



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

November 30, 2012

Douglas Premo, Superintendent
South Lewis Central School District
4264 East Road, P.O. Box 10
Turin, NY 13473

Dear Superintendent Premo:

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: Jack Boak

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 Monday, May 07, 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 : 231101040000

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

231101040000

1.2) School District Name: SOUTH LEWIS CSD

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

South Lewis 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, May 07, 2012

Updated Monday, November 26, 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	South Lewis Locally Developed Kindergarten ELA Assessment
1	District, regional, or BOCES-developed assessment	South Lewis Locally Developed Grade 1 ELA Assessment
2	District, regional, or BOCES-developed assessment	South Lewis 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.	The teachers will develop SLOs using available background and baseline data. Appropriate and rigorous targets for each students results will be set for each SLO. After the specified assessments are administered and scored, the percentage of students who met the differentiated targets (based on each SLO) will be determined. After this percentage is determined the chart below will be utilized to determine the appropriate number of points for each teacher on the HEDI scale. See attached chart.
Highly Effective (18 - 20 points) Results are well-above state average for similar students (or District goals if no state test).	85-100% of students meeting target goal
Effective (9 - 17 points) Results meet state average for similar students (or District goals if no state test).	70-84% of students meeting target goal
Developing (3 - 8 points) Results are below state average for similar students (or District goals if no state test).	50-69% of students meeting target goal
Ineffective (0 - 2 points) Results are well-below state average for similar students (or District goals if no state test).	0-49% of students meeting target goal

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	District, regional, or BOCES-developed assessment	South Lewis Locally Developed Kindergarten Math Assessment
1	District, regional, or BOCES-developed assessment	South Lewis Locally Developed Grade 1 Math Assessment
2	District, regional, or BOCES-developed assessment	South Lewis Locally Developed Grade 2 Math Assessment

	Math	Assessment
3	State assessment	3rd Grade State Assessment

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

Use this box, if needed, to describe the general process for assigning HEDI categories for these grades/subjects in this subcomponent. If needed, you may upload a table or graphic at 2.11, below.	The teachers will develop SLOs using available background and baseline data. Appropriate and rigorous targets for each student will be set for each SLO. After the specified assessments are administered and scored, the percentage of students who met the differentiated targets (based on each SLO) will be determined. After this percentage is determined the chart below will be utilized to determine the appropriate number of points for each teacher on the HEDI scale. See attached chart.
---	--

Highly Effective (18 - 20 points) Results are well-above state average for similar students (or District goals if no state test).	85-100% of students meeting target goal
Effective (9 - 17 points) Results meet state average for similar students (or District goals if no state test).	70-84% of students meeting target goal
Developing (3 - 8 points) Results are below state average for similar students (or District goals if no state test).	50-69% of students meeting target goal
Ineffective (0 - 2 points) Results are well-below state average for similar students (or District goals if no state test).	0-49% of students meeting target goal

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	South Lewis Locally Developed Grade 6 Science Assessment
7	District, regional or BOCES-developed assessment	South Lewis 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.	The teachers will develop SLOs using available background and baseline data. Appropriate and rigorous targets for each student will be set for each SLO. After the specified assessments are administered and scored, the percentage of students who met the differentiated targets (based on each SLO) will be determined. After this percentage is determined the chart below will be utilized to determine the appropriate number of points for each teacher on the HEDI scale. See attached chart.
Highly Effective (18 - 20 points) Results are well-above state average for similar students (or District goals if no state test).	85-100% of students meeting target goal
Effective (9 - 17 points) Results meet state average for similar students (or District goals if no state test).	70-84% of students meeting target goal
Developing (3 - 8 points) Results are below state average for similar students (or District goals if no state test).	50-69% of students meeting target goal
Ineffective (0 - 2 points) Results are well-below state average for similar students (or District goals if no state test).	0-49% of students meeting target goal

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	South Lewis Locally Developed Grade 6 Social Studies Assessment
7	District, regional or BOCES-developed assessment	South Lewis Locally Developed Grade 7 Social Studies Assessment
8	District, regional or BOCES-developed assessment	South Lewis 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.	The teachers will develop SLOs using available background and baseline data. Appropriate and rigorous targets for each student will be set for each SLO. After the specified assessments are administered and scored, the percentage of students who met the differentiated targets (based on each SLO) will be determined. After this percentage is determined the chart below will be utilized to determine the appropriate number of points for each teacher on the HEDI scale. See attached chart.
Highly Effective (18 - 20 points) Results are well-above District goals for similar students.	85-100% of students meeting target goal
Effective (9 - 17 points) Results meet District goals for similar students.	70-84% of students meeting target goal
Developing (3 - 8 points) Results are below District goals for similar students.	50-69% of students meeting target goal
Ineffective (0 - 2 points) Results are well-below District goals for similar students.	0-49% of students meeting target goal

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	South Lewis 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.	The teachers will develop SLOs using available background and baseline data. Appropriate and rigorous targets for each student will be set for each SLO. After the specified assessments are administered and scored, the percentage of students who met the differentiated targets (based on each SLO) will be determined. After this percentage is determined the chart below will be utilized to determine the appropriate number of points for each teacher on the HEDI scale. See attached chart.
Highly Effective (18 - 20 points) Results are well-above District goals for similar students.	85-100% of students meeting target goal
Effective (9 - 17 points) Results meet District goals for similar students.	70-84% of students meeting target goal
Developing (3 - 8 points) Results are below District goals for similar students.	50-69% of students meeting target goal
Ineffective (0 - 2 points) Results are well-below District goals for similar students.	0-49% of students meeting target goal

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.	The teachers will develop SLOs using available background and baseline data. Appropriate and rigorous targets for each student will be set for each SLO. After the specified assessments are administered and scored, the percentage of students who met the differentiated targets (based on each SLO) will be determined. After this percentage is determined the chart below will be utilized to determine the appropriate number of points for each
---	---

	teacher on the HEDI scale. See attached chart.
Highly Effective (18 - 20 points) Results are well-above District goals for similar students.	85-100% of students meeting target goal
Effective (9 - 17 points) Results meet District goals for similar students.	70-84% of students meeting target goal
Developing (3 - 8 points) Results are below District goals for similar students.	50-69% of students meeting target goal
Ineffective (0 - 2 points) Results are well-below District goals for similar students.	0-49% of students meeting target goal

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.	The teachers will develop SLOs using available background and baseline data. Appropriate and rigorous targets for each student will be set for each SLO. After the specified assessments are administered and scored, the percentage of students who met the differentiated targets (based on each SLO) will be determined. After this percentage is determined the chart below will be utilized to determine the appropriate number of points for each teacher on the HEDI scale. See attached chart.
Highly Effective (18 - 20 points) Results are well-above District goals for similar students.	85-100% of students meeting target goal
Effective (9 - 17 points) Results meet District goals for similar students.	70-84% of students meeting target goal
Developing (3 - 8 points) Results are below District goals for similar students.	50-69% of students meeting target goal
Ineffective (0 - 2 points) Results are well-below District goals for similar students.	0-49% of students meeting target goal

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

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.	The teachers will develop SLOs using available background and baseline data. Appropriate and rigorous targets for each student will be set for each SLO. After the specified assessments are administered and scored, the percentage of students who met the differentiated targets (based on each SLO) will be determined. After this percentage is determined the chart below will be utilized to determine the appropriate number of points for each teacher on the HEDI scale. See attached chart.
Highly Effective (18 - 20 points) Results are well-above District goals for similar students.	85-100% of students meeting target goal
Effective (9 - 17 points) Results meet District goals for similar students.	70-84% of students meeting target goal
Developing (3 - 8 points) Results are below District goals for similar students.	50-69% of students meeting target goal
Ineffective (0 - 2 points) Results are well-below District goals for similar students.	0-49% of students meeting target goal

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/5364/125683-TXEttx9bQW/South Lewis Teacher SLO 20 point scale.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.

Not applicable.

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, May 07, 2012

Updated Thursday, October 11, 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	New York State ELA 4 Assessment
5	6(ii) School wide measure computed locally	New York State ELA 8 Assessment
6	6(ii) School wide measure computed locally	New York State ELA 8 Assessment
7	6(ii) School wide measure computed locally	New York State ELA 8 Assessment
8	6(ii) School wide measure computed locally	New York State ELA 8 Assessment

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

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

Use this box, if needed, to describe the general process for assigning HEDI categories for these grades/subjects in this subcomponent. If needed, you may upload a table or graphic at 3.3, below.	We developed these HEDI Scales/scoring ranges for the ELA 4 and 8 based upon the historical student performance on these assessments in our school district buildings. HEDI scale points for the ELA 4 and 8 are based upon percentage of students scoring proficient (Level 3 or 4). There are different HEDI scales for each of our district buildings based upon historical student performance at each of these buildings (Port Leyden Elementary, Glenfield Elementary, and the South Lewis Middle School). See attached chart.
Highly Effective (14 - 15 points) Results are well above District- or BOCES-adopted expectations for growth or achievement for grade/subject.	Port Leyden Elementary: 52-100% (Level 3 or 4) Glenfield Elementary: 65-100% (Level 3 or 4) Middle School: 67-100% (Level 3 or 4)
Effective (8- 13 points) Results meet District- or BOCES-adopted expectations for growth or achievement for grade/subject.	Port Leyden Elementary: 26-51% (Level 3 or 4) Glenfield Elementary: 36-64% (Level 3 or 4) Middle School: 39-66% (Level 3 or 4)
Developing (3 - 7 points) Results are below District- or BOCES-adopted expectations for growth or achievement for grade/subject.	Port Leyden Elementary: 6-25% (Level 3 or 4) Glenfield Elementary: 13-35% (Level 3 or 4) Middle School: 11-38% (Level 3 or 4)
Ineffective (0 - 2 points) Results are well below District- or BOCES-adopted expectations for growth or achievement for grade/subject.	Port Leyden Elementary: 0-5% (Level 3 or 4) Glenfield Elementary: 0-12% (Level 3 or 4) Middle School: 0-10% (Level 3 or 4)

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	NYS ELA 4 Assessment
5	6(ii) School wide measure computed locally	NYS ELA 8 Assessment
6	6(ii) School wide measure computed locally	NYS ELA 8 Assessment
7	6(ii) School wide measure computed locally	NYS ELA 8 Assessment
8	6(ii) School wide measure computed locally	NYS ELA 8 Assessment

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

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

Use this box, if needed, to describe the general process for assigning HEDI categories for these grades/subjects in this subcomponent. If needed, you may upload a table or graphic at 3.3, below.	We developed these HEDI Scales/scoring ranges for the ELA 4 and 8 based upon the historical student performance on these assessments in our school district buildings. HEDI scale points for the ELA 4 and 8 are based upon percentage of students scoring proficient (Level 3 or 4). There are different HEDI scales for each of our district buildings based upon historical student performance at each of these buildings (Port Leyden Elementary, Glenfield Elementary, and the South Lewis Middle School). See attached chart.
Highly Effective (14 - 15 points) Results are well above District- or BOCES-adopted expectations for growth or achievement for grade/subject.	Port Leyden Elementary: 52-100% (Level 3 or 4) Glenfield Elementary: 65-100% (Level 3 or 4) Middle School: 67-100% (Level 3 or 4)
Effective (8- 13 points) Results meet District- or BOCES-adopted expectations for growth or achievement for grade/subject.	Port Leyden Elementary: 26-51% (Level 3 or 4) Glenfield Elementary: 36-64% (Level 3 or 4) Middle School: 39-66% (Level 3 or 4)
Developing (3 - 7 points) Results are below District- or BOCES-adopted expectations for growth or achievement for grade/subject.	Port Leyden Elementary: 6-25% (Level 3 or 4) Glenfield Elementary: 13-35% (Level 3 or 4) Middle School: 11-38% (Level 3 or 4)
Ineffective (0 - 2 points) Results are well below District- or BOCES-adopted expectations for growth or achievement for grade/subject.	Port Leyden Elementary: 0-5% (Level 3 or 4) Glenfield Elementary: 0-12% (Level 3 or 4) Middle School: 0-10% (Level 3 or 4)

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/5139/125685-rhJdBgDruP/SOUTH LEWIS PL.GF.MS Local 15 points.doc

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	NYS ELA 4 Assessment
1	6(ii) School-wide measure computed locally	NYS ELA 4 Assessment
2	6(ii) School-wide measure computed locally	NYS ELA 4 Assessment
3	6(ii) School-wide measure computed locally	NYS ELA 4 Assessment

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

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

Use this box, if needed, to describe the general process for assigning HEDI categories for these grades/subjects in this subcomponent. If needed, you may upload a table or graphic at 3.13, below.	We developed these HEDI Scales/scoring ranges for the ELA 4 based upon the historical student performance on this assessment in our school district buildings. HEDI scale points for the ELA 4 are based upon percentage of students scoring proficient (Level 3 or 4). There are different HEDI scales for each of our elementary buildings based upon historical student performance at each of these buildings (Port Leyden Elementary and Glenfield Elementary). See attached chart.
Highly Effective (18-20 points) Results are well above District- or BOCES-adopted expectations for growth or achievement for grade/subject.	Port Leyden Elementary: 52-100% (Level 3 or 4) Glenfield Elementary: 65-100% (Level 3 or 4)
Effective (9-17 points) Results meet District- or BOCES-adopted expectations for growth or achievement for grade/subject.	Port Leyden Elementary: 26-51% (Level 3 or 4) Glenfield Elementary: 36-64% (Level 3 or 4)
Developing (3 - 8 points) Results are below District- or BOCES-adopted expectations for growth or achievement for grade/subject.	Port Leyden Elementary: 6-25% (Level 3 or 4) Glenfield Elementary: 13-35% (Level 3 or 4)
Ineffective (0 - 2 points) Results are well below District- or BOCES-adopted expectations for growth or achievement for grade/subject.	Port Leyden Elementary: 0-5% (Level 3 or 4) Glenfield Elementary: 0-12% (Level 3 or 4)

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	NYS ELA 4 Assessment
1	6(ii) School-wide measure computed locally	NYS ELA 4 Assessment
2	6(ii) School-wide measure computed locally	NYS ELA 4 Assessment
3	6(ii) School-wide measure computed locally	NYS ELA 4 Assessment

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.	We developed these HEDI Scales/scoring ranges for the ELA 4 based upon the historical student performance on this assessment in our school district buildings. HEDI scale points for the ELA 4 are based upon percentage of students scoring proficient (Level 3 or 4). There are different HEDI scales for each of our elementary buildings based upon historical student performance at each of these buildings (Port Leyden Elementary and Glenfield Elementary). See attached chart.
Highly Effective (18-20 points) Results are well above District- or BOCES-adopted expectations for growth or achievement for grade/subject.	Port Leyden Elementary: 52-100% (Level 3 or 4) Glenfield Elementary: 65-100% (Level 3 or 4)

Effective (9-17 points) Results meet District- or BOCES-adopted expectations for growth or achievement for grade/subject.	Port Leyden Elementary: 26-51% (Level 3 or 4) Glenfield Elementary: 36-64% (Level 3 or 4)
Developing (3 - 8 points) Results are below District -or BOCES-adopted expectations for growth or achievement for grade/subject.	Port Leyden Elementary: 6-25% (Level 3 or 4) Glenfield Elementary: 13-35% (Level 3 or 4)
Ineffective (0 - 2 points) Results are well below District- or BOCES-adopted expectations for growth or achievement for grade/subject.	Port Leyden Elementary: 0-5% (Level 3 or 4) Glenfield Elementary: 0-12% (Level 3 or 4)

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	NYS ELA 8 Assessment
7	6(ii) School wide measure computed locally	NYS ELA 8 Assessment
8	6(ii) School wide measure computed locally	NYS ELA 8 Assessment

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

Use this box, if needed, to describe the general process for assigning HEDI categories for these grades/subjects in this subcomponent. If needed, you may upload a table or graphic at 3.13, below.	We developed this HEDI Scale/scoring range for the ELA 8 based upon the historical student performance on this assessment in our Middle School building. HEDI scale points for the ELA 8 is based upon percentage of students scoring proficient (Level 3 or 4). This HEDI scale is based upon historical student performance at the Middle School building. See attached chart.
Highly Effective (18 - 20 points) Results are well above District- or BOCES-adopted expectations for growth or achievement for grade/subject.	Middle School: 67-100% (Level 3 or 4)
Effective (9 - 17 points) Results meet District- or BOCES-adopted expectations for growth or achievement for grade/subject.	Middle School: 39-66% (Level 3 or 4)
Developing (3 - 8 points) Results are below District- or BOCES-adopted expectations for growth or achievement for grade/subject.	Middle School: 11-38% (Level 3 or 4)
Ineffective (0 - 2 points) Results are well below District- or BOCES-adopted expectations for growth or achievement for grade/subject.	Middle School: 0-10% (Level 3 or 4)

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	NYS ELA 8 Assessment

7	6(ii) School wide measure computed locally	NYS ELA 8 Assessment
8	6(ii) School wide measure computed locally	NYS ELA 8 Assessment

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

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

Use this box, if needed, to describe the general process for assigning HEDI categories for these grades/subjects in this subcomponent. If needed, you may upload a table or graphic at 3.13, below.	We developed this HEDI Scale/scoring range for the ELA 8 based upon the historical student performance on this assessment in our Middle School building. HEDI scale points for the ELA 8 is based upon percentage of students scoring proficient (Level 3 or 4). This HEDI scale is based upon historical student performance at the Middle School building. See attached chart.
Highly Effective (18 - 20 points) Results are well above District- or BOCES-adopted expectations for growth or achievement for grade/subject.	Middle School: 67-100% (Level 3 or 4)
Effective (9 - 17 points) Results meet District- or BOCES-adopted expectations for growth or achievement for grade/subject.	Middle School: 39-66% (Level 3 or 4)
Developing (3 - 8 points) Results are below District- or BOCES-adopted expectations for growth or achievement for grade/subject.	Middle School: 11-38% (Level 3 or 4)
Ineffective (0 - 2 points) Results are well below District- or BOCES-adopted expectations for growth or achievement for grade/subject.	Middle School: 0-10% (Level 3 or 4)

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	Comprehensive English Regents
Global 2	6(ii) School wide measure computed locally	Comprehensive English Regents
American History	6(ii) School wide measure computed locally	Comprehensive English Regents

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.	We developed this HEDI Scale/scoring range for the Comprehensive English Regents based upon the historical student performance on this assessment in our High School building. HEDI scale points for the Comprehensive English Regents is based upon percentage of students receiving a scale score of 65 or higher. See attached chart.
Highly Effective (18 - 20 points) Results are well above District- or BOCES-adopted expectations for growth or achievement for grade/subject.	High School: 96-100% (Scale Score of 65 or higher)
Effective (9 - 17 points) Results meet District- or BOCES-adopted expectations for growth or achievement for grade/subject.	High School: 65-95% (Scale Score of 65 or higher)
Developing (3 - 8 points) Results are below District- or BOCES-adopted expectations for growth or achievement for grade/subject.	High School: 37-64% (Scale Score of 65 or higher)
Ineffective (0 - 2 points) Results are well below District- or BOCES-adopted expectations for growth or achievement for grade/subject.	High School: 0-36% (Scale Score of 65 or higher)

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	Comprehensive English Regents
Earth Science	6(ii) School wide measure computed locally	Comprehensive English Regents
Chemistry	6(ii) School wide measure computed locally	Comprehensive English Regents
Physics	6(ii) School wide measure computed locally	Comprehensive English Regents

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.	We developed this HEDI Scale/scoring range for the Comprehensive English Regents based upon the historical student performance on this assessment in our High School building. HEDI scale points for the Comprehensive English Regents is based upon percentage of students receiving a scale score of 65 or higher. See attached chart.
---	--

Highly Effective (18-20 points) Results are well above District- or BOCES-adopted expectations for growth or achievement for grade/subject.	High School: 96-100% (Scale Score of 65 or higher)
Developing (3 - 8 points) Results are below District- or BOCES-adopted expectations for growth or achievement for grade/subject.	High School: 65-95% (Scale Score of 65 or higher)
Effective (9 - 17points) Results meet District- or BOCES-adopted expectations for growth or achievement for grade/subject.	High School: 37-64% (Scale Score of 65 or higher)
Ineffective (0 - 2 points) Results are well below District- or BOCES-adopted expectations for growth or achievement for grade/subject.	High School: 0-36% (Scale Score of 65 or higher)

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	Comprehensive English Regents
Geometry	6(ii) School wide measure computed locally	Comprehensive English Regents
Algebra 2	6(ii) School wide measure computed locally	Comprehensive English Regents

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.	We developed this HEDI Scale/scoring range for the Comprehensive English Regents based upon the historical student performance on this assessment in our High School building. HEDI scale points for the Comprehensive English Regents is based upon percentage of students receiving a scale score of 65 or higher. See attached chart.
Highly Effective (18 - 20 points) Results are well above District- or BOCES-adopted expectations for growth or achievement for grade/subject.	High School: 96-100% (Scale Score of 65 or higher)
Effective (9 - 17 points) Results meet District- or BOCES-adopted expectations for growth or achievement for grade/subject.	High School: 65-95% (Scale Score of 65 or higher)
Developing (3 - 8 points) Results are below District- or BOCES-adopted expectations for growth or achievement for grade/subject.	High School: 37-64% (Scale Score of 65 or higher)

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

High School: 0-36% (Scale Score of 65 or higher)

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	Comprehensive English Regents
Grade 10 ELA	6(ii) School wide measure computed locally	Comprehensive English Regents
Grade 11 ELA	6(ii) School wide measure computed locally	Comprehensive English Regents

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

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

Use this box, if needed, to describe the general process for assigning HEDI categories for these grades/subjects in this subcomponent. If needed, you may upload a table or graphic at 3.13, below.	We developed this HEDI Scale/scoring range for the Comprehensive English Regents based upon the historical student performance on this assessment in our High School building. HEDI scale points for the Comprehensive English Regents is based upon percentage of students receiving a scale score of 65 or higher. See attached chart.
Highly Effective (18 - 20 points) Results are well above District- or BOCES-adopted expectations for growth or achievement for grade/subject.	High School: 96-100% (Scale Score of 65 or higher)
Effective (9 - 17 points) Results meet District- or BOCES-adopted expectations for growth or achievement for grade/subject.	High School: 65-95% (Scale Score of 65 or higher)
Developing (3 - 8 points) Results are below District- or BOCES-adopted expectations for growth or achievement for grade/subject.	High School: 37-64% (Scale Score of 65 or higher)
Ineffective (0 - 2 points) Results are well below District- or BOCES-adopted expectations for growth or achievement for grade/subject.	High School: 0-36% (Scale Score of 65 or higher)

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.

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/5139/125685-y92vNseFa4/South Lewis Local Measure PL.GF.MS.HS 20 points.doc

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.

Not applicable.

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.

In the case of teachers who have multiple measures, each measure must be weighted proportionately based on the number of students included in locally selected measures.

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, May 07, 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.)

NYSUT Teacher Practice Rubric

(No response)

4.2) Points Within Other Measures

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

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

Is the following points assignment applicable to all teachers?

Yes

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

(No response)

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

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

(No response)

4.3) Survey Tools (if applicable)

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

(No response)

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

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

4.4) Assurances

Please check all of the boxes below:

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

4.5) Process for Assigning Points and Determining HEDI Ratings

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

Each year teachers will be rated on all of the seven teaching standards using the 2011 NYSUT Rubric. Each of the teaching standards has several elements that will be rated/scored. Each of the observed/evaluated elements will be provided a rubric score of 1 to 4. Each rated element within a teaching standard will then be added and averaged to obtain an average rubric score for that teaching standard. This will be done for each of the seven teaching standards. Each of the average scores for the seven teaching standards will then be added and averaged to provide an overall 2011 NYSUT Rubric score to be used to determine the overall measure of effectiveness. This overall average of the equally weighted seven teaching standards will then be applied to our attached chart/scale (South Lewis 60 point rubric scale) to assign the number of points earned from the rubric.

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

assets/survey-uploads/5091/125686-eka9yMJ855/South Lewis 60 point rubric scale.doc

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

Highly Effective: Overall performance and results exceed NYS Teaching Standards.	A total rubric score of 57-60 points which would exceed district expectations.
Effective: Overall performance and results meet NYS Teaching Standards.	A total rubric score of 52-56 points which would meet district expectations.
Developing: Overall performance and results need improvement in order to meet NYS Teaching Standards.	A total rubric score of 34-51 points which would identify needing improvement in order to meet district expectations.
Ineffective: Overall performance and results do not meet NYS Teaching Standards.	A total rubric score of 0-33 point which would not meet district expectations.

Provide the ranges for the 60-point scoring bands.

Highly Effective	57-60
Effective	52-56
Developing	34-51
Ineffective	0-33

4.6) Observations of Probationary Teachers

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

By building principals or other trained administrators

4.6) Observations of Probationary Teachers Formal/Long	2
4.6) Observations of Probationary Teachers Informal/Short	2
4.6) Observations of Probationary Teachers Enter Total	4

By trained in-school peer teachers or other trained reviewers

Formal/Long	0
Informal/Short	0

Independent evaluators

Formal/Long	0
-------------	---

Informal/Short	0
----------------	---

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

-
- In Person
-

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

-
- In Person
-

4.7) Observations of Tenured Teachers

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

By building principals or other trained administrators

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

By trained in-school peer teachers or other trained reviewers

Formal/Long	0
Informal/Short	0

Independent evaluators

Formal/Long	0
Informal/Short	0

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

-
- In Person
-

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

-
- In Person
-

5. Composite Scoring (Teachers)

Created Monday, May 07, 2012

Updated Friday, September 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 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	57-60
Effective	52-56
Developing	34-51
Ineffective	0-33

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, May 07, 2012

Updated Monday, November 26, 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/5265/125688-Df0w3Xx5v6/Teacher Improvement Plan FINAL 9.20.12.doc

6.3) Appeals Process

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

(1) the substance of the annual professional performance review

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

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

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

Described below is the South Lewis Central Schools Teacher Appeals Process which outlines the procedure for ensuring that appeals of APPR evaluations will be handled in a timely and expeditious way.

APPEALS OF INEFFECTIVE AND DEVELOPING RATINGS

This appeals procedure will apply to teachers who have received a cumulative composite score that places them in the Ineffective or Developing categories. This procedure will apply to probationary or tenured teachers.

WHAT RATINGS MAY BE CHALLENGED IN AN APPEAL

The Appeal Process serves to allow a teacher (or the Association on behalf of the teacher) who has received a cumulative composite score that places them in the Ineffective or Developing categories, to refute the rating and present evidence that would allow them to increase their cumulative composite score through a mutually agreed upon process. The Appeal process shall be the exclusive means of challenging a teacher's APPR composite score or improvement plan.

WHAT ISSUES MAY BE APPEALED

Pursuant to §3012-c of New York Education Law, the locally negotiated appeal procedure described herein shall be the sole and exclusive means for a qualifying teacher to challenge an APPR evaluation, with the exception of the permissible CBA grievance described herein (District failing to adhere to the requirements of the Appeals Process or the TIP Plan).

The basis for challenging an APPR evaluation includes:

- (1) a challenge to the substance of the teacher's annual professional performance review;*
- (2) failure by the school district to adhere to the standards and methodologies required for such reviews, pursuant to Education Law §3012-c;*
- (3) failure by the school district to adhere to the Commissioner's regulations, as applicable to such reviews;*
- (4) failure by the school district to comply with any applicable locally negotiated procedures applicable to annual professional performance reviews or improvement plans; and*
- (5) failure of the school district's issuance and/or implementation of the terms of the teacher improvement plan in connection with an ineffective or developing rating in compliance with Education Law §3012-c and locally negotiated procedures.*

Nothing in this agreement shall be construed to authorize a teacher to trigger the appeal process prior to receipt of their composite effectiveness score and rating from the district.

PROHIBITION AGAINST MORE THAN ONE APPEAL

A teacher may not file multiple appeals regarding the same performance review or teacher improvement plan. All grounds for appeal must be raised with specificity within one appeal. Any grounds not raised at the time the appeal is filed shall be deemed null and void. However, it should be noted that one appeal might well include, within it, several points that the teacher feels need addressing (discrepancies). Each discrepancy will be dealt with as a separate issue. Therefore, the appeal will be deliberated on an "issue by issue" basis, not solely as an "accept or reject" decision of the entire appeal.

TIMEFRAME FOR FILING APPEAL

All appeals regarding an annual professional performance review must be submitted to the evaluator, who issued the performance review, in writing no later than 15 calendar days from the date when the teacher acknowledges receipt of his/her annual professional performance review rating OR 15 calendar days from the issuance of the Teacher Improvement Plan. "Receipt of the Annual Professional Performance Review" will be defined as the date and time of a physical signature, either directly upon receipt from the administrator OR the physical signature provided via certified return receipt mail. The failure to file an appeal within these timeframes shall be deemed a waiver of the right to appeal and the appeal shall be deemed abandoned.

In the event that an Annual Professional Performance Review must be mailed to a teacher's home after summer break has begun it will be delivered by certified mail to the teacher's home address. The failure to file an appeal within these timeframes shall be deemed a waiver of the right to appeal and the appeal shall be deemed abandoned unless extended by mutual agreement. Any mutually agreed to time extension must still adhere to the requirements under 3012-c so that the appeal will be addressed in a timely and expeditious manner. In the instance that this method of delivery becomes necessary, the 15 calendar days will begin on the date that the teacher provided a signature acknowledging receipt of the mailing. It is mutually understood that if the Annual Professional Performance Review is delivered electronically (via e-mail or fax) that the document is considered received only after a physical signature is obtained from the teacher.

When filing an appeal, the teacher must submit identical copies of the following to the Superintendent, the SLTA President, and the evaluator (three identical copies for distribution):

- (1) a detailed written description of the specific area(s) of his/her performance review which may include the terms of his/her teacher*

- improvement plan that is being challenged (in the narrative of the Appendix 2: Evaluation Appeal Cover Sheet); and
- (2) any additional documents or materials relevant to the appeal; and
 - (3) a complete copy of the performance review and/or the teacher improvement plan being challenged.
 - (4) a completed "Evaluation Appeal Cover Sheet". (See Appendix 2)

Any information not submitted at the time the appeal is filed shall not be considered. Teachers must use the "Evaluation Appeal Cover Sheet" to explain the basis for their appeal. All supporting documentation and narratives shall be attached to the Evaluation Appeal Cover Sheet and delivered as a whole to the Appeal Panel Team. Documentation will only be considered if it is delivered and attached to the Evaluation Appeal Cover Sheet. Any information not submitted at the time the appeal is filed shall not be considered. The Appeal Panel Team may request further documentation from either the teacher or the administrator who initially performed the evaluation.

TIMEFRAME FOR EVALUATOR RESPONSE

Within 15 calendar days of receipt of an appeal, the evaluator who issued the performance review may submit a detailed written response to the appeal.

The evaluator's response may include:

- (1) a detailed written response to the appeal addressing the specific areas to be challenged; and
- (2) any and all additional documents and written materials specific to the point(s) being challenged that support the evaluator's response and are relevant to the resolution of the appeal; and
- (3) any modifications the evaluator sees fit to the Annual Professional Performance Review;

The teacher initiating the appeal, the Superintendent, and the SLTA President shall receive a copy of the response filed by the evaluator, and any and all additional information submitted with the response should the evaluator choose to respond.

TIMEFRAME FOR APPEAL PANEL TEAM DECISION

Once a teacher submits an appeal or an evaluator responds (or the 15 day window expires), the Superintendent and the SLTA president will select and convene a four-person panel (hereafter referred to as the Appeal Panel Team) as described herein. The role of the Appeal Panel Team will be to evaluate facts and evidence submitted by the teacher or principal and to render a decision on any and all appeals.

The parties agree to convene a four-person panel (Appeal Panel Team) within fifteen (15) days of notice from the SLTA President and Superintendent to further consider and discuss the appeal and render a decision regarding the validity of the appeal. This panel will consist of:

- (1) two (2) third-party panel members chosen mutually by the Association. These two members will include two (2) teachers from within the SLTA who have been trained in Evaluation using the NYSUT T.E.D. Rubric Model; and
- (2) two (2) administrative evaluators who did not initially perform the Annual Professional Performance Review under appeal, who have been trained in Evaluation using the NYSUT T.E.D. Rubric Model.

Note: It is understood that the Superintendent and the SLTA president may appoint themselves to sit on the Appeal Panel Team.

The presence of the appellant and the evaluator(s) is requested on the day of the Appeal Panel Team meeting. If the teacher making the appeal chooses not to be present, the appeal moves directly to the deliberation of the panel without input from the teacher. Neither the appellant nor the original evaluator will be allowed to remain with the Appeal Panel Team during deliberation.

The appeal shall be based on the written record, submitted to the Appeal Panel Team, comprised of the teacher or principal's appeal papers and any documentary evidence accompanying the appeal, as well as the school district's response to the appeal and additional documentary evidence submitted with such papers to the Appeal Panel Team.

The members of the Appeal Panel Team agree to work in confidentiality and shall not divulge the nature of the appeal, the appealing party, or the findings of the team to anyone other than the Superintendent, the SLTA president, the teacher filing the appeal, and the original evaluator. However, as previously stipulated, it should be noted that one appeal might well include, within it, several points that the teacher feels need addressing (discrepancies). Each discrepancy listed in the appeal will be dealt with as a separate issue. Therefore, the appeal will be deliberated on an "issue by issue" basis, not solely as an "accept or reject" decision of the entire appeal. Should the Appeal Panel Team not be able to reach a consensus on a particular issue, that issue shall be deemed abandoned unless extended by mutual agreement for extenuating circumstances.

DECISION OF APPEAL PANEL TEAM

Identical copies of the final decision of the Appeal Panel Team will be distributed to the Superintendent, the SLTA President, the appellant, and the administrator that wrote the evaluation no later than 15 calendar days after the Appeal Panel Team convenes. This decision will be reduced to writing by a member of the Appeal Panel Team and appropriately distributed as above. Any revisions to, or adjustments of, the cumulative composite score will be immediately reported to the Superintendent who will orchestrate the necessary reporting changes to the New York State Education Department and other required entities. Any appealed copies of the evaluation will be removed from the teacher's personnel file, destroyed, and replaced with the newly revised copy which will in no way be marked as a revised or appealed copy.

EXCLUSIVITY OF APPEAL PROCEDURE

As such, the above appeal procedure shall constitute the exclusive means for initiating, reviewing and resolving any and all challenges and appeals related to a teacher's performance review and/or improvement plan. However, the parties agree that should the District fail to adhere to the requirements of the Appeals Process as described above, the Association may file a grievance pursuant to the parties' collective bargaining agreement (Article VII) challenging the District's failure to abide by the agreed to Appeals process.

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.

Administrative staff assigned the responsibility of conducting annual professional performance reviews will receive in-service training each year to address the quality of supervision. This training is provided through a number of sources including, but not limited to, the school attorney, BOCES, in-house training, and conferences. The in-service training varies year to year and will include training in the use of the APPR evaluation process and documents. Initial training of all evaluators will include training and certification in the use of NYSUT's Teacher Evaluation Rubric and use of the T.E.D. Workbook and Handbook.

Ultimately, each evaluator will be trained in and adhere to the "Required Elements of 30-2.9 for Lead Evaluator Certification". These include:

- (1) NYS Teaching Standards and the ISLLC 2008 Leadership Standards
- (2) Evidence-based observation techniques
- (3) Application and use of the student growth and value-added growth model
- (4) Application and use of State-approved teacher/principal rubrics**
- (5) Application and use of any assessment tools you intend to use (e.g., portfolios, surveys, goals)
- (6) Application and use of any State-approved locally developed measures of student achievement you intend to use
- (7) Use of the Statewide Instructional Reporting System
- (8) The scoring methodology used by the department and/or your district
- (9) Specific considerations in evaluating teachers and principals of English language.

(**For the South Lewis Central School District Annual Professional Performance Review it is assured that the NYSUT Teacher Evaluation Rubric is the primary focus of each evaluators satisfaction of this required element.)

The District will work to provide proper training to insure that lead evaluators maintain inter-rater reliability over time and that they are re-certified on an annual basis.

6.5) Assurances -- Evaluators

Please check the boxes below:

-
- Checked
-

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

their related functions, as applicable

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

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

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

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

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

(7) use of the Statewide Instructional Reporting System

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

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

-
- Checked
-

6.6) Assurances -- Teachers

Please check all of the boxes below:

6.6) Assurances -- Teachers Assure the entire APPR plan will be completed for each teacher as soon as practicable, but in no case later than September 1 of the school year next following the 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, May 07, 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):

PK-4
5-8
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
Port Leyden Elementary (PK-4)	State assessment	NYS ELA Assessments for Grades 3 and 4
Port Leyden Elementary (PK-4)	State assessment	NYS Math Assessments for Grades 3 and 4
Glenfield Elementary (PK-4)	State assessment	NYS ELA Assessments for Grades 3 and 4
Glenfield Elementary (PK-4)	State assessment	NYS Math Assessments for Grades 3 and 4

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

Use this box, if needed, to describe the process for assigning HEDI categories in this subcomponent. If needed, you may upload a table or graphic below.

The PK-4 Elementary Building Principals will develop SLO's using available background and baseline data for the NYS ELA and Math Assessments in Grade 3. Appropriate and rigorous targets for each student will be set for each Grade 3 SLO. After the specified assessments are administered and scored, the percentage of students who met the differentiated targets (based on each Grade 3 SLO) will be determined. After this percentage is determined, the chart attached will be utilized to determine the appropriate number of points for each Grade 3 SLO. The points for each Grade 3 SLO (ELA and Math) will then be weighted proportionately to arrive at the comparable growth measures scores and HEDI ratings (See attached chart/scale). This Grade 3 ELA and Math SLO HEDI Score will then be combined with the Grade 4 ELA and Math Growth Scores provided by New York State. The Grade 3 SLO Score and the Grade 4 Growth Score will then be combined and averaged proportionately by the number of students in each grade-level to determine the overall rubric score for the PK-4 Elementary Principal based upon the attached

	chart/scale.
Highly Effective (18 - 20 points) Results are well above state average for similar students (or District goals if no state test).	85-100% of students meeting target goal
Effective (9 - 17 points) Results meet state average for similar students (or District goals if no state test).	70-84% of students meeting target goal
Developing (3 - 8 points) Results are below state average for similar students (or District goals if no state test).	50-69% of students meeting target goal
Ineffective (0 - 2 points) Results are well below state average for similar students (or District goals if no state test).	0-49% of students meeting target goal

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/5365/125689-lha0DogRNw/South Lewis SLO Principal 20 Point Scale.doc

7.4) Special Considerations for Comparable Growth Measures

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

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

No special adjustments or controls

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	Checked

rights laws.	
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, May 07, 2012

Updated Thursday, November 29, 2012

Page 1

Locally-Selected Measures of Student Achievement or Growth

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

Grade Configuration	Locally-Selected Measure from List of Approved Measures	Assessment
5-8	(d) measures used by district for teacher evaluation	NYS ELA 8 Assessment
9-12	(g) % achieving specific level on Regents or alternatives	NYS English 11 Regents Assessment

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

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

Use this box, if needed, to describe the process for assigning HEDI categories. If needed, you may upload a table or graphic below.	We developed these HEDI Scales/scoring ranges for the ELA 8 and English 11 Regents based upon historical student performance on these assessments in our school district. HEDI scale points for the ELA 8 are based upon percentage of students scoring proficient (Level 3 or 4). HEDI scale points for the English 11 Regents are based upon percentage of students passing (scoring 65 or higher). See the attached chart.
Highly Effective (14 - 15 points) Results are well above District- or BOCES-adopted expectations for growth or achievement for grade/subject.	Middle School ELA 8: 67-100% Proficient (Level 3 or 4) High School English 11 Regents: 96-100% Proficient (Scoring 65 or higher)
Effective (8- 13 points) Results meet District- or BOCES-adopted expectations for growth or achievement for grade/subject.	Middle School ELA 8: 39-66% Proficient (Level 3 or 4) High School English 11 Regents: 70-95% Proficient (Scoring 65 or higher)
Developing (3 - 7 points) Results are below District- or BOCES-adopted expectations for growth or achievement for grade/subject.	Middle School ELA 8: 11-38% Proficient (Level 3 or 4) High School English 11 Regents: 37-69% Proficient (Scoring 65 or higher)

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

Middle School ELA 8: 0-10% Proficient (Level 3 or 4)
High School English 11 Regents: 0-36% Proficient (Scoring 65 or higher)

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/5366/125690-qBFVOWF7fC/South Lewis 5-12 Principal Local 15 Point Scale.doc

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
PK-4	(d) measures used by district for teacher evaluation	NYS ELA 4 Assessment

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

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

Use this box, if needed, to describe the process for assigning HEDI categories. If needed, you may upload a table or graphic below.	We developed these HEDI Scales/scoring ranges for the ELA 4 at Port Leyden and Glenfield Elementary based upon historical student performance on these assessments. HEDI scale points for the ELA 4 are based upon percentage of students scoring proficient (Level 3 or 4). The Port Leyden and Glenfield HEDI scales are different because the historical performance of students scoring proficient at each of these buildings has been different. See the attached chart.
Highly Effective (18 - 20 points) Results are well above District- or BOCES-adopted expectations for growth or achievement for grade/subject.	Port Leyden ELA 4: 52-100% Proficient (Level 3 or 4) Glenfield ELA 4: 65-100% Proficient (Level 3 or 4)
Effective (9- 17 points) Results meet District- or BOCES-adopted expectations for growth or achievement for grade/subject.	Port Leyden ELA 4: 26-51% Proficient (Level 3 or 4) Glenfield ELA 4: 36-64% Proficient (Level 3 or 4)
Developing (3 - 8 points) Results are below District- or BOCES-adopted expectations for growth or achievement for grade/subject.	Port Leyden ELA 4: 6-25% Proficient (Level 3 or 4) Glenfield ELA 4: 13-35% Proficient (Level 3 or 4)
Ineffective (0 - 2 points) Results are well below District- or BOCES-adopted expectations for growth or achievement for grade/subject.	Port Leyden ELA 4: 0-5% Proficient (Level 3 or 4) Glenfield ELA 4: 0-12% Proficient (Level 3 or 4)

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/5366/125690-T8MIGWUVm1/South Lewis PK-4 Principal Local 20 Point Scale.doc

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.

We did not use any adjustments, controls, or other special considerations.

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.

We do not have multiple locally selected measures.

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, May 07, 2012

Updated Tuesday, November 27, 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.

Each year principals will be rated on all of the six domains of the Multidimensional Principal Practice Rubric covering the ISLLC Standards. Each of these six domains has several elements that will be rated/scored. Each of the observed/evaluated elements will be provided a rubric score of 1 to 4. Each rated element within a domain will then be added and averaged to obtain an average rubric score for that domain. This will be done for each of the six domains. Each of the average scores for the six domains will then be added and averaged to provide an overall Multidimensional Principal Practice Rubric score to be used to determine the overall measure of effectiveness. This overall average of the equally weighted six domains will then be applied to our attached chart/scale (South Lewis Principal 60 point rubric scale) to assign the number of points earned from the rubric.

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

assets/survey-uploads/5143/125691-pMADJ4gk6R/South Lewis Principal 60 point rubric scale.doc

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

Highly Effective: Overall performance and results exceed standards.	A total rubric score of 57-60 points
Effective: Overall performance and results meet standards.	A total rubric score of 52-56 points
Developing: Overall performance and results need improvement in order to meet standards.	A total rubric score of 34-51 points
Ineffective: Overall performance and results do not meet standards.	A total rubric score of 0-33 points

Please provide the locally-negotiated 60 point scoring bands.

Highly Effective	57-60
Effective	52-56
Developing	34-51

9.8) School Visits

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

Probationary Principals

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

Tenured Principals

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

10. Composite Scoring (Principals)

Created Monday, May 07, 2012

Updated Wednesday, September 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 growth or achievement for grade/subject.

Overall performance and results exceed ISLLC leadership standards.

Effective

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

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

Overall performance and results meet ISLLC leadership standards.

Developing

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

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

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

Ineffective

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

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

Overall performance and results do not meet ISLLC leadership standards.

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

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

2012-13 where there is no Value-Added measure

Growth or Comparable Measures

Locally-selected Measures of

growth or achievement

Other Measures of Effectiveness

(60 points)

Overall

Composite Score

Highly Effective

18-20

18-20

Ranges determined locally--see below

91-100

Effective

9-17

9-17

75-90

Developing

3-8

3-8

65-74

Ineffective

0-2

0-2

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

Highly Effective	57-60
Effective	52-56
Developing	34-51
Ineffective	0-33

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, May 07, 2012

Updated Monday, November 26, 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/5276/125693-Df0w3Xx5v6/Principal Improvement Plan 2.doc

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:

Described below is the South Lewis Central Schools Principal Appeals Process which outlines the procedure for ensuring that appeals of APPR evaluations will be handled in a timely and expeditious way.

I. RATINGS THAT MAY BE APPEALED

A. A probationary or tenured principal may only appeal an Annual Professional Performance Review (“APPR”) rating of Ineffective or Developing.

II. GROUNDS FOR APPEAL

The scope of an APPR rating appeal is limited to the following:

- The District’s adherence to the standards and methodologies required for such reviews, pursuant to Education Law Section 3012-c;*
- The adherence to the Commissioner’s Regulations, as applicable to such reviews;*
and
- The District’s issuance and/or implementation of the terms of a principal improvement plan (“PIP”) under Education Law Section 3012-c.*

III. PROHIBITION AGAINST MULTIPLE APPEALS

A principal may not file multiple appeals regarding the same APPR rating or PIP. All grounds for appeal must be raised with specificity within the one appeal permitted for the APPR or PIP, as applicable. Any grounds not raised at the time the appeal is filed shall be deemed waived and cannot be pursued.

IV. BURDEN OF PROOF

In an appeal, the principal has the burden of demonstrating a clear legal right to the relief requested and the burden of establishing the facts upon which the principal seeks relief.

V. FILING AN APPEAL

A. All appeals must be submitted in writing no later than five (5) calendar days after the date on which the principal receives his/her APPR rating. If the principal is challenging the issuance of a PIP, the appeal must be filed no later than five (5) calendar days of the issuance of the PIP. The appeal and supporting information must be filed with the District staff member who either (i) issued the APPR rating; or (ii) who is responsible for either the issuance or implementation of the terms of the principal’s PIP, and the Superintendent of Schools.

B. The failure to file an appeal within the time frames specified in paragraph A, above, shall constitute a waiver of the right to be appealed, and the appeal shall be dismissed with prejudice.

C. When filing an appeal, the principal must submit a detailed written description of the specific areas of disagreement over the APPR rating being challenged, or the issuance/implementation of the terms of the PIP. Any documentation, materials or evidence in support of the challenge must be submitted with the appeal.

D. Any information not submitted by the principal at the time the appeal is filed will not be considered.

VI. DISTRICT’S RESPONSE TO AN APPEAL

A. Within fifteen (15) calendar days of receipt of an appeal, the District staff member who either (i) issued the APPR rating; or (ii) who is responsible for either the issuance or implementation of the terms of the PIP, must file a detailed written response to the appeal with the Superintendent of Schools. The response must include any and all documents or written materials specific to the point or points of disagreement that support the District’s response and are relevant to the resolution of the appeal.

B. Any information that is not submitted at the time the response is filed shall not be considered in any deliberations related to the resolution of the appeal.

C. The principal initiating the appeal shall receive a copy of the response filed by the District, as well as any and all additional information submitted with the response, at the same time the District files its response with the Superintendent of Schools. If the principal is unavailable to personally receive the District’s response at the time it is filed with the Superintendent of Schools, delivery of a copy of the District’s response to the principal may be accomplished by either (i) placing the District’s Response in a sealed envelope marked “confidential” at the location designated for the principal to receive mail at the District; (2) e-mail of a copy of the District’s Response to the principal at the principal’s District e-mail address; or (3) mailing of the District’s Response to the principal’s last home address on file with the District on the same day the decision is filed with the Superintendent of Schools.

VII. REVIEW OF APPEAL

A. For each APPR appeal filed under this appeals process, a panel shall be established that acts as the final authority on that appeal (the "Panel"). The Panel shall consist of:

1. A Superintendent from one of the Jefferson-Lewis-Hamilton-Herkimer-Oneida BOCES (the "BOCES") component School Districts, selected by the Superintendent of Schools;

2. An administrator from either the BOCES or one of the BOCES component School Districts, selected by the appealing principal;

3. A third individual, also an employee of either the BOCES or one of the BOCES component School Districts, selected by the first two Panel members.

B. The Superintendent of Schools and the appealing principal shall each designate their respective Panel member selections within five (5) calendar days of the Superintendent of Schools' receipt of the appeal. The Superintendent of Schools shall give notice of his/her designation in writing to the appealing principal, and the appealing principal shall give notice of his/her designation in writing to the Superintendent of Schools. Each designation shall include the name, title, and employer of the selected individual. The designation shall include written verification that the selected individual has agreed to act as a Panel member. The written notification and verification required by this paragraph may be accomplished by electronic mail ("e-mail").

C. Within five (5) calendar days of designation as Panel members, the two selected individuals shall designate the third Panel member and notify the Superintendent of Schools and the principal in writing of the name, title, and employer of the third Panel member. The designation shall include written verification that the selected individual has agreed to act as a Panel member. The written notification and verification required by this paragraph may be accomplished by electronic mail ("e-mail").

D. The Panel shall coordinate with the Superintendent of Schools to ensure that each Panel member receives a copy of the appeal and a copy of the District's response to the appeal.

E. Within five (5) calendar days of designation of the third Panel member, the entire Panel shall meet to review the appeal and the District's response to the appeal. The Panel will not receive or take testimony and shall review the merits of the appeal solely based on the written record. Notwithstanding the foregoing, in the event that the Panel determines that the appeal should be dismissed in accordance with Article III or Article V - paragraph B, no meeting shall be necessary and the Panel may render its decision without having held a meeting to review the written evidence. In the event this occurs, the filing and notification required under paragraph F, below, shall occur on or before the date on which the Panel was to meet to review the appeal.

F. The Panel shall file a written decision on the appeal within fifteen (15) calendar days of the meeting referenced in paragraph E, above. The decision shall be filed with the Superintendent of Schools and a copy provided to both the appealing principal and the evaluator/person responsible for either issuing or implementing the terms of a PIP, contemporaneously with the filing of the written decision with the Superintendent of Schools. The decision shall be based on the written record, comprised of the principal's appeal papers and supporting information, as well as the response required under Section VI, above. This decision shall be final and binding. If the principal is unavailable to personally receive the decision at the time it is filed with the Superintendent of Schools, delivery of a copy of the decision to the principal may be accomplished by either (i) placing the decision in a sealed envelope marked "confidential" at the location designated for the principal to receive mail at the District; (2) e-mail of a copy of the decision to the principal at the principal's District e-mail address; or (3) mailing of the decision to the principal's last home address on file with the District on the same day the decision is filed with the Superintendent of Schools.

G. The decision shall set forth the reasons and factual basis for each determination on each of the specific issues raised in the principal's appeal. If the appeal is sustained, the Panel may (i) set aside a rating if it has been affected by substantial error or defect; (ii) modify a rating if it has been affected by substantial error or defect; or (iii) order a new evaluation if procedures have been violated.

H. The original decision, original appeal (and supporting information), and original response required under Article VI (and supporting information), shall be placed in the principal's personnel file.

I. The time frames specified in this Article may be extended by mutual consent of all parties. The consent must be in writing. Any mutually agreed to time extension must still adhere to the requirements under 3012-c so that the appeal will be addressed in a timely and expeditious manner. For purposes of this paragraph, the written consent may be accomplished by electronic mail ("e-mail")

VIII. EXCLUSIVITY OF EDUCATION LAW SECTION 3012-C APPEAL PROCEDURE

This appeal procedure shall constitute the exclusive means for initiating, reviewing and resolving any and all challenges and appeals related to a principal APPR or improvement plan. A principal may not resort to any other procedure for the resolution of challenges

and appeals related to an APPR or improvement plan including, but not limited to, any grievance procedure set forth in an applicable collective bargaining agreement, except as otherwise authorized by law.

11.4) Training and Certification of Lead Evaluators and Evaluators

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

The District will ensure that all lead evaluators/evaluators are properly trained and certified to complete an individual's APPR. Evaluator training will be conducted by our local Network Team Equivalent, the Jefferson-Lewis BOCES Network Team personnel, and other appropriate sources and trainers. Evaluator training will occur locally and regionally and will replicate the recommended State Education Department ("SED") model certification process incorporating the Regulations that were enacted to implement Education Law §3012-c. Evaluators will attend these trainings on an on-going basis. This training will include the following Requirements for Lead Evaluators/Evaluators:

- *New York State Teaching Standards and ISSLC Standards;*
- *Evidence-based observation;*
- *Application and use of Student Growth Percentile and Value Added Growth Model data;*
- *Application and use of the State-approved teacher or principal practice rubrics;*
- *Application and use of any assessment tools used to evaluate teachers and principals;*
- *Application and use of State-approved locally selected measures of student achievement;*
- *Use of Statewide Instructional Reporting System;*
- *Scoring methodology used to evaluate teachers and principals; and*
- *Specific considerations in evaluating teachers and principals of English language learners ("ELLS") and students with disabilities.*

The District will work to provide proper training to ensure that lead evaluators maintain inter-rater reliability over time and that they are re-certified on an annual basis.

11.5) Assurances -- Evaluators

Please check the boxes below:

-
- Checked
-

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

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

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

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

(5) application and use of any assessment tools that the school district or BOCES utilizes to evaluate its classroom teachers or building

principals, including but not limited to, structured portfolio reviews; student, parent, teacher and/or community surveys; professional growth goals and school improvement goals, etc.

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

(7) use of the Statewide Instructional Reporting System

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

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

-
- Checked
-

11.6) Assurances -- Principals

Please check all of the boxes below:

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

11.7) Assurances -- Data

Please check all of the boxes below:

11.7) Assurances -- Data Assure that the NYSED will receive accurate teacher and student data, including enrollment and attendance data and any other student, teacher, school, course, and teacher/student linkage data necessary to comply with this Subpart, in a format and timeline prescribed by the Commissioner.	Checked
--	---------

11.7) Assurances -- Data Certify that the district provides an opportunity for every classroom teacher to verify the subjects and/or student rosters assigned to them.	Checked
11.7) Assurances -- Data Assure scores for all principals will be reported to NYSED for each subcomponent, as well as the composite rating, as per NYSED requirements.	Checked

12. Joint Certification of APPR Plan

Created Monday, May 07, 2012

Updated Thursday, November 29, 2012

Page 1

12.1) Upload the Joint Certification of the APPR Plan

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

assets/survey-uploads/5581/125694-3Uqgn5g9Iu/South Lewis Certification Form_1.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.

South Lewis Central School District
 PK-4 Principal: 20-Point Scale
 K-12 Comparable Growth Measure
 (Student Learning Objective)

Percent of Students Meeting Target Goal	Points
95-100	20
90-94	19
85-89	18
83-84	17
81-82	16
79-80	15
77-78	14
75-76	13
73-74	12
72	11
71	10
70	9
65-69	8
62-64	7
59-61	6
56-58	5
53-55	4
50-52	3
25-49	2
1-24	1
0	0

South Lewis Central School
Locally Selected Measure
Principals 5-12

MS ELA 8

Points Based on Percent Proficient
(Scoring Level 3 or 4)

HS English 11 Regents

Points Based on Percent Passing
(Scoring 65 or higher)

Points	MS ELA 8	HS English 11 Regents
15	72-100	97-100
14	67-71	96
13	62-66	95
12	57-61	92-94
11	47-56	90-91
10	43-46	85-89
9	41-42	75-84
8	39-40	70-74
7	34-38	65-69
6	29-33	58-64
5	25-28	55-57
4	20-24	49-54
3	11-19	37-48
2	6-10	31-36
1	1-5	21-30
0	0	0-20

South Lewis Central School
 Locally Selected Measure
 Principals PK-4

Points Based on Percent Proficient
 (Scoring Level 3 or 4)

Points	Port Leyden ELA 4	Glenfield ELA 4
20	61-100	71-100
19	57-60	68-70
18	52-56	65-67
17	50-51	61-64
16	47-49	59-60
15	45-46	57-58
14	42-44	55-56
13	34-41	44-54
12	32-33	42-43
11	30-31	40-41
10	28-29	38-39
9	26-27	36-37
8	23-25	33-35
7	20-22	30-32
6	16-19	26-29
5	12-15	22-25
4	9-11	18-21
3	6-8	13-17
2	3-5	7-12
1	1-2	1-6
0	0	0

South Lewis Central School
Principals
Other Measures of Effectiveness
60-Point Multidimensional Principal Performance Rubric

Rubric Score	Points	Rubric Score	Points
4.000- 3.951	60	1.517-1.476	30
3.950-3.751	59	1.475-1.426	29
3.750-3.551	58	1.425-1.389	28
3.550-3.351	57	1.388-1.364	27
3.350-3.151	56	1.363-1.339	26
3.150-2.951	55	1.338-1.314	25
2.950-2.751	54	1.313-1.295	24
2.750-2.551	53	1.294-1.282	23
2.550-2.451	52	1.281-1.270	22
2.450-2.351	51	1.269-1.257	21
2.350-2.276	50	1.256-1.245	20
2.275-2.226	49	1.244-1.232	19
2.225-2.189	48	1.231-1.220	18
2.188-2.164	47	1.219-1.207	17
2.163-2.139	46	1.206-1.195	16
2.138-2.114	45	1.194-1.182	15
2.113-2.089	44	1.181-1.170	14
2.088-2.064	43	1.169-1.157	13
2.063-2.039	42	1.156-1.145	12
2.038-2.014	41	1.144-1.132	11
2.013-1.976	40	1.131-1.120	10
1.975-1.926	39	1.119-1.107	9
1.925-1.876	38	1.106-1.095	8
1.875-1.826	37	1.094-1.082	7
1.825-1.776	36	1.081-1.070	6
1.775-1.726	35	1.069-1.057	5
1.725-1.651	34	1.056-1.045	4
1.650-1.584	33	1.044-1.032	3
1.583-1.551	32	1.031-1.020	2
1.550-1.518	31	1.019-1.007	1
		1.006-1.000	0

Principal Improvement Plan

It is the desire of the District that all principals be successful in their job performance. The Annual Professional Performance Review is intended to support principals to this end. Any principals who earns an overall composite rating that places them in a Developing or Ineffective range shall be placed on a Principal Improvement Plan (PIP). Additionally, any principal who is identified as having a major difficulty can be placed on a Principal Improvement Plan (PIP), irrelevant of their overall composite score.

Principal Name: _____

Date: _____

A staff member should be put on an Improvement Plan when the staff member has deficiencies with professional performance.

I. Background Information

Position: _____

School Building: _____

II. Statement of Deficiency

List the item(s) the staff member did not perform satisfactorily.

III. General Statement for Improvement Plan

List the deficiencies and the tasks that must be done to correct them.

IV. Assistance to be offered

List the people and/or resources that will be available to help the principal, when asked, to overcome the deficiencies listed in Section III.

V. **Monitoring System**

1. Alterations to this plan may be made depending on additional information or lack of need to continue any given requirements. Any additions or deletions will be made in writing to the staff member.
2. A minimum of three meetings will be scheduled periodically before May 15th for the purpose of reviewing the degree to which the staff member has corrected the deficiencies stated in this plan of assistance. It is hoped that the staff member will have corrected these deficiencies and that they will no longer exist.

VI. **Signatures**

All parties involved - staff member, supervisor, and any other person listed under assistance to be offered, should sign and date the document. These signatures signify an acknowledgment of receipt and a commitment to improve identified deficiencies.

VII. **Final Evaluation**

1. A final evaluation of your satisfactory or unsatisfactory performance on the previously stated deficiencies will be made on or before August 30th. At that time, a recommendation will be made.
2. If the Superintendent fails to meet the timeline or responsibilities in this agreement, the plan must be rewritten for the following year.

Principal

Date

Superintendent

Date

Other Administrative Representative

Date

Other

Date

Other

Date

South Lewis Central School District
 K-12 Comparable Growth Measure
 (Student Learning Objective)
 20-point scale

Percent of Students Meeting Target Goal	Points
95-100	20
90-94	19
85-89	18
83-84	17
81-82	16
79-80	15
77-78	14
75-76	13
73-74	12
72	11
71	10
70	9
65-69	8
62-64	7
59-61	6
56-58	5
53-55	4
50-52	3
25-49	2
1-24	1
0	0

South Lewis Central School
PORT LEYDEN ELEMENTARY
Locally Selected Measure K-4

Points Based on Percent Proficient
(Scoring Level 3 or 4)

Points	PORT LEYDEN ELA 4
15	57-100
14	52-56
13	46-51
12	42-45
11	34-41
10	30-33
9	28-29
8	26-27
7	23-25
6	19-22
5	16-18
4	12-15
3	6-11
2	3-5
1	1-2
0	0

South Lewis Central School
GLENFIELD ELEMENTARY
Locally Selected Measure K-4

Points Based on Percent Proficient
(Scoring Level 3 or 4)

Points	GLENFIELD ELA 4
15	68-100
14	65-67
13	60-64
12	55-59
11	44-54
10	40-43
9	38-39
8	36-37
7	30-35
6	26-29
5	22-25
4	18-21
3	13-17
2	7-12
1	1-6
0	0

South Lewis Central School
MIDDLE SCHOOL
Locally Selected Measure 5-8

Points Based on Percent Proficient
(Scoring Level 3 or 4)

Points	MIDDLE SCHOOL ELA 8
15	72-100
14	67-71
13	62-66
12	57-61
11	47-56
10	43-46
9	41-42
8	39-40
7	34-38
6	29-33
5	25-28
4	20-24
3	11-19
2	6-10
1	1-5
0	0

South Lewis Central School
PORT LEYDEN ELEMENTARY
Locally Selected Measure K-4

Points Based on Percent Proficient
(Scoring Level 3 or 4)

Points	Port Leyden ELA 4
20	61-100
19	57-60
18	52-56
17	50-51
16	47-49
15	45-46
14	42-44
13	34-41
12	32-33
11	30-31
10	28-29
9	26-27
8	23-25
7	20-22
6	16-19
5	12-15
4	9-11
3	6-8
2	3-5
1	1-2
0	0

South Lewis Central School
GLENFIELD ELEMENTARY
Locally Selected Measure K-4

Points Based on Percent Proficient
(Scoring Level 3 or 4)

Points	GLENFIELD ELA 4
20	71-100
19	68-70
18	65-67
17	61-64
16	59-60
15	57-58
14	55-56
13	44-54
12	42-43
11	40-41
10	38-39
9	36-37
8	33-35
7	30-32
6	26-29
5	22-25
4	18-21
3	13-17
2	7-12
1	1-6
0	0

South Lewis Central School
MIDDLE SCHOOL
Locally Selected Measure 5-8

Points Based on Percent Proficient
(Scoring Level 3 or 4)

Points	MIDDLE SCHOOL ELA 8
20	76-100
19	71-75
18	67-70
17	64-66
16	62-63
15	59-61
14	57-58
13	47-56
12	45-46
11	43-44
10	41-42
9	39-40
8	34-38
7	29-33
6	24-28
5	20-23
4	16-19
3	11-15
2	6-10
1	1-5
0	0

South Lewis Central School
HIGH SCHOOL
Locally Selected Measure 9-12

Points Based on Percent Proficient
(Scale Score 65 or higher)

Points	High School Comprehensive English Regents
20	99-100
19	97-98
18	96
17	95
16	93-94
15	92
14	90-91
13	85-89
12	80-84
11	75-79
10	70-74
9	65-69
8	60-64
7	58-59
6	55-57
5	49-54
4	43-48
3	37-42
2	31-36
1	21-30
0	0-20

South Lewis Central School
Other Measures of Effectiveness
60-Point NYSUT Rubric Scale

Rubric Score	Points	Rubric Score	Points
4.000- 3.951	60	1.517-1.476	30
3.950-3.751	59	1.475-1.426	29
3.750-3.551	58	1.425-1.389	28
3.550-3.351	57	1.388-1.364	27
3.350-3.151	56	1.363-1.339	26
3.150-2.951	55	1.338-1.314	25
2.950-2.751	54	1.313-1.295	24
2.750-2.551	53	1.294-1.282	23
2.550-2.451	52	1.281-1.270	22
2.450-2.351	51	1.269-1.257	21
2.350-2.276	50	1.256-1.245	20
2.275-2.226	49	1.244-1.232	19
2.225-2.189	48	1.231-1.220	18
2.188-2.164	47	1.219-1.207	17
2.163-2.139	46	1.206-1.195	16
2.138-2.114	45	1.194-1.182	15
2.113-2.089	44	1.181-1.170	14
2.088-2.064	43	1.169-1.157	13
2.063-2.039	42	1.156-1.145	12
2.038-2.014	41	1.144-1.132	11
2.013-1.976	40	1.131-1.120	10
1.975-1.926	39	1.119-1.107	9
1.925-1.876	38	1.106-1.095	8
1.875-1.826	37	1.094-1.082	7
1.825-1.776	36	1.081-1.070	6
1.775-1.726	35	1.069-1.057	5
1.725-1.651	34	1.056-1.045	4
1.650-1.584	33	1.044-1.032	3
1.583-1.551	32	1.031-1.020	2
1.550-1.518	31	1.019-1.007	1
		1.006-1.000	0

Teacher Improvement Plan

It is the desire of the District that all teachers be successful in their job performance. The Annual Professional Performance Review is intended to support teachers to this end. Any teacher who earns an overall composite rating that places them in a Developing or Ineffective range shall be placed on a Teacher Improvement Plan (TIP). Additionally, any teacher who is identified as having a major difficulty can be placed on a Teacher Improvement Plan (TIP), irrelevant of their overall composite score.

Teacher Name: _____

Date: _____

A staff member should be put on an Improvement Plan when the staff member has deficiencies with professional performance.

I. Background Information

Position: _____

School Building: _____

II. Statement of Deficiency

List the item(s) the staff member did not perform satisfactorily.

III. General Statement for Improvement Plan

List the deficiencies and the tasks that must be done to correct them.

IV. Assistance to be offered

List the people and/or resources that will be available to help the teacher, when asked, to overcome the deficiencies listed in Section III.

V. **Monitoring System**

1. Alterations to this plan may be made depending on additional information or lack of need to continue any given requirements. Any additions or deletions will be made in writing to the staff member.
2. A minimum of three meetings will be scheduled periodically before May 15th for the purpose of reviewing the degree to which the staff member has corrected the deficiencies stated in this plan of assistance. It is hoped that the staff member will have corrected these deficiencies and that they will no longer exist.

VI. **Signatures**

All parties involved - staff member, supervisor, and any other person listed under assistance to be offered, should sign and date the document. These signatures signify an acknowledgment of receipt and a commitment to improve identified deficiencies.

VII. **Final Evaluation**

1. A final evaluation of your satisfactory or unsatisfactory performance on the previously stated deficiencies will be made on or before June 1st. At that time, a recommendation will be made as to the continuance or modification of the plan.
2. If administration fails to meet the timeline or responsibilities in this agreement, the plan must be rewritten for the following year.

Staff Member

Date

Administrator

Date

Union Representative

Date

Other

Date

Other

Date

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

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

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

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

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

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

Signatures, dates

Superintendent Signature: Date: 11/29/12



Teachers Union President Signature: Date: 11/29/12



Administrative Union President Signature: Date: 11/29/12



Board of Education President Signature: Date: 11/29/12

