THE STATE EDUCATION DEPARTMENT / THE UNIVERSITY OF THE STATE OF NEW YORK / ALBANY, NY 12234

COMMISSIONER OF EDUCATION
PRESIDENT OF THE UNIVERSITY OF THE STATE OF NEW YORK

August 30, 2012

Dr. Kenneth Graham, Superintendent
Rush-Henrietta Central School District
2034 Lehigh Station Road
Henrietta, NY 14467

Dear Superintendent Graham:

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 certification 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.

Pursuant to Education Law §3012-c and Subpart 30-2, the Department will continue to work with districts to help ensure compliance with the statute and the regulations. We will be analyzing data supplied by districts, BOCES, and/or schools and may ask for 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. Please be advised that, if any provisions of your APPR plan violate the statute or the regulations, the Department reserves the right to require your district to correct and/or resolve such violations.

The Department looks 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

c: Daniel T. White

NOTE: 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.

Annual Professional Performance Reviews: 2012-13

Created Thursday, June 14, 2012
Updated Wednesday, August 29, 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 : 261701060000

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

261701060000

1.2) School District Name: RUSH-HENRIETTA CSD

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

RUSH-HENRIETTA CSD

1.3) School Improvement Grant (SIG) Districts Only

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

(No response)

1.4) Award Classification

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

- Governor’s Management Efficiency Grant

- Performance Improvement Grant

1.5) Assurances

Please check all of the boxes below:

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

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

Re-submission to address deficiencies

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

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

Annual (2012-13)

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

Created Thursday, June 14, 2012
Updated Wednesday, August 29, 2012

Page 1

STATE-PROVIDED MEASURES OF STUDENT GROWTH

(25 points with an approved value-added measure)

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

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

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

2.1) Assurances

Please check the boxes below:

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

STUDENT LEARNING OBJECTIVES AS COMPARABLE GROWTH MEASURES (20 points)

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

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

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

If no State assessment or Regents exam exists:

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

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

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

State assessments, *required if one exists*

List of State-approved 3rd party assessments

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

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

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

2.2) Grades K-3 ELA

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

	ELA	Assessment
K	School-or BOCES-wide, group or team results based on State assessments	ELA 5 state assessment
1	School-or BOCES-wide, group or team results based on State assessments	ELA 5 state assessment
2	School-or BOCES-wide, group or team results based on State assessments	ELA 5 state assessment

	ELA	Assessment
3	State assessment	3rd Grade State Assessment

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

Use this box, if needed, to describe the general process for assigning HEDI categories for these grades/subjects in this	Growth will be demonstrated by the increase in the percentage of students performing level 3 and 4 on the Grade 5 ELA state

subcomponent. If needed, you may upload a table or graphic at 2.11, below.	assessment Spring 2013 as compared to the Grade 5 ELA state assessment Spring 2012. Grade 3 teachers will similarly be measured using the Grade 3 ELA state assessment Spring 2013 as compared to the Grade 3 ELA state assessment Spring 2012.
Highly Effective (18 - 20 points) Results are well-above state average for similar students (or District goals if no state test).	A 7% or more increase in literacy proficiency (level 3 or better) on the Grade 3/5 ELA state assessment Spring 2013 as compared to the Grade 3/5 ELA state assessment Spring 2012. The percent listed is the minimum percent needed to achieve the corresponding HEDI score. 20 points: > or equal to 9% increase 19 points: 8% increase 18 points: 7% increase
Effective (9 - 17 points) Results meet state average for similar students (or District goals if no state test).	A -2.0 to 6.0% increase in literacy proficiency (level 3 or better) on the Grade 3/5 ELA state assessment Spring 2013 as compared to the Grade 3/5 ELA state assessment Spring 2012.The percent listed is the minimum percent needed to achieve the corresponding HEDI score. 17 points: 6% increase 16 points: 5% increase 15 points: 4% increase 14 points: 3% increase 13 points: 2% increase 12 points: 1% increase 11 points: 0% increase 10 points: -1% increase 9 points: -2% increase
Developing (3 - 8 points) Results are below state average for similar students (or District goals if no state test).	A -8 to -3% increase in literacy proficiency (level 3 or better) on the Grade 3/5 ELA state assessment Spring 2013 as compared to the Grade 3/5 ELA state assessment Spring 2012. The percent listed is the minimum percent needed to achieve the corresponding HEDI score. 8 points: -3 % increase 7 points: -4 % increase 6 points: -5 %increase 5 points: -6% increase 4 points: -7% increase 3 points: -8 %increase
Ineffective (0 - 2 points) Results are well-below state average for similar students (or District goals if no state test).	A -9% or less increase in literacy proficiency (level 3 or better) on the Grade 3/5 ELA state assessment Spring 2013 as compared to the Grade 3/5 ELA state assessment Spring 2012. The percent listed is the minimum percent needed to achieve the corresponding HEDI score. 2 points: -9 % increase 1 point: .- 10% increase 0 points: > -10% increase

2.3) Grades K-3 Math

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

	Math	Assessment
K	School-or BOCES-wide, group or team results based on State assessments	Grade 5 State Math Assessment
1	School-or BOCES-wide, group or team results based on State assessments	Grade 5 State Math Assessment

2	School-or BOCES-wide, group or team results based on State assessments	Grade 5 State Math Assessment

	Math	Assessment
3	State assessment	3rd Grade State Assessment

For Grades K-3 Math: describe the district-adopted expectations for the level of performance required for each HEDI rating category and the process for assigning points to teachers based on SLO results consistent with regulations and assurances in the Comparable Growth Measures subcomponent. Include any district-determined expectations for 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.	Growth will be demonstrated by the increase in the percentage of students performing level 3 and 4 on the Grade 5 Math state assessment Spring 2013 as compared to the Grade 5 Math state assessment Spring 2012. Grade 3 teachers will similarly be measured using the Grade 3 Math state assessment Spring 2013 as compared to the Grade 3 Math state assessment Spring 2012.
Highly Effective (18 - 20 points) Results are well-above state average for similar students (or District goals if no state test).	A 7% or more increase in proficiency (level 3 or better) on the Grade 3/5 Math state assessment Spring 2013 as compared to the Grade 3/5 Math state assessment Spring 2012. The percent listed is the minimum percent needed to achieve the corresponding HEDI score. 20 points: > or equal to 9% increase 19 points: 8% increase 18 points: 7% increase
Effective (9 - 17 points) Results meet state average for similar students (or District goals if no state test).	A -2.0 to 6.0% increase in proficiency (level 3 or better) on the Grade 3/5 Math state assessment Spring 2013 as compared to the Grade 3/5 Math state assessment Spring 2012.The percent listed is the minimum percent needed to achieve the corresponding HEDI score. 17 points: 6% increase 16 points: 5% increase 15 points: 4% increase 14 points: 3% increase 13 points: 2% increase 12 points: 1% increase 11 points: 0% increase 10 points: -1% increase 9 points: -2% increase
Developing (3 - 8 points) Results are below state average for similar students (or District goals if no state test).	A -8 to -3% increase in proficiency (level 3 or better) on the Grade 3/5 Math state assessment Spring 2013 as compared to the Grade 3/5 Math state assessment Spring 2012. The percent listed is the minimum percent needed to achieve the corresponding HEDI score. 8 points: -3 % increase 7 points: -4 % increase 6 points: -5 %increase 5 points: -6% increase 4 points: -7% increase 3 points: -8 %increase
Ineffective (0 - 2 points) Results are well-below state average for similar students (or District goals if no state test).	A -9% or less increase in proficiency (level 3 or better) on the Grade 3/5 Math state assessment Spring 2013 as compared to the Grade 3/5 Math state assessment Spring 2012. The percent listed is the minimum percent needed to achieve the corresponding HEDI score.

	2 points: -9 % increase 1 point: .- 10% increase 0 points: > -10% increase

2.4) Grades 6-8 Science

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

	Science	Assessment
6	District, regional or BOCES-developed assessment	Grade 6 Science District Assessment
7	District, regional or BOCES-developed assessment	Grade 7 Science District Assessment

	Science	Assessment
8	State assessment	8th Grade State Science Assessment

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

Use this box, if needed, to describe the general process for assigning HEDI categories for these grades/subjects in this subcomponent. If needed, you may upload a table or graphic at 2.11, below.	Growth will be demonstrated by the increase in the percentage of students scoring a 75 or better on the Spring 2013 Grade 6-7 Science District Assessment and the Grade 8 Earth Science Regents as compared to Spring 2012 performance on those same tests. This goal reflects a district priority of raising the passing score from 65 - 75.
Highly Effective (18 - 20 points) Results are well-above state average for similar students (or District goals if no state test).	A 7% or more increase in proficiency (75 or better) on the Grade 6-7 Science District Assessment Spring 2013 as compared to the Grade 6-7 Science District Assessment Spring 2012. Grade 8 Earth Science will be calculated similarly. The percent listed is the minimum percent needed to achieve the corresponding HEDI score. 20 points: > or equal to 9% increase 19 points: 8% increase 18 points: 7% increase
Effective (9 - 17 points) Results meet state average for similar students (or District goals if no state test).	A -2.0 to 6.0% increase in proficiency (75 or better) on the Grade 6-7 Science District Assessment Spring 2013 as compared to the Grade 6-7 Science District Assessment Spring 2012. Grade 8 Earth Science will be calculated similarly. The percent listed is the minimum percent needed to achieve the corresponding HEDI score. 17 points: 6% increase 16 points: 5% increase 15 points: 4% increase 14 points: 3% increase 13 points: 2% increase 12 points: 1% increase 11 points: 0% increase 10 points: -1% increase 9 points: -2% increase
Developing (3 - 8 points) Results are below state average for similar students (or District goals if no state test).	A -8 to -3% increase in proficiency (75 or better) on the Grade 6-7 Science District Assessment Spring 2013 as compared to the

	Grade 6-7 Science District Assessment Spring 2012. Grade 8 Earth Science will be calculated similarly. The percent listed is the minimum percent needed to achieve the corresponding HEDI score. 8 points: -3 % increase 7 points: -4 % increase 6 points: -5 %increase 5 points: -6% increase 4 points: -7% increase 3 points: -8 %increase
Ineffective (0 - 2 points) Results are well-below state average for similar students (or District goals if no state test).	A -9% or less increase in proficiency (75 or better) on the Grade 6-7 Science District Assessment Spring 2013 as compared to the Grade 6-7 Science District Assessment Spring 2012. Grade 8 Earth Science will be calculated similarly. The percent listed is the minimum percent needed to achieve the corresponding HEDI score. 2 points: -9 % increase 1 point: .- 10% increase 0 points: > -10% increase

2.5) Grades 6-8 Social Studies

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

	Social Studies	Assessment
6	District, regional or BOCES-developed assessment	Grade 6 Social Studies District Assessment
7	District, regional or BOCES-developed assessment	Grade 7 Social Studies District Assessment
8	District, regional or BOCES-developed assessment	Grade 8 Social Studies District Assessment

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

Use this box, if needed, to describe the general process for assigning HEDI categories for these grades/subjects in this subcomponent. If needed, you may upload a table or graphic at 2.11, below.	Growth will be demonstrated by the increase in the percentage of students scoring a 75% or better on the Spring 2013 Grade 6-7-8 Social Studies District Assessment as compared to Spring 2012 performance on those same tests. This goal reflects a district priority of raising the passing score from 65 - 75%.
Highly Effective (18 - 20 points) Results are well-above District goals for similar students.	A 7% or more increase in proficiency (75% or better) on the Grade 6-7-8 Social Studies District Assessments Spring 2013 as compared to the Grade 6-7-8 Social Studies District Assessments Spring 2012. The percent listed is the minimum percent needed to achieve the corresponding HEDI score. 20 points: > or equal to 9% increase 19 points: 8% increase 18 points: 7% increase
Effective (9 - 17 points) Results meet District goals for similar students.	A -2.0 to 6.0% increase in proficiency (75% or better) on the Grade 6-7-8 Social Studies District Assessments Spring 2013 as compared to the Grade 6-7-8 Social Studies District Assessment Spring 2012. The percent listed is the minimum percent needed to achieve the corresponding HEDI score. 17 points: 6% increase 16 points: 5% increase

	15 points: 4% increase 14 points: 3% increase 13 points: 2% increase 12 points: 1% increase 11 points: 0% increase 10 points: -1% increase 9 points: -2% increase
Developing (3 - 8 points) Results are below District goals for similar students.	A -8 to -3% increase in proficiency (75% or better) on the Grade 6-7-8 Social Studies District Assessments Spring 2013 as compared to the Grade 6-7-8 Social Studies District Assessments Spring 2012. The percent listed is the minimum percent needed to achieve the corresponding HEDI score. 8 points: -3 % increase 7 points: -4 % increase 6 points: -5 %increase 5 points: -6% increase 4 points: -7% increase 3 points: -8 %increase
Ineffective (0 - 2 points) Results are well-below District goals for similar students.	A -9% or less increase in proficiency (75% or better) on the Grade 6-7-8 Social Studies District Assessment Spring 2013 as compared to the Grade 6-7-8 District Social Studies Assessments Spring 2012. The percent listed is the minimum percent needed to achieve the corresponding HEDI score. 2 points: -9 % increase 1 point: .- 10% increase 0 points: > -10% increase

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	School-/BOCES-wide group/team results based on State assessments	Regents Assessment

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

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

Use this box, if needed, to describe the general process for assigning HEDI categories for these grades/subjects in this subcomponent. If needed, you may upload a table or graphic at 2.11, below.	Growth will be demonstrated by the increase in the percentage of students scoring a 75 or better on the Spring 2013 Global/US History Regents Exams as compared to Spring 2012 performance on those same tests. This goal reflects a district priority of raising the passing score from 65 - 75.

Highly Effective (18 - 20 points) Results are well-above District goals for similar students.	A 7% or more increase in proficiency (75 or better) on the Spring 2013 Global/US History Regents Exams as compared to Spring 2012 performance on those same tests. The percent listed is the minimum percent needed to achieve the corresponding HEDI score. 20 points: > or equal to 9% increase 19 points: 8% increase 18 points: 7% increase
Effective (9 - 17 points) Results meet District goals for similar students.	A -2.0 to 6.0% increase in proficiency (75 or better) on the Spring 2013 Global/US History Regents Exams as compared to Spring 2012 performance on those same tests. The percent listed is the minimum percent needed to achieve the corresponding HEDI score. 17 points: 6% increase 16 points: 5% increase 15 points: 4% increase 14 points: 3% increase 13 points: 2% increase 12 points: 1% increase 11 points: 0% increase 10 points: -1% increase 9 points: -2% increase
Developing (3 - 8 points) Results are below District goals for similar students.	A -8 to -3% increase in proficiency (75 or better) on Spring 2013 Global/US History Regents Exams as compared to Spring 2012 performance on those same tests. The percent listed is the minimum percent needed to achieve the corresponding HEDI score. 8 points: -3 % increase 7 points: -4 % increase 6 points: -5 %increase 5 points: -6% increase 4 points: -7% increase 3 points: -8 %increase
Ineffective (0 - 2 points) Results are well-below District goals for similar students.	A -9% or less increase in proficiency (75 or better) on the Spring 2013 Global/US History Regents Exams as compared to Spring 2012 performance on those same tests.The percent listed is the minimum percent needed to achieve the corresponding HEDI score. 2 points: -9 % increase 1 point: .- 10% increase 0 points: > -10% increase

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.	Growth will be demonstrated by the increase in the percentage of students scoring a 75 or better on the Spring 2013 Science Regents Exams (Earth Science, Living Environment,Chemistry, Physics) as compared to Spring 2012 performance on those same tests. This goal reflects a district priority of raising the passing score from 65 - 75.
Highly Effective (18 - 20 points) Results are well-above District goals for similar students.	A 7% or more increase in proficiency (75 or better) on the Spring 2013 Science Regents Exams as compared to Spring 2012 performance on those same tests. The percent listed is the minimum percent needed to achieve the corresponding HEDI score. 20 points: > or equal to 9% increase 19 points: 8% increase 18 points: 7% increase
Effective (9 - 17 points) Results meet District goals for similar students.	A -2.0 to 6.0% increase in proficiency (75 or better) on the Spring 2013 Science Regents Exams as compared to Spring 2012 performance on those same tests. The percent listed is the minimum percent needed to achieve the corresponding HEDI score. 17 points: 6% increase 16 points: 5% increase 15 points: 4% increase 14 points: 3% increase 13 points: 2% increase 12 points: 1% increase 11 points: 0% increase 10 points: -1% increase 9 points: -2% increase
Developing (3 - 8 points) Results are below District goals for similar students.	A -8 to -3% increase in proficiency (75 or better) on Spring 2013 Science Regents Exams as compared to Spring 2012 performance on those same tests. The percent listed is the minimum percent needed to achieve the corresponding HEDI score. 8 points: -3 % increase 7 points: -4 % increase 6 points: -5 %increase 5 points: -6% increase 4 points: -7% increase 3 points: -8 %increase
Ineffective (0 - 2 points) Results are well-below District goals for similar students.	A -9% or less increase in proficiency (75 or better) on the Spring 2013 Science Regents Exams as compared to Spring 2012 performance on those same tests. The percent listed is the minimum percent needed to achieve the corresponding HEDI score. 2 points: -9 % increase 1 point: .- 10% increase 0 points: > -10% increase

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.	Growth will be demonstrated by the increase in the percentage of students scoring a 75 or better on the Spring 2013 Mathematics (Algebra 1, Geometry, Algebra II) Regents Exams as compared to Spring 2012 performance on those same tests. This goal reflects a district priority of raising the passing score from 65 - 75.
Highly Effective (18 - 20 points) Results are well-above District goals for similar students.	A 7% or more increase in proficiency (75 or better) on the Spring 2013 Mathematics (Algebra 1, Geometry, Algebra II) Regents Exams as compared to Spring 2012 performance on those same tests. The percent listed is the minimum percent needed to achieve the corresponding HEDI score. 20 points: > or equal to 9% increase 19 points: 8% increase 18 points: 7% increase
Effective (9 - 17 points) Results meet District goals for similar students.	A -2.0 to 6.0% increase in proficiency (75 or better) on the Spring 2013 Mathematics (Algebra 1, Geometry, Algebra II) Regents Exams as compared to Spring 2012 performance on those same tests. The percent listed is the minimum percent needed to achieve the corresponding HEDI score. 17 points: 6% increase 16 points: 5% increase 15 points: 4% increase 14 points: 3% increase 13 points: 2% increase 12 points: 1% increase 11 points: 0% increase 10 points: -1% increase 9 points: -2% increase
Developing (3 - 8 points) Results are below District goals for similar students.	A -8 to -3% increase in proficiency (75 or better) on Spring 2013 Mathematics (Algebra 1, Geometry, Algebra II) Regents Exams as compared to Spring 2012 performance on those same tests. The percent listed is the minimum percent needed to achieve the corresponding HEDI score. 8 points: -3 % increase 7 points: -4 % increase 6 points: -5 %increase 5 points: -6% increase 4 points: -7% increase 3 points: -8 %increase
Ineffective (0 - 2 points) Results are well-below District goals for similar students.	A -9% or less increase in proficiency (75 or better) on the Spring 2013 Mathematics (Algebra 1, Geometry, Algebra II)

	Regents Exams as compared to Spring 2012 performance on those same tests. The percent listed is the minimum percent needed to achieve the corresponding HEDI score. 2 points: -9 % increase 1 point: .- 10% increase 0 points: > -10% increase

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	Regents assessment	ELA 11 Regents
Grade 10 ELA	Regents assessment	ELA 11 Regents
Grade 11 ELA	Regents assessment	ELA 11 Regents

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

Use this box, if needed, to describe the general process for assigning HEDI categories for these grades/subjects in this subcomponent. If needed, you may upload a table or graphic at 2.11, below.	Growth will be demonstrated by the increase in the percentage of students scoring a 75 or better on the Spring 2013 ELA 11 Regents exam as compared to Spring 2012 performance on the same test. This goal reflects a district priority of raising the passing score from 65 - 75.
Highly Effective (18 - 20 points) Results are well-above District goals for similar students.	A 7% or more increase in proficiency (75 or better) on the Spring 2013 ELA 11 Regents exam as compared to Spring 2012 performance on the same test. The percent listed is the minimum percent needed to achieve the corresponding HEDI score. 20 points: > or equal to 9% increase 19 points: 8% increase 18 points: 7% increase
Effective (9 - 17 points) Results meet District goals for similar students.	A -2.0 to 6.0% increase in proficiency (75 or better) on the Spring 2013 ELA 11 Regents exam as compared to Spring 2012 performance on the same test. The percent listed is the minimum percent needed to achieve the corresponding HEDI score. 17 points: 6% increase 16 points: 5% increase 15 points: 4% increase 14 points: 3% increase 13 points: 2% increase 12 points: 1% increase 11 points: 0% increase 10 points: -1% increase 9 points: -2% increase
Developing (3 - 8 points) Results are below District goals for similar students.	A -8 to -3% increase in proficiency (75 or better) on Spring 2013 ELA 11 Regents exam as compared to Spring 2012 performance on the same test. The percent listed is the minimum

	percent needed to achieve the corresponding HEDI score. 8 points: -3 % increase 7 points: -4 % increase 6 points: -5 %increase 5 points: -6% increase 4 points: -7% increase 3 points: -8 %increase
Ineffective (0 - 2 points) Results are well-below District goals for similar students.	A -9% or less increase in proficiency (75 or better) on the Spring 2013 ELA 11 Regents exam as compared to Spring 2012 performance on the same test. The percent listed is the minimum percent needed to achieve the corresponding HEDI score. 2 points: -9 % increase 1 point: .- 10% increase 0 points: > -10% increase

2.10) All Other Courses

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

	Course(s) or Subject(s)	Option	Assessment
	All other courses K-5	School/BOCES-wide/group/team results based on State	ELA 5
	All other courses 6-8	School/BOCES-wide/group/team results based on State	ELA 8
	All other courses 9-12	School/BOCES-wide/group/team results based on State	ELA 11

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.	For all other courses K-5, growth will be demonstrated by increase in the percent of students scoring a level 3 or 4 on the ELA 5. Likewise, For all other course 6-8, growth will be demonstrated by an increase in the percent of students scoring a level 3 or 4 on the ELA 8. For all other courses at the high school level grades 9-12, growth will demonstrated by an increase in the percent of students scoring > than 75 on the ELA 11 Regents exam. For each of these assessments, the percentage increase is measured from Spring 2013 exams as compared to the Spring 2012 exams.
Highly Effective (18 - 20 points) Results are well-above District goals for similar students.	A 7% or more increase in proficiency (level 3 /4 or 75 or better where applicable) on the Spring 2013 exams as compared to Spring 2012 performance on those same tests. The percent listed is the minimum percent needed to achieve the corresponding HEDI score. 20 points: > or equal to 9% increase

	19 points: 8% increase 18 points: 7% increase
Effective (9 - 17 points) Results meet District goals for similar students.	A -2.0 to 6.0% increase in proficiency (level 3 /4 or 75 or better where applicable) on the Spring 2013 exams as compared to Spring 2012 performance on those same tests. The percent listed is the minimum percent needed to achieve the corresponding HEDI score. 17 points: 6% increase 16 points: 5% increase 15 points: 4% increase 14 points: 3% increase 13 points: 2% increase 12 points: 1% increase 11 points: 0% increase 10 points: -1% increase 9 points: -2% increase
Developing (3 - 8 points) Results are below District goals for similar students.	A -8 to -3% increase in proficiency (Level 3 or 4 or 75 or better where applicable) on Spring 2013 exams as compared to Spring 2012 performance on those same tests. The percent listed is the minimum percent needed to achieve the corresponding HEDI score. 8 points: -3 % increase 7 points: -4 % increase 6 points: -5 %increase 5 points: -6% increase 4 points: -7% increase 3 points: -8 %increase
Ineffective (0 - 2 points) Results are well-below District goals for similar students.	A -9% or less increase in proficiency (Level 3 or 4 or 75 or better) on the Spring 2013 exams as compared to Spring 2012 performance on those same tests.The percent listed is the minimum percent needed to achieve the corresponding HEDI score. 2 points: -9 % increase 1 point: .- 10% increase 0 points: > -10% increase

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/5364/142757-TXEtxx9bQW/Copy of Growth Score Apdx K-1.xlsx

2.12) Locally Developed Controls

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

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

No local adjustments because we are using the all students category in all cases for all grade levels.

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, June 14, 2012
Updated Wednesday, August 29, 2012

Page 1

Locally Selected Measures of Student Achievement or Growth

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

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

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

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

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

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

Growth or achievement measure(s) from these options.

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

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

Measures based on:

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

3.1) Grades 4-8 ELA

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

	Locally-Selected Measure from List of Approved Measures	Assessment
4	6(ii) School wide measure computed locally	Math 5 Spring 2013 State Assessment
5	6(ii) School wide measure computed locally	Math 5 Spring 2013 State Assessment
6	6(ii) School wide measure computed locally	Math 8 Spring 2013 State Assessment
7	6(ii) School wide measure computed locally	Math 8 Spring 2013 State Assessment
8	6(ii) School wide measure computed locally	Math 8 Spring 2013 State Assessment

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

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

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.	To measure achievement, the average level performance will be calculated using the state results of the Spring 2013 State Math 5 or 8 exam. The methodology will calculate the number of 1,2,3,4, performances for the Math exams and then divide by the number of students to determine an average level performance which will then be converted to HEDI point scores(see uploaded chart)
Highly Effective (14 - 15 points) Results are well above District- or BOCES-adopted expectations for growth or achievement for grade/subject.	An average level performance of 3.5 to 4.0 is considered highly effective achievement. (see chart attached) The average level of performance listed is the minimum level needed to achieve the corresponding HEDI score.
Effective (8- 13 points) Results meet District- or BOCES-adopted expectations for growth or achievement for grade/subject.	An average level of performance of 2.5 to 3.4 is considered effective achievement. (see chart attached) The average level of performance listed is the minimum level needed to achieve the corresponding HEDI score.
Developing (3 - 7 points) Results are below District- or BOCES-adopted expectations for growth or achievement for grade/subject.	An average level of performance of 1.5 to 2.4 is considered developing achievement. (see chart attached) The average level of performance listed is the minimum level needed to achieve the corresponding HEDI score.
Ineffective (0 - 2 points) Results are well below District- or BOCES-adopted expectations for growth or achievement for grade/subject.	An average level of performance of 1 to 1.4 is considered ineffective achievement. (see chart attached) The average level of performance listed is the minimum level needed to achieve the corresponding HEDI score.

3.2) Grades 4-8 Math

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

	Locally-Selected Measure from List of Approved Measures	Assessment
4	6(ii) School wide measure computed locally	Math 5 Spring 2013 State Assessment
5	6(ii) School wide measure computed locally	Math 5 Spring 2013 State Assessment
6	6(ii) School wide measure computed locally	Math 8 Spring 2013 State Assessment
7	6(ii) School wide measure computed locally	Math 8 Spring 2013 State Assessment
8	6(ii) School wide measure computed locally	Math 8 Spring 2013 State Assessment

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

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

assurances listed to the left of each box.

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.	To measure achievement, the average level performance will be calculated using the state results of the Spring 2013 State Math 5 or 8 exam. The methodology will calculate the number of 1,2,3,4, performances for the Math exams and then divide by the number of students to determine an average level performance which will then be converted to HEDI point scores(see uploaded chart)
Highly Effective (14 - 15 points) Results are well above District- or BOCES-adopted expectations for growth or achievement for grade/subject.	An average level performance of 3.5 to 4.0 is considered highly effective achievement. (see chart attached) The average level of performance listed is the minimum level needed to achieve the corresponding HEDI score.
Effective (8- 13 points) Results meet District- or BOCES-adopted expectations for growth or achievement for grade/subject.	An average level of performance of 2.5 to 3.4 is considered effective achievement. (see chart attached) The average level of performance listed is the minimum level needed to achieve the corresponding HEDI score.
Developing (3 - 7 points) Results are below District- or BOCES-adopted expectations for growth or achievement for grade/subject.	An average level of performance of 1.5 to 2.4 is considered developing achievement. (see chart attached) The average level of performance listed is the minimum level needed to achieve the corresponding HEDI score.
Ineffective (0 - 2 points) Results are well below District- or BOCES-adopted expectations for growth or achievement for grade/subject.	An average level of performance of 1 to 1.4 is considered ineffective achievement. (see chart attached) The average level of performance listed is the minimum level needed to achieve the corresponding HEDI score.

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/5139/142778-rhJdBgDruP/Local 20 Conversion Apdx L.docx

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

Growth or achievement measure(s) from these options.

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

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

Measures based on:

1) The change in percentage of a teacher's students who achieve a specific level of performance as determined locally, on such assessments/examinations compared to those students' level of performance on such assessments/examinations in the previous school year (e.g., a three percentage point increase in students earning the proficient level (three) or better performance level on the 7th grade

math State assessment compared to those same students' performance levels on the 6th grade math State assessment, or an increase in the percentage of a teacher's students earning the advanced performance level (four) on the 4th grade ELA or math State assessments compared to those students' performance levels on the 3rd grade ELA or math State assessments)

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

3.4) Grades K-3 ELA

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

	Locally-Selected Measure from List of Approved Measures	Assessment
K	6(ii) School-wide measure computed locally	Math 5 Spring 2013 State Assessment
1	6(ii) School-wide measure computed locally	Math 5 Spring 2013 State Assessment
2	6(ii) School-wide measure computed locally	Math 5 Spring 2013 State Assessment
3	6(ii) School-wide measure computed locally	Math 5 Spring 2013 State Assessment

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

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

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 average level performance will be calculated using the state results of the state mathematics exams Spring 2013 grade 5. This methodology will calculate the number of 1,2,3,4, performances for the Math exams and then determine and average level performance which will then be converted using the scale attached.
Highly Effective (18-20 points) Results are well above District- or BOCES-adopted expectations for growth or achievement for grade/subject.	An average level performance of 3.5 to 4.0 is considered highly effective achievement. (see chart attached) The average level of performance listed is the minimum level needed to achieve the corresponding HEDI score.
Effective (9-17 points) Results meet District- or BOCES-adopted expectations for growth or achievement for grade/subject.	An average level of performance of 2.5 to 3.4 is considered effective achievement. (see chart attached) The average level of performance listed is the minimum level needed to achieve the corresponding HEDI score.
Developing (3 - 8 points) Results are below District- or BOCES-adopted expectations for growth or achievement for grade/subject.	An average level of performance of 1.5 to 2.4 is considered developing achievement. (see chart attached) The average level of performance listed is the minimum level needed to achieve the corresponding HEDI score.
Ineffective (0 - 2 points) Results are well below District- or BOCES-adopted expectations for growth or achievement for grade/subject.	An average level of performance of 1 to 1.4 is considered ineffective achievement. (see chart attached) The average level of performance listed is the minimum level needed to achieve the corresponding HEDI score.

3.5) Grades K-3 Math

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

	Locally-Selected Measure from List of Approved Measures	Assessment
K	6(ii) School-wide measure computed locally	Math 5 Spring 2013 State Assessment
1	6(ii) School-wide measure computed locally	Math 5 Spring 2013 State Assessment
2	6(ii) School-wide measure computed locally	Math 5 Spring 2013 State Assessment
3	6(ii) School-wide measure computed locally	MAth 5 Spring 2013 State Assessemnt

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

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

Use this box, if needed, to describe the general process for assigning HEDI categories for these grades/subjects in this subcomponent. If needed, you may upload a table or graphic at 3.13, below.	The average level performance will be calculated using the state results of the State mathematics exams Spring 2013 grade 5. This methodology will calculate the number of 1,2,3,4, performances for the Math exams and then determine and average level performance which will then be converted using

	the scale attached.
Highly Effective (18-20 points) Results are well above District- or BOCES-adopted expectations for growth or achievement for grade/subject.	An average level performance of 3.5 to 4.0 is considered highly effective achievement. (see chart attached) The average level of performance listed is the minimum level needed to achieve the corresponding HEDI score.
Effective (9-17 points) Results meet District- or BOCES-adopted expectations for growth or achievement for grade/subject.	An average level of performance of 2.5 to 3.4 is considered effective achievement. (see chart attached) The average level of performance listed is the minimum level needed to achieve the corresponding HEDI score.
Developing (3 - 8 points) Results are below District -or BOCES-adopted expectations for growth or achievement for grade/subject.	An average level of performance of 1.5 to 2.4 is considered developing achievement. (see chart attached) The average level of performance listed is the minimum level needed to achieve the corresponding HEDI score.
Ineffective (0 - 2 points) Results are well below District- or BOCES-adopted expectations for growth or achievement for grade/subject.	An average level of performance of 1 to 1.4 is considered ineffective achievement. (see chart attached) The average level of performance listed is the minimum level needed to achieve the corresponding HEDI score.

3.6) Grades 6-8 Science

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

	Locally-Selected Measure from List of Approved Measures	Assessment
6	6(ii) School wide measure computed locally	Math 8 Spring 2013 State Assessment
7	6(ii) School wide measure computed locally	Math 8 Spring 2013 State Assessment
8	6(ii) School wide measure computed locally	Math 8 Spring 2013 State Assessment

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

Use this box, if needed, to describe the general process for assigning HEDI categories for these grades/subjects in this subcomponent. If needed, you may upload a table or graphic at 3.13, below.	The average level performance will be calculated using the state results of the state mathematics exams grade 8 Spring 2013. This methodology will calculate the number of 1,2,3,4, performances for the Math exams and then determine and average level performance which will then be converted using the scale attached.
Highly Effective (18 - 20 points) Results are well above District- or BOCES-adopted expectations for growth or achievement for grade/subject.	An average level performance of 3.5 to 4.0 is considered highly effective achievement. (see chart attached) The average level of performance listed is the minimum level needed to achieve the corresponding HEDI score.
Effective (9 - 17 points) Results meet District- or BOCES-adopted expectations for growth or achievement for grade/subject.	An average level of performance of 2.5 to 3.4 is considered effective achievement. (see chart attached) The average level of performance listed is the minimum level needed to achieve the corresponding HEDI score.
Developing (3 - 8 points) Results are below District- or BOCES-adopted expectations for growth or achievement for grade/subject.	An average level of performance of 1.5 to 2.4 is considered developing achievement. (see chart attached) The average level of performance listed is the minimum level needed to achieve the corresponding HEDI score.

Ineffective (0 - 2 points) Results are well below District- or BOCES-adopted expectations for growth or achievement for grade/subject.	An average level of performance of 1 to 1.4 is considered ineffective achievement. (see chart attached) The average level of performance listed is the minimum level needed to achieve the corresponding HEDI score.

3.7) Grades 6-8 Social Studies

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

	Locally-Selected Measure from List of Approved Measures	Assessment
6	6(ii) School wide measure computed locally	Math 8 Spring 2013 State Assessment
7	6(ii) School wide measure computed locally	Math 8 Spring 2013 State Assessment
8	6(ii) School wide measure computed locally	Math 8 Spring 2013 State Assessment

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

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

Use this box, if needed, to describe the general process for assigning HEDI categories for these grades/subjects in this subcomponent. If needed, you may upload a table or graphic at 3.13, below.	The average level performance will be calculated using the state results of the state mathematics exams grade 8. This methodology will calculate the number of 1,2,3,4, performances for the Math exams and then determine and average level performance which will then be converted using the scale attached.
Highly Effective (18 - 20 points) Results are well above District- or BOCES-adopted expectations for growth or achievement for grade/subject.	An average level performance of 3.5 to 4.0 is considered highly effective achievement. (see chart attached) The average level of performance listed is the minimum level needed to achieve the corresponding HEDI score.
Effective (9 - 17 points) Results meet District- or BOCES-adopted expectations for growth or achievement for grade/subject.	An average level of performance of 2.5 to 3.4 is considered effective achievement. (see chart attached) The average level of performance listed is the minimum level needed to achieve the corresponding HEDI score.
Developing (3 - 8 points) Results are below District- or BOCES-adopted expectations for growth or achievement for grade/subject.	An average level of performance of 1.5 to 2.4 is considered developing achievement. (see chart attached) The average level of performance listed is the minimum level needed to achieve the corresponding HEDI score.
Ineffective (0 - 2 points) Results are well below District- or BOCES-adopted expectations for growth or achievement for grade/subject.	An average level of performance of 1 to 1.4 is considered ineffective achievement. (see chart attached) The average level of performance listed is the minimum level needed to achieve the corresponding HEDI score.

3.8) High School Social Studies

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

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

	Locally-Selected Measure from List of Approved Measures	Assessment
Global 1	6(ii) School wide measure computed locally	Regents Assessments Spring 2013
Global 2	6(ii) School wide measure computed locally	Regents Assessments Spring 2013
American History	6(ii) School wide measure computed locally	Regents Assessments spring 2103

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 average of five Regents exams necessary for graduation will be calculated using the attached 0-100 conversion chart. The five Regents used will be Algebra 1, Global History, US History, English 11, and Living Environment. These are the gate keeper Regents exams to graduation.
Highly Effective (18 - 20 points) Results are well above District- or BOCES-adopted expectations for growth or achievement for grade/subject.	An 85-100 average of all five 2013 Regents exams listed above will be considered highly effective. (See chart attached) The range listed is the minimum points needed to achieve the corresponding HEDI points.
Effective (9 - 17 points) Results meet District- or BOCES-adopted expectations for growth or achievement for grade/subject.	A 65- 84 average of all five 2013 Regents exams listed above will be considered effective. (See chart attached)The range listed is the minimum points needed to achieve the corresponding HEDI points.
Developing (3 - 8 points) Results are below District- or BOCES-adopted expectations for growth or achievement for grade/subject.	A 55-64 average of all five 2013 Regents exams listed above will be considered developing. (See chart attached) The range listed is the minimum points needed to achieve the corresponding HEDI points.
Ineffective (0 - 2 points) Results are well below District- or BOCES-adopted expectations for growth or achievement for grade/subject.	0-54 average of all five 2013 Regents exams listed above will be considered ineffective. (See chart attached) The range listed is the minimum points needed to achieve the corresponding HEDI points.

3.9) High School Science

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

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

	Locally-Selected Measure from List of Approved Measures	Assessment
Living Environment	6(ii) School wide measure computed locally	Regents Assessments Spring 2013
Earth Science	6(ii) School wide measure computed locally	Regents Assessments Spring 2013

Chemistry	6(ii) School wide measure computed locally	Regents Assessments Spring 2013
Physics	6(ii) School wide measure computed locally	Regents Assessments Spring 2013

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 average of five Regents exams necessary for graduation will be calculated using the attached 0-100 conversion chart. The five Regents used will be Algebra 1, Global History, US History, English 11, and Living Environment. These are the gate keeper Regents exams to graduation.
Highly Effective (18-20 points) Results are well above District- or BOCES-adopted expectations for growth or achievement for grade/subject.	An 85-100 average of all five 2013 Regents exams listed above will be considered highly effective. (See chart attached) The range listed is the minimum points needed to achieve the corresponding HEDI points.
Developing (3 - 8 points) Results are below District- or BOCES-adopted expectations for growth or achievement for grade/subject.	A 65- 84 average of all five 2013 Regents exams listed above will be considered effective. (See chart attached) The range listed is the minimum points needed to achieve the corresponding HEDI points.
Effective (9 - 17points) Results meet District- or BOCES-adopted expectations for growth or achievement for grade/subject.	A 55-64 average of all five 2013 Regents exams listed above will be considered developing. (See chart attached) The range listed is the minimum points needed to achieve the corresponding HEDI points.
Ineffective (0 - 2 points) Results are well below District- or BOCES-adopted expectations for growth or achievement for grade/subject.	0-54 average of all five 2013 Regents exams listed above will be considered ineffective. (See chart attached) The range listed is the minimum points needed to achieve the corresponding HEDI points.

3.10) High School Math

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

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

	Locally-Selected Measure from List of Approved Measures	Assessment
Algebra 1	6(ii) School wide measure computed locally	Regents Asssessment Spring 2013
Geometry	6(ii) School wide measure computed locally	Regents Assessment Spring 2013
Algebra 2	6(ii) School wide measure computed locally	Regents Assessmnet Spring 2013

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 average of five Regents exams necessary for graduation will be calculated using the attached 0-100 conversion chart. The five Regents used will be Algebra 1, Global History, US History, English 11, and Living Environment. These are the gate keeper Regents exams to graduation.
Highly Effective (18 - 20 points) Results are well above District- or BOCES-adopted expectations for growth or achievement for grade/subject.	An 85-100 average of all five 2013 Regents exams listed above will be considered highly effective. (See chart attached) The range listed is the minimum points needed to achieve the corresponding HEDI points.
Effective (9 - 17 points) Results meet District- or BOCES-adopted expectations for growth or achievement for grade/subject.	A 65- 84 average of all five 2013 Regents exams listed above will be considered effective. (See chart attached) The range listed is the minimum points needed to achieve the corresponding HEDI points.
Developing (3 - 8 points) Results are below District- or BOCES-adopted expectations for growth or achievement for grade/subject.	A 55-64 average of all five 2013 Regents exams listed above will be considered developing. (See chart attached) The range listed is the minimum points needed to achieve the corresponding HEDI points.
Ineffective (0 - 2 points) Results are well below District- or BOCES-adopted expectations for growth or achievement for grade/subject.	0-54 average of all five 2013 Regents exams listed above will be considered ineffective. (See chart attached) The range listed is the minimum points needed to achieve the corresponding HEDI points.

3.11) High School English Language Arts

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

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

	Locally-Selected Measure from List of Approved Measures	Assessment
Grade 9 ELA	6(ii) School wide measure computed locally	Regents Assessments Spring 2013
Grade 10 ELA	6(ii) School wide measure computed locally	Regents Assessments Spring 2013
Grade 11 ELA	6(ii) School wide measure computed locally	Regents Assessments Spring 2013

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

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

Use this box, if needed, to describe the general process for assigning HEDI categories for these grades/subjects in this	The average of five Regents exams necessary for graduation will be calculated using the attached 0-100 conversion chart.

subcomponent. If needed, you may upload a table or graphic at 3.13, below.	The five Regents used will be Algebra 1, Global History, US History, English 11, and Living Environment. These are the gate keeper Regents exams to graduation.
Highly Effective (18 - 20 points) Results are well above District- or BOCES-adopted expectations for growth or achievement for grade/subject.	An 85-100 average of all five 2013 Regents exams listed above will be considered highly effective. (See chart attached) The range listed is the minimum points needed to achieve the corresponding HEDI points.
Effective (9 - 17 points) Results meet District- or BOCES-adopted expectations for growth or achievement for grade/subject.	A 65- 84 average of all five 2013 Regents exams listed above will be considered effective. (See chart attached) The range listed is the minimum points needed to achieve the corresponding HEDI points.
Developing (3 - 8 points) Results are below District- or BOCES-adopted expectations for growth or achievement for grade/subject.	A 55-64 average of all five 2013 Regents exams listed above will be considered developing. (See chart attached) The range listed is the minimum points needed to achieve the corresponding HEDI points.
Ineffective (0 - 2 points) Results are well below District- or BOCES-adopted expectations for growth or achievement for grade/subject.	0-54 average of all five 2013 Regents exams listed above will be considered ineffective. (See chart attached) The range listed is the minimum points needed to achieve the corresponding HEDI points.

3.12) All Other Courses

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

	Course(s) or Subject(s)	Locally-Selected Measure from List of Approved Measures	Assessment
	All other courses K-5	6(ii) School wide measure computed locally	Math 5 State Assessment Spring 2013
	All other courses 6-8	6(ii) School wide measure computed locally	Math 8 State Assessment Spring 2013
	All other courses 9-12	6(ii) School wide measure computed locally	Regent Assessments Spring 2013

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

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

Use this box, if needed, to describe the general process for assigning HEDI categories for these grades/subjects in this subcomponent. If needed, you may upload a table or graphic at	For all other teachers K-5, an average level of performance will be calculated using the Spring 2013 Math 5 state assessment. For all other teachers 6-8, an average level of performance will

3.13, below.	be calculated using the Spring 2013 Math 8 state assessment. For all other teachers grades 9-12, the average of the five gate keeper Regents exams Spring 2013 will be calculated.
Highly Effective (18 - 20 points) Results are well above District- or BOCES -adopted expectations for growth or achievement for grade/subject.	See chart attached.
Effective (9 - 17 points) Results meet District- or BOCES-adopted expectations for growth or achievement for grade/subject.	See chart attached.
Developing (3 - 8 points) Results are below District- or BOCES-adopted expectations for growth or achievement for grade/subject.	See chart attached.
Ineffective (0 - 2 points) Results are well below District- or BOCES-adopted expectations for growth or achievement for grade/subject.	See chart attached.

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/5139/142778-y92vNseFa4/Local 20 Conversion Apdx L.docx

3.14) Locally Developed Controls

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

No local adjustments - We are using the all students categories for the 2008 Cohort June 2012 graduation

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.

Not applicable.

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, June 14, 2012
Updated Wednesday, August 29, 2012

Page 1

4.1) Teacher Practice Rubric

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

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

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

Danielson's Framework for Teaching

Not Applicable

4.2) Points Within Other Measures

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

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

Is the following points assignment applicable to all teachers?

Yes

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

(No response)

Multiple (at least two) classroom observations by principal or other trained administrator, at least one of which must be unannounced [at least 31 points]	60
One or more observation(s) by trained independent evaluators	0
Observations by trained in-school peer teachers	0
Feedback from students using State-approved survey tool	0
Feedback from parents/caregivers using State-approved survey tool	0
Structured reviews of lesson plans, student portfolios and other teacher artifacts	0

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

(No response)

4.3) Survey Tools (if applicable)

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

(No response)

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

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

4.4) Assurances

Please check all of the boxes below:

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

4.5) Process for Assigning Points and Determining HEDI Ratings

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

Teachers will be evaluated using the Danielson 2007 Frameworks. Each component is being rated throughout the year and scored at the end of the year. End of the year scores will be calculated by assigning a rating to each component area. A corresponding number will be assigned to each rating. (highly effective = 4, effective = 3, developing = 2, ineffective = 1)
An average score will then be calculated with each component score receiving equal weight. The average score will then be converted to a scaled score using the agreed upon NYSUT conversion chart. The full 60 points will be evaluated using the rubric.

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/5091/142781-eka9yMJ855/Rubric Score Apdx M.docx

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.	59-60 points. The teacher is a master teacher and makes contribution to the field, both in and outside school. The classroom is a community of learners who are highly motivated and engaged and students assume responaibility for their own learning.
Effective: Overall performance and results meet NYS Teaching Standards.	57-58 points. The teacher clearly understands the concepts of the Danielson Framework and implements them well. Learning is clearly taking place.
Developing: Overall performance and results need improvement in order to meet NYS Teaching Standards.	50-56 points. The teacher appears to understand some of the concepts underlying the Danielson Framework. Implementation is sporadic, intermittent or otherwise not entirely successful.
Ineffective: Overall performance and results do not meet NYS Teaching Standards.	0-49 points. The teacher does not yet appear to understand the concepts underlying the Danielson Framework. Very little or no learning is taking place in the classroom.

Provide the ranges for the 60-point scoring bands.

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

4.6) Observations of Probationary Teachers

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

By building principals or other trained administrators

4.6) Observations of Probationary Teachers | Formal/Long	1
4.6) Observations of Probationary Teachers | Informal/Short	1
4.6) Observations of Probationary Teachers | Enter Total	2

By trained in-school peer teachers or other trained reviewers

Formal/Long	0
Informal/Short	0

Independent evaluators

Formal/Long	0
Informal/Short	0

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

- In Person

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

- In Person

4.7) Observations of Tenured Teachers

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

By building principals or other trained administrators

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

By trained in-school peer teachers or other trained reviewers

Formal/Long	0
Informal/Short	0

Independent evaluators

Formal/Long	0
Informal/Short	0

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

- In Person

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

- In Person

5. Composite Scoring (Teachers)

Created Thursday, June 14, 2012
Updated Wednesday, August 29, 2012

Page 1

Standards for Rating Categories

Growth or Comparable Measures

Locally-selected Measures of

growth or achievement

Other Measures of Effectiveness

(Teacher and Leader standards)

Highly

Effective

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

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

Overall performance and results exceed NYS Teaching Standards.

Effective

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

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

Overall performance and results meet NYS Teaching Standards.

Developing

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

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

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

Ineffective

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

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

Overall performance and results do not meet NYS Teaching Standards.

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

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

2012-13 where there is no Value-Added measure

Growth or Comparable Measures

Locally-selected Measures of

growth or achievement

Other Measures of Effectiveness

(60 points)

Overall

Composite Score

Highly Effective

18-20

18-20

Ranges determined locally--see below

91-100

Effective

9-17

9-17

75-90

Developing

3-8

3-8

65-74

Ineffective

0-2

0-2

0-64

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

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

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

2012-13 where Value-Added growth measure applies

Growth or Comparable Measures

Locally-selected Measures of

growth or achievement

Other Measures of Effectiveness

(60 points)

Overall

Composite Score

Highly Effective

22-25

14-15

Ranges determined locally--see above

91-100

Effective

10-21

8-13

75-90

Developing

3-9

3-7

65-74

Ineffective

0-2

0-2

0-64

6. Additional Requirements - Teachers

Created Thursday, June 14, 2012
Updated Wednesday, August 29, 2012

Page 1

6.1) Assurances -- Improvement Plans

Please check the boxes below:

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

6.2) Attachment: Teacher Improvement Plan Forms

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

assets/survey-uploads/5265/142787-Df0w3Xx5v6/APPR - Denise A 4.pdf

6.3) Appeals Process

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

(1) the substance of the annual professional performance review

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

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

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

TEACHER APPEAL PROCESS - APPR
(Article 16/Section 6)
I. Eligibility
Appeals are limited to tenured teachers with a composite rating of Ineffective or Developing AND
whose 60 point rating is lower than either of their two 20 point ratings.

II. Subjects for Appeals
Appeals are limited to adherence to commissioner's regulations, compliance to negotiated procedures, and adherence to education law. Additionally, areas designated by the teacher, with their supporting documentation attached at the time, in the observation process that are contrary to the evaluator's ratings, may serve as the basis for an appeal subject to the criteria as outlined in I. above.
III. One Appeal
A teacher may not file multiple appeals regarding the same performance review or teacher improvement plan (TIP). All grounds for appeal, as outlined in II above must be raised with specificity within one appeal. Any grounds not raised at the time the appeal is filed shall be deemed waived.
IV. Burden of Proof
The teacher filing the appeal has the burden of demonstrating a right to the relief requested and the burden of establishing the facts upon which relief is sought.
V. Decision-Making
Appeals shall be submitted to the Superintendent. Upon receipt of such appeal, the Superintendent, or designee, shall notify the President of the Association. A committee of two [2] teachers, who have received a composite rating of Effective or Highly Effective, selected by the President of the Association, and two [2] administrators, neither of whom evaluated the appellant, selected by the Superintendent, or designee, shall be convened to hear the appeal. If a principal is selected to the committee, he/she must also have received a composite rating of Effective or Highly Effective.
VI. Decision
A majority opinion is required to sustain the appeal. A written decision, sustaining or denying the appeal, shall be sent to the appellant, evaluator of the appellant, and Superintendent, setting forth the reasons and factual basis for each determination on each of the specific issues raised by the appeal. If the appeal is sustain, the rating may be modified or set aside (new evaluation in whole or in part). In the case of a 2-2 split, while the appeal is denied, the rationale for both views will be stated in writing.
VII. Time frame
All appeals must be submitted, in writing, to the Superintendent no later than seven [7] calendar days from receipt of the composite score or the August Superintendent's Conference Day, whichever is later.The evaluator of the appellant has five [5] calendar days to respond to the appeal upon notification from the committee. The committee has ten [10] calendar days, from receipt of the above information, to make a decision.
VIII. Exclusivity of Appeal Procedure
This appeal procedure shall constitute the exclusive means for initiating, reviewing, and resolving any challenges and appeals related to a teacher's APPR and/or TIP. A teacher may not resort to any other contractual grievance procedures for the resolution of challenges or appeals related to an APPR or TIP.

6.4) Training and Certification of Lead Evaluators and Evaluators

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

There will be a five day initial training on the Danielson 2007 Framework with an emphasis on evidenced based observation. During the training, administrators will practice scripting, tagging and rating teacher performance from video exemplars to insure inter-rater reliability.

Each administrator will be initially assessed using the Teachscape tool for certification. Inter-rater reliability of lead evaluators is being insured through the use of a common assessment tool - the Teachscape Framework for Teacher Proficiency System assessment.

Thereafter, ongoing training will be conducted to refine observation and evaluation practices at our monthly leadership development meetings. Each August, lead evaluators will be reassessed and recertified through a district designed re-calibration assessment.

New administrators will complete the same protocol as current administrators upon hiring.

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	Checked

the last school day of the school year for which the teacher or principal is being measured.	
6.6) Assurances -- Teachers | Assure that the APPR will be put on the district website by September 10 or within 10 days after approval, whichever is later.	Checked
6.6) Assurances -- Teachers | Assure that the evaluation system will be used as a significant factor for employment decisions.	Checked
6.6) Assurances -- Teachers | Assure that teachers will receive timely and constructive feedback as part of the evaluation process.	Checked
6.6) Assurances -- Teachers | Assure the district has appeal procedures that are consistent with the regulations and that they provide for the timely and expeditious resolution of an appeal.	Checked

6.7) Assurances -- Data

Please check all of the boxes below:

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

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

Created Thursday, June 14, 2012
Updated Wednesday, August 29, 2012

Page 1

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

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

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

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

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

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

Please check the boxes below:

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

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

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

State assessments, *required if one exists*

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

List of State-approved 3rd party assessments

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

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

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

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

Use this box, if needed, to describe the process for assigning HEDI categories in this subcomponent. If needed, you may upload a table or graphic below.	Not applicable
Highly Effective (18 - 20 points) Results are well above state average for similar students (or District goals if no state test).	Not applicable
Effective (9 - 17 points) Results meet state average for similar students (or District goals if no state test).	Not applicable
Developing (3 - 8 points) Results are below state average for similar students (or District goals if no state test).	Not applicable
Ineffective (0 - 2 points) Results are well below state average for similar students (or District goals if no state test).	Not applicable

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

(No response)

7.4) Special Considerations for Comparable Growth Measures

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

Note: The only allowable controls or adjustments for Comparable Growth Measures are those used in State Growth measures, which include: prior student achievement results, students with disabilities, English language learners, students in poverty, and, in the future,

any other student-, classroom-, and school-level characteristics approved by the Board of Regents.

(No response)

7.5) Principals with More Than One Growth Measure

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

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

7.6) Assurances -- Comparable Growth Measures

Please check all of the boxes below:

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

8. Local Measures (Principals)

Created Monday, June 18, 2012
Updated Wednesday, August 29, 2012

Page 1

Locally-Selected Measures of Student Achievement or Growth

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

	Grade Configuration	Locally-Selected Measure from List of Approved Measures	Assessment
	K-5	(a) achievement on State assessments	Math 5 Spring 2013 State Assessment
	6-8	(a) achievement on State assessments	Math 8 Spring 2013 State Assessment
	9-12	(g) % achieving specific level on Regents or alternatives	Average of 5 Regents necessary for graduation (ALgebra, Global, Bio, US History, and ELA 11)

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.	For all principals K-5, an average level of performance will be calculated using the Spring 2013 Math 5 State assessment. For all principals 6-8, an average level of performance will be calculated using the Spring 2013 Math 8 State assessment. For all principals grades 9-12, the average of five gate keeper Regents exams Spring 2013 will be calculated.
Highly Effective (14 - 15 points) Results are well above District- or BOCES-adopted expectations for growth or achievement for grade/subject.	See conversion charts attached.
Effective (8- 13 points) Results meet District- or BOCES-adopted expectations for growth or achievement for grade/subject.	See conversion charts attached.
Developing (3 - 7 points) Results are below District- or BOCES-adopted expectations for growth or achievement for grade/subject.	See conversion charts attached.
Ineffective (0 - 2 points) Results are well below District- or BOCES-adopted expectations for growth or achievement for	See conversion charts attached.

grade/subject.

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/5366/143474-qBFVOWF7fC/Local 20 Conversion Apdx L.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

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.	(No response)
Highly Effective (18 - 20 points) Results are well above District- or BOCES-adopted expectations for growth or achievement for grade/subject.	Not applicable
Effective (9- 17 points) Results meet District- or BOCES-adopted expectations for growth or achievement for grade/subject.	Not applicable
Developing (3 - 8 points) Results are below District- or BOCES-adopted expectations for growth or achievement for grade/subject.	Not applicable
Ineffective (0 - 2 points) Results are well below District- or BOCES-adopted expectations for growth or achievement for grade/subject.	Not applicable

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

(No response)

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

(No response)

8.3) Locally Developed Controls

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

No local controls - we are using the ALL students group. We will track student credits and passing grades at each level as a monitor of the path towards graduation for all students at all grades.

8.4) Principals with More Than One Locally Selected Measure

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

Not applicable.

8.5) Assurances

Please check all of the boxes below:

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

9. Other Measures of Effectiveness (Principals)

Created Monday, June 18, 2012
Updated Wednesday, August 29, 2012

Page 1

9.1) Principal Practice Rubric

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

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

Marshall's Principal Evaluation Rubric

(No response)

9.2) Points Within Other Measures

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

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

Is the following points assignment for all principals?

Yes

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

(No response)

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

Broad assessment of principal leadership and management actions based on the practice rubric by the supervisor, a trained administrator or a trained independent evaluator. This must incorporate multiple school visits by supervisor, trained administrator, or trained independent evaluator, at least one of which must be from a supervisor, and at least one of which must be unannounced. [At least 31 points]	60
Any remaining points shall be assigned based on results of one or more ambitious and measurable goals set collaboratively with principals and their superintendents or district superintendents.	0

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

(No response)

9.3) Assurances -- Goals

Please check the boxes below (if applicable):

9.3) Assurances -- Goals | Assure that if any points are assigned to goals, at least one goal will address the principal's contribution to improving teacher effectiveness based on one or more of the following: improved retention of high performing teachers; correlation of student growth scores to teachers granted vs. denied tenure; or improvements in proficiency rating of the principal on specific teacher effectiveness standards in the principal practice rubric.	Checked
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).	Checked

9.4) Sources of Evidence (if applicable)

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

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

9.5) Survey Tool(s) (if applicable)

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

(No response)

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

(No response)

(No response)

(No response)

9.6) Assurances

Please check all of the boxes below:

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

9.7) Process for Assigning Points and Determining HEDI Ratings

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

For the six domains of the Marshall rubric, evidence will be gathered throughout the year by the Superintendent who is conducting the evaluation. At the end of year, the principal and Superintendent will confer to reflect on the evidence gathered which has been rated to the rubric Marshall rubric domains and components. The Marshall rubric will be used holistically to determine points. The predominant rating will determine the category of the final rating. Points will be assigned based on the predominant rating. The bands are only two points apart to minimize subjectivity.

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

(No response)

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

Highly Effective: Overall performance and results exceed standards.	The highly effective level is reserved for truly outstanding leadership. Points will be assigned on holistic review of the six domains. To earn 60 points, a principal must rate highly effective in all components of all domains. To earn 59 points, the majority of components (51%) are rated highly effective and no developing or ineffective component ratings are scored.
Effective: Overall performance and results meet standards.	The effective level represents solid and expected professional performance. Points will be assigned on holistic review of the six domains. To earn 58 points, the majority of components (51%) are effective and no ineffective component ratings are scored and the remaining components are scored more highly effective than developing. To earn 57 points, the majority of components (51%) rated are effective and of the majority of remaining components scored are developing.
Developing: Overall performance and results need improvement in order to meet standards.	Performance has real deficiencies and must improve. Points will be assigned on holistic review of the six domains. To earn 56 points, the majority of components (51%) rated are developing and the majority of remaining components scored are more effective than ineffective. To earn 55 points, the majority of components (51%) rated are developing

	and the majority of remaining rated components scored are ineffective.
Ineffective: Overall performance and results do not meet standards.	Clearly unacceptable and will lead to dismissal if not improved immediately. Points will be assigned on holistic review of the six domains. To score a 54 or less, the majority of components (51%) rated are ineffective. The remaining HEDI scores will be determined based on the combination of the remaining component ratings. The principal has the ability to score a zero.

Please provide the locally-negotiated 60 point scoring bands.

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

9.8) School Visits

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

Probationary Principals

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

Tenured Principals

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

10. Composite Scoring (Principals)

Created Monday, June 18, 2012
Updated Wednesday, August 29, 2012

Page 1

Standards for Rating Categories

Growth or Comparable Measures

Locally-selected Measures of

growth or achievement

Other Measures of Effectiveness

(Teacher and Leader standards)

Highly

Effective

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

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

Overall performance and results exceed ISLLC leadership standards.

Effective

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

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

Overall performance and results meet ISLLC leadership standards.

Developing

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

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

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

Ineffective

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

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

Overall performance and results do not meet ISLLC leadership standards.

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

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

2012-13 where there is no Value-Added measure

Growth or Comparable Measures

Locally-selected Measures of

growth or achievement

Other Measures of Effectiveness

(60 points)

Overall

Composite Score

Highly Effective

18-20

18-20

Ranges determined locally--see below

91-100

Effective

9-17

9-17

75-90

Developing

3-8

3-8

65-74

Ineffective

0-2

0-2

0-64

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

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

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 Monday, June 18, 2012
Updated Wednesday, August 29, 2012

Page 1

11.1) Assurances -- Improvement Plans

Please check the boxes below.

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

11.2) Attachment: Principal Improvement Plan Forms

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

assets/survey-uploads/5276/143506-Df0w3Xx5v6/Princp Improve Plan PIP.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:

PRINCIPAL APPEAL PROCESS - APPR

I. Ratings
Appeals are limited to those of “Ineffective” or “Developing” only.

II. Challenges

Appeals are limited to adherence to Commissioner's regulations, compliance with negotiated procedures, and adherence to Education Law.

III. One Appeal
A principal may not file multiple appeals regarding the same performance review. All grounds for appeal must be raised with specificity within one appeal. All grounds not raised at the time the appeal is filed shall be deemed waived.

IV. Tenured Principals
Only principals who have previously been awarded tenure by the district may file an appeal of their performance review. An appeal may be filed by the affected principal only. Nothing in this APPR Plan shall be construed to affect the right of the Board of Education to terminate a probationary principal or restrict the discretion of the Superintendent and/or Board of Education to make a determination on the status of a probationary principal and/or to deny tenure, in compliance with Education Law 3012c.

V. Burden of Proof
Principal filing the appeal has the burden of demonstrating a clear legal right to a change of review rating and the burden of establishing such facts. The Principal may choose to appear before the panel (or Superintendent) to clarify their written appeal.

VI. Decision-Making
Appeals shall be submitted to the Superintendent. Upon receipt of such appeal, the Superintendent, or designee, shall notify the President of AARH. A committee of four [4] representatives, two [2] principals, who have received an APPR rating of highly effective, selected by the President of AARH, and two [2] administrators, selected by the Superintendent, or designee, shall be convened to hear the appeal. A majority opinion is required to sustain the appeal. Alternatively, the appellant may appeal solely to the Superintendent for a decision.

VII. Decision
The decision shall set forth the reasons and factual basis for each determination on each of the specific issues raised by the appeal. If the appeal is sustained, the rating may be modified or set aside (new evaluation). A copy of the decision shall be provided to the principal and evaluator.

VIII. Timeframe
All appeals must be submitted in writing to the Superintendent no later than fifteen [15] calendar days from the date when the principal received their APPR. Failure to adhere to said timeframe shall deem a waiver of the right to appeal. When filing an appeal, principal must submit a detailed written description of specific areas of disagreement over the APPR and include any additional documents relevant to the appeal. The APPR must also be submitted with the appeal. Any information not submitted at the time of the appeal shall not be considered. Within fifteen [15] calendar days of receipt of an appeal, the Superintendent, or designee, shall submit a written response to the appeal, with copies to the principal initiating the appeal and the APPR evaluator.

IX. Exclusivity of Appeal Procedure
The appeals procedure, as outlined above, shall constitute the exclusive means for initiating, reviewing, and revising any APPR appeal. No other contractual grievance procedure is applicable.

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.

The superintendent is the lead evaluator for principals. The superintendent will be initially trained and certified by LEAF in the use of the Marshall rubric. In 2011-2012, the superintendent has been trained in leadership workshops on using evidence based methodology. The superintendent will participate in a week long summer training. For re-certification, the superintendent will attend an annual workshop on evidence based observation using the Marshall rubric. To insure inter-rater reliability with district teacher lead evaluators for formative supervision of principals, the superintendent will complete the Teachscape Framework for Teaching Proficiency System assessment as required of all other district administrators.

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 Monday, June 18, 2012
Updated Wednesday, August 29, 2012

Page 1

12.1)Upload the Joint Certification of the APPR Plan

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

assets/survey-uploads/5581/143510-3Uqgn5g9Iu/District Certification Form-1 final.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.

APPR STATE GROWTH SCORE

Target	Percent increase of students scoring a LEVEL 3/4 OR 75 or better as a measure of growth from one year's assessment to another																			
	HIGHLY	EFFECTIVE		EFFECTIVE									DEVELOPING						INEFFECT	
HEDI	20	19	18	17	16	15	14	13	12	11	10	9	8	7	6	5	4	3	2	1
	≥ 9.0%	8.0%	7.0%	6.0%	5.0%	4.0%	3.0%	2.0%	1.0%	0%	-1.0%	-2.0%	-3.0%	-4.0%	-5.0%	-6.0%	-7.0%	-8.0%	-9.0%	-10.0%

APPENDIX K

IVE
0
>-10.0%

Local 20 0-100 Point Scale Conversion & 1-4 Conversion Scale		
Ineffective		
0-14	1	0
15-27	1.1	1
28-40	1.2	1.5
41-53	1.3	2.0
54	1.4	2.5
Developing		
55	1.5	3
56	1.6	3.6
57	1.7	4.2
58	1.8	4.8
59	1.9	5.4
60	2	6
61	2.1	6.6
62	2.2	7.2
63	2.3	7.8
64	2.4	8.4
Effective		
65-66	2.5	9
67-68	2.6	9.9
69-70	2.7	10.8
71-72	2.8	11.7
73-74	2.9	12.6
75-76	3	13.5
77-78	3.1	14.4
79-81	3.2	15.3
82-83	3.3	16.2
84	3.4	17.1
Highly Effective		
85-87	3.5	18
88-90	3.6	18.4
91-93	3.7	18.8
94-96	3.8	19.2
97-99	3.9	19.6
100	4	20

** The 20 point conversion rounds down to the nearest whole number to assign the HEDI score.

APPENDIX L

Local 20 0-100 Point Scale Conversion & 1-4 Conversion Scale		
Ineffective		
0-14	1	0
15-27	1.1	1
28-40	1.2	1.5
41-53	1.3	2.0
54	1.4	2.5
Developing		
55	1.5	3
56	1.6	3.6
57	1.7	4.2
58	1.8	4.8
59	1.9	5.4
60	2	6
61	2.1	6.6
62	2.2	7.2
63	2.3	7.8
64	2.4	8.4
Effective		
65-66	2.5	9
67-68	2.6	9.9
69-70	2.7	10.8
71-72	2.8	11.7
73-74	2.9	12.6
75-76	3	13.5
77-78	3.1	14.4
79-81	3.2	15.3
82-83	3.3	16.2
84	3.4	17.1
Highly Effective		
85-87	3.5	18
88-90	3.6	18.4
91-93	3.7	18.8
94-96	3.8	19.2
97-99	3.9	19.6
100	4	20

** The 20 point conversion rounds down to the nearest whole number to assign the HEDI score.

APPENDIX L

Rubric Score to Sub-Component Chart

Total Average Rubric Score	Category	Conversion score for composite
Ineffective 0-49		
1.000		0
1.008		1
1.017		2
1.025		3
1.033		4
1.042		5
1.050		6
1.058		7
1.067		8
1.075		9
1.083		10
1.092		11
1.100		12
1.108		13
1.115		14
1.123		15
1.131		16
1.138		17
1.146		18
1.154		19
1.162		20
1.169		21
1.177		22
1.185		23
1.192		24
1.200		25
1.208		26
1.217		27
1.225		28
1.233		29
1.242		30
1.250		31
1.258		32
1.267		33
1.275		34
1.283		35
1.292		36
1.300		37
1.308		38
1.317		39
1.325		40
1.333		41
1.342		42
1.350		43
1.358		44

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

The 60 point conversion rounds down to the nearest whole number to assign the HEDI score.

APPENDIX M

Local 20 0-100 Point Scale Conversion & 1-4 Conversion Scale		
Ineffective		
0-14	1	0
15-27	1.1	1
28-40	1.2	1.5
41-53	1.3	2.0
54	1.4	2.5
Developing		
55	1.5	3
56	1.6	3.6
57	1.7	4.2
58	1.8	4.8
59	1.9	5.4
60	2	6
61	2.1	6.6
62	2.2	7.2
63	2.3	7.8
64	2.4	8.4
Effective		
65-66	2.5	9
67-68	2.6	9.9
69-70	2.7	10.8
71-72	2.8	11.7
73-74	2.9	12.6
75-76	3	13.5
77-78	3.1	14.4
79-81	3.2	15.3
82-83	3.3	16.2
84	3.4	17.1
Highly Effective		
85-87	3.5	18
88-90	3.6	18.4
91-93	3.7	18.8
94-96	3.8	19.2
97-99	3.9	19.6
100	4	20

** The 20 point conversion rounds down to the nearest whole number to assign the HEDI score.

APPENDIX L

TEACHER IMPROVEMENT PLAN [TIP]

STATUS

☐ Probationary

☐ Tenured

☐ Other (LTS, etc.)

DATE FINAL EVALUATION CONDUCTED:

_____

SCHOOL YEAR FOR TIP:

_____

Teacher: _____ Position: _____

Supervisory Administrator: _____ Position: _____

Meeting Participants: _____

Place a check mark in the box next to any domain below that is rated as Developing or Ineffective.

___ Planning and Preparation ___ Classroom Environment ___ Instruction ___ Professional Responsibilities

In the space below, describe the following: List goals to address the domains assessed as Developing or Ineffective; list differentiated activities to support the teacher's improvement in the areas listed above; describe the manner in which the improvement will be assessed and provide a timeline for achieving improvement.

TIMEFRAMES	RECOMMENDED SUPPORTS/RESOURCES	SUCCESS MEASURES

PRINCIPAL IMPROVEMENT PLAN [PIP]

STATUS

☐ Probationary

☐ Tenured

DATE FINAL EVALUATION CONDUCTED:

_____

SCHOOL YEAR FOR PIP:

_____

Principal: _____ Position: _____

Supervisory Administrator: _____ Position: _____

Meeting Participants: _____

Place a check mark in the box next to any domain below that is rated as Developing or Ineffective.

___ Planning and Preparation ___ Classroom Environment ___ Instruction ___ Professional Responsibilities

In the space below, describe the following: List goals to address the domains assessed as Developing or Ineffective; list differentiated activities to support the principal's improvement in the areas listed above; describe the manner in which the improvement will be assessed and provide a timeline for achieving improvement.

TIMEFRAMES	RECOMMENDED SUPPORTS/RESOURCES	SUCCESS MEASURES

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 the 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: 8/29/12

J. Kenneth Tabb Jr.

Teachers Union President Signature: Date: 8/29/12

Betty W. Crooks

Administrative Union President Signature: Date: 8/29/12

Virginia Darnberg

Board of Education President Signature: Date: 8/29/12

Diane E. McBride