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

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

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

December 5, 2012

Janie Nusser, Superintendent
South Seneca Central School District
7263 Main Street
Ovid, NY 14521

Dear Superintendent Nusser:

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

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

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

Thank you again for your hard work.

Sincerely,

John B. King, Jr.
Commissioner

Attachment

c: William Speck

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

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

Annual Professional Performance Reviews: 2012-13

Created Monday, July 30, 2012
Updated Monday, November 19, 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 : 560501040000

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

560501040000

1.2) School District Name: SOUTH SENECA CSD

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

SOUTH SENECA CSD

1.3) School Improvement Grant (SIG) Districts Only

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

(No response)

1.4) Award Classification

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

(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, July 30, 2012
Updated Monday, December 03, 2012

Page 1

STATE-PROVIDED MEASURES OF STUDENT GROWTH

(25 points with an approved value-added measure)

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

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

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

2.1) Assurances

Please check the boxes below:

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

STUDENT LEARNING OBJECTIVES AS COMPARABLE GROWTH MEASURES (20 points)

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

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

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

If no State assessment or Regents exam exists:

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

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

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

State assessments, *required if one exists*

List of State-approved 3rd party assessments

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

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

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

2.2) Grades K-3 ELA

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

	ELA	Assessment
K	School-or BOCES-wide, group or team results based on State assessments	NYS Grades 4-5 ELA assessment
1	School-or BOCES-wide, group or team results based on State assessments	NYS Grades 4-5 ELA assessment
2	School-or BOCES-wide, group or team results based on State assessments	NYS Grades 4-5 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 school uses multiple measures of literacy assessments to determine students' levels entering grade 3. This serves as baseline data for grade 3 students. For students in grades 4 and 5, prior state assessments add to baseline data. A differentiated model is used to set growth targets. Grade level teachers propose targets, which are approved first by the building principal, and then by the superintendent. For teachers of grades K-2, HEDI points are assigned based on the percentage of students in grades 4 and 5 meeting their growth targets on the NYS ELA assessments. For teachers of grade 3, HEDI points are assigned based on the percentage of students in grade 3 meeting their growth targets on the NYS ELA assessment.
Highly Effective (18 - 20 points) Results are well-above state average for similar students (or District goals if no state test).	85% or more of students meet target 95-100% = 20 90-94% = 19 85-89% = 18
Effective (9 - 17 points) Results meet state average for similar students (or District goals if no state test).	60-84% of students meet target 83-84% = 17 80-82% = 16 78-79% = 15 76-77% = 14 74-75% = 13 72-73% = 12 70-71% = 11 66-69% = 10 60-65% = 9
Developing (3 - 8 points) Results are below state average for similar students (or District goals if no state test).	40-59% of students meet target 56-59% = 8 54-55% = 7 52-53% = 6 50-51% = 5 46-49% = 4 40-45% = 3
Ineffective (0 - 2 points) Results are well-below state average for similar students (or District goals if no state test).	Fewer than 40% of students meet target 34-39% = 2 20-33% = 1 0-19% = 0

2.3) Grades K-3 Math

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

	Math	Assessment
K	School-or BOCES-wide, group or team results based on State assessments	NYS Grades 4-5 Math assessment
1	School-or BOCES-wide, group or team results based on State assessments	NYS Grades 4-5 Math assessment
2	School-or BOCES-wide, group or team results based on State assessments	NYS Grades 4-5 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 school uses multiple measures of mathematics assessments to determine students' levels entering grade 3. This serves as baseline data for grade 3 students. For students in grades 4 and 5, prior state assessments add to baseline data. A differentiated model is used to set growth targets. Grade level teachers propose targets, which are approved first by the building principal, and then by the superintendent. For teachers of grades K-2, HEDI points are assigned based on the percentage of students in grades 4 and 5 meeting their growth targets on the NYS Math assessments. For teachers of grade 3, HEDI points are assigned based on the percentage of students in grade 3 meeting their growth targets on the NYS Math assessment.
Highly Effective (18 - 20 points) Results are well-above state average for similar students (or District goals if no state test).	85% or more of students meet target 95-100% = 20 90-94% = 19 85-89% = 18
Effective (9 - 17 points) Results meet state average for similar students (or District goals if no state test).	60-84% of students meet target 83-84% = 17 80-82% = 16 78-79% = 15 76-77% = 14 74-75% = 13 72-73% = 12 70-71% = 11 66-69% = 10 60-65% = 9
Developing (3 - 8 points) Results are below state average for similar students (or District goals if no state test).	40-59% of students meet target 56-59% = 8 54-55% = 7 52-53% = 6 50-51% = 5 46-49% = 4 40-45% = 3
Ineffective (0 - 2 points) Results are well-below state average for similar students (or District goals if no state test).	Fewer than 40% of students meet target 34-39% = 2 20-33% = 1 0-19% = 0

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 Seneca developed 6th grade science assessment
7	District, regional or BOCES-developed assessment	South Seneca developed 7th grade 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 school will administer pre-assessments to determine baseline levels. A differentiated model is used to set growth targets. Grade level teachers propose targets, which are approved first by the building principal and then by the superintendent. Points are assigned based on the percentage of students meeting targets.
Highly Effective (18 - 20 points) Results are well-above state average for similar students (or District goals if no state test).	85% or more of students meet target 95-100% = 20 90-94% = 19 85-89% = 18
Effective (9 - 17 points) Results meet state average for similar students (or District goals if no state test).	60-84% of students meet target 83-84% = 17 80-82% = 16 78-79% = 15 76-77% = 14 74-75% = 13 72-73% = 12 70-71% = 11 66-69% = 10 60-65% = 9
Developing (3 - 8 points) Results are below state average for similar students (or District goals if no state test).	40-59% of students meet target 56-59% = 8 54-55% = 7 52-53% = 6 50-51% = 5 46-49% = 4 40-45% = 3
Ineffective (0 - 2 points) Results are well-below state average for similar students (or District goals if no state test).	Fewer than 40% of students meet target 34-39% = 2 20-33% = 1 0-19% = 0

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 Seneca developed 6th grade social studies assessment
7	District, regional or BOCES-developed assessment	South Seneca developed 7th grade social studies assessment
8	District, regional or BOCES-developed assessment	South Seneca developed 8th grade 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 school will administer pre-assessments to determine baseline levels. A differentiated model is used to set growth targets. Grade level teachers propose targets, which are approved first by the building principal and then by the superintendent. Points are assigned based on the percentage of students meeting targets.
Highly Effective (18 - 20 points) Results are well-above District goals for similar students.	85% or more of students meet target 95-100% = 20 90-94% = 19 85-89% = 18
Effective (9 - 17 points) Results meet District goals for similar students.	60-84% of students meet target 83-84% = 17 80-82% = 16 78-79% = 15 76-77% = 14 74-75% = 13 72-73% = 12 70-71% = 11 66-69% = 10 60-65% = 9
Developing (3 - 8 points) Results are below District goals for similar students.	40-59% of students meet target 56-59% = 8 54-55% = 7 52-53% = 6 50-51% = 5 46-49% = 4 40-45% = 3
Ineffective (0 - 2 points) Results are well-below District goals for similar students.	Fewer than 40% of students meet target 34-39% = 2 20-33% = 1 0-19% = 0

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 Seneca developed Global I Social Studies 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 school will administer pre-assessments to determine baseline levels. A differentiated model is used to set growth targets. Grade level teachers propose targets, which are approved first by the building principal and then by the superintendent. Points are assigned based on the percentage of students meeting targets.
Highly Effective (18 - 20 points) Results are well-above District goals for similar students.	85% or more of students meet target 95-100% = 20 90-94% = 19 85-89% = 18
Effective (9 - 17 points) Results meet District goals for similar students.	60-84% of students meet target 83-84% = 17 80-82% = 16 78-79% = 15 76-77% = 14 74-75% = 13 72-73% = 12 70-71% = 11 66-69% = 10 60-65% = 9
Developing (3 - 8 points) Results are below District goals for similar students.	40-59% of students meet target 56-59% = 8 54-55% = 7 52-53% = 6 50-51% = 5 46-49% = 4 40-45% = 3
Ineffective (0 - 2 points) Results are well-below District goals for similar students.	Fewer than 40% of students meet target 34-39% = 2 20-33% = 1 0-19% = 0

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 school will administer pre-assessments to determine baseline levels. A differentiated model is used to set growth targets. Grade level teachers propose targets, which are approved first by the building principal and then by the superintendent. Points are assigned based on the percentage of students meeting targets.
Highly Effective (18 - 20 points) Results are well-above District goals for similar students.	85% or more of students meet target 95-100% = 20 90-94% = 19 85-89% = 18
Effective (9 - 17 points) Results meet District goals for similar students.	60-84% of students meet target 83-84% = 17 80-82% = 16 78-79% = 15 76-77% = 14 74-75% = 13 72-73% = 12 70-71% = 11 66-69% = 10 60-65% = 9
Developing (3 - 8 points) Results are below District goals for similar students.	40-59% of students meet target 56-59% = 8 54-55% = 7 52-53% = 6 50-51% = 5 46-49% = 4 40-45% = 3
Ineffective (0 - 2 points) Results are well-below District goals for similar students.	Fewer than 40% of students meet target 34-39% = 2 20-33% = 1 0-19% = 0

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 school will administer pre-assessments to determine baseline levels. A differentiated model is used to set growth targets. Grade level teachers propose targets, which are approved first by the building principal and then by the superintendent. Points are assigned based on the percentage of students meeting targets.
Highly Effective (18 - 20 points) Results are well-above District goals for similar students.	85% or more of students meet target 95-100% = 20 90-94% = 19 85-89% = 18
Effective (9 - 17 points) Results meet District goals for similar students.	60-84% of students meet target 83-84% = 17 80-82% = 16 78-79% = 15 76-77% = 14 74-75% = 13 72-73% = 12 70-71% = 11 66-69% = 10 60-65% = 9
Developing (3 - 8 points) Results are below District goals for similar students.	40-59% of students meet target 56-59% = 8 54-55% = 7 52-53% = 6 50-51% = 5 46-49% = 4 40-45% = 3
Ineffective (0 - 2 points) Results are well-below District goals for similar students.	Fewer than 40% of students meet target 34-39% = 2 20-33% = 1 0-19% = 0

2.9) High School English Language Arts

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

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

	High School English Courses	Assessment
Grade 9 ELA	District, regional or BOCES-developed assessment	South Seneca developed Grade 9 ELA assessment

Grade 10 ELA	District, regional or BOCES-developed assessment	South Seneca developed Grade 10 ELA assessment
Grade 11 ELA	Regents assessment	Comprehensive English Regents Exam

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

Use this box, if needed, to describe the general process for assigning HEDI categories for these grades/subjects in this subcomponent. If needed, you may upload a table or graphic at 2.11, below.	The school will administer pre-assessments to determine baseline levels. A differentiated model is used to set growth targets. Grade level teachers propose targets, which are approved first by the building principal and then by the superintendent. Points are assigned based on the percentage of students meeting targets.
Highly Effective (18 - 20 points) Results are well-above District goals for similar students.	85% or more of students meet target 95-100% = 20 90-94% = 19 85-89% = 18
Effective (9 - 17 points) Results meet District goals for similar students.	60-84% of students meet target 83-84% = 17 80-82% = 16 78-79% = 15 76-77% = 14 74-75% = 13 72-73% = 12 70-71% = 11 66-69% = 10 60-65% = 9
Developing (3 - 8 points) Results are below District goals for similar students.	40-59% of students meet target 56-59% = 8 54-55% = 7 52-53% = 6 50-51% = 5 46-49% = 4 40-45% = 3
Ineffective (0 - 2 points) Results are well-below District goals for similar students.	Fewer than 40% of students meet target 34-39% = 2 20-33% = 1 0-19% = 0

2.10) All Other Courses

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

Course(s) or Subject(s)	Option	Assessment
Physical Education Grades 6-12	District, Regional or BOCES-developed	South Seneca developed grade specific Physical Education assessment
Music Grades 6-12	District, Regional or BOCES-developed	South Seneca developed grade specific Music assessment

Art Grades 6-12	District, Regional or BOCES-developed	South Seneca developed grade specific Art assessment
Health	District, Regional or BOCES-developed	South Seneca developed grade specific Health assessment
Spanish	District, Regional or BOCES-developed	TST BOCES Spanish regional course-specific assessment
All other teachers in K-5 building not named above	School/BOCES-wide/group/team results based on State	NYS Grades 4-5 ELA and Math assessments
All other teachers in Middle School grades 6-8 not named above	School/BOCES-wide/group/team results based on State	NYS Grades 6-8 ELA and Math assessments
All other teachers in High School grades 9-12 not named above	School/BOCES-wide/group/team results based on State	Gatekeeper NYS Regents exams given

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.	With teachers for whom an individual (teacher-specific) SLO(s) is needed, the school will administer pre-assessments to determine baseline levels. A differentiated model is used to set growth targets. Grade level or subject-area teachers propose targets, which are approved first by the building principal, and then by the superintendent. Points are assigned based on the percentage of students meeting targets. With teachers for whom the school-wide group results based on state assessment (group metric) is used, the following HEDI structure and methodology is applied: For teachers of grades K-5, HEDI points are assigned based on the percentage of students in grades 4 and 5 meeting their growth targets on the NYS ELA and Math assessments. For teachers of grade 6-8, HEDI points are assigned based on the percentage of students in grades 6-8 meeting their growth targets on the NYS ELA and Math assessments. For teachers of grades 9-12, HEDI points are assigned based on the percentage of students in grades 9-12 meeting their growth targets on the gatekeeper NYS Regents exams.
Highly Effective (18 - 20 points) Results are well-above District goals for similar students.	85% or more of students meet target 95-100% = 20 90-94% = 19 85-89% = 18
Effective (9 - 17 points) Results meet District goals for similar students.	60-84% of students meet target 83-84% = 17 80-82% = 16

	78-79% = 15 76-77% = 14 74-75% = 13 72-73% = 12 70-71% = 11 66-69% = 10 60-65% = 9
Developing (3 - 8 points) Results are below District goals for similar students.	40-59% of students meet target 56-59% = 8 54-55% = 7 52-53% = 6 50-51% = 5 46-49% = 4 40-45% = 3
Ineffective (0 - 2 points) Results are well-below District goals for similar students.	Fewer than 40% of students meet target 34-39% = 2 20-33% = 1 0-19% = 0

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.

(No response)

2.12) Locally Developed Controls

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

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

(No response)

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, July 30, 2012
Updated Wednesday, December 05, 2012

Page 1

Locally Selected Measures of Student Achievement or Growth

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

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

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

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

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

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

Growth or achievement measure(s) from these options.

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

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

Measures based on:

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

3.1) Grades 4-8 ELA

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

	Locally-Selected Measure from List of Approved Measures	Assessment
4	4) State-approved 3rd party assessments	STAR Reading Enterprise
5	4) State-approved 3rd party assessments	STAR Reading Enterprise
6	3) Teacher specific achievement or growth score computed locally	NYS Grade 6 ELA assessment
7	3) Teacher specific achievement or growth score computed locally	NYS Grade 7 ELA assessment

8	3) Teacher specific achievement or growth score computed locally	NYS Grade 8 ELA 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.	The school will administer pre-assessments to determine baseline levels. A differentiated model is used to set targets. For grades 6-8 teachers, the job of teachers and principals will be to set specific achievement targets. Of course, targets will be consistent for all teachers within a particular subject/grade level. Grade level or subject-area teachers propose targets, which are approved first by the building principal and then by the superintendent. Points are assigned based on the percentage of students meeting targets.
Highly Effective (14 - 15 points) Results are well above District- or BOCES-adopted expectations for growth or achievement for grade/subject.	85% or more of students meet target 95-100% = 15 85-94% = 14
Effective (8- 13 points) Results meet District- or BOCES-adopted expectations for growth or achievement for grade/subject.	60-84% of students meet target 81-84% = 13 76-80% = 12 72-75% = 11 68-71% = 10 64-67% = 9 60-63% = 8
Developing (3 - 7 points) Results are below District- or BOCES-adopted expectations for growth or achievement for grade/subject.	40-59% of students meet target 55-59% = 7 52-54% = 6 50-51% = 5 46-49% = 4 40-45% = 3
Ineffective (0 - 2 points) Results are well below District- or BOCES-adopted expectations for growth or achievement for grade/subject.	Fewer than 40% of students meet target 34-39% = 2 20-33% = 1 0-19% = 0

3.2) Grades 4-8 Math

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

	Locally-Selected Measure from List of Approved Measures	Assessment
4	4) State-approved 3rd party assessments	STAR Math Enterprise
5	4) State-approved 3rd party assessments	STAR Math Enterprise
6	3) Teacher specific achievement or growth score computed locally	NYS Grade 6 Math assessment

7	3) Teacher specific achievement or growth score computed locally	NYS Grade 7 Math assessment
8	3) Teacher specific achievement or growth score computed locally	NYS Grade 8 Math 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.	The school will administer pre-assessments to determine baseline levels. A differentiated model is used to set targets. For grades 6-8 teachers, the job of teachers and principals will be to set specific achievement targets. Of course, targets will be consistent for all teachers within a particular subject/grade level. Grade level or subject-area teachers propose targets, which are approved first by the building principal and then by the superintendent. Points are assigned based on the percentage of students meeting targets.
Highly Effective (14 - 15 points) Results are well above District- or BOCES-adopted expectations for growth or achievement for grade/subject.	85% or more of students meet target 95-100% = 15 85-94% = 14
Effective (8- 13 points) Results meet District- or BOCES-adopted expectations for growth or achievement for grade/subject.	60-84% of students meet target 81-84% = 13 76-80% = 12 72-75% = 11 68-71% = 10 64-67% = 9 60-63% = 8
Developing (3 - 7 points) Results are below District- or BOCES-adopted expectations for growth or achievement for grade/subject.	40-59% of students meet target 55-59% = 7 52-54% = 6 50-51% = 5 46-49% = 4 40-45% = 3
Ineffective (0 - 2 points) Results are well below District- or BOCES-adopted expectations for growth or achievement for grade/subject.	Fewer than 40% of students meet target 34-39% = 2 20-33% = 1 0-19% = 0

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.

(No response)

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

Growth or achievement measure(s) from these options.

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

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

Measures based on:

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

BOCES-developed assessment that is rigorous and comparable across classrooms

3.4) Grades K-3 ELA

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

	Locally-Selected Measure from List of Approved Measures	Assessment
K	4) State-approved 3rd party assessments	STAR Reading Enterprise
1	4) State-approved 3rd party assessments	STAR Reading Enterprise
2	4) State-approved 3rd party assessments	STAR Reading Enterprise
3	4) State-approved 3rd party assessments	STAR Reading Enterprise

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

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

Use this box, if needed, to describe the general process for assigning HEDI categories for these grades/subjects in this subcomponent. If needed, you may upload a table or graphic at 3.13, below.	The school will administer pre-assessments to determine baseline levels. A differentiated model is used to set growth targets. Grade level teachers propose targets, which are approved first by the building principal and then by the superintendent. Points are assigned based on the percentage of students meeting targets.
Highly Effective (18-20 points) Results are well above District- or BOCES-adopted expectations for growth or achievement for grade/subject.	85% or more of students meet target 95-100% = 20 90-94% = 19 85-89% = 18
Effective (9-17 points) Results meet District- or BOCES-adopted expectations for growth or achievement for grade/subject.	60-84% of students meet target 83-84% = 17 80-82% = 16 78-79% = 15 76-77% = 14 74-75% = 13 72-73% = 12 70-71% = 11 66-69% = 10 60-65% = 9
Developing (3 - 8 points) Results are below District- or BOCES-adopted expectations for growth or achievement for grade/subject.	40-59% of students meet target 56-59% = 8 54-55% = 7 52-53% = 6 50-51% = 5 46-49% = 4 40-45% = 3
Ineffective (0 - 2 points) Results are well below District- or BOCES-adopted expectations for growth or achievement for grade/subject.	Fewer than 40% of students meet target 34-39% = 2 20-33% = 1 0-19% = 0

3.5) Grades K-3 Math

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

	Locally-Selected Measure from List of Approved Measures	Assessment
K	4) State-approved 3rd party assessments	STAR Math Enterprise
1	4) State-approved 3rd party assessments	STAR Math Enterprise
2	4) State-approved 3rd party assessments	STAR Math Enterprise
3	4) State-approved 3rd party assessments	STAR Math Enterprise

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

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

Use this box, if needed, to describe the general process for assigning HEDI categories for these grades/subjects in this subcomponent. If needed, you may upload a table or graphic at 3.13, below.	The school will administer pre-assessments to determine baseline levels. A differentiated model is used to set growth targets. Grade level teachers propose targets, which are approved first by the building principal and then by the superintendent. Points are assigned based on the percentage of students meeting targets.
Highly Effective (18-20 points) Results are well above District- or BOCES-adopted expectations for growth or achievement for grade/subject.	85% or more of students meet target 95-100% = 20 90-94% = 19 85-89% = 18
Effective (9-17 points) Results meet District- or BOCES-adopted expectations for growth or achievement for grade/subject.	60-84% of students meet target 83-84% = 17 80-82% = 16 78-79% = 15 76-77% = 14 74-75% = 13 72-73% = 12 70-71% = 11 66-69% = 10 60-65% = 9
Developing (3 - 8 points) Results are below District -or BOCES-adopted expectations for growth or achievement for grade/subject.	40-59% of students meet target 56-59% = 8 54-55% = 7 52-53% = 6 50-51% = 5 46-49% = 4 40-45% = 3
Ineffective (0 - 2 points) Results are well below District- or BOCES-adopted expectations for growth or achievement for grade/subject.	Fewer than 40% of students meet target 34-39% = 2 20-33% = 1 0-19% = 0

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	5) District, regional, or BOCES–developed assessments	South Seneca developed 6th grade science assessment
7	5) District, regional, or BOCES–developed assessments	South Seneca developed 7th grade science assessment
8	3) Teacher specific achievement or growth score computed locally	NYS Grade 8 Science assessment

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

Use this box, if needed, to describe the general process for assigning HEDI categories for these grades/subjects in this subcomponent. If needed, you may upload a table or graphic at 3.13, below.	The school will administer pre-assessments to determine baseline levels. A differentiated model is used to set targets. The job of teachers and principals will be to set specific achievement targets. Of course, targets will be consistent for all teachers within a particular subject/grade level. Grade level or subject-area teachers propose targets, which are approved by the building principal. Points are assigned based on the percentage of students meeting targets.
Highly Effective (18 - 20 points) Results are well above District- or BOCES-adopted expectations for growth or achievement for grade/subject.	85% or more of students meet target 95-100% = 20 90-94% = 19 85-89% = 18
Effective (9 - 17 points) Results meet District- or BOCES-adopted expectations for growth or achievement for grade/subject.	60-84% of students meet target 83-84% = 17 80-82% = 16 78-79% = 15 76-77% = 14 74-75% = 13 72-73% = 12 70-71% = 11 66-69% = 10 60-65% = 9
Developing (3 - 8 points) Results are below District- or BOCES-adopted expectations for growth or achievement for grade/subject.	40-59% of students meet target 56-59% = 8 54-55% = 7 52-53% = 6 50-51% = 5 46-49% = 4 40-45% = 3
Ineffective (0 - 2 points) Results are well below District- or BOCES-adopted expectations for growth or achievement for grade/subject.	Fewer than 40% of students meet target 34-39% = 2 20-33% = 1 0-19% = 0

3.7) Grades 6-8 Social Studies

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

	Locally-Selected Measure from List of Approved Measures	Assessment
6	5) District, regional, or BOCES–developed assessments	South Seneca developed 6th grade social studies assessment
7	5) District, regional, or BOCES–developed assessments	South Seneca developed 7th grade social studies assessment
8	5) District, regional, or BOCES–developed assessments	South Seneca developed 8th grade social studies assessment

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

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

Use this box, if needed, to describe the general process for assigning HEDI categories for these grades/subjects in this subcomponent. If needed, you may upload a table or graphic at 3.13, below.	The school will administer pre-assessments to determine baseline levels. A differentiated model is used to set targets. The job of teachers and principals will be to set specific achievement targets. Of course, targets will be consistent for all teachers within a particular subject/grade level. Grade level or subject-area teachers propose targets, which are approved by the building principal. Points are assigned based on the percentage of students meeting targets.
Highly Effective (18 - 20 points) Results are well above District- or BOCES-adopted expectations for growth or achievement for grade/subject.	85% or more of students meet target 95-100% = 20 90-94% = 19 85-89% = 18
Effective (9 - 17 points) Results meet District- or BOCES-adopted expectations for growth or achievement for grade/subject.	60-84% of students meet target 83-84% = 17 80-82% = 16 78-79% = 15 76-77% = 14 74-75% = 13 72-73% = 12 70-71% = 11 66-69% = 10 60-65% = 9
Developing (3 - 8 points) Results are below District- or BOCES-adopted expectations for growth or achievement for grade/subject.	40-59% of students meet target 56-59% = 8 54-55% = 7 52-53% = 6 50-51% = 5 46-49% = 4 40-45% = 3
Ineffective (0 - 2 points) Results are well below District- or BOCES-adopted expectations for growth or achievement for grade/subject.	Fewer than 40% of students meet target 34-39% = 2 20-33% = 1 0-19% = 0

3.8) High School Social Studies

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

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

	Locally-Selected Measure from List of Approved Measures	Assessment
Global 1	5) District, regional, or BOCES–developed assessments	South Seneca developed Global I Social Studies local assessment
Global 2	3) Teacher specific achievement or growth score computed locally	Global History Regents assessment
American History	3) Teacher specific achievement or growth score computed locally	American History Regents assessment

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

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

Use this box, if needed, to describe the general process for assigning HEDI categories for these grades/subjects in this subcomponent. If needed, you may upload a table or graphic at 3.13, below.	The school will administer pre-assessments to determine baseline levels. A differentiated model is used to set targets. The job of teachers and principals will be to set specific achievement targets. Of course, targets will be consistent for all teachers within a particular subject/grade level. Grade level or subject-area teachers propose targets, which are approved by the building principal. Points are assigned based on the percentage of students meeting targets.
Highly Effective (18 - 20 points) Results are well above District- or BOCES-adopted expectations for growth or achievement for grade/subject.	85% or more of students meet target 95-100% = 20 90-94% = 19 85-89% = 18
Effective (9 - 17 points) Results meet District- or BOCES-adopted expectations for growth or achievement for grade/subject.	60-84% of students meet target 83-84% = 17 80-82% = 16 78-79% = 15 76-77% = 14 74-75% = 13 72-73% = 12 70-71% = 11 66-69% = 10 60-65% = 9
Developing (3 - 8 points) Results are below District- or BOCES-adopted expectations for growth or achievement for grade/subject.	40-59% of students meet target 56-59% = 8 54-55% = 7 52-53% = 6 50-51% = 5

	46-49% = 4 40-45% = 3
Ineffective (0 - 2 points) Results are well below District- or BOCES-adopted expectations for growth or achievement for grade/subject.	Fewer than 40% of students meet target 34-39% = 2 20-33% = 1 0-19% = 0

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	3) Teacher specific achievement or growth score computed locally	Living Environment Regents assessment
Earth Science	3) Teacher specific achievement or growth score computed locally	Earth Science Regents assessment9-12
Chemistry	3) Teacher specific achievement or growth score computed locally	Chemistry Regents assessment
Physics	3) Teacher specific achievement or growth score computed locally	Physics Regents assessment

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

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

Use this box, if needed, to describe the general process for assigning HEDI categories for these grades/subjects in this subcomponent. If needed, you may upload a table or graphic at 3.13, below.	The school will administer pre-assessments to determine baseline levels. A differentiated model is used to set targets. The job of teachers and principals will be to set specific achievement targets. Of course, targets will be consistent for all teachers within a particular subject/grade level. Grade level or subject-area teachers propose targets, which are approved by the building principal. Points are assigned based on the percentage of students meeting targets.
Highly Effective (18-20 points) Results are well above District- or BOCES-adopted expectations for growth or achievement for grade/subject.	85% or more of students meet target 95-100% = 20 90-94% = 19 85-89% = 18
Developing (3 - 8 points) Results are below District- or BOCES-adopted expectations for growth or achievement for grade/subject.	(Effective) 60-84% of students meet target 83-84% = 17 80-82% = 16 78-79% = 15

	76-77% = 14 74-75% = 13 72-73% = 12 70-71% = 11 66-69% = 10 60-65% = 9
Effective (9 - 17points) Results meet District- or BOCES-adopted expectations for growth or achievement for grade/subject.	(Developing) 40-59% of students meet target 56-59% = 8 54-55% = 7 52-53% = 6 50-51% = 5 46-49% = 4 40-45% = 3
Ineffective (0 - 2 points) Results are well below District- or BOCES-adopted expectations for growth or achievement for grade/subject.	Fewer than 40% of students meet target 34-39% = 2 20-33% = 1 0-19% = 0

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	3) Teacher specific achievement or growth score computed locally	Algebra Regents assessment
Geometry	3) Teacher specific achievement or growth score computed locally	Geometry Regents assessment
Algebra 2	3) Teacher specific achievement or growth score computed locally	Algebra 2 Regents assessment

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

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

Use this box, if needed, to describe the general process for assigning HEDI categories for these grades/subjects in this subcomponent. If needed, you may upload a table or graphic at 3.13, below.	The school will administer pre-assessments to determine baseline levels. A differentiated model is used to set targets. The job of teachers and principals will be to set specific achievement targets. Of course, targets will be consistent for all teachers within a particular subject/grade level. Grade level or subject-area teachers propose targets, which are approved by the building principal. Points are assigned based on the percentage of students meeting targets.

Highly Effective (18 - 20 points) Results are well above District- or BOCES-adopted expectations for growth or achievement for grade/subject.	85% or more of students meet target 95-100% = 20 90-94% = 19 85-89% = 18
Effective (9 - 17 points) Results meet District- or BOCES-adopted expectations for growth or achievement for grade/subject.	60-84% of students meet target 83-84% = 17 80-82% = 16 78-79% = 15 76-77% = 14 74-75% = 13 72-73% = 12 70-71% = 11 66-69% = 10 60-65% = 9
Developing (3 - 8 points) Results are below District- or BOCES-adopted expectations for growth or achievement for grade/subject.	40-59% of students meet target 56-59% = 8 54-55% = 7 52-53% = 6 50-51% = 5 46-49% = 4 40-45% = 3
Ineffective (0 - 2 points) Results are well below District- or BOCES-adopted expectations for growth or achievement for grade/subject.	Fewer than 40% of students meet target 34-39% = 2 20-33% = 1 0-19% = 0

3.11) High School English Language Arts

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

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

	Locally-Selected Measure from List of Approved Measures	Assessment
Grade 9 ELA	5) District, regional, or BOCES–developed assessments	South Seneca developed Grade 9 ELA local assessment
Grade 10 ELA	5) District, regional, or BOCES–developed assessments	South Seneca developed Grade 10 ELA local assessment
Grade 11 ELA	3) Teacher specific achievement or growth score computed locally	Comprehensive English Regents assessment

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.	The school will administer pre-assessments to determine baseline levels. A differentiated model is used to set targets. The job of teachers and principals will be to set specific achievement targets. Of course, targets will be consistent for all teachers within a particular subject/grade level. Grade level or subject-area teachers propose targets, which are approved by the building principal. Points are assigned based on the percentage of students meeting targets.
Highly Effective (18 - 20 points) Results are well above District- or BOCES-adopted expectations for growth or achievement for grade/subject.	85% or more of students meet target 95-100% = 20 90-94% = 19 85-89% = 18
Effective (9 - 17 points) Results meet District- or BOCES-adopted expectations for growth or achievement for grade/subject.	60-84% of students meet target 83-84% = 17 80-82% = 16 78-79% = 15 76-77% = 14 74-75% = 13 72-73% = 12 70-71% = 11 66-69% = 10 60-65% = 9
Developing (3 - 8 points) Results are below District- or BOCES-adopted expectations for growth or achievement for grade/subject.	40-59% of students meet target 56-59% = 8 54-55% = 7 52-53% = 6 50-51% = 5 46-49% = 4 40-45% = 3
Ineffective (0 - 2 points) Results are well below District- or BOCES-adopted expectations for growth or achievement for grade/subject.	Fewer than 40% of students meet target 34-39% = 2 20-33% = 1 0-19% = 0

3.12) All Other Courses

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

Course(s) or Subject(s)	Locally-Selected Measure from List of Approved Measures	Assessment
Physical Education Grades K-5	5) District/regional/BOCES–developed	South Seneca developed grade specific Physical Education assessment
Music Grades K-5	5) District/regional/BOCES–developed	South Seneca developed grade specific Music assessment
Art Grades K-5	5) District/regional/BOCES–developed	South Seneca developed grade specific Art assessment
All other teachers in K-5 building not named above	4) State-approved 3rd party	STAR Math Enterprise and STAR Reading Enterprise
All other teachers in Middle School grades 6-8 not named	4) State-approved 3rd party	Scholastic Reading Inventory

	above		
	All other teachers in High School grades 9-12 not named above	4) State-approved 3rd party	Scholastic Reading Inventory

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

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

Use this box, if needed, to describe the general process for assigning HEDI categories for these grades/subjects in this subcomponent. If needed, you may upload a table or graphic at 3.13, below.	With teachers for whom an individual (teacher-specific) SLO(s) is needed, the school will administer pre-assessments to determine baseline levels. A differentiated model is used to set achievement targets. Grade level or subject-area teachers propose targets, which are approved by the building principal. Points are assigned based on the percentage of students meeting targets. With teachers for whom the 3rd party assessment metric is used: School will administer pre-assessments to collect baseline data in the fall. Each student will be assigned by the building principal an individual growth target for post-assessment in the spring, based upon a differentiated model. Points are assigned based on the percentage of students meeting targets. In the case of the K-5 teachers using both the STAR Reading Enterprise and the STAR Math Enterprise assessments, separate ratings will be assigned to teachers for each assessment, and the average of the two ratings, rounded to the nearest whole number, will determine the final rating.
Highly Effective (18 - 20 points) Results are well above District- or BOCES -adopted expectations for growth or achievement for grade/subject.	85% or more of students meet target 95-100% = 20 90-94% = 19 85-89% = 18
Effective (9 - 17 points) Results meet District- or BOCES-adopted expectations for growth or achievement for grade/subject.	60-84% of students meet target 83-84% = 17 80-82% = 16 78-79% = 15 76-77% = 14 74-75% = 13 72-73% = 12 70-71% = 11 66-69% = 10 60-65% = 9

Developing (3 - 8 points) Results are below District- or BOCES-adopted expectations for growth or achievement for grade/subject.	40-59% of students meet target 56-59% = 8 54-55% = 7 52-53% = 6 50-51% = 5 46-49% = 4 40-45% = 3
Ineffective (0 - 2 points) Results are well below District- or BOCES-adopted expectations for growth or achievement for grade/subject.	Fewer than 40% of students meet target 34-39% = 2 20-33% = 1 0-19% = 0

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.

(No response)

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.

Rationale: While the District's overall attendance rate is good, there will be occasions in which a teacher in a small District such as ours will have a course or class that contains an unusually high number of students who have attendance problems and this fact could unfairly deflate the composite score.

In the Appeals section of the APPR, if a teacher receives an Inerffective or Developing Composite Score, s/he may appeal based on attendance, and attendance MAY be considered in the appeals process. The process is as follows: (1) For the purposes of attendance, if the teacher follows the steps below, the hearing committee and/or Superintendent may consider attendance in making a determination of the appeal:

(a) Provide a roster of all students for whom poor attendance may have affected attainment of targets, including the number of class days absent for each student in question
(b) For each student listed in part (a), calculate the percentage of class days in attendance
(c) For each student, multiply the growth target by the percentage calculated in part (b). This will define a potential NEW growth target for each student.
(d) Recalculate overall percentage of students reaching targets

All information and calculations related to attendance must be submitted with the written appeal that is sent to the Superintendent and must be verifiable. No adjustment of final HEDI rating shall exceed two points.

To mitigate potentially problematic incentives, a teacher using attendance data for the purposes of an appeal must prove that the District's plans to improve atttedance have been followed and that all efforts have been made to minimize the negative academic effects of the student's absences.

District's Plan to improve attendance:

1. Teacher reports absence, school notifies parents and arranges parent teacher conference with principal and teacher (if necessary) as soon as the student has missed 15% of his/her classes.
2. If absences continue, referrals are made to the Dean of Students, Instructional Support Teams, and Consolidation of Student Services Team.
3. If absences continue, PINS processes are initiated.

3.15) Teachers with More Than One Locally Selected Measure

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

For teachers with more than one local measure, the District will calculate each measure separately, and the final HEDI score will be determined by using an average of all measures, weighted by enrollment.

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, July 30, 2012
Updated Monday, November 19, 2012

Page 1

4.1) Teacher Practice Rubric

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

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

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

Danielson's Framework for Teaching (2011 Revised Edition)

(No response)

4.2) Points Within Other Measures

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

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

Is the following points assignment applicable to all teachers?

Yes

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

(No response)

Multiple (at least two) classroom observations by principal or other trained administrator, at least one of which must be unannounced [at least 31 points]	35
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	25

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

(No response)

4.3) Survey Tools (if applicable)

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

(No response)

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

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

4.4) Assurances

Please check all of the boxes below:

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

4.5) Process for Assigning Points and Determining HEDI Ratings

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

The remaining 60% (or 60 out of the total 100 point composite score) of the composite effectiveness score shall be based on teacher observations and the summative meeting. As part of the observation process, teachers are permitted to submit artifacts pertaining to any element of the rubric for consideration by an administrator during pre and post observation conferences and at the summative meeting. Any documentation provided should specifically indicate which domain and component that the teacher feels it addresses.

South Seneca has determined the following scale to correspond with each level of performance in HEDI categories:

Highly Effective 59-60 points

Effective 57-58 points
Developing 50-56 points
Ineffective 0-49 points

Furthermore, the district has partitioned the 60 point score such that 35 points will come from observation evidence (pertaining to Danielson Domains 2 and 3), and 25 points will come from other artifacts and evidence collected (pertaining to Domains 1 and 4).

An administrator will employ the following procedure to determine a teacher's score:

1. After the observation cycles have been completed and all evidence has been collected, the administrator will weigh all evidence in a holistic manner and determine which of the HEDI categories is appropriate for that teacher in Domains 2 and 3.
2. Once the category is determined, the administrator will assign a point value to the teacher according to the following:

Highly Effective 35 points
Effective 34 points
Developing 30-33 points
Ineffective 0-29 points

3. Similarly, after the full set of artifacts and evidence pertaining to Domains 1 and 4 have been collected, the administrator will weigh all evidence in a holistic manner and determine which of the HEDI categories is appropriate for that teacher in those domains.

4. Once the category is determined, the administrator will assign a point value to the teacher according to the following:

Highly Effective 25 points
Effective 24 points
Developing 20-23 points
Ineffective 0-19 points

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/5091/156656-eka9yMJ855/South Seneca Multiple Measures July 31 version_1.docx

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

Highly Effective: Overall performance and results exceed NYS Teaching Standards.	The teacher's performance exceeds expectations established by the NYS Teaching Standards. In order to receive this rating, the teacher can lose only one point out of all of the multiple measures.
Effective: Overall performance and results meet NYS Teaching Standards.	The teacher's performance meets the expectations established by the NYS Teaching Standards. In order to receive this rating, the teacher can lose only two or three points out of all of the multiple measures.
Developing: Overall performance and results need improvement in order to meet NYS Teaching Standards.	The teacher's performance on one or more measure does not meet the NYS Teaching Standards by four to ten points out of sixty.
Ineffective: Overall performance and results do not meet NYS Teaching Standards.	The teacher's performance on multiple measures does not meet NYS Teaching Standards by at least eleven points out of sixty.

Provide the ranges for the 60-point scoring bands.

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

4.6) Observations of Probationary Teachers

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

By building principals or other trained administrators

4.6) Observations of Probationary Teachers | Formal/Long	2
4.6) Observations of Probationary Teachers | Informal/Short	1
4.6) Observations of Probationary Teachers | Enter Total	3

By trained in-school peer teachers or other trained reviewers

Formal/Long	0
Informal/Short	0

Independent evaluators

Formal/Long	0
Informal/Short	0

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

- In Person

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

- In Person

4.7) Observations of Tenured Teachers

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

By building principals or other trained administrators

4.7) Observations of Tenured Teachers | Formal/Long	2
4.7) Observations of Tenured Teachers | Informal/Short	1
4.7) Observations of Tenured Teachers | Total	3

By trained in-school peer teachers or other trained reviewers

Formal/Long	0
Informal/Short	0

Independent evaluators

Formal/Long	0
Informal/Short	0

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

- In Person

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

- In Person

5. Composite Scoring (Teachers)

Created Thursday, August 02, 2012
Updated Monday, November 19, 2012

Page 1

Standards for Rating Categories

Growth or Comparable Measures

Locally-selected Measures of

growth or achievement

Other Measures of Effectiveness

(Teacher and Leader standards)

Highly

Effective

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

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

Overall performance and results exceed NYS Teaching Standards.

Effective

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

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

Overall performance and results meet NYS Teaching Standards.

Developing

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

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

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

Ineffective

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

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

Overall performance and results do not meet NYS Teaching Standards.

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

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

2012-13 where there is no Value-Added measure

Growth or Comparable Measures

Locally-selected Measures of

growth or achievement

Other Measures of Effectiveness

(60 points)

Overall

Composite Score

Highly Effective

18-20

18-20

Ranges determined locally--see below

91-100

Effective

9-17

9-17

75-90

Developing

3-8

3-8

65-74

Ineffective

0-2

0-2

0-64

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

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

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

2012-13 where Value-Added growth measure applies

Growth or Comparable Measures

Locally-selected Measures of

growth or achievement

Other Measures of Effectiveness

(60 points)

Overall

Composite Score

Highly Effective

22-25

14-15

Ranges determined locally--see above

91-100

Effective

10-21

8-13

75-90

Developing

3-9

3-7

65-74

Ineffective

0-2

0-2

0-64

6. Additional Requirements - Teachers

Created Monday, July 30, 2012
Updated Monday, December 03, 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/5265/156760-Df0w3Xx5v6/Tip Part I and II_1.docx

6.3) Appeals Process

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

(1) the substance of the annual professional performance review

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

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

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

ARTICLE IX
PROCEDURES FOR APPEALS

9.1 The following procedures are the exclusive means for initiating, reviewing and resolving any and all challenges and appeals

related to a teacher's annual professional performance review process.

9.2. In making a determination to recommend the discontinuance of the employment of a probationary teacher based on performance as determined by the Annual Professional Performance Review (Summative Evaluation) , the superintendent will take into account any procedural violations related to the Annual Professional Performance Review, adjusting the recommendation based on the seriousness of any existing violations. The probationary teacher will make known to the Superintendent any procedural violations relating to observations, TIPS, SLO's, or the Annual Professional Performance Review (summative evaluation) at the point of time at which they occur. The only other appeal available to probationary teachers is in the matter of weighting for student attendance (See The Appeal of the Summative Evaluation, #2, below). Probationary teachers have no other right to appeal.

9.3 All teachers will make known to the Superintendent any procedural violations relating to observations, TIPS, SLO's, or the Annual Professional Performance Review (summative evaluation) at the point of time at which they occur. Likewise, all evaluators will notify the superintendent in a timely manner when violations will occur or have occurred, and efforts will be made to rectify the situation in collaboration with the teacher (and Association representative, if the teacher so desires to have representation).

9.4 In considering an appeal, the Superintendent and/or Review Committee will first determine whether there have been any significant procedural violations of the Annual Professional Performance Review Plan. For example, if the teacher is to receive two formal observations and receives instead only one, through no fault of the teacher, then the Superintendent will agree to modify the contested rating (s) to the degree warranted by the seriousness of the particular violation. Any violation that substantially interferes with the teacher's right to a complete evaluation, unless the violation is clearly the result of the teacher's actions, will result in an improvement in the teacher's evaluation. Regarding the Teacher Improvement Plan, the same principle applies. If the improvement plan calls for six meetings with a consultant, and through no fault of the teacher, only two meetings occur, then the Superintendent will adjust the teacher's performance rating to the degree warranted by the seriousness of the particular violation. At the other extreme, if a teacher receives his/her visitation summary one day beyond the due date, then any adjustments made would reflect the minor seriousness of the violation.

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

9.6 This procedure shall be in effect unless changed by the parties or until the requirement to have such a procedure under Education Law §3012-c is repealed by law, regulation or a valid ruling by a court or administrative agency with jurisdiction. Under no circumstance will any change violate Education Law 3012-c.

Appeal of Observations

(1) A tenured teacher who receives a rating of "ineffective" or "developing" on a formal observation may appeal his or her observation only if the evaluator and the teacher cannot agree. Ratings of "highly effective" or "effective" cannot be appealed.

(2) A tenured teacher may appeal only the substance of his or her observation (visitation summary), the school district's adherence to standards and methodologies required for such observation reviews, adherence to applicable regulations of the commissioner of education, and compliance with the procedures for the conduct of performance reviews (visitation summaries) set forth in the annual professional performance review plan.

(3) A tenured teacher may not file multiple appeals regarding the same observation. All grounds for appealing a particular observation must be raised within the same appeal. Any grounds not raised at the time the appeal is filed shall be deemed waived.

(4) Appeals concerning a tenured teacher observation must be received in the office of the Superintendent of Schools no later than five (5) school days after the date of the meeting when the teacher and evaluator determine they cannot come to agreement. The failure to submit an appeal to the Superintendent of Schools within this time frame shall result in a waiver of the teacher's right to appeal that performance review (visitation summary).

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

(6) The Superintendent or designee will meet with the teacher within five (5) school days of the Superintendent's receipt of an appeal to hear the appeal. The teacher may have a union representative present at the appeal hearing. The Superintendent may invite the evaluator to the appeal hearing.

(7) The Superintendent shall issue a written decision on the merits of the appeal no later than five (5) school days from the date the appeal hearing ends unless extenuating circumstances exist. In the event of extenuating circumstanaces, the resolution of the appeal will occur in a timely and expeditious manner. If the Superintendent sustains the appeal, he/she shall issue an appropriate remedy. If the Superintendent dismisses or denies the appeal, the observation evaluation (visitation summary) shall remain unchanged and the appeal process shall end. The Superintendent's decision shall be final and binding and may not be reviewed or appealed further.

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

Appeal of Teacher Improvement Plan

(1) A tenured teacher's appeal of a TIP may occur only at the plan's completion. The appeal must be filed within five (5) school days of that date except in extenuating circumstances as determined by the Superintendent. The failure to submit an appeal to the Superintendent of Schools within this time frame shall result in a waiver of the teacher's right to appeal that TIP.

(2) A tenured teacher may appeal only the substance of his or her TIP, the school district's adherence to standards and methodologies required for such plans, adherence to applicable regulations of the commissioner of education, and compliance with the procedures for the conduct of TIPS set forth in the annual professional performance review plan.

(3) A tenured teacher may not file multiple appeals regarding the same TIP. All grounds for appealing a particular TIP must be raised within the same appeal. Any grounds not raised at the time the appeal is filed shall be deemed waived.

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

(5) The Superintendent or designee will meet with the teacher within five (5) school days of the Superintendent's receipt of an appeal to hear the appeal except under extenuating circumstances. The teacher may have a union representative present at the appeal hearing. The Superintendent may invite the evaluator to the appeal hearing.

(6) The Superintendent shall issue a written decision on the merits of the appeal no later than five (5) school days from the date the appeal hearing ends. If the Superintendent sustains the appeal, he/she shall issue an appropriate remedy. If the Superintendent dismisses or denies the appeal, the TIP, including its results, shall remain unchanged and the appeal process shall end. The Superintendent's decision shall be final and binding and may not be reviewed or appealed further.

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

Appeal of the Summative Evaluation

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

(2) A tenured teacher may appeal only the substance of his or her performance review (summative evaluation), the school district's adherence to standards and methodologies required for such reviews, adherence to applicable regulations of the commissioner of education, and compliance with the procedures for the conduct of performance reviews (summative evaluations) set forth in the annual professional performance review plan, or the weighting of scores for attendance. The substance of the appeal may concern only Domains 1 and 4 or the composite score or SLO scores. Observations and TIPs may not be parts of the appeal. For the purposes of attendance, if the tenured teacher follows the steps below, the hearing committee and/or Superintendent may consider attendance in making a determination of the appeal. For the purposes of attendance, if the probationary teacher follows the steps below, the Superintendent may consider attendance in making a determination of the appeal.

(a) Provide a roster of all students for whom poor attendance may have affected attainment of targets, including the number of class days absent for each student in question
(b) For each student listed in part (a), calculate the percentage of class days in attendance
(c) For each student, multiply the growth target by the percentage calculated in part (b). This will define a potential NEW growth target for each student.

(d) Recalculate overall percentage of students reaching targets

No adjustment for attendance will exceed two points for HEDI scores.

All information and calculations related to attendance must be submitted with the written appeal that is sent to the Superintendent and must be verifiable.

(3) A tenured teacher may not file multiple appeals regarding the same performance review (summative evaluation). All grounds for appealing a particular performance review (summative evaluation) must be raised within the same appeal. Any grounds not raised at the time the appeal is filed shall be deemed waived.

(4) Appeals concerning a tenured teacher performance review (summative evaluation). must be received in the office of the Superintendent of Schools no later than five (5) school days after the date when the teacher receives his/her performance review (summative evaluation). . The failure to submit an appeal to the Superintendent of Schools within this time frame shall result in a waiver of the teacher's right to appeal that performance review (summative evaluation). .

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

(6) The tenured teacher and evaluator will meet with an SSTA-designated representative (not the teacher in question) and an administrator (not the evaluator and not the Superintendent). This meeting will take place within five (5) school days of the Superintendent's receipt of an appeal to hear the appeal unless extenuating circumstances exist.

(7) The two-member appeal panel will issue a written statement of the determination of the panel within five (5) school days of the appeal hearing. If there is no consensus, the Superintendent will hear the appeal within five days of receipt of the panel's determination. The Superintendent shall issue a written decision on the merits of the appeal no later than five (5) school days from the date the appeal hearing ends. If the Superintendent sustains the appeal, he/she shall issue an appropriate remedy. If the Superintendent dismisses or denies the appeal, the teacher's score and evaluation shall remain unchanged and the appeal process shall end. The Superintendent's decision shall be final and binding and may not be reviewed or appealed further.

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

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.

The superintendent will ensure that all evaluators have been trained and that all Lead Evaluators have been trained and certified in accordance with Regulation. The District will utilize our BOCES Network Team evaluator training and Lead Evaluator training in accordance with SED procedures and processes. Lead Evaluator training will include training on all nine required elements.

The superintendent will ensure that Lead Evaluators participate in annual training and are recertified on an annual basis. The BOCES Network Team will be utilized to provide the retraining and recertification on some of the nine elements each year. All of the nine elements will be covered in a three-year cycle for returning administrators. New administrators will be given the original training over the course of their first six months on the job through the Joint Management Team of Central New York. Any individual who fails to achieve required training or recertification as applicable shall not conduct or complete evaluations.

TST BOCES is offering follow-up evaluator training that includes calibration training. In addition, each of the District's evaluators will receive inter-reliability training through Teachscape, which consists of on-line sessions followed by on-line assessments. The Superintendent certifies that each evaluator will provide proof of completion of this training before being used as a teacher evaluator. The District will require yearly recertification in inter-rater reliability as required by SED.

6.5) Assurances -- Evaluators

Please check the boxes below:

- Checked

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

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

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

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

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

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

(7) use of the Statewide Instructional Reporting System

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

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

- Checked

6.6) Assurances -- Teachers

Please check all of the boxes below:

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

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

6.7) Assurances -- Data

Please check all of the boxes below:

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

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

Created Wednesday, August 08, 2012
Updated Monday, November 19, 2012

Page 1

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

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

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

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

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

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

Please check the boxes below:

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

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

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

State assessments, *required if one exists*

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

List of State-approved 3rd party assessments

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

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

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

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

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

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

(No response)

7.4) Special Considerations for Comparable Growth Measures

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

Note: The only allowable controls or adjustments for Comparable Growth Measures are those used in State Growth measures, which

include: prior student achievement results, students with disabilities, English language learners, students in poverty, and, in the future, any other student-, classroom-, and school-level characteristics approved by the Board of Regents.

(No response)

7.5) Principals with More Than One Growth Measure

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

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

7.6) Assurances -- Comparable Growth Measures

Please check all of the boxes below:

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

8. Local Measures (Principals)

Created Wednesday, August 08, 2012
Updated Monday, November 19, 2012

Page 1

Locally-Selected Measures of Student Achievement or Growth

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

	Grade Configuration	Locally-Selected Measure from List of Approved Measures	Assessment
	K-5	(d) measures used by district for teacher evaluation	STAR Math Enterprise and STAR Reading Enterprise
	6-12	(d) measures used by district for teacher evaluation	Composite of NYS Grades 6-8 ELA and math assessments
	6-12	(d) measures used by district for teacher evaluation	Composite of NYS gatekeeper Regents exams given Grades 9-12
	6-12	(h) students' progress toward graduation	South Seneca HS credits earned per student in grades 9-12

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

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

Use this box, if needed, to describe the process for assigning HEDI categories. If needed, you may upload a table or graphic below.	The Elementary Principal's score in this category will be determined by the composite growth in students' math and reading levels, as determined by the STAR assessments administered in the building during the 2012-13 school year. School will administer pre-assessments to collect baseline data in the fall. Each student will be assigned by the building principal, and approved by the Superintendent, an individual growth target for post-assessment in the spring, based upon a differentiated model. Points are assigned based on the percentage of students meeting targets. The Secondary Principal's score in this category will be determined by a combination of middle school and high school targets. In the case of high school students earning

	credits, the measure will be the percentage of students earning at least 5.5 credits. In the case of school-wide metrics for performance on state assessments, the following methodology is applied: Student growth is measured based on achievement compared to the school's three-year prior history. Success on the next school year's assessments is measured by the percentage of students attaining level 3 or 4 scores (or passing scores in the case of Regents exams). A match with the prior three-year average success rate (defined as a percentage equal to the three-year average, within one percent) will be set as a HEDI score of 10. This target percentage will be determined and approved by the Superintendent. Precisely, a percentage exactly two percent higher (inclusive) will define the lower threshold for the next higher score on the HEDI scale, making a measure of exactly seven percent higher the threshold for a Highly Effective rating. Within the highly effective range, it will take a five percentage point increase to move to the next highest score on the HEDI scale, making a measure of exactly 12 percent higher than the three-year average—or anything higher—the definition of a fifteen rating. Below the three-year average, a percentage exactly two percent below the three-year average (inclusive) will define the upper threshold for the next lower score within the effective range, making a measure of exactly five percent lower than the three-year average the upper threshold for a Developing rating. Within the developing range, it will take a two percentage point decrease to move to the next lower score on the HEDI scale, making a measure of exactly 15 percentage points lower than the three-year average the upper threshold for an Ineffective rating. Within the ineffective range, it will take a five percentage point decrease to move to the next lower score on the HEDI scale, making a measure of exactly 25 percent lower than the three-year average—or anything larger—the definition of a zero rating. Because the secondary principal's measure is a composite of three separate metrics, the final rating will be a weighted average (based on student populations in the middle grades and the high school grades) of the three individual ratings.
Highly Effective (14 - 15 points) Results are well above District- or BOCES-adopted expectations for growth or achievement for grade/subject.	Individual (teacher-specific) measure: 85% or more of students meet target 96-100% = 15 85-95% = 14 School-wide metric: If X is the three-year prior percentage of students successful on the state assessments, and Y is the percentage of students successful on the next year's exams, then $Y \geq X + 12$, score is 15 $X + 7 \leq Y < X + 12$, score is 14 Credits earned per high school student: 90% or more students earn at least 5.5 credits 96-100% = 15 90-95% = 14

Effective (8- 13 points) Results meet District- or BOCES-adopted expectations for growth or achievement for grade/subject.	Individual (teacher-specific) measure: 60-84% of students meet target 83-84% = 13 80-82% = 12 77-79% = 11 74-76% = 10 70-73% = 9 60-69% = 8 School-wide metric: If X is the three-year prior percentage of students successful on the state assessments, and Y is the percentage of students successful on the next year's exams, then $X + 5 \leq Y < X + 7$, score is 13 $X + 3 \leq Y < X + 5$, score is 12 $X + 1 \leq Y < X + 3$, score is 11 $X – 1 < Y < X + 1$, score is 10 $X – 3 < Y \leq X – 1$, score is 9 $X – 5 < Y \leq X – 3$, score is 8 Credits earned per high school student: 67-89% of students earn at least 5.5 credits 87-89% = 13 84-86% = 12 81-83% = 11 75-80% = 10 71-74% = 9 67-70% = 8
Developing (3 - 7 points) Results are below District- or BOCES-adopted expectations for growth or achievement for grade/subject.	Individual (teacher-specific) measure: 40-59% of students meet target 54-59% = 7 52-53% = 6 50-51% = 5 46-49% = 4 40-45% = 3 School-wide metric: If X is the three-year prior percentage of students successful on the state assessments, and Y is the percentage of students successful on the next year's exams, then $X – 7 < Y \leq X – 5$, score is 7 $X – 9 < Y \leq X – 7$, score is 6 $X – 11 < Y \leq X – 9$, score is 5 $X – 13 < Y \leq X – 11$, score is 4 $X – 15 < Y \leq X – 13$, score is 3 Credits earned per high school student: 50-66% of students earn at least 5.5 credits 64-66% = 7 62-63% = 6 60-61% = 5 56-59% = 4 50-55% = 3
Ineffective (0 - 2 points) Results are well below District- or BOCES-adopted expectations for growth or achievement for grade/subject.	Individual (teacher-specific) measure: Fewer than 40% of students meet target 34-39% = 2 20-33% = 1

	0-32% = 0 School-wide metric: If X is the three-year prior percentage of students successful on the state assessments, and Y is the percentage of students successful on the next year's exams, then X – 20 <Y ≤ X – 15 , score is 2 X – 25 <Y ≤ X – 20 , score is 1 Y ≤ X – 25 , score is 0 Credits earned per high school student: Fewer than 50% of students earn at least 5.5 credits 45-49% = 2 33-44% = 1 0-32% = 0

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

(No response)

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

(No response)

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

Grade Configuration	Locally-Selected Measure from List of Approved Measures	Assessment

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

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

(No response)

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

(No response)

8.3) Locally Developed Controls

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

(No response)

8.4) Principals with More Than One Locally Selected Measure

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

Not applicable

8.5) Assurances

Please check all of the boxes below:

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

9. Other Measures of Effectiveness (Principals)

Created Wednesday, August 08, 2012
Updated Friday, November 30, 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.

Process for Assigning Points and Determining HEDI Ratings

District is using the Multi-Dimensional Principal Performance Rubric.
Each of the Domains in the rubric has been assigned point values on a 100-point scale as follows:
• Domain 1-Shared Vision of Learning: 15 points
• Domain 2-School Culture and Instructional Program: 30 points
• Domain 3-Safe, Efficient, Effective Learning Environment: 20 points
• Domain 4-Community: 10 points
• Domain 5-Integrity, Fairness, and Ethics: 15 points
• Domain 6-Policical, Social, Economic, Legal and Cultural Context: 10 points
The Superintendent will utilize the MPP Rubric to rate each principal on each of the domains from 1.0 to 4.0. Multiple pieces of evidence will be used to make this rating, and the final rating in each domain will be rounded to the nearest tenth. These ratings will be converted to a point value on the 100-point scale according to agreed-upon conversion charts. Points from each domain will be added together to arrive at a total rating out of 100 points, and this rating will be finally converted to a 60 point scale, again using an agreed-upon conversion chart. The HEDI category will be determined according to the following:
Highly Effective 59-60 points
Effective 57-58 points
Developing 50-56 points
Ineffective 0-49 points

Highly Effective Principals in this category are observed, over multiple visits, to consistently exceed district expectations and to warrant highly effective ratings across all domains of the Multi-Dimensional Principal Performance Rubric.

Specifically, a principal will earn at least 59 total points out of 60 after conversion.
Effective Principals in this category are observed, over multiple visits, to consistently meet district expectations and to warrant effective ratings across all domains of the Multi-Dimensional Principal Performance Rubric.

Specifically, a principal will earn 57-58 total points out of 60 after conversion.
Developing Principals in this category are observed, over multiple visits, to fall short of district expectations and to warrant some ineffective ratings across some domains of the Multi-Dimensional Principal Performance Rubric.

Specifically, a principal will earn 50-56 total points out of 60 after conversion.
Ineffective Principals in this category are observed, over multiple visits, to consistently fail to meet district expectations and to warrant ineffective ratings across all domains of the Multi-Dimensional Principal Performance Rubric.

Specifically, a principal will earn fewer than 50 total points out of 60 after conversion.

Attached file: Conversion Charts for Principal Ratings

Domains 1 and 5: Vision and Integrity
Superintendent's Evaluation Rating on 100-point scale
1.0 0
1.1-1.2 1
1.3-1.4 2
1.5-1.6 3
1.7-1.8 4
1.9-2.0 5
2.1-2.2 6
2.3-2.4 7
2.5-2.6 8
2.7-2.8 9
2.9-3.0 10
3.1-3.2 11
3.3-3.4 12
3.5-3.6 13
3.7-3.8 14
3.9-4.0 15

Domain 2: Culture and Program
Superintendent's Evaluation Rating on 100-point scale
1.0 0
1.1 1
1.2 2
1.3 3
1.4 4
1.5 5
1.6 6
1.7 7
1.8 8
1.9 9
2.0 10
2.1 11
2.2 12
2.3 13
2.4 14
2.5 15
2.6 16
2.7 17
2.8 18
2.9 19
3.0 20
3.1 21
3.2 22
3.3 23
3.4 24
3.5 25
3.6 26
3.7 27
3.8 28
3.9 29
4.0 30

Domain 3: Learning Environment
Superintendent's Evaluation Rating on 100-point scale
1.0 0
1.1 1
1.2 2
1.3 3
1.4 4

1.5 5
1.6 6
1.7 7
1.8 8
1.9 9
2.0 10
2.1-2.2 11
2.3-2.4 12
2.5-2.6 13
2.7-2.9 14
3.0-3.2 15
3.3-3.4 16
3.5-3.6 17
3.7 18
3.8 19
3.9-4.0 20

Domains 4 and 6: Community and Context
Superintendent's Evaluation Rating on 100-point scale
1.0-1.2 0
1.3-1.5 1
1.6-1.9 2
2.0-2.1 3
2.2-2.3 4
2.4-2.6 5
2.7-2.9 6
3.0-3.1 7
3.2-3.3 8
3.4-3.7 9
3.8-4.0 10

Overall Rubric Score Rating Category 0-60 Point Distribution
96-100 Highly Effective 60
91-95 Highly Effective 59
86-90 Effective 58
80-85 Effective 57
77-79 Developing 56
75-76 Developing 55
73-74 Developing 54
71-72 Developing 53
70 Developing 52
68-69 Developing 51
65-67 Developing 50
56-64 Ineffective 49
48-55 Ineffective 48
47 Ineffective 47
46 Ineffective 46
45 Ineffective 45
44 Ineffective 44
43 Ineffective 43
42 Ineffective 42
41 Ineffective 41
40 Ineffective 40
39 Ineffective 39
38 Ineffective 38
37 Ineffective 37
36 Ineffective 36

35 Ineffective 35
34 Ineffective 34
33 Ineffective 33
32 Ineffective 32
31 Ineffective 31
30 Ineffective 30
29 Ineffective 29
28 Ineffective 28
27 Ineffective 27
26 Ineffective 26
25 Ineffective 25
24 Ineffective 24
23 Ineffective 23
22 Ineffective 22
21 Ineffective 21
20 Ineffective 20
19 Ineffective 19
18 Ineffective 18
17 Ineffective 17
16 Ineffective 16
15 Ineffective 15
14 Ineffective 14
13 Ineffective 13
12 Ineffective 12
11 Ineffective 11
10 Ineffective 10
9 Ineffective 9
8 Ineffective 8
7 Ineffective 7
6 Ineffective 6
5 Ineffective 5
4 Ineffective 4
3 Ineffective 3
2 Ineffective 2
1 Ineffective 1
0 Ineffective 0

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

(No response)

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

Highly Effective: Overall performance and results exceed standards.	The principal will score either 59 or 60 points when individual domain ratings are converted to the 60 point scale.
Effective: Overall performance and results meet standards.	The principal will score either 57 or 58 points when individual domain ratings are converted to the 60 point scale.
Developing: Overall performance and results need improvement in order to meet standards.	The principal will score between 50 and 56 points (inclusive) when individual domain ratings are converted to the 60 point scale.
Ineffective: Overall performance and results do not meet standards.	The principal will score below 50 points when individual domain ratings are converted to the 60 point scale.

Please provide the locally-negotiated 60 point scoring bands.

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

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 Wednesday, August 08, 2012
Updated Monday, November 19, 2012

Page 1

Standards for Rating Categories

Growth or Comparable Measures

Locally-selected Measures of

growth or achievement

Other Measures of Effectiveness

(Teacher and Leader standards)

Highly

Effective

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

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

Overall performance and results exceed ISLLC leadership standards.

Effective

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

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

Overall performance and results meet ISLLC leadership standards.

Developing

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

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

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

Ineffective

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

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

Overall performance and results do not meet ISLLC leadership standards.

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

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

2012-13 where there is no Value-Added measure

Growth or Comparable Measures

Locally-selected Measures of

growth or achievement

Other Measures of Effectiveness

(60 points)

Overall

Composite Score

Highly Effective

18-20

18-20

Ranges determined locally--see below

91-100

Effective

9-17

9-17

75-90

Developing

3-8

3-8

65-74

Ineffective

0-2

0-2

0-64

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

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

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 Wednesday, August 08, 2012
Updated Monday, November 19, 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/5276/160661-Df0w3Xx5v6/PIP Process.docx

11.3) Appeals Process

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

(1) the substance of the annual professional performance review

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

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

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

1. Appeals Process

A. Appeals for tenured principals are limited to those identified by Education Law §3012-c, as follows:
• The substance of the annual professional performance review;
• The school district’s adherence to the standards and methodologies required for such reviews;
• The adherence to the Commissioner’s regulations, as applicable to such reviews;

• Compliance with any applicable locally negotiated procedures applicable to annual professional performance reviews.
• The appeals process does not apply to probationary principals.
B. In making a determination to recommend the discontinuance of the employment of a probationary principal based on performance as determined by the Annual Professional Performance Review (Summative Evaluation), the superintendent will take into account any procedural violations related to the Annual Professional Performance Review, adjusting the recommendation based on the seriousness of any existing violations. The probationary principal will make known to the Superintendent any procedural violations relating to observations, TIPS, SLO's, or the Annual Professional Performance Review (summative evaluation) at the point of time at which they occur.
C. Appeals of annual professional performance reviews (composite effectiveness score/Summative Evaluation) may be brought for ineffective or developing ratings only.
D. A principal may not file multiple appeals regarding the same annual performance review. All grounds for appeal must be raised with specificity within such appeal. Any grounds not raised shall be deemed waived.
E. A principal who receives a rating of "ineffective" or "developing" on an annual professional performance review may appeal his or her summative evaluation only if the superintendent and principal cannot agree. Ratings of 'highly effective" or "effective" cannot be appealed.
F. All appeals shall be filed in writing.
G. An appeal of annual professional performance review must be filed no later than ten (10) business days of the date when the principal receives their final and complete annual professional performance review.
H. When filing an appeal, the principal must submit a written description of the specific areas of disagreement over his or her performance review (composite effectiveness score/Summative Evaluation). Supportive evidence about the challenges must also be submitted with the appeal. Any such information that is not submitted at the time the response is filed shall not be considered on behalf of the principal in the deliberations related to the resolution of the appeal. The performance review being challenged must also be submitted with the appeal. Any additional documents or materials relevant to the appeal will be supplied by the superintendent upon request. Any such information that is not submitted at the time of the request shall not be considered on behalf of the District in the deliberations related to the resolution of the appeal.
I. Within ten (10) business days of receipt of an appeal, the superintendent must submit a detailed written response to the appeal to the principal. The response must include all additional documents or written materials relevant to the point(s) of disagreement that support the district's response. Any such information that is not submitted at the time the response is filed shall not be considered on behalf of the district in the deliberations related to the resolution of the appeal.
J. If the principal wishes to appeal the superintendent's determination, notice must be provided to the Superintendent within five (5) days of the date of the appeal response. Within ten (10) business days of the notice of appeal, a Review Committee will be formed, consisting of one representative chosen by the District and one administrator chosen by the SSAA. The parties agree that:
• The Review Committee shall hear appeals in a timely manner after the appeal is made, but in no event shall it be less than five (5) business days or more than fifteen (15) business days after the committee is selected.
• The hearing shall be conducted in no more than three (3) hours unless extenuating circumstances are present and the Review Committee (consensus) requests more time. In all cases, all steps of the appeal and resolutions of appeals will be handled in a timely and expeditious manner.
• The parties shall have the ability to be represented by association/union representative or attorney.
• The principal shall have the opportunity to present its case supporting the rating and the district shall have the opportunity to present his or her case supporting a change in rating. The presentations may include the presentation of materials, affidavits in lieu of testimony, and/or, if requested by the Review Committee (consensus), witnesses. Any review hearings or meetings are to be considered confidential and not open to the public.
• In considering an appeal, the or Review Committee will first determine whether there have been any significant procedural violations of the Annual Professional Performance Review Plan. For example, if the principal is to receive three site visits receives instead only one, through no fault of the princpal, then the Superintendent will agree to modify the contested rating (s) to the degree warranted by the seriousness of the particular violation. Any violation that substantially interferes with the principal's right to a complete evaluation, unless the violation is clearly the result of the principal's actions, will result in an improvement in the prinicpal's evaluation. Regarding the Principal Improvement Plan, the same principle applies. If the improvement plan calls for six meetings with a consultant, and through no fault of the principal, only two meetings occur, then the Review Committee will adjust the principal's performance rating to the degree warranted by the seriousness of the particular violation. At the other extreme, if a principal receives his/her visitation summary one day beyond the due date, then any adjustments made would reflect the minor seriousness of the violation.
• All principals will make known to the Superintendent any procedural violations relating to site visits, PIPS, or the Annual Professional Performance Review (summative evaluation/composite effectiveness score) at the point of time at which they occur. Efforts will be made to rectify the situation in collaboration with the principal (and Association representative, if the principal so desires to have representation).
• The Review Committee's decision will be made by consensus.
K. A written decision on the merits of the appeal shall be rendered by the review Committee no later than fifteen (15) business days from the close of the hearing. Such decision shall be a final administrative decision. The decision shall set forth the reasons and factual basis for the determination on each of the specific issues raised in the appeal. The reviewers must either affirm or set aside a superintendent's' rating. A copy of the decision shall be provided to the principal and the district representative. In the event that

consensus is not reached, the Review Committee will name a third party within five business days to review the appeal and break the tie. The third party will hear the appeal within five business days after being named. The third party will issue a written decision within two business days of the hearing.
L. This appeal procedure shall constitute the means for initiating, reviewing and resolving challenges to a principal performance review. A principal may not resort to any other contractual grievance procedures for the resolution of challenges and appeals related to a professional performance review.
M. In addition to any further limitations agreed to within the APPR agreement, an annual professional performance review shall not be placed in a principal's personnel file until either the expiration of the fifteen (15) business day period in which to file an notice of appeal without action being taken by the principal or the conclusion of the appeal process described herein, whichever is later.
N. A principal who takes advantage of the appeals process described herein does not waive his/her right to submit a written rebuttal to the final evaluation. A principal who elects to submit a written rebuttal to his/her evaluation prior to the expiration of the fifteen (15) business days in which to file a notice of appeal does not waive her/his right to file an appeal.

11.4) Training and Certification of Lead Evaluators and Evaluators

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

The superintendent will ensure that all evaluators have been trained and that all Lead Evaluators have been trained and certified in accordance with Regulation. The District will utilize our BOCES Network Team evaluator training and Lead Evaluator training in accordance with SED procedures and processes. Lead Evaluator training will include training on all nine required elements.

The superintendent will ensure that Lead Evaluators participate in annual training and are recertified on an annual basis. The BOCES Network Team will be utilized to provide the retraining and recertification on some of the nine elements each year. All of the nine elements will be covered in a three-year cycle for returning administrators. New administrators will be given the original training over the course of their first six months on the job through the Joint Management Team of Central New York. Any individual who fails to achieve required training or recertification as applicable shall not conduct or complete evaluations.

Only one evaluator will evaluate principals. Inter-rater reliability training that is offered through TST BOCES will be utilized. If required training has not been completed, the District's Lead Evaluator of Principals will not be utilized.

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,	Checked

and teacher/student linkage data necessary to comply with this Subpart, in a format and timeline prescribed by the Commissioner.	
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, July 30, 2012
Updated Wednesday, December 05, 2012

Page 1

12.1)Upload the Joint Certification of the APPR Plan

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

assets/survey-uploads/5581/156772-3Uqgn5g9Iu/Certification form Dec 5.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 Seneca Central School District: Multiple Measures of Effectiveness

The remaining 60% (or 60 out of the total 100 point composite score) of the composite effectiveness score shall be based on teacher observations and the summative meeting. As part of the observation process, teachers are permitted to submit artifacts pertaining to any element of the rubric for consideration by an administrator during pre and post observation conferences and at the summative meeting. Any documentation provided should specifically indicate which domain and component that the-teacher feels it addresses.

South Seneca has determined the following scale to correspond with each level of performance in HEDI categories:

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

Furthermore, the district has partitioned the 60 point score such that 35 points will come from observation evidence (pertaining to Danielson Domains 2 and 3), and 25 points will come from other artifacts and evidence collected (pertaining to Domains 1 and 4).

An administrator will employ the following procedure to determine a teacher's score:

1. After the observation cycles have been completed and all evidence has been collected, the administrator will weigh all evidence and determine a score for each of the subcomponents of the Danielson rubric in Domains 2 and 3. Each subcomponent will be rated in a holistic manner to determine a teacher score from 1-4, with 1.0-1.4 corresponding to Ineffective in that subcomponent; 1.5-2.4 corresponding to Developing; 2.5-3.4 corresponding to Effective; and 3.5-4.0 corresponding to Highly Effective. At this stage, the administrator may utilize a scale to the nearest tenth of a point (e.g. assigning a score of 2.7 for a subcomponent).
2. Once these subcomponent scores have been determined, the administrator will determine the AVERAGE rating of subcomponents for Domains 2 and 3, calculated to the nearest thousandth.
3. The average rating will be converted to a teacher score based on the following conversion chart:

Total Average Rubric Score	Teacher Score
Ineffective 0-29	
1.000	0
1.014	1
1.028	2
1.042	3
1.056	4
1.070	5
1.084	6
1.098	7
1.112	8
1.126	9

1.140	10
1.154	11
1.168	12
1.182	13
1.196	14
1.210	15
1.224	16
1.238	17
1.252	18
1.266	19
1.280	20
1.294	21
1.308	22
1.322	23
1.335	24
1.348	25
1.361	26
1.374	27
1.387	28
1.400-1.449	29
Developing 30-33	
1.450-1.500	30
1.800	31
2.100	32
2.400-2.449	33
Effective 34	
2.450-3.449	34
Highly Effective 35	
3.500-4.000	35

4. Similarly, after the full set of artifacts and evidence pertaining to Domains 1 and 4 have been collected, the administrator will weigh all evidence and determine a score for each of the subcomponents of the Danielson rubric in Domains 1 and 4. Each subcomponent will be rated in a holistic manner to determine a teacher score from 1-4, with 1.0-1.4 corresponding to Ineffective in that subcomponent; 1.5-2.4 corresponding to Developing; 2.5-3.4 corresponding to Effective; and 3.5-4.0 corresponding to Highly Effective. At this stage, the administrator may utilize a scale to the nearest tenth of a point (e.g. assigning a score of 2.7 for a subcomponent).
5. Once these subcomponent scores have been determined, the administrator will determine the AVERAGE rating of subcomponents for Domains 1 and 4, calculated to the nearest thousandth.
6. The average rating will be converted to a teacher score based on the following conversion chart:

Total Average Rubric Score	Teacher Score
Ineffective 0-19	
1.000	0
1.021	1

1.042	2
1.063	3
1.084	4
1.105	5
1.126	6
1.147	7
1.168	8
1.189	9
1.210	10
1.231	11
1.252	12
1.273	13
1.294	14
1.315	15
1.336	16
1.358	17
1.379	18
1.400-1.449	19
Developing 20-23	
1.450-1.500	20
1.800	21
2.100	22
2.400-2.449	23
Effective 24	
2.450-3.449	24
Highly Effective 25	
3.500-4.000	25

7. Finally, the teacher score for Domains 2 and 3 will be added to the score for Domains 1 and 4, and a total score for the teacher will be determined between 0 and 60.

Teacher Improvement Plan (TIP) Part I

Supervising Administrator: _____Bargaining unit member: _____

A: Written Notification Designation as a Bargaining Unit Member in Need of Improvement *Administrator:* *Date:*	**B: Plan for Improvement with Specific, Measurable Objectives, Timeline, and Evaluation Process** *Administrator:* *Teacher:* *Date received:* *Meeting Date:*	**C: Feedback and Results of Plan for Improvement** *Administrator:* *Teacher:* *Date:*
Note[1] Criterion/Criteria That Have Not Been Met Successfully are indicated below.	Note [2] Note [3] Note [4] Note[5] Note[6] **Objectives:** **Meausrable Objectives:** **Evaluation Process:** **Timeline:**	Note [7] Recommendation (Check One): _____ This bargaining unit member has met all the criterion/criteria identified as in need of improvement and will return to his/her original designation and Action Plan. _____ This bargaining unit member has not met the criterion/criteria identified as in need of improvement and will be cited for disciplinary action. _____ This bargaining unit member has not met the criterion/criteria identified as in need of improvement and will remain as a Bargaining Unit Member in Need of Improvement with revised goals and timeline. Explanation for the designation:

[1] Evidence may include informal administrative observations, formal, announced or unannounced observations, or any incidents, behaviors, or other indications that form the basis on which the administrator made the decision to notify the Bargaining Unit Member of the issue of concern. Before evidence is used as evidence, however, the district must share the evidence with the Bargaining Unit Member and document that the evidence was shared.

[2] The administrator will schedule a meeting with the unit member to discuss a plan for how s/he may successfully meet the criterion/criteria. The member is directed to sign this document as his/her acknowledgement that the document will become a part of the personnel file unless the administrator and teacher cannot agree.

[3] If the bargaining unit member and administrator cannot agree on a plan, the Superintendent will determine the contents of the plan. The plan will be completed and this form returned to the bargaining unit member no more than 2 business days after this meeting. The teacher will immediately sign the form and return a copy of it to the administrator for placement in the personnel file.

[4] The plan will be completed by April 1 for tenured teachers. The plan will be completed by February 15 for probationary teachers.

[5] If the teacher is absent any day on which she was to meet with a peer, the offer of a meeting with a peer for that time may be forfeited. If the teacher is absent any day on which she was to meet with a consultant or could not attend a workshop or course of any kind for any reason, the offer of time for that day will be lost and will NOT be rescheduled.

[6] If the teacher misses an extra announced observation for any reason, the number of observations provided will be reduced accordingly except at the discretion of the Superintendent.

[7] The administrator must attach all evidence to this form, including observation summaries, incident reports, etc.

Teacher Improvement Plan (TIP), Part II

Supervising Administrator: _____Bargaining unit member: _____

	Action from the Plan	Measurement	Result
Domain 1 Planning and Preparation			
1a: Demonstrating Knowledge of Content and Pedagogy			
1b:Demonstrating Knowledge of Students			
1c: Setting Instructional Outcomes			
1d: Demonstrating Knowledge of Resources			
1e: Designing Coherent Instruction			
1f: Designing Student Assessments			
Domain 2: Classroom Environment			
2a: Creating an environment of respect and rapport			
2b: Establishing a culture for learning			
2c: Managing classroom procedures			
2d: Managing student behavior			
2e: Organizing physical space			
Domain 3: Instruction			
3a: Communicating with students			
3b: Using questioning prompts and discussions			
3c: Engaging students in learning			
3d: Using assessment in instruction			
3e: Demonstrating flexibility and responsiveness			
Domain 4: Professional Responsibilities			
4a: Reflection on teaching			
4b: Maintaining accurate records			
4c: Communicating with families			
4d: Participating in a professional community			
4e: Growing and developing professionally			
4f: Showing professionalism			

SECTION V: IMPROVEMENT PLAN

SOUTH SENECA CENTRAL SCHOOL DISTRICT

Principal Improvement Plan Process

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

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

PRINCIPAL IMPROVEMENT PLAN

Name of Principal: _____

School Building: _____Academic Year: _____

Deficiency that promulgated the "ineffective" or "developing" performance rating:

Improvement Goal/Outcome:

Action Steps/Activities:

Timeline for Completion:

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

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

December:

March:

Other:

Evidence to be provided for Goal Achievement:

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

Signatures, dates

Superintendent Signature: Date: 12-4-12

Teachers Union President Signature: Date:

L McChrystal co president 12-4-12

Vincent Schoedel co president 12-4-12

Administrative Union President Signature: Date:

Margaret R. Centure 12/4/12

Board of Education President Signature: Date:

12/4/12