professional Performance Review or Administrator Improvement Plan. The writing must explain in detail the specific basis for the challenge, and must provide any relevant supporting documentation. Any grounds not raised in the appeal shall be deemed waived. The appeal must be submitted within fifteen (15) calendar days of the issuance of the Annual Professional Performance Review or Administrator Improvement Plan or it is deemed waived. The administrator has the burden of demonstrating a clear legal right to the relief requested and the burden of establishing the facts upon which such relief is sought.

Within fifteen (15) calendar days of receipt of the challenge, the Superintendent conducting the Annual Professional Performance Review or Administrator Improvement Plan shall submit a written determination. If the administrator received an "ineffective" rating and disagrees with the determination, the administrator may submit a copy of the challenge, the determination, and a written statement explaining in detail the basis for disagreement with the determination, with any relevant supporting documentation, to a Third Party Panel consisting of one representative chosen by the Administrator, one representative chosen by the District and the third representative to be mutually chosen by the parties within fifteen (15) calendar days. Should the parties be unable to agree on the 3rd panel member, then one shall be chosen randomly from a list of names (not to exceed 3 each) provided by each of the first two panel members. The parties further agree that such panel (a) shall hear appeals in a timely manner after the appeal is made, (b) shall issue a decision regarding the appeal within five (5) week days after the appeal meeting.

The Superintendent of Schools retains the authority to accept or reject the Third Party Panel's recommendation and the District may commence expedited 3020-a charges as allowed by the regulations. The parties agree that all evidence and information produced through the steps are admissible and challengeable in the 3020-a proceeding. A challenge or determination under this section shall be exempt from the grievance and arbitration provisions in the collective negotiations agreement between the Parties, and may not be challenged in any other forum.

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.

In addition to the ten+ full days per year of training received from the Catt/Alle BOCES Network Team, RCS Lead Evaluators contracted with the Candi McKay Consulting Group for in-District training that consisted of four full days. For the 2012-13 school year, we have purchased the Teachscape program and all evaluators will complete the Teachscape training and testing for certification. Mandatory participation in the Teachscape training and testing for certification is our process for periodically re-certifying lead evaluators and for ensuring inter-rater reliability.

In addition to the Network Team training on the Principal Evaluation, the Superintendent has attended eight sessions with Joanne Picone Zocchia, LCI through the Erie 2 and Catt/Alle BOCES. In the 2012-23 school year, the Superintendent has enrolled in the Communities for Learning (LCI) Fellowship full year program to further study and develop leadership personally and within the Administrative, BOE, and Teacher Leader teams.

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

5. Composite Scoring (Teachers)

Created Tuesday, April 30, 2013

Page 1

Standards for Rating Categories

Growth or Comparable Measures

Locally-selected Measures of growth or achievement

Other Measures of Effectiveness (Teacher and Leader standards)

Highly

Effective

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

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

Overall performance and results exceed NYS Teaching Standards.

Effective

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

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

Overall performance and results meet NYS Teaching Standards.

Developing

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

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

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

Ineffective

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

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

Overall performance and results do not meet NYS Teaching Standards.

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

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

2012-13 where there is no Value-Added measure

Growth or Comparable Measures

Locally-selected Measures of

growth or achievement

Other Measures of Effectiveness

(60 points)

Overall

Composite Score

Highly Effective

18-20

18-20

Ranges determined locally--see below

91-100

Effective

9-17

9-17

75-90

Developing

3-8

3-8

65-74

Ineffective

0-2

0-2

0-64

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

Highly Effective	59-60
Effective	57-58
Developing	8-56
Ineffective	0-7

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

3. Local Measures (Teachers)

Created Wednesday, May 23, 2012

Updated Tuesday, October 02, 2012

Page 1

Locally Selected Measures of Student Achievement or Growth

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

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

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

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

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

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

Growth or achievement measure(s) from these options.

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

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

Measures based on:

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

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

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

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

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

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

3.1) Grades 4-8 ELA

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

	Locally-Selected Measure from List of Approved Measures	Assessment
4	4) State-approved 3rd party assessments	iReady Diagnostic Assessment, ELA 4
5	4) State-approved 3rd party assessments	iReady Diagnostic Assessment, ELA 5
6	4) State-approved 3rd party assessments	iReady Diagnostic Assessment, ELA 6
7	4) State-approved 3rd party assessments	iReady Diagnostic Assessment, ELA 7
8	4) State-approved 3rd party assessments	iReady Diagnostic Assessment, ELA 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 target goals set throughout the local measures will be based on this year's achievement results on each assessment. The achievement targets will be based on consideration of prior academic history on these assessments.
Highly Effective (14 - 15 points) Results are well above District- or BOCES-adopted expectations for growth or achievement for grade/subject.	89% of students or more will meet or exceed their target goal on the summative assessment. 93-100% of students who meet their target will result in 15 points; 89-92%=14 points.
Effective (8- 13 points) Results meet District- or BOCES-adopted expectations for growth or achievement for grade/subject.	80-88% of students will meet or exceed their target goal on the summative assessment. 87-88%=13 pts; 85-86%=12 pts; 83-84%=11 pts; 82%=10 pts; 81%=9 pts; 80%=8 pts.
Developing (3 - 7 points) Results are below District- or BOCES-adopted expectations for growth or achievement for grade/subject.	68-79% of students will meet or exceed their target goal on the summative assessment. 77-79%=7 pts; 74-76%=6 pts; 72-73%=5 pts; 70-71%=4 pts; 68-69%=3 pts.
Ineffective (0 - 2 points) Results are well below District- or BOCES-adopted expectations for growth or achievement for grade/subject.	67% or fewer students will meet or exceed their target goal on the summative assessment. 60-67%=2 pts; 51-59%=1 pt; 50% and below = 0 pts.

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	4) State-approved 3rd party assessments	iReady Diagnostic Assessment, Math 4
5	4) State-approved 3rd party assessments	iReady Diagnostic Assessment, Math 5
6	4) State-approved 3rd party assessments	iReady Diagnostic Assessment, Math 6
7	4) State-approved 3rd party assessments	iReady Diagnostic Assessment, Math 7
8	4) State-approved 3rd party assessments	iReady Diagnostic Assessment, Math 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 target goals set throughout the local measures will be based on this year's achievement results on each assessment. The achievement targets will be based on consideration of prior academic history on these assessments.
--	--

Highly Effective (14 - 15 points) Results are well above District- or BOCES-adopted expectations for growth or achievement for grade/subject.	89% of students or more will meet or exceed their target goal on the summative assessment. 93-100% of students who meet their target will result in 15 points; 89-92%=14 points.
Effective (8- 13 points) Results meet District- or BOCES-adopted expectations for growth or achievement for grade/subject.	80-88% of students will meet or exceed their target goal on the summative assessment. 87-88%=13 pts; 85-86%=12 pts; 83-84%=11 pts; 82%=10 pts; 81%=9 pts; 80%=8 pts.
Developing (3 - 7 points) Results are below District- or BOCES-adopted expectations for growth or achievement for grade/subject.	68-79% of students will meet or exceed their target goal on the summative assessment. 77-79%=7 pts; 74-76%=6 pts; 72-73%=5 pts; 70-71%=4 pts; 68-69%=3 pts.
Ineffective (0 - 2 points) Results are well below District- or BOCES-adopted expectations for growth or achievement for grade/subject.	67% or fewer students will meet or exceed their target goal on the summative assessment. 60-67%=2 pts; 51-59%=1 pt; 50% and below = 0 pts.

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.

(No response)

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	4) State-approved 3rd party assessments	iReady Diagnostic Assessment, ELA 3
1	4) State-approved 3rd party assessments	iReady Diagnostic Assessment, ELA 1
2	4) State-approved 3rd party assessments	iReady Diagnostic Assessment, ELA 2
3	4) State-approved 3rd party assessments	iReady Diagnostic Assessment, ELA 3

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

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

Use this box, if needed, to describe the general process for assigning HEDI categories for these grades/subjects in this subcomponent. If needed, you may upload a table or graphic at 3.13, below.	The target goals set throughout the local measures will be based on this year's achievement results on each assessment. The achievement targets will be based on consideration of prior academic history on these assessments.
Highly Effective (18-20 points) Results are well above District- or BOCES-adopted expectations for growth or achievement for grade/subject.	89% of students or more will meet or exceed their target goal on the summative assessment. 95-100% of students who meet their target will result in 20 points; 92-94%=19 points; 89-91%=18 points.

Effective (9-17 points) Results meet District- or BOCES-adopted expectations for growth or achievement for grade/subject.	80-88% of students will meet or exceed their target goal on the summative assessment. 88%=17 pts; 87%=16 pts; 86%=15 pts; 85%=14 pts; 84%=13 pts; 83%=12 pts; 82%=11 pts; 81%=10 pts; 80%=9 pts.
Developing (3 - 8 points) Results are below District- or BOCES-adopted expectations for growth or achievement for grade/subject.	68-79% of students will meet or exceed their target goal on the summative assessment. 78-79%=8 pts; 76-77%=7 pts; 74-75%=6 pts; 72-73%=5 pts; 70-71%=4 pts; 68-69%=3 pts.
Ineffective (0 - 2 points) Results are well below District- or BOCES-adopted expectations for growth or achievement for grade/subject.	67% or fewer students will meet or exceed their target goal on the summative assessment. 60-67%=2 pts; 51-59%=1 pt; 50% and below = 0 pts.

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	4) State-approved 3rd party assessments	iReady Diagnostic Assessment, Math K
1	4) State-approved 3rd party assessments	iReady Diagnostic Assessment, Math 1
2	4) State-approved 3rd party assessments	iReady Diagnostic Assessment, Math 2
3	4) State-approved 3rd party assessments	iReady Diagnostic Assessment, Math 3

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

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

Use this box, if needed, to describe the general process for assigning HEDI categories for these grades/subjects in this subcomponent. If needed, you may upload a table or graphic at 3.13, below.	The target goals set throughout the local measures will be based on this year's achievement results on each assessment. The achievement targets will be based on consideration of prior academic history on these assessments.
Highly Effective (18-20 points) Results are well above District- or BOCES-adopted expectations for growth or achievement for grade/subject.	89% of students or more will meet or exceed their target goal on the summative assessment. 95-100% of students who meet their target will result in 20 points; 92-94%=19 points; 89-91%=18 points.
Effective (9-17 points) Results meet District- or BOCES-adopted expectations for growth or achievement for grade/subject.	80-88% of students will meet or exceed their target goal on the summative assessment. 88%=17 pts; 87%=16 pts; 86%=15 pts; 85%=14 pts; 84%=13 pts; 83%=12 pts; 82%=11 pts; 81%=10 pts; 80%=9 pts.
Developing (3 - 8 points) Results are below District -or BOCES-adopted expectations for growth or achievement for grade/subject.	68-79% of students will meet or exceed their target goal on the summative assessment. 78-79%=8 pts; 76-77%=7 pts; 74-75%=6 pts; 72-73%=5 pts; 70-71%=4 pts; 68-69%=3 pts.
Ineffective (0 - 2 points) Results are well below District- or BOCES-adopted expectations for growth or achievement for grade/subject.	67% or fewer students will meet or exceed their target goal on the summative assessment. 60-67%=2 pts; 51-59%=1 pt; 50% and below = 0 pts.

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

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

Use this box, if needed, to describe the general process for assigning HEDI categories for these grades/subjects in this subcomponent. If needed, you may upload a table or graphic at 3.13, below.	The target goals set throughout the local measures will be based on this year's achievement results on each assessment. The achievement targets will be based on consideration of prior academic history on these assessments.
Highly Effective (18 - 20 points) Results are well above District- or BOCES-adopted expectations for growth or achievement for grade/subject.	89% of students or more will meet or exceed their target goal on the summative assessment. 95-100% of students who meet their target will result in 20 points; 92-94%=19 points; 89-91%=18 points.
Effective (9 - 17 points) Results meet District- or BOCES-adopted expectations for growth or achievement for grade/subject.	80-88% of students will meet or exceed their target goal on the summative assessment. 88%=17 pts; 87%=16 pts; 86%=15 pts; 85%=14 pts; 84%=13 pts; 83%=12 pts; 82%=11 pts; 81%=10 pts; 80%=9 pts.
Developing (3 - 8 points) Results are below District- or BOCES-adopted expectations for growth or achievement for grade/subject.	68-79% of students will meet or exceed their target goal on the summative assessment. 78-79%=8 pts; 76-77%=7 pts; 74-75%=6 pts; 72-73%=5 pts; 70-71%=4 pts; 68-69%=3 pts.
Ineffective (0 - 2 points) Results are well below District- or BOCES-adopted expectations for growth or achievement for grade/subject.	67% or fewer students will meet or exceed their target goal on the summative assessment. 60-67%=2 pts; 51-59%=1 pt; 50% and below = 0 pts.

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	RCS Grade 6 SS SLO Assessment
7	5) District, regional, or BOCES–developed assessments	RCS Grade 7 SS SLO Assessment
8	5) District, regional, or BOCES–developed assessments	RCS Grade 8 SS SLO Assessment

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

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

Use this box, if needed, to describe the general process for assigning HEDI categories for these grades/subjects in this subcomponent. If needed, you may upload a table or graphic at 3.13, below.	The target goals set throughout the local measures will be based on this year's achievement results on each assessment. The achievement targets will be based on consideration of prior academic history on these assessments.
Highly Effective (18 - 20 points) Results are well above District- or BOCES-adopted expectations for growth or achievement for grade/subject.	89% of students or more will meet or exceed their target goal on the summative assessment. 95-100% of students who meet their target will result in 20 points; 92-94%=19 points; 89-91%=18 points.
Effective (9 - 17 points) Results meet District- or BOCES-adopted expectations for growth or achievement for grade/subject.	80-88% of students will meet or exceed their target goal on the summative assessment. 88%=17 pts; 87%=16 pts; 86%=15 pts; 85%=14 pts; 84%=13 pts; 83%=12 pts; 82%=11 pts; 81%=10 pts; 80%=9 pts.
Developing (3 - 8 points) Results are below District- or BOCES-adopted expectations for growth or achievement for grade/subject.	68-79% of students will meet or exceed their target goal on the summative assessment. 78-79%=8 pts; 76-77%=7 pts; 74-75%=6 pts; 72-73%=5 pts; 70-71%=4 pts; 68-69%=3 pts.
Ineffective (0 - 2 points) Results are well below District- or BOCES-adopted expectations for growth or achievement for grade/subject.	67% or fewer students will meet or exceed their target goal on the summative assessment. 60-67%=2 pts; 51-59%=1 pt; 50% and below = 0 pts.

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	RCS Global 1 SLO Assessment
Global 2	3) Teacher specific achievement or growth score computed locally	Global Studies Regents
American History	3) Teacher specific achievement or growth score computed locally	American History Regents

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

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

Use this box, if needed, to describe the general process for assigning HEDI categories for these grades/subjects in this subcomponent. If needed, you may upload a table or graphic at 3.13, below.	The target goals set throughout the local measures will be based on this year's achievement results on each assessment. The achievement targets will be based on consideration of prior academic history on these assessments.
Highly Effective (18 - 20 points) Results are well above District- or BOCES-adopted expectations for growth or achievement for grade/subject.	89% of students or more will meet or exceed their target goal on the summative assessment. 95-100% of students who meet their target will result in 20 points; 92-94%=19 points; 89-91%=18 points.

Effective (9 - 17 points) Results meet District- or BOCES-adopted expectations for growth or achievement for grade/subject.	80-88% of students will meet or exceed their target goal on the summative assessment. 88%=17 pts; 87%=16 pts; 86%=15 pts; 85%=14 pts; 84%=13 pts; 83%=12 pts; 82%=11 pts; 81%=10 pts; 80%=9 pts.
Developing (3 - 8 points) Results are below District- or BOCES-adopted expectations for growth or achievement for grade/subject.	68-79% of students will meet or exceed their target goal on the summative assessment. 78-79%=8 pts; 76-77%=7 pts; 74-75%=6 pts; 72-73%=5 pts; 70-71%=4 pts; 68-69%=3 pts.
Ineffective (0 - 2 points) Results are well below District- or BOCES-adopted expectations for growth or achievement for grade/subject.	67% or fewer students will meet or exceed their target goal on the summative assessment. 60-67%=2 pts; 51-59%=1 pt; 50% and below = 0 pts.

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	LE Regents
Earth Science	3) Teacher specific achievement or growth score computed locally	Earth Science Regents
Chemistry	3) Teacher specific achievement or growth score computed locally	Chemistry Regents
Physics	3) Teacher specific achievement or growth score computed locally	Physics Regents

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

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

Use this box, if needed, to describe the general process for assigning HEDI categories for these grades/subjects in this subcomponent. If needed, you may upload a table or graphic at 3.13, below.	The target goals set throughout the local measures will be based on this year's achievement results on each assessment. The achievement targets will be based on consideration of prior academic history on these assessments.
Highly Effective (18-20 points) Results are well above District- or BOCES-adopted expectations for growth or achievement for grade/subject.	89% of students or more will meet or exceed their target goal on the summative assessment. 95-100% of students who meet their target will result in 20 points; 92-94%=19 points; 89-91%=18 points.
Developing (3 - 8 points) Results are below District- or BOCES-adopted expectations for growth or achievement for grade/subject.	80-88% of students will meet or exceed their target goal on the summative assessment. 88%=17 pts; 87%=16 pts; 86%=15 pts; 85%=14 pts; 84%=13 pts; 83%=12 pts; 82%=11 pts; 81%=10 pts; 80%=9 pts.
Effective (9 - 17points) Results meet District- or BOCES-adopted expectations for growth or achievement for grade/subject.	68-79% of students will meet or exceed their target goal on the summative assessment. 78-79%=8 pts; 76-77%=7 pts; 74-75%=6 pts; 72-73%=5 pts; 70-71%=4 pts; 68-69%=3 pts.
Ineffective (0 - 2 points) Results are well below District- or BOCES-adopted expectations for growth or achievement for	67% or fewer students will meet or exceed their target goal on the summative assessment. 60-67%=2 pts; 51-59%=1 pt; 50%

grade/subject.

and below = 0 pts.

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 1 Regents
Geometry	3) Teacher specific achievement or growth score computed locally	Geometry Regents
Algebra 2	3) Teacher specific achievement or growth score computed locally	Algebra 2 Regents

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

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

Use this box, if needed, to describe the general process for assigning HEDI categories for these grades/subjects in this subcomponent. If needed, you may upload a table or graphic at 3.13, below.	The target goals set throughout the local measures will be based on this year's achievement results on each assessment. The achievement targets will be based on consideration of prior academic history on these assessments.
Highly Effective (18 - 20 points) Results are well above District- or BOCES-adopted expectations for growth or achievement for grade/subject.	89% of students or more will meet or exceed their target goal on the summative assessment. 95-100% of students who meet their target will result in 20 points; 92-94%=19 points; 89-91%=18 points.
Effective (9 - 17 points) Results meet District- or BOCES-adopted expectations for growth or achievement for grade/subject.	80-88% of students will meet or exceed their target goal on the summative assessment. 88%=17 pts; 87%=16 pts; 86%=15 pts; 85%=14 pts; 84%=13 pts; 83%=12 pts; 82%=11 pts; 81%=10 pts; 80%=9 pts.
Developing (3 - 8 points) Results are below District- or BOCES-adopted expectations for growth or achievement for grade/subject.	68-79% of students will meet or exceed their target goal on the summative assessment. 78-79%=8 pts; 76-77%=7 pts; 74-75%=6 pts; 72-73%=5 pts; 70-71%=4 pts; 68-69%=3 pts.
Ineffective (0 - 2 points) Results are well below District- or BOCES-adopted expectations for growth or achievement for grade/subject.	67% or fewer students will meet or exceed their target goal on the summative assessment. 60-67%=2 pts; 51-59%=1 pt; 50% and below = 0 pts.

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	RCS Grade 9 SLO Assessment
Grade 10 ELA	5) District, regional, or BOCES–developed assessments	RCS Grade 10 SLO Assessment
Grade 11 ELA	3) Teacher specific achievement or growth score computed locally	Comprehensive ELA Regents

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

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

Use this box, if needed, to describe the general process for assigning HEDI categories for these grades/subjects in this subcomponent. If needed, you may upload a table or graphic at 3.13, below.	The target goals set throughout the local measures will be based on this year's achievement results on each assessment. The achievement targets will be based on consideration of prior academic history on these assessments.
Highly Effective (18 - 20 points) Results are well above District- or BOCES-adopted expectations for growth or achievement for grade/subject.	89% of students or more will meet or exceed their target goal on the summative assessment. 95-100% of students who meet their target will result in 20 points; 92-94%=19 points; 89-91%=18 points.
Effective (9 - 17 points) Results meet District- or BOCES-adopted expectations for growth or achievement for grade/subject.	80-88% of students will meet or exceed their target goal on the summative assessment. 88%=17 pts; 87%=16 pts; 86%=15 pts; 85%=14 pts; 84%=13 pts; 83%=12 pts; 82%=11 pts; 81%=10 pts; 80%=9 pts.
Developing (3 - 8 points) Results are below District- or BOCES-adopted expectations for growth or achievement for grade/subject.	68-79% of students will meet or exceed their target goal on the summative assessment. 78-79%=8 pts; 76-77%=7 pts; 74-75%=6 pts; 72-73%=5 pts; 70-71%=4 pts; 68-69%=3 pts.
Ineffective (0 - 2 points) Results are well below District- or BOCES-adopted expectations for growth or achievement for grade/subject.	67% or fewer students will meet or exceed their target goal on the summative assessment. 60-67%=2 pts; 51-59%=1 pt; 50% and below = 0 pts.

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
Grade 7 Art	5) District/regional/BOCES–developed	RCS Gr. 7 Art SLO Assessment
Grade 8 Art	5) District/regional/BOCES–developed	RCS Gr. 8 Art SLO Assessment
JH Chorus	5) District/regional/BOCES–developed	RCS JH Chorus SLO Assessment
HS Chorus	5) District/regional/BOCES–developed	RCS HS Chorus SLO Assessment
Grade 7 Health	5) District/regional/BOCES–developed	RCS Health 7 SLO Assessment
HS Health	5) District/regional/BOCES–developed	RCS HS Health SLO Assessment
Grade 7 Home and Careers	5) District/regional/BOCES–developed	RCS H&C 7 SLO Assessment

Grade 8 Home and Careers	5) District/regional/BOCES–developed	RCS H&C 8 SLO Assessment
Spanish III	5) District/regional/BOCES–developed	RCS Spanish III SLO Assessment
Spanish IIB	5) District/regional/BOCES–developed	RCS Spanish IIB SLO Assessment
Grade 8 Library Skills	5) District/regional/BOCES–developed	RCS Library Skills 8 SLO Assessment
Grade 8 Technology	5) District/regional/BOCES–developed	RCS Technology 8 SLO Assessment
Lego Mindstream	5) District/regional/BOCES–developed	RCS Lego Mindstream SLO Assessment
Multimedia	5) District/regional/BOCES–developed	RCS Multimedia SLO Assessment
3rd Grade Keyboarding	5) District/regional/BOCES–developed	RCS Grade 3 Keyboarding SLO Assessment
7th Grade Phys. Ed (girls)	5) District/regional/BOCES–developed	RCS Grade 7 Phys. Ed SLO Assessment
8th Grade Phys. Ed (girls)	5) District/regional/BOCES–developed	RCS Grade 8 Phys. Ed SLO Assessment
7th Grade Phys. Ed (boys)	5) District/regional/BOCES–developed	RCS Grade 7 Phys. Ed SLO Assessment
8th Grade Phys. Ed (boys)	5) District/regional/BOCES–developed	RCS Grade 8 Phys. Ed SLO Assessment
Spanish IA	5) District/regional/BOCES–developed	RCS Spanish IA SLO Assessment

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

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

Use this box, if needed, to describe the general process for assigning HEDI categories for these grades/subjects in this subcomponent. If needed, you may upload a table or graphic at 3.13, below.	The target goals set throughout the local measures will be based on this year's achievement results on each assessment. The achievement targets will be based on consideration of prior academic history on these assessments.
Highly Effective (18 - 20 points) Results are well above District- or BOCES -adopted expectations for growth or achievement for grade/subject.	89% of students or more will meet or exceed their target goal on the summative assessment. 95-100% of students who meet their target will result in 20 points; 92-94%=19 points; 89-91%=18 points.
Effective (9 - 17 points) Results meet District- or BOCES-adopted expectations for growth or achievement for grade/subject.	80-88% of students will meet or exceed their target goal on the summative assessment. 88%=17 pts; 87%=16 pts; 86%=15 pts; 85%=14 pts; 84%=13 pts; 83%=12 pts; 82%=11 pts; 81%=10 pts; 80%=9 pts.
Developing (3 - 8 points) Results are below District- or BOCES-adopted expectations for growth or achievement for grade/subject.	68-79% of students will meet or exceed their target goal on the summative assessment. 78-79%=8 pts; 76-77%=7 pts; 74-75%=6 pts; 72-73%=5 pts; 70-71%=4 pts; 68-69%=3 pts.
Ineffective (0 - 2 points) Results are well below District- or BOCES-adopted expectations for growth or achievement for grade/subject.	67% or fewer students will meet or exceed their target goal on the summative assessment. 60-67%=2 pts; 51-59%=1 pt; 50% and below = 0 pts.

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.

(No response)

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.

The following methodology will be used to adjust teacher scores based on student attendance as reported by period in PowerSchool. The steps are:

- 1. Multiply each students' assessment score by the number of days they were in attendance*
- 2. Sum step 1 scores for an all student number*
- 3. Sum all days attended by student group*
- 4. Divide step 2 by step 3*

This will NOT result in an adjustment to a teacher's HEDI score of more than two (2) points.

In addition the District follows Policy #7110 Comprehensive Student Attendance Policy for its plan to improve student attendance.

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.

Any time there is more than one locally selected measure, each locally selected measure will be counted as a proportion of the students it represents.

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

10. Composite Scoring (Principals)

Created Tuesday, June 05, 2012

Updated Friday, June 15, 2012

Page 1

Standards for Rating Categories

Growth or Comparable Measures

Locally-selected Measures of

growth or achievement

Other Measures of Effectiveness

(Teacher and Leader standards)

Highly

Effective

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

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

Overall performance and results exceed ISLLC leadership standards.

Effective

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

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

Overall performance and results meet ISLLC leadership standards.

Developing

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

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

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

Ineffective

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

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

Overall performance and results do not meet ISLLC leadership standards.

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

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

2012-13 where there is no Value-Added measure

Growth or Comparable Measures

Locally-selected Measures of

growth or achievement

Other Measures of Effectiveness

(60 points)

Overall

Composite Score

Highly Effective

18-20

18-20

Ranges determined locally--see below

91-100

Effective

9-17

9-17

75-90

Developing

3-8

3-8

65-74

Ineffective

0-2

0-2

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

Highly Effective	59-60
Effective	57-58
Developing	8-56
Ineffective	0-7

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

6. Additional Requirements - Teachers

Created Thursday, May 24, 2012

Updated Tuesday, October 02, 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/5265/132887-Df0w3Xx5v6/TIP Plan_1.docx](#)

6.3) Appeals Process

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

(1) the substance of the annual professional performance review

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

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

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

Appeals of Annual Professional Performance Reviews shall be limited to only those which rate a classroom teacher as ineffective or developing. A unit member may challenge only the substance of the Annual Professional Performance Review, the District's adherence to the standards and methodologies required for such Annual Professional Performance Review, the District's compliance with its procedures for conducting the Annual Professional Performance Review, or its issuance and/or implementation of the terms of the Teacher Improvement Plan.

Such challenge must be submitted in writing to the Administrator performing the Annual Professional Performance Review or Teacher Improvement Plan. There may be only one appeal submitted in relation to any particular Annual Professional Performance Review or Teacher Improvement Plan. The writing must explain in detail the specific basis for the challenge, and must provide any relevant supporting documentation. Any grounds not raised in the appeal shall be deemed waived. The appeal must be submitted within fifteen (15) calendar days of the issuance of the Annual Professional Performance Review or Teacher Improvement Plan or it is deemed waived. The teacher has the burden of demonstrating a clear legal right to the relief requested and the burden of establishing the facts upon which such relief is sought.

Within ten (10) calendar days of receipt of the challenge, the Administrator conducting the Annual Professional Performance Review or Teacher Improvement Plan shall submit a written determination. If the teacher received an "ineffective" rating and disagrees with the determination, the teacher may submit a copy of the challenge, the determination, and a written statement explaining in detail the basis for disagreement with the determination, with any relevant supporting documentation, to the Superintendent of Schools. Upon receipt of a challenge, the Superintendent then has ten (10) calendar days in which to convene a Third Party Panel consisting of one representative chosen by the Association, one representative chosen by the Superintendent and the third representative to be mutually chosen by the parties. If the third representative cannot be mutually chosen, then each party will submit three (3) names from which one will be randomly selected. The parties further agree that such panel (a) shall hear appeals in a timely manner after the appeal is made, (b) shall issue a decision regarding the appeal within ten (10) week days after the appeal meeting. If the Third Party Panel does not reach a unanimous decision, the appeal is moved to the Superintendent of Schools for a final decision. A challenge or determination under this section shall be exempt from the grievance and arbitration provisions in the collective negotiations agreement between the Parties, and may not be challenged in any other forum.

Where and to the extent applicable, the Annual Professional Performance Review of classroom teachers shall be a significant factor for employment decisions and teacher development as determined by the District, and will be subject to any procedures which may in the future be negotiated by the District and the Association in compliance with Ed Law 3012-c.

Nothing in this Memorandum of Agreement shall in any way restrict or affect the District's non-reviewable authority to terminate the appointment of or deny tenure to a probationary teacher, in compliance with the requirements of Education Law 3012-c and any such termination or denial shall not in any way be subject to challenge through the grievance and arbitration provisions of the collective negotiations agreement between the Parties or in any other forum.

The following form/process will also be used for notification of composite scores:

Randolph Central School Composite Score Notification

To be completed and signed prior to the last day of the school year.

As a result of classroom observation and evidence collection it has been determined that your rating is _____ out of 60 points for the Danielson Evaluation portion of the composite score.

Teacher Date Administrator Date

Once your total composite score is determined with the inclusion of the remaining 40 points, there is a possibility of the creation of a Teacher Improvement Plan for next school year if your overall composite score is in the ineffective or developing range. The final determination of your overall rating and the implementation of a TIP will be after the District has received and distributed your composite score.*

(Optional to be included on low scores) Based on your score out of 60 points which indicates it's likely you'll be overall ineffective or developing, at this time the District is recommending the following staff development courses be taken during the summer recess:

**If composite scores are not received from NYSED preceding the end of the school year, TOTAL composite scores will not be delivered from the District until the first day of school or September 1, whichever is earlier, so that timelines may be adhered to in a possible appeal process without the difficulties presented in bringing parties together in July and August.*

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.

In addition to the ten+ full days per year of training received from the Catt/Alle BOCES Network Team, RCS Lead Evaluators and Evaluators contracted with the Candi McKay Consulting Group for in-District training that consisted of four full days. For the 2012-13 school year, we have purchased the Teachscape program and all evaluators will complete the Teachscape training and testing for certification.

Our lead evaluators are certified at the conclusion of training and are tested through Teachscape so that those who successfully complete the testing will be certified. Certification using Teachscape training modules and testing allows us to insure inter-rater reliability.

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

Annual Professional Performance Reviews: 2012-13

Created Thursday, May 17, 2012

Updated Tuesday, August 21, 2012

1

Disclaimers

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

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

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

1. SCHOOL DISTRICT INFORMATION

1.1) School District's BEDS Number : 043001040000

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

043001040000

1.2) School District Name: RANDOLPH CSD

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

RANDOLPH CSD

1.3) School Improvement Grant (SIG) Districts Only

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

(No response)

1.4) Award Classification

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

(No response)

1.5) Assurances

Please check all of the boxes below:

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

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

Re-submission to address deficiencies

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

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

Annual (2012-13)

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

Created Thursday, May 17, 2012

Updated Tuesday, August 21, 2012

Page 1

STATE-PROVIDED MEASURES OF STUDENT GROWTH

(25 points with an approved value-added measure)

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

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

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

2.1) Assurances

Please check the boxes below:

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

STUDENT LEARNING OBJECTIVES AS COMPARABLE GROWTH MEASURES (20 points)

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

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

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

If no State assessment or Regents exam exists:

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

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

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

State assessments, *required if one exists*

List of State-approved 3rd party assessments

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

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

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

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

2.2) Grades K-3 ELA

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

	ELA	Assessment
K	State-approved 3rd party assessment	iReady Diagnostic Assessment, ELA K
1	State-approved 3rd party assessment	iReadyDiagnostic Assessment, ELA 1
2	State-approved 3rd party assessment	iReady Diagnostic Assessment, ELA 2

	ELA	Assessment
3	State assessment	3rd Grade State Assessment

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

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

Based on the baseline data of the pre-assessment, targeted growth goals will be set for bands of students.

subcomponent. If needed, you may upload a table or graphic at 2.11, below.	
Highly Effective (18 - 20 points) Results are well-above state average for similar students (or District goals if no state test).	89% of students or more will meet or exceed their target goal on the summative assessment. 95-100% of students who meet their target will result in 20 points; 92-94%=19 points; 89-91%=18 points.
Effective (9 - 17 points) Results meet state average for similar students (or District goals if no state test).	80-88% of students will meet or exceed their target goal on the summative assessment. 88%=17 pts; 87%=16 pts; 86%=15 pts; 85%=14 pts; 84%=13 pts; 83%=12 pts; 82%=11 pts; 81%=10 pts; 80%=9 pts.
Developing (3 - 8 points) Results are below state average for similar students (or District goals if no state test).	68-79% of students will meet or exceed their target goal on the summative assessment. 78-79%=8 pts; 76-77%=7 pts; 74-75%=6 pts; 72-73%=5 pts; 70-71%=4 pts; 68-69%=3 pts.
Ineffective (0 - 2 points) Results are well-below state average for similar students (or District goals if no state test).	67% or fewer students will meet or exceed their target goal on the summative assessment. 60-67%=2 pts; 51-59%=1 pt; 50% and below = 0 pts.

2.3) Grades K-3 Math

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

	Math	Assessment
K	State-approved 3rd party assessment	iReady Diagnostic Assessment, Math K
1	State-approved 3rd party assessment	iReady Diagnostic Assessment, Math 1
2	State-approved 3rd party assessment	iReady Diagnostic Assessment, Math 2
	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.	Based on the baseline data of the pre-assessment, targeted growth goals will be set for bands of students.
Highly Effective (18 - 20 points) Results are well-above state average for similar students (or District goals if no state test).	89% of students or more will meet or exceed their target goal on the summative assessment. 95-100% of students who meet their target will result in 20 points; 92-94%=19 points; 89-91%=18 points.
Effective (9 - 17 points) Results meet state average for similar students (or District goals if no state test).	80-88% of students will meet or exceed their target goal on the summative assessment. 88%=17 pts; 87%=16 pts; 86%=15 pts; 85%=14 pts; 84%=13 pts; 83%=12 pts; 82%=11 pts; 81%=10 pts; 80%=9 pts.
Developing (3 - 8 points) Results are below state average for similar students (or District goals if no state test).	68-79% of students will meet or exceed their target goal on the summative assessment

78-79%=8 pts; 76-77%=7 pts; 74-75%=6 pts; 72-73%=5 pts; 70-71%=4 pts; 68-69%=3 pts.

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

67% or fewer students will meet or exceed their target goal on the summative assessment.

60-67%=2 pts; 51-59%=1 pt; 50% and below = 0 pts.

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	RCS Grade 6 Science SLO Assessment
7	District, regional or BOCES-developed assessment	RCS Grade 7 Science SLO Assessment
	Science	Assessment
8	State assessment	8th Grade State Science Assessment

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

Use this box, if needed, to describe the general process for assigning HEDI categories for these grades/subjects in this subcomponent. If needed, you may upload a table or graphic at 2.11, below.	Based on the baseline data of the pre-assessment, targeted growth goals will be set for bands of students.
Highly Effective (18 - 20 points) Results are well-above state average for similar students (or District goals if no state test).	89% of students or more will meet or exceed their target goal on the summative assessment. 95-100% of students who meet their target will result in 20 points; 92-94%=19 points; 89-91%=18 points.
Effective (9 - 17 points) Results meet state average for similar students (or District goals if no state test).	80-88% of students will meet or exceed their target goal on the summative assessment. 88%=17 pts; 87%=16 pts; 86%=15 pts; 85%=14 pts; 84%=13 pts; 83%=12 pts; 82%=11 pts; 81%=10 pts; 80%=9 pts.
Developing (3 - 8 points) Results are below state average for similar students (or District goals if no state test).	68-79% of students will meet or exceed their target goal on the summative assessment. 78-79%=8 pts; 76-77%=7 pts; 74-75%=6 pts; 72-73%=5 pts; 70-71%=4 pts; 68-69%=3 pts.
Ineffective (0 - 2 points) Results are well-below state average for similar students (or District goals if no state test).	67% or fewer students will meet or exceed their target goal on the summative assessment. 60-67%=2 pts; 51-59%=1 pt; 50% and below = 0 pts.

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	RCS Grade 6 SS SLO Assessment

7	District, regional or BOCES-developed assessment	RCS Grade 7 SS SLO Assessment
8	District, regional or BOCES-developed assessment	RCS Grade 8 SS SLO 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.	Based on the baseline data of the pre-assessment, targeted growth goals will be set for bands of students.
Highly Effective (18 - 20 points) Results are well-above District goals for similar students.	89% of students or more will meet or exceed their target goal on the summative assessment. 95-100% of students who meet their target will result in 20 points; 92-94%=19 points; 89-91%=18 points.
Effective (9 - 17 points) Results meet District goals for similar students.	80-88% of students will meet or exceed their target goal on the summative assessment. 88%=17 pts; 87%=16 pts; 86%=15 pts; 85%=14 pts; 84%=13 pts; 83%=12 pts; 82%=11 pts; 81%=10 pts; 80%=9 pts.
Developing (3 - 8 points) Results are below District goals for similar students.	68-79% of students will meet or exceed their target goal on the summative assessment. 78-79%=8 pts; 76-77%=7 pts; 74-75%=6 pts; 72-73%=5 pts; 70-71%=4 pts; 68-69%=3 pts.
Ineffective (0 - 2 points) Results are well-below District goals for similar students.	67% or fewer students will meet or exceed their target goal on the summative assessment. 60-67%=2 pts; 51-59%=1 pt; 50% and below = 0 pts.

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	RCS Global 1 SLO Assessment
	Social Studies Regents Courses	Assessment
Global 2	Regents assessment	Regents assessment
American History	Regents assessment	Regents assessment

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

Use this box, if needed, to describe the general process for assigning HEDI categories for these grades/subjects in this	Based on the baseline data of the pre-assessment, targeted growth goals will be set for bands of students.
--	--

subcomponent. If needed, you may upload a table or graphic at 2.11, below.	
Highly Effective (18 - 20 points) Results are well-above District goals for similar students.	89% of students or more will meet or exceed their target goal on the summative assessment. 95-100% of students who meet their target will result in 20 points; 92-94%=19 points; 89-91%=18 points.
Effective (9 - 17 points) Results meet District goals for similar students.	80-88% of students will meet or exceed their target goal on the summative assessment. 88%=17 pts; 87%=16 pts; 86%=15 pts; 85%=14 pts; 84%=13 pts; 83%=12 pts; 82%=11 pts; 81%=10 pts; 80%=9 pts.
Developing (3 - 8 points) Results are below District goals for similar students.	68-79% of students will meet or exceed their target goal on the summative assessment. 78-79%=8 pts; 76-77%=7 pts; 74-75%=6 pts; 72-73%=5 pts; 70-71%=4 pts; 68-69%=3 pts.
Ineffective (0 - 2 points) Results are well-below District goals for similar students.	67% or fewer students will meet or exceed their target goal on the summative assessment. 60-67%=2 pts; 51-59%=1 pt; 50% and below = 0 pts.

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.	Based on the baseline data of the pre-assessment, targeted growth goals will be set for bands of students.
Highly Effective (18 - 20 points) Results are well-above District goals for similar students.	89% of students or more will meet or exceed their target goal on the summative assessment. 95-100% of students who meet their target will result in 20 points; 92-94%=19 points; 89-91%=18 points.
Effective (9 - 17 points) Results meet District goals for similar students.	80-88% of students will meet or exceed their target goal on the summative assessment. 88%=17 pts; 87%=16 pts; 86%=15 pts; 85%=14 pts; 84%=13 pts; 83%=12 pts; 82%=11 pts; 81%=10 pts; 80%=9 pts.
Developing (3 - 8 points) Results are below District goals for similar students.	68-79% of students will meet or exceed their target goal on the summative assessment.

78-79%=8 pts; 76-77%=7 pts; 74-75%=6 pts; 72-73%=5 pts;
70-71%=4 pts; 68-69%=3 pts.

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

67% or fewer students will meet or exceed their target goal on the summative assessment.

60-67%=2 pts; 51-59%=1 pt; 50% and below = 0 pts.

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.

Based on the baseline data of the pre-assessment, targeted growth goals will be set for bands of students.

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

89% of students or more will meet or exceed their target goal on the summative assessment.

95-100% of students who meet their target will result in 20 points; 92-94%=19 points; 89-91%=18 points.

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

80-88% of students will meet or exceed their target goal on the summative assessment.

88%=17 pts; 87%=16 pts; 86%=15 pts; 85%=14 pts; 84%=13 pts; 83%=12 pts; 82%=11 pts; 81%=10 pts; 80%=9 pts.

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

68-79% of students will meet or exceed their target goal on the summative assessment.

78-79%=8 pts; 76-77%=7 pts; 74-75%=6 pts; 72-73%=5 pts; 70-71%=4 pts; 68-69%=3 pts.

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

67% or fewer students will meet or exceed their target goal on the summative assessment.

60-67%=2 pts; 51-59%=1 pt; 50% and below = 0 pts.

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	RCS Grade 9 ELA SLO Assessment
Grade 10 ELA	District, regional or BOCES-developed assessment	RCS Grade 10 ELA SLO Assessment
Grade 11 ELA	Regents assessment	Regents assessment

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

Use this box, if needed, to describe the general process for assigning HEDI categories for these grades/subjects in this subcomponent. If needed, you may upload a table or graphic at 2.11, below.	Based on the baseline data of the pre-assessment, targeted growth goals will be set for bands of students.
Highly Effective (18 - 20 points) Results are well-above District goals for similar students.	89% of students or more will meet or exceed their target goal on the summative assessment. 95-100% of students who meet their target will result in 20 points; 92-94%=19 points; 89-91%=18 points.
Effective (9 - 17 points) Results meet District goals for similar students.	80-88% of students will meet or exceed their target goal on the summative assessment. 88%=17 pts; 87%=16 pts; 86%=15 pts; 85%=14 pts; 84%=13 pts; 83%=12 pts; 82%=11 pts; 81%=10 pts; 80%=9 pts.
Developing (3 - 8 points) Results are below District goals for similar students.	68-79% of students will meet or exceed their target goal on the summative assessment. 78-79%=8 pts; 76-77%=7 pts; 74-75%=6 pts; 72-73%=5 pts; 70-71%=4 pts; 68-69%=3 pts.
Ineffective (0 - 2 points) Results are well-below District goals for similar students.	67% or fewer students will meet or exceed their target goal on the summative assessment. 60-67%=2 pts; 51-59%=1 pt; 50% and below = 0 pts.

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
Grade 7 Art	District, Regional or BOCES-developed	RCS Gr. 7 Art SLO Assessment
Grade 8 Art	District, Regional or BOCES-developed	RCS Gr. 8 Art SLO Assessment
JH Chorus	District, Regional or BOCES-developed	RCS JH Chorus SLO Assessment
HS Chorus	District, Regional or BOCES-developed	RCS HS Chorus SLO Assessment
Grade 7 Health	District, Regional or BOCES-developed	RCS Health 7 SLO Assessment
High School Health	District, Regional or BOCES-developed	RCS HS Health SLO Assessment

Grade 7 Home and Careers	District, Regional or BOCES-developed	RCS H & C 7 SLO Assessment
Grade 8 Home and Careers	District, Regional or BOCES-developed	RCS H & C 8 SLO Assessment
Spanish III	District, Regional or BOCES-developed	RCS Spanish III SLO Assessment
Spanish IIB	District, Regional or BOCES-developed	RCS Spanish IIB SLO Assessment
Grade 8 Library Skills	District, Regional or BOCES-developed	RCS Library Skills 8 SLO Assessment
Grade 8 Technology	District, Regional or BOCES-developed	RCS Technology 8 SLO Assessment
Lego Mindstream	District, Regional or BOCES-developed	RCS Lego Mindstream SLO Assessment
Multimedia	District, Regional or BOCES-developed	RCS Multimedia SLO Assessment
3rd Grade Keyboarding	District, Regional or BOCES-developed	RCS Grade 3 Keyboarding SLO Assessment
7th Grade Phys. Ed (girls)	District, Regional or BOCES-developed	RCS Grade 7 Phys. Ed SLO Assessment
8th Grade Phys. Ed (girls)	District, Regional or BOCES-developed	RCS Grade 8 Phys. Ed SLO Assessment
7th Grade Phys. Ed (boys)	District, Regional or BOCES-developed	RCS Grade 7 Phys. Ed SLO Assessment
8th Grade Phys. Ed (boys)	District, Regional or BOCES-developed	RCS Grade 8 Phys. Ed SLO Assessment
Spanish IA	District, Regional or BOCES-developed	RCS Spanish 1A SLO Assessment

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.	Based on the baseline data of the pre-assessment, targeted growth goals will be set for bands of students.
Highly Effective (18 - 20 points) Results are well-above District goals for similar students.	89% of students or more will meet or exceed their target goal on the summative assessment. 95-100% of students who meet their target will result in 20 points; 92-94%=19 points; 89-91%=18 points.
Effective (9 - 17 points) Results meet District goals for similar students.	80-88% of students will meet or exceed their target goal on the summative assessment. 88%=17 pts; 87%=16 pts; 86%=15 pts; 85%=14 pts; 84%=13 pts; 83%=12 pts; 82%=11 pts; 81%=10 pts; 80%=9 pts.
Developing (3 - 8 points) Results are below District goals for similar students.	68-79% of students will meet or exceed their target goal on the summative assessment. 78-79%=8 pts; 76-77%=7 pts; 74-75%=6 pts; 72-73%=5 pts; 70-71%=4 pts; 68-69%=3 pts.

Ineffective (0 - 2 points) Results are well-below District goals for similar students.	67% or fewer students will meet or exceed their target goal on the summative assessment. 60-67%=2 pts; 51-59%=1 pt; 50% and below = 0 pts.
--	---

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)

assets/survey-uploads/5364/130615-avH4IQNZMh/Form_2_10_All_Other_SLOsCourse.doc

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.

(No response)

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.

NONE

2.13) Teachers with more than one growth measure

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

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

2.14) Assurances

Please check all of the boxes below:

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

2.14) Assurances Assure that procedures for ensuring data accuracy and integrity are being utilized.	Checked
2.14) Assurances Assure that district will develop SLOs according to the rules established by SED (see: http://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

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

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

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

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

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

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

- Assure that the evaluation system will be used as a significant factor for employment decisions and teacher and principal development
- Assure that the entire APPR plan will be completed for each teacher or principal as soon as practicable, but in no case later than September 1 of the school year next following the school year for which the classroom teacher or building principal's performance is being measured
- Assure that the district or BOCES will provide the teacher's or principal's score and rating on the locally selected measures subcomponent, if available, and on the other measures of teacher and principal effectiveness subcomponent for a teacher's or principal's annual professional performance review, in writing, no later than the last school day of the school year for which the teacher or principal is being measured
- Assure that the APPR plan will be posted on the district's or BOCES' website by September 10 or within 10 days after it is approved by the Commissioner, whichever is later
- Assure that accurate teacher and student data will be provided to the Commissioner in a format and timeline prescribed by the Commissioner
- Assure that the district or BOCES will report the individual subcomponent scores and the total composite effectiveness score for each classroom teacher and building principal in a manner prescribed by the Commissioner
- Certify that the district provides an opportunity for every classroom teacher and building principal to verify the subjects and/or student rosters assigned to them
- Assure that teachers and principals will receive timely and constructive feedback as part of the evaluation process
- Assure that any training course for lead evaluator certification addresses each of the requirements in the regulations, including specific considerations in evaluating teachers and principals of English Language Learners and students with disabilities

- Assure that educators who receive a Developing or Ineffective rating will receive a TIP or PIP plan, in accordance with the regulations, as soon as practicable but in no case later than 10 school days from the opening of classes in the school year following the performance year
- Assure that all evaluators and lead evaluators will be properly trained and that lead evaluators will be certified and recertified as necessary in accordance with the regulations
- Assure that the district or BOCES has appeal procedures that are consistent with the regulations and that they provide for the timely and expeditious resolution of an appeal
- Assure that, for teachers, all NYS Teaching Standards are assessed at least once per year, and, for principals, all Leadership Standards are assessed at least once per year
- Assure that it is possible for a teacher or principal to obtain each point in the scoring ranges, including 0 for each subcomponent and that the APPR Plan describes the process for assigning points for each subcomponent
- Assure that locally-selected measures are rigorous and comparable across all classrooms (for teachers, the same locally-selected measure is used across a subject and/or grade level; for principals, the same locally-selected measure must be used for all principals in the same or similar program or grade configuration)
- Assure that, if more than one type of locally-selected measure is used for different groups of teachers within a grade/subject, the measures are comparable based on the Standards of Educational and Psychological Testing
- Assure that, if more than one type of locally-selected measure is used for principals in the same or similar grade configuration or program, the measures are comparable based on the Standards of Educational and Psychological Testing
- Assure that the process for assigning points for all subcomponents and the composite scores will use the narrative HEDI descriptions described in the regulations to effectively differentiate educators' performance in ways that improve student learning and instruction
- Assure that district or BOCES will develop SLOs according to the rules and/or guidance established by SED and that past academic performance and / or baseline academic data of students is taken into account when developing an SLO
- Assure that Student Growth/Value Added Measure will be used where applicable
- Assure that any material changes to this APPR Plan will be submitted to the Commissioner for approval as soon as practicable and/or in a timeframe prescribed by the Commissioner
- Assure that this APPR Plan applies to all classroom teachers and building principals as defined in the regulation and SED guidance
- Assure that the district or BOCES will provide the Department with any information necessary to conduct annual monitoring pursuant to the regulations
- If this APPR Plan is being submitted subsequent to July 1, 2013, assure that this was the result of unresolved collective bargaining negotiations

Signatures, dates

Superintendent Signature: _____ Date: _____
Kimberly Moritz *9/17/13*

Teachers Union President Signature: _____ Date: _____
[Signature] *9/17/13*

Administrative Union President Signature: _____ Date: _____
[Signature] *9/17/13*

Board of Education President Signature: _____ Date: _____
[Signature] *9/17/13*