



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

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

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

January 8, 2013

Jeffrey P. Simons, Superintendent
Rome City School District
409 Bell Road
Rome, NY 13440

Dear Superintendent Simons:

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

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

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

Thank you again for your hard work.

Sincerely,


John B. King, Jr.
Commissioner

Attachment

c: Jacklin G. Starks

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

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

Annual Professional Performance Reviews: 2012-13

Created Wednesday, November 14, 2012

Updated Friday, December 28, 2012

1

Disclaimers

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

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

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

1. SCHOOL DISTRICT INFORMATION

1.1) School District's BEDS Number : 411800010000

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

411800010000

1.2) School District Name: ROME CITY SD

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

ROME CITY SD

1.3) School Improvement Grant (SIG) Districts Only

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

Not applicable

1.4) Award Classification

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

(No response)

1.5) Assurances

Please check all of the boxes below:

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

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

Re-submission to address deficiencies

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

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

Annual (2012-13)

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

Created Wednesday, November 14, 2012

Updated Monday, January 07, 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)
1	State-approved 3rd party assessment	Measures of Academic Progress (Primary Grades)
2	State-approved 3rd party assessment	Measures of Academic Progress (Primary Grades)

	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	District will develop student learning objectives (SLOs) as comparable growth measures for all grades. Each
---	---

this subcomponent. If needed, you may upload a table or graphic at 2.11, below.	Principal in collaboration with teachers will review historical data and pre-assessment data and set individual growth targets. Please see the attached.
Highly Effective (18 - 20 points) Results are well-above state average for similar students (or District goals if no state test).	the 'Highly Effective' rating category is assigned when 85-100% of students meet identified SLO targets.
Effective (9 - 17 points) Results meet state average for similar students (or District goals if no state test).	the 'Effective' rating category is assigned when 35-84% of students meet identified SLO targets.
Developing (3 - 8 points) Results are below state average for similar students (or District goals if no state test).	the 'Developing' rating category is assigned when 8-34% of students meet identified SLO targets.
Ineffective (0 - 2 points) Results are well-below state average for similar students (or District goals if no state test).	the 'Ineffective' rating category is assigned when 0-7% of students meet identified SLO targets.

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)
1	State-approved 3rd party assessment	Measures of Academic Progress (Primary Grades)
2	State-approved 3rd party assessment	Measures of Academic Progress (Primary Grades)
	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.	District will develop student learning objectives (SLOs) as comparable growth measures for all grades. Each Principal in collaboration with teachers will review historical data and pre-assessment data and set individual growth targets. Please see the attached.
Highly Effective (18 - 20 points) Results are well-above state average for similar students (or District goals if no state test).	the 'Highly Effective' rating category is assigned when 85-100% of students meet identified SLO targets.
Effective (9 - 17 points) Results meet state average for similar students (or District goals if no state test).	the 'Effective' rating category is assigned when 35-84% of students meet identified SLO targets.
Developing (3 - 8 points) Results are below state average for similar students (or District goals if no state test).	the 'Developing' rating category is assigned when 8 - 34% of students meet identified SLO targets.
Ineffective (0 - 2 points) Results are well-below state average for similar students (or District goals if no state test).	the 'Ineffective' rating category is assigned when 0-7% of students meet identified SLO targets.

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	Not applicable	not applicable
7	State-approved 3rd party assessment	Measures of Academic Progress (Science)

	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.	District will develop student learning objectives (SLOs) as comparable growth measures for all grades. Each Principal in collaboration with teachers will review historical data and pre-assessment data and set individual growth targets. Please see the attached.
Highly Effective (18 - 20 points) Results are well-above state average for similar students (or District goals if no state test).	the 'Highly Effective' rating is assigned when 85-100% of students meet identified SLO targets.
Effective (9 - 17 points) Results meet state average for similar students (or District goals if no state test).	the 'Effective' rating category is assigned when 35-84% of students meet identified SLO targets.
Developing (3 - 8 points) Results are below state average for similar students (or District goals if no state test).	the 'Developing' rating category is assigned when 8-34% of students meet identified SLO targets.
Ineffective (0 - 2 points) Results are well-below state average for similar students (or District goals if no state test).	the 'Ineffective' rating category is assigned when 0-7% of students meet identified SLO targets.

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	Not applicable	
7	District, regional or BOCES-developed assessment	Herkimer/Oswego BOCES-developed Assessment for Grade 7 Social Studies
8	District, regional or BOCES-developed assessment	Herkimer/Oswego BOCES-developed Assessment for Grade 8 Social Studies

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.	District will develop student learning objectives (SLOs) as comparable growth measures for all grades. Each Principal in collaboration with teachers will review historical data and pre-assessment data and set individual growth targets. Please see attached.
Highly Effective (18 - 20 points) Results are well-above District goals for similar students.	the 'Highly Effective' rating category is assigned when 85-100% of students meet identified SLO targets.
Effective (9 - 17 points) Results meet District goals for similar students.	the 'Effective' rating category is assigned when 35-84% of students meet identified SLO targets.
Developing (3 - 8 points) Results are below District goals for similar students.	the 'Developing' rating category is assigned when 8-34% of students meet identified SLO targets.
Ineffective (0 - 2 points) Results are well-below District goals for similar students.	the 'Ineffective' rating category is assigned when 0-7% of students meet identified SLO targets.

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	Rome City School District-developed Assessment for Global 1

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

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

Use this box, if needed, to describe the general process for assigning HEDI categories for these grades/subjects in this subcomponent. If needed, you may upload a table or graphic at 2.11, below.	District will develop student learning objectives (SLOs) as comparable growth measures for all grades. Each Principal in collaboration with teachers will review historical data and pre-assessment data and set individual growth targets. Please see the attached.
Highly Effective (18 - 20 points) Results are well-above District goals for similar students.	the 'Highly Effective' rating category is assigned when 85-100% of students meet identified SLO targets.
Effective (9 - 17 points) Results meet District goals for similar students.	the 'Effective' rating category is assigned when 35-84% of students meet identified SLO targets.
Developing (3 - 8 points) Results are below District goals for similar students.	the 'Developing' rating category is assigned when 8-34% of students meet identified SLO targets.

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

the 'Ineffective' rating category is assigned when 0-7% of students meet identified SLO targets.

2.7) High School Science Regents Courses

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

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

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

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

Use this box, if needed, to describe the general process for assigning HEDI categories for these grades/subjects in this subcomponent. If needed, you may upload a table or graphic at 2.11, below.	District will develop student learning objectives (SLOs) as comparable growth measures for all grades. Each Principal in collaboration with teachers will review historical data and pre-assessment data and set individual growth targets. Please see the attached.
Highly Effective (18 - 20 points) Results are well-above District goals for similar students.	the 'Highly Effective' rating category is assigned when 85-100% of students meet identified SLO targets.
Effective (9 - 17 points) Results meet District goals for similar students.	the 'Effective' rating category is assigned when 35-84% of students meet identified SLO targets.
Developing (3 - 8 points) Results are below District goals for similar students.	the 'Developing' rating category is assigned when 8-34% of students meet identified SLO targets.
Ineffective (0 - 2 points) Results are well-below District goals for similar students.	the 'Ineffective' rating category is assigned when 0-7% of students meet identified SLO targets.

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.	District will develop student learning objectives (SLOs) as comparable growth measures for all grades. Each Principal in collaboration with teachers will review historical data and pre-assessment data and set individual growth targets. Please see the attached.
Highly Effective (18 - 20 points) Results are well-above District goals for similar students.	the 'Highly Effective' rating category is assigned when 85-100% of students meet identified SLO targets.
Effective (9 - 17 points) Results meet District goals for similar students.	the 'Effective' rating category is assigned when 35-84% of students meet identified SLO targets.
Developing (3 - 8 points) Results are below District goals for similar students.	the 'Developing' rating category is assigned when 8-34% of students meet identified SLO targets.
Ineffective (0 - 2 points) Results are well-below District goals for similar students.	the 'Ineffective' rating category is assigned when 0-7% of students meet identified SLO targets.

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	NYS ELA Regents assessment Grade 11

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.	District will develop student learning objectives (SLOs) as comparable growth measures for all grades. Each Principal in collaboration with teachers will review historical data and pre-assessment data and set individual growth targets. Please see the attached.
Highly Effective (18 - 20 points) Results are well-above District goals for similar students.	the 'Highly Effective' rating category is assigned when 85-100% of students meet identified SLO targets.
Effective (9 - 17 points) Results meet District goals for similar students.	the 'Effective' rating category is assigned when 35-84% of students meet identified SLO targets.
Developing (3 - 8 points) Results are below District goals for similar students.	the 'Developing' rating category is assigned when 8-34% of students meet identified SLO targets.

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

the 'Ineffective' rating category is assigned when 0-7% of students meet identified SLO targets.

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
Art K-4	District, Regional or BOCES-developed	Rome City School District-developed Assessments for Art (All assessments will be grade and subject specific)
ESL K-2	State Assessment	NYSESLAT
Physical Education 5-6; Health/Wellness 5-6	District, Regional or BOCES-developed	Madison-Oneida BOCES-developed Assessment for Physical Education and Health Wellness Grades 5-6 (All assessments will be grade and subject specific)
Art 5-6	District, Regional or BOCES-developed	Rome City School District-developed Assessment for Art (All assessments will be grade and subject specific)Grades 5-6
Music 5-6	District, Regional or BOCES-developed	Madison-Oneida BOCES-developed Assessment for Music Grades 5-6(All assessments will be grade and subject specific)
7 Reading, AIS Reading 7, 8 Reading, M Reading, AIS Reading 8, Writing Lab, Level B2 Corrective Reading, Level C Corrective Reading, and Read 180	State Assessment	NYS 7 and 8 ELA Exam
AIS Math 7, AIS Math 8	State Assessment	NYS 7 and 8 Math assessments
ESL 9-12	State Assessment	NYSESLAT
Technology, Home and Careers, Health 7-8	District, Regional or BOCES-developed	Madison-Oneida BOCES/Camden-developed Assessments respectively for Technology, Home and Careers and(All assessments will be grade and subject specific) Health, 7-8
Music 7-8	District, Regional or BOCES-developed	Madison-Oneida BOCES-developed Assessment for Music 7-8 (All assessments will be grade and subject specific)
Foreign Language 7-8, Art 7-8, and Music courses: Chorus, Prep Band, Orchestra, Concert Band 7-8	District, Regional or BOCES-developed	Rome City School District-developed Assessments for respectively: Foreign Language 7-8, Art 7-8, and Music courses: Chorus, Prep Band, Orchestra, Concert Band 7-8 (All assessments will be grade and subject specific)

Read 180, AIS Reading, AIS ELA 9-12	State-approved 3rd party assessment	Measures of Academic Progress (ELA)
Grades 9-12 Technology, Business, Art, Music, SWD Support, Foreign Language (not Regents)	District, Regional or BOCES-developed	Rome City School District-developed Assessments for Technology, Business, Art, Music, SWD Support for Grades 9-12 (All assessments will be grade and subject specific)
Foundations of P.E., Choice P.E, Music History Lit, Music in Our Lives, Music Theory	District, Regional or BOCES-developed	Madison-Oneida BOCES-developed Assessments respectively for Foundations of P.E., Choice P.E, Health, Music 9-12(All assessments will be grade and subject specific)
Music K-4;	District, Regional or BOCES-developed	Rome City School District-developed Assessments for Music K-4 (All assessments will be grade and subject specific)
Physical Education K-4	District, Regional or BOCES-developed	Rome City School District-developed Assessments for Physical Education K-4 (All assessments will be grade and subject specific)
Library K-6	District, Regional or BOCES-developed	Rome City School District-developed Assessments for Library K-6 (All assessments will be grade and subject specific)
All other subjects and teachers not included above	District, Regional or BOCES-developed	Rome City School District-developed Assessments for each course not listed (All assessments will be grade and subject specific)

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

Use this box, if needed, to describe the general process for assigning HEDI categories for these grades/subjects in this subcomponent. If needed, you may upload a table or graphic at 2.11, below.	District will develop student learning objectives (SLOs) as comparable growth measures for all grades. Each Principal in collaboration with teachers will review historical data and pre-assessment data and set individual growth targets. Please see the attached.
Highly Effective (18 - 20 points) Results are well-above District goals for similar students.	the 'Highly Effective' rating category is assigned when 85-100% of students meet identified SLO targets.
Effective (9 - 17 points) Results meet District goals for similar students.	the 'Effective' rating category is assigned when 35-84% of students meet identified SLO targets.
Developing (3 - 8 points) Results are below District goals for similar students.	the 'Developing' rating category is assigned when 8-34% of students meet identified SLO targets.
Ineffective (0 - 2 points) Results are well-below District goals for similar students.	the 'Ineffective' rating category is assigned when 0-7% of students meet identified SLO targets.

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

(No response)

2.11) HEDI Tables or Graphics

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

assets/survey-uploads/5364/233125-TXEttx9bQW/APPR 20 points for growth revised Jan 4 2013.docx

2.12) Locally Developed Controls

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

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

There will be no locally developed 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: http://usny.nysed.gov/rttt/teachers-leaders/slo/home.html).	Checked
2.14) Assurances Assure that past academic performance and/or baseline academic data of students will be taken into account when developing an SLO.	Checked

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

3. Local Measures (Teachers)

Created Thursday, November 29, 2012

Updated Monday, January 07, 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.	The district will develop achievement targets as comparable achievement measures for teachers. Each teacher in collaboration with the Principal will set achievement targets. HEDI points will be calculated based on the percentage of students meeting or exceeding their achievement target, Scoring bands are attached here for the HEDI Conversion Chart. (see attachment)
Highly Effective (14 - 15 points) Results are well above District- or BOCES-adopted expectations for growth or achievement for grade/subject.	The "Highly Effective" rating is assigned when 85-100% of students meet identified achievement targets.
Effective (8- 13 points) Results meet District- or BOCES-adopted expectations for growth or achievement for grade/subject.	The "Effective" rating is assigned when 35-84% of students meet identified achievement targets.
Developing (3 - 7 points) Results are below District- or BOCES-adopted expectations for growth or achievement for grade/subject.	The "Developing" rating is assigned when 8-34% of students meet identified achievement targets.
Ineffective (0 - 2 points) Results are well below District- or BOCES-adopted expectations for growth or achievement for grade/subject.	The "Ineffective" rating is assigned when 0-7% of students meet identified achievement targets.

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.	The district will develop achievement targets as comparable achievement measures for teachers. Each teacher in collaboration with the Principal will set achievement targets. HEDI points will be calculated based on the percentage of students meeting or exceeding their achievement target, Scoring bands are attached here for the HEDI Conversion Chart. (see attachment)
Highly Effective (14 - 15 points) Results are well above District- or BOCES-adopted expectations for growth or achievement for grade/subject.	The "Highly Effective" rating is assigned when 85-100% of students meet identified achievement targets.
Effective (8- 13 points) Results meet District- or BOCES-adopted expectations for growth or achievement for grade/subject.	The "Effective" rating is assigned when 35-84% of students meet identified achievement targets.
Developing (3 - 7 points) Results are below District- or BOCES-adopted expectations for growth or achievement for grade/subject.	The "Developing" rating is assigned when 8-34% of students meet identified achievement targets.
Ineffective (0 - 2 points) Results are well below District- or BOCES-adopted expectations for growth or achievement for grade/subject.	The "Ineffective" rating is assigned when 0-7% of students meet identified achievement targets.

3.3) HEDI Tables or Graphics

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

assets/survey-uploads/5139/255482-rhJdBgDruP/APPR 15 point chart revised Jan 4 2013.docx

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

Growth or achievement measure(s) from these options.

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

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

Measures based on:

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

3.4) Grades K-3 ELA

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

	Locally-Selected Measure from List of Approved Measures	Assessment
K	4) State-approved 3rd party assessments	Measures of Academic Progress (Primary Grades)
1	4) State-approved 3rd party assessments	Measures of Academic Progress (Primary Grades)
2	4) State-approved 3rd party assessments	Measures of Academic Progress (Primary Grades)
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.

Use this box, if needed, to describe the general process for assigning HEDI categories for these grades/subjects in this subcomponent. If needed, you may upload a table or graphic at 3.13, below.	The district will develop achievement targets as comparable achievement measures for teachers. Each teacher in collaboration with the Principal will set achievement targets. HEDI points will be calculated based on the percentage of students meeting or exceeding their achievement target, Please see the attached.
Highly Effective (18-20 points) Results are well above District- or BOCES-adopted expectations for growth or achievement for grade/subject.	The "Highly Effective" rating is assigned when 85-100% of students meet identified achievement targets.
Effective (9-17 points) Results meet District- or BOCES-adopted expectations for growth or achievement for grade/subject.	The "Effective" rating is assigned when 35-84% of students meet identified achievement targets.
Developing (3 - 8 points) Results are below District- or BOCES-adopted expectations for growth or achievement for grade/subject.	The "Developing" rating is assigned when 8-34% of students meet identified achievement targets.
Ineffective (0 - 2 points) Results are well below District- or BOCES-adopted expectations for growth or achievement for grade/subject.	The "Ineffective" rating is assigned when 0-7% of students meet identified achievement targets.

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

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	The district will develop achievement targets as comparable achievement measures for teachers. Each teacher in collaboration with the Principal will set
---	--

graphic at 3.13, below.	achievement targets. HEDI points will be calculated based on the percentage of students meeting or exceeding their achievement target. Please see the attached.
Highly Effective (18-20 points) Results are well above District- or BOCES-adopted expectations for growth or achievement for grade/subject.	The "Highly Effective" rating is assigned when 85-100% of students meet identified achievement targets.
Effective (9-17 points) Results meet District- or BOCES-adopted expectations for growth or achievement for grade/subject.	The "Effective" rating is assigned when 35-84% of students meet identified achievement targets.
Developing (3 - 8 points) Results are below District -or BOCES-adopted expectations for growth or achievement for grade/subject.	The "Developing" rating is assigned when 8-34% of students meet identified achievement targets.
Ineffective (0 - 2 points) Results are well below District- or BOCES-adopted expectations for growth or achievement for grade/subject.	The "Ineffective" rating is assigned when 0-7% of students meet identified achievement targets.

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	4) State-approved 3rd party assessments	Measures of Academic Progress (Science)
7	4) State-approved 3rd party assessments	Measures of Academic Progress (Science)
8	4) State-approved 3rd party assessments	Measures of Academic Progress (Science)

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

Use this box, if needed, to describe the general process for assigning HEDI categories for these grades/subjects in this subcomponent. If needed, you may upload a table or graphic at 3.13, below.	The district will develop achievement targets as comparable achievement measures for teachers. Each teacher in collaboration with the Principal will set achievement targets. HEDI points will be calculated based on the percentage of students meeting or exceeding their achievement target. Please see the attached.
Highly Effective (18 - 20 points) Results are well above District- or BOCES-adopted expectations for growth or achievement for grade/subject.	The "Highly Effective" rating is assigned when 85-100% of students meet identified achievement targets.
Effective (9 - 17 points) Results meet District- or BOCES-adopted expectations for growth or achievement for grade/subject.	The "Effective" rating is assigned when 35-84% of students meet identified achievement targets.
Developing (3 - 8 points) Results are below District- or BOCES-adopted expectations for growth or achievement for grade/subject.	The "Developing" rating is assigned when 8-34% of students meet identified achievement targets.
Ineffective (0 - 2 points) Results are well below District- or BOCES-adopted expectations for growth or achievement for grade/subject.	The "Ineffective" rating is assigned when 0-7% of students meet identified achievement targets..

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	Rome City School District-developed Assessment for Social Studies 6
7	5) District, regional, or BOCES–developed assessments	Herkimer/Oswego BOCES-developed Assessment for Social Studies 7
8	5) District, regional, or BOCES–developed assessments	Herkimer/Oswego BOCES-developed Assessment for Social Studies 8

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

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

Use this box, if needed, to describe the general process for assigning HEDI categories for these grades/subjects in this subcomponent. If needed, you may upload a table or graphic at 3.13, below.	The district will develop achievement targets as comparable achievement measures for teachers. Each teacher in collaboration with the Principal will set achievement targets. HEDI points will be calculated based on the percentage of students meeting or exceeding their achievement target. Please see the attached.
Highly Effective (18 - 20 points) Results are well above District- or BOCES-adopted expectations for growth or achievement for grade/subject.	The 'Highly Effective' rating will be assigned when 85-100% of students meet identified achievement targets.
Effective (9 - 17 points) Results meet District- or BOCES-adopted expectations for growth or achievement for grade/subject.	The "Effective" rating is assigned when 35-84% of students meet identified achievement targets.
Developing (3 - 8 points) Results are below District- or BOCES-adopted expectations for growth or achievement for grade/subject.	The "Developing" rating is assigned when 8-34% of students meet identified achievement targets.
Ineffective (0 - 2 points) Results are well below District- or BOCES-adopted expectations for growth or achievement for grade/subject.	The "Ineffective" rating is assigned when 0-7% of students meet identified achievement targets.

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	Rome City School District-developed Assessment for Global 1
Global 2	5) District, regional, or BOCES–developed assessments	Rome City School District-developed Assessment for Global 2
American History	5) District, regional, or BOCES–developed assessments	Rome City School District-developed Assessment for American History

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

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

Use this box, if needed, to describe the general process for assigning HEDI categories for these grades/subjects in this subcomponent. If needed, you may upload a table or graphic at 3.13, below.	The district will develop achievement targets as comparable achievement measures for teachers. Each teacher in collaboration with the Principal will set achievement targets. HEDI points will be calculated based on the percentage of students meeting or exceeding their achievement target, Please see the attached.
Highly Effective (18 - 20 points) Results are well above District- or BOCES-adopted expectations for growth or achievement for grade/subject.	The 'Highly Effective' will be assigned when 85-100% of students meet identified achievement targets.
Effective (9 - 17 points) Results meet District- or BOCES-adopted expectations for growth or achievement for grade/subject.	The "Effective" rating is assigned when 35-84% of students meet identified achievement targets.
Developing (3 - 8 points) Results are below District- or BOCES-adopted expectations for growth or achievement for grade/subject.	The "Developing" rating is assigned when 8-34% of students meet identified performance targets.
Ineffective (0 - 2 points) Results are well below District- or BOCES-adopted expectations for growth or achievement for grade/subject.	The "Ineffective" rating is assigned when 0-7% of students meet identified performance targets.

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	5) District, regional, or BOCES–developed assessments	Rome City School District-developed Assessment for Living Environment

Earth Science	5) District, regional, or BOCES—developed assessments	Rome City School District-developed Assessment for Earth Science
Chemistry	5) District, regional, or BOCES—developed assessments	Rome City School District-developed Assessment for Chemistry
Physics	5) District, regional, or BOCES—developed assessments	Rome City School District-developed Assessment for Physics

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

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

Use this box, if needed, to describe the general process for assigning HEDI categories for these grades/subjects in this subcomponent. If needed, you may upload a table or graphic at 3.13, below.	The district will develop achievement targets as comparable achievement measures for teachers. Each teacher in collaboration with the Principal will set achievement targets. HEDI points will be calculated based on the percentage of students meeting or exceeding their achievement target, Please see the attached.
Highly Effective (18-20 points) Results are well above District- or BOCES-adopted expectations for growth or achievement for grade/subject.	The 'Highly Effective' rating will be assigned when 85-100% of students meet identified achievement targets.
Developing (3 - 8 points) Results are below District- or BOCES-adopted expectations for growth or achievement for grade/subject.	The "Developing" rating is assigned when 8-34% of students meet identified achievement targets.
Effective (9 - 17points) Results meet District- or BOCES-adopted expectations for growth or achievement for grade/subject.	The "Effective" rating is assigned when 35-84% of students meet identified achievement targets.
Ineffective (0 - 2 points) Results are well below District- or BOCES-adopted expectations for growth or achievement for grade/subject.	The "Ineffective" rating is assigned when 0-7% of students meet identified achievement targets.

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	5) District, regional, or BOCES—developed assessments	Rome City School District-developed Assessment for Algebra 1
Geometry	5) District, regional, or BOCES—developed assessments	Rome City School District-developed Assessment for Geometry
Algebra 2	5) District, regional, or BOCES—developed assessments	Rome City School District-developed Assessment for Algebra 2

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

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

Use this box, if needed, to describe the general process for assigning HEDI categories for these grades/subjects in this subcomponent. If needed, you may upload a table or graphic at 3.13, below.	The district will develop achievement targets as comparable achievement measures for teachers. Each teacher in collaboration with the Principal will set achievement targets. HEDI points will be calculated based on the percentage of students meeting or exceeding their achievement target, Please see the attached.
Highly Effective (18 - 20 points) Results are well above District- or BOCES-adopted expectations for growth or achievement for grade/subject.	The 'Highly Effective' rating will be assigned when 85-100% of students meet identified achievement targets.
Effective (9 - 17 points) Results meet District- or BOCES-adopted expectations for growth or achievement for grade/subject.	The "Effective" rating is assigned when 35-84% of students meet identified achievement targets.
Developing (3 - 8 points) Results are below District- or BOCES-adopted expectations for growth or achievement for grade/subject.	The "Developing" rating is assigned when 8-34% of students meet identified achievement targets.
Ineffective (0 - 2 points) Results are well below District- or BOCES-adopted expectations for growth or achievement for grade/subject.	The "Ineffective" rating is assigned when 0-7% of students meet identified achievement targets.

3.11) High School English Language Arts

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

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

	Locally-Selected Measure from List of Approved Measures	Assessment
Grade 9 ELA	5) District, regional, or BOCES–developed assessments	Rome City School District-developed Assessment for ELA 9
Grade 10 ELA	5) District, regional, or BOCES–developed assessments	Rome City School District-developed Assessment for ELA 10
Grade 11 ELA	5) District, regional, or BOCES–developed assessments	Rome City School District-developed Assessment for ELA 11

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

	on the percentage of students meeting or exceeding their achievement target, Please see the attached.
Highly Effective (18 - 20 points) Results are well above District- or BOCES -adopted expectations for growth or achievement for grade/subject.	The 'Highly Effective' rating will be assigned when 85-100% of students meet identified achievement targets.
Effective (9 - 17 points) Results meet District- or BOCES-adopted expectations for growth or achievement for grade/subject.	The "Effective" rating is assigned when 35-84% of students meet identified achievement targets.
Developing (3 - 8 points) Results are below District- or BOCES-adopted expectations for growth or achievement for grade/subject.	The "Developing" rating is assigned when 8-34% of students meet identified achievement targets.
Ineffective (0 - 2 points) Results are well below District- or BOCES-adopted expectations for growth or achievement for grade/subject.	The "Ineffective" rating is assigned when 0-7% of students meet identified achievement targets.

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/5139/255482-y92vNseFa4/APPR 20 points for local assessments revised Jan 4 2013.docx

3.14) Locally Developed Controls

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

Our classroom teachers with students with special needs are facing unique instructional challenges, consequently we have implemented a locally developed control. The teachers with students who have been identified by the CSE as disabled will have their HEDI scores adjusted in the following manner: HEDI scores will be increased by 0.25 for each identified student. Students identified as English Language Learners and assigned to the K-12 program for ELL will have their scores adjusted in the same manner as students with a disability because achievement of their learning goals is compromised by their lack of facility with the English language; thus requiring different instructional supports. Scores will be rounded up for .5 and above to the next highest number. A maximum of 2 points can be added to the HEDI score for each teacher.

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.

If educators have more than one local measure of student achievement, the percent of students who meet their achievement targets will be averaged. Averages will be weighted proportionally based on the number of students in each class.

3.16) Assurances

Please check all of the boxes below:

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

4. Other Measures of Effectiveness (Teachers)

Created Thursday, November 29, 2012

Updated Monday, January 07, 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.)

NYSUT Teacher Practice Rubric (2012 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	(No response)
Observations by trained in-school peer teachers	(No response)
Feedback from students using State-approved survey tool	(No response)
Feedback from parents/caregivers using State-approved survey tool	(No response)
Structured reviews of lesson plans, student portfolios and other teacher artifacts	(No response)

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

(No response)

4.3) Survey Tools (if applicable)

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

(No response)

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

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

4.4) Assurances

Please check all of the boxes below:

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

4.5) Process for Assigning Points and Determining HEDI Ratings

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

The 60 points will be scored using the NYSUT rubric. Each element or subcomponent within each standard will be rated on a 1-4 scale (H=4; E=3; D=2; I=1). All elements or subcomponent scores will be averaged together in order to create a 1-4 score for every standard within the rubric. These seven standard scores will be averaged together to create a final 1-4 score for the observations. Multiple observations will be weighted equally and averaged together to create final 1-4 rating. This score (between 1 and 4) shall then be converted to points earned on the HEDI scale according to the attached conversion chart.

All standards will be scored by the end of the school year. Each standard will have an equal weight for the total score. Rounding rules will not result in overlapping bands.

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/5091/255324-eka9yMJ855/Rubric to 60 Points Conversion Chart.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.	An overall average rubric score between 3.5 and 4.0 will convert to a composite score (see attached chart) 60 and be deemed 'Highly Effective.'
Effective: Overall performance and results meet NYS Teaching Standards.	An overall average rubric score between 2.5 and 3.4 will convert to a composite score (see attached chart) between 57 and 59 and be deemed 'Effective.'
Developing: Overall performance and results need improvement in order to meet NYS Teaching Standards.	An overall average rubric score between 1.5 and 2.4 will convert to a composite score (see attached chart) between 50 and 56 and be deemed 'Developing.'
Ineffective: Overall performance and results do not meet NYS Teaching Standards.	An overall average rubric score between 1.0 and 1.4 will convert to a composite score (see attached chart) between 1 and 49 and be deemed 'Ineffective.'

Provide the ranges for the 60-point scoring bands.

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

4.6) Observations of Probationary Teachers

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

By building principals or other trained administrators

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

By trained in-school peer teachers or other trained reviewers

Formal/Long	0
Informal/Short	0

Independent evaluators

Formal/Long	0
Informal/Short	0

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

- In Person

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

- In Person

4.7) Observations of Tenured Teachers

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

By building principals or other trained administrators

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

By trained in-school peer teachers or other trained reviewers

Formal/Long	0
Informal/Short	0

Independent evaluators

Formal/Long	0
Informal/Short	0

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

- In Person

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

5. Composite Scoring (Teachers)

Created Thursday, November 29, 2012

Updated Friday, January 04, 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	60
Effective	57-59
Developing	50-56
Ineffective	0-49

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

2012-13 where Value-Added growth measure applies

Growth or Comparable Measures

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

Other Measures of Effectiveness

(60 points)

Overall

Composite Score

Highly Effective

22-25

14-15

Ranges determined locally--see above

91-100

Effective

10-21

8-13

75-90

Developing

3-9

3-7

65-74

Ineffective

0-2

0-2

0-64

6. Additional Requirements - Teachers

Created Thursday, November 29, 2012

Updated Friday, January 04, 2013

Page 1

6.1) Assurances -- Improvement Plans

Please check the boxes below:

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

6.2) Attachment: Teacher Improvement Plan Forms

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

[assets/survey-uploads/5265/255424-Df0w3Xx5v6/Teacher Improvement Plan Docs.doc](#)

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:

The procedure for the Appeals Process is as follows:

A teacher who receives a rating of "ineffective" or "developing" may appeal his or her performance review. Ratings of "highly effective" or "effective" cannot be appealed.

A teacher may appeal only the substance of his or her performance review.

A teacher may not file multiple appeals regarding the same performance review.

All grounds for appealing a particular performance review must be raised within the same appeal. Any grounds not raised at the time the appeal is filed shall be deemed waived.

Appeals concerning a teacher performance review must be received in the office of the Superintendent of Schools no later than ten (10) work days after the date the teacher receives his/her performance review. The failure to submit an appeal to the Superintendent of Schools within this time frame shall result in a waiver of the teacher's right to appeal that performance review.

A teacher wishing to initiate an appeal must submit in writing (email or other electronic submissions are not permitted), to the Superintendent or his/her designee, with a detailed description of the precise point(s) of disagreement over his or her performance review along with any and all additional documents or written materials that he or she believes are relevant to the resolution of the appeal. Any such additional information not submitted at the time the appeal is filed shall not be considered in the deliberations related to the resolution of the appeal.

The Tri-Party Panel will be comprised of the Superintendent and his/her designee, an administrator chosen by the teacher, and a neutral administrator selected from an agreed-upon, odd-numbered panel of administrators. The selection of the neutral administrator from that panel will come from the use of a striking process. The Panel will meet with the teacher within ten (10) working days of the Superintendent's receipt of an appeal to hear the appeal. The teacher may have a union representative present at the appeal hearing.

The Tri-Party Panel shall issue a written decision on the merits of the appeal no later than ten (10) work days from the date the appeal hearing ends. If the Tri-Party Panel sustains the appeal, he/she will issue an appropriate remedy. If the Tri-Party Panel dismisses or denies the appeal, the teacher's score and evaluation shall remain unchanged and the appeal process shall end.

The Tri-Party Panel's decision shall be final and binding and may not be reviewed or appealed further.

The teacher's failure to comply with the requirements of this procedure shall result in a waiver and/or denial of the appeal.

The appeals process must be completed within 30 working days of the initial application for appeal unless mutually-agreed upon in writing. The timeline for each step and the entire appeals process will occur in a timely and expeditious manner in accordance with Education Law 3012-c.

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.

Evaluators will be trained according to NYSED requirements. All administrators currently on staff with evaluation responsibilities are near completion or have completed the nine training modules provide by the Madison-Oneida BOCES network team (1 administrator was trained at Herkimer BOCES)and been certified by the Board of Education.

The district's Superintendent and Board of Education have approved a district reorganization plan through which the district will be hiring three (3) Supervisors of Teaching and Learning to assist with evaluation of teachers and principals. There will be one at the prek-4 level, 5-8 level, and the 9-12 level. Supervisors of Teaching and Learning will be meeting with principals from multiple buildings to review and ensure that the APPR evaluation process is being implemented consistently in all district schools. Continuous training will be provided by the district and BOCES with opportunities for the principals to view videos of classroom instruction, use the evaluation system to rate teachers using the evidence-based model, share ratings and discuss consistencies and noted variances.

Inter-rater reliability of teacher and principal evaluations will be ensured through consistent training provided by Madison-Oneida BOCES.

Evaluators will be re-certified according to all NYSED requirements.

All documentation of training and development activities will be kept on file. Upon gathering ample documentation that evaluators and lead evaluators have been properly trained, the Superintendent will make the recommendation for the Board of Education to certify each evaluator to conduct evaluations. The in-district activities outlined and participation in regional meetings and trainings will be ongoing, and documention of training will continue in order for all evaluators to be recertified each year.

6.5) Assurances -- Evaluators

Please check the boxes below:

-
- Checked
-

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

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

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

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

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

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

(7) use of the Statewide Instructional Reporting System

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

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

-
- Checked
-

6.6) Assurances -- Teachers

Please check all of the boxes below:

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

6.7) Assurances -- Data

Please check all of the boxes below:

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

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

Created Thursday, November 29, 2012

Updated Monday, January 07, 2013

Page 1

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

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

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

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

5-6
7-8
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
Elementary K-4	State-approved 3rd party assessment	AIMSWEB
Elementary K-4	State assessment	NYS Assessment in Grade 3 and Grade 4 ELA and Math

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.	<p>The Rome City School District will use both NYS grade 4 ELA and Math Assessments, NYS Grade 3 ELA and Math Assessments and AIMSWEB to measure student growth for state growth for Principals.</p> <p>The state will provide HEDI results for grade 4 ELA and Math. These results will be weighted proportionally with the third grade ELA and Math SLO results and the AIMSWEB results. Our process for establishing growth targets for grade 3 ELA and Math and AIMSWEB requires Principals and their supervisors to examine a variety of data together to set rigorous yet achievable targets. Data reviewed will include pre-assessment and also include historical academic data.</p>
Highly Effective (18 - 20 points) Results are well above state average for similar students (or District goals if no state test).	The "Highly Effective" rating is assigned when 85-100% of students meet identified performance targets.
Effective (9 - 17 points) Results meet state average for similar students (or District goals if no state test).	The "Effective" rating is assigned when 35-84% of students meet identified performance targets.
Developing (3 - 8 points) Results are below state average for similar students (or District goals if no state test).	The "Developing" rating is assigned when 8-34% of students meet identified performance targets.
Ineffective (0 - 2 points) Results are well below state average for similar students (or District goals if no state test).	The "Ineffective" rating is assigned when 0-7% of students meet identified performance targets.

test).

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

assets/survey-uploads/5365/255964-lha0DogRNw/APPR 20 points for growth revised Jan 4 2013.docx

7.4) Special Considerations for Comparable Growth Measures

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

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

No adjustments, controls or other special considerations will be used.

7.5) Principals with More Than One Growth Measure

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

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

7.6) Assurances -- Comparable Growth Measures

Please check all of the boxes below:

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

7.6) Assurances -- Comparable Growth Measures Assure that it is possible for a principal to earn each point, including 0, for SLOs in the Growth subcomponent scoring range.	Checked
--	---------

7.6) Assurances -- Comparable Growth Measures Assure that processes are in place to monitor SLOs to ensure rigor and comparability across classrooms.	Checked
---	---------

8. Local Measures (Principals)

Created Friday, November 30, 2012

Updated Monday, January 07, 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
5-6	(d) measures used by district for teacher evaluation	AIMSWEB
7-8	(d) measures used by district for teacher evaluation	Measures of Academic Progress (ELA, Math)
9-12	(d) measures used by district for teacher evaluation	Regents Examinations (ELA and Algebra I and Algebra II, Geometry)

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

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

Use this box, if needed, to describe the process for assigning HEDI categories. If needed, you may upload a table or graphic below.	The district will develop achievement targets as comparable achievement measures for Principals. Each Principal in collaboration with their lead evaluator will set achievement targets. HEDI points will be awarded based on percentage of students meeting or exceeding achievement targets.
Highly Effective (14 - 15 points) Results are well above District- or BOCES-adopted expectations for growth or achievement for grade/subject.	When 85-100% of the students achieve the target, the Principal shall be considered well above the district's expectation and will receive a rating of highly effective.
Effective (8- 13 points) Results meet District- or BOCES-adopted expectations for growth or achievement for grade/subject.	When 35-84% of the students achieve the target, the Principal shall be considered effective.
Developing (3 - 7 points) Results are below District- or BOCES-adopted expectations for growth or achievement for grade/subject.	When 8-34% of the students achieve the target, the Principal shall be considered developing.

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

When 0-7% of the students achieve the target, the Principal shall be considered ineffective.

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

(No response)

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

assets/survey-uploads/5366/257672-qBFVOWF7fC/APPR 15 point chart revised Jan 4 2013.docx

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

In the table below, list all of the grade configurations 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
K-4	(d) measures used by district for teacher evaluation	AIMSWEB

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

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

Use this box, if needed, to describe the process for assigning HEDI categories. If needed, you may upload a table or graphic below.	The district will develop achievement targets as comparable achievement measures for Principals. Each Principal in collaboration with their lead evaluator will set achievement targets. HEDI points will be awarded based on percentage of students meeting or exceeding achievement targets.
Highly Effective (18 - 20 points) Results are well above District- or BOCES-adopted expectations for growth or achievement for grade/subject.	When 85-100% of the students achieve the target, the Principal shall be considered well above the district's expectation and will receive a rating of highly effective.
Effective (9- 17 points) Results meet District- or BOCES-adopted expectations for growth or achievement for grade/subject.	When 35-84% of the students achieve the target, the Principal shall be considered effective.
Developing (3 - 8 points) Results are below District- or BOCES-adopted expectations for growth or achievement for grade/subject.	When 8-34% of the students achieve the target, the Principal shall be considered developing.
Ineffective (0 - 2 points) Results are well below District- or BOCES-adopted expectations for growth or achievement for grade/subject.	When 0-7% of the students achieve the target, the Principal shall be considered ineffective.

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

(No response)

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

assets/survey-uploads/5366/257672-T8MIGWUVm1/APPR 20 points for local assessments revised Jan 4 2013.docx

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.

Our Principals with schools with students with special needs are facing unique instructional challenges, consequently we have implemented a locally developed control. The Principals with students who have been identified by the CSE as disabled will have their HEDI scores adjusted in the following manner: Raw HEDI scores will be increased by 0.25 for every 10 identified students. Students identified as English Language Learners and assigned to the K-12 program for ELL will have their raw scores adjusted in the same manner as students with a disability because achievement of their learning goals is compromised by their lack of facility with the English language; thus requiring different instructional supports. Scores will be rounded up for .5 and above to the next highest number. A maximum of 2 points can be added to the HEDI score for each Principal.

8.4) Principals with More Than One Locally Selected Measure

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

If educators have more than one measure of student achievement, the percent of students who meet their achievement targets will be averaged. Percentages will be weighted proportionally based on the student population.

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 Friday, November 30, 2012

Updated Monday, January 07, 2013

Page 1

9.1) Principal Practice Rubric

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

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

Multidimensional Principal Performance Rubric

(No response)

9.2) Points Within Other Measures

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

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

Is the following points assignment for all principals?

Yes

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

(No response)

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

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

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

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

(No response)

9.3) Assurances -- Goals

Please check the boxes below (if applicable):

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

9.4) Sources of Evidence (if applicable)

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

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

9.5) Survey Tool(s) (if applicable)

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

(No response)

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

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

9.6) Assurances

Please check all of the boxes below:

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

9.7) Process for Assigning Points and Determining HEDI Ratings

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

Principals will be assigned a raw score from 0 to 60 based on observations and evaluations conducted using the Multidimensional Principal Performance Rubric. In order to determine this score (0 to 60), the principal will receive a score of 1 to 4 for each subcomponent observed within the 6 Domains. The score from all observed subcomponents within each domain will be averaged to determine an average Domain score out of 1-4. Once all Domains are scored they will be averaged together resulting in an Overall Rubric score out of 1-4. The Overall Rubric Score will then convert to a HEDI score of 0 to 60 using the uploaded conversion chart in Task 9.7.

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/5143/257748-pMADJ4gk6R/Adm. Rubric Scoring Meth..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.	An overall average rubric score between 3.51 and 4 will convert to a composite score between 59 and 60 and be deemed "Highly Effective."
Effective: Overall performance and results meet standards.	An overall average rubric score of 2.51 to 3.5 will convert to a composite score between 57 and 58 and be deemed "Effective."
Developing: Overall performance and results need improvement in order to meet standards.	An overall rubric score between 1.55 and 2.5 will convert to a composite score between 55 and 56 and be deemed "Developing."
Ineffective: Overall performance and results do not meet standards.	An overall rubric score between 1.00 and 1.54 will convert to a composite score between 0-54 and be deemed "Ineffective."

Please provide the locally-negotiated 60 point scoring bands.

Highly Effective	59-60
Effective	57-58
Developing	55-56
Ineffective	0-54

9.8) School Visits

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

Probationary Principals

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

Tenured Principals

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

10. Composite Scoring (Principals)

Created Friday, November 30, 2012

Updated Friday, January 04, 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	55-56
Ineffective	0-54

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

2012-13 where Value-Added growth measure applies

Growth or Comparable Measures

Locally-selected Measures of growth or achievement

Other Measures of Effectiveness

(60 points)

Overall

Composite Score

Highly Effective

22-25

14-15

Ranges determined locally--see above

91-100

Effective

10-21

8-13

75-90

Developing

3-9

3-7

65-74

Ineffective

0-2

0-2

0-64

11. Additional Requirements - Principals

Created Friday, November 30, 2012

Updated Monday, January 07, 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/5276/257836-Df0w3Xx5v6/Principal Improvement Plan forms.pdf](assets/survey-uploads/5276/257836-Df0w3Xx5v6/Principal%20Improvement%20Plan%20forms.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:

*Rome City School District
Principal APPR Appeal Process*

CHALLENGES IN AN APPEAL:

Appeals are limited to those identified by Education Law §3012-c, as follows:

(1) The substance of the annual professional performance review;

(2) The school district's or board of cooperative educational services' adherence to the standards and methodologies required for such reviews;

(3) The adherence to the Commissioner's regulations, as applicable to such reviews;

(4) Compliance with any applicable locally negotiated procedures applicable to annual professional performance reviews or improvement plans; and

(5) The school district's or board of cooperative educational services' issuance and/or implementation of the terms of the principal improvement plan.

RATINGS THAT MAY BE APPEALED:

Appeals of annual professional performance reviews may be brought for ineffective, developing or any rating tied to compensation. An appeal may only be initiated once a principal receives the overall composite score and rating.

PROHIBITION AGAINST MORE THAN ONE APPEAL

A principal may not file multiple appeals regarding the same performance review. The issuance of an improvement plan may prompt an appeal independent of the performance review. The implementation of an improvement plan may be appealed upon each alleged breach thereof. All grounds for appeal must be raised with specificity within such appeal. Any grounds not raised shall be deemed waived.

BURDEN OF PROOF

In an appeal, the Principal has the burden of demonstrating a clear legal right to the relief requested and the burden of establishing the facts upon which the petitioner seeks relief. The district must establish by the preponderance of the evidence that the rating given to the appellants was justified or that an improvement plan was appropriately issued and/or implemented.

TIME FRAME FOR FILING APPEAL

All appeals shall be filed in writing to the Superintendent. The act of mailing the appeal shall constitute filing.

An appeal of a performance review must be filed no later than fifteen (15) business days of the date when the principal receives their final and complete annual professional performance review. If a principal is challenging the issuance of a principal improvement plan, appeals must be filed with fifteen (15) business days of issuance of such plan. An appeal of the implementation of an improvement plan shall be within fifteen (15) business days of the failure of the district to implement any component of the plan.

The failure to file an appeal within these timeframes shall be deemed a waiver of the right to appeal and the appeal shall be deemed abandoned. An extension of the time in which to appeal may be granted by the Superintendent upon written request.

When filing an appeal, the principal must submit a written description of the specific areas of disagreement over his or her performance review, or the issuance and/or implementation of the terms of his or her improvement plan. Supportive evidence about the challenges may also be submitted with the appeal. Any additional documents or materials relevant to the appeal must be provided by the district upon written request for same. The performance review and/or improvement plan being challenged must also be submitted with the appeal.

TIME FRAME FOR DISTRICT RESPONSE

Within ten (10) business days of receipt of an appeal, the district must submit a detailed written response to the appeal to the affected Principal. The response must include all additional documents or written materials relevant to the point(s) of disagreement that support the district's response. Any such information that is not submitted at the time the response is filed shall not be considered on behalf of the district in the deliberations related to the resolution of the appeal. The principal initiating the appeal shall receive a copy of the response filed by the school district, and all additional information submitted with the response, at the same time the school district files its response. Additional material supporting the challenges may be submitted by the principal up to the date of the hearing.

DECISION PROCESS FOR APPEAL

Within five (5) business days of the district's response, a single individual hearing officer shall be chosen from the list of hearing officers approved mutually by the district and bargaining unit representing the principals. The list of hearing officers will be updated each time the contract is negotiated.

The parties agree that:

- a. The hearing officer shall hear appeals in a timely manner after the appeal is made, but in no event shall it be less than five (5) business days or more than fifteen (15) business days after the hearing officer is selected.
- b. The hearing shall be conducted in no more than one business day unless extenuating circumstances are present and the hearing officer agrees to a second day.
- c. The parties shall have the ability to be represented by either legal counsel, union representative, or appear pro se;
- d. The parties shall exchange an anticipated witness list no less than two (2) business days before the scheduled hearing date;
- e. The principal shall have the prerogative to determine whether the appeal shall be open to the public or not;
- f. The district shall have the opportunity to present its case supporting the rating or improvement plan and then the principal may refute the presentation. These may include the presentation of material, witnesses and/or affidavits in lieu of testimony.

DECISION

A written decision on the merits of the appeal shall be rendered no later than ten (10) business days from the close of the hearing. Such decision shall be a final administrative decision.

The decision shall set forth the reasons and factual basis for the determination on each of the specific issues raised in the appeal. The reviewer must either, affirm, set aside or modify a district's rating or improvement plan. A copy of the decision shall be provided to the principal and the district representative.

EXCLUSIVITY OF SECTION 3012-C APPEAL PROCEDURE

This appeal procedure shall constitute the means for initiating, reviewing and resolving challenges to a principal performance review or improvement plan. A principal may not resort to any other contractual grievance procedures for the resolution of challenges and appeals related to a professional performance review and/or improvement plan.

OTHER

1. The district and bargaining unit for the principal shall maintain a list of no less than three (3) mutually agreed upon hearing officers.
2. Appeals shall be assigned to hearing officers on a rotational basis, alphabetically by last name. The district or the administrator has the right to request a move to the next person on the list.
3. The cost of a hearing officer shall be the responsibility of the district.
4. In addition to any further limitations agreed to within the APPR agreement, an evaluation shall not be placed in a principal's personnel file until either the expiration of the fifteen (15) business day period in which to file an notice of appeal without action being taken by the principal or the conclusion of the appeal process described herein, whichever is later.
5. A principal who takes advantage of the appeals process described herein does not waive his/her right to submit a written rebuttal to the final evaluation. A principal who elects to submit a written rebuttal to his/her evaluation prior to the expiration of the fifteen (15) business days in which to file a notice of appeal does not waive her/his right to file an appeal.
6. The appeals process must be completed within 30 working days of the initial application for appeal unless mutually-agreed upon in writing. The timeline for each step and the entire appeals process will occur in a timely and expeditious manner in accordance with Education Law 3012-c.

11.4) Training and Certification of Lead Evaluators and Evaluators

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

Evaluators will be trained according to NYSED requirements. All administrators currently on staff with evaluation responsibilities are near completion or have completed the nine training modules provided by the Madison-Oneida BOCES network team (1 administrator was trained at Herkimer BOCES) and been certified by the Board of Education.

The district's superintendent and Board of Education have approved a district reorganization plan through which the district will be hiring three Supervisors of Teaching and Learning to assist with evaluation of teachers and principals. There will be one supervisor at each of three levels: prek-4; 5-8; and 9-12. Each supervisor will be trained and certified as an evaluator. They will work together to ensure that the APPR evaluation process is being implemented consistently in all district schools. District administrators will meet and will spend a minimum of one full day per year to ensure ongoing calibration for evidence collection, coding of evidence and rating according to the rubrics.

All documentation of training and development activities will be kept on file. In-district activities and participation in regional meetings and trainings will be ongoing, and documentation of training will continue in order for all evaluators to be recertified each year. The district will work to ensure that lead evaluators maintain inter-rater reliability over time and that they are re-certified on an annual and receive updated training on any changes in the law, regulations or applicable collective bargaining agreements.

11.5) Assurances -- Evaluators

Please check the boxes below:

-
- Checked
-

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

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

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

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

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

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

(7) use of the Statewide Instructional Reporting System

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

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

- Checked

11.6) Assurances -- Principals

Please check all of the boxes below:

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

11.7) Assurances -- Data

Please check all of the boxes below:

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

12. Joint Certification of APPR Plan

Created Thursday, November 29, 2012

Updated Monday, January 07, 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/5581/255476-3Uqgn5g9Iu/APPR signature page 1.7.13.pdf](assets/survey-uploads/5581/255476-3Uqgn5g9Iu/APPR%20signature%20page%201.7.13.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.

Rome City School District
APPR 20 point distribution for growth

Percentage of students who met target	APPR Points for local assessment	HEDI category
96 – 100%	20	Highly Effective
91 - 95%	19	Highly Effective
85 – 90%	18	Highly Effective
78 - 84%	17	Effective
72 – 77%	16	Effective
66 - 71%	15	Effective
61 – 65%	14	Effective
56 - 60%	13	Effective
50 – 55%	12	Effective
45 – 49%	11	Effective
40 – 44%	10	Effective
35 – 39%	9	Effective
29 – 34%	8	Developing
24 – 28%	7	Developing
19 – 23%	6	Developing
15 – 18%	5	Developing
11 – 14%	4	Developing
8 – 10%	3	Developing
5 – 7%	2	Ineffective
2 – 4%	1	Ineffective
0 – 1%	0	Ineffective

Teacher Rubric Score to Sub-Component Conversion Chart

Total Average Rubric Score	Conversion Score	Total Average Rubric Score	Conversion Score
Ineffective	0-49	Ineffective	0-49
1.000	0	1.317	39
1.008	1	1.325	40
1.017	2	1.333	41
1.025	3	1.342	42
1.033	4	1.350	43
1.042	5	1.358	44
1.050	6	1.367	45
1.058	7	1.375	46
1.067	8	1.383	47
1.075	9	1.392	48
1.083	10	1.400	49
1.092	11	Developing	50-56
1.100	12	1.5	50
1.108	13	1.6	51
1.115	14	1.7	51
1.123	15	1.8	52
1.131	16	1.9	53
1.138	17	2.0	54
1.146	18	2.1	54
1.154	19	2.2	55
1.162	20	2.3	56
1.169	21	2.4	56
1.177	22	Effective	57-59
1.185	23	2.5	57
1.192	24	2.6	57
1.200	25	2.7	57
1.208	26	2.8	58
1.217	27	2.9	58
1.225	28	3.0	58
1.233	29	3.1	58
1.242	30	3.2	58
1.250	31	3.3	59
1.258	32	3.4	59
1.267	33	Highly Effective	60
1.275	34	3.5	60
1.283	35	3.6	60
1.292	36	3.7	60
1.300	37	3.8	60
1.308	38	3.9	60
		4.0	60

Rome City School District Teacher Improvement Plan

Goal:

To provide an opportunity for a teacher who has been rated as “developing” or “ineffective” to achieve the rating of “effective” or “highly effective.”

Description:

- A Teacher Improvement Plan (TIP) is intended to help educators improve professionally by providing support in order to improve job performance. It is not intended to be used as a disciplinary tool or to gather evidence to terminate an educator.
- An improvement plan may be designed to address performance concerns at any time; however, any teacher who receives a “developing” or “ineffective” rating in two or more areas in his/her end of the year evaluation will be subject to a formal Teacher Improvement Plan.
- Confidentiality will be maintained at all times.
- The Teacher Improvement Plan is developed in collaboration with the educator and the administrator(s). At the request of the educator, a union representative may participate at the initial meeting and/or at any juncture in the process.
- The development of the TIP should be a professional, constructive conversation identifying goals as well as solutions to problems and resources to help the educator achieve the goals.
- It is strongly recommended that the teacher keep a log of completed activities with reflections.
- In order for the TIP process to be effective, all parties need to follow the plan as written. A teacher may request additional observations by alternative administrators.

The Teacher Improvement Plan will include:

- Goals for teacher improvement
- Documentation of proposed activities and strategies
- Identified supports/resources to promote success
- Evaluation procedures
- Timelines for implementation
- Written feedback summarizing the discussion at each review interval
- Costs associated with this process are the responsibility of the District.

New York State Regulations:

Notwithstanding any other law, rule or regulation to the contrary, upon rating a teacher or a principal as “developing” or “ineffective” through an annual professional performance review conducted pursuant to the subdivision of this section, the school district or board of cooperative educational services shall formulate and commence implementation of a teacher improvement plan for such teacher as soon as practicable but in no case later than ten days after the date on which teachers are required to report to the opening of classes for the school year.

Supports

Includes but is not limited to:

1. Mentoring-relevant to their subject/building area
2. Collaboration-Team meetings
3. Professional Learning Communities
4. Opportunity to observe highly effective teachers or programs
5. Co-teaching/Team teaching opportunities
6. Peer/Instructional Coach
7. Professional development opportunities
8. Resources (books, sample lesson plans, educational research, materials...)
9. Visual Chart for task completion or other visual organizer

NOTE: Release time will be provided for attendance of professional growth opportunities.

Teacher Improvement Plan Checklist

A Teacher Improvement Plan will include the following:

- Identify the area(s) of Professional Practice Standards to be improved
- Specific goals for improvement which are linked to the performance indicators and/or the APPR evaluation criteria
- Activities, strategies are identified clearly
- Identification of multiple resources and supports are listed to help the teacher, *such as, but not limited to:*
 - *Mentors*
 - *Professional Development Plan offerings*
 - *BOCES and Teacher Center workshops*
 - *Higher Education Institution courses*
 - *Observations of other environments*
 - *Employee Assistance Program recommendation*
 - *Release time for courses, workshops, observations and mentoring*
- Indicators of progress are defined with criteria (if needed)
- Evaluation procedures and methods are identified
- Evaluation timeline with review timeframes are listed
- Signatures by the teacher and administrator(s) are included

Notice of Right to Representation Letter is issued to the Teacher who is in need of improvement.

Phase 1

The initial meeting the Building Administrator & Program Director (when necessary) will meet with the teacher to discuss concerns. Discussions between the parties will take place so there is a clear understanding of the districts concerns. The Parties will schedule a second meeting within a reasonable time period (no later than 5 school days from the initial meeting) at which time the district will present a draft improvement plan for review. The teacher involved will be asked to bring to the second meeting, suggestions that they feel necessary for their success. The district will mail to the employee and the Union an initial draft of the Improvement Plan in advance of the second meeting. Union Representation will be present if requested.

Phase 2

At the second meeting a draft of the Improvement Plan will be developed with the input from the teacher. The draft will include the focus areas, goals and strategies and support for improvement. A timeline, as agreed to by the parties, for the implementation of the TIPS will be established outlining the dates for progress meetings to be held, as well as discussing as to the minimum number of formal and informal observations to be had. Present at this meeting will be: the Teacher, Union Representation, Building Administrator and the Director of Employee Relations. Draft plan will be provided and reviewed with the teacher.

Phase 3

At the third meeting, a final version of the Teacher Improvement Plan will be presented for review, any modifications of the plan will be made prior to the signature. Present at this meeting will be: the Teacher, Union Representation, Building Administrator and the Director of Employee Relations.

The TIP will be implemented by the 10th day of classes.

As part of the TIP, the parties will review and evaluate the following:

- Discussion of the each progress meeting, outline growth achieved by the teacher, with a review of formal and informal observations given.

Rome City School District

TEACHER IMPROVEMENT PLAN

Teacher's Name:	Tenured: [] Yes [] No		
School Building:	School Year:		
TIP Creation Meeting Dates:	1 st	2 nd	3 rd
Dates of Implementation:	Beginning date:	End date:	Date submitted:
Administrator submitting the TIP:			Title:

Check specific focus area(s) of Professional Practice Standards to be improved:

- | | |
|---|--|
| <input type="checkbox"/> Content Knowledge | <input type="checkbox"/> Student Assessment |
| <input type="checkbox"/> Planning & Preparation | <input type="checkbox"/> Collaboration/PLCs |
| <input type="checkbox"/> Instructional Delivery | <input type="checkbox"/> Reflective & Responsive Practice |
| <input type="checkbox"/> Classroom Management | <input type="checkbox"/> Fulfills Professional Obligations |
| <input type="checkbox"/> Student Development | |

Specific goals for improvement in each area:

Focus Area #1

Goals for Improvement:

Strategies and Activities (with timelines if applicable):

Indicators of Progress:

Supports and Resources:

Focus Area #2

Goals for Improvement:

Strategies and Activities (with timelines if applicable):

Indicators of Progress:

Supports and Resources:

Focus Area #3

Goals for Improvement:

Strategies and Activities (with timelines if applicable):

Indicators of Progress:

Supports and Resources:

Evaluation Procedures:

Scheduled dates for review and feedback:

_____	To	_____	Meeting:	_____
_____	To	_____	Meeting:	_____
_____	To	_____	Meeting:	_____
_____	To	_____	Meeting:	_____

Signatures:

Educator's Name: *(Please print)*: _____ Date: _____

Educator's Signature: _____ Date: _____

Administrator's Signature and Title: _____ Date: _____

School: _____

**ROME
TEACHER IMPROVEMENT PLAN FEEDBACK FORM**

Teacher's Name: _____ Tenured Yes No

School: _____

Dates of Plan Implementation: _____

Submitted by: _____

Collaborative Meeting Dates: _____

Specific Area to be Improved	Specific Goals for Improvement	Strategies, Activities, Supports & Resources for Each Area Identified <i>(Activities and Timeline when applicable)</i>	Indicators of Progress	Evaluation Procedures	Plan Evaluation Timeline/Review Period(s)
<input type="checkbox"/> Content Knowledge					
<input type="checkbox"/> Planning and Preparation					
<input type="checkbox"/> Instructional Delivery					
<input type="checkbox"/> Classroom Management					
<input type="checkbox"/> Student Development					
<input type="checkbox"/> Student Assessment					
<input type="checkbox"/> Collaborative PLC's					
<input type="checkbox"/> Reflective and Responsive Practices					
<input type="checkbox"/> Fulfills Professional Obligations					

Educator's Name: (Please Print) _____

Educator's Signature: _____

Date: _____

Administrator's Name and Title: (Please Print) _____

Administrator's Signature: _____

Date: _____

School: _____

COLLABORATIVE POST MEETING REFLECTION LOG

Date: _____

Meeting Comments/Recommendations:

Date: _____

Meeting Comments/Recommendations:

Date: _____

Meeting Comments/Recommendations:

Rome City School District
APPR 15 point distribution for local assessments

Percentage of students who met target	APPR Points for local assessment	HEDI category
93 – 100%	15	Highly Effective
85 - 92%	14	Highly Effective
76 - 84%	13	Effective
67 - 75%	12	Effective
59 – 66%	11	Effective
51 – 58%	10	Effective
43 – 50%	9	Effective
35 – 42%	8	Effective
29 – 34%	7	Developing
23 – 28%	6	Developing
17 – 22%	5	Developing
12 – 16%	4	Developing
8 – 11%	3	Developing
5 – 7%	2	Ineffective
2 – 4%	1	Ineffective
0 – 1%	0	Ineffective

Rome City School District
APPR 20 point distribution for local assessments

Percentage of students who met target	APPR Points for local assessment	HEDI category
96 – 100%	20	Highly Effective
91 - 95%	19	Highly Effective
85 – 90%	18	Highly Effective
78 - 84%	17	Effective
72 – 77%	16	Effective
66 - 71%	15	Effective
61 – 65%	14	Effective
56 - 60%	13	Effective
50 – 55%	12	Effective
45 – 49%	11	Effective
40 – 44%	10	Effective
35 – 39%	9	Effective
29 – 34%	8	Developing
24 – 28%	7	Developing
19 – 23%	6	Developing
15 – 18%	5	Developing
11 – 14%	4	Developing
8 – 10%	3	Developing
5 – 7%	2	Ineffective
2 – 4%	1	Ineffective
0 – 1%	0	Ineffective

Rome City School District
APPR 20 point distribution for growth

Percentage of students who met target	APPR Points for local assessment	HEDI category
96 – 100%	20	Highly Effective
91 - 95%	19	Highly Effective
85 – 90%	18	Highly Effective
78 - 84%	17	Effective
72 – 77%	16	Effective
66 - 71%	15	Effective
61 – 65%	14	Effective
56 - 60%	13	Effective
50 – 55%	12	Effective
45 – 49%	11	Effective
40 – 44%	10	Effective
35 – 39%	9	Effective
29 – 34%	8	Developing
24 – 28%	7	Developing
19 – 23%	6	Developing
15 – 18%	5	Developing
11 – 14%	4	Developing
8 – 10%	3	Developing
5 – 7%	2	Ineffective
2 – 4%	1	Ineffective
0 – 1%	0	Ineffective

Rome City School District
APPR 15 point distribution for local assessments

Percentage of students who met target	APPR Points for local assessment	HEDI category
93 – 100%	15	Highly Effective
85 - 92%	14	Highly Effective
76 - 84%	13	Effective
67 - 75%	12	Effective
59 – 66%	11	Effective
51 – 58%	10	Effective
43 – 50%	9	Effective
35 – 42%	8	Effective
29 – 34%	7	Developing
23 – 28%	6	Developing
17 – 22%	5	Developing
12 – 16%	4	Developing
8 – 11%	3	Developing
5 – 7%	2	Ineffective
2 – 4%	1	Ineffective
0 – 1%	0	Ineffective

Rome City School District
APPR 20 point distribution for local assessments

Percentage of students who met target	APPR Points for local assessment	HEDI category
96 – 100%	20	Highly Effective
91 - 95%	19	Highly Effective
85 – 90%	18	Highly Effective
78 - 84%	17	Effective
72 – 77%	16	Effective
66 - 71%	15	Effective
61 – 65%	14	Effective
56 - 60%	13	Effective
50 – 55%	12	Effective
45 – 49%	11	Effective
40 – 44%	10	Effective
35 – 39%	9	Effective
29 – 34%	8	Developing
24 – 28%	7	Developing
19 – 23%	6	Developing
15 – 18%	5	Developing
11 – 14%	4	Developing
8 – 10%	3	Developing
5 – 7%	2	Ineffective
2 – 4%	1	Ineffective
0 – 1%	0	Ineffective

Rome City School District Rome Administrator's Association

RUBRIC SCORING METHODOLOGIES

60 Point "Other measures"

1. The parties agree that Principals shall be evaluated using the Multidimensional Principal Performance Rubric for the Other Measures subcomponent. The assessment of Other Measures on the rubric shall account for 60% of a Principal's HEDI rating. Ratings and scores shall be determined for the summative evaluation based on observations/meetings and other sources of evidence provided.
2. Each element of the Multidimensional domain shall be rated using the HEDI criteria which shall be converted to a four point scale: Highly Effective = 4 points; Effective = 3 points; Developing = 2 points; and Ineffective = 1 point. The element scores shall be averaged to determine a rubric score which shall be converted to a HEDI rating and points pursuant to the following chart.

Rubric Score (Average)	Subcomponent Points
Ineffective	
1.00	0
1.01	1
1.02	2
1.03	3
1.04	4
1.05	5
1.06	6
1.07	7
1.08	8
1.09	9
1.10	10
1.11	11
1.12	12
1.13	13
1.14	14
1.15	15
1.16	16
1.17	17
1.18	18
1.19	19
1.20	20
1.21	21
1.22	22
1.23	23
1.24	24
1.25	25
1.26	26
1.27	27
1.28	28
1.29	29
1.30	30
1.31	31
1.32	32

1.33	33
1.34	34
1.35	35
1.36	36
1.37	37
1.38	38
1.39	39
1.40	40
1.41	41
1.42	42
1.43	43
1.44	44
1.45	45
1.46	46
1.47	47
1.48	48
1.49	49
1.50	50
1.51	51
1.52	52
1.53	53
1.54	54
Developing	
1.55-2.00	55
2.01 -2.50	56
Effective	
2.51-3.00	57
3.01-3.50	58
Highly Effective	
3.51-3.74	59
3.75-4.00	60

Principal's Signature and date _____

Rome City School District Principal Improvement Plan Process

Upon rating a principal as ineffective or developing, an improvement plan designed to rectify perceived or demonstrated deficiencies must be developed and commenced no later than ten (10) school days after the start of a school year. The superintendent or designee, in conjunction with the principal, must develop an improvement plan that contains:

1. A clear delineation of the deficiencies that resulted in the ineffective or developing assessment.
2. Specific improvement goal/outcome statements.
3. Specific improvement action steps/activities.
4. A reasonable time line for achieving improvement.
5. Required and accessible resources to achieve goal.
6. A formative evaluation process documenting meetings strategically scheduled throughout the year to assess progress. These meetings shall occur at least twice during the year: the first between December 1 and December 15 and the second between March 1 and March 15. A written summary of feedback on progress shall be given within 5 business days of each meeting.
7. A clear manner in which improvement efforts will be assessed, including evidence demonstrating improvement.
8. A formal, final written summative assessment delineating progress made with an opportunity for comments by the principal.

Rome City School District Principal Improvement Plan

Name of Principal _____

School Building _____ Academic Year _____

Deficiency that promulgated the “ineffective” or “developing” performance rating:

Improvement Goal/Outcome:

Action Steps/Activities:

Timeline for completion:

Required and Accessible Resources, including identification of responsibility for provision:

Dates of formative evaluation on progress (lead evaluator and principal initial each date to confirm the meeting):

December:

March:

Other:

Evidence to be provided for Goal Achievement:

Assessment Summary: Superintendent is to attach a narrative summary of improvement progress, including verification of the provision of support and resources as outlined above no later than 10 days after the identified completion date. Such summary shall be signed by the superintendent and principal with the opportunity for the principal to attach comments.

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:

Jeff P. Jovan 1/7/13

Teachers Union President Signature: Date:

Robert A. Wood 7 JANUARY 2013

Administrative Union President Signature: Date:

Mel S. Bem 1.7.13

Board of Education President Signature: Date:

Patricia S. Giedde 1/7/13