



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

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

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

December 7, 2012

Lynn Schwartz, Superintendent
Sagaponack Common School District
400 Main Street
Sagaponack, NY 11962

Dear Superintendent Schwartz:

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

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

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

Thank you again for your hard work.

Sincerely,



John B. King, Jr.
Commissioner

Attachment

c: Dean Lucera

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

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

Annual Professional Performance Reviews: 2012-13

Created Tuesday, May 22, 2012

Updated Tuesday, December 04, 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 : 580910080000

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

580910080000

1.2) School District Name: SAGAPONACK COMN SD

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

SAGAPONACK COMN SD

1.3) School Improvement Grant (SIG) Districts Only

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

Not applicable

1.4) Award Classification

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

(No response)

1.5) Assurances

Please check all of the boxes below:

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

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

Re-submission to address deficiencies

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

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

Annual (2012-13)

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

Created Tuesday, May 22, 2012

Updated Wednesday, December 05, 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	Not applicable	District does not have K
1	State-approved 3rd party assessment	Terra Nova 3
2	State-approved 3rd party assessment	Terra Nova 3

	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	Terra Nova 3 will be used to determine baseline data. The Head Teacher and the 3rd Grade Teacher will work
---	--

this subcomponent. If needed, you may upload a table or graphic at 2.11, below.	collaboratively to set individualized growth tarrgets. HEDI points will be assigned based on the percentage of students who meet or exceed the targets. (Ineffective 0-29%, Developing30-55%, Effective 56-84%, Highly Effective 85-100%).
Highly Effective (18 - 20 points) Results are well-above state average for similar students (or District goals if no state test).	see Appendix A
Effective (9 - 17 points) Results meet state average for similar students (or District goals if no state test).	see Appendix A
Developing (3 - 8 points) Results are below state average for similar students (or District goals if no state test).	see Appendix A
Ineffective (0 - 2 points) Results are well-below state average for similar students (or District goals if no state test).	see Appendix A

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	Not applicable	District does not have K
1	State-approved 3rd party assessment	Terra Nova 3
2	State-approved 3rd party assessment	Terra Nova 3

	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.	Terra Nova 3 will be used to determine baseline data. The Head Teacher and the 3rd Grade Teacher will work collaboratively to set individualized growth tarrgets. HEDI points will be assigned based on the percentage of students who meet or exceed the targets. (Ineffective 0-29%, Developing30-55%, Effective 56-84%, Highly Effective 85-100%).
Highly Effective (18 - 20 points) Results are well-above state average for similar students (or District goals if no state test).	see Appendix A
Effective (9 - 17 points) Results meet state average for similar students (or District goals if no state test).	see Appendix A
Developing (3 - 8 points) Results are below state average for similar students (or District goals if no state test).	see Appendix A
Ineffective (0 - 2 points) Results are well-below state average for similar students (or District goals if no state	see Appendix A

test).

2.4) Grades 6-8 Science

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

	Science	Assessment
6	Not applicable	District does not have grade 6
7	Not applicable	District does not have grade 7

	Science	Assessment
8	Not applicable	Not applicable

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.	NA
Highly Effective (18 - 20 points) Results are well-above state average for similar students (or District goals if no state test).	NA
Effective (9 - 17 points) Results meet state average for similar students (or District goals if no state test).	NA
Developing (3 - 8 points) Results are below state average for similar students (or District goals if no state test).	NA
Ineffective (0 - 2 points) Results are well-below state average for similar students (or District goals if no state test).	NA

2.5) Grades 6-8 Social Studies

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

	Social Studies	Assessment
6	Not applicable	District does not have grade 6
7	Not applicable	District does not have grade 7
8	Not applicable	District does not have grade 8

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.	NA
---	----

Highly Effective (18 - 20 points) Results are well-above District goals for similar students.	NA
Effective (9 - 17 points) Results meet District goals for similar students.	NA
Developing (3 - 8 points) Results are below District goals for similar students.	NA
Ineffective (0 - 2 points) Results are well-below District goals for similar students.	NA

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	Not applicable	District does not have HS

	Social Studies Regents Courses	Assessment
Global 2	Not applicable	Not applicable
American History	Not applicable	Not applicable

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.	NA
Highly Effective (18 - 20 points) Results are well-above District goals for similar students.	NA
Effective (9 - 17 points) Results meet District goals for similar students.	NA
Developing (3 - 8 points) Results are below District goals for similar students.	NA
Ineffective (0 - 2 points) Results are well-below District goals for similar students.	NA

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	Not applicable	Not applicable
Earth Science	Not applicable	Not applicable
Chemistry	Not applicable	Not applicable

Physics	Not applicable	Not applicable
---------	----------------	----------------

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.	NA
Highly Effective (18 - 20 points) Results are well-above District goals for similar students.	NA
Effective (9 - 17 points) Results meet District goals for similar students.	NA
Developing (3 - 8 points) Results are below District goals for similar students.	NA
Ineffective (0 - 2 points) Results are well-below District goals for similar students.	NA

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	Not applicable	Not applicable
Geometry	Not applicable	Not applicable
Algebra 2	Not applicable	Not applicable

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.	NA
Highly Effective (18 - 20 points) Results are well-above District goals for similar students.	NA
Effective (9 - 17 points) Results meet District goals for similar students.	NA
Developing (3 - 8 points) Results are below District goals for similar students.	NA
Ineffective (0 - 2 points) Results are well-below District goals for similar students.	NA

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).

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/5364/132173-TXEttx9bQW/Appendix A_1.pdf](#)

2.12) Locally Developed Controls

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

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

NA

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 Tuesday, May 22, 2012

Updated Wednesday, December 05, 2012

Page 1

Locally Selected Measures of Student Achievement or Growth

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

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

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

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

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

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

Growth or achievement measure(s) from these options.

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

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

Measures based on:

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

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

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

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

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

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

3.1) Grades 4-8 ELA

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

	Locally-Selected Measure from List of Approved Measures	Assessment
4	4) State-approved 3rd party assessments	AIMSweb
5	Not applicable	NA
6	Not applicable	NA
7	Not applicable	NA
8	Not applicable	NA

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.	see Appendix B
Highly Effective (14 - 15 points) Results are well above District- or BOCES-adopted expectations for growth or achievement for grade/subject.	see Appendix B
Effective (8- 13 points) Results meet District- or BOCES-adopted expectations for growth or achievement for grade/subject.	see Appendix B
Developing (3 - 7 points) Results are below District- or BOCES-adopted expectations for growth or achievement for grade/subject.	see Appendix B
Ineffective (0 - 2 points) Results are well below District- or BOCES-adopted expectations for growth or achievement for grade/subject.	see Appendix B

3.2) Grades 4-8 Math

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

	Locally-Selected Measure from List of Approved Measures	Assessment
4	4) State-approved 3rd party assessments	AIMSweb
5	Not applicable	NA
6	Not applicable	NA
7	Not applicable	NA
8	Not applicable	NA

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.	see Appendix B
Highly Effective (14 - 15 points) Results are well above District- or BOCES-adopted expectations for growth or achievement for grade/subject.	see Appendix B
Effective (8- 13 points) Results meet District- or BOCES-adopted expectations for growth or achievement for grade/subject.	see Appendix B

Developing (3 - 7 points) Results are below District- or BOCES-adopted expectations for growth or achievement for grade/subject.	see Appendix B
Ineffective (0 - 2 points) Results are well below District- or BOCES-adopted expectations for growth or achievement for grade/subject.	see Appendix B

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/5139/132185-rhJdBgDruP/Appendix B-15pts_1.pdf

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

Growth or achievement measure(s) from these options.

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

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

Measures based on:

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

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

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

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

- 5) Student growth or achievement computed in a manner determined locally based on a district, regional or BOCES-developed

assessment that is rigorous and comparable across classrooms

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

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

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

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

3.4) Grades K-3 ELA

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

	Locally-Selected Measure from List of Approved Measures	Assessment
K	Not applicable	NA
1	4) State-approved 3rd party assessments	AIMSweb
2	4) State-approved 3rd party assessments	AIMSweb
3	4) State-approved 3rd party assessments	AIMSweb

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

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	Not applicable	NA
1	4) State-approved 3rd party assessments	AIMSweb
2	4) State-approved 3rd party assessments	AIMSweb
3	4) State-approved 3rd party assessments	AIMSweb

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

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	Not applicable	NA
7	Not applicable	NA
8	Not applicable	NA

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

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

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	Not applicable	NA
7	Not applicable	NA
8	Not applicable	NA

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

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	Not applicable	NA
Global 2	Not applicable	NA

American History	Not applicable	NA
------------------	----------------	----

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

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	Not applicable	NA
Earth Science	Not applicable	NA
Chemistry	Not applicable	NA
Physics	Not applicable	NA

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.	NA
---	----

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

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	Not applicable	NA
Geometry	Not applicable	NA
Algebra 2	Not applicable	NA

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

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

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/5139/132185-y92vNseFa4/Appendix B.pdf

3.14) Locally Developed Controls

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

No adjustments or controls are being used.

3.15) Teachers with More Than One Locally Selected Measure

Describe the district's process for combining multiple locally selected measures, each scored from 0-15 or 0-20 points as applicable, into a single subcomponent HEDI category and score. Examples may include: 4th grade teacher with locally-selected measures for both ELA and Math; High School teacher with more than 1 SLO.

For each subject area we have developed a rubric that provides points for both SLO's and local assessment areas. We will combine the scores and divide them to come up with a final conversion of points.

3.16) Assurances

Please check all of the boxes below:

3.16) Assurances Assure the application of locally-developed controls will be rigorous, fair, and transparent.	Checked
--	---------

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

4. Other Measures of Effectiveness (Teachers)

Created Tuesday, June 19, 2012

Updated Tuesday, December 04, 2012

Page 1

4.1) Teacher Practice Rubric

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

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

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

Danielson's Framework for Teaching (2011 Revised Edition)

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]	40
One or more observation(s) by trained independent evaluators	0
Observations by trained in-school peer teachers	0
Feedback from students using State-approved survey tool	0
Feedback from parents/caregivers using State-approved survey tool	0
Structured reviews of lesson plans, student portfolios and other teacher artifacts	20

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

(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.

Teacher performance will be evaluated via the Charolette Danielson 2011 Framework for Teaching and by a review of teacher artifacts. Forty points will be allocated for the Danielson Rubric with each of the four domains being weighted differently. The twenty points being allocated for artifacts will specifically be based on Danielson's fourth domain: Professional Responsibilities. All teachers will be observed two times throughout the school year. Please note, that normal rounding rules will apply and the overall composite score will be converted to a whole number. See Appendices C and D

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/5091/143955-eka9yMJ855/Appendices C D.pdf

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

Highly Effective: Overall performance and results exceed NYS Teaching Standards.	see Appendices C and D
Effective: Overall performance and results meet NYS Teaching Standards.	see Appendices C and D
Developing: Overall performance and results need improvement in order to meet NYS Teaching Standards.	see Appendices C and D
Ineffective: Overall performance and results do not meet NYS Teaching Standards.	see Appendices C and D

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 Tuesday, June 19, 2012

Updated Wednesday, October 17, 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	18-20
Effective	9-17
Developing	3-8
Ineffective	0-2

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

2012-13 where Value-Added growth measure applies

Growth or Comparable Measures

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

Other Measures of Effectiveness

(60 points)

Overall

Composite Score

Highly Effective

22-25

14-15

Ranges determined locally--see above

91-100

Effective

10-21

8-13

75-90

Developing

3-9

3-7

65-74

Ineffective

0-2

0-2

0-64

6. Additional Requirements - Teachers

Created Tuesday, June 19, 2012

Updated Tuesday, December 04, 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/5265/143974-Df0w3Xx5v6/TEACHER IMPROVEMENT PLAN.pdf](assets/survey-uploads/5265/143974-Df0w3Xx5v6/TEACHER_IMPROVEMENT_PLAN.pdf)

6.3) Appeals Process

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

(1) the substance of the annual professional performance review

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

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

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

Appeals of Annual Performance Evaluations:

a. Appeal Protocols

Only ineffective and developing ratings are eligible for appeal.

To the extent that a teacher or principal wishes to challenge an ineffective or developing performance review and/or the improvement

plan, the Sagaponack Common School District will entertain appeals in accordance with appeal procedures developed through negotiations. Under Education Law 3012-c a teacher/principal may only challenge:

- *The substance of the annual professional performance review.*
- *The school districts or board of cooperative educational services adherence to the standards and methodologies required for such reviews, pursuant to Education Law 3012-c.*
- *The adherence to the Commissioner's Regulations, as applicable to such reviews.*
- *Compliance with any applicable locally negotiated procedures applicable to annual professional performance reviews or improvement plans.*
- *The school district issuance and/or implementation of the terms of the teacher or principal improvement plan under Education Law 3012-c.*

b. Prohibition against more than one appeal

A teacher or principal may not file multiple appeals regarding the same performance review and/or teacher/principal improvement plan. All grounds for appeal must be raised with specificity within one appeal. Any grounds not raised at the time the appeal is filed shall be deemed waived.

c. Timeframe for Filing a Teacher Appeal

All appeals must be submitted in writing to the Superintendent of Schools, no later than 10 work days of the date when the teacher receives his or her annual professional performance review. If a teacher is challenging the issuance of a teacher improvement plan, appeals must be filed within 10 work days of issuance of such plan. The failure to file an appeal within these timeframes shall be deemed a waiver of the right to appeal.

When filing an appeal, the teacher must submit a detailed written description of the specific areas of disagreement over his or her performance review, or the issuance/ implementation of the terms of his or her improvement plan. The performance review/improvement plan being challenged must also be submitted with the appeal. Any additional documents or materials relevant to the appeal must be submitted within the appeals timeframe. Any information not submitted at the time the appeal is filed shall not be considered.

d. Timeframe for District Response to Teacher Appeal

Within 10 work days of receipt of an appeal, the Superintendent of Schools must submit a detailed written response to the individual who is making the appeal. This response must include any and all documents or written materials specific to the points of disagreement that support the evaluator's position and are relevant to the resolution of the appeal. Any such information that is not submitted at the time the response is filed shall not be considered in the deliberations related to the resolution of the appeal.

e. Decision-Maker on Teacher Appeal

Upon receipt of an appeal, the superintendent of schools will refer the appeal to the Board of Trustees.

f. Decision on Teacher Appeal

A written decision on the merits of the appeal, generated by the Board of Trustees, shall be rendered no later than 30 work days from the date upon which the teacher filed his or her appeal. Such decision shall be final.

g. Principal Appeal

An appeal of the principal's evaluation shall be submitted directly to the independent evaluator within 10 work days of receiving such evaluation. The appeal to the independent evaluator shall set forth in detail the basis for such appeal. The appeal must align with the requirements of Education Law 3012-c. Within 10 work days of receipt of an appeal, the independent evaluator must submit a detailed written response to the individual who is making the appeal. This response must include any and all documents or written materials specific to the points of disagreement that support the independent evaluator's position and are relevant to the resolution of the appeal. Any such information that is not submitted at the time the response is filed shall not be considered in the deliberations related to the resolution of the appeal. Upon receipt of an appeal, the independent evaluator will refer the appeal to the Board of Trustees. A binding written decision on the merits of the appeal shall be rendered by the Board of Trustees no later than 30 work days from the date upon

which the principal filed his/her appeal. Such decision shall be final.

h. Final Determination

The final determination in both the teacher and principal appeal shall set forth the reasons and factual basis for such determination on each of the specific issues raised in the appeal. If the appeal is sustained, the rating will be modified. A copy of the final decision shall be provided to the teacher/principal and the appropriate evaluator.

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.

Evaluating Training:

The Sagaponack Common School District will ensure that all lead evaluators are properly trained and certified, as necessary to complete an individual's performance review. Lead evaluator training will be conducted in accordance with the certification requirements per the Commissioner's regulations. This training will include the following:

- *New York State Teaching Standards and ISLLC Standards.*
- *Evidence-based observation.*
- *Application and use of the Student Growth Percentile and Value Added Growth Model data.*
- *Application and use of the State-approved teacher rubrics.*
- *Application and use of any assessment tools used to evaluate teachers.*
- *Application and use of State-approved locally selected measures of student achievement.*
- *Use of Statewide Instructional Reporting System.*
- *Scoring methodology used to evaluate teachers and principals.*

- *Specific considerations in evaluating teachers of ELLs and students with disabilities.*

The District is using the Danielson 2011 model for observation and evaluation of all teaching staff. The District subscribed to and participated in training on the use of the Danielson model as well as all aspects of teacher evaluation and student assessment. Vendors who delivered the training include: Peconic Teacher Center through Joan Daly Lewis, Eastern Suffolk BOCES and trained consultants such as Emma Klimek. The district also participated in a number of webinars which focused on the evaluation process and reviewed a significant amount of relevant materials and resources on teacher evaluation.

The District's only administrator throughout his career attended numerous training sessions on evaluation. He has evaluated hundreds of faculty and remains current with the latest trends in observation and evaluation.

The Sagaponack Common School District will establish a process to ensure that lead evaluators maintain inter-rater reliability over time and that they are recertified on an annual basis.

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	Checked
--	---------

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

6.7) Assurances -- Data

Please check all of the boxes below:

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

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

Created Tuesday, June 19, 2012

Updated Wednesday, December 05, 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):

1-4
(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
Sagaponack Common School	State assessment	NYS ELA and Math-Grade 3 4

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.	I will as the part time Superintendent, work collaboratively with the outside evaluator to determine individualized growth targets. HEDI points will be assigned based on the percentage of students who meet or exceed the targets. (Ineffective 0-29%, Developing30-55%, Effective 56-84%, Highly Effective 85-100%).
Highly Effective (18 - 20 points) Results are well above state average for similar students (or District goals if no state test).	see 2.11 upload
Effective (9 - 17 points) Results meet state average for similar students (or District goals if no state test).	see 2.11 upload
Developing (3 - 8 points) Results are below state average for similar students (or District goals if no state test).	see 2.11 upload
Ineffective (0 - 2 points) Results are well below state average for similar students (or District goals if no state test).	see 2.11 upload

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

<assets/survey-uploads/5365/143977-lha0DogRNw/HEDI Chart.pdf>

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 Tuesday, June 19, 2012

Updated Thursday, December 06, 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
NA		

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.	NA
Highly Effective (14 - 15 points) Results are well above District- or BOCES-adopted expectations for growth or achievement for grade/subject.	NA
Effective (8- 13 points) Results meet District- or BOCES-adopted expectations for growth or achievement for grade/subject.	NA
Developing (3 - 7 points) Results are below District- or BOCES-adopted expectations for growth or achievement for grade/subject.	NA
Ineffective (0 - 2 points) Results are well below District- or BOCES-adopted expectations for growth or achievement for grade/subject.	NA

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

(No response)

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

(No response)

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

Grade Configuration	Locally-Selected Measure from List of Approved Measures	Assessment
1-4	(d) measures used by district for teacher evaluation	AIMSweb

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

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

Use this box, if needed, to describe the process for assigning HEDI categories. If needed, you may upload a table or graphic below.	see Appendix B
Highly Effective (18 - 20 points) Results are well above District- or BOCES-adopted expectations for growth or achievement for grade/subject.	see Appendix B
Effective (9- 17 points) Results meet District- or BOCES-adopted expectations for growth or achievement for grade/subject.	see Appendix B
Developing (3 - 8 points) Results are below District- or BOCES-adopted expectations for growth or achievement for grade/subject.	see Appendix B
Ineffective (0 - 2 points) Results are well below District- or BOCES-adopted expectations for growth or achievement for grade/subject.	see Appendix B

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. \(MS Word\)](#)

[assets/survey-uploads/5366/143985-pi29aiX4bL/Attachment #3-Principal.pdf](#)

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/5366/143985-T8MIGWUVm1/Appendix B chart.pdf](#)

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 adjustments or controls are being used.

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.

(No response)

8.5) Assurances

Please check all of the boxes below:

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

9. Other Measures of Effectiveness (Principals)

Created Tuesday, June 19, 2012

Updated Tuesday, December 04, 2012

Page 1

9.1) Principal Practice Rubric

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

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

Multidimensional Principal Performance Rubric

(No response)

9.2) Points Within Other Measures

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

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

Is the following points assignment for all principals?

Yes

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

(No response)

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

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

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

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

(No response)

9.3) Assurances -- Goals

Please check the boxes below (if applicable):

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

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

9.6) Assurances

Please check all of the boxes below:

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

9.7) Process for Assigning Points and Determining HEDI Ratings

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

*The MPPR Review would be utilized for the 60 points (See Appendix E).
Please note that normal rounding rules apply and the overall composite score will be converted to a whole number.*

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

<assets/survey-uploads/5143/143988-pMADJ4gk6R/Appendix E.pdf>

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

Highly Effective: Overall performance and results exceed standards.	See Appendix E
Effective: Overall performance and results meet standards.	See Appendix E
Developing: Overall performance and results need improvement in order to meet standards.	See Appendix E
Ineffective: Overall performance and results do not meet standards.	See Appendix E

Please provide the locally-negotiated 60 point scoring bands.

Highly Effective	55-60
Effective	46-54.9
Developing	38-45.9
Ineffective	0-37.9

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	1
By trained administrator	1
By trained independent evaluator	1
Enter Total	3

Tenured Principals

By supervisor	1
By trained administrator	1
By trained independent evaluator	1
Enter Total	3

10. Composite Scoring (Principals)

Created Friday, June 29, 2012

Updated Thursday, December 06, 2012

Page 1

Standards for Rating Categories

Growth or Comparable Measures

Locally-selected Measures of growth or achievement

Other Measures of Effectiveness

(Teacher and Leader standards)

Highly

Effective

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

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

Overall performance and results exceed ISLLC leadership standards.

Effective

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

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

Overall performance and results meet ISLLC leadership standards.

Developing

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

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

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

Ineffective

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

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

Overall performance and results do not meet ISLLC leadership standards.

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

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

2012-13 where there is no Value-Added measure

Growth or Comparable Measures

Locally-selected Measures of

growth or achievement

Other Measures of Effectiveness

(60 points)

Overall

Composite Score

Highly Effective

18-20

18-20

Ranges determined locally--see below

91-100

Effective

9-17

9-17

75-90

Developing

3-8

3-8

65-74

Ineffective

0-2

0-2

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

Highly Effective	55-60
Effective	46-54.9
Developing	38-45.9
Ineffective	0-37.9

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

2012-13 where Value-Added growth measure applies

Growth or Comparable Measures

Locally-selected Measures of growth or achievement

Other Measures of Effectiveness

(60 points)

Overall

Composite Score

Highly Effective

22-25

14-15

Ranges determined locally--see above

91-100

Effective

10-21

8-13

75-90

Developing

3-9

3-7

65-74

Ineffective

0-2

0-2

0-64

11. Additional Requirements - Principals

Created Friday, June 29, 2012

Updated Tuesday, December 04, 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/5276/147288-Df0w3Xx5v6/PRINCIPAL_IMPROVEMENT_PLAN.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:

Appeals of Annual Performance Evaluations:

a. Appeal Protocols

Only ineffective and developing ratings are eligible for appeal.

To the extent that a teacher or principal wishes to challenge an ineffective or developing performance review and/or the improvement plan, the Sagaponack Common School District will entertain appeals in accordance with appeal procedures developed through

negotiations. Under Education Law 3012-c a teacher/principal may only challenge:

- *The substance of the annual professional performance review.*
- *The school districts or board of cooperative educational services adherence to the standards and methodologies required for such reviews, pursuant to Education Law 3012-c.*
- *The adherence to the Commissioner's Regulations, as applicable to such reviews.*
- *Compliance with any applicable locally negotiated procedures applicable to annual professional performance reviews or improvement plans.*
- *The school district issuance and/or implementation of the terms of the teacher or principal improvement plan under Education Law 3012-c.*

b. Prohibition against more than one appeal

A teacher or principal may not file multiple appeals regarding the same performance review and/or teacher/principal improvement plan. All grounds for appeal must be raised with specificity within one appeal. Any grounds not raised at the time the appeal is filed shall be deemed waived.

c. Timeframe for Filing a Teacher Appeal

All appeals must be submitted in writing to the Superintendent of Schools, no later than 10 work days of the date when the teacher receives his or her annual professional performance review. If a teacher is challenging the issuance of a teacher improvement plan, appeals must be filed within 10 work days of issuance of such plan. The failure to file an appeal within these timeframes shall be deemed a waiver of the right to appeal.

When filing an appeal, the teacher must submit a detailed written description of the specific areas of disagreement over his or her performance review, or the issuance/ implementation of the terms of his or her improvement plan. The performance review/improvement plan being challenged must also be submitted with the appeal. Any additional documents or materials relevant to the appeal must be submitted within the appeals timeframe. Any information not submitted at the time the appeal is filed shall not be considered.

d. Timeframe for District Response to Teacher Appeal

Within 10 work days of receipt of an appeal, the Superintendent of Schools must submit a detailed written response to the individual who is making the appeal. This response must include any and all documents or written materials specific to the points of disagreement that support the evaluator's position and are relevant to the resolution of the appeal. Any such information that is not submitted at the time the response is filed shall not be considered in the deliberations related to the resolution of the appeal.

e. Decision-Maker on Teacher Appeal

Upon receipt of an appeal, the superintendent of schools will refer the appeal to the Board of Trustees.

f. Decision on Teacher Appeal

A written decision on the merits of the appeal, generated by the Board of Trustees, shall be rendered no later than 30 work days from the date upon which the teacher filed his or her appeal. Such decision shall be final.

g. Principal Appeal

An appeal of the principal's evaluation shall be submitted directly to the independent evaluator within 10 work days of receiving such evaluation. The appeal to the independent evaluator shall set forth in detail the basis for such appeal. The appeal must align with the requirements of Education Law 3012-c. Within 10 work days of receipt of an appeal, the independent evaluator must submit a detailed written response to the individual who is making the appeal. This response must include any and all documents or written materials specific to the points of disagreement that support the independent evaluator's position and are relevant to the resolution of the appeal. Any such information that is not submitted at the time the response is filed shall not be considered in the deliberations related to the resolution of the appeal. Upon receipt of an appeal, the independent evaluator will refer the appeal to the Board of Trustees. A binding written decision on the merits of the appeal shall be rendered by the Board of Trustees no later than 30 work days from the date upon which the principal filed his/her appeal. Such decision shall be final.

h. Final Determination

The final determination in both the teacher and principal appeal shall set forth the reasons and factual basis for such determination on each of the specific issues raised in the appeal. If the appeal is sustained, the rating will be modified. A copy of the final decision shall be provided to the teacher/principal and the appropriate evaluator.

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.

Evaluating Training:

The Sagaponack Common School District will ensure that all lead evaluators are properly trained and certified, as necessary to complete an individual's performance review. Lead evaluator training will be conducted in accordance with the certification requirements per the Commissioner's regulations. This training will include the following:

- *New York State Teaching Standards and ISLLC Standards.*
- *Evidence-based observation.*
- *Application and use of the Student Growth Percentile and Value Added Growth Model data.*
- *Application and use of the State-approved teacher rubrics.*
- *Application and use of any assessment tools used to evaluate teachers.*
- *Application and use of State-approved locally selected measures of student achievement.*
- *Use of Statewide Instructional Reporting System.*
- *Scoring methodology used to evaluate teachers and principals.*
- *Specific considerations in evaluating teachers of ELLs and students with disabilities.*

The District is using the Danielson 2011 model for observation and evaluation of all teaching staff. The District subscribed to and participated in training on the use of the Danielson model as well as all aspects of teacher evaluation and student assessment. Vendors who delivered the training include: Peconic Teacher Center through Joan Daly Lewis, Eastern Suffolk BOCES and trained consultants such as Emma Klimek. The district also participated in a number of webinars which focused on the evaluation process and reviewed a significant amount of relevant materials and resources on teacher evaluation.

The District's only administrator throughout his career attended numerous training sessions on evaluation. He has evaluated hundreds of faculty and remains current with the latest trends in observation and evaluation.

The Sagaponack Common School District will establish a process to ensure that lead evaluators maintain inter-rater reliability over time and that they are recertified on an annual basis.

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	Checked
---	---------

the school year for which the building principal's performance is being measured.	
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 Friday, June 29, 2012

Updated Thursday, December 13, 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/5581/147338-3Uqgn5g9Iu/Certification Form.pdf>

File types supported for uploads

PDF (preferred)

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

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

Open Office (.odt, .ott)

Images (.jpg, .gif)

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

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

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

APPENDIX A**Sagaponack Common School District****Terra Nova 3 Conversion Chart**

Total Average Rubric Score	Category	Terra Nova 3 Scores
Ineffective 0-2		
0		Average Score -23 or below
1		Average Score -21 to -22
2		Average Score -19 to -20
Developing 3-8		
3		Average Score -16 to -18
4		Average Score -13 to -15
5		Average Score -10 to -12
6		Average Score -7 to -9
7		Average Score -4 to -6
8		Average Score -1 to -3
Effective 9-17		
9		Average Score-Target
10		Average Score + 1 to +2
11		Average Score + 3 to +4
12		Average Score + 5 to +6
13		Average Score + 7 to +8
14		Average Score + 9 to +10
15		Average Score + 11 to +12
16		Average Score + 13 to +14
17		Average Score + 15 to +16
Highly Effective 18-20		
18		Average Score + 17 to +20
19		Average Score + 21 to +25
20		Average Score + 26 & above

See attachment #1 entitled Terra Nova 3 20%-State Scoring

TERRA NOVA 3 20%- NY State Scoring

The score for the State testing component will be determined using the TERRA NOVA 3 growth average for each grade 1-4. The HEDI score will be computed according to the conversion chart in APPENDIX A.

The TERRA NOVA 3 Subtests for ELA, are as follows:

First-Fourth grades:

Reading
Word Analysis
Vocabulary
Language Mechanics
Spelling

The ELA teacher for each grade will be scored on a scale of 0-20. The teacher's performance rating score will be determined by averaging the overall student growth of the entire grade by comparing the fall benchmark to the final benchmark given in the spring.

To determine the teacher's performance rating score, we will utilize the TERRA NOVA 3 Report and graph where available. The rating score will be derived in the following way: The average growth scores from each subtest in each grade will be combined and averaged for each of the fall and the spring benchmark tests. The score from the fall benchmark will be subtracted from the spring benchmark. This number will determine the range score that is expressed in the conversion chart in APPENDIX A. (**Conversion score for composite column**) From this range score, the teacher will receive a conversion number between 0-20. (**Conversion Average Rubric Score**)

All students' scores, (general and special education students) will be included and averaged together to determine the teacher's total average rubric score.

The TERRA NOVA 3 Subtests for Mathematics, are as follows:

First-Fourth grades:

Math

Math Computation

The Math teacher for each grade will be scored on a scale of 0-20. The teacher's performance rating score will be determined by averaging the overall student growth of the entire grade by comparing the fall benchmark to the final benchmark given in the spring.

To determine the teacher's performance rating score, we will utilize the TERRA NOVA 3 Report and graph where available. The rating score will be derived in the following way: The average growth scores from each subtest in each grade will be combined and averaged for each of the fall and the spring benchmark tests. The score from the fall benchmark will be subtracted from the spring benchmark. This number will determine the range score that is expressed in the conversion chart in APPENDIX A. (**Conversion score for composite column**) From this range score, the teacher will receive a conversion number between 0-20. (**Conversion Average Rubric Score**)

All students' scores, (general and special education students) will be included and averaged together to determine the teacher's total average rubric score.

HEDI CHART
State Assessment

Highly Effective			Effective									Developing					Ineffective			
20	19	18	17	16	15	14	13	12	11	10	9	8	7	6	5	4	3	2	1	0
100	99-91%	90-85%	84%	83-82%	81-79%	78-76%	75%	74-70%	69-65%	64-60%	59-56%	55%	54-50%	49-45%	44-40%	39-35%	34-30%	29-15%	14-1%	0

APPENDIX B**Sagaponack Common School District****AIMSweb Conversion Chart-Teacher**

(Approved Value Added-15 pts.)

Total Average Rubric Score	Category	AIMSweb Scores
Ineffective 0-2		
0		Average Score -23 or below
1		Average Score -21 to -22
2		Average Score -19 to -20
Developing 3-7		
3		Average Score -16 to -18
4		Average Score -13 to -15
5		Average Score -8 to -12
6		Average Score -3 to -7
7		Average Score -1 to -2
Effective 8-13		
8		Average Score-Target
9		Average Score +1 to +3
10		Average Score + 4 to +7
11		Average Score + 8 to +11
12		Average Score + 12 to +14
13		Average Score + 15 to +16
Highly Effective 14-15		
14		Average Score + 17 to +22
15		Average Score + 23 and above

Attachment #2

AIMSweb 15% - Local Scoring

The score for the local testing component will be determined using the AIMSweb growth average for each grade 1-4. The HEDI score will be computed according to the conversion chart in APPENDIX B above.

The AIMSweb testing components for ELA, are as follows:

First grade:

TEL: Tests of Early Literacy

LNF: Letter Naming Fluency

LSF: Letter Sound Fluency

PSF: Phoneme Sound Fluency

NWF: Nonsense Word Fluency

R-CBM: Reading-Curriculum Based Measure: Fluency and Maze

S-CBM: Spelling-Curriculum Based Measure

WE-CBM: Writing Expression-Curriculum Based Measure

TWW: Total Words Written

WSC: Words Spelled Correctly

CWS: Correct Words in Sequence

Second -Fourth grades

R-CBM: Reading-Curriculum Based Measure: Fluency and Maze

S-CBM: Spelling-Curriculum Based Measure

WE-CBM: Writing Expression-Curriculum Based Measure

TWW: Total Words Written

WSC: Words Spelled Correctly

CWS: Correct Words in Sequence

The ELA teacher for each grade will be scored on a scale of 0-15. The teacher's performance rating score will be determined by averaging the overall student growth of the entire grade by comparing the fall benchmark to the final benchmark given in the spring.

To determine the teacher's performance rating score, we will utilize the AIMSweb Average Score by Service Code report and graph. The rating score will be derived in the following way: The average growth scores from each subtest in each grade

will be combined and averaged for each of the fall and the spring benchmark tests. The score from the fall benchmark will be subtracted from the spring benchmark. This number will determine the range score that is expressed on the conversion chart in APPENDIX B. (*Conversion score for composite column*) From this range score, the teacher will receive a conversion number between 0-15. **(Conversion Average Rubric Score)**

The AIMSweb testing components for Math, depending on the students' grade levels, will be comprised of either one or two sub-tests. These tests are: M-COMP and M-CAP. The 1st grade consists of only the M-COMP, while grades 2 through 4 consists of both the M-COMP and M-CAP.

The math teacher from each grade will be scored on a scale of 0-15. The teacher's performance score will be determined by averaging the overall student growth of the entire grade by comparing the fall benchmark to the final benchmark given in the spring.

Working from the AIMSweb Average Score by Service Code report and graph, since there is only one sub- test in first grade, the first grade math teacher's M-COMP score will be derived from the following: The score from the spring benchmark will be subtracted from the fall benchmark. This number will determine the range score that is expressed on the conversion chart above. (*Conversion score for composite column*) From this range score, the teacher will receive a number between 0-15. **(Conversion Average Rubric Score)**

Further, working from the AIMSweb Average Score by Service Code report and graph, the second through fourth grade math teacher's M-COMP and M-CAP scores will be combined and averaged. The M-COMP score from the spring benchmark will be subtracted from the fall benchmark. The same is done for the M-CAP score. These two numbers will be averaged together to determine the range score that is expressed on the conversion chart above. ***{Conversion score for composite column}*** From this range score the teacher will receive a number between 0-15. **(Conversion Average Rubric Score)**

All students' scores, (general and special education students) will be included and averaged together to determine teacher's total average rubric score.

APPENDIX B**Sagaponack Common School District****AIMSweb Conversion Chart**

Total Average Rubric Score	Category	AIMSweb Scores
Ineffective 0-2		
0		Average Score -23 or below
1		Average Score -21 to -22
2		Average Score -19 to -20
Developing 3-8		
3		Average Score -16 to -18
4		Average Score -13 to -15
5		Average Score -10 to -12
6		Average Score -7 to -9
7		Average Score -4 to -6
8		Average Score -1 to -3
Effective 9-17		
9		Average Score-Target
10		Average Score + 1 to +2
11		Average Score + 3 to +4
12		Average Score + 5 to +6
13		Average Score + 7 to +8
14		Average Score + 9 to +10
15		Average Score + 11 to +12
16		Average Score + 13 to +14
17		Average Score + 15 to +16
Highly Effective 18-20		
18		Average Score + 17 to +20
19		Average Score + 21 to +25
20		Average Score + 26 & above

See attachment #2 entitled AIMSweb 20%-Local Scoring

Attachment #2

AIMSweb 20% - Local Scoring

The score for the local testing component will be determined using the AIMSweb growth average for each grade 1-4. The HEDI score will be computed according to the conversion chart in APPENDIX B above.

The AIMSweb testing components for ELA, are as follows:

First grade:

TEL: Tests of Early Literacy

LNF: Letter Naming Fluency

LSF: Letter Sound Fluency

PSF: Phoneme Sound Fluency

NWF: Nonsense Word Fluency

R-CBM: Reading-Curriculum Based Measure: Fluency and Maze

S-CBM: Spelling-Curriculum Based Measure

WE-CBM: Writing Expression-Curriculum Based Measure

TWW: Total Words Written

WSC: Words Spelled Correctly

CWS: Correct Words in Sequence

Second -Fourth grades

R-CBM: Reading-Curriculum Based Measure: Fluency and Maze

S-CBM: Spelling-Curriculum Based Measure

WE-CBM: Writing Expression-Curriculum Based Measure

TWW: Total Words Written

WSC: Words Spelled Correctly

CWS: Correct Words in Sequence

The ELA teacher for each grade will be scored on a scale of 0-20. The teacher's performance rating score will be determined by averaging the overall student growth of the entire grade by comparing the fall benchmark to the final benchmark given in the spring.

To determine the teacher's performance rating score, we will utilize the AIMSweb Average Score by Service Code report and graph. The rating score will be derived in the following way: The average growth scores from each subtest in each grade will be combined and averaged for each of the fall and the spring benchmark tests. The score from the fall benchmark will be subtracted from the spring

benchmark. This number will determine the range score that is expressed on the conversion chart in APPENDIX B. (*Conversion score for composite column*) From this range score, the teacher will receive a conversion number between 0-20.

(Conversion Average Rubric Score)

The AIMSweb testing components for Math, depending on the students' grade levels, will be comprised of either one or two sub-tests. These tests are: M-COMP and M-CAP. The 1st grade consists of only the M-COMP, while grades 2 through 4 consists of both the M-COMP and M-CAP.

The math teacher from each grade will be scored on a scale of 0-20. The teacher's performance score will be determined by averaging the overall student growth of the entire grade by comparing the fall benchmark to the final benchmark given in the spring.

Working from the AIMSweb Average Score by Service Code report and graph, since there is only one sub- test in first grade, the first grade math teacher's M-COMP score will be derived from the following: The score from the spring benchmark will be subtracted from the fall benchmark. This number will determine the range score that is expressed on the conversion chart above. (*Conversion score for composite column*) From this range score, the teacher will receive a number between 0-20. **(Conversion Average Rubric Score)**

Further, working from the AIMSweb Average Score by Service Code report and graph, the second through fourth grade math teacher's M-COMP and M-CAP scores will be combined and averaged. The M-COMP score from the spring benchmark will be subtracted from the fall benchmark. The same is done for the M-CAP score. These two numbers will be averaged together to determine the range score that is expressed on the conversion chart above. **{Conversion score for composite column}** From this range score the teacher will receive a number between 0-20. **(Conversion Average Rubric Score)**

All students' scores, (general and special education students) will be included and averaged together to determine teacher's total average rubric score.

APPENDIX C

**SAGAPONACK COMMON SCHOOL DISTRICT ANNUAL
PROFESSIONAL PERFORMANCE REVIEW EVALUATION**

TEACHER:	
SCHOOL YEAR:	
ASSIGNMENT	Common Branch <input type="checkbox"/> Subjects):
	Tenured: Probationary: Part-Time: Substitute:
EVALUATOR:	

Part A: Professional Competencies-Danielson 2011-Rubric

Chart: 1					
PROFESSIONAL COMPETENCIES					
DANIELSON 2011 Version					
(Part A: 40 Points: Observation &					
Part B: 20 Points: Structured reviews of lesson plans, student portfolios, teacher artifacts and professional growth activities)					
Section 1: FRAMEWORK FOR TEACHING	HE	E	D	I	Rating
<i>Domain I: Planning and Preparation</i>					
Demonstrating Knowledge of Content and Pedagogy (1a)	1.7	1.4-1.6	1.0-1.3	0-9	
Demonstrating Knowledge of Students (1b)	1.7	1.4-1.6	1.0-1.3	0-9	
Setting Instructional Outcomes (1c)	1.7	1.4-1.6	1.0-1.3	0-9	
Demonstrating Knowledge of Resources (1d)	1.6	1.3-1.5	1.0-1.2	0-9	
Demonstrating Effective/Coherent Instruction (1e)	1.7	1.4-1.6	1.0-1.3	0-9	
Designing Student Assessments (1f)	1.6	1.3-1.5	1.0-1.2	0-9	
<i>Domain II: Classroom Environment</i>					
Creating an Environment of Respect and Rapport (2a)	1.2	1.0-1.1	.6-.9	0-.5	
Establishing a Culture for Learning (2b)	1.2	1.0-1.1	.6-.9	0-.5	
Managing Classroom Procedures (2c)	1.2	1.0-1.1	.6-.9	0-.5	
Managing Student Behavior (2d)	1.2	1.0-1.1	.6-.9	0-.5	
Organizing Physical Space (2e)	1.2	1.0-1.1	.6-.9	0-.5	
<i>Domain III: Instruction</i>					
Communicating with Students (3a)	3.2	2.7-3.1	1.8-2.6	0-1.7	
Questioning and Discussion Techniques (3b)	3.2	2.7-3.1	1.8-2.6	0-1.7	
Engaging Students in Learning (3c)	3.2	2.7-3.1	1.8-2.6	0-1.7	
Using Assessment in Instruction (3d)	3.2	2.7-3.1	1.8-2.6	0-1.7	
Demonstrating Flexibility and Responsiveness (3e)	3.2	2.7-3.1	1.8-2.6	0-1.7	
<i>Domain IV: Professional Responsibilities</i>					
Reflecting on Teaching (4a)	1.4	1.2-1.3	.8-1.1	0-.7	
Maintaining Accurate records (4b)	1.3	1.1-1.2	.7-1.0	0-.6	
Communicating with Families (4c)	1.3	1.1-1.2	.7-1.0	0-.6	
Participating in a Professional Community (4d)	1.3	1.1-1.2	.7-1.0	0-.6	
Growing and developing Professionally (4e)	1.4	1.2-1.3	.8-1.1	0-.7	
Showing Professionalism (4f)	1.3	1.1-1.2	.7-1.0	0-.6	
Total Observation Points: Possible Total: 40					

APPENDIX D

**SAGAPONACK COMMON SCHOOL DISTRICT ANNUAL
PROFESSIONAL PERFORMANCE REVIEW EVALUATION**

TEACHER:	
SCHOOL YEAR:	
ASSIGNMENT	Common Branch <input type="checkbox"/> Subjects): Grade(s):
	Tenured: Probationary: Part-Time: Substitute:
EVALUATOR:	

Total Composite Score-Other Measures

Part B: Artifacts Structured review of lesson plans, student portfolios, teacher artifacts and participating in professional growth activities.	HE	E	D	I	Rating
Structured Lesson Plans- Examples of materials used in teaching lessons, alignment with the common core standards, implementation of best practice and student engagement activities.	4.6-5	3.1-4.5	1.6-3.0	0-1.5	
Student Portfolios-Evidence of student learning, demonstration of growth over time, student projects and assignments.	4.6-5	3.1-4.5	1.6-3.0	0-1.5	
Teacher Artifacts-Samples of student work, reflection logs and communication logs.	4.6-5	3.1-4.5	1.6-3.0	0-1.5	
Professional Growth Activities-Participation in in-service and/or professional conferences.	4.6-5	3.1-4.5	1.6-3.0	0-1.5	
Total Possible Points:	20				
Points for section B:					
Total points for section A and B:					

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

Evaluation of Teacher Artifacts will be based on Danielson Rubric.

HIGHLY EFFECTIVE			EFFECTIVE									DEVELOPING					INEFFECTIVE			
20	19	18	17	16	15	14	<u>13</u>	12	11	10	9	8	7	6	5	4	3	2	1	0
100	99-91%	90-85%	84%	83-82%	81-79%	78-76%	75%	74-70%	69-65%	64-60%	59-56%	55%	54-50%	49-45%	44-40%	39-35%	34-30%	29-15%	14-1%	0

Attachment #3

AIMSweb 20% - Local Scoring

The score for the local testing component will be determined using the AIMSweb growth average for each grade 1-4. The HEDI score will be computed according to the conversion chart in APPENDIX B above.

The AIMSweb testing components for ELA, are as follows:

First grade:

TEL: Tests of Early Literacy

LNF: Letter Naming Fluency

LSF: Letter Sound Fluency

PSF: Phoneme Sound Fluency

NWF: Nonsense Word Fluency

R-CBM: Reading-Curriculum Based Measure: Fluency and Maze

S-CBM: Spelling-Curriculum Based Measure

WE-CBM: Writing Expression-Curriculum Based Measure

TWW: Total Words Written

WSC: Words Spelled Correctly

CWS: Correct Words in Sequence

Second -Fourth grades

R-CBM: Reading-Curriculum Based Measure: Fluency and Maze

S-CBM: Spelling-Curriculum Based Measure

WE-CBM: Writing Expression-Curriculum Based Measure

TWW: Total Words Written

WSC: Words Spelled Correctly

CWS: Correct Words in Sequence

The principal for each grade will be scored on a scale of 0-20. The principal's performance rating score will be determined by averaging the overall student growth of the entire grade by comparing the fall benchmark to the final benchmark given in the spring.

To determine the principal's performance rating score, we will utilize the AIMSweb Average Score by Service Code report and graph. The rating score will be derived in the following way: The average growth scores from each subtest in each grade will be combined and averaged for each of the fall and the spring benchmark tests. The score from the fall benchmark will be subtracted from the

spring benchmark. This number will determine the range score that is expressed on the conversion chart in APPENDIX B. (*Conversion score for composite column*) From this range score, the principal will receive a conversion number between 0-20. **(Conversion Average Rubric Score)**

The AIMSweb testing components for Math, depending on the students' grade levels, will be comprised of either one or two sub-tests. These tests are: M-COMP and M-CAP. The 1st grade consists of only the M-COMP, while grades 2 through 4 consists of both the M-COMP and M-CAP.

The principal from each grade will be scored on a scale of 0-20. The principal's performance score will be determined by averaging the overall student growth of the entire grade by comparing the fall benchmark to the final benchmark given in the spring.

Working from the AIMSweb Average Score by Service Code report and graph, since there is only one sub- test in first grade, the M-COMP score will be derived from the following: The score from the spring benchmark will be subtracted from the fall benchmark. This number will determine the range score that is expressed on the conversion chart above. (*Conversion score for composite column*) From this range score, the principal will receive a number between 0-20. **(Conversion Average Rubric Score)**

Further, working from the AIMSweb Average Score by Service Code report and graph, the second through fourth grade M-COMP and M-CAP scores will be combined and averaged. The M-COMP score from the spring benchmark will be subtracted from the fall benchmark. The same is done for the M-CAP score. These two numbers will be averaged together to determine the range score that is expressed on the conversion chart above. (*Conversion score for composite column*) From this range score the principal will receive a number between 0-20. **(Conversion Average Rubric Score)**

All students' scores, (general and special education students) will be included and averaged together to determine teacher's total average rubric score.

APPENDIX B**Sagaponack Common School District****AIMSweb Conversion Chart**

Total Average Rubric Score	Category	AIMSweb Scores
Ineffective 0-2		
0		Average Score -23 or below
1		Average Score -21 to -22
2		Average Score -19 to -20
Developing 3-8		
3		Average Score -16 to -18
4		Average Score -13 to -15
5		Average Score -10 to -12
6		Average Score -7 to -9
7		Average Score -4 to -6
8		Average Score -1 to -3
Effective 9-17		
9		Average Score-Target
10		Average Score + 1 to +2
11		Average Score + 3 to +4
12		Average Score + 5 to +6
13		Average Score + 7 to +8
14		Average Score + 9 to +10
15		Average Score + 11 to +12
16		Average Score + 13 to +14
17		Average Score + 15 to +16
Highly Effective 18-20		
18		Average Score + 17 to +20
19		Average Score + 21 to +25
20		Average Score + 26 & above

See attachment #2 entitled AIMSweb 20%-Local Scoring

Appendix E

SAGAPONACK COMMON SCHOOL DISTRICT

Principal: _____ School: _____ Date: _____

MPPR-Multidimensional Professional Performance Review (60 Points)

<u>DOMAIN 1 - SHARED VISION OF LEARNING</u>				
An education leader promotes the success of every student by facilitating the development, articulation, implementation, and stewardship of a vision of learning that is shared and supported by all stakeholders.				
Total out of Six Points:	HE	E	D	I
A. Collaboratively develop and implement a shared vision and mission.				
B. Collect and use data to identify goals, assess organizational effectiveness, and promote organizational learning.				
C. Create and implement plans to achieve goals.				
D. Promote continuous and sustainable improvement.				
E. Monitor and evaluate progress and revise plans.				
<u>Evidence:</u>				
<u>DOMAIN 2 -SCHOOL CULTURE AND INSTRUCTIONAL PROGRAM</u>				
An education leader promotes the success of every student by advocating, nurturing, and sustaining a school culture and instructional program conducive to student learning and staff professional growth.				
Total out of Fifteen Points:	HE	E	D	I
A. Nurture and sustain a culture of collaboration, trust, learning, and high expectations.				
B. Create a comprehensive, rigorous, and coherent curricular program.				
C. Create a personalized and motivating learning environment for students.				
D. Supervise instruction.				
E. Develop assessment and accountability systems to monitor student progress.				
F. Develop the instructional and leadership capacity of staff.				
G. Maximize time spent on quality instruction.				
H. Promote the use of the high effective and appropriate technologies to support teaching and learning.				
I. Monitor and evaluate the impact of the. Monitor and instructional Program.				
<u>Evidence:</u>				

DOMAIN 3 - SAFE, EFFICIENT, EFFECTIVE LEARNING ENVIRONMENT

An education leader promotes the success of every student by ensuring management of the organization, operation, and resources for a safe, efficient, and effective learning environment.

Total out of Twelve Points:	HE	E	D	I
A. Monitor and evaluate the management and operational systems.				
B. Obtain, allocate, align, and efficiently utilize human, fiscal, and technological resources.				
C. Promote and protect the welfare and safety of students and staff.				
D. Develop the capacity for distributed leadership.				
E. Ensure teacher and organizational time is focused to support quality instructional student learning.				

Evidence:

DOMAIN 4 - COMMUNITY

An education leader promotes the success of every student by collaborating with faculty and community members, responding to diverse community interests and needs, and mobilizing community resources.

Total out of Nine Points:	HE	E	D	I
A. Collect and analyze data and information pertinent to the educational environment.				
B. Promote understanding, appreciation, and use of the community's diverse cultural, social, and intellectual resources.				
C. Build and sustain positive relationships with families and caregivers.				
D. Build and sustain productive relationships with community partners.				

Evidence:

DOMAIN 5 - INTEGRITY, FAIRNESS, ETHICS

An education leader promotes the success of every student by acting with integrity, fairness, and in an ethical manner.

Total out of Six Points:	HE	E	D	I
A. Ensure a system of accountability for every student's academic and social				
B. Model principles of self-awareness, reflective practice, transparency, and				
C. Safeguard the values of democracy, equity, and diversity.				
D. Consider and evaluate the potential moral and legal consequences of				
E. Promote social justice and ensure that individual student needs inform all aspects of schooling.				

Evidence:

DOMAIN 6 - POLITICAL, SOCIAL, ECONOMIC, LEGAL AND CULTURAL CONTEXT

An education leader promotes the success of every student by understanding and responding to, and influencing the political, social, economic, legal, and cultural context.

Total out of Three Points:	HE	E	D	I
A. Advocate for children, families, and caregivers.				
B. Act to influence local, district, state, and national decisions affecting student learning.				
C. Assess, analyze, and anticipate emerging trends and initiatives in order to adapt leadership strategies.				

Evidence:

DOMAIN 7 - GOAL SETTING AND ATTAINMENT

Total out of Nine Points:	HE	E	D	I
A. Uncovering Goals-Align, Define.				
B. Strategic Planning-Prioritize, Strategize.				
C. Taking Action-Mobilize, Monitor, Refine.				
D. Evaluating Attainment-Document Insights, Accomplishments, New Questions, Implications for Moving Forward, Next Steps.				

Evidence:

MPPR - Point Distribution for Each Domain

Domain 1 Shared Vision of Learning 6pts	HE	E	D	1
A	1.2	1.0	.75	0
B	1.2	1.0	.75	0
C	1.2	1.0	.75	0
D	1.2	1.0	.75	0
E	1.2	1.0	.75	0
Domain 2 School Culture and Instructional Program 15pts				
A	1.7	1.35	.75	0
B	1.6	1.35	.75	0
C	1.7	1.35	.75	0
D	1.7	1.35	.75	0
E	1.6	1.35	.75	0
F	1.7	1.35	.75	0
G	1.6	1.35	.75	0
H	1.7	1.35	.75	0
I	1.7	1.35	.75	0
Domain 3 Safe, Efficient, Effective Learning Environment 12pts				
A	2.4	2.0	1.5	0
B	2.4	2.0	1.5	0
C	2.4	2.0	1.5	0
D	2.4	2.0	1.5	0
E	2.4	2.0	1.5	0
Domain 4 Community 9pts				
A	2.25	2.0	1.5	0
B	2.25	2.0	1.5	0
C	2.25	2.0	1.5	0
D	2.25	2.0	1.5	0
Domain 5 Integrity, Fairness, Ethics, 6pts				
A	1.2	1.0	.75	0
B	1.2	1.0	.75	0
C	1.2	1.0	.75	0
D	1.2	1.0	.75	0
E	1.2	1.0	.75	0

Domain 6 Political, Social, Economic, Legal and Cultural Context 3pts				
A	1.0	.75	.50	0
B	1.0	.75	.50	0
C	1.0	.75	.50	0
Domain 7 Goals Setting and Attainment 9pts				
A	2.25	2.0	1.5	0
B	2.25	2.0	1.5	0
C	2.25	2.0	1.5	0
D	2.25	2.0	1.5	0

	MPPR	Overall
Highly Effective	55-60	91-100
Effective	46-54.9	75-90
Developing	38-45.9	65-74
Ineffective	0-37.9	0-64

Sagaponack Common School District

TEACHER IMPROVEMENT PLAN

(to be completed jointly by the Superintendent and coach)

Teacher _____ School _____ Date _____

Administrator _____ Facilitator _____

Domain/Standard in need of Improvement	Timeline for Achieving Improvement	Manner in which improvement is to be assessed	Differentiated activities to support improvement (if appropriate)	Evidence of Improvement (teacher responsibilities)	Support and assistance to be received	Determination of whether adequate improvement has been made (Y,N)

Teacher's Signature _____ Date _____

Superintendent's Signature _____ Date _____

Coach's Signature _____ Date _____

Sagaponack Common School District

PRINCIPAL IMPROVEMENT PLAN

(to be completed jointly by the supervising administrator, principal & facilitator)

Principal _____ School _____ Date _____

Administrator _____ Facilitator _____

Domain/Standard in need of Improvement	Timeline for Achieving Improvement	Manner in which improvement is to be assessed	Differentiated activities to support improvement (if appropriate)	Evidence of Improvement (teacher responsibilities)	Support and assistance to be received	Determination of whether adequate improvement has been made (Y,N)

Principal's Signature _____ Date _____

Supervising Administrator's Signature _____ Date _____

Facilitator's Signature _____ Date _____

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

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

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

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

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

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

Signatures, dates

Superintendent Signature: Date:

[Handwritten Signature] 12/7/12

Teachers Union President Signature: Date:

No teachers union

Administrative Union President Signature: Date:

No Administrative Union

Board of Education President Signature: Date:

Joseph P. Touchette 12/7/12