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 6, 2012

Judith Pastel, Interim Superintendent
Skaneateles Central School District
45 East Elizabeth Street
Skaneateles, NY 13152

Dear Superintendent Pastel:

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: William Speck

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 Friday, September 28, 2012
Updated Monday, November 26, 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 : 421601060000

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

421601060000

1.2) School District Name: SKANEATELES CSD

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

SKANEATELES CSD

1.3) School Improvement Grant (SIG) Districts Only

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

Not applicable

1.4) Award Classification

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

(No response)

1.5) Assurances

Please check all of the boxes below:

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

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

Re-submission to address deficiencies

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

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

Annual (2012-13)

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

Created Monday, October 01, 2012
Updated Monday, December 03, 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	District, regional, or BOCES-developed assessment	Skaneateles Locally Developed K ELA Assessment
1	District, regional, or BOCES-developed assessment	Skaneateles Locally Developed Grade 1 ELA Assessment
2	District, regional, or BOCES-developed assessment	Skaneateles Locally Developed Grade 2 ELA Assessment

	ELA	Assessment
3	State assessment	3rd Grade State Assessment

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

Use this box, if needed, to describe the general process for assigning HEDI categories for these grades/subjects in this subcomponent. If needed, you may upload a table or graphic at 2.11, below.	See 2.11 upload
Highly Effective (18 - 20 points) Results are well-above state average for similar students (or District goals if no state test).	86-100% of students meet the target.
Effective (9 - 17 points) Results meet state average for similar students (or District goals if no state test).	76-85% of students meet the target.
Developing (3 - 8 points) Results are below state average for similar students (or District goals if no state test).	66-75% of students meet the target.
Ineffective (0 - 2 points) Results are well-below state average for similar students (or District goals if no state test).	0-65% of students meet the target.

2.3) Grades K-3 Math

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

	Math	Assessment
K	State-approved 3rd party assessment	AIMsweb Math K
1	State-approved 3rd party assessment	AIMsweb Math 1
2	State-approved 3rd party assessment	AIMswEb Math 2

	Math	Assessment
3	State assessment	3rd Grade State Assessment

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

Use this box, if needed, to describe the general process for assigning HEDI categories for these grades/subjects in this subcomponent. If needed, you may upload a table or graphic at 2.11, below.	See 2.11 upload
Highly Effective (18 - 20 points) Results are well-above state average for similar students (or District goals if no state test).	86-100% of students meet the target.
Effective (9 - 17 points) Results meet state average for similar students (or District goals if no state test).	76-85% of students meet the target.
Developing (3 - 8 points) Results are below state average for similar students (or District goals if no state test).	66-75% of students meet the target.
Ineffective (0 - 2 points) Results are well-below state average for similar students (or District goals if no state test).	0-65% of students meet the target.

2.4) Grades 6-8 Science

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

Science	Assessment

6	District, regional or BOCES-developed assessment	Skaneateles Locally develop Grade 6 Science Assessment
7	District, regional or BOCES-developed assessment	Skaneateles Locally Developed Grade 7 Science Assessment

	Science	Assessment
8	State assessment	8th Grade State Science Assessment

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

Use this box, if needed, to describe the general process for assigning HEDI categories for these grades/subjects in this subcomponent. If needed, you may upload a table or graphic at 2.11, below.	See 2.11 upload
Highly Effective (18 - 20 points) Results are well-above state average for similar students (or District goals if no state test).	86-100% of students meet the target.
Effective (9 - 17 points) Results meet state average for similar students (or District goals if no state test).	76-85% of students meet the target.
Developing (3 - 8 points) Results are below state average for similar students (or District goals if no state test).	66-75% of students meet the target.
Ineffective (0 - 2 points) Results are well-below state average for similar students (or District goals if no state test).	0-65% of students meet the target.

2.5) Grades 6-8 Social Studies

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

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

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

Use this box, if needed, to describe the general process for assigning HEDI categories for these grades/subjects in this subcomponent. If needed, you may upload a table or graphic at 2.11, below.	See 2.11 upload
Highly Effective (18 - 20 points) Results are well-above District goals for similar students.	86-100% of students meet the target.

Effective (9 - 17 points) Results meet District goals for similar students.	76-85% of students meet the target.
Developing (3 - 8 points) Results are below District goals for similar students.	66-75% of students meet the target.
Ineffective (0 - 2 points) Results are well-below District goals for similar students.	0-65% of students meet the target.

2.6) High School Social Studies Regents Courses

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

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

		Assessment
Global 1	District, regional, or BOCES-developed assessment	Skaneateles Locally Developed Global 1 Assessment

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

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

Use this box, if needed, to describe the general process for assigning HEDI categories for these grades/subjects in this subcomponent. If needed, you may upload a table or graphic at 2.11, below.	See 2.11 upload
Highly Effective (18 - 20 points) Results are well-above District goals for similar students.	86-100% of students meet the target.
Effective (9 - 17 points) Results meet District goals for similar students.	76-85% of students meet the target.
Developing (3 - 8 points) Results are below District goals for similar students.	66-75% of students meet the target.
Ineffective (0 - 2 points) Results are well-below District goals for similar students.	0-65% of students meet the target.

2.7) High School Science Regents Courses

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

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

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

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

Use this box, if needed, to describe the general process for assigning HEDI categories for these grades/subjects in this subcomponent. If needed, you may upload a table or graphic at 2.11, below.	See 2.11 upload
Highly Effective (18 - 20 points) Results are well-above District goals for similar students.	86-100% of students meet the target.
Effective (9 - 17 points) Results meet District goals for similar students.	76-85% of students meet the target.
Developing (3 - 8 points) Results are below District goals for similar students.	66-75% of students meet the target.
Ineffective (0 - 2 points) Results are well-below District goals for similar students.	0-65% of students meet the target.

2.8) High School Math Regents Courses

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

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

	Math Regents Courses	Assessment
Algebra 1	Regents assessment	Regents assessment
Geometry	Regents assessment	Regents assessment
Algebra 2	Regents assessment	Regents assessment

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

Use this box, if needed, to describe the general process for assigning HEDI categories for these grades/subjects in this subcomponent. If needed, you may upload a table or graphic at 2.11, below.	See 2.11 upload
Highly Effective (18 - 20 points) Results are well-above District goals for similar students.	86-100% of students meet the target.
Effective (9 - 17 points) Results meet District goals for similar students.	76-85% of students meet the target.

Developing (3 - 8 points) Results are below District goals for similar students.	66-75% of students meet the target.
Ineffective (0 - 2 points) Results are well-below District goals for similar students.	0-65% of students meet the target.

2.9) High School English Language Arts

Using the drop-down boxes below, please first select the assessment that will be used for SLOs for the grade/subject listed. Then name the specific assessment, listing the full name of the assessment. Regents assessment must be used where available. Be sure to select the English Regents assessment in at least one grade in Task 2.9 (9, 10, and/or 11).

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

	High School English Courses	Assessment
Grade 9 ELA	District, regional or BOCES-developed assessment	Skaneateles Locally Developed Grade 9 ELA Assessment
Grade 10 ELA	District, regional or BOCES-developed assessment	Skaneateles Locally Developed Grade 10 ELA Assessment
Grade 11 ELA	Regents assessment	English Regents Exam

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

Use this box, if needed, to describe the general process for assigning HEDI categories for these grades/subjects in this subcomponent. If needed, you may upload a table or graphic at 2.11, below.	See 2.11 upload
Highly Effective (18 - 20 points) Results are well-above District goals for similar students.	86-100% of students meet the target.
Effective (9 - 17 points) Results meet District goals for similar students.	76-85% of students meet the target.
Developing (3 - 8 points) Results are below District goals for similar students.	66-75% of students meet the target.
Ineffective (0 - 2 points) Results are well-below District goals for similar students.	0-65% of students meet the target.

2.10) All Other Courses

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

	Course(s) or Subject(s)	Option	Assessment
	All other courses not named above	District, Regional or BOCES-developed	Skaneateles Locally Developed Assessment for each specific course

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

Use this box, if needed, to describe the general process for assigning HEDI categories for these grades/subjects in this subcomponent. If needed, you may upload a table or graphic at 2.11, below.	See 2.11 upload
Highly Effective (18 - 20 points) Results are well-above District goals for similar students.	86-100% of students meet the target.
Effective (9 - 17 points) Results meet District goals for similar students.	76-85% of students meet the target.
Developing (3 - 8 points) Results are below District goals for similar students.	66-75% of students meet the target.
Ineffective (0 - 2 points) Results are well-below District goals for similar students.	0-65% of students meet the target.

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/5364/184892-TXEtxx9bQW/2-11 Student Learning Objectives structure and scoring scale. reviseddoc_1.doc

2.12) Locally Developed Controls

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

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

No locally developed controls

2.13) Teachers with more than one growth measure

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

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

2.14) Assurances

Please check all of the boxes below:

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

3. Local Measures (Teachers)

Created Monday, October 01, 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	6(ii) School wide measure computed locally	Grades 3-5 NYS Assessments in ELA, Math, and Science
5	6(ii) School wide measure computed locally	Grades 3-5 NYS Assessments in ELA, Math, and Science

6	6(ii) School wide measure computed locally	Grades 6-8NYS Assessments in ELA, Math, and Science
7	6(ii) School wide measure computed locally	Grades 6-8 NYS Assessments in ELA, Math, and Science
8	6(ii) School wide measure computed locally	Grades 6-8 NYS Assessments in ELA, Math, and Science

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 3.3 upload
Highly Effective (14 - 15 points) Results are well above District- or BOCES-adopted expectations for growth or achievement for grade/subject.	Percentage of Exams demonstrating proficiency on NYS Assessments in ELA, Math, and Science schoolwide = 77-100%
Effective (8- 13 points) Results meet District- or BOCES-adopted expectations for growth or achievement for grade/subject.	Percentage of Exams demonstrating proficiency on NYS Assessments in ELA, Math, and Science schoolwide= 68-76%
Developing (3 - 7 points) Results are below District- or BOCES-adopted expectations for growth or achievement for grade/subject.	Percentage of Exams demonstrating proficiency on NYS Assessments in ELA, Math, and Science schoolwide= 53-67%
Ineffective (0 - 2 points) Results are well below District- or BOCES-adopted expectations for growth or achievement for grade/subject.	Percentage of Exams demonstrating proficiency on NYS Assessments in ELA, Math, and Science schoolwide=0-52%

3.2) Grades 4-8 Math

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

	Locally-Selected Measure from List of Approved Measures	Assessment
4	6(ii) School wide measure computed locally	grades 3-5 NYS Assessments in ELA, Math, and Science
5	6(ii) School wide measure computed locally	Grades 3-5 NYS Assessments in ELA, Math, and Science
6	6(ii) School wide measure computed locally	Grades 6-8NYS Assessments in ELA, Math, and Science
7	6(ii) School wide measure computed locally	Grades 6-8 NYS Assessments in ELA, Math, and Science
8	6(ii) School wide measure computed locally	Grades 6-8 NYS Assessments in ELA, Math, and Science

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 3.3 upload
Highly Effective (14 - 15 points) Results are well above District- or BOCES-adopted expectations for growth or achievement for grade/subject.	Percentage of Exams demonstrating proficiency on NYS Assessments in ELA, Math, and Science schoolwide= 77-100%
Effective (8- 13 points) Results meet District- or BOCES-adopted expectations for growth or achievement for grade/subject.	Percentage of Exams demonstrating proficiency on NYS Assessments in ELA, Math, and Science schoolwide= 68-76%
Developing (3 - 7 points) Results are below District- or BOCES-adopted expectations for growth or achievement for grade/subject.	Percentage of Exams demonstrating proficiency on NYS Assessments in ELA, Math, and Science schoolwide= 53-67%
Ineffective (0 - 2 points) Results are well below District- or BOCES-adopted expectations for growth or achievement for grade/subject.	Percentage of Exams demonstrating proficiency on NYS Assessments in ELA, Math, and Science schoolwide=0-52%

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/5139/184967-rhJdBgDruP/3-3 Locally Selected Measures of Student Achievement 15 percent revised_1.docx

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

Growth or achievement measure(s) from these options.

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

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

Measures based on:

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

3.4) Grades K-3 ELA

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

	Locally-Selected Measure from List of Approved Measures	Assessment
K	6(ii) School-wide measure computed locally	AIMsweb Math Grade K-2
1	6(ii) School-wide measure computed locally	AIMsweb Math Grade K-2
2	6(ii) School-wide measure computed locally	AIMsweb Math Grade K-2
3	6(ii) School-wide measure computed locally	Grades 3-5 NYS Assessments in ELA, Math, and Science Grade 3-5

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 3.13 upload
Highly Effective (18-20 points) Results are well above District- or BOCES-adopted expectations for growth or achievement for grade/subject.	For K-2 AIMsweb Math: National Norms 45-94 For 3-5 NYS Assessments in ELA, Math, and Science: 84-100% proficiency
Effective (9-17 points) Results meet District- or BOCES-adopted expectations for growth or achievement for grade/subject.	For K-2 AIMsweb Math: National Norms 26-44 For 3-5 NYS Assessments in ELA, Math, and Science: 71-83% proficiency
Developing (3 - 8 points) Results are below District- or BOCES-adopted expectations for growth or achievement for grade/subject.	For K-2 AIMsweb Math: National Norms 10-25 For 3-5 NYS Assessments in ELA, Math, and Science: 53-70% proficiency
Ineffective (0 - 2 points) Results are well below District- or BOCES-adopted expectations for growth or achievement for grade/subject.	For K-2 AIMsweb Math: National Norms 0-9 For 3-5 NYS Assessments in ELA, Math, and Science: 0-52% proficiency

3.5) Grades K-3 Math

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

	Locally-Selected Measure from List of Approved Measures	Assessment
K	6(ii) School-wide measure computed locally	AIMsweb Math Grade K-2
1	6(ii) School-wide measure computed locally	AIMsweb Math Grade K-2
2	6(ii) School-wide measure computed locally	AIMsweb Math Grade K-2
3	6(ii) School-wide measure computed locally	Grades 3-5 NYS Assessments in ELA, Math, and Science Grade 3-5

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 3.13 upload
Highly Effective (18-20 points) Results are well above District- or BOCES-adopted expectations for growth or achievement for grade/subject.	For K-2 AIMsweb Math: National Norms 45-94 For 3-5 NYS Assessments in ELA, Math, and Science: 84-100% proficiency

Effective (9-17 points) Results meet District- or BOCES-adopted expectations for growth or achievement for grade/subject.	For K-2 AIMsweb Math: National Norms 26-44 For 3-5 NYS Assessments in ELA, Math, and Science: 71-83% proficiency
Developing (3 - 8 points) Results are below District -or BOCES-adopted expectations for growth or achievement for grade/subject.	For K-2 AIMsweb Math : National Norms 10-25 For 3-5 NYS Assessments in ELA, Math, and Science: 53-70% proficiency
Ineffective (0 - 2 points) Results are well below District- or BOCES-adopted expectations for growth or achievement for grade/subject.	For K-2 AIMsweb Math: National Norms 0-9 For 3-5 NYS Assessments in ELA, Math, and Science: 0-52% proficiency

3.6) Grades 6-8 Science

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

	Locally-Selected Measure from List of Approved Measures	Assessment
6	6(ii) School wide measure computed locally	Grades 6-8 NYS Assessments in ELA, Math, and Science
7	6(ii) School wide measure computed locally	Grades 6-8 NYS Assessments in ELA, Math, and Science
8	6(ii) School wide measure computed locally	Grades 6-8 New York State Assessments in ELA, Math, and Science

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

Use this box, if needed, to describe the general process for assigning HEDI categories for these grades/subjects in this subcomponent. If needed, you may upload a table or graphic at 3.13, below.	See 3.13 upload
Highly Effective (18 - 20 points) Results are well above District- or BOCES-adopted expectations for growth or achievement for grade/subject.	Percentage of Exams demonstrating proficiency on NYS Assessments in ELA, Math, and Science = 84-100%
Effective (9 - 17 points) Results meet District- or BOCES-adopted expectations for growth or achievement for grade/subject.	Percentage of Exams demonstrating proficiency on NYS Assessments in ELA, Math, and Science = 71-83%
Developing (3 - 8 points) Results are below District- or BOCES-adopted expectations for growth or achievement for grade/subject.	Percentage of Exams demonstrating proficiency on NYS Assessments in ELA, Math, and Science = 53-70%
Ineffective (0 - 2 points) Results are well below District- or BOCES-adopted expectations for growth or achievement for grade/subject.	Percentage of Exams demonstrating proficiency on NYS Assessments in ELA, Math, and Science = 0-52%

3.7) Grades 6-8 Social Studies

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

	Locally-Selected Measure from List of Approved Measures	Assessment
6	6(ii) School wide measure computed locally	Grades 6-8 NYS Assessments in ELA, Math, and Science
7	6(ii) School wide measure computed locally	Grades 6-8 NYS Assessments in ELA, Math, and Science
8	6(ii) School wide measure computed locally	Grades 6-8 NYS Assessments in ELA, Math, and Science

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.	See 3.13 upload
Highly Effective (18 - 20 points) Results are well above District- or BOCES-adopted expectations for growth or achievement for grade/subject.	Percentage of Exams demonstrating proficiency on NYS Assessments in ELA, Math, and Science = 84-100%
Effective (9 - 17 points) Results meet District- or BOCES-adopted expectations for growth or achievement for grade/subject.	Percentage of Exams demonstrating proficiency on NYS Assessments in ELA, Math, and Science = 71-83%
Developing (3 - 8 points) Results are below District- or BOCES-adopted expectations for growth or achievement for grade/subject.	Percentage of Exams demonstrating proficiency on NYS Assessments in ELA, Math, and Science = 53-70%
Ineffective (0 - 2 points) Results are well below District- or BOCES-adopted expectations for growth or achievement for grade/subject.	Percentage of Exams demonstrating proficiency on NYS Assessments in ELA, Math, and Science = 0-52%

3.8) High School Social Studies

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

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

	Locally-Selected Measure from List of Approved Measures	Assessment
Global 1	6(ii) School wide measure computed locally	Regents Exams in Algebra 1, Living Environment, English, US History, and Global History
Global 2	6(ii) School wide measure computed locally	Regents Exams in Algebra 1, Living Environment, English, US History, and Global History
American History	6(ii) School wide measure computed locally	Regents Exams in Algebra 1, Living Environment, English, US History, and Global History

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

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

Use this box, if needed, to describe the general process for assigning HEDI categories for these grades/subjects in this subcomponent. If needed, you may upload a table or graphic at 3.13, below.	See 3.13 upload
Highly Effective (18 - 20 points) Results are well above District- or BOCES-adopted expectations for growth or achievement for grade/subject.	Percentage of Regents Exams achieving Mastery Level on the following subjects: Algebra 1, Living Environment, English, US History, and Global History = 60-100%
Effective (9 - 17 points) Results meet District- or BOCES-adopted expectations for growth or achievement for grade/subject.	Percentage of Regents Exams achieving Mastery Level on the following subjects: Algebra 1, Living Environment, English, US History, and Global History = 22-59%
Developing (3 - 8 points) Results are below District- or BOCES-adopted expectations for growth or achievement for grade/subject.	Percentage of Regents Exams achieving Mastery Level on the following subjects: Algebra 1, Living Environment, English, US History, and Global History = 10-21%
Ineffective (0 - 2 points) Results are well below District- or BOCES-adopted expectations for growth or achievement for grade/subject.	Percentage of Regents Exams achieving Mastery Level on the following subjects: Algebra 1, Living Environment, English, US History, and Global History = 0-9%

3.9) High School Science

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

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

	Locally-Selected Measure from List of Approved Measures	Assessment
Living Environment	6(ii) School wide measure computed locally	Regents Exams in Algebra 1, Living Environment, English, US History, and Global History
Earth Science	6(ii) School wide measure computed locally	Regents Exams in Algebra 1, Living Environment, English, US History, and Global History
Chemistry	6(ii) School wide measure computed locally	Regents Exams in Algebra 1, Living Environment, English, US History, and Global History
Physics	6(ii) School wide measure computed locally	Regents Exams in Algebra 1, Living Environment, English, US History, and Global History

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.	See 3.13 upload
Highly Effective (18-20 points) Results are well above District- or BOCES-adopted expectations for growth or achievement for grade/subject.	Percentage of Regents Exams achieving Mastery Level on the following subjects: Algebra 1, Living Environment, English, US History, and Global History = 60-100%
Developing (3 - 8 points) Results are below District- or BOCES-adopted expectations for growth or achievement for grade/subject.	Percentage of Regents Exams achieving Mastery Level on the following subjects: Algebra 1, Living Environment, English, US History, and Global History = 22-59%
Effective (9 - 17points) Results meet District- or BOCES-adopted expectations for growth or achievement for grade/subject.	Percentage of Regents Exams achieving Mastery Level on the following subjects: Algebra 1, Living Environment, English, US History, and Global History = 10-21%
Ineffective (0 - 2 points) Results are well below District- or BOCES-adopted expectations for growth or achievement for grade/subject.	Percentage of Regents Exams achieving Mastery Level on the following subjects: Algebra 1, Living Environment, English, US History, and Global History = 0-9%

3.10) High School Math

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

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

	Locally-Selected Measure from List of Approved Measures	Assessment
Algebra 1	6(ii) School wide measure computed locally	Regents Exams in Algebra 1, Living Environment, English, US History, and Global History
Geometry	6(ii) School wide measure computed locally	Regents Exams in Algebra 1, Living Environment, English, US History, and Global History
Algebra 2	6(ii) School wide measure computed locally	Regents Exams in Algebra 1, Living Environment, English, US History, and Global History

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.	See 3.13 upload
Highly Effective (18 - 20 points) Results are well above District- or BOCES-adopted expectations for growth or	Percentage of Regents Exams achieving Mastery Level on the following subjects: Algebra 1, Living Environment,

achievement for grade/subject.	English, US History, and Global History = 60-100%
Effective (9 - 17 points) Results meet District- or BOCES-adopted expectations for growth or achievement for grade/subject.	Percentage of Regents Exams achieving Mastery Level on the following subjects: Algebra 1, Living Environment, English, US History, and Global History = 22-59%
Developing (3 - 8 points) Results are below District- or BOCES-adopted expectations for growth or achievement for grade/subject.	Percentage of Regents Exams achieving Mastery Level on the following subjects: Algebra 1, Living Environment, English, US History, and Global History = 10-21%
Ineffective (0 - 2 points) Results are well below District- or BOCES-adopted expectations for growth or achievement for grade/subject.	Percentage of Regents Exams achieving Mastery Level on the following subjects: Algebra 1, Living Environment, English, US History, and Global History = 0-9%

3.11) High School English Language Arts

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

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

	Locally-Selected Measure from List of Approved Measures	Assessment
Grade 9 ELA	6(ii) School wide measure computed locally	Regents Exams in Algebra 1, Living Environment, English, US History, and Global History
Grade 10 ELA	6(ii) School wide measure computed locally	Regents Exams in Algebra 1, Living Environment, English, US History, and Global History
Grade 11 ELA	6(ii) School wide measure computed locally	Regents Exams in Algebra 1, Living Environment, English, US History, and Global History

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

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

Use this box, if needed, to describe the general process for assigning HEDI categories for these grades/subjects in this subcomponent. If needed, you may upload a table or graphic at 3.13, below.	See 3.13 upload
Highly Effective (18 - 20 points) Results are well above District- or BOCES-adopted expectations for growth or achievement for grade/subject.	Percentage of Regents Exams achieving Mastery Level on the following subjects: Algebra 1, Living Environment, English, US History, and Global History = 60-100%
Effective (9 - 17 points) Results meet District- or BOCES-adopted expectations for growth or achievement for grade/subject.	Percentage of Regents Exams achieving Mastery Level on the following subjects: Algebra 1, Living Environment, English, US History, and Global History = 22-59%
Developing (3 - 8 points) Results are below District- or BOCES-adopted expectations for growth or achievement for grade/subject.	Percentage of Regents Exams achieving Mastery Level on the following subjects: Algebra 1, Living Environment, English, US History, and Global History = 10-21%

Ineffective (0 - 2 points) Results are well below District- or BOCES-adopted expectations for growth or achievement for grade/subject.	Percentage of Regents Exams achieving Mastery Level on the following subjects: Algebra 1, Living Environment, English, US History, and Global History = 0-9%

3.12) All Other Courses

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

	Course(s) or Subject(s)	Locally-Selected Measure from List of Approved Measures	Assessment
	All other courses	6(ii) School wide measure computed locally	Regents Exams in Algebra 1, Living Environment, English, US History, and Global History. All of these courses are taught at the high school (9-12) level.

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

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

Use this box, if needed, to describe the general process for assigning HEDI categories for these grades/subjects in this subcomponent. If needed, you may upload a table or graphic at 3.13, below.	See 3.13 upload
Highly Effective (18 - 20 points) Results are well above District- or BOCES -adopted expectations for growth or achievement for grade/subject.	Percentage of Regents Exams achieving Mastery Level on the following subjects: Algebra 1, Living Environment, English, US History, and Global History = 60-100%
Effective (9 - 17 points) Results meet District- or BOCES-adopted expectations for growth or achievement for grade/subject.	Percentage of Regents Exams achieving Mastery Level on the following subjects: Algebra 1, Living Environment, English, US History, and Global History = 22-59%
Developing (3 - 8 points) Results are below District- or BOCES-adopted expectations for growth or achievement for grade/subject.	Percentage of Regents Exams achieving Mastery Level on the following subjects: Algebra 1, Living Environment, English, US History, and Global History = 10-21%
Ineffective (0 - 2 points) Results are well below District- or BOCES-adopted expectations for growth or achievement for grade/subject.	Percentage of Regents Exams achieving Mastery Level on the following subjects: Algebra 1, Living Environment, English, US History, and Global History = 0-9%

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/5139/184967-y92vNseFa4/3-13 Locally Selected Measures of Student Achievement revised_3.docx

3.14) Locally Developed Controls

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

No locally developed controls

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.

Teachers with more than one locally selected measure will have their scores calculated based on a combination of the individual scores in the same proportion as the number of students within each measure. This score will have a maximum value of 20 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 Monday, October 01, 2012
Updated Tuesday, November 27, 2012

Page 1

4.1) Teacher Practice Rubric

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

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

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

Danielson's Framework for Teaching (2011 Revised Edition)

(No response)

4.2) Points Within Other Measures

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

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

Is the following points assignment applicable to all teachers?

Yes

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

(No response)

Multiple (at least two) classroom observations by principal or other trained administrator, at least one of which must be unannounced [at least 31 points]	40
One or more observation(s) by trained independent evaluators	(No response)
Observations by trained in-school peer teachers	(No response)
Feedback from students using State-approved survey tool	(No response)
Feedback from parents/caregivers using State-approved survey tool	(No response)
Structured reviews of lesson plans, student portfolios and other teacher artifacts	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.

See 4.5 upload

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/5091/184998-eka9yMJ855/4-5 Process for Assigning 0-60 points revised.docx

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

Highly Effective: Overall performance and results exceed NYS Teaching Standards.	Using a composite rating from the observations and the summative, teachers receiving a score of 59-60 will be deemed Highly Effective.
Effective: Overall performance and results meet NYS Teaching Standards.	Using a composite rating from the observations and the summative, teachers receiving a score of 57-58 will be deemed Effective.
Developing: Overall performance and results need improvement in order to meet NYS Teaching Standards.	Using a composite rating from the observations and the summative, teachers receiving a score of 55-56 will be deemed Developing.
Ineffective: Overall performance and results do not meet NYS Teaching Standards.	Using a composite rating from the observations and the summative, teachers receiving a score of 0 -54 will be deemed Ineffective.

Provide the ranges for the 60-point scoring bands.

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

4.6) Observations of Probationary Teachers

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

By building principals or other trained administrators

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

By trained in-school peer teachers or other trained reviewers

Formal/Long	0
Informal/Short	0

Independent evaluators

Formal/Long	0
Informal/Short	0

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

- In Person

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

- Not Applicable

4.7) Observations of Tenured Teachers

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

By building principals or other trained administrators

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

By trained in-school peer teachers or other trained reviewers

Formal/Long	0
Informal/Short	0

Independent evaluators

Formal/Long	0
Informal/Short	0

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

- In Person

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

- Not Applicable

5. Composite Scoring (Teachers)

Created Monday, October 01, 2012
Updated Friday, October 12, 2012

Page 1

Standards for Rating Categories

Growth or Comparable Measures

Locally-selected Measures of

growth or achievement

Other Measures of Effectiveness

(Teacher and Leader standards)

Highly

Effective

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

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

Overall performance and results exceed NYS Teaching Standards.

Effective

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

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

Overall performance and results meet NYS Teaching Standards.

Developing

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

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

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

Ineffective

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

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

Overall performance and results do not meet NYS Teaching Standards.

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

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

2012-13 where there is no Value-Added measure

Growth or Comparable Measures

Locally-selected Measures of

growth or achievement

Other Measures of Effectiveness

(60 points)

Overall

Composite Score

Highly Effective

18-20

18-20

Ranges determined locally--see below

91-100

Effective

9-17

9-17

75-90

Developing

3-8

3-8

65-74

Ineffective

0-2

0-2

0-64

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

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

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 Monday, October 01, 2012
Updated Friday, October 12, 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/5265/185024-Df0w3Xx5v6/6-2 TIP.docx

6.3) Appeals Process

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

(1) the substance of the annual professional performance review

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

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

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

PROCEDURES FOR APPEALING AN
ANNUAL PROFESSIONAL PERFORMANCE REVIEW
SKANEATELES CENTRAL SCHOOL DISTRICT

The following procedures are the exclusive means for initiating, reviewing, and resolving any and all challenges and appeals to a tenured teacher's annual professional performance review (APPR). The procedures contained herein are not available to probationary teachers.

The grievance procedures in any negotiated agreement shall not be used to appeal or review a tenured teacher's APPR. To the extent that a conflict exists between a negotiated agreement and this procedure, the terms and conditions of this procedure shall prevail.

This procedure shall be in effect unless changed by the parties or until the requirement to have such a procedure under Education Law 3012-c is repealed by law, regulation, or a valid ruling by a court or administrative agency with jurisdiction. All correspondence including notifications must be done in writing (email and other electronic submissions are not permitted.)

1. A teacher who receives a rating of Ineffective or Developing may appeal his or her performance review. Ratings of Highly Effective or Effective cannot be appealed.

2. A teacher may appeal only:
the substance of his or her performance review
the school district's adherence to standards and methodologies required for such reviews
adherence to applicable regulations of the Commissioner of Education
compliance with the procedures for the conduct of performance reviews set forth in the APPR plan.

3. A teacher may not file multiple appeals regarding the same performance review. All grounds for appeal for a particular performance review must be raised within the same appeal.

4. The timeline for an appeal shall proceed as follows:
4.1 Appeals concerning a teacher's performance review must be received by the supervising principal or coordinator no later than ten (10) workdays after the date when the teacher receives his or her State composite score. The failure to submit an appeal within this timeframe shall result in a waiver of the teacher's right to appeal the performance review. This appeal must contain a detailed description of the precise point(s) of disagreement over his or her performance review, along with any and all documents or written material that he or she believes are relevant to the resolution of the appeal.
4.2 The administrator who received the appeal has five (5) workdays to respond to the teacher in writing. The administrator will simultaneously notify the teacher and the superintendent of the decision to grant or deny the appeal.

4.3 Upon receipt of a notice of a denial to an appeal, the superintendent will immediately put the Appeals Panel on notice that they are convening on the eighth (8th) working day following the receipt of that notice.

The Appeals Panel shall consist of:
Two teachers (An STA association officer and another teacher, to be designated by the STA President).
Teachers cannot be from the same building as the teacher who is appealing)
Two administrators (other than the Superintendent)
The membership of this panel will be stipulated at the beginning of each school year, with the understanding that they may be empanelled at any time during the school year. Two teachers will be chosen for each school (Waterman, State Street, Middle School, and High School)
The STA President will choose and designate the teacher members.
The superintendent will choose and designate the administrator members.

The appealing teacher may also ask an STA representative to accompany him or her to the appeals hearing. This representative has no vote on the panel.

4.4 The appealing teacher must notify the superintendent no later than 8:00 am on the seventh workday after the administrator denied the teacher's appeal that the teacher plans to appeal to the Appeals Panel. Upon the written notice of a request for an appeal, the superintendent will also immediately notify the appealing teacher of the time and place of the appeals hearing.

4.5 During the review before the Appeals Panel, the teacher will have an opportunity to once again state his or her case. The Appeals Panel members will also have an opportunity to question the appealing teacher. The intent is that the panel will gather as much information as feasible in order to make a good decision.
4.6 After the teacher has stated his or her case, the teacher and his or her STA representative will be excused from the room. At that time, the panel will discuss and deliberate the merits of the case. They will come to a conclusion by the end of the meeting. This conclusion is limited to the following:

The appeal is granted by a majority vote.
The appeal is denied by a majority vote.

The panel is deadlocked by a two to two vote.

Each member is required to vote by granting or denying the appeal.

4.7 This conclusion is then immediately forwarded to the Superintendent. If deadlocked, each position will submit a written explanation of their findings to be given to the superintendent within five workdays.

4.8 If the panel is deadlocked, the Superintendent will gather the facts and rule on the appeal with a final decision. The Superintendent will issue a written decision on the merits of the appeal no later than ten (10) workdays after receipt of the panel's written explanations regarding his or her decision. If the Superintendent sustains the appeal, he or she will issue an appropriate remedy. If the Superintendent dismisses or denies the appeal, the teacher's APPR score and evaluation shall remain unchanged, and the appeal process shall end. The Superintendent's decision shall be final and binding, and may not be appealed or reviewed further.

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

4.10 The teacher bringing the appeal has the responsibility of demonstrating that the original performance review rating should be changed.

4.11 Notwithstanding the above, in the event that a tenured teacher has received two consecutive ineffective APPR evaluation ratings, the third tier appeal shall be to an individual selected from a list of APPR hearing officers mutually chosen by the Superintendent and Association President from a list of hearing officers trained and approved by the BOCES served by the District. In the event that the BOCES does not maintain a list of trained and approved hearing officers for this purpose, the Superintendent and Association President shall at the beginning of the school year mutually agree upon no less than two and no more than four trained hearing officers for this purpose. The hearing officer shall make a final and binding decision upon the appeal of the APPR evaluation and/or teacher improvement plan. The hearing officer's decision will be made in a timely manner.

In the event that the district then proceeds to a probable cause finding under Section 3020-a of the Education Law, and determines to conduct such hearing, the hearing officer who ruled on the appeal shall be jointly selected by the teacher and the District to be the Section 3020-a hearing officer. Notwithstanding the aforementioned language, nothing herein shall be construed as limiting the right of the employee to challenge said evaluation in any proceeding brought pursuant to Education Law §3020-a, so long as the identical issue wasn't resolved in the level three appeal or clearly should have been presented in the level three appeal but was not. It is expected that the cost of said hearing shall be paid for in accordance with the provision of Education Law.

In order to take advantage of the procedure outlined above, the tenured teacher must consent to the use of the hearing officer for APPR appeals should the district proceed to find probable cause under Section 3020-a of the Education Law. If the tenured teacher is unwilling to do so, the third tier appeal shall be heard by the Superintendent.

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.

EVALUATOR TRAINING

The superintendent will ensure that all evaluators have been trained and that all lead evaluators have been trained and certified in accordance with regulation. The District will utilize BOCES Network Team evaluator training and lead evaluator training and certification in accordance with SED procedures and processes. Lead evaluator training will include training on:

(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;

(4) Application and use of the teacher or principal rubric(s), 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 District 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 locally selected measures of student achievement used by the district evaluate its teachers or principals;

(7) Use of the Statewide Instructional Reporting System;

(8) The scoring methodology 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; and

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

The Superintendent will ensure that lead evaluators participate in annual training and are re-certified on an annual basis. The BOCES Network Team will be utilized to provide the training and recertification. Any individual who fails to achieve required training or certification or re-certification, as applicable, shall not conduct or complete evaluations.

Lead evaluators will be trained by the Cayuga-Onondaga BOCES Network Team in accordance with the requirements of Education Law 3012-c. This regional evaluator training program directly reflects the materials, resources, and training that is provided by the New York State Education Department. Throughout the course of the ongoing training program, learning opportunities will be aligned to all nine training components required for certification.

The training program consists of two full days of initial training followed by a minimum of six half-day sessions throughout the first year. A minimum of three additional sessions will be offered each subsequent school year to maintain calibration and inter-rater reliability. Inter-rater reliability will be assessed through the training process as participants will be required to collect evidence, align the evidence to the rubric, and score sample teacher performance. Each evaluator will be required to maintain records verifying their participation in the training program. These records, along with a sampling of the evaluators work, will be used to certify and re-certify all evaluators.

Principal Evaluator Training (Task 11.4)
Principal evaluators will be trained by the Cayuga-Onondaga BOCES Network Team in accordance with the requirements of Education Law 3012-c. This regional principal evaluator training program directly reflects the materials, resources, and training that is provided by the New York State Education Department. Throughout the course of the ongoing training program, learning opportunities will be aligned to all nine training components required for certification.

The training program consists of six half-days of initial training followed by a minimum of three half-day sessions throughout the first year. A minimum of three additional sessions will be offered each subsequent school year to maintain calibration and inter-rater reliability. Inter-rater reliability will be assessed through the training process as participants will be required to collect evidence, align the evidence to the rubric, and score sample principal performance. Each evaluator will be required to maintain records verifying their participation in the training program. These records, along with a sampling of the evaluators work, will be used to certify and re-certify all evaluators.

6.5) Assurances -- Evaluators

Please check the boxes below:

- Checked

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

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

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

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

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

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

(7) use of the Statewide Instructional Reporting System

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

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

- Checked

6.6) Assurances -- Teachers

Please check all of the boxes below:

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

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

6.7) Assurances -- Data

Please check all of the boxes below:

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

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

Created Monday, October 01, 2012
Updated Tuesday, November 27, 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):

3-5
6-8
9-12
(No response)
(No response)
(No response)
(No response)

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

Please check the boxes below:

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

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

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

State assessments, *required if one exists*

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

List of State-approved 3rd party assessments

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

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

	School or Program Type	SLO with Assessment Option	Name of the Assessment
	Elementary K-2	District, regional, or BOCES-developed	Skaneateles Locally Developed K-2 ELA Assessment
	Elementary K-2	State-approved 3rd party assessment	AIMsweb Math K-2

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.	see 7.3 upload
Highly Effective (18 - 20 points) Results are well above state average for similar students (or District goals if no state test).	86-100% of student exams meet the SLO target.
Effective (9 - 17 points) Results meet state average for similar students (or District goals if no state test).	69-85% of student exams meet the SLO target.
Developing (3 - 8 points) Results are below state average for similar students (or District goals if no state test).	60-68% of student exams meet the SLO target.
Ineffective (0 - 2 points) Results are well below state average for similar students (or District goals if no state test).	0-59% of student exams meet the SLO target.

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/5365/185031-lha0DogRNw/7-3 Student Learning Objectives principals.docx

7.4) Special Considerations for Comparable Growth Measures

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

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

None

7.5) Principals with More Than One Growth Measure

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

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

7.6) Assurances -- Comparable Growth Measures

Please check all of the boxes below:

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

8. Local Measures (Principals)

Created Monday, October 01, 2012
Updated Wednesday, December 05, 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
	3-5	(d) measures used by district for teacher evaluation	NYS Assessments in ELA, and Math 3-5, and Science 4
	6-8	(d) measures used by district for teacher evaluation	NYS Assessments in ELA and Math 6-8, and Science 8
	9-12	(g) % achieving specific level on Regents or alternatives	Regents Exams in Algebra 1, Living Environment, English, US History, and Global History

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 8.1 upload
Highly Effective (14 - 15 points) Results are well above District- or BOCES-adopted expectations for growth or achievement for grade/subject.	For 3-8: Percentage of Exams demonstrating proficiency on NYS Assessments in ELA and Math 3-8, and Science 4 or 8 = 77-100% For 9-12 NYS Regents Exams in Algebra 1, Living Environment, English, Us History, and Global History: Percent scoring at Mastery Level 46-100%
Effective (8- 13 points) Results meet District- or BOCES-adopted expectations for growth or achievement for grade/subject.	For 3-8: Percentage of Exams demonstrating proficiency on NYS Assessments in ELA and Math 3-8, and Science 4 or 8 = 68-76% For 9-12 NYS Regents Exams in Algebra 1, Living Environment, English, Us History, and Global History:

	Percent scoring at Mastery Level 20-45%
Developing (3 - 7 points) Results are below District- or BOCES-adopted expectations for growth or achievement for grade/subject.	For 3-8: Percentage of Exams demonstrating proficiency on NYS Assessments in ELA and Math 3-8, and Science 4 or 8 = 53-67% For 9-12 NYS Regents Exams in Algebra 1, Living Environment, English, Us History, and Global History: Percent scoring at Mastery Level 10-19%
Ineffective (0 - 2 points) Results are well below District- or BOCES-adopted expectations for growth or achievement for grade/subject.	For 3-8: Percentage of Exams demonstrating proficiency on NYS Assessments in ELA and Math 3-8, and Science 4 or 8 = 0-52% For 9-12 NYS Regents Exams in Algebra 1, Living Environment, English, Us History, and Global History: Percent scoring at Mastery Level 0-9%

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

(No response)

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

assets/survey-uploads/5366/185039-qBFVOWF7fC/8-1 Locally Selected Measures of Student Achievement for Principals revised_1.docx

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

	Grade Configuration	Locally-Selected Measure from List of Approved Measures	Assessment
	K-2	(d) measures used by district for teacher evaluation	AIMsweb Math K-2

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 8.2 upload
Highly Effective (18 - 20 points) Results are well above District- or BOCES-adopted expectations for growth or achievement for grade/subject.	For K-2 AIMsweb Math: National Norms 45-94
Effective (9- 17 points) Results meet District- or BOCES-adopted expectations for growth or achievement for grade/subject.	For K-2 AIMsweb Math: National Norms 26-44

Developing (3 - 8 points) Results are below District- or BOCES-adopted expectations for growth or achievement for grade/subject.	For K-2 AIMsweb Math: National Norms 10-25
Ineffective (0 - 2 points) Results are well below District- or BOCES-adopted expectations for growth or achievement for grade/subject.	For K-2 AIMsweb Math: National Norms 0-9

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

(No response)

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

assets/survey-uploads/5366/185039-T8MlGWUVm1/8-2 Locally Selected Measures of Student Achievement for Principals revised_1.docx

8.3) Locally Developed Controls

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

None

8.4) Principals with More Than One Locally Selected Measure

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

N/A

8.5) Assurances

Please check all of the boxes below:

8.5) Assurances | Assure that the application of locally developed controls will be rigorous, fair, and transparent	Check
8.5) Assurances | Assure that use of locally developed controls will not have a disparate impact on underrepresented students, in accordance with any applicable civil rights laws.	Check
8.5) Assurances | Assure that enrolled students are included in accordance with policies for student assignment to schools and may not be excluded.	Check
8.5) Assurances | Assure that procedures for ensuring data accuracy and integrity are being utilized.	Check
8.5) Assurances | Assure that the process for assigning points for locally selected measures will use the narrative HEDI descriptions described in the regulations to effectively differentiate principals' performance in ways that improve student learning and instruction.	Check
8.5) Assurances | Assure that it is possible for a principal to earn each point, including 0, for the locally selected measures subcomponent.	Check

8.5) Assurances | Assure that locally-selected measures are rigorous and comparable across all principals in the same or similar programs or grade configurations across the district.	Check
8.5) Assurances | If more than one type of locally-selected measure is used for different groups of principals in the same or similar grade configuration or program, certify that the measures are comparable based on the Standards of Educational and Psychological Testing.	Check
8.5) Assurances | Assure that all locally-selected measures for a principal are different than any measures used for the State assessment or other comparable measures subcomponent.	Check

9. Other Measures of Effectiveness (Principals)

Created Monday, October 01, 2012
Updated Wednesday, November 28, 2012

Page 1

9.1) Principal Practice Rubric

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

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

Multidimensional Principal Performance Rubric

(No response)

9.2) Points Within Other Measures

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

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

Is the following points assignment for all principals?

Yes

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

(No response)

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

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

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

(No response)

9.3) Assurances -- Goals

Please check the boxes below (if applicable):

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

9.4) Sources of Evidence (if applicable)

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

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

9.5) Survey Tool(s) (if applicable)

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

(No response)

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

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.

see 9.7 upload

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/5143/185049-pMADJ4gk6R/9-7 Revised Principal APPR section on 60 percent.docx

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

Highly Effective: Overall performance and results exceed standards.	Using the composite ratings of the visitations and the summative conference, a score of 59-60 is Highly Effective.
Effective: Overall performance and results meet standards.	Using the composite ratings of the visitations and the summative conference, a score of 57-58 is Effective.
Developing: Overall performance and results need improvement in order to meet standards.	Using the composite ratings of the visitations and the summative conference, a score of 55-56 is Developing.
Ineffective: Overall performance and results do not meet standards.	Using the composite ratings of the visitations and the summative conference, a score of 0-54 is Ineffective.

Please provide the locally-negotiated 60 point scoring bands.

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

9.8) School Visits

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

Probationary Principals

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

Tenured Principals

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

10. Composite Scoring (Principals)

Created Friday, September 28, 2012
Updated Wednesday, November 28, 2012

Page 1

Standards for Rating Categories

Growth or Comparable Measures

Locally-selected Measures of

growth or achievement

Other Measures of Effectiveness

(Teacher and Leader standards)

Highly

Effective

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

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

Overall performance and results exceed ISLLC leadership standards.

Effective

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

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

Overall performance and results meet ISLLC leadership standards.

Developing

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

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

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

Ineffective

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

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

Overall performance and results do not meet ISLLC leadership standards.

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

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

2012-13 where there is no Value-Added measure

Growth or Comparable Measures

Locally-selected Measures of

growth or achievement

Other Measures of Effectiveness

(60 points)

Overall

Composite Score

Highly Effective

18-20

18-20

Ranges determined locally--see below

91-100

Effective

9-17

9-17

75-90

Developing

3-8

3-8

65-74

Ineffective

0-2

0-2

0-64

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

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

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

2012-13 where Value-Added growth measure applies

Growth or Comparable Measures

Locally-selected Measures of

growth or achievement

Other Measures of Effectiveness

(60 points)

Overall

Composite Score

Highly Effective

22-25

14-15

Ranges determined locally--see above

91-100

Effective

10-21

8-13

75-90

Developing

3-9

3-7

65-74

Ineffective

0-2

0-2

0-64

11. Additional Requirements - Principals

Created Monday, October 01, 2012
Updated Wednesday, November 28, 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/5276/185057-Df0w3Xx5v6/11-2 PRINCIPAL IMPROVEMENT PLANS.docx

11.3) Appeals Process

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

(1) the substance of the annual professional performance review

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

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

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

PROCEDURES FOR APPEALING AN ANNUAL PROFESSIONAL PERFORMANCE REVIEW

Through strict adherence to the prescribed timeline, the appeals process will progress in a timely and expeditious way. Each deadline allows for the parties to prepare their cases, while still moving the process forward.

To the extent a principal wishes to challenge his/her performance review and/or improvement plan (PIP) under the new APPR system; the District has developed an appeals procedure. A tenured principal who receives an effectiveness composite score rating of "ineffective" or "developing" may appeal his/her performance review. A probationary principal may only appeal an ineffective rating. Ratings of "highly effective" or "effective" cannot be appealed. This appeals procedure does not diminish the authority of the School Board to terminate probationary principals during their probationary period for reasons other than performance. While the APPR shall be a "significant factor" in tenure and other employment decisions, nothing herein requires an appeal be exhausted before a tenure determination can be made. In addition, appeal procedures shall not cause a principal to acquire tenure when an evaluation appeal is pending. A probationary principal who is either terminated or denied tenure may still pursue any appeal filed prior to the termination of his/her employment.

In order to implement the requirements of N.Y. Education Law 3012-c, the District and the Association hereby agree as follows: A unit member holding the position of building principal may appeal only the substance of the Annual Professional Performance Review, the District's adherence to the standards and methodologies required for such review, and the District's compliance with its procedures for conducting the Annual Professional Performance Review, or its issuance and/or implementation of the terms of the Principal Improvement Plan.

A principal may not file multiple appeals regarding the same performance review. All grounds for appealing a particular performance review must be raised within the same appeal. Any grounds not raised at the time the appeal is filed shall be deemed waived.

Under this appeals process, the principal bears the responsibility of proving by substantial evidence the merits of his or her appeal.

Such appeal must be submitted in writing to the Superintendent. (Email and other electronic submissions are not permitted. When filing an appeal, the principal must submit a written description of the specific areas of disagreement over his or her performance review, or issuance and/or implementation of the terms of his or her improvement plan. This information shall be submitted to the Superintendent. Supportive evidence about the challenges shall be submitted with the appeal. Any additional documents or materials relevant to the appeal must be provided by the district upon written request by the principal. The performance review and/or improvement plan being challenged must also be submitted with the appeal. The appeal must be submitted within 15 workdays of the principal's receipt of the final Annual Professional Performance Review or Principal Improvement Plan, or other act under this section.

Within fifteen (15) workdays of receipt of an appeal, the district must submit a detailed written response to the appeal. The response must include all additional documents or written material relevant to the point(s) of disagreement that support the district's response. Any such information that is not submitted at the time the response is filed shall not be considered on behalf of the district in the deliberation related to the resolution of the appeal. The principal initiating the appeal shall receive a copy of the response filed by the school district, and all additional information submitted with the response, at the same time the school district files its response.

Upon receipt of the school district's response, the Superintendent and SAA President shall mutually agree on a hearing officer who has been trained (if available) in the selected rubric. The hearing officer shall be provided with a copy of the written appeal and the district's response. The hearing officer shall render a decision based on the written submissions, this APPR Plan and memorandum of agreement, and Education Law §3012-c and any implementing regulations. The hearing officer shall issue a written decision within thirty (30) days after receiving such written appeal. The hearing officer's decision shall be final, binding, and unreviewable.

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.

EVALUATOR TRAINING

The superintendent will ensure that all evaluators have been trained and that all lead evaluators have been trained and certified in accordance with regulation. The District will utilize BOCES Network Team evaluator training and lead evaluator training and certification in accordance with SED procedures and processes. Lead evaluator training will include training on:

(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;

(4) Application and use of the teacher or principal rubric(s), 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 District 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 locally selected measures of student achievement used by the district evaluate its teachers or principals;

(7) Use of the Statewide Instructional Reporting System;

(8) The scoring methodology 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; and

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

The Superintendent will ensure that lead evaluators participate in annual training and are re-certified on an annual basis. The BOCES Network Team will be utilized to provide the training and recertification. Any individual who fails to achieve required training or certification or re-certification, as applicable, shall not conduct or complete evaluations.

Lead evaluators will be trained by the Cayuga-Onondaga BOCES Network Team in accordance with the requirements of Education Law 3012-c. This regional evaluator training program directly reflects the materials, resources, and training that is provided by the New York State Education Department. Throughout the course of the ongoing training program, learning opportunities will be aligned to all nine training components required for certification.

The training program consists of two full days of initial training followed by a minimum of six half-day sessions throughout the first year. A minimum of three additional sessions will be offered each subsequent school year to maintain calibration and inter-rater reliability. Inter-rater reliability will be assessed through the training process as participants will be required to collect evidence, align the evidence to the rubric, and score sample teacher performance. Each evaluator will be required to maintain records verifying their participation in the training program. These records, along with a sampling of the evaluators work, will be used to certify and re-certify all evaluators.

Principal Evaluator Training (Task 11.4)
Principal evaluators will be trained by the Cayuga-Onondaga BOCES Network Team in accordance with the requirements of Education Law 3012-c. This regional principal evaluator training program directly reflects the materials, resources, and training that is provided by the New York State Education Department. Throughout the course of the ongoing training program, learning opportunities will be aligned to all nine training components required for certification.

The training program consists of six half-days of initial training followed by a minimum of three half-day sessions throughout the first year. A minimum of three additional sessions will be offered each subsequent school year to maintain calibration and inter-rater reliability. Inter-rater reliability will be assessed through the training process as participants will be required to collect evidence, align the evidence to the rubric, and score sample principal performance. Each evaluator will be required to maintain records verifying their participation in the training program. These records, along with a sampling of the evaluators work, will be used to certify and re-certify all evaluators.

11.5) Assurances -- Evaluators

Please check the boxes below:

- Checked

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

their related functions, as applicable

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

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

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

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

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

(7) use of the Statewide Instructional Reporting System

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

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

- Checked

11.6) Assurances -- Principals

Please check all of the boxes below:

11.6) Assurances -- Principals | Assure the entire APPR plan will be completed for each principal as soon as practicable, but in no case later than September 1 of the school year next following the school year for which the building principal's performance is being measured.	Checked
11.6) Assurances -- Principals | Assure that the district will provide the principal's score and rating on the locally selected measures subcomponent, if available, and on the other measures of principal effectiveness subcomponent for a principal's annual professional performance review, in writing, no later than the last school day of the school year for which the principal is being measured.	Checked

11.6) Assurances -- Principals | Assure that the APPR will be put on the district website by September 10 or within 10 days after approval, whichever is later.	Checked
11.6) Assurances -- Principals | Assure that the evaluation system will be used as a significant factor for employment decisions.	Checked
11.6) Assurances -- Principals | Assure that principals will receive timely and constructive feedback as part of the evaluation process.	Checked
11.6) Assurances -- Principals | Assure the district has appeal procedures that are consistent with the regulations and that they provide for the timely and expeditious resolution of an appeal.	Checked

11.7) Assurances -- Data

Please check all of the boxes below:

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

12. Joint Certification of APPR Plan

Created Friday, September 28, 2012
Updated Wednesday, December 05, 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/5581/183840-3Uqgn5g9Iu/Signature page APPR 12-4-12.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.

Student Learning Objective Structure

All SLOs will include the following basic components:	
Population	**Roster of students assessed**
Learning Content	**New York State Learning Standards, including Common Core Standards for both Math and ELA**
Interval of Instructional Time	**Course duration**
Evidence	**1. District-developed pre-assessment administered at the beginning of the school year.** **2. District-developed summative assessment administered at the end of the school year OR Regents exam OR NYS Assessments in ELA and math OR AIMsweb, where applicable.**
Baseline	**Summary of student results from the pre-assessment.**
Target(s)	**80% of students will score ___% or higher on the end of year assessment.** **These growth targets will be developed by the Administrative Team (Principals and Curriculum Coordinators) in collaboration with the teachers.**
HEDI Scoring	**Highly Effective: 86-100% of students meet the target.** **Effective: 76% -85% of students meet the target.** **Developing: 66% -75% of students meet the target.**

	Ineffective: 0-65% of students meet the target.																				
	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
	96-100	95-90	86-89	84-85	83	82	81	80%	79	78	77	76	75	74	72-73	70-71	68-69	66-67	60-65	50-59	0-49

Locally Selected Measures of Student Achievement for 4-8 Teachers of ELA and Math for which there is a 15% Value Added Measure

This locally selected measure is based on the school-wide percentage of students who score in the proficient range on New York State assessments in ELA, Math, and Science 3-8.

Local Scale for 2012-13 - Exams Proficient in NYS Assessments in 3-8 ELA, Math & Science

% of Exams Proficient on NYS Assessments in ELA, Math & Science	Points for Local Measure HEDI	Points for Value-Added Growth Model HEDI
90-100	20 H	15 H
87-89	19 H	15 H
84-86	18 H	15 H
80-83	17 E	15 H
79	16 E	15 H
78	15 E	15 H
77	14 E	14 H
76	13 E	13 E
75	12 E	12 E
73-74	11 E	11 E
72	10 E	10 E
71	9 E	9 E
68-70	8 D	8 E
65-67	7 D	7 D
62-64	6 D	6 D
59-61	5 D	5 D
56-58	4 D	4 D
53-55	3 D	3 D
35-52	2 I	2 I
18-34	1 I	1 I
0-17	0 I	0 I

Local Scale for 2012 - 2103 Skaneateles High School Completers-
% Achieving Mastery Level (A score of 85 or higher) on the following Regents Examinations:
Algebra I, Living Environment, English, U. S. History, Global History

% of students achieving mastery level (score of 85 or higher)	Conversion Scale HEDI	Value Added
91 – 100	H 20	H 15
76 - 90	H 19	H 15
60 - 75	H 18	H 15
56 - 59	E 17	H 14
51 - 55	E 16	H 14
46 - 50	E 15	H 14
41 - 45	E 14	E 13
36 - 40	E 13	E 13
31 - 35	E 12	E 12
26 - 30	E 11	E 11
24 - 25	E 10	E 10
22 - 23	E 9	E 9
20 -21	D 8	E 8
18 - 19	D 7	D 7
16 - 17	D 6	D 6
14 - 15	D 5	D 5
12 - 13	D 4	D 4
10 - 11	D 3	D 3
6 - 9	I 2	I 2
2 -5	I 1	I 1
0 - 1	I 0	I 0

Locally Selected Measures of Student Achievement for K-12 Teachers for which there is no 15% Value Added Measure (20 points)

20% of the composite effectiveness score is based on State assessments and locally-selected measures of student achievement.
The STA and the District agree that they shall meet to discuss the inclusion of any new State assessment or Regents examination in the foregoing calculation.

K-2 teachers will use a composite score based on the school-wide results from the K-2 LAT using the state-approved assessment, AIMsweb. See table below.

3-8 teachers will use a composite score based on the school-wide results of the New York State Assessments in ELA, Math, and Science. See table below.

9-12 teachers will use a composite score based on the school-wide results of students achieving a Mastery Level score (85 or higher) on five Regents exams. See table below.

Waterman Primary K-2 Math LAT based on total number of exams taken using AIMsweb National Norms. (Exams: K= *Missing Number*, 1st Grade=*Computation*, 2nd Grade= *Computation*)

The process to be used for math shall consist of the State approved AIMsweb. The process to be used shall consist of a pre-test administered at the beginning of the class (no later than the end of the third week of the course) and a final examination that will be administered at the end of the course. HEDI points will be assigned by comparing the achievement of our students to the national norms. (Exams: K= *Missing Number*, 1st Grade=*Computation*, 2nd Grade= *Computation*).

HEDI	AIMsweb National Norms (Percentile)	**Conversion Scale**	Points for Value-Added Growth Model
H	70-94	20	15
H	56-69	19	15
H	45-55	18	15
E	41-44	17	15
E	36-40	16	15
E	34-35	15	15
E	31-33	14	14
E	30	13	13
E	29	12	12
E	28	11	11
E	27	10	10
E	26	9	9
D	25	8	8
D	21-24	7	7
D	17-20	6	6
D	14-16	5	5
D	12-13	4	4
D	10-11	3	3
I	6-9	2	2
I	2-5	1	1
I	0-1	0	0

Local Scale for 2012-2013
Percentage of Exams Proficient in NYS Assessments in 3-8 ELA, Math & Science

% of Exams Proficient on NYS Assessments in ELA, Math & Science	**Points for Local Measure**	Points for Value-Added Growth Model
90-100 H	20	15
87-89 H	19	15
84-86 H	18	15
80-83 E	17	15
79 E	16	15
78 E	15	15
77 E	14	14
76 E	13	13
75 E	12	12
73-74 E	11	11
72 E	10	10
71 E	9	9
68-70 D	8	8
65-67 D	7	7
62-64 D	6	6
59-61 D	5	5
56-58 D	4	4
53-55 D	3	3
35-52 I	2	2
18-34 I	1	1
0-17 I	0	0

Local Scale for 2012 - 2103 Skaneateles High School Completers-
% Achieving Mastery Level (score of 85 or higher) on the following Regents Examinations:
Algebra I, Living Environment, English, U. S. History, Global History (for all courses taught at the high school (9-12) level.

HEDI Scale	% of students achieving mastery level (85 or higher)	Conversion Scale	Value Added
	91 - 100	20	15
H	76 - 90	19	15
	60 - 75	18	15
	56 - 59	17	14
	51 - 55	16	14
	46 - 50	15	14
	41 - 45	14	13
E	36 - 40	13	13
	31 - 35	12	12
	26 - 30	11	11
	24 - 25	10	10
	22 - 23	9	9
	20 -21	8	8
	18 - 19	7	7
D	16 - 17	6	6
	14 - 15	5	5
	12 - 13	4	4
	10 - 11	3	3
	6 - 9	2	2
I	2 -5	1	1
	0 - 1	0	0

Process for Assigning 0-60 Points (Other Measures of Effectiveness) and Determining HEDI Ratings

The remaining 60% (or 60 out of the total 100 point composite score) of the composite effectiveness score shall be based on teacher observations and the summative conference. 40 points will be assigned through the classroom observations, while 20 points will be assigned from the year-end summative conference. This summative conference includes "Structured reviews of lesson plans, student portfolios, and other teacher artifacts." For each observation, an administrator who is a certified evaluator will observe the teacher using the Charlotte Danielson Rubric, revised 2011. Based on the evidence from the lesson, the evaluator will rate each element from Domains One, Two, and Three in one of the four categories from the rubric: Unsatisfactory, Basic, Proficient, or Distinguished. Any element that is not observed will not get a rating.

Following the lesson, the administrator will use a holistic scoring method to determine an overall rating based on which of the four categories received the most hits. This cluster scoring will yield an overall, single rating of Unsatisfactory, Basic, Proficient, or Distinguished for that lesson. During the post-observation conference, in addition to discussing the details of the lesson, the administrator will share the overall categorical rating of the lesson (Unsatisfactory, Basic, Proficient, or Distinguished).

This process will be the same for the second observation, as well as the third observation for non-tenured teachers. The process will remain the same for announced and unannounced observations. As part of the observation process, teachers are permitted to submit artifacts pertaining to any element of the rubric for consideration by an administrator during pre and post observation conferences and at the summative meeting. Any documentation provided should specifically indicate which standard and indicator that the teacher feels it addresses.

Finally, a similar process will be employed for the summative evaluation. This summative conference closely matches the APPR descript of "Structured reviews of lesson plans, student portfolios, and other teacher artifacts." During the summative conference, the administrator will assign ratings for the appropriate elements in Domain One and all of the elements in Domain Four. Once again each element will be rated Unsatisfactory, Basic, Proficient, or Distinguished. The administrator will determine a holistic rating for the summative evaluation based on the clustering of the individual ratings from each element.

At the end of the school year, therefore, tenured teachers will have received three holistic ratings, two from the observations and one from the summative. Non-tenured teachers will have received four ratings, three from observations and one from the summative.

From these observations and the summative, the teacher will receive 0-60 points based on the three (or four) ratings that he or she has achieved, using the following table:

For tenured teachers	**Non-tenured teachers**
Highly Effective D D D = 60 D D P = 59	**Highly Effective** D D D D = 60 D D D P= 59 D D P P = 59
Effective D P P = 58 P P P = 58 P P B = 57	**Effective** D P P P = 58 P P P P= 58 P P P B = 57 P P B B = 57
Developing P B B = 56 B B B = 55 B B U = 55	**Developing** P B B B = 56 B B B B = 56 B B B U = 55 B B U U = 55
Ineffective B U U = 54 U U U = 53-0 (see table below)	**Ineffective** B U U U = 54 U U U U = 53-0 (see table below)

Note: D B = P P
P U = B B

For all teachers who received three ratings of U U U or four ratings of U U U U, the administrator will employ the following method to allocate points from 53 to 0 (out of 60):

The administrator will tally all of the individual element ratings from all three classroom observations. He or she will then calculate the percentage of individual ratings which were higher than Unsatisfactory. (This range would be 0% to 50%, since more than 50% would have resulted in a rating of higher than Unsatisfactory for the lesson.) After calculating this percentage, the administrator will allocate 53 to 0 points based on the following table:

Percentage of elements Higher than Unsatisfactory	Points allocated (out of 60)
50	53
49	52
48	51
47	50
46	49
45	48
44	47
43	46
42	45
41	44
40	43
39	42
38	41
37	40
36	39
35	38
34	37
33	36
32	35
31	34
30	33
29	32
28	31
27	30
26	29
25	28
24	27
23	26
22	25
21	24
20	23
19	22

18	21
17	20
16	19

Percentage of elements Higher than Unsatisfactory	Points allocated (out of 60)
15	18
14	17
13	16
12	15
11	14
10	13
9	12
8	11
7	10
6	9
5	8
4	7
3	6
2	5
1	4
0	3 (Percentage of ratings above U the Summative exceeds 40%)
0	2 (Percentage of ratings above U the Summative exceeds 30%)
0	1 (Percentage of ratings above U the Summative exceeds 20%)
0	0 (Percentage of ratings above U the Summative is less than 21%)

TEACHER IMPROVEMENT PLANS

If a teacher's performance is evaluated as "ineffective" or "developing", the supervisor shall be required to develop a Teacher Improvement Plan (TIP) in consultation with the staff member. Such Plan will be shared with and implemented within ten (10) work days of the start of the school year within which the Plan will be applied. The Plan shall include, but not be limited to, an identification of the areas in need of improvement, a timeline for achieving improvement, suggestions for improvement, support to be provided, and measurable outcomes to be evaluated.

The procedures outlined above will also be used for any and all appeals of Teacher Improvement Plans that are issued in accordance with the annual professional performance review plan. Appeals related to the issuance of an improvement plan are limited to issues regarding compliance with the requirements prescribed in applicable law and regulations for the issuance of improvement plans, and must be initiated within ten (10) calendar days of the alleged failure of the District to comply with such requirements.

Teacher Improvement Plan

The District's **Annual Professional Performance Review process (APPR)** is designed to recognize, support, and improve the teaching-learning process. The majority of teachers (as defined in the STA contract) will be well served by the APPR process and will find it to be a valuable experience for professional growth. There may be a small number of individuals, however, who need additional support. That support will come through a mutually developed plan related to the Annual Professional Performance Review process.

The **TIP ~ Teacher Improvement Plan ~** is designed to recognize, support, and improve the teaching-learning process. The TIP also is designed to help teachers address areas in need of improvement based on one or more of the eight New York State Criteria for Evaluation. The eight criteria are: (1) content knowledge; (2) preparation; (3) instructional delivery; (4) classroom management; (5) student development; (6) student assessment; (7) collaboration; and (8) reflective and responsive practice.

THE PURPOSES OF THE TIP

- To demonstrate the commitment of the district to the professional growth and development of all teachers;
- To improve the performance of teachers who are identified by the administration as needing improvement in any of the eight criteria for evaluation;
- To implement a process that is a good faith effort to provide a supportive and structured plan for improvement within a certain timeframe.

THE TIP PROCEDURES

The TIP procedures are guidelines for the administrator and teacher involved in the TIP process. The teacher may involve a selected representative, such as the Instructional Leader, veteran teacher, mentor, or an STA representative.

- Document incidents related to the area(s) of concern;

- Identify the area(s) of concern;
- List the members of the support team;
- Develop a TIP plan.

THE TIP PLAN

The teacher and the administrator will draft and complete a TIP document using the district's model to guide the development of the TIP language. The TIP document will be signed by the teacher, the administrator, and an ETA representative. Every effort will be made to ensure confidentiality. The plan will include:

- Goal(s)
- Action Steps
- Members of the Support Team
- A Timeline
- Monitoring Steps
- Assessment Criteria and Evaluation

SAMPLE TIP FORMAT

TEACHER IMPROVEMENT PLAN FOR [TEACHER NAME]

[DATE]

1. DESCRIPTION OF UNSATISFACTORY PERFORMANCE

On [date] 2012, you met with [names of administrators] to discuss some concerns we had with your progress here in the Skaneateles School District. At this meeting we discussed a number of concerns that we have:

A. **Classroom management [example]**

[detailed narrative of deficiencies, with examples and evidence, as well as notations about conversations the administrators have had with the teacher regarding these deficiencies.]

B. **Lesson design [example]**

[detailed narrative of deficiencies, with examples and evidence, as well as notations about conversations the administrators have had with the teacher regarding these deficiencies.]

C. Recordkeeping [example]

[detailed narrative of deficiencies, with examples and evidence, as well as notations about conversations the administrators have had with the teacher regarding these deficiencies.]

D. Student assessment [example]

[detailed narrative of deficiencies, with examples and evidence, as well as notations about conversations the administrators have had with the teacher regarding these deficiencies.]

2. PROFESSIONAL DEVELOPMENT GOALS AND ACTIVITIES

At the very minimum, we expect you to accomplish all of the following professional goals. [possible examples listed below]

A. Develop a specific classroom management plan for . . .
B. Make the arrangements to observe two specific teachers who have classes similar to yours. The first of these observations should occur before November 8 and the second before November 15. For both of these observations, make some reflective notes which you will share with [administrator].
C. Continue to submit lesson plans on time and in good detail. Also, during your observations, make specific note of the lesson design of the two teachers. Discuss your reflections on those designs with [administrator].
D. Continue to post student grades online throughout the remainder of the year.
E. Develop a fair and rigorous assessment system which challenges students. This system should result in a typical distribution of grades for high achieving second language students. You should discuss the grading policies and procedures with the other teachers who teach courses similar to yours.
F. Submit all tests to [administrator] at least three days before administering them.
G. Meet regularly and frequently with your mentor to seek guidance on any aspect of the school's expectations and culture which you may not understand. She is an excellent resource for you.

3. GOALS

For each item in Section 1, there will be a corresponding goal or directive which identifies the required level of performance for each item.
[example goal: Develop an assessment system that is based on sound educational practices rather than idiosyncrasies.]
[example directive: Arrive to school on time each day.]

4. TIMELINE

Next Checkpoint [date]

[example] Plan to meet with [administrator] every other Friday during period 8 to discuss your progress toward these goals. These meetings will begin on Friday, November 12.

Final Checkpoint

On [date] you will meet with [administrator] to discuss your progress on the items outlined in this Plan. At that date, the administrator will inform you that either:

A. Your progress is satisfactory and this TIP is concluded OR
B. Your progress has not been satisfactory and the TIP will be extended until a definite point in time.

The administrators in this district are invested in your success. We are here to help you achieve the success which we expect of all teachers.

Support Team

Principal(s): _____

Coordinator(s): _____

Union representative: _____

Sincerely,

Signatures of administrators (administrator names) presented this plan and reviewed it with me on (date).

_____

Signature
(indicates that the teacher has had the opportunity to review the TIP)

Optional Teacher Response:

Student Learning Objectives (Principals)

For principals in buildings that do not have at least 30% of their students covered by State provided growth measures, their growth score will be based on Student Learning Objectives ("SLO"). A Principal's growth SLO will be based on school wide student results.

All SLOs shall include the following elements: Student population; Learning content; Interval of instructional time; Evidence; Baseline; Target and HEDI criteria; and Rationale. The K-2 principal's ELA SLO will be based on a local assessment. The SLO process to be used shall consist of a pre-test administered at the beginning of the class (no later than the end of the third week of the course) and a final examination that will be administered at the end of the course. The SLO established is 80 % of all students tested in grades K-2 will meet the grade level benchmark on the local literacy exam.

The SLO process to be used for math shall consist of the State approved AIMsweb. The SLO process to be used shall consist of a pre-test administered at the beginning of the class (no later than the end of the third week of the course) and a final examination that will be administered at the end of the course. The SLO established is 80% of all students tested in grades K-2 will meet the 30th percentile according to AIMsweb National Norms. (Exams: K= *Missing Number*, 1st Grade=*Computation*, 2nd Grade= *Computation*).

The K-2 Principal percentage will be determined by averaging the ELA and Math SLO. The following will be used to determine points achieved by the Principal:

Highly Effective	86% - 100% of examinations meet SLO target	18-20 points
Effective	69% - 85% of examinations meet SLO target	9-17 points
Developing	60 - 68% of examinations meet SLO target	3-8 points
Ineffective	Less than 60% of examinations meet SLO target	0-2 points

HEDI	Average of math and ELA SLO	Conversion Scale	Points for Value-Added Growth Model
H	97-100	20	15
H	93-96	19	15
H	86-92	18	15
E	85	17	15
E	83-84	16	15
E	82	15	15
E	81	14	14
E	80	13	13
E	75-79	12	12
E	73-74	11	11
E	70-72	10	10
E	69	9	9
D	68	8	8
D	66-67	7	7
D	63-65	6	6
D	62	5	5
D	61	4	4
D	60	3	3
I	50-59	2	2
I	41-49	1	1
I	0-40	0	0

Locally Selected Measures of Student Achievement for Principals

20% of the composite effectiveness score is based on State assessments or other locally-selected measures of student achievement that are determined to be rigorous and comparable across classrooms as defined by the **Commissioner (decreased to 15% upon implementation of value-added growth model).**

The SAA and the District agree that they shall meet to discuss the inclusion of any new State assessment or Regents examination in the foregoing calculation.

Waterman Primary K-2 Math LAT based on total number of exams taken using AIMsweb National Norms. (Exams: K= *Missing Number*, 1st Grade=*Computation*, 2nd Grade= *Computation*)

AIMsweb National Norms (Percentile)	Conversion Scale HEDI	**Points for Value-Added Growth Model HEDI**
70-94	20 H	15 H
56-69	19 H	15 H
45-55	18 H	15 H
41-44	17 E	15 H
36-40	16 E	15 H
34-35	15 E	15 H
31-33	14 E	14 H
30	13 E	13 E
29	12 E	12 E
28	11 E	11 E
27	10 E	10 E
26	9 E	9 E
25	8 D	8 E
21-24	7 D	7 D
17-20	6 D	6 D
14-16	5 D	5 D
12-13	4 D	4 D
10-11	3 D	3 D
6-9	2 I	2 I
2-5	1 I	1 I
0-1	0 I	0 I

Local Scale for 2012-13 - Exams Proficient in NYS Assessments in 3-8 ELA, Math & Science

% of Exams Proficient on NYS Assessments in ELA, Math & Science	Points for Local Measure HEDI	**Points for Value-Added Growth Model HEDI**
90-100	20 H	15 H
87-89	19 H	15 H
84-86	18 H	15 H
80-83	17 E	15 H
79	16 E	15 H
78	15 E	15 H
77	14 E	14 H
76	13 E	13 E
75	12 E	12 E
73-74	11 E	11 E
72	10 E	10 E
71	9 E	9 E
68-70	8 D	8 E
65-67	7 D	7 D
62-64	6 D	6 D
59-61	5 D	5 D
56-58	4 D	4 D
53-55	3 D	3 D
35-52	2 I	2 I
18-34	1 I	1 I
0-17	0 I	0 I

Local Scale for 2012 - 2103 Skaneateles High School Completers-
% Achieving Mastery Level (score of 85 or higher) on the following Regents Examinations:
Algebra I, Living Environment, English, U. S. History, Global History

% of students achieving mastery level (85 or higher)	Conversion Scale HEDI	**Value Added**
91 - 100	H 20	H 15
76 - 90	H 19	H 15
60 - 75	H 18	H 15
56 - 59	E 17	H 14
51 - 55	E 16	H 14
46 - 50	E 15	H 14
41 - 45	E 14	E 13
36 - 40	E 13	E 13
31 - 35	E 12	E 12
26 - 30	E 11	E 11
24 - 25	E 10	E 10
22 - 23	E 9	E 9
20 -21	D 8	E 8
18 - 19	D 7	D 7
16 - 17	D 6	D 6
14 - 15	D 5	D 5
12 - 13	D 4	D 4
10 - 11	D 3	D 3
6 - 9	I 2	I 2
2 -5	I 1	I 1
0 - 1	I 0	I 0

Locally Selected Measures of Student Achievement for Principals

20% of the composite effectiveness score is based on State assessments or other locally-selected measures of student achievement that are determined to be rigorous and comparable across classrooms as defined by the Commissioner (decreased to 15% upon implementation of value-added growth model).

The SAA and the District agree that they shall meet to discuss the inclusion of any new State assessment or Regents examination in the foregoing calculation.

Waterman Primary K-2 Math LAT based on total number of exams taken using AIMsweb National Norms. (Exams: K= *Missing Number*, 1st Grade=*Computation*, 2nd Grade= *Computation*)

The process to be used for math shall consist of the State approved AIMsweb. The process to be used shall consist of a pre-test administered at the beginning of the class (no later than the end of the third week of the course) and a final examination that will be administered at the end of the course. HEDI points will be assigned by comparing the achievement of our students to the national norms. (Exams: K= *Missing Number*, 1st Grade=*Computation*, 2nd Grade= *Computation*).

AIMsweb National Norms (Percentile)	**Conversion Scale HEDI**	Points for Value-Added Growth Model HEDI
70-94	20 H	15 H
56-69	19 H	15 H
45-55	18 H	15 H
41-44	17 E	15 H
36-40	16 E	15 H
34-35	15 E	15 H
31-33	14 E	14 H
30	13 E	13 E
29	12 E	12 E
28	11 E	11 E
27	10 E	10 E
26	9 E	9 E
25	8 D	8 E
21-24	7 D	7 D
17-20	6 D	6 D
14-16	5 D	5 D
12-13	4 D	4 D
10-11	3 D	3 D
6-9	2 I	2 I
2-5	1 I	1 I
0-1	0 I	0 I

Local Scale for 2012-13 - Exams Proficient in NYS Assessments in 3-8 ELA, Math & Science

% of Exams Proficient on NYS Assessments in ELA, Math & Science	**Points for Local Measure HEDI**	Points for Value-Added Growth Model HEDI
90-100	20 H	15 H
87-89	19 H	15 H
84-86	18 H	15 H
80-83	17 E	15 H
79	16 E	15 H
78	15 E	15 H
77	14 E	14 H
76	13 E	13 E
75	12 E	12 E
73-74	11 E	11 E
72	10 E	10 E
71	9 E	9 E
68-70	8 D	8 E
65-67	7 D	7 D
62-64	6 D	6 D
59-61	5 D	5 D
56-58	4 D	4 D
53-55	3 D	3 D
35-52	2 I	2 I
18-34	1 I	1 I
0-17	0 I	0 I

Local Scale for 2012 - 2103 Skaneateles High School Completers-
% Achieving Mastery Level (score of 85 or higher) on the following Regents Examinations:
Algebra I, Living Environment, English, U. S. History, Global History

% of students achieving mastery level (85 or higher)	**Conversion Scale HEDI**	Value Added
91 - 100	H 20	H 15
76 - 90	H 19	H 15
60 - 75	H 18	H 15
56 - 59	E 17	H 14
51 - 55	E 16	H 14
46 - 50	E 15	H 14
41 - 45	E 14	E 13
36 - 40	E 13	E 13
31 - 35	E 12	E 12
26 - 30	E 11	E 11
24 - 25	E 10	E 10
22 - 23	E 9	E 9
20 -21	D 8	E 8
18 - 19	D 7	D 7
16 - 17	D 6	D 6
14 - 15	D 5	D 5
12 - 13	D 4	D 4
10 - 11	D 3	D 3
6 - 9	I 2	I 2
2 -5	I 1	I 1
0 - 1	I 0	I 0

Process for Assigning 0-60 points and Determining HEDI Ratings for Principals

The remaining 60% (or 60 out of the total 100 point composite score) of the composite effectiveness score shall be based on teacher observations and the summative meeting. For each building visitation, the superintendent, who is a certified evaluator, will use the Multidimensional Principal Performance rubric which is SED approved. Based on the evidence from the visitation, the evaluator will rate each element from Domains One, Two, Three, in one of the four categories from the rubric:. Ineffective, Developing, Effective, or Highly Effective. Any element that is not observed will not get a rating.

Following the visitation, the evaluator will use a holistic scoring method to determine an overall rating based on which of the four categories received the most hits. This cluster scoring will yield an overall, single rating of Ineffective, Developing, Effective, or Highly Effective for that visitation. During the post-visitation conference, in addition to discussing the details of the visitation, the evaluator will share the overall categorical rating of the visitation (Ineffective, Developing, Effective, or Highly Effective).

This process will be the same for the second visitation, as well as the third visitation for non-tenured principals. The process will remain the same for announced and unannounced visitations. As part of the visitation process, principals are permitted to submit artifacts pertaining to any element of the rubric for consideration by an evaluator during pre and post visitation conferences and at the summative meeting. Any documentation provided should specifically indicate which standard and indicator that the principal feels it addresses.

Finally, a similar process will be employed for the summative evaluation. During the summative, the evaluator will assign ratings for the appropriate elements in all the remaining Domains of the Multidimensional Principal Performance Rubric. Once again each element will be rated Ineffective, Developing, Effective, or Highly Effective. The evaluator will determine a holistic rating for the summative evaluation based on the clustering of the individual ratings from each element.

At the end of the school year, therefore, tenured principals will have received three holistic ratings, two from the visitation and one from the summative. Non-tenured principals will have received four ratings, three from visitations and one from the summative.

Appendix A
Scoring bands for the Multidimensional Principal Performance Rubric

From the building visitations and the summative, the principal will receive 0-60 points based on the three (or four) ratings that he or she has achieved, using the following table:

For tenured principals	**Non-tenured principals**
Highly Effective H H H = 60 H H E = 59	**Highly Effective** H H H H = 60 H H H E = 59 H H E E = 59
Effective H E E = 58 E E E = 58 E D D = 57	**Effective** H E E E = 58 E E E E = 58 E E E D = 57 E E D D = 57
Developing E D D = 56 D D D = 55 D D I= 55	**Developing** E D D D = 56 D D D D = 56 D D D I = 55 D D I I = 55
Ineffective D I I = 54 I I I = 53-0	**Ineffective** D I I I = 54 I I I I = 53-0

Note: H D = E E
E I = D D

For all principals who received three ratings of I, I, I or four ratings of I, I, I, I, the evaluator will employ the following method to allocate points from 53 to 0 (out of 60):

The evaluator will tally all of the individual element ratings from all three building visitations. He or she will then calculate the percentage of individual ratings which were higher than Ineffective. (This range would be 0% to 50%, since more than 50% would have resulted in a rating of higher than Ineffective for the visitation.) After calculating this percentage, the evaluator will allocate 53 to 0 points based on the following table:

Percentage of elements Higher than Unsatisfactory	Points allocated (out of 60)
50	53
49	52
48	51
47	50
46	49
45	48
44	47
43	46
42	45
41	44
40	43
39	42
38	41
37	40
36	39
35	38
34	37
33	36
32	35
31	34
30	33
29	32
28	31
27	30
26	29
25	28
24	27
23	26
22	25
21	24
20	23

19	22
18	21
17	20
16	19

Percentage of elements Higher than Ineffective	Points allocated (out of 60)
15	18
14	17
13	16
12	15
11	14
10	13
9	12
8	11
7	10
6	9
5	8
4	7
3	6
2	5
1	4
0	3 (Percentage of ratings above I the Summative exceeds 40%)
0	2 (Percentage of ratings above I the Summative exceeds 30%)
0	1 (Percentage of ratings above I the Summative exceeds 20%)
0	0 (Percentage of ratings above I the Summative is less than 21%)

PRINCIPAL IMPROVEMENT PLANS

If a principal's performance is evaluated as "ineffective" or "developing", the Superintendent shall be required to develop a Principal Improvement Plan (PIP) in consultation with the principal. Such Plan will be shared with and implemented within fifteen (15) workdays of the start of the school year within which the Plan will be applied. The Plan shall include, but not be limited to, an identification of the areas in need of improvement, a timeline for achieving improvement, suggestions for improvement, support to be provided, and measurable outcomes to be evaluated.

Meetings will be scheduled by the Superintendent monthly, except for December to assess progress. These meetings shall be scheduled by the Superintendent. A written summary of feedback by the Superintendent on progress shall be given within ten (10) workdays of each meeting.

The procedures outlined in this Plan will also be used for any and all appeals of Principal Improvement Plans that are issued in accordance with the annual professional performance review plan. Appeals related to the issuance of an improvement plan are limited to issues regarding compliance with the requirements prescribed in applicable law and regulations for the issuance of improvement plans, and must be initiated within ten (10) workdays of the alleged failure of the District to comply with such requirements.

The forms to be used for a PIP are appended below.

Principal Improvement Plan

The District's **Annual Professional Performance Review process (APPR)** is designed to recognize, support, and improve the teaching-learning process. The majority of principals (as defined in the SAA contract) will be well served by the APPR process and will find it to be a valuable experience for professional growth. There may be a small number of individuals, however, who need additional support. That support will come through a mutually developed plan related to the Annual Professional Performance Review process.

The **PIP ~ Principal Improvement Plan ~** is designed to recognize, support, and improve the teaching-learning process. The PIP also is designed to help principals address areas in need of improvement based on one or more of the six domains and/or other of the Multidimensional Principal Performance Rubric. The seven criteria are: (1) shared vision of learning; (2) school culture and instructional program; (3) safe, efficient, effective learning environment; (4) community; (5) integrity, fairness, ethics; (6) political, social, economic, legal and cultural context; (7) goal setting and attainment.

THE PURPOSES OF THE PIP

- To demonstrate the commitment of the district to the professional growth and development of all principals;
- To improve the performance of principals who are identified by the superintendent as needing improvement in any of the seven criteria for evaluation;

- To implement a process that is a good faith effort to provide a supportive and structured plan for improvement within a certain timeframe.

THE PIP PROCEDURES

The PIP procedures are guidelines for the superintendent and principal involved in the PIP process. The principal may involve a selected representative, such as an Association Member, veteran principal, or mentor.

- Document incidents related to the areas(s) of concern;
- Identify the area(s) of concern;
- List the members of the support team;
- Develop a PIP plan.

THE PIP PLAN

The principal and the superintendent will draft and complete a PIP document using the district's model to guide the development of the PIP language. The PIP document will be signed by the principal, the superintendent, and a SAA representative. Every effort will be made to ensure confidentiality. The plan will include:

- Goal(s)
- Action Steps
- Members of the Support Team
- A Timeline
- Monitoring Steps
- Assessment Criteria and Evaluation

PRINCIPAL IMPROVEMENT PLAN FOR (PRINCIPAL NAME)

(DATE)

1. DESCRIPTION OF UNSATISFACTORY PERFORMANCE

On (date) 2012, you met with (name of superintendent) to discuss some concerns he/she had with your progress here in the Skaneateles School District. At this meeting he/she discussed a number of concerns that he/she had:

A. Building Management [example]

[detailed narrative of deficiencies, with examples and evidence, as well as notations about conversations with superintendent has had with the principal regarding these deficiencies.]

B. Instructional Program [example]

[detailed narrative of deficiencies, with examples and evidence, as well as notations about conversations the superintendent has had with the principal regarding these deficiencies.]

C. Relationships with Staff, Parents, and/or Students [example]

[detailed narrative of deficiencies, with examples and evidence, as well as notations about conversations the superintendent has had with the principal regarding these deficiencies.]

D. Communication with Staff, Parents, and Community [example]

[detailed narrative of deficiencies, with examples and evidence, as well as notations about conversations the superintendent has had with the principal regarding these deficiencies.]

2. PROFESSIONAL DEVELOPMENT GOALS AND ACTIVITIES

At the very minimum, we expect you to accomplish all of the following professional goals. [possible examples listed below]

A. Develop a specific management plan for …
B. Make the arrangements to meet with two other building principals. The first of these meetings should occur before November 8 and the second before November 15. For both of these meetings, make some reflective notes which you will share with superintendent.
C. Meet regularly and frequently with your mentor to seek guidance on any aspect of the superintendent's expectations and school culture which you may not understand.

3. GOALS

For each item in Section 1, there will be a corresponding goal or directive which identifies the required level of performance for each item.
[example goal: Develop a communication plan that is based on up-to-date technology.]
[example directive: Do not admonish individual teachers in public meetings.]

4. TIMELINE

Next Checkpoint [date]

[example: Plan to meet with the superintendent monthly (except December) to discuss your progress toward these goals. These meetings will begin on (date).]

Final Checkpoint

[On (date) you will meet with the superintendent to discuss your progress on the items outlined in this Plan. At that date, the superintendent will inform you that either:

A. Your progress is satisfactory and this PIP is concluded OR
B. Your progress has not been satisfactory and the PIP will be extended until a definite point in time.]

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

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

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

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

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

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

Signatures, dates

Superintendent Signature: Date:

Judith C Pastel 12-4-12

Teachers Union President Signature: Date:

Michael H Bar 12/4/12

Administrative Union President Signature: Date:

12/4/12

Board of Education President Signature: Date:

Evan Dr 12/4/12