



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

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

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

January 12, 2013

Joseph Phelan, Superintendent  
Rhinebeck Central School District  
45 North Park Road  
PO Box 351  
Rhinebeck, NY 12572

Dear Superintendent Phelan:

Congratulations. I am pleased to inform you that your multi-year (2012-2014) 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: John C. Pennoyer

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

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

# Annual Professional Performance Reviews: 2012-13

Created Saturday, October 20, 2012

Updated Wednesday, January 02, 2013

---

## 1

### Disclaimers

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

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

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

### 1. SCHOOL DISTRICT INFORMATION

#### 1.1) School District's BEDS Number : 131801040000

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

*131801040000*

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

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

*Rhinebeck CSD*

#### 1.3) School Improvement Grant (SIG) Districts Only

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

*Not applicable*

#### 1.4) Award Classification

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

*(No response)*

## 1.5) Assurances

Please check all of the boxes below:

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

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

*Re-submission to address deficiencies*

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

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

2012-13, 2013-14

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

Created Saturday, October 20, 2012

Updated Friday, January 11, 2013

---

### Page 1

#### STATE-PROVIDED MEASURES OF STUDENT GROWTH

(25 points with an approved value-added measure)

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

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

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

#### 2.1) Assurances

Please check the boxes below:

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

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

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

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

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

If no State assessment or Regents exam exists:

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

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

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

State assessments, *required if one exists*

List of State-approved 3rd party assessments

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

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

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

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

## 2.2) Grades K-3 ELA

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

|   | ELA                                 | Assessment   |
|---|-------------------------------------|--|
| K | State-approved 3rd party assessment | Measures of Academic Progress (Primary Grades) ELA |
| 1 | State-approved 3rd party assessment | Measures of Academic Progress (Primary Grades) ELA |
| 2 | State-approved 3rd party assessment | Measures of Academic Progress (Primary Grades) ELA |

|   | ELA              | Assessment                 |
|---|------------------|----------------------------|
| 3 | State assessment | 3rd Grade State Assessment |

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

|   |   |
|---|---|
| Use this box, if needed, to describe the general process for assigning HEDI categories for these grades/subjects in | The Rhinebeck Central School District will be using the conditional growth index (CGI) based on the Measures of |
|---|---|

this subcomponent. If needed, you may upload a table or graphic at 2.11, below.

Academic Progress (Primary grades) ELA to calculate teacher-level effectiveness ratings for the comparable growth measures in ELA grades K-2. The conditional growth index captures the contributions educators make to student learning on the Measures of Academic Progress (Primary Grades) by comparing actual student growth to the student growth norms. These norms reflect the amount of growth that might be expected from these students based on their grade, subject, and starting RIT score. CGI scores are expressed in standard deviation units, or z-scores, with scores above zero indicating students exceeding the growth norms, and scores below zero indicating growth less than the growth norm. CGI scores are indicative of students meeting their growth norms.

To construct an evaluative rating, CGI scores for all students linked to a particular teacher will be averaged, with the average CGI score converted to the four-category HEDI range. The objective is to facilitate valid and fair comparisons of productivity with respect to student outcomes, given that teachers often serve very different student populations. Major modeling and score translation decisions were decided by a Technical Advisory panel made up of volunteer districts from across the state.

To assign teachers to HEDI categories, we will assume a normal distribution of teacher effects centered on 13. From this point, we will use the following cut points to assign teachers to categories:

Highly Effective: Greater than or equal to .9 standard deviations above average (13);

Effective: Less than .9 standard deviations above average and greater than or equal to -.9 standard deviations below average;

Developing: Less than -.9 standard deviations below average and greater than or equal to -2.1 standard deviations below average;

Ineffective: Less than -2.1 standard deviations below average.

For Grade 3 Assessment, student targets will be established by the teacher of record and approved by the principal, using baseline data from locally developed assessments based on the appropriate New York State and Common Core standards.

We will use the following cut points to assign teachers to categories:

Highly Effective - 85%-100% of student targets being met;

Effective - 54%-84% of student targets being met;

Developing- 28% - 53% of student targets being met;

Ineffective- 0% - 27% of student targets being met

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

Within the category of Highly Effective, for those teachers who fall at greater than or equal to .9 standard deviations above average, we further divide the distribution to determine specific points. The specific point breakdown, with upper and lower bounds denoted in standard deviation units, is as follows:  
 $\geq 0.9 / < 1.1 = 18$  APPR points

$\geq 1.1 / < 1.3 = 19$  APPR points

$\geq 1.3 = 20$  APPR points

For Grade 3 Assessment: Within the category of Highly Effective, those teachers who have from 85% to 100% of their student targets met will be awarded points as follows:  
85% - 90% of student targets met = 18 APPR points  
91% - 95% of student targets met = 19 APPR points  
96% - 100% of student targets met = 20 APPR points

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

Within the category of Effective, for those teachers who fall at less than .9 standard deviations above average and greater than or equal to -.9 standard deviations below average, we further divide the distribution to determine specific points. The specific point breakdown, with upper and lower bounds denoted in standard deviation units, is as follows:

$\geq -0.9 / < -0.7 = 9$  APPR points

$\geq -0.7 / < -0.5 = 10$  APPR points

$\geq -0.5 / < -0.3 = 11$  APPR points

$\geq -0.3 / < -0.1 = 12$  APPR points

$\geq -0.1 / < 0.1 = 13$  APPR points

$\geq 0.1 / < 0.3 = 14$  APPR points

$\geq 0.3 / < 0.5 = 15$  APPR points

$\geq 0.5 / < 0.7 = 16$  APPR points

$\geq 0.7 / < 0.9 = 17$  APPR points

For Grade 3 Assessment: Within the category of Effective, those teachers who have from 54% to 84% of their student targets met will be awarded points as follows:  
54% - 56% of student targets met = 9 APPR points  
57% - 59% of student targets met = 10 APPR points  
60% - 62% of student targets met = 11 APPR points  
63% - 64% of student targets met = 12 APPR points  
65% - 67% of student targets met = 13 APPR points  
68% - 70% of student targets met = 14 APPR points  
71% - 74% of student targets met = 15 APPR points  
75% - 78% of student targets met = 16 APPR points  
79% - 84% of student targets met = 17 APPR points

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

Within the category of Developing, for those teachers who fall at less than -.9 standard deviations below average and greater than or equal to -2.1 standard deviations below average, we further divide the distribution to determine specific points. The specific point breakdown, with upper and lower bounds denoted in standard deviation units, is as follows:

$\geq -2.1 / < -1.9 = 3$  APPR points

$\geq -1.9 / < -1.7 = 4$  APPR points

$\geq -1.7 / < -1.5 = 5$  APPR points

$\geq -1.5 / < -1.3 = 6$  APPR points

$\geq -1.3 / < -1.1 = 7$  APPR points

$\geq -1.1 / < -0.9 = 8$  APPR points

For Grade 3 Assessment: Within the category of Developing, those teachers who have from 28% to 53% of their student targets met will be awarded points as follows:  
28% - 33% of student targets met = 3 APPR points  
34% - 38% of student targets met = 4 APPR points  
39% - 42% of student targets met = 5 APPR points  
43% - 46% of student targets met = 6 APPR points

47% - 50% of student targets met = 7 APPR points  
 51% - 53% of student targets met = 8 APPR points

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

Within the category of Ineffective, for those teachers who fall at less than -2.1 standard deviations, we further divide the distribution to determine specific points. The specific point breakdown, with upper and lower bounds denoted in standard deviation units, is as follows:

<-2.5 = 0 APPR points  
 ≥-2.5/<-2.3 = 1 APPR points  
 ≥-2.3/<-2.1 = 2 APPR points

For Grade 3 Assessment: Within the category of Ineffective, those teachers who have from 0% to 27% of their student targets met will be awarded points as follows:  
 0% - 20% of student targets met = 0 APPR points  
 21% - 23% of student targets met = 1 APPR point  
 24% - 27% of student targets met = 2 APPR points

### 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 | Measures of Academic Progress (Primary Grades) Math |
| 1 | State-approved 3rd party assessment | Measures of Academic Progress (Primary Grades) Math |
| 2 | State-approved 3rd party assessment | Measures of Academic Progress (Primary Grades) Math |

|   | Math             | Assessment                 |
|---|------------------|----------------------------|
| 3 | State assessment | 3rd Grade State Assessment |

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

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

The Rhinebeck Central School District will be using the conditional growth index (CGI) based on the Measures of Academic Progress (Primary Grades) Math to calculate teacher-level effectiveness ratings for the comparable growth measures in Math grades K-2. The conditional growth index captures the contributions educators make to student learning on the Measures of Academic Progress (Primary Grades) by comparing actual student growth to the student growth norms. These norms reflect the amount of growth that might be expected from these students based on their grade, subject, and starting RIT score. CGI scores are expressed in standard deviation units, or z-scores, with scores above zero indicating students exceeding the growth norms, and scores below zero indicating growth less than the growth norm. CGI scores are indicative of students meeting their growth norms.

To construct an evaluative rating, CGI scores for all students linked to a particular teacher will be averaged, with the average CGI score converted to the four-category HEDI range. The objective is to facilitate valid and fair comparisons of productivity with respect to student outcomes, given that teachers often serve very different student populations. Major modeling and score translation decisions were decided by a Technical Advisory panel made up of volunteer districts from across the state.

To assign teachers to HEDI categories, we will assume a normal distribution of teacher effects centered on 13. From this point, we will use the following cut points to assign teachers to categories:

Highly Effective: Greater than or equal to .9 standard deviations above average (13)

Effective: Less than .9 standard deviations above average and greater than or equal to -.9 standard deviations below average

Developing: Less than -.9 standard deviations below average and greater than or equal to -2.1 standard deviations below average

Ineffective: Less than -2.1 standard deviations below average

For Grade 3 Assessment, student targets will be established by the teacher of record and approved by the principal, using baseline data from locally developed assessments based on the appropriate New York State and Common Core standards.

We will use the following cut points to assign teachers to categories:

Highly Effective - 85%-100% of student targets being met;

Effective - 54%-84% of student targets being met;

Developing- 28% - 53% of student targets being met;

Ineffective- 0% - 27% of student targets being met

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

Within the category of Highly Effective, for those teachers who fall at greater than or equal to .9 standard deviations above average, we further divide the distribution to determine specific points. The specific point breakdown, with upper and lower bounds denoted in standard deviation units, is as follows:

$\geq 0.9 / < 1.1 = 18$  APPR points

$\geq 1.1 / < 1.3 = 19$  APPR points

$\geq 1.3 = 20$  APPR points

For Grade 3 Assessment: Within the category of Highly Effective, those teachers who have from 85% to 100% of their student targets met will be awarded points as follows:  
85% - 90% of student targets met = 18 APPR points  
91% - 95% of student targets met = 19 APPR points  
96% - 100% of student targets met = 20 APPR points

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

Within the category of Effective, for those teachers who fall at less than .9 standard deviations above average and greater than or equal to -.9 standard deviations below average, we further divide the distribution to determine specific points. The specific point breakdown, with upper

and lower bounds denoted in standard deviation units, is as follows:

- $\geq -0.9 / < -0.7 = 9$  APPR points
- $\geq -0.7 / < -0.5 = 10$  APPR points
- $\geq -0.5 / < -0.3 = 11$  APPR points
- $\geq -0.3 / < -0.1 = 12$  APPR points
- $\geq -0.1 / < 0.1 = 13$  APPR points
- $\geq 0.1 / < 0.3 = 14$  APPR points
- $\geq 0.3 / < 0.5 = 15$  APPR points
- $\geq 0.5 / < 0.7 = 16$  APPR points
- $\geq 0.7 / < 0.9 = 17$  APPR points

For Grade 3 Assessment: Within the category of Effective, those teachers who have from 54% to 84% of their student targets met will be awarded points as follows:

- 54% - 56% of student targets met = 9 APPR points
- 57% - 59% of student targets met = 10 APPR points
- 60% - 62% of student targets met = 11 APPR points
- 63% - 64% of student targets met = 12 APPR points
- 65% - 67% of student targets met = 13 APPR points
- 68% - 70% of student targets met = 14 APPR points
- 71% - 74% of student targets met = 15 APPR points
- 75% - 78% of student targets met = 16 APPR points
- 79% - 84% of student targets met = 17 APPR points

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

Within the category of Developing, for those teachers who fall at less than  $-.9$  standard deviations below average and greater than or equal to  $-2.1$  standard deviations below average, we further divide the distribution to determine specific points. The specific point breakdown, with upper and lower bounds denoted in standard deviation units, is as follows:

- $\geq -2.1 / < -1.9 = 3$  APPR points
- $\geq -1.9 / < -1.7 = 4$  APPR points
- $\geq -1.7 / < -1.5 = 5$  APPR points
- $\geq -1.5 / < -1.3 = 6$  APPR points
- $\geq -1.3 / < -1.1 = 7$  APPR points
- $\geq -1.1 / < -0.9 = 8$  APPR points

For Grade 3 Assessment: Within the category of Developing, those teachers who have from 28% to 53% of their student targets met will be awarded points as follows:

- 28% - 33% of student targets met = 3 APPR points
- 34% - 38% of student targets met = 4 APPR points
- 39% - 42% of student targets met = 5 APPR points
- 43% - 46% of student targets met = 6 APPR points
- 47% - 50% of student targets met = 7 APPR points
- 51% - 53% of student targets met = 8 APPR points

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

Within the category of Ineffective, for those teachers who fall at less than  $-2.1$  standard deviations, we further divide the distribution to determine specific points. The specific point breakdown, with upper and lower bounds denoted in standard deviation units, is as follows:

- $< -2.5 = 0$  APPR points
- $\geq -2.5 / < -2.3 = 1$  APPR points
- $\geq -2.3 / < -2.1 = 2$  APPR points

For Grade 3 Assessment: Within the category of Ineffective, those teachers who have from 0% to 27% of their student targets met will be awarded points as follows:

0% - 20% of student targets met = 0 APPR points  
 21% - 23% of student targets met = 1 APPR point  
 24% - 27% of student targets met = 2 APPR points

## 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 | Rhinebeck Central School District-developed 6th Grade Science Assessment |
| 7 | District, regional or BOCES-developed assessment | Rhinebeck Central School District-developed 7th Grade Science Assessment |
|   | Science  | Assessment   |
| 8 | State assessment                                 | 8th Grade State Science Assessment                                       |

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

|   |  |
|---|--|
| Use this box, if needed, to describe the general process for assigning HEDI categories for these grades/subjects in this subcomponent. If needed, you may upload a table or graphic at 2.11, below. | <p>Student targets will be established by the teacher of record and approved by the principal, using baseline data from locally developed assessments based on the appropriate New York State and Common Core standards.</p> <p>We will use the following cut points to assign teachers to categories:<br/>           Highly Effective: 85% - 100% of student targets being met<br/>           Effective: 54% - 84% of student targets being met<br/>           Developing: 28% - 53% of student targets being met<br/>           Ineffective: 0% - 27% of student targets being met</p>   |
| Highly Effective (18 - 20 points) Results are well-above state average for similar students (or District goals if no state test).   | <p>Within the category of Highly Effective, those teachers who have from 85% to 100% of their student targets met will be awarded points as follows:<br/>           85% - 90% of student targets met = 18 APPR points<br/>           91% - 95% of student targets met = 19 APPR points<br/>           96% - 100% of student targets met = 20 APPR points</p>   |
| Effective (9 - 17 points) Results meet state average for similar students (or District goals if no state test).   | <p>Within the category of Effective, those teachers who have from 54% to 84% of their student targets met will be awarded points as follows:<br/>           54% - 56% of student targets met = 9 APPR points<br/>           57% - 59% of student targets met = 10 APPR points<br/>           60% - 62% of student targets met = 11 APPR points<br/>           63% - 64% of student targets met = 12 APPR points<br/>           65% - 67% of student targets met = 13 APPR points<br/>           68% - 70% of student targets met = 14 APPR points<br/>           71% - 74% of student targets met = 15 APPR points<br/>           75% - 78% of student targets met = 16 APPR points<br/>           79% - 84% of student targets met = 17 APPR points</p> |

|  |   |
|--|---|
| Developing (3 - 8 points) Results are below state average for similar students (or District goals if no state test).       | <p>Within the category of Developing, those teachers who have from 28% to 53% of their student targets met will be awarded points as follows:</p> <p>28% - 33% of student targets met = 3 APPR points<br/> 34% - 38% of student targets met = 4 APPR points<br/> 39% - 42% of student targets met = 5 APPR points<br/> 43% - 46% of student targets met = 6 APPR points<br/> 47% - 50% of student targets met = 7 APPR points<br/> 51% - 53% of student targets met = 8 APPR points</p> |
| Ineffective (0 - 2 points) Results are well-below state average for similar students (or District goals if no state test). | <p>Within the category of Ineffective, those teachers who have from 0% to 27% of their student targets met will be awarded points as follows:</p> <p>0% - 20% of student targets met = 0 APPR points<br/> 21% - 23% of student targets met = 1 APPR point<br/> 24% - 27% of student targets met = 2 APPR points</p>   |

## 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 | Rhinebeck Central School District-developed 6th Grade Social Studies Assessment |
| 7 | District, regional or BOCES-developed assessment | Rhinebeck Central School District-developed 7th grade Social Studies Assessment |
| 8 | District, regional or BOCES-developed assessment | Rhinebeck Central School District-developed 8th Grade Social Studies Assessment |

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

|   |  |
|---|--|
| Use this box, if needed, to describe the general process for assigning HEDI categories for these grades/subjects in this subcomponent. If needed, you may upload a table or graphic at 2.11, below. | <p>Student targets will be established by the teacher of record and approved by the principal, using baseline data from locally developed assessments based on the appropriate New York State and Common Core standards.</p> <p>We will use the following cut points to assign teachers to categories:<br/> Highly Effective: 85% - 100% of student targets being met<br/> Effective: 54% - 84% of student targets being met<br/> Developing: 28% - 53% of student targets being met<br/> Ineffective: 0% - 27% of student targets being met</p> |
| Highly Effective (18 - 20 points) Results are well-above District goals for similar students.   | <p>Within the category of Highly Effective, those teachers who have from 85% to 100% of their student targets met will be awarded points as follows:</p> <p>85% - 90% of student targets met = 18 APPR points<br/> 91% - 95% of student targets met = 19 APPR points<br/> 96% - 100% of student targets met = 20 APPR points</p>   |
| Effective (9 - 17 points) Results meet District goals for similar students.   | <p>Within the category of Effective, those teachers who have from 54% to 84% of their student targets met will be awarded points as follows:</p>   |

54% - 56% of student targets met = 9 APPR points  
 57% - 59% of student targets met = 10 APPR points  
 60% - 62% of student targets met = 11 APPR points  
 63% - 64% of student targets met = 12 APPR points  
 65% - 67% of student targets met = 13 APPR points  
 68% - 70% of student targets met = 14 APPR points  
 71% - 74% of student targets met = 15 APPR points  
 75% - 78% of student targets met = 16 APPR points  
 79% - 84% of student targets met = 17 APPR points

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

Within the category of Developing, those teachers who have from 28% to 53% of their student targets met will be awarded points as follows:

28% - 33% of student targets met = 3 APPR points  
 34% - 38% of student targets met = 4 APPR points  
 39% - 42% of student targets met = 5 APPR points  
 43% - 46% of student targets met = 6 APPR points  
 47% - 50% of student targets met = 7 APPR points  
 51% - 53% of student targets met = 8 APPR points

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

Within the category of Ineffective, those teachers who have from 0% to 27% of their student targets met will be awarded points as follows:

0% - 20% of student targets met = 0 APPR points  
 21% - 23% of student targets met = 1 APPR point  
 24% - 27% of student targets met = 2 APPR points

## 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 | Rhinebeck Central School District-developed Global 1 Assessment |

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

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

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

Student targets will be established by the teacher of record and approved by the principal, using baseline data from locally developed assessments based on the appropriate New York State and Common Core standards.

We will use the following cut points to assign teachers to categories:  
 Highly Effective: 85% - 100% of student targets being met  
 Effective: 54% - 84% of student targets being met  
 Developing: 28% - 53% of student targets being met  
 Ineffective: 0% - 27% of student targets being met

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

Within the category of Highly Effective, those teachers who have from 85% to 100% of their student targets met will be awarded points as follows:  
 85% - 90% of student targets met = 18 APPR points  
 91% - 95% of student targets met = 19 APPR points  
 96% - 100% of student targets met = 20 APPR points

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

Within the category of Effective, those teachers who have from 54% to 84% of their student targets met will be awarded points as follows:  
 54% - 56% of student targets met = 9 APPR points  
 57% - 59% of student targets met = 10 APPR points  
 60% - 62% of student targets met = 11 APPR points  
 63% - 64% of student targets met = 12 APPR points  
 65% - 67% of student targets met = 13 APPR points  
 68% - 70% of student targets met = 14 APPR points  
 71% - 74% of student targets met = 15 APPR points  
 75% - 78% of student targets met = 16 APPR points  
 79% - 84% of student targets met = 17 APPR points

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

Within the category of Developing, those teachers who have from 28% to 53% of their student targets met will be awarded points as follows:  
 28% - 33% of student targets met = 3 APPR points  
 34% - 38% of student targets met = 4 APPR points  
 39% - 42% of student targets met = 5 APPR points  
 43% - 46% of student targets met = 6 APPR points  
 47% - 50% of student targets met = 7 APPR points  
 51% - 53% of student targets met = 8 APPR points

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

Within the category of Ineffective, those teachers who have from 0% to 27% of their student targets met will be awarded points as follows:  
 0% - 20% of student targets met = 0 APPR points  
 21% - 23% of student targets met = 1 APPR point  
 24% - 27% of student targets met = 2 APPR points

## 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.

|  |  |
|--|--|
| <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>Student targets will be established by the teacher of record and approved by the principal, using baseline data from locally developed assessments based on the appropriate New York State and Common Core standards.</p> <p>We will use the following cut points to assign teachers to categories:<br/>         Highly Effective: 85% - 100% of student targets being met<br/>         Effective: 54% - 84% of student targets being met<br/>         Developing: 28% - 53% of student targets being met<br/>         Ineffective: 0% - 27% of student targets being met</p>   |
| <p>Highly Effective (18 - 20 points) Results are well-above District goals for similar students.</p>   | <p>Within the category of Highly Effective, those teachers who have from 85% to 100% of their student targets met will be awarded points as follows:<br/>         85% - 90% of student targets met = 18 APPR points<br/>         91% - 95% of student targets met = 19 APPR points<br/>         96% - 100% of student targets met = 20 APPR points</p>   |
| <p>Effective (9 - 17 points) Results meet District goals for similar students.</p>   | <p>Within the category of Effective, those teachers who have from 54% to 84% of their student targets met will be awarded points as follows:<br/>         54% - 56% of student targets met = 9 APPR points<br/>         57% - 59% of student targets met = 10 APPR points<br/>         60% - 62% of student targets met = 11 APPR points<br/>         63% - 64% of student targets met = 12 APPR points<br/>         65% - 67% of student targets met = 13 APPR points<br/>         68% - 70% of student targets met = 14 APPR points<br/>         71% - 74% of student targets met = 15 APPR points<br/>         75% - 78% of student targets met = 16 APPR points<br/>         79% - 84% of student targets met = 17 APPR points</p> |
| <p>Developing (3 - 8 points) Results are below District goals for similar students.</p>  | <p>Within the category of Developing, those teachers who have from 28% to 53% of their student targets met will be awarded points as follows:<br/>         28% - 33% of student targets met = 3 APPR points<br/>         34% - 38% of student targets met = 4 APPR points<br/>         39% - 42% of student targets met = 5 APPR points<br/>         43% - 46% of student targets met = 6 APPR points<br/>         47% - 50% of student targets met = 7 APPR points<br/>         51% - 53% of student targets met = 8 APPR points</p>  |
| <p>Ineffective (0 - 2 points) Results are well-below District goals for similar students.</p>  | <p>Within the category of Ineffective, those teachers who have from 0% to 27% of their student targets met will be awarded points as follows:<br/>         0% - 20% of student targets met = 0 APPR points<br/>         21% - 23% of student targets met = 1 APPR point<br/>         24% - 27% of student targets met = 2 APPR points</p>  |

## 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. | <p>Student targets will be established by the teacher of record and approved by the principal, using baseline data from locally developed assessments based on the appropriate New York State and Common Core standards.</p> <p>We will use the following cut points to assign teachers to categories:<br/>           Highly Effective: 85% - 100% of student targets being met<br/>           Effective: 54% - 84% of student targets being met<br/>           Developing: 28% - 53% of student targets being met<br/>           Ineffective: 0% - 27% of student targets being met</p>   |
| Highly Effective (18 - 20 points) Results are well-above District goals for similar students.   | <p>Within the category of Highly Effective, those teachers who have from 85% to 100% of their student targets met will be awarded points as follows:<br/>           85% - 90% of student targets met = 18 APPR points<br/>           91% - 95% of student targets met = 19 APPR points<br/>           96% - 100% of student targets met = 20 APPR points</p>   |
| Effective (9 - 17 points) Results meet District goals for similar students.   | <p>Within the category of Effective, those teachers who have from 54% to 84% of their student targets met will be awarded points as follows:<br/>           54% - 56% of student targets met = 9 APPR points<br/>           57% - 59% of student targets met = 10 APPR points<br/>           60% - 62% of student targets met = 11 APPR points<br/>           63% - 64% of student targets met = 12 APPR points<br/>           65% - 67% of student targets met = 13 APPR points<br/>           68% - 70% of student targets met = 14 APPR points<br/>           71% - 74% of student targets met = 15 APPR points<br/>           75% - 78% of student targets met = 16 APPR points<br/>           79% - 84% of student targets met = 17 APPR points</p> |
| Developing (3 - 8 points) Results are below District goals for similar students.  | <p>Within the category of Developing, those teachers who have from 28% to 53% of their student targets met will be awarded points as follows:<br/>           28% - 33% of student targets met = 3 APPR points<br/>           34% - 38% of student targets met = 4 APPR points<br/>           39% - 42% of student targets met = 5 APPR points<br/>           43% - 46% of student targets met = 6 APPR points<br/>           47% - 50% of student targets met = 7 APPR points<br/>           51% - 53% of student targets met = 8 APPR points</p>  |
| Ineffective (0 - 2 points) Results are well-below District goals for similar students.  | <p>Within the category of Ineffective, those teachers who have from 0% to 27% of their student targets met will be awarded points as follows:<br/>           0% - 20% of student targets met = 0 APPR points</p>   |

21% - 23% of student targets met = 1 APPR point  
 24% - 27% of student targets met = 2 APPR points

## 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  | State approved 3rd party assessment | Measures of Academic Progress (ELA) |
| Grade 10 ELA | State approved 3rd party assessment | Measures of Academic Progress (ELA) |
| Grade 11 ELA | Regents assessment                  | Grade 11 ELA Regents                |

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

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

The Rhinebeck Central School District will be using the conditional growth index (CGI) based on the Measures of Academic Progress (ELA) to calculate teacher-level effectiveness ratings for the comparable growth measures in ELA grades 9-10. The conditional growth index captures the contributions educators make to student learning on the Measures of Academic Progress (ELA) by comparing actual student growth to the student growth norms. These norms reflect the amount of growth that might be expected from these students based on their grade, subject, and starting RIT score. CGI scores are expressed in standard deviation units, or z-scores, with scores above zero indicating students exceeding the growth norms, and scores below zero indicating growth less than the growth norm. CGI scores are indicative of students meeting their growth norms.

To construct an evaluative rating, CGI scores for all students linked to a particular teacher will be averaged, with the average CGI score converted to the four-category HEDI range. The objective is to facilitate valid and fair comparisons of productivity with respect to student outcomes, given that teachers often serve very different student populations. Major modeling and score translation decisions were decided by a Technical Advisory panel made up of volunteer districts from across the state.

To assign teachers to HEDI categories, we will assume a normal distribution of teacher effects centered on 13. From this point, we will use the following cut points to assign teachers to categories:  
 Highly Effective: Greater than or equal to .9 standard deviations above average (13)

Effective: Less than .9 standard deviations above average and greater than or equal to -.9 standard deviations below average

Developing: Less than -.9 standard deviations below average and greater than or equal to -2.1 standard deviations below average

Ineffective: Less than -2.1 standard deviations below average.

For Grade 11 ELA Regents, student targets will be established by the teacher of record and approved by the principal, using baseline data from locally developed assessments based on the appropriate New York State and Common Core standards.

We will use the following cut points to assign teachers to categories:

Highly Effective - 85%-100% of student targets being met;

Effective - 54%-84% of student targets being met;

Developing- 28% - 53% of student targets being met;

Ineffective- 0% - 27% of student targets being met

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

Within the category of Highly Effective, for those teachers who fall at greater than or equal to .9 standard deviations above average, we further divide the distribution to determine specific points. The specific point breakdown, with upper and lower bounds denoted in standard deviation units, is as follows:

$\geq 0.9 / < 1.1 = 18$  APPR points

$\geq 1.1 / < 1.3 = 19$  APPR points

$\geq 1.3 = 20$  APPR points

For Grade 11 ELA Regents: Within the category of Highly Effective, those teachers who have from 85% to 100% of their student targets met will be awarded points as follows:

85% - 90% of student targets met = 18 APPR points

91% - 95% of student targets met = 19 APPR points

96% - 100% of student targets met = 20 APPR points

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

Within the category of Effective, for those teachers who fall at less than .9 standard deviations above average and greater than or equal to -.9 standard deviations below average, we further divide the distribution to determine specific points. The specific point breakdown, with upper and lower bounds denoted in standard deviation units, is as follows:

$\geq -0.9 / < -0.7 = 9$  APPR points

$\geq -0.7 / < -0.5 = 10$  APPR points

$\geq -0.5 / < -0.3 = 11$  APPR points

$\geq -0.3 / < -0.1 = 12$  APPR points

$\geq -0.1 / < 0.1 = 13$  APPR points

$\geq 0.1 / < 0.3 = 14$  APPR points

$\geq 0.3 / < 0.5 = 15$  APPR points

$\geq 0.5 / < 0.7 = 16$  APPR points

$\geq 0.7 / < 0.9 = 17$  APPR points

For Grade 11 ELA Regents: Within the category of Effective, those teachers who have from 54% to 84% of their student targets met will be awarded points as follows:

54% - 56% of student targets met = 9 APPR points

57% - 59% of student targets met = 10 APPR points

60% - 62% of student targets met = 11 APPR points  
 63% - 64% of student targets met = 12 APPR points  
 65% - 67% of student targets met = 13 APPR points  
 68% - 70% of student targets met = 14 APPR points  
 71% - 74% of student targets met = 15 APPR points  
 75% - 78% of student targets met = 16 APPR points  
 79% - 84% of student targets met = 17 APPR points

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

Within the category of Developing, for those teachers who fall at less than -.9 standard deviations below average and greater than or equal to -2.1 standard deviations below average, we further divide the distribution to determine specific points. The specific point breakdown, with upper and lower bounds denoted in standard deviation units, is as follows:

$\geq -2.1 / < -1.9 = 3$  APPR points  
 $\geq -1.9 / < -1.7 = 4$  APPR points  
 $\geq -1.7 / < -1.5 = 5$  APPR points  
 $\geq -1.5 / < -1.3 = 6$  APPR points  
 $\geq -1.3 / < -1.1 = 7$  APPR points  
 $\geq -1.1 / < -0.9 = 8$  APPR points

For Grade 11 ELA Regents: Within the category of Developing, those teachers who have from 28% to 53% of their student targets met will be awarded points as follows:

28% - 33% of student targets met = 3 APPR points  
 34% - 38% of student targets met = 4 APPR points  
 39% - 42% of student targets met = 5 APPR points  
 43% - 46% of student targets met = 6 APPR points  
 47% - 50% of student targets met = 7 APPR points  
 51% - 53% of student targets met = 8 APPR points

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

Within the category of Ineffective, for those teachers who fall at less than -2.1 standard deviations, we further divide the distribution to determine specific points. The specific point breakdown, with upper and lower bounds denoted in standard deviation units, is as follows:

$< -2.5 = 0$  APPR points  
 $\geq -2.5 / < -2.3 = 1$  APPR points  
 $\geq -2.3 / < -2.1 = 2$  APPR points

For Grade 11 ELA Regents: Within the category of Ineffective, those teachers who have from 0% to 27% of their student targets met will be awarded points as follows:

0% - 20% of student targets met = 0 APPR points  
 21% - 23% of student targets met = 1 APPR point  
 24% - 27% of student targets met = 2 APPR points

## 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 courses       | District, Regional or BOCES-developed | Rhinebeck Central School District-developed grade-specific and subject-specific assessments |
|                         |                                       |   |
|                         |                                       |   |
|                         |                                       |   |

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

|  |  |
|--|--|
| <p>Use this box, if needed, to describe the general process for assigning HEDI categories for these grades/subjects in this subcomponent. If needed, you may upload a table or graphic at 2.11, below.</p> | <p>Student targets will be established by the teacher of record and approved by the principal, using baseline data from locally developed assessments based on the appropriate New York State and Common Core standards.</p> <p>We will use the following cut points to assign teachers to categories:<br/>         Highly Effective: 85% - 100% of student targets being met<br/>         Effective: 54% - 84% of student targets being met<br/>         Developing: 28% - 53% of student targets being met<br/>         Ineffective: 0% - 27% of student targets being met</p>   |
| <p>Highly Effective (18 - 20 points) Results are well-above District goals for similar students.</p>   | <p>Within the category of Highly Effective, those teachers who have from 85% to 100% of their student targets met will be awarded points as follows:<br/>         85% - 90% of student targets met = 18 APPR points<br/>         91% - 95% of student targets met = 19 APPR points<br/>         96% - 100% of student targets met = 20 APPR points</p>   |
| <p>Effective (9 - 17 points) Results meet District goals for similar students.</p>   | <p>Within the category of Effective, those teachers who have from 54% to 84% of their student targets met will be awarded points as follows:<br/>         54% - 56% of student targets met = 9 APPR points<br/>         57% - 59% of student targets met = 10 APPR points<br/>         60% - 62% of student targets met = 11 APPR points<br/>         63% - 64% of student targets met = 12 APPR points<br/>         65% - 67% of student targets met = 13 APPR points<br/>         68% - 70% of student targets met = 14 APPR points<br/>         71% - 74% of student targets met = 15 APPR points<br/>         75% - 78% of student targets met = 16 APPR points<br/>         79% - 84% of student targets met = 17 APPR points</p> |
| <p>Developing (3 - 8 points) Results are below District goals for similar students.</p>  | <p>Within the category of Developing, those teachers who have from 28% to 53% of their student targets met will be awarded points as follows:<br/>         28% - 33% of student targets met = 3 APPR points<br/>         34% - 38% of student targets met = 4 APPR points<br/>         39% - 42% of student targets met = 5 APPR points<br/>         43% - 46% of student targets met = 6 APPR points<br/>         47% - 50% of student targets met = 7 APPR points<br/>         51% - 53% of student targets met = 8 APPR points</p>  |
| <p>Ineffective (0 - 2 points) Results are well-below District goals for similar students.</p>  | <p>Within the category of Ineffective, those teachers who have from 0% to 27% of their student targets met will be awarded points as follows:<br/>         0% - 20% of student targets met = 0 APPR points<br/>         21% - 23% of student targets met = 1 APPR point</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 in setting targets for Comparable Growth Measures, the rationale for including such factors, and the processes that will be used to mitigate potentially problematic incentives associated with the controls or adjustments.

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

*The District will not be using any controls.*

## 2.13) Teachers with more than one growth measure

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

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

## 2.14) Assurances

Please check all of the boxes below:

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

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

### 3. Local Measures (Teachers)

Created Saturday, October 20, 2012

Updated Friday, January 11, 2013

---

#### Page 1

#### Locally Selected Measures of Student Achievement or Growth

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

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

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

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

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

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

**Growth or achievement measure(s) from these options.**

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

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

Measures based on:

- 1) The change in percentage of a teacher’s students who achieve a specific level of performance as determined locally, on such assessments/examinations compared to those students’ level of performance on such assessments/examinations in the previous school year (e.g., a three percentage point increase in students earning the proficient level (three) or better performance level on the 7th grade math State assessment compared to those same students’ performance levels on the 6th grade math State assessment, or an increase in the percentage of a teacher’s students earning the advanced performance level (four) on the 4th grade ELA or math State assessments compared to those students’ performance levels on the 3rd grade ELA or math State assessments)
  
- 2) Teacher specific growth score computed by the Department based on the percent of the teacher’s students earning a State determined level of growth. The methodology to translate such growth into the State-established sub-component scoring ranges shall be determined locally
  
- 3) Teacher specific achievement or growth score computed in a manner determined locally based on a measure of student performance on the State assessments, Regents examinations and/or Department approved alternative examinations other than the measure described in subclause 1) or 2) of this clause
  
- 4) Student growth or achievement computed in a manner determined locally based on a State-approved 3rd party assessment
  
- 5) Student growth or achievement computed in a manner determined locally based on a district, regional or BOCES-developed assessment that is rigorous and comparable across classrooms
  
- 6) A school-wide measure of either student growth or achievement based on either:
  - (i) A State-provided student growth score covering all students in the school that took the State assessment in ELA or Math in Grades 4-8; or
  - (ii) A school-wide measure of student growth or achievement computed in a manner determined locally based on a State, State-approved 3rd party, or district, regional or BOCES developed assessment that is rigorous and comparable across classrooms.

### 3.1) Grades 4-8 ELA

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

|   | Locally-Selected Measure from List of Approved Measures | Assessment                          |
|---|---|-------------------------------------|
| 4 | 4) State-approved 3rd party assessments                 | Measures of Academic Progress (ELA) |
| 5 | 4) State-approved 3rd party assessments                 | Measures of Academic Progress (ELA) |
| 6 | 4) State-approved 3rd party assessments                 | Measures of Academic Progress (ELA) |
| 7 | 4) State-approved 3rd party assessments                 | Measures of Academic Progress (ELA) |

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.

HEDI categories will be assigned according to the percentage of students in a teacher's class who meet or exceed the targeted RIT score growth resulting from the administration of the Measures of Academic Progress (ELA). Targets for each student will be established by the teacher of record and approved by the principal.

We will use cut points to assign teachers to HEDI categories as follows:

Highly Effective: 85% - 100% of students achieving targeted RIT score growth;

Effective: 54% - 84% of students achieving targeted RIT score growth;

Developing: 28 - 53% of students achieving targeted RIT score growth;

Ineffective: 0% - 27% of students achieving targeted RIT score growth

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

Within the category of Highly Effective, those teachers who have from 85% to 100% of their students achieve targeted RIT score growth will be awarded points as follows:

85% - 92% of students achieving targeted RIT score growth = 14 APPR points;

93% - 100% of students achieving targeted RIT score growth = 15 APPR points

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

Within the category of Effective, those teachers who have from 54% to 84% of their students achieve targeted RIT score growth will be awarded points as follows:

54% - 56% of students achieving targeted RIT score growth = 8 APPR points;

57% - 61% of students achieving targeted RIT score growth = 9 APPR points;

62% - 66% of students achieving targeted RIT score growth = 10 APPR points;

67% - 72% of students achieving targeted RIT score growth = 11 APPR points;

73% - 77% of students achieving targeted RIT score growth = 12 APPR points;

78% - 84% of students achieving targeted RIT score growth = 13 APPR points

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

Within the category of Developing, those teachers who have from 28% to 53% of their students achieve targeted RIT score growth will be awarded points as follows:  
28% - 31% of students achieving targeted RIT score

growth = 3 APPR points;  
 32% - 37% of students achieving RIT targeted score  
 growth = 4 APPR points;  
 38% - 43% of students achieving targeted RIT score  
 growth = 5 APPR points;  
 44% - 49% of students achieving targeted RIT score  
 growth = 6 APPR points;  
 50% - 53% of students achieving targeted RIT score  
 growth = 7 APPR points.

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

Within the category of Ineffective, those teachers who have from 0% to 27% of their students achieve targeted RIT score growth will be awarded points as follows:  
 0% - 20% of students achieving targeted RIT score growth = 0 APPR points;  
 21% - 23% of students achieving targeted RIT score growth = 1 APPR points;  
 24% - 27% of students achieving targeted RIT score growth = 2 APPR points.

### 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                 | Measures of Academic Progress (Math) |
| 5 | 4) State-approved 3rd party assessments                 | Measures of Academic Progress (Math) |
| 6 | 4) State-approved 3rd party assessments                 | Measures of Academic Progress (Math) |
| 7 | 4) State-approved 3rd party assessments                 | Measures of Academic Progress (Math) |
| 8 | 4) State-approved 3rd party assessments                 | Measures of Academic Progress (Math) |

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.

HEDI categories will be assigned according to the percentage of students in a teacher's class who meet or exceed the targeted RIT score growth resulting from the administration of the Measures of Academic Progress (Math). Targets for each student will be established by the teacher of record and approved by the principal.

We will use cut points to assign teachers to HEDI categories as follows:  
 Highly Effective: 85% - 100% of students achieving targeted RIT score growth;  
 Effective: 54% - 84% of students achieving targeted RIT score growth;

Developing: 28% - 53% of students achieving targeted RIT score growth;  
Ineffective: 0% - 27% of students achieving targeted RIT score growth.

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

Within the category of Highly Effective, those teachers who have from 85% to 100% of their students achieve targeted RIT score growth will be awarded points as follows:  
85% - 92% of students achieving targeted RIT score growth = 14 APPR points;  
93% - 100% of students achieving targeted RIT score growth = 15 APPR points.

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

Within the category of Effective, those teachers who have from 54% to 84% of their students achieve targeted RIT score growth will be awarded points as follows:  
54% - 56% of students achieving targeted RIT score growth = 8 APPR points;  
57% - 61% of students achieving targeted RIT score growth = 9 APPR points;  
62% - 66% of students achieving targeted RIT score growth = 10 APPR points;  
67% - 72% of students achieving targeted RIT score growth = 11 APPR points;  
73% - 77% of students achieving targeted RIT score growth = 12 APPR points;  
78% - 84% of students achieving targeted RIT score growth = 13 APPR points.

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

Within the category of Developing, those teachers who have from 28% to 53% of their students achieve targeted RIT score growth will be awarded points as follows:  
28% - 31% of students achieving targeted RIT score growth = 3 APPR points;  
32% - 37% of students achieving targeted RIT score growth = 4 APPR points;  
38% - 43% of students achieving targeted RIT score growth = 5 APPR points;  
44% - 49% of students achieving targeted RIT score growth = 6 APPR points;  
50% - 53% of students achieving targeted RIT score growth = 7 APPR points.

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

Within the category of Ineffective, those teachers who have from 0% to 27% of their students achieve targeted RIT score growth will be awarded points as follows:  
0% - 20% of students achieving targeted RIT score growth = 0 APPR points;  
21% - 23% of students achieving targeted RIT score growth = 1 APPR points;  
24% - 27% of students achieving targeted RIT score growth = 2 APPR points.

### 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.

## 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                 | Measures of Academic Progress (Primary Grades) ELA |
| 1 | 4) State-approved 3rd party assessments                 | Measures of Academic Progress (Primary Grades) ELA |
| 2 | 4) State-approved 3rd party assessments                 | Measures of Academic Progress (Primary Grades) ELA |
| 3 | 4) State-approved 3rd party assessments                 | Measures of Academic Progress (ELA)                |

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

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

|  |  |
|--|--|
| <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>HEDI categories will be assigned according to the percentage of students in a teacher's class who meet or exceed the targeted RIT score growth resulting from the administration of the Measures of Academic Progress (Primary Grades) ELA for grades K, 1, and 2, and the administration of the Measures of Academic Progress (ELA) for grade 3. Targets for each student will be established by the teacher of record and approved by the principal.</p> <p>We will use cut points to assign teachers to HEDI categories as follows:<br/>           Highly Effective: 85%-100% of students meeting or exceeding targeted RIT score growth;<br/>           Effective: 54%-84% of students meeting or exceeding targeted RIT score growth;<br/>           Developing: 28-53% of students meeting or exceeding targeted RIT score growth;<br/>           Ineffective: 0%-27% of students meeting or exceeding targeted RIT score growth.</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>Within the category of Highly Effective, those teachers who have from 85% to 100% of their students meet or exceed targeted RIT score growth will be awarded points as follows:<br/>           85% - 90% of students of students meeting or exceeding targeted RIT score growth = 18 APPR points;</p>   |

91% - 95% of students of students meeting or exceeding targeted RIT score growth = 19 APPR points;  
96% - 100% of students of students meeting or exceeding targeted RIT score growth = 20 APPR points.

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

Within the category of Effective, those teachers who have from 54% to 84% of their students meet or exceed targeted RIT score growth will be awarded points as follows:  
54% - 56% of students meeting or exceeding targeted RIT score growth = 9 APPR points;  
57% - 59% of students meeting or exceeding targeted RIT score growth = 10 APPR points;  
60% - 62% of students meeting or exceeding targeted RIT score growth = 11 APPR points;  
63% - 64% of students meeting or exceeding targeted RIT score growth = 12 APPR points;  
65% - 67% of students meeting or exceeding targeted RIT score growth = 13 APPR points;  
68% - 70% of students meeting or exceeding targeted RIT score growth = 14 APPR points;  
71% - 74% of students meeting or exceeding targeted RIT score growth = 15 APPR points;  
75% - 78% of students meeting or exceeding targeted RIT score growth = 16 APPR points;  
79% - 84% of students meeting or exceeding targeted RIT score growth = 17 APPR points.

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

Within the category of Developing, those teachers who have from 28% to 53% of their students meet or exceed targeted RIT score growth will be awarded points as follows:  
28% - 33% of students meeting or exceeding targeted RIT score growth = 3 APPR points;  
34% - 38% of students meeting or exceeding targeted RIT score growth = 4 APPR points;  
39% - 42% of students meeting or exceeding targeted RIT score growth = 5 APPR points;  
43% - 46% of students meeting or exceeding targeted RIT score growth = 6 APPR points;  
47% - 50% of students meeting or exceeding targeted RIT score growth = 7 APPR points;  
51% - 53% of students meeting or exceeding targeted RIT score growth = 8 APPR points.

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

Within the category of Ineffective, those teachers who have from 0% to 27% of their students meet or exceed targeted RIT score growth will be awarded points as follows:  
0% - 20% of students meeting or exceeding targeted RIT score growth = 0 APPR points;  
21% - 23% of students meeting or exceeding targeted RIT score growth = 1 APPR point;  
24% - 27% of students meeting or exceeding targeted RIT score growth = 2 APPR points.

### 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                 | Measures of Academic Progress (Primary Grades) Math |
| 1 | 4) State-approved 3rd party assessments                 | Measures of Academic Progress (Primary Grades) Math |
| 2 | 4) State-approved 3rd party assessments                 | Measures of Academic Progress (Primary Grades) Math |
| 3 | 4) State-approved 3rd party assessments                 | Measures of Academic Progress (Math)                |

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>HEDI categories will be assigned according to the percentage of students in a teacher's class who meet or exceed the targeted RIT score growth resulting from the administration of the Measures of Academic Progress (Primary Grades) Math in grades K, 1, and 2, and the administration of the Measures of Academic Progress (Math) in grade 3. Targets for each student will be established by the teacher of record and approved by the 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>We will use cut points to assign teachers to HEDI categories as follows:<br/>         Highly Effective: 85% - 100% of students achieving targeted RIT score growth;<br/>         Effective: 54% - 84% of students achieving targeted RIT score growth;<br/>         Developing: 28 - 53% of students achieving targeted RIT score growth;<br/>         Ineffective: 0% - 27% of students achieving targeted RIT score growth</p>   |
| <p>Effective (9-17 points) Results meet District- or BOCES-adopted expectations for growth or achievement for grade/subject.</p>   | <p>Within the category of Highly Effective, those teachers who have from 85% to 100% of their students meet or exceed targeted RIT score growth will be awarded points as follows:<br/>         85% - 90% of students meeting or exceeding targeted RIT score growth = 18 APPR points;<br/>         91% - 95% of students meeting or exceeding targeted RIT score growth = 19 APPR points;<br/>         96% - 100% of students meeting or exceeding targeted RIT score growth = 20 APPR points.</p> |
|  | <p>Within the category of Effective, those teachers who have from 54% to 84% of their students meet or exceed targeted RIT score growth will be awarded points as follows:<br/>         54% - 56% of students meeting or exceeding targeted RIT score growth = 9 APPR points;</p>   |

57% - 59% of students meeting or exceeding targeted RIT score growth = 10 APPR points;  
 60% - 62% of students meeting or exceeding targeted RIT score growth = 11 APPR points;  
 63% - 64% of students meeting or exceeding targeted RIT score growth = 12 APPR points;  
 65% - 67% of students meeting or exceeding targeted RIT score growth = 13 APPR points;  
 68% - 70% of students meeting or exceeding targeted RIT score growth = 14 APPR points;  
 71% - 74% of students meeting or exceeding targeted RIT score growth = 15 APPR points;  
 75% - 78% of students meeting or exceeding targeted RIT score growth = 16 APPR points;  
 79% - 84% of students meeting or exceeding targeted RIT score growth = 17 APPR points.

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

Within the category of Developing, those teachers who have from 28% to 53% of their students meet or exceed targeted RIT score growth will be awarded points as follows:  
 28% - 33% of students meeting or exceeding targeted RIT score growth = 3 APPR points;  
 34% - 38% of students meeting or exceeding targeted RIT score growth = 4 APPR points;  
 39% - 42% of students meeting or exceeding targeted RIT score growth = 5 APPR points;  
 43% - 46% of students meeting or exceeding targeted RIT score growth = 6 APPR points;  
 47% - 50% of students meeting or exceeding targeted RIT score growth = 7 APPR points;  
 51% - 53% of students meeting or exceeding targeted RIT score growth = 8 APPR points.

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

Within the category of Ineffective, those teachers who have from 0% to 27% of their students meet or exceed targeted RIT score growth will be awarded points as follows:  
 0% - 20% of students meeting or exceeding targeted RIT score growth = 0 APPR points;  
 21% - 23% of students meeting or exceeding targeted RIT score growth = 1 APPR point;  
 24% - 27% of students meeting or exceeding targeted RIT score growth = 2 APPR points.

### 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            | Rhinebeck Central School District-developed Grade 6 Science Final Assessment |
| 7 | 5) District, regional, or BOCES–developed assessments            | Rhinebeck Central School District-developed Grade 7 Science Final Assessment |
| 8 | 3) Teacher specific achievement or growth score computed locally | New York State 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>HEDI categories will be assigned according to the percentage of students in a teacher's class that meet or exceed the achievement target for the class. Targets for each student will be established by the teacher of record and approved by the principal.</p> <p>We will use cut points to assign teachers to HEDI categories as follows:<br/>         Highly Effective: 85% - 100% of students meeting or exceeding the achievement target;<br/>         Effective: 54% - 84% of students meeting or exceeding the achievement target;<br/>         Developing: 28%- 53% of students meeting or exceeding the achievement target;<br/>         Ineffective: 0% - 27% of students meeting or exceeding the achievement target.</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>Within the category of Highly Effective, those teachers who have from 85% to 100% of their students meeting or exceeding the achievement target will be awarded points as follows:<br/>         85% - 90% of students meeting or exceeding the achievement target = 18 APPR points;<br/>         91% - 95% of students meeting or exceeding the achievement target = 19 APPR points;<br/>         96% - 100% of students meeting or exceeding the achievement target = 20 APPR points.</p>  |
| <p>Effective (9 - 17 points) Results meet District- or BOCES-adopted expectations for growth or achievement for grade/subject.</p>   | <p>Within the category of Effective, those teachers who have from 54% to 84% of their of students meeting or exceeding the achievement target will be awarded points as follows:<br/>         54% - 56% of students meeting or exceeding the achievement target = 9 APPR points;<br/>         57% - 59% of students meeting or exceeding the achievement target = 10 APPR points;<br/>         60% - 62% of students meeting or exceeding the achievement target = 11 APPR points;<br/>         63% - 64% of students meeting or exceeding the achievement target = 12 APPR points;<br/>         65% - 67% of students meeting or exceeding the achievement target = 13 APPR points;<br/>         68% - 70% of students meeting or exceeding the achievement target = 14 APPR points;<br/>         71% - 74% of students meeting or exceeding the achievement target = 15 APPR points;<br/>         75% - 78% of students meeting or exceeding the achievement target = 16 APPR points;<br/>         79% - 84% of students meeting or exceeding the achievement target = 17 APPR points.</p> |
| <p>Developing (3 - 8 points) Results are below District- or BOCES-adopted expectations for growth or achievement for grade/subject.</p>  | <p>Within the category of Developing, those teachers who have from 28% to 53% of students meeting or exceeding the achievement target will be awarded points as follows:<br/>         28% - 33% of students meeting or exceeding the achievement target = 3 APPR points;<br/>         34% - 38% of students meeting or exceeding the</p>   |

achievement target = 4 APPR points;  
 39% - 42% of students meeting or exceeding the achievement target = 5 APPR points;  
 43% - 46% of students meeting or exceeding the achievement target = 6 APPR points;  
 47% - 50% of students meeting or exceeding the achievement target = 7 APPR points;  
 51% - 53% of students meeting or exceeding the achievement target = 8 APPR points.

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

Within the category of Ineffective, those teachers who have from 0% to 27% of students meeting or exceeding the achievement target will be awarded points as follows:  
 0% - 20% of students meeting or exceeding the achievement target = 0 APPR points;  
 21% - 23% of students meeting or exceeding the achievement target = 1 APPR point;  
 24% - 27% of students meeting or exceeding the achievement target = 2 APPR points.

### 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   | Rhinebeck Central School District-developed Grade 6 Social Studies Final Assessment |
| 7 | 5) District, regional, or BOCES–developed assessments   | Rhinebeck Central School District-developed Grade 7 Social Studies Final Assessment |
| 8 | 5) District, regional, or BOCES–developed assessments   | Rhinebeck Central School District-developed Grade 8 Social Studies Final 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.

HEDI categories will be assigned according to the percentage of students in a teacher's class that meet or exceed the achievement target for the class. Targets for each student will be established by the teacher of record and approved by the principal.

We will use cut points to assign teachers to HEDI categories as follows:  
 Highly Effective: 85% - 100% of students meeting or exceeding the achievement target;  
 Effective: 54% - 84% of students meeting or exceeding the achievement target;  
 Developing: 28% - 53% of students meeting or exceeding

the achievement target;  
Ineffective: 0% - 27% of students meeting or exceeding the achievement target.

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

Within the category of Highly Effective, those teachers who have from 85% to 100% of their students meeting or exceeding the achievement target will be awarded points as follows:  
85% - 90% of students meeting or exceeding the achievement target = 18 APPR points;  
91% - 95% of students meeting or exceeding the achievement target = 19 APPR points;  
96% - 100% of students meeting or exceeding the achievement target = 20 APPR points.

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

Within the category of Effective, those teachers who have from 54% to 84% of their of students meeting or exceeding the achievement target will be awarded points as follows:  
54% - 56% of students meeting or exceeding the achievement target = 9 APPR points;  
57% - 59% of students meeting or exceeding the achievement target = 10 APPR points;  
60% - 62% of students meeting or exceeding the achievement target = 11 APPR points;  
63% - 64% of students meeting or exceeding the achievement target = 12 APPR points;  
65% - 67% of students meeting or exceeding the achievement target = 13 APPR points;  
68% - 70% of students meeting or exceeding the achievement target = 14 APPR points;  
71% - 74% of students meeting or exceeding the achievement target = 15 APPR points;  
75% - 78% of students meeting or exceeding the achievement target = 16 APPR points;  
79% - 84% of students meeting or exceeding the achievement target = 17 APPR points.

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

Within the category of Developing, those teachers who have from 28% to 53% of students meeting or exceeding the achievement target will be awarded points as follows:  
28% - 33% of students meeting or exceeding the achievement target = 3 APPR points;  
34% - 38% of students meeting or exceeding the achievement target = 4 APPR points;  
39% - 42% of students meeting or exceeding the achievement target = 5 APPR points;  
43% - 46% of students meeting or exceeding the achievement target = 6 APPR points;  
47% - 50% of students meeting or exceeding the achievement target = 7 APPR points;  
51% - 53% of students meeting or exceeding the achievement target = 8 APPR points.

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

Within the category of Ineffective, those teachers who have from 0% to 27% of students meeting or exceeding the achievement target will be awarded points as follows:  
0% - 20% of students meeting or exceeding the achievement target = 0 APPR points;  
21% - 23% of students meeting or exceeding the achievement target = 1 APPR point;  
24% - 27% of students meeting or exceeding the

### 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            | Rhinebeck Central School District-developed Global 1 Final Assessment |
| Global 2         | 3) Teacher specific achievement or growth score computed locally | Global 2 Regents Examination  |
| American History | 3) Teacher specific achievement or growth score computed locally | American History Regents Examination                                  |

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

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

|  |   |
|--|---|
| <p>Use this box, if needed, to describe the general process for assigning HEDI categories for these grades/subjects in this subcomponent. If needed, you may upload a table or graphic at 3.13, below.</p> | <p>HEDI categories will be assigned according to the percentage of students in a teacher's class that meet or exceed the achievement target for the class. Targets for each student will be established by the teacher of record and approved by the principal.</p> <p>We will use cut points to assign teachers to HEDI categories as follows:<br/>                     Highly Effective: 85% - 100% of students meeting or exceeding the achievement target;<br/>                     Effective: 54% - 84% of students meeting or exceeding the achievement target;<br/>                     Developing: 28% - 53% of students meeting or exceeding the achievement target;<br/>                     Ineffective: 0% - 27% of students meeting or exceeding the achievement target.</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>Within the category of Highly Effective, those teachers who have from 85% to 100% of their students meeting or exceeding the achievement target will be awarded points as follows:<br/>                     85% - 90% of students meeting or exceeding the achievement target = 18 APPR points;<br/>                     91% - 95% of students meeting or exceeding the achievement target = 19 APPR points;<br/>                     96% - 100% of students meeting or exceeding the achievement target = 20 APPR points.</p>   |

|   |  |
|---|--|
| <p>Effective (9 - 17 points) Results meet District- or BOCES-adopted expectations for growth or achievement for grade/subject.</p>            | <p>Within the category of Effective, those teachers who have from 54% to 84% of their of students meeting or exceeding the achievement target will be awarded points as follows:<br/> 54% - 56% of students meeting or exceeding the achievement target = 9 APPR points;<br/> 57% - 59% of students meeting or exceeding the achievement target = 10 APPR points;<br/> 60% - 62% of students meeting or exceeding the achievement target = 11 APPR points;<br/> 63% - 64% of students meeting or exceeding the achievement target = 12 APPR points;<br/> 65% - 67% of students meeting or exceeding the achievement target = 13 APPR points;<br/> 68% - 70% of students meeting or exceeding the achievement target = 14 APPR points;<br/> 71% - 74% of students meeting or exceeding the achievement target = 15 APPR points;<br/> 75% - 78% of students meeting or exceeding the achievement target = 16 APPR points;<br/> 79% - 84% of students meeting or exceeding the achievement target = 17 APPR points.</p> |
| <p>Developing (3 - 8 points) Results are below District- or BOCES-adopted expectations for growth or achievement for grade/subject.</p>       | <p>Within the category of Developing, those teachers who have from 28% to 53% of students meeting or exceeding the achievement target will be awarded points as follows:<br/> 28% - 33% of students meeting or exceeding the achievement target = 3 APPR points;<br/> 34% - 38% of students meeting or exceeding the achievement target = 4 APPR points;<br/> 39% - 42% of students meeting or exceeding the achievement target = 5 APPR points;<br/> 43% - 46% of students meeting or exceeding the achievement target = 6 APPR points;<br/> 47% - 50% of students meeting or exceeding the achievement target = 7 APPR points;<br/> 51% - 53% of students meeting or exceeding the achievement target = 8 APPR points.</p>   |
| <p>Ineffective (0 - 2 points) Results are well below District- or BOCES-adopted expectations for growth or achievement for grade/subject.</p> | <p>Within the category of Ineffective, those teachers who have from 0% to 27% of students meeting or exceeding the achievement target will be awarded points as follows:<br/> 0% - 20% of students meeting or exceeding the achievement target = 0 APPR points;<br/> 21% - 23% of students meeting or exceeding the achievement target = 1 APPR point;<br/> 24% - 27% of students meeting or exceeding the achievement target = 2 APPR points.</p>   |

### 3.9) High School Science

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

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

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

|                    |  |  |
|--------------------|--|--|
| Living Environment | 3) Teacher specific achievement or growth score computed locally | Living Environment Regents Examination |
| Earth Science      | 3) Teacher specific achievement or growth score computed locally | Earth Science Regents Examination      |
| Chemistry          | 3) Teacher specific achievement or growth score computed locally | Chemistry Regents Examination          |
| Physics            | 3) Teacher specific achievement or growth score computed locally | Physics Regents Examination            |

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.*

|  |   |
|--|---|
| <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>HEDI categories will be assigned according to the percentage of students in a teacher's class that meet or exceed the achievement target for the class. Targets for each student will be established by the teacher of record and approved by the principal.</p> <p>We will use cut points to assign teachers to HEDI categories as follows:<br/>         Highly Effective: 85% - 100% of students meeting or exceeding the achievement target;<br/>         Effective: 54% - 84% of students meeting or exceeding the achievement target;<br/>         Developing: 28% - 53% of students meeting or exceeding the achievement target;<br/>         Ineffective: 0% - 27% of students meeting or exceeding the achievement target.</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>Within the category of Highly Effective, those teachers who have from 85% to 100% of their students meeting or exceeding the achievement target will be awarded points as follows:<br/>         85% - 90% of students meeting or exceeding the achievement target = 18 APPR points;<br/>         91% - 95% of students meeting or exceeding the achievement target = 19 APPR points;<br/>         96% - 100% of students meeting or exceeding the achievement target = 20 APPR points.</p>   |
| <p>Developing (3 - 8 points) Results are below District- or BOCES-adopted expectations for growth or achievement for grade/subject.</p>  | <p>Within the category of Effective, those teachers who have from 54% to 84% of their of students meeting or exceeding the achievement target will be awarded points as follows:<br/>         54% - 56% of students meeting or exceeding the achievement target = 9 APPR points;<br/>         57% - 59% of students meeting or exceeding the achievement target = 10 APPR points;<br/>         60% - 62% of students meeting or exceeding the achievement target = 11 APPR points;<br/>         63% - 64% of students meeting or exceeding the achievement target = 12 APPR points;</p>   |

65% - 67% of students meeting or exceeding the achievement target = 13 APPR points;  
 68% - 70% of students meeting or exceeding the achievement target = 14 APPR points;  
 71% - 74% of students meeting or exceeding the achievement target = 15 APPR points;  
 75% - 78% of students meeting or exceeding the achievement target = 16 APPR points;  
 79% - 84% of students meeting or exceeding the achievement target = 17 APPR points.

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

Within the category of Developing, those teachers who have from 28% to 53% of students meeting or exceeding the achievement target will be awarded points as follows:  
 28% - 33% of students meeting or exceeding the achievement target = 3 APPR points;  
 34% - 38% of students meeting or exceeding the achievement target = 4 APPR points;  
 39% - 42% of students meeting or exceeding the achievement target = 5 APPR points;  
 43% - 46% of students meeting or exceeding the achievement target = 6 APPR points;  
 47% - 50% of students meeting or exceeding the achievement target = 7 APPR points;  
 51% - 53% of students meeting or exceeding the achievement target = 8 APPR points.

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

Within the category of Ineffective, those teachers who have from 0% to 27% of students meeting or exceeding the achievement target will be awarded points as follows:  
 0% - 20% of students meeting or exceeding the achievement target = 0 APPR points;  
 21% - 23% of students meeting or exceeding the achievement target = 1 APPR point;  
 24% - 27% of students meeting or exceeding the achievement target = 2 APPR points.

### 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 Examination |
| Geometry  | 3) Teacher specific achievement or growth score computed locally | Geometry Regents Examination  |
| Algebra 2 | 3) Teacher specific achievement or growth score computed locally | Algebra 2 Regents Examination |

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.

HEDI categories will be assigned according to the percentage of students in a teacher's class that meet or exceed the achievement target for the class. Targets for each student will be established by the teacher of record and approved by the principal.

We will use cut points to assign teachers to HEDI categories as follows:  
Highly Effective: 85% - 100% of students meeting or exceeding the achievement target;  
Effective: 54% - 84% of students meeting or exceeding the achievement target;  
Developing: 28% - 53% of students meeting or exceeding the achievement target;  
Ineffective: 0% - 27% of students meeting or exceeding the achievement target.

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

Within the category of Highly Effective, those teachers who have from 85% to 100% of their students meeting or exceeding the achievement target will be awarded points as follows:  
85% - 90% of students meeting or exceeding the achievement target = 18 APPR points;  
91% - 95% of students meeting or exceeding the achievement target = 19 APPR points;  
96% - 100% of students meeting or exceeding the achievement target = 20 APPR points.

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

Within the category of Effective, those teachers who have from 54% to 84% of their of students meeting or exceeding the achievement target will be awarded points as follows:  
54% - 56% of students meeting or exceeding the achievement target = 9 APPR points;  
57% - 59% of students meeting or exceeding the achievement target = 10 APPR points;  
60% - 62% of students meeting or exceeding the achievement target = 11 APPR points;  
63% - 64% of students meeting or exceeding the achievement target = 12 APPR points;  
65% - 67% of students meeting or exceeding the achievement target = 13 APPR points;  
68% - 70% of students meeting or exceeding the achievement target = 14 APPR points;  
71% - 74% of students meeting or exceeding the achievement target = 15 APPR points;  
75% - 78% of students meeting or exceeding the achievement target = 16 APPR points;  
79% - 84% of students meeting or exceeding the achievement target = 17 APPR points;

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

Within the category of Developing, those teachers who have from 28% to 53% of students meeting or exceeding the achievement target will be awarded points as follows:  
28% - 33% of students meeting or exceeding the achievement target = 3 APPR points;

34% - 38% of students meeting or exceeding the achievement target = 4 APPR points;  
 39% - 42% of students meeting or exceeding the achievement target = 5 APPR points;  
 43% - 46% of students meeting or exceeding the achievement target = 6 APPR points;  
 47% - 50% of students meeting or exceeding the achievement target = 7 APPR points;  
 51% - 53% of students meeting or exceeding the achievement target = 8 APPR points.

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

Within the category of Ineffective, those teachers who have from 0% to 27% of students meeting or exceeding the achievement target will be awarded points as follows:  
 0% - 20% of students meeting or exceeding the achievement target = 0 APPR points;  
 21% - 23% of students meeting or exceeding the achievement target = 1 APPR point;  
 24% - 27% of students meeting or exceeding the achievement target = 2 APPR points.

### 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  | 4) State-approved 3rd party assessments                          | Measures of Academic Progress (ELA) |
| Grade 10 ELA | 4) State-approved 3rd party assessments                          | Measures of Academic Progress (ELA) |
| Grade 11 ELA | 3) Teacher specific achievement or growth score computed locally | Grade 11 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.

HEDI categories will be assigned for ELA 9 and ELA 10 according to the percentage of students in a teacher's class who meet or exceed the targeted RIT score growth resulting from the administration of the Measures of Academic Progress (ELA), or for ELA 11 according to the percentage of students in a teacher's class that meet or exceed the achievement target for the class. Targets for each student will be established by the teacher of record

and approved by the principal.

We will use cut points to assign teachers to HEDI categories as follows:

Highly Effective: 85% - 100% of students achieving targeted RIT score growth (ELA 9 and 10) or of students meeting or exceeding the achievement target (ELA 11);

Effective: 54% - 84% of students attaining targeted RIT score growth (ELA 9 and 10) or of students meeting or exceeding the achievement target (ELA 11);

Developing: 28% - 53% of students attaining targeted RIT score growth (ELA 9 and 10) or of students meeting or exceeding the achievement target (ELA 11);

Ineffective: 0% - 27% of students attaining targeted RIT score growth (ELA 9 and 10) or of students meeting or exceeding the achievement target (ELA 11).

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

Within the category of Highly Effective, those teachers who have from 85% to 100% of their students achieve targeted RIT score growth (ELA 9 and 10) or of students meeting or exceeding the achievement target (ELA 11) will be awarded points as follows:

85% - 90% of students achieving targeted RIT score growth (ELA 9 and 10) or of students meeting or exceeding the achievement target (ELA 11) = 18 APPR points;

91% - 95% of students achieving targeted RIT score growth (ELA 9 and 10) or of students meeting or exceeding the achievement target (ELA 11) = 19 APPR points; 96% - 100% of students achieving targeted RIT score growth (ELA 9 and 10) or of students meeting or exceeding the achievement target (ELA 11) = 20 APPR points;

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

Within the category of Effective, those teachers who have from 54% to 84% of their students achieve targeted RIT score growth (ELA 9 and 10) or of students meeting or exceeding the achievement target (ELA 11) will be awarded points as follows:

54% - 56% of students achieving targeted RIT score growth (ELA 9 and 10) or of students meeting or exceeding the achievement target (ELA 11) = 9 APPR points;

57% - 59% of students achieving targeted RIT score growth (ELA 9 and 10) or of students meeting or exceeding the achievement target (ELA 11) = 10 APPR points;

60% - 62% of students achieving targeted RIT score growth (ELA 9 and 10) or of students meeting or exceeding the achievement target (ELA 11) = 11 APPR points;

63% - 64% of students achieving targeted RIT score growth (ELA 9 and 10) or of students meeting or exceeding the achievement target (ELA 11) = 12 APPR points;

65% - 67% of students achieving targeted RIT score growth (ELA 9 and 10) or of students meeting or exceeding the achievement target (ELA 11) = 13 APPR points;

68% - 70% of students achieving targeted RIT score growth (ELA 9 and 10) or of students meeting or

exceeding the achievement target (ELA 11) = 14 APPR points;  
71% - 74% of students achieving targeted RIT score growth (ELA 9 and 10) or of students meeting or exceeding the achievement target (ELA 11) = 15 APPR points;  
75% - 78% of students achieving targeted RIT score growth (ELA 9 and 10) or of students meeting or exceeding the achievement target (ELA 11) = 16 APPR points;  
79% - 84% of students achieving targeted RIT score growth (ELA 9 and 10) or of students meeting or exceeding the achievement target (ELA 11) = 17 APPR points.

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

Within the category of Developing, those teachers who have from 28% to 53% of their students achieve targeted RIT score growth (ELA 9 and 10) or of students meeting or exceeding the achievement target (ELA 11) will be awarded points as follows:

28% - 33% of students achieving targeted RIT score growth (ELA 9 and 10) or of students meeting or exceeding the achievement target (ELA 11) = 3 APPR points;

34% - 38% of students achieving targeted RIT score growth (ELA 9 and 10) or of students meeting or exceeding the achievement target (ELA 11) = 4 APPR points;

39% - 42% of students achieving targeted RIT score growth (ELA 9 and 10) or of students meeting or exceeding the achievement target (ELA 11) = 5 APPR points;

43% - 46% of students achieving targeted RIT score growth (ELA 9 and 10) or of students meeting or exceeding the achievement target (ELA 11) = 6 APPR points;

47% - 50% of students achieving targeted RIT score growth (ELA 9 and 10) or of students meeting or exceeding the achievement target (ELA 11) = 7 APPR points;

51% - 53% of students achieving targeted RIT score growth (ELA 9 and 10) or of students meeting or exceeding the achievement target (ELA 11) = 8 APPR points.

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

Within the category of Ineffective, those teachers who have from 0% to 27% of their students achieve targeted RIT score growth (ELA 9 and 10) or of students meeting or exceeding the achievement target (ELA 11) will be awarded points as follows:

0% - 20% of students achieving targeted RIT score growth (ELA 9 and 10) or of students meeting or exceeding the achievement target (ELA 11) = 0 APPR points;

21% - 23% of students achieving targeted RIT score growth (ELA 9 and 10) or of students meeting or exceeding the achievement target (ELA 11) = 1 APPR point;

24% - 27% of students achieving targeted RIT score growth (ELA 9 and 10) or of students meeting or exceeding the achievement target (ELA 11) = 2 APPR points.



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

Within the category of Effective, those teachers who have from 54% to 84% of their of students meeting or exceeding the achievement target will be awarded points as follows:

54% - 56% of students meeting or exceeding the achievement target = 9 APPR points;  
57% - 59% of students meeting or exceeding the achievement target = 10 APPR points;  
60% - 62% of students meeting or exceeding the achievement target = 11 APPR points;  
63% - 64% of students meeting or exceeding the achievement target = 12 APPR points;  
65% - 67% of students meeting or exceeding the achievement target = 13 APPR points;  
68% - 70% of students meeting or exceeding the achievement target = 14 APPR points;  
71% - 74% of students meeting or exceeding the achievement target = 15 APPR points;  
75% - 78% of students meeting or exceeding the achievement target = 16 APPR points;  
79% - 84% of students meeting or exceeding the achievement target = 17 APPR points.

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

Within the category of Developing, those teachers who have from 28% to 53% of students meeting or exceeding the achievement target will be awarded points as follows:

28% - 33% of students meeting or exceeding the achievement target = 3 APPR points;  
34% - 38% of students meeting or exceeding the achievement target = 4 APPR points;  
39% - 42% of students meeting or exceeding the achievement target = 5 APPR points;  
43% - 46% of students meeting or exceeding the achievement target = 6 APPR points;  
47% - 50% of students meeting or exceeding the achievement target = 7 APPR points;  
51% - 53% of students meeting or exceeding the achievement target = 8 APPR points.

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

Within the category of Ineffective, those teachers who have from 0% to 27% of students meeting or exceeding the achievement target will be awarded points as follows:

0% - 20% of students meeting or exceeding the achievement target = 0 APPR points;  
21% - 23% of students meeting or exceeding the achievement target = 1 APPR point;  
24% - 27% of students meeting or exceeding the achievement target = 2 APPR points.

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

*(No response)*

### 3.13) HEDI Tables or Graphics

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

and upload that file here.

*assets/survey-uploads/5139/201548-y92vNseFa4/10-19-12 RTA APPR SMOA final - LOCAL 20 APP A revised 01-08-13\_4.pdf*

### 3.14) Locally Developed Controls

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

*Student Attendance Weighting Calculation: The attendance of students shall be taken into consideration when computing the Local 20 Points (or Local 15 Points when applicable) by applying the following formula:*

- 1. The number of days that students are in attendance between the day of administration of the pre and post assessments who advanced their RIT score shall be aggregated.*
- 2. The maximum number of days for those students shall be determined for that same time period.*
- 3. The results of Step 1 shall be divided by the results of Step 2. If the ratio is less than .9 but greater than .8, one point shall be added to the teacher's local 20 or 15 point score. If the ratio is .8 or less, then 2 points shall be added to the teacher's local 20 or 15 point score. In no case will more than 2 points be added to a teacher's score.*

*Student attendance is a significant factor in ensuring that students are provided with appropriate instruction from which they can benefit and demonstrate learning. In order to mitigate problematic incentives for teachers or principals, the District has an established process for early identification of student attendance issues that encourages parents to send their children to school regularly and students to attend school.*

*This process consists of the following related interventions: regular (monthly) school-level meetings to identify students experiencing issues with attendance; electronic and hard-copy communication with parents regarding student attendance; counselor, social worker, and/or school resource officer involvement as necessary; and conferences with student and parents regarding 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.

*For teachers in Grades K-5, Measures of Academic Progress (ELA) and Measures of Academic Progress (Math), HEDI scores will be averaged. For teachers in grades 6-12, HEDI scores will be determined by proportionately weighing each HEDI score based on the number of students to determine each 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 | Checked |

|   |         |
|---|---------|
| educators' performance in ways that improve student learning and instruction.   |         |
| 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 Saturday, October 20, 2012

Updated Friday, January 11, 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 (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] | 60 |
| One or more observation(s) by trained independent evaluators   | 0  |
| Observations by trained in-school peer teachers  | 0  |
| Feedback from students using State-approved survey tool  | 0  |
| Feedback from parents/caregivers using State-approved survey tool  | 0  |
| Structured reviews of lesson plans, student portfolios and other teacher artifacts   | 0  |

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

(No response)

### 4.3) Survey Tools (if applicable)

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

(No response)

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

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

### 4.4) Assurances

Please check all of the boxes below:

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

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

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

*Teachers will be evaluated based on the seven New York State Teaching Standards and the performance indicators as described by the Danielson Framework for Teaching (2011 revised edition.)*

*Teacher performance will be assessed according to the four (4) domains of the Danielson Framework for Teaching (2011 revised edition). A maximum of 16 points will be available through the six subdomains of Domain #1 - Planning and Preparation, a maximum of 15 points through the five sub-domains of Domain #2 - The Classroom Environment, a maximum of 16 points through the five sub-domains of Domain #3 - Instruction, and a maximum of 13 points through the six sub-domains of Domain #4 - Professional Responsibilities.*

Domains #1 and #4 will be assessed based upon structured reviews of lesson plans, student portfolios, teacher artifacts, professional development, and any other evidence as deemed appropriate by the lead evaluator. Domains #2 and #3 will be assessed through evidence collected and documented by the lead evaluator based upon the Danielson Framework for Teaching (2011 revised edition) through the observation process

The Local 60 points will be computed for the purpose of the Final Summative Evaluation based upon the following methodology:

- A "Highly Effective" rating shall receive 100% of the total point value for the sub-domain;
- An "Effective" rating shall receive 96% of the total point value for the sub-domain;
- A "Developing" rating shall receive 88% of the total point value for the sub-domain;
- An "Ineffective" rating shall receive 0% of the total point value for the sub-domain. However, based upon the evaluation of the evidence collected by the lead evaluator, an "Ineffective" rating on one or more of the sub-components of a domain that is rated "Ineffective" may be awarded between 1% and 25% of the total point value for the sub-domain;
- If a raw score number contains a decimal of .5 or greater, it will be rounded up to the nearest whole number, and if a raw score number contains a decimal of less than .5, it will be rounded down to the nearest whole number to obtain the teacher's Local 60 Point score.

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

assets/survey-uploads/5091/201549-eka9yMJ855/01-09-13 4.5 APPR submittal docs\_2.pdf

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

Highly Effective: Overall performance and results exceed NYS Teaching Standards.

A maximum of 16 points will be available through the six sub-domains of Domain #1 - Planning and Preparation, a maximum of 15 points through the five sub-domains of Domain #2 - The Classroom Environment, a maximum of 16 points through the five sub-domains of Domain #3 - Instruction, and a maximum of 13 points through the six sub-domains of Domain #4 - Professional Responsibilities. A Highly Effective teacher will earn 59-60 points.

Effective: Overall performance and results meet NYS Teaching Standards.

A maximum of 16 points will be available through the six sub-domains of Domain #1 - Planning and Preparation, a maximum of 15 points through the five sub-domains of Domain #2 - The Classroom Environment, a maximum of 16 points through the five sub-domains of Domain #3 - Instruction, and a maximum of 13 points through the six sub-domains of Domain #4 - Professional Responsibilities. An Effective teacher will earn 57-58 points.

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

A maximum of 16 points will be available through the six sub-domains of Domain #1 - Planning and Preparation, a maximum of 15 points through the five sub-domains of Domain #2 - The Classroom Environment, a maximum of 16 points through the five sub-domains of Domain #3 - Instruction, and a maximum of 13 points through the six sub-domains of Domain #4 - Professional Responsibilities. A Developing teacher will earn 48-56 points.

Ineffective: Overall performance and results do not meet NYS Teaching Standards.

A maximum of 16 points will be available through the six sub-domains of Domain #1 - Planning and Preparation, a maximum of 15 points through the five sub-domains of Domain #2 - The Classroom Environment, a maximum of 16 points through the five sub-domains of Domain #3 - Instruction, and a maximum of 13 points through the six

sub-domains of Domain #4 - Professional Responsibilities.  
An Ineffective teacher will earn 0-47 points.

Provide the ranges for the 60-point scoring bands.

|                  |       |
|------------------|-------|
| Highly Effective | 59-60 |
| Effective        | 57-58 |
| Developing       | 48-56 |
| Ineffective      | 0-47  |

#### 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 | 0 |
| 4.6) Observations of Probationary Teachers   Enter 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 probationary teachers be done in person, by video, or both?

- In Person

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

- Not Applicable

#### 4.7) Observations of Tenured Teachers

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

By building principals or other trained administrators

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

By trained in-school peer teachers or other trained reviewers

|                |   |
|----------------|---|
| Formal/Long    | 0 |
| Informal/Short | 0 |

Independent evaluators

|                |   |
|----------------|---|
| Formal/Long    | 0 |
| Informal/Short | 0 |

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

- 
- In Person
- 

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

- 
- Not Applicable
-

# 5. Composite Scoring (Teachers)

Created Saturday, October 20, 2012

Updated Tuesday, January 08, 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       | 48-56 |
| Ineffective      | 0-47  |

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

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

**Growth or Comparable Measures**

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

**Other Measures of Effectiveness**

**(60 points)**

**Overall**

**Composite Score**

**Highly Effective**

**22-25**

**14-15**

**Ranges determined locally--see above**

**91-100**

**Effective**

**10-21**

**8-13**

**75-90**

**Developing**

**3-9**

**3-7**

**65-74**

**Ineffective**

**0-2**

**0-2**

**0-64**

# 6. Additional Requirements - Teachers

Created Saturday, October 20, 2012  
Updated Thursday, January 10, 2013

---

## Page 1

### 6.1) Assurances -- Improvement Plans

Please check the boxes below:

|   |         |
|---|---------|
| 6.1) Assurances -- Improvement Plans<br>  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<br>  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/5265/201551-Df0w3Xx5v6/10-19-12 RTA APPR SMOA final - TIP form.pdf](#)

### 6.3) Appeals Process

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

(1) the substance of the annual professional performance review

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

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

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

#### *APPEALS PROCESS*

##### *I. General Appeals Process:*

*A. A teacher may appeal his/her annual APPR rating based on the following:*

a. A tenured teacher who receives an ineffective composite APPR rating, or a developing composite APPR rating coupled with a developing or ineffective score on his/her sixty (60) point Rubric evaluation.

b. A probationary teacher who receives an ineffective composite APPR rating.

B. The appeal must be submitted in writing to the Superintendent of Schools or an SDA or SDL certified administrative designee mutually agreed upon with the Superintendent, who must be trained in accordance with the requirements of the statute and regulations. In the event that the Superintendent or the designee served as an evaluator or lead evaluator in determining a teacher's composite APPR rating, then he/she shall not hear the appeal. While an appeal may not be commenced until the Teacher's receipt of his/her annual composite APPR rating, nothing herein shall prevent a teacher from informally discussing the Final Summative Evaluation or the Local 20 Points allocation with the Lead Evaluator who completed it prior to the issuance of the composite APPR rating.

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

D. An appeal of an APPR evaluation or development of a TIP must be commenced within ten (10) school days of the presentation of the final document to the teacher or else the right to appeal shall be deemed waived in all regards; provided, however, notwithstanding the above, in the event that the State's 20 or 25 points are known by the District and the 100 point annual composite score is presented to a probationary teacher on or before June 15th, that probationary teacher must present his or her APPR appeal within 30 calendar days, or else his/her right to appeal shall be waived in all regards. In the event that the 100 point annual composite APPR score is presented to the probationer after June 15th, the probationer must commence the appeal within ten (10) school days of the presentation of said score to him or her or else the right to appeal shall be deemed waived in all regards.

E. In the case of appealing a completed TIP, there shall be a twenty (20) calendar day period following the end date of the TIP for filing the TIP appeal and failure to appeal the TIP within those twenty (20) calendar days shall be deemed a waiver of the right to appeal any TIP related concerns.

F. The Superintendent or an administrative designee mutually agreed upon with the Superintendent shall respond to an appeal in writing by granting said appeal and directing further administrative action, or denying said appeal with the specific reason for the denial being stated. The decision of the Superintendent or the designee shall be made within twenty (20) calendar days from receipt of the appeal. So long as the decision on the appeal is made within the timeframe set forth in this paragraph, the decision of the Superintendent or the designee shall be final and binding and shall not be subject to review in any judicial, administrative or other forum for the purposes of said appeal. In the event that the Superintendent or the designee fails to decide the appeal within the timeframe set forth in this paragraph, the appeal shall be deemed upheld.

G. The provisions set forth above shall not be construed to alter or affect the rights of probationary teachers pursuant to §3031 of the New York State Education Law.

2. *Optional Appeals Process for a tenured teacher who has received a second consecutive ineffective APPR composite rating:*

A. Notwithstanding Paragraph 1(A) through (F) above, in the event that a tenured teacher has received two consecutive ineffective APPR evaluation ratings, the appeal shall be made to one of the four agreed upon arbitrators set forth below selected on a rotating basis from the following list, based on order and reasonable timeframe of availability: Dennis Campagna, Jeffrey Selchick, Howard Edelman and Sheila Cole, who shall make a final and binding decision upon the appeal of the APPR evaluation and TIP within 35 calendar days. If the tenured teacher is unwilling to consent to the use of one of the above-named arbitrators, the appeal shall be heard by the Superintendent or an administrative designee mutually agreed upon with the Superintendent (as described hereinabove at Section 1).

B. In the event that either party has a question regarding the authenticity of any documentation provided, the same shall be presented in writing immediately to the arbitrator and copied to the other party for the arbitrator's review and consideration. The arbitrator shall review the evidence underlying the observations of the teacher along with all other evidence submitted by the teacher prior to rendering a decision.

C. In the event that the district then proceeds to a probable cause finding under Section 3020-a of the Education law, and determines to conduct such a hearing, the arbitrator shall be jointly selected by the teacher and the district from those listed above to be the Section 3020-a hearing officer. If agreement cannot be reached with ten (10) calendar days, the next available arbitrator shall be assigned the case.

*D. Notwithstanding the aforementioned language, nothing herein shall be construed as limiting the right of the employee to challenge said evaluation in any proceeding brought pursuant to Education law §3020-a, so long as the identical issue wasn't resolved in the earlier appeal to the arbitrator or clearly should have been presented in the earlier appeal and was not.*

*E. In the event that SED will not pay for the costs of the hearing, that expense shall be borne by the District and the proceedings shall be in the nature of a disciplinary arbitration and not a statutory hearing under Section 3020-a of the Education Law.*

*F. The disciplinary arbitration procedure shall be consistent with the statutory procedure and penalty parameters as set forth in Education Law Section 3020-a.*

*G. During the pendency of a disciplinary arbitration the pay rights of the teacher shall be the same as those afforded to teachers who are subject to statutory proceedings under Section 3020-a of the Education Law.*

*H. In order to take advantage of the procedure outlined in paragraph 2(A) above, the tenured teacher must consent to the use of one of the above-named arbitrators should the District proceed to find probable cause under Section 3020-a of the Education Law. If the tenured teacher is unwilling to do so, the appeal shall be heard by the Superintendent or an administrative designee mutually agreed upon with the Superintendent (as described hereinabove at Section 1).*

## 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.

*Lead evaluators will be trained per Education Law 3012-c by attending turnkey trainings offered by regional BOCES Network Team staff and/or by attending District-provided training. Refresher training will be offered and attended annually. Newly-hired administrators who are to evaluate teachers must provide documentation of certification as a lead evaluator from a previous District and/or will be required to attend turnkey and/or refresher training as offered by the New York State Education Department, regional BOCES Network Team staff, the District, and/or other organizations or agencies designated by the District. Trainings per 3012-c will include inter-rater reliability training (evidence based observations) utilizing the Teachscape platform. Training will be ongoing until all required aspects of training have been satisfied. Refresher training will occur annually.*

*To qualify for certification by the Board of Education as a lead evaluator, an individual must successfully complete training that meets certain minimum requirements prescribed in the Commissioner's Regulations outlined in the 9 below-listed required elements (section 6.5). Lead evaluators must also be periodically recertified by the Board of Education to ensure inter-rater reliability.*

*The following is a representative, though not all-inclusive, list of Lead Evaluator training dates on the 9 required elements that have been attended by the District's lead evaluators:*

*February 16, 2012*

*February 21, 2012*

*February 27, 2012*

*March 2, 2012*

*March 9, 2012*

*April 2-3, 2012*

*July 18-19, 2012*

*July 26, 2012*

*August 8-10, 2012*

*August 24-25, 2012*

*September 12, 2012*

*September 19-20, 2012*

*October 3, 2012*

## 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 | Checked |
|---|---------|

|   |         |
|---|---------|
| 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. |         |
| 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 Saturday, October 20, 2012  
Updated Thursday, December 20, 2012

## Page 1

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

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

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

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

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

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

Please check the boxes below:

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

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

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

State assessments, *required if one exists*

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

List of State-approved 3rd party assessments

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

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

| School or Program Type | SLO with Assessment Option | Name of the Assessment |
|------------------------|----------------------------|------------------------|
| 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.

|  |                |
|--|----------------|
| 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. | Not applicable |
| Highly Effective (18 - 20 points) Results are well above state average for similar students (or District goals if no state test).                        | Not applicable |
| Effective (9 - 17 points) Results meet state average for similar students (or District goals if no state test).  | Not applicable |
| Developing (3 - 8 points) Results are below state average for similar students (or District goals if no state test).                                     | Not applicable |
| Ineffective (0 - 2 points) Results are well below state average for similar students (or District goals if no state test).                               | Not applicable |

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.

*Not applicable*

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

# 8. Local Measures (Principals)

Created Saturday, October 20, 2012

Updated Friday, January 11, 2013

---

## Page 1

### Locally-Selected Measures of Student Achievement or Growth

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

- (a) student achievement levels on State assessments in ELA and/or Math in Grades 4-8 (e.g., percentage of students in the school whose performance levels on State assessments are proficient or advanced)
- (b) student growth or achievement on State assessments in ELA and/or Math in Grades 4-8 for students in each specific performance level (e.g., Level 1, Level 2)
- (c) student growth or achievement on State assessments in ELA and/or Math in Grades 4-8 for students with disabilities and English Language Learners in Grades 4-8

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

| Grade Configuration | Locally-Selected Measure from List of Approved Measures       | Assessment   |
|---------------------|---|--|
| K-5                 | (d) measures used by district for teacher evaluation          | Measures of Academic Progress (Primary Grades) ELA Math, Measures of Academic Progress (ELA), and Measures of Academic Progress (Math) |
| 6-8                 | (d) measures used by district for teacher evaluation          | Measures of Academic Progress (ELA), and Measures of Academic Progress (Math)  |
| 9-12                | (e) 4, 5, and/or 6-year high school grad and/or dropout rates | New York State Annual High School Report Card Total 4-year Graduate Completers   |
|                     |   |  |
|                     |   |  |
|                     |   |  |
|                     |   |  |

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

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

|  |  |
|--|--|
| <p>Use this box, if needed, to describe the process for assigning HEDI categories. If needed, you may upload a table or graphic below.</p> | <p>HEDI categories will be assigned according to the percentage of students in an elementary or middle school principal's school who meet or exceed the target for RIT score growth resulting from the administration of the Measures of Academic Progress (Primary Grades, ELA, or Math), or the percentage of students in a high school principal's school within the group of New York State Annual School Report Card Total 4-year Graduate Completers. Targets for each student will be established by the teacher of record and approved by the principal.</p> <p>We will use cut points to assign building principals to HEDI categories as follows:<br/>         Highly Effective: 85% - 100% of elementary or middle school students meeting or exceeding targeted RIT score growth, or 95% - 100% of high school students within the</p> |
|--|--|

group of New York State Annual School Report Card Total 4-year Graduate Completers;  
Effective: 54% - 84% of elementary or middle school students meeting or exceeding targeted RIT score growth, or 75% - 94% of high school students within the group of New York State Annual School Report Card Total 4-year Graduate Completers;  
Developing: 28% - 53% of elementary or middle school students meeting or exceeding targeted RIT score growth, or 58% - 74% of high school students within the group of New York State Annual School Report Card Total 4-year Graduate Completers;  
Ineffective: 0% - 27% of students meeting or exceeding targeted RIT score growth, or 0% - 57% of high school students achieving within the group of New York State Annual School Report Card Total 4-year Graduate Completers.

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

Within the category of Highly Effective, those elementary or middle school principals who have 85% - 100% of their students meet or exceed targeted RIT score growth, or those high school principals who have 95% - 100% of their students within the group of New York State Annual School Report Card Total 4-year Graduate Completers, will be awarded points as follows:  
85% - 92% of elementary or middle school students meeting or exceeding targeted RIT score growth, or 95% - 96% of high school students within the group of New York State Annual School Report Card Total 4-year Graduate Completers = 14 APPR points;  
93% - 100% of elementary or middle school students meeting or exceeding targeted RIT score growth, or 97% - 100% of high school students within the group of New York State Annual School Report Card Total 4-year Graduate Completers = 15 APPR points;

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

Within the category of Effective, those elementary or middle school principals who have 54% - 84% of their students meet or exceed targeted RIT score growth, or those high school principals who have 75%-94% of their students within the group of New York State Annual School Report Card Total 4-year Graduate Completers, will be awarded points as follows:  
54% - 56% of elementary or middle school students meeting or exceeding targeted RIT score growth, or 75% - 78% of high school students within the group of New York State Annual School Report Card Total 4-year Graduate Completers = 8 APPR points;  
57%-61% of elementary or middle school students meeting or exceeding targeted RIT score growth, or 79% - 82% of high school students within the group of New York State Annual School Report Card Total 4-year Graduate Completers = 9 APPR points;  
62% - 66% of elementary or middle school students meeting or exceeding targeted RIT score growth, or 83% - 85% of high school students within the group of New York State Annual School Report Card Total 4-year Graduate Completers = 10 APPR points;  
67% - 72% of elementary or middle school students meeting or exceeding targeted RIT score growth, or 86% -

88% of high school students within the group of New York State Annual School Report Card Total 4-year Graduate Completers = 11 APPR points;  
73% - 77% of elementary or middle school students meeting or exceeding targeted RIT score growth, or 89%-91% of high school students within the group of New York State Annual School Report Card Total 4-year Graduate Completers = 12 APPR points;  
78% - 84% of elementary or middle school students meeting or exceeding targeted RIT score growth, or 92% - 94% of high school students within the group of New York State Annual School Report Card Total 4-year Graduate Completers = 13 APPR points.

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

Within the category of Developing, those elementary or middle school principals who have 28% - 53% of their students meet or exceed targeted RIT score growth, or those high school principals who have 58% - 74% of their students within the group of New York State Annual School Report Card Total 4-year Graduate Completers, will be awarded points as follows:  
28% - 31% of elementary or middle school students meeting or exceeding targeted RIT score growth, or 58% - 60% of high school students within the group of New York State Annual School Report Card Total 4-year Graduate Completers = 3 APPR points;  
32% - 37% of elementary or middle school students meeting or exceeding targeted RIT score growth, or 61% - 64% of high school students within the group of New York State Annual School Report Card Total 4-year Graduate Completers = 4 APPR points;  
38% - 43% of elementary or middle school students meeting or exceeding targeted RIT score growth, or 65% - 67% of high school students within the group of New York State Annual School Report Card Total 4-year Graduate Completers = 5 APPR points;  
44% - 49% of elementary or middle school students meeting or exceeding targeted RIT score growth, or 68% - 70% of high school students within the group of New York State Annual School Report Card Total 4-year Graduate Completers = 6 APPR points;  
50% - 53% of elementary or middle school students meeting or exceeding targeted RIT score growth, or 71% - 74% of high school students within the group of New York State Annual School Report Card Total 4-year Graduate Completers = 7 APPR points.

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

Within the category of Ineffective, elementary or middle school principals who have 0% - 27% of their students meet or exceed targeted RIT score growth, or high school principals who have 0% - 57% of their students within the group of New York State Annual High School Report Card Total 4-year Graduate Completers, will be awarded points as follows:  
0% - 20% of elementary or middle school students meeting or exceeding targeted RIT score growth, or 0% - 51% of high school students within the group of New York State Annual School Report Card Total 4-year Graduate Completers = 0 APPR points;  
21% - 23% of elementary or middle school students meeting or exceeding targeted RIT score growth, or 52% -

54% of high school students within the group of New York State Annual School Report Card Total 4-year Graduate Completers = 1 APPR points;  
24% - 27% of elementary or middle school students meeting or exceeding targeted RIT score growth, or 55% - 57% of high school students within the group of New York State Annual School Report Card Total 4-year Graduate Completers = 2 APPR points.

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

*(No response)*

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

[assets/survey-uploads/5366/201553-qBFVOWF7fC/12-11-12 RAA APPR Local 15% Measures revised 01-11-13.pdf](#)

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

*(g) percentage of a cohort of students that achieve specified scores on Regents examinations and/or Department approved alternative*

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

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

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

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

| Grade Configuration | Locally-Selected Measure from List of Approved Measures | Assessment |
|---------------------|---|------------|
| Not applicable      |   |            |
|                     |   |            |
|                     |   |            |
|                     |   |            |
|                     |   |            |
|                     |   |            |
|                     |   |            |

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.

*Student Attendance Weighting Calculation: The attendance of students shall be taken into consideration when computing the Local 20 Points (or Local 15 Points when applicable) by applying the following formula:*

- 1. The number of days that students are in attendance between the day of administration of the pre and post assessments who maintained or advanced their RIT score shall be aggregated.*
- 2. The maximum number of days for those students shall be determined for that same time period.*
- 3. The results of Step 1 shall be divided by the results of Step 2. If the ratio is less than .9 but greater than .8, one point shall be added to the teacher's local 20 or 15 point score. If the ratio is .8 or less, then 2 points shall be added to the teacher's local 20 or 15 point score. In no case will more than 2 points be added to a principal's score.*

*Student attendance is a significant factor in ensuring that students are provided with appropriate instruction from which they can benefit and demonstrate learning. In order to mitigate problematic incentives for teachers or principals, the District has an established process for early identification of student attendance issues that encourages parents to send their children to school regularly and students to attend school.*

*This process consists of the following related interventions: regular (monthly) school-level meetings to identify students experiencing issues with attendance; electronic and hard-copy communication with parents regarding student attendance; counselor, social worker, and/or school resource officer involvement as necessary; and conferences with student and parents regarding 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.

*Not applicable.*

### 8.5) Assurances

Please check all of the boxes below:

|   |       |
|---|-------|
| 8.5) Assurances   Assure that the application of locally developed controls will be rigorous, fair, and transparent   | Check |
| 8.5) Assurances   Assure that use of locally developed controls will not have a disparate impact on underrepresented students, in accordance with any applicable civil rights laws. | Check |
| 8.5) Assurances   Assure that enrolled students are included in accordance with policies for student assignment to schools and may not be excluded.                                 | Check |
| 8.5) Assurances   Assure that procedures for ensuring data accuracy and integrity are being utilized.   | Check |

|   |       |
|---|-------|
| 8.5) Assurances   Assure that the process for assigning points for locally selected measures will use the narrative HEDI descriptions described in the regulations to effectively differentiate principals' performance in ways that improve student learning and instruction.  | Check |
| 8.5) Assurances   Assure that it is possible for a principal to earn each point, including 0, for the locally selected measures subcomponent.   | Check |
| 8.5) Assurances   Assure that locally-selected measures are rigorous and comparable across all principals in the same or similar programs or grade configurations across the district.  | Check |
| 8.5) Assurances   If more than one type of locally-selected measure is used for different groups of principals in the same or similar grade configuration or program, certify that the measures are comparable based on the Standards of Educational and Psychological Testing. | Check |
| 8.5) Assurances   Assure that all locally-selected measures for a principal are different than any measures used for the State assessment or other comparable measures subcomponent.  | Check |

# 9. Other Measures of Effectiveness (Principals)

Created Saturday, October 20, 2012

Updated Friday, January 11, 2013

## Page 1

### 9.1) Principal Practice Rubric

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

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

*Multidimensional Principal Performance Rubric*

*(No response)*

### 9.2) Points Within Other Measures

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

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

Is the following points assignment for all principals?

*Yes*

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

*(No response)*

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

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

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

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

*(No response)*

### 9.3) Assurances -- Goals

Please check the boxes below (if applicable):

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

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

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

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

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

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

*(No response)*

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

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

|   |               |
|---|---------------|
| Principal Evaluation Tripod School Perception Survey (Combined Parent Survey)   | (No response) |
| Principal Evaluation Tripod School Perception Survey (Combined Student Surveys) | (No response) |

## 9.6) Assurances

Please check all of the boxes below:

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

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

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

*Principals will be evaluated based on the seven New York State Teaching Standards and the performance indicators as described by the Multidimensional Principal Performance Rubric (MPPR).*

*Principal performance will be assessed according to the six (6) domains of the Multidimensional Principal Performance Rubric (MPPR). A maximum of 8 points will be available through the two subdomains of Domain #1 - Shared Vision of Learning; a maximum of 20 points through the five sub-domains of Domain #2 - School Culture and Instructional Program; a maximum of 16 points through the four sub-domains of Domain #3 - Efficient, Effective Learning Environment; a maximum of 6.5 points through the three sub-domains of Domain #4 - Community; a maximum of 7.5 points through the two sub-domains of Domain #5 - Integrity, Fairness, Ethics; and a maximum of 2 points through the two sub-domains of Domain #6 - Political, Social, Economic, Legal, Cultural Context.*

*The Local 60 points will be computed for the purpose of the Final Summative Evaluation based upon the following methodology:*

- A "Highly Effective" rating shall receive 100% of the total point value for the sub-domain;*
- An "Effective" rating shall receive 96% of the total point value for the sub-domain;*
- A "Developing" rating shall receive 88% of the total point value for the sub-domain;*
- An "Ineffective" rating shall receive 0% of the total point value for the sub-domain, provided, however, based upon the evaluation of the evidence collected by the lead evaluator, an "Ineffective" rating on one or more of the sub-components of a domain that is rated "Ineffective" may be awarded between 1% and 25% of the total point value for the sub-domain;*
- If a raw score number contains a decimal of .5 or greater, it will be rounded up to the nearest whole number, and if a raw score number contains a decimal of less than .5, it will be rounded down to the nearest whole number to obtain the teacher's Local 60 Point score.*

*Any deficiency observed by the principal evaluator will be documented, in writing, along with constructive and specific ways in which the principal may achieve improvement in regards to that specific perceived deficiency. The principal shall have one (1) week to submit a response to the observation including any supporting documentation.*

*Two (2) formal school visits (one unannounced) will be conducted each year. In the event that the principal evaluator is unable to obtain evidence necessary to complete the Local 60 Point rubric score after having conducted two school visits, then one or more additional school visits shall be scheduled, either announced or unannounced as mutually agreed upon by the parties with the length thereof to be mutually agreed upon by the parties.*

*The announced school visit shall be a minimum of 60 minutes in duration and the unannounced school visit shall be a minimum of 30 minutes in duration.*

*With the exception of the unannounced school visits, all formal observations must be scheduled three (3) work days in advance. At the time the principal evaluator arrives for an unannounced school visit, he/she shall inform the building principal that such visit will constitute an unannounced school visit for APPR evaluation purposes. The principal shall be advised by written communication that the unannounced school visit will be conducted within a period of 30 calendar days.*

*A pre-observation meeting shall be held at least three (3) work days prior to scheduled formal school visit to discuss planned activities to be observed and the related practice rubric domains that will be the focus of the school visit.*

*At the time of arrival for the unannounced school visit, the principal evaluator will make it known that the visit is for evaluation purposes.*

*Post-observation meeting shall be held no later than ten (10) work days after the formal school visit and a written summary, including any suggested guidance, which is to be delivered to the principal within one week of the post-observation meeting on a form to be mutually agreed-upon by the parties.*

*The principal shall have ten (10) work days to submit a response to the school visit including any supporting documentation.*

*The principal may submit, prior to June 1st, evidence of and artifacts supporting his/her performance in each of the domains. The principal evaluator shall review and consider all evidence/artifacts submitted for each domain and such evidence/artifacts shall be reflected on the final evaluation form, with copies annexed to the evaluation form. In addition, for each domain, the final evaluation form shall include the evaluator's overall comments as well as a specific, complete, and accurate explanation of evidence and/or facts supporting a rating of Ineffective for any domain.*

*Formal monitoring or observation of the work performance of the principal during the announced visit shall be conducted openly and with the full knowledge of the principal;*

*The principal evaluator, based upon observation summary and responses, shall complete an end-of-the-year evaluation on a form to be mutually agreed upon by the parties, with the assigned point total included, and will deliver it to the building principal no later than June 15th.*

*An ineffective rating in any subcomponent within a domain must be supported by specific, complete, and accurate evidence and/or facts to be provided by the evaluator.*

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

[assets/survey-uploads/5143/201554-pMADJ4gk6R/12-11-12 RAA APPR Assigning Points HEDI Ratings\\_1.pdf](#)

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

Highly Effective: Overall performance and results exceed standards.

A maximum of 8 points will be available through the two subdomains of Domain #1 - Shared Vision of Learning; a maximum of 20 points through the five sub-domains of Domain #2 - School Culture and Instructional Program; a maximum of 16 points through the four sub-domains of Domain #3 - Efficient, Effective Learning Environment; a maximum of 6.5 points through the three sub-domains of Domain #4 - Community; a maximum of 7.5 points through the two sub-domains of Domain #5 - Integrity, Fairness, Ethics; and a maximum of 2 points through the two sub-domains of Domain #6 - Political, Social, Economic, Legal, Cultural Context. A Highly Effective principal will earn 59-60 points.

|  |  |
|--|--|
| Effective: Overall performance and results meet standards.                               | A maximum of 8 points will be available through the two subdomains of Domain #1 - Shared Vision of Learning; a maximum of 20 points through the five sub-domains of Domain #2 - School Culture and Instructional Program; a maximum of 16 points through the four sub-domains of Domain #3 - Efficient, Effective Learning Environment; a maximum of 6.5 points through the three sub-domains of Domain #4 - Community; a maximum of 7.5 points through the two sub-domains of Domain #5 - Integrity, Fairness, Ethics; and a maximum of 2 points through the two sub-domains of Domain #6 - Political, Social, Economic, Legal, Cultural Context. An Effective principal will earn 57-58 points.  |
| Developing: Overall performance and results need improvement in order to meet standards. | A maximum of 8 points will be available through the two subdomains of Domain #1 - Shared Vision of Learning; a maximum of 20 points through the five sub-domains of Domain #2 - School Culture and Instructional Program; a maximum of 16 points through the four sub-domains of Domain #3 - Efficient, Effective Learning Environment; a maximum of 6.5 points through the three sub-domains of Domain #4 - Community; a maximum of 7.5 points through the two sub-domains of Domain #5 - Integrity, Fairness, Ethics; and a maximum of 2 points through the two sub-domains of Domain #6 - Political, Social, Economic, Legal, Cultural Context. A Developing principal will earn 48-56 points.  |
| Ineffective: Overall performance and results do not meet standards.                      | A maximum of 8 points will be available through the two subdomains of Domain #1 - Shared Vision of Learning; a maximum of 20 points through the five sub-domains of Domain #2 - School Culture and Instructional Program; a maximum of 16 points through the four sub-domains of Domain #3 - Efficient, Effective Learning Environment; a maximum of 6.5 points through the three sub-domains of Domain #4 - Community; a maximum of 7.5 points through the two sub-domains of Domain #5 - Integrity, Fairness, Ethics; and a maximum of 2 points through the two sub-domains of Domain #6 - Political, Social, Economic, Legal, Cultural Context. An Ineffective principal will earn 0-47 points. |

Please provide the locally-negotiated 60 point scoring bands.

|                  |       |
|------------------|-------|
| Highly Effective | 59-60 |
| Effective        | 57-58 |
| Developing       | 48-56 |
| Ineffective      | 0-47  |

## 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 Saturday, October 20, 2012

Updated Wednesday, January 09, 2013

---

## Page 1

### **Standards for Rating Categories**

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

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

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

#### **Highly**

##### **Effective**

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

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

Overall performance and results exceed ISLLC leadership standards.

##### **Effective**

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

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

Overall performance and results meet ISLLC leadership standards.

##### **Developing**

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

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

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

##### **Ineffective**

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

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

Overall performance and results do not meet ISLLC leadership standards.

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

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

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

**Growth or Comparable Measures**

**Locally-selected Measures of**

**growth or achievement**

**Other Measures of Effectiveness**

**(60 points)**

**Overall**

**Composite Score**

**Highly Effective**

**18-20**

**18-20**

**Ranges determined locally--see below**

**91-100**

**Effective**

**9-17**

**9-17**

**75-90**

**Developing**

**3-8**

**3-8**

**65-74**

**Ineffective**

**0-2**

**0-2**

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

|                  |       |
|------------------|-------|
| Highly Effective | 59-60 |
| Effective        | 57-58 |
| Developing       | 48-56 |
| Ineffective      | 0-47  |

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

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

**Growth or Comparable Measures**

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

**Other Measures of Effectiveness**

**(60 points)**

**Overall**

**Composite Score**

**Highly Effective**

22-25

14-15

Ranges determined locally--see above

91-100

**Effective**

10-21

8-13

75-90

**Developing**

3-9

3-7

**65-74**

**Ineffective**

**0-2**

**0-2**

**0-64**

# 11. Additional Requirements - Principals

Created Saturday, October 20, 2012  
Updated Thursday, January 10, 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 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/5276/201556-Df0w3Xx5v6/12-04-12 PIP form.pdf>

### 11.3) Appeals Process

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

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

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

#### *I. Appeals Process:*

*A. A tenured building principal who receives an ineffective composite APPR rating or a developing composite APPR rating coupled with a developing or ineffective score on his/her sixty (60) point rubric evaluation shall be entitled to appeal his/her annual APPR rating, based upon a paper submission to the Superintendent of Schools or the Superintendent's administrative designee, who shall be trained in accordance with the requirements of the statute and regulations and also possesses either an SDA or SDL Certification;*

provided, however, in the event that the Superintendent or the Superintendent's administrative designee served as an evaluator or lead evaluator, he or she shall not hear the appeal. A probationary building principal who receives an ineffective composite APPR rating may appeal his/her APPR.

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

C. An appeal of an APPR evaluation or a PIP must be commenced within fourteen (14) business days of the presentation of the final document to the principal or else the right to appeal shall be deemed waived in all regards; provided, however, that in the case of a PIP appeal, there shall be a second fourteen business day period for a PIP appeal following the end date of the PIP. In the event that the Superintendent conducted the APPR evaluation under appeal, the parties agree that the Superintendent shall not hear the appeal, and that he/she will consult with the Rhinebeck Administrator's Association to identify an individual who is qualified to hear the appeal and is agreeable to both the Superintendent and the Rhinebeck Administrator's Association.

D. Whoever shall hear the appeal shall respond to the appeal with a written answer granting the appeal and directing further administrative action, or denying the appeal. The Superintendent or the Superintendent's administrative designee shall review the evidence underlying the observations of the principal along with all other evidence submitted by the principal prior to rendering a decision. Such decision shall be made within fourteen (14) business days of the receipt of the appeal. So long as the decision is made within the timeframe set forth in this paragraph, the decision of the Superintendent or the Superintendent's administrative designee shall be final and binding in all regards and shall not be subject to review at arbitration, before any administrative agency or in any court of law. In the event that the decision is not made within the timeframe set forth in this paragraph, the Appeal shall be sustained.

E. 1. Notwithstanding the above, in the event that a tenured principal has received two consecutive ineffective APPR evaluation ratings, the appeal shall be to an arbitrator selected on a rotating basis from the following list, based on order and reasonable timeframe of availability: Bonnie Siber-Weinstock, Ira Lobel, Jeffrey Selchick, Margaret Leibowitz, Sheila Cole and Howard Edelman, who shall make a final and binding decision upon the appeal of the APPR evaluation and/or the PIP that shall be issued within 35 calendar days of his/her receipt of the written appeal. The documentation to be furnished to the arbitrator on behalf of the tenured principal and by the District shall be exchanged between the tenured principal and the administration on an immediate basis at the time of submission to the arbitrator. In the event that either party has a question regarding the authenticity of such documentation, the same shall be presented in writing immediately to the arbitrator and copied to the other party for the arbitrator's review and consideration. The Arbitrator shall review the evidence underlying the observations of the principal along with all other evidence submitted by the principal prior to rendering a decision. In the event that the district then proceeds to a probable cause finding under Section 3020-a of the Education Law, and determines to conduct such a hearing, the arbitrator who ruled upon the appeal shall be jointly selected by the principal and the district to be the Section 3020-a hearing officer. Notwithstanding the aforementioned language, nothing herein shall be construed as limiting the right of the employee to challenge said evaluation in any proceeding brought pursuant to Education Law Section 3020-a, so long as the identical issue wasn't resolved in the appeal or clearly should have been presented in the appeal but was not. It is expected that the cost of said hearing shall be paid for in accordance with the provision of the Education Law.

2. In order to take advantage of the procedure outlined in E(1) above, the tenured principal must consent, following consultation with an Association representative, to the use of an arbitrator from the arbitration panel set forth in paragraph E(1) above, should the district proceed to find probable cause under Section 3020-a of the Education Law. If the tenured principal is unwilling to do so, the appeal shall be heard by the Superintendent or the Superintendent's administrative designee.

F. The provisions set forth above shall neither be construed to alter or affect the rights of probationary principals pursuant to § 3031 of the New York State Education Law.

## 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.

Principal evaluators will be trained per Education Law 3012-c by attending turnkey trainings offered by regional BOCES Network Team staff and/or by attending District-provided training. Refresher training will be offered and attended annually. Newly-hired administrators who are to evaluate principals must provide documentation of certification as a principal evaluator from a previous District and/or will be required to attend turnkey and/or refresher training as offered by the New York State Education Department, regional BOCES Network Team staff, the District, and/or other organizations or agencies designated by the District. Trainings per

3012-c will include inter-rater reliability training (evidence based observations). Training will be ongoing until all required aspects of training have been satisfied. Refresher training will occur annually.

To qualify for certification by the Board of Education as a principal evaluator, an individual must successfully complete training that meets certain minimum requirements prescribed in the Commissioner's Regulations outlined in the 9 below-listed required elements (section 11.5). Principal evaluators must also be periodically recertified by the Board of Education to ensure inter-rater reliability.

The following is a representative, though not all-inclusive, list of Principal Evaluator training dates on the 9 below-listed required elements (section 11.5) that have been attended by the District's principal evaluators:

February 16, 2012

March 2, 2012

June 27, 2012

July 11, 2012

August 6, 2012

August 9-10, 2012

August 21, 2012

September 19-20, 2012

October 11, 2012

## 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 Saturday, October 20, 2012

Updated Friday, January 11, 2013

---

### Page 1

#### 12.1) Upload the Joint Certification of the APPR Plan

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

<assets/survey-uploads/5581/201557-3Uqgn5g9Iu/01-11-13 District Certification form.pdf>

#### File types supported for uploads

PDF (preferred)

Microsoft Office (.doc, .ppt, .xls)

Microsoft Office 2007: Supported but not recommended (.docx, .pptx, .xlsx)

Open Office (.odt, .ott)

Images (.jpg, .gif)

Other Formats (.html, .xhtml, .txt, .rtf, .latex)

Please note that .docx, .pptx, and .xlsx formats are not entirely supported.

Please save your file types as .doc, .ppt or .xls respectively before uploading.

**Local 60 Points Allocation:**

| Danielson 2011 Revised Framework for Teaching        |  | Total Point Value |
|--|--|-------------------|
| <b>1. PLANNING &amp; PREPARATION: 16 Points</b>      |  |                   |
| 1a: Demonstrating Knowledge of Content and Pedagogy. |  | 3                 |
| 1b: Demonstrating Knowledge of Students.             |  | 2                 |
| 1c: Setting Instructional Outcomes.                  |  | 3                 |
| 1d: Demonstrating Knowledge of Resources.            |  | 2                 |
| 1e: Designing Coherent Instruction.                  |  | 3                 |
| 1f: Designing Student Assessments.                   |  | 3                 |
| <b>2. THE CLASSROOM ENVIRONMENT: 15 Points</b>       |  |                   |
| 2a: Creating an Environment of Respect and Rapport.  |  | 3                 |
| 2b: Establishing A Culture for Learning.             |  | 3                 |
| 2c: Managing Classroom Procedures.                   |  | 3                 |
| 2d: Managing Student Behavior.                       |  | 3                 |
| 2e: Organizing Physical Space.                       |  | 3                 |
| <b>3. INSTRUCTION: 16 Points</b>                     |  |                   |
| 3a. Communicating with Students.                     |  | 4                 |
| 3b. Using Questioning and Discussion Techniques.     |  | 3                 |
| 3c. Engaging Students in Learning.                   |  | 4                 |
| 3d. Using Assessment in Instruction.                 |  | 3                 |
| 3e. Demonstrating Flexibility & Responsiveness.      |  | 2                 |
| <b>4. PROFESSIONAL RESPONSIBILITIES: 13 Points</b>   |  |                   |
| 4a. Reflecting on Teaching.                          |  | 3                 |
| 4b. Maintaining Accurate Records.                    |  | 2                 |
| 4c. Communicating with Families.                     |  | 3                 |
| 4d. Participating in a Professional Community.       |  | 2                 |
| 4e. Growing and Developing Professionally.           |  | 2                 |
| 4f. Showing Professionalism.                         |  | 1                 |
| <b>Total Possible Points:</b>                        |  | <b>60</b>         |

The above-referenced point distribution places a majority of the points within Domains 2 and 3, in accordance with the mandates of Education Law Section 3012-c, as these Domains are directly observable in the classroom.

The parties further agree that for the 2012-13 and 2013-14 school years, the Local 60 Points will be computed for the purpose of the Final Summative Evaluation based upon the following methodology:

1. A "Highly Effective" rating shall receive 100% of the total point value for the sub-domain.
2. An "Effective" rating shall receive 96% of the total point value for the sub-domain.
3. A "Developing" rating shall receive 88% of the total point value for that sub-domain.
4. An "Ineffective" rating shall receive 0% of the total point value for the sub-

domain; provided, however, that based upon the evaluation of the evidence collected by the lead evaluator, an "Ineffective" rating on one or more of the sub-components of a domain that is rated "Ineffective" may be awarded between 1% and 25% of the total point value for the sub-domain.

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

| <b>Rating</b>    | <b>Point Range</b> |
|------------------|--------------------|
| Highly Effective | 59-60              |
| Effective        | 57-58              |
| Developing       | 48-56              |
| Ineffective      | 0-47               |

**APPR - Teacher Evaluation**  
**Local 60 Points Calculation Spreadsheet - Rhinebeck Central School District**

|                    | Entry by Administrator = H,E,D,I | =Points assigned | Total Possible Points = 100% | Sub-totals | Highly Effective = 100% | Effective = 96.0% | Developing = 88% | Ineffective = 0% |
|--------------------|----------------------------------|------------------|------------------------------|------------|-------------------------|-------------------|------------------|------------------|
| 1a                 | E                                | 2.88             | 3.00                         | 19%        | 3.00                    | 2.88              | 2.64             | 0.00             |
| 1b                 | E                                | 1.92             | 2.00                         | 13%        | 2.00                    | 1.92              | 1.76             | 0.00             |
| 1c                 | D                                | 2.64             | 3.00                         | 19%        | 3.00                    | 2.88              | 2.64             | 0.00             |
| 1d                 | E                                | 1.92             | 2.00                         | 13%        | 2.00                    | 1.92              | 1.76             | 0.00             |
| 1e                 | E                                | 2.88             | 3.00                         | 19%        | 3.00                    | 2.88              | 2.64             | 0.00             |
| 1f                 | D                                | 2.64             | 3.00                         | 19%        | 3.00                    | 2.88              | 2.64             | 0.00             |
|                    |                                  |                  |                              | <b>15</b>  | <b>27%</b>              |                   |                  |                  |
| 2a                 | H                                | 3.00             | 3.00                         | 20%        | 3.00                    | 2.88              | 2.64             | 0.00             |
| 2b                 | E                                | 2.88             | 3.00                         | 20%        | 3.00                    | 2.88              | 2.64             | 0.00             |
| 2c                 | E                                | 2.88             | 3.00                         | 20%        | 3.00                    | 2.88              | 2.64             | 0.00             |
| 2d                 | E                                | 2.88             | 3.00                         | 20%        | 3.00                    | 2.88              | 2.64             | 0.00             |
| 2e                 | D                                | 2.64             | 3.00                         | 20%        | 3.00                    | 2.88              | 2.64             | 0.00             |
|                    |                                  |                  |                              | <b>15</b>  | <b>28%</b>              |                   |                  |                  |
| 3a                 | E                                | 3.84             | 4.00                         | 25%        | 4.00                    | 3.84              | 3.52             | 0.00             |
| 3b                 | E                                | 2.88             | 3.00                         | 19%        | 3.00                    | 2.88              | 2.64             | 0.00             |
| 3c                 | E                                | 3.84             | 4.00                         | 25%        | 4.00                    | 3.84              | 3.52             | 0.00             |
| 3d                 | E                                | 2.88             | 3.00                         | 19%        | 3.00                    | 2.88              | 2.64             | 0.00             |
| 3e                 | D                                | 1.76             | 2.00                         | 13%        | 2.00                    | 1.92              | 1.76             | 0.00             |
|                    |                                  |                  |                              | <b>16</b>  | <b>27%</b>              |                   |                  |                  |
| 4a                 | E                                | 2.88             | 3.00                         | 23%        | 3.00                    | 2.88              | 2.64             | 0.00             |
| 4b                 | D                                | 1.76             | 2.00                         | 15%        | 2.00                    | 1.92              | 1.76             | 0.00             |
| 4c                 | H                                | 3.00             | 3.00                         | 23%        | 3.00                    | 2.88              | 2.64             | 0.00             |
| 4d                 | E                                | 1.92             | 2.00                         | 15%        | 2.00                    | 1.92              | 1.76             | 0.00             |
| 4e                 | E                                | 1.92             | 2.00                         | 15%        | 2.00                    | 1.92              | 1.76             | 0.00             |
| 4f                 | E                                | 0.96             | 1.00                         | 8%         | 1.00                    | 0.96              | 0.88             | 0.00             |
| <b>Raw Score</b>   |                                  | <b>56.80</b>     |                              | <b>15</b>  | <b>27%</b>              |                   |                  |                  |
| <b>Final Total</b> |                                  | <b>57.00</b>     | <b>60.00</b>                 | <b>60</b>  | <b>100%</b>             | <b>60.00</b>      | <b>57.60</b>     | <b>52.80</b>     |

| HEDI BANDS |       |   |
|------------|-------|---|
| 0-47       | 0.00  | I |
|            | 47.00 | I |
| 48-56      | 48.00 | D |
|            | 56.00 | D |
| 57-58      | 57.00 | E |
|            | 58.00 | E |
| 59-60      | 59.00 | H |
|            | 60.00 | H |

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

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

**TEACHER IMPROVEMENT PLAN FOR TEACHERS SUBJECT TO SECTION 3012-c OF THE EDUCATION LAW AND  
PART 30-2 OF THE REGENTS RULES**

(For a teacher who is rated ineffective or developing on his/her Final Summative Evaluation)

| 1. The area(s) in need of improvement. | 2.The performance goals, expectations, benchmarks, standards and timeliness the teacher must meet in order to achieve an effective rating. | 3. How improvement will be measured and monitored, including periodic reviews of progress and goal achievement. | 4. The anticipated frequency and duration of meetings of the teacher, administrator, and mentor (if one is assigned). |
|--|--|---|---|
|  |  |   |   |
|  |  |   |   |
|  |  |   |   |



**Appendix “B”  
Rhinebeck Central School District  
Local 15 Measure of Student Growth or Achievement**

**(2012-13 School Year Using Data from NWEA MAP – to be upon the State’s introduction of a Value-Added Growth Measure during the 2012-13 school year)**

| % of students in a teacher’s class who meet or exceed the RIT score growth target when MAP is administered | <b>Highly Effective</b> | <b>Effective</b> | <b>Developing</b> | <b>Ineffective</b> |
|--|-------------------------|------------------|-------------------|--------------------|
| 0-20   |                         |                  |                   | 0                  |
| 21-23  |                         |                  |                   | 1                  |
| 24-27  |                         |                  |                   | 2                  |
| 28-31  |                         |                  | 3                 |                    |
| 32-37  |                         |                  | 4                 |                    |
| 38-43  |                         |                  | 5                 |                    |
| 44-49  |                         |                  | 6                 |                    |
| 50-53  |                         |                  | 7                 |                    |
| 54-56  |                         | 8                |                   |                    |
| 57-61  |                         | 9                |                   |                    |
| 62-66  |                         | 10               |                   |                    |
| 67-72  |                         | 11               |                   |                    |
| 73-77  |                         | 12               |                   |                    |
| 78-84  |                         | 13               |                   |                    |
| 85-92  | 14                      |                  |                   |                    |
| 93-100   | 15                      |                  |                   |                    |

**Appendix “A”**  
**Rhinebeck Central School District**  
**Local 20 Measure of Student Growth or Achievement**  
**(2012-13 School Year Using Data from NWEA MAP or other class target)**

**Student Attendance Weighting Calculation**

The attendance of students shall be taken into consideration when computing the Local 20 Points (or Local 15 Points when applicable) by applying the following formula:

1. The number of days that students are in attendance between the day of administration of the pre and post assessments who maintained or advanced their RIT score shall be aggregated.
2. The maximum number of days for those students shall be determined for that same time period.
3. The results of Step 1 shall be divided by the results of Step 2. If the ratio is less than .9 but greater than .8, one point shall be added to the teacher’s local 20 or 15 point score. If the ratio is .8 or less, then 2 points shall be added to the teacher’s local 20 or 15 point score.

| % of students in a teacher’s class who meet or exceed the achievement Target for the class or who meet or exceed the RIT score growth target (if MAP is administered) | <b>Highly Effective</b> | <b>Effective</b> | <b>Developing</b> | <b>Ineffective</b> |
|---|-------------------------|------------------|-------------------|--------------------|
| 0-20  |                         |                  |                   | 0                  |
| 21-23   |                         |                  |                   | 1                  |
| 24-27   |                         |                  |                   | 2                  |
| 28-33   |                         |                  | 3                 |                    |
| 34-38   |                         |                  | 4                 |                    |
| 39-42   |                         |                  | 5                 |                    |
| 43-46   |                         |                  | 6                 |                    |
| 47-50   |                         |                  | 7                 |                    |
| 51-53   |                         |                  | 8                 |                    |
| 54-56   |                         | 9                |                   |                    |
| 57-59   |                         | 10               |                   |                    |
| 60-62   |                         | 11               |                   |                    |
| 63-64   |                         | 12               |                   |                    |
| 65-67   |                         | 13               |                   |                    |
| 68-70   |                         | 14               |                   |                    |
| 71-74   |                         | 15               |                   |                    |
| 75-78   |                         | 16               |                   |                    |
| 79-84   |                         | 17               |                   |                    |
| 85-90   | 18                      |                  |                   |                    |
| 91-95   | 19                      |                  |                   |                    |
| 96-100  | 20                      |                  |                   |                    |

Allocating the Local 60 Points:

Points within the Multidimensional Principal Performance Rubric shall be allocated as follows for the 2012-13 and 2013-14 school years.

| <b>Multidimensional Principal Performance Rubric</b>                       | <b>Points</b> |
|--|---------------|
| <b>Domain 1: Shared Vision of Learning</b>                                 | <b>8</b>      |
| a. Culture   | 4             |
| b. Sustainability  | 4             |
| <b>Domain 2: School Culture &amp; Instructional Program</b>                | <b>20</b>     |
| a. Culture   | 4             |
| b. Instructional Program   | 4             |
| c. Capacity Building   | 4             |
| d. Sustainability  | 4             |
| e. Strategic Planning Process  | 4             |
| <b>Domain 3: Safe, Efficient, Effective Learning Environment</b>           | <b>16</b>     |
| a. Capacity Building   | 4             |
| b. Culture   | 4             |
| c. Sustainability  | 4             |
| d. Instructional Program   | 4             |
| <b>Domain 4: Community</b>   | <b>6.5</b>    |
| a. Strategic Planning Process: Inquiry                                     | 3             |
| b. Culture   | 1.5           |
| c. Sustainability  | 2             |
| <b>Domain 5: Integrity, Fairness, Ethics</b>                               | <b>7.5</b>    |
| a. Sustainability  | 4             |
| b. Culture   | 3.5           |
| <b>Domain 6: Political, Social, Economic, Legal &amp; Cultural Context</b> | <b>2</b>      |
| a. Sustainability  | 1             |
| b. Culture   | 1             |
| <b>TOTAL POINTS</b>  | <b>60</b>     |

## SAMPLE POINTS COMPUTATION

### APPR - Principal Evaluation

#### Local 60 Points Calculation Spreadsheet - Rhinebeck Central School District

|                    | Entry by Administrator = H,E,D,I | =Points assigned | Total Possible Points = 100% | Sub-totals  | Highly Effective = 100% | Effective = 96.0% | Developing = 88% | Ineffective = 0% |             |
|--------------------|----------------------------------|------------------|------------------------------|-------------|-------------------------|-------------------|------------------|------------------|-------------|
| 1a                 | E                                | 3.84             | 4.00                         | 50%         | 4.00                    | 3.84              | 3.52             | 0.00             |             |
| 1b                 | E                                | 3.84             | 4.00                         | 50%         | 4.00                    | 3.84              | 3.52             | 0.00             |             |
|                    |                                  |                  |                              | <b>8</b>    | <b>13%</b>              |                   |                  |                  |             |
| 2a                 | E                                | 3.84             | 4.00                         | 20%         | 4.00                    | 3.84              | 3.52             | 0.00             |             |
| 2b                 | E                                | 3.84             | 4.00                         | 20%         | 4.00                    | 3.84              | 3.52             | 0.00             |             |
| 2c                 | D                                | 3.52             | 4.00                         | 20%         | 4.00                    | 3.84              | 3.52             | 0.00             |             |
| 2d                 | D                                | 3.52             | 4.00                         | 20%         | 4.00                    | 3.84              | 3.52             | 0.00             |             |
| 2e                 | E                                | 3.84             | 4.00                         | 20%         | 4.00                    | 3.84              | 3.52             | 0.00             |             |
|                    |                                  |                  |                              | <b>20</b>   | <b>33%</b>              |                   |                  |                  |             |
| 3a                 | H                                | 4.00             | 4.00                         | 25%         | 4.00                    | 3.84              | 3.52             | 0.00             |             |
| 3b                 | E                                | 3.84             | 4.00                         | 25%         | 4.00                    | 3.84              | 3.52             | 0.00             |             |
| 3c                 | D                                | 3.52             | 4.00                         | 25%         | 4.00                    | 3.84              | 3.52             | 0.00             |             |
| 3d                 | E                                | 3.84             | 4.00                         | 25%         | 4.00                    | 3.84              | 3.52             | 0.00             |             |
|                    |                                  |                  |                              | <b>16</b>   | <b>27%</b>              |                   |                  |                  |             |
| 4a                 | E                                | 2.88             | 3.00                         | 46%         | 3.00                    | 2.88              | 2.64             | 0.00             |             |
| 4b                 | E                                | 1.44             | 1.50                         | 23%         | 1.50                    | 1.44              | 1.32             | 0.00             |             |
| 4c                 | D                                | 1.76             | 2.00                         | 31%         | 2.00                    | 1.92              | 1.76             | 0.00             |             |
|                    |                                  |                  |                              | <b>6.50</b> | <b>11%</b>              |                   |                  |                  |             |
| 5a                 | E                                | 3.84             | 4.00                         | 53%         | 4.00                    | 3.84              | 3.52             | 0.00             |             |
| 5b                 | E                                | 3.36             | 3.50                         | 47%         | 3.50                    | 3.36              | 3.08             | 0.00             |             |
|                    |                                  |                  |                              | <b>8</b>    | <b>13%</b>              |                   |                  |                  |             |
| 6a                 | E                                | 0.96             | 1.00                         | 50%         | 1.00                    | 0.96              | 0.880            | 0.00             |             |
| 6b                 | D                                | 0.88             | 1.00                         | 50%         | 1.00                    | 0.96              | 0.880            | 0.00             |             |
| Raw Score          |                                  | <b>56.56</b>     |                              | <b>2.00</b> | <b>3%</b>               |                   |                  |                  |             |
| <b>Final Total</b> | <b>E</b>                         | <b>57.00</b>     | <b>60.00</b>                 | <b>60</b>   | <b>100 %</b>            | <b>60.00</b>      | <b>57.60</b>     | <b>52.80</b>     | <b>0.00</b> |

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

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

## PRINCIPAL IMPROVEMENT PLAN

| <b>(1) AREA(S) IN NEED OF IMPROVEMENT</b> | <b>(2) TIME LIMIT FOR ACHIEVING IMPROVEMENT</b> | <b>(3) DIFFERENTIATED ACTIVITIES TO SUPPORT IMPROVEMENT</b> | <b>(4) MANNER OF ASSESSMENT OF IMPROVEMENT</b> |
|---|---|---|--|
|   |   |   |  |
|   |   |   |  |

\_\_\_\_\_  
**Educator's Signature**

\_\_\_\_\_  
**Date**

\_\_\_\_\_  
**Administrator's Signature**

\_\_\_\_\_  
**Date**

**Appendix “A-2”  
Rhinebeck Central School District  
Local 15 Measure of Student Growth for Elementary and Middle School Building Principals**

**(2012-13 School Year Using Data from NWEA MAP – to be used upon the State’s introduction of a Value-Added Growth Measure during the 2012-13 school year)**

| <b>% of students in the building who meet or exceed RIT score growth targets (based upon increased RIT score growth on the MAP assessment)</b> | <b>Highly Effective</b> | <b>Effective</b> | <b>Developing</b> | <b>Ineffective</b> |
|--|-------------------------|------------------|-------------------|--------------------|
| <b>0-20</b>  |                         |                  |                   | 0                  |
| <b>21-23</b>   |                         |                  |                   | 1                  |
| <b>24-27</b>   |                         |                  |                   | 2                  |
| <b>28-31</b>   |                         |                  | 3                 |                    |
| <b>32-37</b>   |                         |                  | 4                 |                    |
| <b>38-43</b>   |                         |                  | 5                 |                    |
| <b>44-49</b>   |                         |                  | 6                 |                    |
| <b>50-53</b>   |                         |                  | 7                 |                    |
| <b>54-56</b>   |                         | 8                |                   |                    |
| <b>57-61</b>   |                         | 9                |                   |                    |
| <b>62-66</b>   |                         | 10               |                   |                    |
| <b>67-72</b>   |                         | 11               |                   |                    |
| <b>73-77</b>   |                         | 12               |                   |                    |
| <b>78-84</b>   |                         | 13               |                   |                    |
| <b>85-92</b>   | 14                      |                  |                   |                    |
| <b>93-100</b>  | 15                      |                  |                   |                    |

**APPENDIX B-2**  
**Rhinebeck Central School District**

**Local 15 Measure of Student Achievement for the High School Principal**  
**(2012-13 School Year Using H.S. Graduation Rates)**

| <b>% of students within Annual School Report Card Total 4-year Graduate "Completers" Group</b> | <b>Highly Effective</b> | <b>Effective</b> | <b>Developing</b> | <b>Ineffective</b> |
|--|-------------------------|------------------|-------------------|--------------------|
| 0-51   |                         |                  |                   | 0                  |
| 52-54  |                         |                  |                   | 1                  |
| 55-57  |                         |                  |                   | 2                  |
| 58-60  |                         |                  | 3                 |                    |
| 61-64  |                         |                  | 4                 |                    |
| 65-67  |                         |                  | 5                 |                    |
| 68-70  |                         |                  | 6                 |                    |
| 71-74  |                         |                  | 7                 |                    |
| 75-78  |                         | 8                |                   |                    |
| 79-82  |                         | 9                |                   |                    |
| 83-85  |                         | 10               |                   |                    |
| 86-88  |                         | 11               |                   |                    |
| 89-91  |                         | 12               |                   |                    |
| 92-94  |                         | 13               |                   |                    |
| 95-96  | 14                      |                  |                   |                    |
| 97-100   | 15                      |                  |                   |                    |

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

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

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

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

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

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

**Signatures, dates**

Superintendent Signature:      Date:

*Joseph L. Deelan*      1/11/2013

Teachers Union President Signature:      Date:

*Suzanne M. VanVelsce*      1/11/2013

Administrative Union President Signature:      Date:

*Maryann L. Kups*      1/11/2013

Board of Education President Signature:      Date:

*Dorinda Burns*      1/11/2013