



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

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

September 18, 2012

Joseph Morgan, Superintendent
Spencer-Van Etten CSD
P.O. Box 307
16 Dartts Crossroads
Spencer, NY 14883

Dear Superintendent Morgan:

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

Pursuant to Education Law §3012-c and Subpart 30-2, the Department will continue to work with districts to help ensure compliance with the statute and the regulations. We will be analyzing data supplied by districts, BOCES, and/or schools and may ask for a corrective action plan if there are unacceptably low correlation results between the student growth subcomponent and any other measures of teacher and principal effectiveness and/or if the teacher or principal scores or ratings show little differentiation across educators and/or the lack of differentiation is not justified by equivalently consistent student achievement results. Please be advised that, if any provisions of your APPR plan violate the statute or the regulations, the Department reserves the right to require your district to correct and/or resolve such violations.

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

Thank you again for your hard work.

Sincerely,



John B. King, Jr.
Commissioner

c: Horst Graefe

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

Annual Professional Performance Reviews: 2012-13

Created Tuesday, May 08, 2012

Updated Tuesday, August 28, 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 : 600801040000

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

600801040000

1.2) School District Name: SPENCER-VAN ETTEN CSD

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

SPENCER-VAN ETTEN 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 Wednesday, May 02, 2012

Updated Tuesday, August 28, 2012

Page 1

STATE-PROVIDED MEASURES OF STUDENT GROWTH

(25 points with an approved value-added measure)

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

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

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

2.1) Assurances

Please check the boxes below:

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

STUDENT LEARNING OBJECTIVES AS COMPARABLE GROWTH MEASURES (20 points)

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

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

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

If no State assessment or Regents exam exists:

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

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

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

State assessments, *required if one exists*

List of State-approved 3rd party assessments

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

School- or BOCES-wide, group or team results based on State assessments

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

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

2.2) Grades K-3 ELA

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

	ELA	Assessment
K	District, regional, or BOCES-developed assessment	SVE developed Kindergarten ELA Assessment
1	District, regional, or BOCES-developed assessment	SVE developed 1st grade ELA Assessment
2	District, regional, or BOCES-developed assessment	SVE developed 2nd grade 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

Table outlining our HEDI expectations for the K-2 ELA assessments are attached in section 2.11. Grades K-2 will use

subcomponent. If needed, you may upload a table or graphic at 2.11, below.	the ELA benchmark chart. Teachers will calculate the percentage of students that increased their reading levels based on the following expected growth: Kindergarten = 3 levels; 1st grade = 5 levels; and 2nd grade = 5 levels. The percentage of students who met the target would determine the teacher's final HEDI rating. For grade 3, the conversion chart alone will be used based on the percentage of students who meet the SLO target would determine the teacher's final HEDI rating. For teachers with multiple SLOs, each SLO will be rated proportionately and then averaged together to get determine the teacher's final HEDI rating using the Conversion Chart.
Highly Effective (18 - 20 points) Results are well-above state average for similar students (or District goals if no state test).	see attached table in section 2.11
Effective (9 - 17 points) Results meet state average for similar students (or District goals if no state test).	see attached table in section 2.11
Developing (3 - 8 points) Results are below state average for similar students (or District goals if no state test).	see attached table in section 2.11
Ineffective (0 - 2 points) Results are well-below state average for similar students (or District goals if no state test).	see attached table in section 2.11

2.3) Grades K-3 Math

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

	Math	Assessment
K	District, regional, or BOCES-developed assessment	SVE developed Kindergarten Math Assessment
1	District, regional, or BOCES-developed assessment	SVE developed 1st grade Math Assessment
2	District, regional, or BOCES-developed assessment	SVE developed 2nd grade 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.	Table outlining our HEDI expectations for the K-2 Math assessments are attached in section 2.11. A pre-assessment will be used to determine the baseline for each student. All students would be expected to make half the growth required to score 100. A 100 point post-assessment would be used to determine whether students met the target or not (yes/no). The percentage of students who meet the target would determine the teacher's final HEDI rating. For grade 3, the conversion chart alone will be used based on the percentage of students who met the SLO target would determine the teacher's final HEDI rating. For teachers with multiple SLOs, each SLO will be rated proportionately and then averaged together to get determine the teacher's final HEDI rating using the Conversion Chart.
---	---

Highly Effective (18 - 20 points) Results are well-above state average for similar students (or District goals if no state test).	see attached table in section 2.11
Effective (9 - 17 points) Results meet state average for similar students (or District goals if no state test).	see attached table in section 2.11
Developing (3 - 8 points) Results are below state average for similar students (or District goals if no state test).	see attached table in section 2.11
Ineffective (0 - 2 points) Results are well-below state average for similar students (or District goals if no state test).	see attached table in section 2.11

2.4) Grades 6-8 Science

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

	Science	Assessment
6	Not applicable	Not applicable
7	District, regional or BOCES-developed assessment	SVE 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.	6th grade science is not applicable as teachers will receive a SPG score in ELA and/or Math as 50% of more of their instruction/student population is in these areas. A table outlining our HEDI expectations for the grade 7 science assessment is attached in section 2.11 A pre-assessment will be used to determine the baseline for each student. All students would be expected to make half the growth required to score 100. A 100 point post-assessment would be used to determine whether students met the target or not (yes/no). The percentage of students who met the target would determine the teacher's final HEDI rating. For grade 8, the conversion chart alone will be used based on the percentage of students who meet the SLO target would determine the teacher's final HEDI rating. For teachers with multiple SLOs, each SLO will be rated proportionately and then averaged together to get determine the teacher's final HEDI rating using the Conversion Chart.
---	---

Highly Effective (18 - 20 points) Results are well-above state average for similar students (or District goals if no state test).	see attached table in section 2.11
Effective (9 - 17 points) Results meet state average for similar students (or District goals if no state test).	see attached table in section 2.11
Developing (3 - 8 points) Results are below state average for similar students (or District goals if no state test).	see attached table in section 2.11
Ineffective (0 - 2 points) Results are well-below state average for similar students (or District goals if no state test).	see attached table in section 2.11

2.5) Grades 6-8 Social Studies

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

	Social Studies	Assessment
6	Not applicable	Not applicable
7	Not applicable	Not applicable
8	Not applicable	Not applicable

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.	Social studies teacher in grades 6-8 are using a Humanities Model and will receive a SPG in ELA in each respective grade.
Highly Effective (18 - 20 points) Results are well-above District goals for similar students.	Not applicable (see response above)
Effective (9 - 17 points) Results meet District goals for similar students.	Not applicable (see response above)
Developing (3 - 8 points) Results are below District goals for similar students.	Not applicable (see response above)
Ineffective (0 - 2 points) Results are well-below District goals for similar students.	Not applicable (see response above)

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	developed 9th grade 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.	A table outlining our HEDI expectations for Global , the 9th grade social studies assessment, is attached in section 2.11. A pre-assessment will be used to determine the baseline for each student. All students would be expected to make half the growth required to score 100. The Regents will be used to determine whether students met the target or not (yes/no). The percentage of students who met the target would determine the teacher's final HEDI rating. For Global 2 and American History, the conversion chart alone will be used based on the percentage of students who meet the SLO target would determine the teacher's final HEDI rating. For teachers with multiple SLOs, each SLO will be rated proportionately and then averaged together to get determine the teacher's final HEDI rating using the Conversion Chart.
Highly Effective (18 - 20 points) Results are well-above District goals for similar students.	see attached table in section 2.11
Effective (9 - 17 points) Results meet District goals for similar students.	see attached table in section 2.11
Developing (3 - 8 points) Results are below District goals for similar students.	see attached table in section 2.11
Ineffective (0 - 2 points) Results are well-below District goals for similar students.	see attached table in section 2.11

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.	For Living Environment, Chemistry, Earth Science, and Physics, the conversion chart alone will be used based on the percentage of students who meet the SLO target would determine the teacher's final HEDI rating. For teachers with multiple SLOs, each SLO will be rated proportionately and then averaged together to get determine the teacher's final HEDI rating using the Conversion Chart.
Highly Effective (18 - 20 points) Results are well-above District goals for similar students.	see attached table in section 2.11

Effective (9 - 17 points) Results meet District goals for similar students.	see attached table in section 2.11
Developing (3 - 8 points) Results are below District goals for similar students.	see attached table in section 2.11
Ineffective (0 - 2 points) Results are well-below District goals for similar students.	see attached table in section 2.11

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.	For Algebra 1 and 2, Geometry, the conversion chart alone will be used based on the percentage of students who meet the SLO target would determine the teacher's final HEDI rating. For teachers with multiple SLOs, each SLO will be rated proportionately and then averaged together to get determine the teacher's final HEDI rating using the Conversion Chart.
Highly Effective (18 - 20 points) Results are well-above District goals for similar students.	see attached table in section 2.11
Effective (9 - 17 points) Results meet District goals for similar students.	see attached table in section 2.11
Developing (3 - 8 points) Results are below District goals for similar students.	see attached table in section 2.11
Ineffective (0 - 2 points) Results are well-below District goals for similar students.	see attached table in section 2.11

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	SVE developed 9th grade ELA Assessment
Grade 10 ELA	District, regional or BOCES-developed assessment	SVE developed 10th grade ELA Assessment
Grade 11 ELA	Regents assessment	Regents assessment

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.	A table outlining our HEDI expectations for the grade 9 and 10 ELA assessment is attached in section 2.11 A pre-assessment will be used to determine the baseline for each student. All students would be expected to make half the growth required to score 100. A 100 point post-assessment would be used to determine whether students met the target or not (yes/no). The percentage of students who met the target would determine the teacher's final HEDI rating. For grade 11 ELA, the conversion chart alone will be used based on the percentage of students who meet the SLO target would determine the teacher's final HEDI rating. For teachers with multiple SLOs, each SLO will be rated proportionately and then averaged together to get determine the teacher's final HEDI rating using the Conversion Chart.
Highly Effective (18 - 20 points) Results are well-above District goals for similar students.	see attached table in section 2.11
Effective (9 - 17 points) Results meet District goals for similar students.	see attached table in section 2.11
Developing (3 - 8 points) Results are below District goals for similar students.	see attached table in section 2.11
Ineffective (0 - 2 points) Results are well-below District goals for similar students.	see attached table in section 2.11

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	District, Regional or BOCES-developed	SVE developed Physical Education Fitness Assessment
ART	District, Regional or BOCES-developed	SVE developed Art Assessment
Music	District, Regional or BOCES-developed	SVE developed Music Assessment
Technology	District, Regional or BOCES-developed	SVE developed Technology Assessment
Health	District, Regional or BOCES-developed	SVE developed Health Assessment
Home and Careers	District, Regional or BOCES-developed	SVE developed Home and Careers Assessment

LOTE	District, Regional or BOCES-developed	GST BOCES developed Assessment
Humanities grades 5- 8	State Assessment	Grade Specific ELA Assessment
All other teachers not named above	District, Regional or BOCES-developed	Grade and Course Specific Assessment

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.	A table outlining our HEDI expectations for all other courses listed above is attached in section 2.11 A pre-assessment will be used to determine the baseline for each student. All students would be expected to make half the growth required to score 100. A 100 point post-assessment would be used to determine whether students met the target or not (yes/no). The percentage of students who met the target would determine the teacher's final HEDI rating. For teachers with multiple SLOs, each SLO will be rated proportionately and then averaged together to get determine the teacher's final HEDI rating using the Conversion Chart.
Highly Effective (18 - 20 points) Results are well-above District goals for similar students.	see attached table in section 2.11
Effective (9 - 17 points) Results meet District goals for similar students.	see attached table in section 2.11
Developing (3 - 8 points) Results are below District goals for similar students.	see attached table in section 2.11
Ineffective (0 - 2 points) Results are well-below District goals for similar students.	see attached table in section 2.11

If you need additional space, upload a copy of "Form 2.10: All Other Courses" as an attachment for review. Click here for a downloadable copy of Form 2.10. (MS Word)

(No response)

2.11) HEDI Tables or Graphics

For questions 2.2 through 2.10 above, if you are using tables or other graphics to explain your general process for assigning HEDI categories, please combine all such tables or graphics into a single file, labeling each so it is clear which grades/subjects it applies to, and upload that file here.

assets/survey-uploads/5364/124002-TXEttx9bQW/SVE 0-20 HEDI Conversion Chart for Growth on State Assessment or Comparable Measures.pdf

2.12) Locally Developed Controls

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

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

We are not applying any locally developed controls to our choices of comparable growth measure. The way we set our HEDI ratings is exactly as described above for all students enrolled in the courses.

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/rtt/teachers-leaders/slo/home.html).	Checked
2.14) Assurances Assure that past academic performance and/or baseline academic data of students will be taken into account when developing an SLO.	Checked
2.14) Assurances Assure that the process for assigning points for SLOs for the Growth Subcomponent will use the narrative HEDI descriptions described in the regulations to effectively differentiate educators in ways that improve student learning and instruction.	Checked
2.14) Assurances Assure that it is possible for an educator to earn each point, including 0, for SLOs in the Growth subcomponent scoring range.	Checked
2.14) Assurances Assure that processes are in place to monitor SLOs to ensure rigor and comparability across classrooms.	Checked

3. Local Measures (Teachers)

Created Tuesday, May 08, 2012

Updated Tuesday, August 28, 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	Measures of Academic Progress (ELA) Northwest Evaluation Association (NWEA)
5	4) State-approved 3rd party assessments	Measures of Academic Progress (ELA) Northwest Evaluation Association (NWEA)

6	4) State-approved 3rd party assessments	Measures of Academic Progress (ELA) Northwest Evaluation Association (NWEA)
7	4) State-approved 3rd party assessments	Measures of Academic Progress (ELA) Northwest Evaluation Association (NWEA)
8	4) State-approved 3rd party assessments	Measures of Academic Progress (ELA) Northwest Evaluation Association (NWEA)

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.	Measures of Academic Progress (ELA) Northwest Evaluation Association (NWEA) provided score using the attached table in 3.3.
Highly Effective (14 - 15 points) Results are well above District- or BOCES-adopted expectations for growth or achievement for grade/subject.	Measures of Academic Progress (ELA) Northwest Evaluation Association (NWEA) provided score. Reference table 3.3.
Effective (8- 13 points) Results meet District- or BOCES-adopted expectations for growth or achievement for grade/subject.	Measures of Academic Progress (ELA) Northwest Evaluation Association (NWEA) provided score. Reference table 3.3.
Developing (3 - 7 points) Results are below District- or BOCES-adopted expectations for growth or achievement for grade/subject.	Measures of Academic Progress (ELA) Northwest Evaluation Association (NWEA) provided score. Reference table 3.3
Ineffective (0 - 2 points) Results are well below District- or BOCES-adopted expectations for growth or achievement for grade/subject.	Measures of Academic Progress (ELA) Northwest Evaluation Association (NWEA) provided score. Reference table 3.3

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	Measures of Academic Progress (Math) Northwest Evaluation Association (NWEA)
5	4) State-approved 3rd party assessments	Measures of Academic Progress (Math) Northwest Evaluation Association (NWEA)
6	4) State-approved 3rd party assessments	Measures of Academic Progress (Math) Northwest Evaluation Association (NWEA)
7	4) State-approved 3rd party assessments	Measures of Academic Progress (Math) Northwest Evaluation Association (NWEA)
8	4) State-approved 3rd party assessments	Measures of Academic Progress (Math) Northwest Evaluation Association (NWEA)

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.	Measures of Academic Progress (Math) Northwest Evaluation Association (NWEA) provided score using the attached table in 3.3.
Highly Effective (14 - 15 points) Results are well above District- or BOCES-adopted expectations for growth or achievement for grade/subject.	Measures of Academic Progress (Math) Northwest Evaluation Association (NWEA) provided score. Reference table 3.3.
Effective (8- 13 points) Results meet District- or BOCES-adopted expectations for growth or achievement for grade/subject.	Measures of Academic Progress (Math) Northwest Evaluation Association (NWEA) provided score. Reference table 3.3.
Developing (3 - 7 points) Results are below District- or BOCES-adopted expectations for growth or achievement for grade/subject.	Measures of Academic Progress (Math) Northwest Evaluation Association (NWEA) provided score. Reference table 3.3.
Ineffective (0 - 2 points) Results are well below District- or BOCES-adopted expectations for growth or achievement for grade/subject.	Measures of Academic Progress (Math) Northwest Evaluation Association (NWEA) provided score. Reference table 3.3.

3.3) HEDI Tables or Graphics

For questions 3.1 and 3.2 above, if you are using tables or other graphics to explain your general process for assigning HEDI categories, please combine all such tables or graphics into a single file, labeling each so it is clear which grades/subjects it applies to, and upload that file here.

<assets/survey-uploads/5139/126657-rhJdBgDruP/NWEA MAP Assessment VARC Conversion Charts.pdf>

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

Growth or achievement measure(s) from these options.

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

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

Measures based on:

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

3.4) Grades K-3 ELA

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

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

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

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

Use this box, if needed, to describe the general process for assigning HEDI categories for these grades/subjects in this subcomponent. If needed, you may upload a table or graphic at 3.13, below.	AIMSWEB will provide students' growth percentile which is converted to a 15 or 20 point scale. The teacher score will reflect the average student growth. Please reference additional information in section 3.13
Highly Effective (18-20 points) Results are well above District- or BOCES-adopted expectations for growth or achievement for grade/subject.	AIMSWEB provided score. Reference chart in 3.13.
Effective (9-17 points) Results meet District- or BOCES-adopted expectations for growth or achievement for grade/subject.	AIMSWEB provided score. Reference chart in 3.13.
Developing (3 - 8 points) Results are below District- or BOCES-adopted expectations for growth or achievement for grade/subject.	AIMSWEB provided score. Reference chart in 3.13.
Ineffective (0 - 2 points) Results are well below District- or BOCES-adopted expectations for growth or achievement for grade/subject.	AIMSWEB provided score. Reference chart in 3.13.

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	AIMSWEB
1	4) State-approved 3rd party assessments	AIMSWEB
2	4) State-approved 3rd party assessments	AIMSWEB
3	4) State-approved 3rd party assessments	AIMSWEB

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

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

Use this box, if needed, to describe the general process for assigning HEDI categories for these grades/subjects in this subcomponent. If needed, you may upload a table or graphic at 3.13, below.	AIMSWEB will provide students' growth percentile which is converted to a 15 or 20 point scale. The teacher score will reflect the average student growth. Please reference additional information in section 3.13
Highly Effective (18-20 points) Results are well above District- or BOCES-adopted expectations for growth or achievement for grade/subject.	AIMSWEB provided score. Reference chart in 3.13.
Effective (9-17 points) Results meet District- or BOCES-adopted expectations for growth or achievement for grade/subject.	AIMSWEB provided score. Reference chart in 3.13.

Developing (3 - 8 points) Results are below District -or BOCES-adopted expectations for growth or achievement for grade/subject.	AIMSWEB provided score. Reference chart in 3.13.
Ineffective (0 - 2 points) Results are well below District- or BOCES-adopted expectations for growth or achievement for grade/subject.	AIMSWEB provided score. Reference chart in 3.13.

3.6) Grades 6-8 Science

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

	Locally-Selected Measure from List of Approved Measures	Assessment
6	Not applicable	Not applicable
7	4) State-approved 3rd party assessments	Measures of Academic Progress (ELA) Northwest Evaluation Association (NWEA)
8	4) State-approved 3rd party assessments	Measures of Academic Progress (Math) Northwest Evaluation Association (NWEA)

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.	Science grade 6 is not applicable as the teacher will meet requirements in mathematics through the 50% guideline. Measures of Academic Progress (Math) Northwest Evaluation Association (NWEA) provided score using the attached table in 3.13.
Highly Effective (18 - 20 points) Results are well above District- or BOCES-adopted expectations for growth or achievement for grade/subject.	Measures of Academic Progress (Math) Northwest Evaluation Association (NWEA) provided score. Reference table 3.13.
Effective (9 - 17 points) Results meet District- or BOCES-adopted expectations for growth or achievement for grade/subject.	Measures of Academic Progress (Math) Northwest Evaluation Association (NWEA) provided score. Reference table 3.13.
Developing (3 - 8 points) Results are below District- or BOCES-adopted expectations for growth or achievement for grade/subject.	Measures of Academic Progress (Math) Northwest Evaluation Association (NWEA) provided score. Reference table 3.13.
Ineffective (0 - 2 points) Results are well below District- or BOCES-adopted expectations for growth or achievement for grade/subject.	Measures of Academic Progress (Math) Northwest Evaluation Association (NWEA) provided score. Reference table 3.13.

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	4) State-approved 3rd party assessments	Measures of Academic Progress (ELA) Northwest Evaluation Association (NWEA)

7	4) State-approved 3rd party assessments	Measures of Academic Progress (ELA) Northwest Evaluation Association (NWEA)
8	4) State-approved 3rd party assessments	Measures of Academic Progress (ELA) Northwest Evaluation Association (NWEA)

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.	Measures of Academic Progress (ELA) Northwest Evaluation Association (NWEA) provided score using the attached table in 3.13.
Highly Effective (18 - 20 points) Results are well above District- or BOCES-adopted expectations for growth or achievement for grade/subject.	Measures of Academic Progress (ELA) Northwest Evaluation Association (NWEA) provided score. Reference table 3.13.
Effective (9 - 17 points) Results meet District- or BOCES-adopted expectations for growth or achievement for grade/subject.	Measures of Academic Progress (ELA) Northwest Evaluation Association (NWEA) provided score. Reference table 3.13.
Developing (3 - 8 points) Results are below District- or BOCES-adopted expectations for growth or achievement for grade/subject.	Measures of Academic Progress (ELA) Northwest Evaluation Association (NWEA) provided score. Reference table 3.13.
Ineffective (0 - 2 points) Results are well below District- or BOCES-adopted expectations for growth or achievement for grade/subject.	Measures of Academic Progress (ELA) Northwest Evaluation Association (NWEA) provided score. Reference table 3.13.

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	4) State-approved 3rd party assessments	Measures of Academic Progress (ELA) Northwest Evaluation Association (NWEA)
Global 2	4) State-approved 3rd party assessments	Measures of Academic Progress (ELA) Northwest Evaluation Association (NWEA)
American History	4) State-approved 3rd party assessments	Measures of Academic Progress (ELA) Northwest Evaluation Association (NWEA)

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.	Measures of Academic Progress (ELA) Northwest Evaluation Association (NWEA) provided score using the attached table in 3.13.
Highly Effective (18 - 20 points) Results are well above District- or BOCES-adopted expectations for growth or achievement for grade/subject.	Measures of Academic Progress (ELA) Northwest Evaluation Association (NWEA) provided score. Reference table 3.13.
Effective (9 - 17 points) Results meet District- or BOCES-adopted expectations for growth or achievement for grade/subject.	Measures of Academic Progress (ELA) Northwest Evaluation Association (NWEA) provided score. Reference table 3.13.
Developing (3 - 8 points) Results are below District- or BOCES-adopted expectations for growth or achievement for grade/subject.	Measures of Academic Progress (ELA) Northwest Evaluation Association (NWEA) provided score. Reference table 3.13.
Ineffective (0 - 2 points) Results are well below District- or BOCES-adopted expectations for growth or achievement for grade/subject.	Measures of Academic Progress (ELA) Northwest Evaluation Association (NWEA) provided score. Reference table 3.13.

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	4) State-approved 3rd party assessments	Measures of Academic Progress (ELA) Northwest Evaluation Association (NWEA)
Earth Science	4) State-approved 3rd party assessments	Measures of Academic Progress (Math) Northwest Evaluation Association (NWEA)
Chemistry	4) State-approved 3rd party assessments	Measures of Academic Progress (Math) Northwest Evaluation Association (NWEA)
Physics	4) State-approved 3rd party assessments	Measures of Academic Progress (Math) Northwest Evaluation Association (NWEA)

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.	Measures of Academic Progress (ELA/Math) Northwest Evaluation Association (NWEA) provided score using the attached table in 3.13.
Highly Effective (18-20 points) Results are well above District- or BOCES-adopted expectations for growth or achievement for grade/subject.	Measures of Academic Progress (ELA/Math) Northwest Evaluation Association (NWEA) provided score. Reference table 3.13
Developing (3 - 8 points) Results are below District- or BOCES-adopted expectations for growth or achievement for grade/subject.	Measures of Academic Progress (ELA/Math) Northwest Evaluation Association (NWEA) provided score. Reference table 3.13
Effective (9 - 17points) Results meet District- or BOCES-adopted expectations for growth or achievement for grade/subject.	Measures of Academic Progress (ELA/Math) Northwest Evaluation Association (NWEA) provided score. Reference table 3.13
Ineffective (0 - 2 points) Results are well below District- or BOCES-adopted expectations for growth or achievement for grade/subject.	Measures of Academic Progress (ELA/Math) Northwest Evaluation Association (NWEA) provided score. Reference table 3.13

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	4) State-approved 3rd party assessments	Measures of Academic Progress (Math) Northwest Evaluation Association (NWEA)
Geometry	4) State-approved 3rd party assessments	Measures of Academic Progress (Math) Northwest Evaluation Association (NWEA)
Algebra 2	4) State-approved 3rd party assessments	Measures of Academic Progress (Math) Northwest Evaluation Association (NWEA)

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.	Measures of Academic Progress (Math) Northwest Evaluation Association (NWEA) provided score using the attached table in 3.13.
Highly Effective (18 - 20 points) Results are well above District- or BOCES-adopted expectations for growth or achievement for grade/subject.	Measures of Academic Progress (Math) Northwest Evaluation Association (NWEA) provided score. Reference table 3.13

Effective (9 - 17 points) Results meet District- or BOCES-adopted expectations for growth or achievement for grade/subject.	Measures of Academic Progress (Math) Northwest Evaluation Association (NWEA) provided score. Reference table 3.13
Developing (3 - 8 points) Results are below District- or BOCES-adopted expectations for growth or achievement for grade/subject.	Measures of Academic Progress (Math) Northwest Evaluation Association (NWEA) provided score. Reference table 3.13
Ineffective (0 - 2 points) Results are well below District- or BOCES-adopted expectations for growth or achievement for grade/subject.	Measures of Academic Progress (Math) Northwest Evaluation Association (NWEA) provided score. Reference table 3.13

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	4) State-approved 3rd party assessments	Measures of Academic Progress (ELA) Northwest Evaluation Association (NWEA)
Grade 10 ELA	4) State-approved 3rd party assessments	Measures of Academic Progress (ELA) Northwest Evaluation Association (NWEA)
Grade 11 ELA	4) State-approved 3rd party assessments	Measures of Academic Progress (ELA) Northwest Evaluation Association (NWEA)

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.	Measures of Academic Progress (ELA) Northwest Evaluation Association (NWEA) provided score using the attached table in 3.13.
Highly Effective (18 - 20 points) Results are well above District- or BOCES-adopted expectations for growth or achievement for grade/subject.	Measures of Academic Progress (ELA) Northwest Evaluation Association (NWEA) provided score. Reference table 3.13
Effective (9 - 17 points) Results meet District- or BOCES-adopted expectations for growth or achievement for grade/subject.	Measures of Academic Progress (ELA) Northwest Evaluation Association (NWEA) provided score. Reference table 3.13
Developing (3 - 8 points) Results are below District- or BOCES-adopted expectations for growth or achievement for grade/subject.	Measures of Academic Progress (ELA) Northwest Evaluation Association (NWEA) provided score. Reference table 3.13
Ineffective (0 - 2 points) Results are well below District- or BOCES-adopted expectations for growth or achievement for	Measures of Academic Progress (ELA) Northwest Evaluation Association (NWEA) provided score. Reference table 3.13

grade/subject.

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	7) Student Learning Objectives	Presidential Challenge
Music	5) District/regional/BOCES-developed	SVE developed grade specific music assessment
ART	5) District/regional/BOCES-developed	SVE developed grade specific art assessment
Business Education	4) State-approved 3rd party	Measures of Academic Progress (Math) Northwest Evaluation Association (NWEA)
Technology	4) State-approved 3rd party	Measures of Academic Progress (Math) Northwest Evaluation Association (NWEA)
Health	4) State-approved 3rd party	Measures of Academic Progress (ELA) Northwest Evaluation Association (NWEA)
Home and Careers	4) State-approved 3rd party	Measures of Academic Progress (ELA) Northwest Evaluation Association (NWEA)
LOTE	4) State-approved 3rd party	Measures of Academic Progress (ELA) Northwest Evaluation Association (NWEA)
Government	4) State-approved 3rd party	Measures of Academic Progress (ELA) Northwest Evaluation Association (NWEA)
Economics	4) State-approved 3rd party	Measures of Academic Progress (Math) Northwest Evaluation Association (NWEA)

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.	Measures of Academic Progress (ELA/Math) Northwest Evaluation Association (NWEA) provided score using the attached table in 3.13. A table outlining our HEDI expectations for all other assessments listed above are attached in section 3.13. A pre-assessment will be used to determine the baseline for each student. All students would be expected to make half the growth required to score 100. A 100 point post-assessment would be used to determine whether students met the target or not (yes/no). The percentage of students who meet the target would determine the teacher's final HEDI rating. For teachers
---	---

with multiple goals, each will be rated proportionately and then averaged together to get determine the teacher's final HEDI rating using the Conversion Chart.

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

Reference file in 3.13.

Effective (9 - 17 points) Results meet District- or BOCES-adopted expectations for growth or achievement for grade/subject.

Reference file in 3.13.

Developing (3 - 8 points) Results are below District- or BOCES-adopted expectations for growth or achievement for grade/subject.

Reference file in 3.13.

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

Reference file in 3.13.

If you need additional space, upload a copy of "Form 3.12: All Other Courses" as an attachment for review. Click here for a downloadable copy of Form 3.12. (MS Word)

(No response)

3.13) HEDI Tables or Graphics

For questions 3.4 through 3.12 above, if you are using tables or other graphics to explain your general process for assigning HEDI categories, please combine all such tables or graphics into a single file, labeling each so it is clear which grades/subjects it applies to, and upload that file here.

assets/survey-uploads/5139/126657-y92vNseFa4/AIMSWEB NWEA and LOCAL Assessment Conversion Charts for SVE.docx

3.14) Locally Developed Controls

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

We are not applying any locally developed controls.

3.15) Teachers with More Than One Locally Selected Measure

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

For teachers with multiple SLOs, each SLO will be rated proportionately and then averaged together to get determine the teacher's final HEDI rating using the Conversion Chart uploaded in section 3.13.

3.16) Assurances

Please check all of the boxes below:

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

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

4. Other Measures of Effectiveness (Teachers)

Created Thursday, May 10, 2012

Updated Thursday, June 28, 2012

Page 1

4.1) Teacher Practice Rubric

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

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

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

Danielson's Framework for Teaching (2011 Revised Edition)

Not Applicable

4.2) Points Within Other Measures

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

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

Is the following points assignment applicable to all teachers?

Yes

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

(No response)

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

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

(No response)

4.3) Survey Tools (if applicable)

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

(No response)

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

(No response)

(No response)

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.

Reference the attached file below.

Narrative HEDI descriptions are the same as those outlined in Table 2A Educator Evaluation Rating Categories in the Guidance on NYS's Annual Professional Performance Review for Teachers and Principals (updated June 1, 2012).

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/5091/128087-eka9yMJ855/SVE process for assigning HEDI ratings for teachers.pdf](#)

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

Highly Effective: Overall performance and results exceed NYS Teaching Standards.	Total average rubric score will be between 3.5 and 4.
Effective: Overall performance and results meet NYS Teaching Standards.	Total average rubric score will be between 2.5 and 3.4.
Developing: Overall performance and results need improvement in order to meet NYS Teaching Standards.	Total average rubric score will be between 1.5 and 2.4.
Ineffective: Overall performance and results do not meet NYS Teaching Standards.	Total average rubric score will be between 1.000 and 1.400.

Provide the ranges for the 60-point scoring bands.

Highly Effective	59-60
Effective	57-58.8
Developing	50-56.3
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	3
4.6) Observations of Probationary Teachers Informal/Short	2
4.6) Observations of Probationary Teachers Enter Total	5

By trained in-school peer teachers or other trained reviewers

Formal/Long	0
Informal/Short	0

Independent evaluators

Formal/Long	0
Informal/Short	0

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

-
- In Person
-

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

-
- In Person
-

4.7) Observations of Tenured Teachers

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

By building principals or other trained administrators

4.7) Observations of Tenured Teachers Formal/Long	1
4.7) Observations of Tenured Teachers Informal/Short	2
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, May 10, 2012

Updated Tuesday, August 28, 2012

Page 1

Standards for Rating Categories

Growth or Comparable Measures

Locally-selected Measures of growth or achievement

Other Measures of Effectiveness (Teacher and Leader standards)

Highly

Effective

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

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

Overall performance and results exceed NYS Teaching Standards.

Effective

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

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

Overall performance and results meet NYS Teaching Standards.

Developing

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

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

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

Ineffective

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

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

Overall performance and results do not meet NYS Teaching Standards.

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

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

2012-13 where there is no Value-Added measure

Growth or Comparable Measures

Locally-selected Measures of

growth or achievement

Other Measures of Effectiveness

(60 points)

Overall

Composite Score

Highly Effective

18-20

18-20

Ranges determined locally--see below

91-100

Effective

9-17

9-17

75-90

Developing

3-8

3-8

65-74

Ineffective

0-2

0-2

0-64

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

Highly Effective	59-60
Effective	57-58.8
Developing	50-56.3
Ineffective	0-49

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

2012-13 where Value-Added growth measure applies

Growth or Comparable Measures

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

Other Measures of Effectiveness

(60 points)

Overall

Composite Score

Highly Effective

22-25

14-15

Ranges determined locally--see above

91-100

Effective

10-21

8-13

75-90

Developing

3-9

3-7

65-74

Ineffective

0-2

0-2

0-64

6. Additional Requirements - Teachers

Created Thursday, May 10, 2012

Updated Monday, September 10, 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/5265/128109-Df0w3Xx5v6/Teacher Improvement Plan.pdf](assets/survey-uploads/5265/128109-Df0w3Xx5v6/Teacher%20Improvement%20Plan.pdf)

6.3) Appeals Process

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

(1) the substance of the annual professional performance review

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

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

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

Appeals of annual performance reviews shall be limited to those performance reviews in which the unit member received the following:

- *Non- Tenured staff- a composite rating of "ineffective"*

- *Tenured Staff- a composite rating of “ineffective” or “developing”*

- *Any unit member may appeal a TIP if the plan was generated as the result of an ineffective or developing composite rating, in accordance with the APPR.*

The scope of the appeal will be limited to the following subjects:

- *The substance of the annual summative evaluation.*

- *The District’s adherence to the standards and methodologies required for such reviews, pursuant to Education law 3012-c.*

- *The adherence to Commissioner’s regulations.*

- *Compliance with any locally negotiated procedures regarding annual professional growth plan or improvement plans.*

- *The District’s issuance and/or implementation of the terms of the Teacher Improvement Plan under Education law 3012-c in connection with an ineffective or developing rating.*

Prohibition against more than one appeal: A unit member may not file multiple appeals regarding the same performance review or improvement plan. All grounds for appeal must be raised with specificity within one appeal. Any grounds not raised at the time the appeal is filed shall be deemed null and void.

Burden of proof: Except for procedural appeals for failure to follow timelines, the unit member has the burden of demonstrating a clear and legal right to the relief requested and the burden of establishing the facts upon which petitioner seeks relief.

Arbitration: With the exception of grievances based on failure to follow the procedural steps, the Superintendent’s decision shall be final and binding and not subject to the grievance procedure.

Timelines:

All timelines shall be adhered to unless extended by mutual agreement. Failure of the petitioner to meet a timeline will nullify the appeal. Failure of the respondent to meet a timeline will allow movement of the appeal to the next level. In no event should the entire appeals process take longer than 65 days.

Level 1- Evaluator:

Informal- Following a qualifying event as defined in the above sections, the unit member may request a follow-up meeting with the lead evaluator to informally discuss any and all related issues.

Formal- Any appeal must be submitted to the evaluator in writing no later than ten (10) school days from the date when the teacher receives his/her annual performance professional review. If the unit member is challenging the issuance, implementation or adherence of a teacher improvement plan, the appeal must be submitted within ten (10) schools days of when the alleged breach of such plan occurred.

When submitting an appeal, the unit member must submit a detailed written description of the specific grounds for the appeal as well as the performance review and/or improvement plan being challenged. Along with the appeal, all supporting documentation must be submitted, or specifically noted if pending.

Within ten (10) school days of receipt of an appeal, the lead evaluator must submit a detailed written response to the appeal including all supporting documents, as well as any additional supporting documents or materials relevant to the response. The unit member and Association President will receive copies of the response and documents.

Any supporting documentation/information not submitted or noted by either party in the Stage 1 appeal shall not be considered at the further steps of the appeal.

Level 2- Review Board:

A Review Board, consisting of one tenured administrator (not the evaluator) appointed by the Superintendent or designee and two tenured unit members appointed by the SVETA President or designee, which may include retirees. The committee shall operate under the consensus model.

Within five (5) school days of the receipt of the written Level 1 response, if a teacher is not satisfied with such response, the unit member must submit a written appeal to the Review Panel.

Within ten (10) school days of receipt of the unit member's appeal, the Review Panel will conduct a hearing at which the unit member and his/her union representative (option) and the evaluator will be allowed to present oral arguments in support of the appeal and the response, respectively.

Within five (5) school days of the Review Panels hearing, the review panel will issue a written determination to the unit member, Teacher Association President and the evaluator. The determination may be to deny the appeal; to sustain the appeal and grant the remedy sought; or sustain the appeal and modify the remedy. In the event, the parties cannot come to consensus, each member of the panel will issue a recommendation.

Level 3- Superintendent

Within five (5) school days of the receipt of the Review Panel's Level 2 response, if a unit member is not satisfied with such response, the unit member must submit a written appeal to the Superintendent.

Within ten (10) school days of the receipt of the written level two (2) response, the Superintendent will conduct a hearing at which the unit member and his/her union representative (option) and the evaluator will be allowed to present oral arguments in support of the appeal and the response, respectively.

Within five (5) school days of the Superintendent's hearing, the Superintendent shall issue a written determination to the unit member, Teacher's Association President and the evaluator. The determination may be to deny the appeal; to sustain the appeal and grant the remedy sought; or sustain the appeal and modify the remedy.

Records

The entire appeals record will be part of the unit member's APPR.

After entering or noting a document into the record at Stage 1 of the appeals process, the District shall maintain copies of all the documents/information for all further stages of the appeals process.

6.4) Training and Certification of Lead Evaluators and Evaluators

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

Evaluator Training:

- 1. The District will ensure that all Evaluators/Lead Evaluators are properly trained and certified. Lead evaluators are qualified to conduct teacher evaluations under 3012-c and Commissioner's Regulation 30-2. [30-2.9(a)]*
- 2. The District will provide training to evaluators and lead evaluators through the GST BOCES RTTT Evaluator Training program. The District will maintain records of certification of evaluators. Certified evaluators will be monitored and recertified on a periodic basis to be determined by the District in collaboration with SVETA. Training will include the following topics: NYS teaching and leadership standards, evidence-based observation techniques, application and use of student growth and value-added models, application and use of state approved teacher and principal rubrics, application and use of assessment tools, applications and use of state approved locally developed measures of student achievement, use of the statewide instructional reporting system, the scoring methodology that will be used and specific considerations in evaluating teachers and principals of English Language Learners and Students with Disabilities. We approximate that evaluators will receive at least twenty (20) hours of training annually.*
- 3. Nothing herein shall be construed to prohibit an evaluator who is properly certified by the State as a school administrator from conducting classroom observations or school visits as part of an annual professional performance review under Chapter 103 prior to completion of the training required by said Chapter or the regulations thereunder, as long as such training is successfully completed prior to completion of the annual professional performance review.*

Inter-Rater Reliability:

The District will establish a process to maintain inter-rater reliability over time in accordance to NYSED guidance and protocols. This aspect is specifically covered in the BOCES training.

Data Submission to The Department (See Commissioner's Regulation 30-2.3(b)(1)):

The District will work with the State Education Department (the "SED") to develop a process that aligns its data systems to ensure that SED receives timely and accurate teacher, course and student "linkage" data, as well as a process for teacher and principal verification of the courses and/or student rosters assigned to them.

Ensuring Accurate Teacher and Student Data

The district shall ensure that SED receives accurate teacher and student data, including enrollment, attendance data, and any other course and teacher/student linkage data necessary to comply with the regulations of the Board of Regents and Commissioner of Education. The District will provide such data in a format and timeline prescribed by the Commissioner.

The District collects and archives data on student enrollment, attendance and achievement on State wide assessments in the student data management suite of the products including School Tools. The data will be maintained by our Chief Information Officer in collaboration with the District Registrar, Supervisors and Coaches, Guidance Department staff & who regularly verify attendance, grades, assessment results, and course assignments. Additionally, the District will utilize, but not be limited to, DIAL, NWEA MAP assessments, AIMS Web, and local assessment databases to aid in the analysis and monitoring of student progress.

The New York State Department's APPR Guidance and field memos, relating to the Student Information Repository System (SIRS), will provide detailed guidance related to the collection and reporting of data, including student-teacher linkage and student attendance. The District will continue to monitor data and develop additional processes, as needed and consistent with NYSED reporting requirements, to verify that the data submitted to the State is complete and accurate. NYSED advises that it will provide roster verification reports to assist in this process. The NYSED also will provide guidelines for the use of student-teacher instructional weighting and student exclusion flags.

Verification: The District's student data system identifies teacher assignments, student enrollment and student attendance. The District has obtained the NYSED statewide unique identifier for all certified individuals employed by the District through "TEACH." The District has entered this information into the District's data system for reporting to SIRS in accordance with NYSED guidance. Student enrollment in all courses linked to a state assessment is recorded using the statewide standardized course codes. The District will verify assignments of classroom teachers of common branch subjects, ELA and Mathematics in grades 4-8 through the links established between WinCap and SchoolTool. Teachers use these systems to record daily attendance, maintain a grade book, produce progress reports, and report cards. The District will work with SVETA to determine an appropriate role for individual teachers to play in this verification process.

*Teacher Verification of Subjects Taught and Students Assigned
(See Commissioner's Regulation 30-2.3(b)(1)):*

Classroom teachers to whom this plan applies shall be provided an opportunity to verify the subjects and students assigned to them. [30-2.3(b)(1)] The attendance records kept by the teacher for each class will constitute verification of subjects taught and students assigned.

*Reporting Teachers' Subcomponent and Composite Scores to the Department
(See Commissioner's Regulation 30-2.3(b)(2)):*

The District will report to the Department the individual subcomponent scores and the composite effectiveness score for each teacher to whom this plan applies in a format and on a timeline prescribed by the Commissioner. [30-2.3(b)(2)]. The District plans to use the current student data and personnel management software systems to establish and track the teacher/student course linkage as required by law and said data will be uploaded when the NYSED system is ready to receive the data.

The assessment development, security, and scoring processes utilized to ensure that assessments and measures used to evaluate teachers are not disseminated to students and that teachers do not have a vested interest in the outcome of the assessments they score follow: (See Commissioner's Regulation 30-2.3(b)(3)):

Development: The District will continue to obtain feedback and input from the APPR Committee to determine decisions about local measures of student achievement; teacher and principal practice rubrics; other instruments (such as surveys, self-assessments, portfolios); and the scoring methodology for the assignment of points to locally selected measures of student achievement and other measures of teacher or principal effectiveness.

6.5) Assurances -- Evaluators

Please check the boxes below:

-
- Checked
-

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

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

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

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

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

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

(7) use of the Statewide Instructional Reporting System

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

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

-
- Checked
-

6.6) Assurances -- Teachers

Please check all of the boxes below:

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

6.7) Assurances -- Data

Please check all of the boxes below:

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

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

Created Thursday, May 10, 2012

Updated Monday, September 10, 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):

Middle School 5-8
High School 9-12
(No response)

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

Please check the boxes below:

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

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

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

State assessments, *required if one exists*

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

List of State-approved 3rd party assessments

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

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

School or Program Type	SLO with Assessment Option	Name of the Assessment
Elementary School PK-4	District, regional, or BOCES-developed	SVE developed K ELA and Math Assessment
Elementary School PK-4	District, regional, or BOCES-developed	SVE developed 1st grade ELA and Math Assessment
Elementary School PK-4	District, regional, or BOCES-developed	SVE developed 2nd grade ELA and Math Assessment
Elementary School PK-4	State assessment	3rd Grade NYS Assessment in ELA and Math
Elementary School PK-4	State assessment	4th Grade NYS Assessment in ELA and Math

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

Use this box, if needed, to describe the process for assigning HEDI categories in this subcomponent. If needed, you may upload a table or graphic below.	The Elementary School Principal for PK-4 HEDI categories will be based on the results of all students at each grade level as measured by their SLOs and/or SPGs. All student points will be averaged together to determine the principal's points.
Highly Effective (18 - 20 points) Results are well above state average for similar students (or District goals if no state test).	Reference attached table.
Effective (9 - 17 points) Results meet state average for similar students (or District goals if no state test).	Reference attached table.
Developing (3 - 8 points) Results are below state average for similar students (or District goals if no state test).	Reference attached table.
Ineffective (0 - 2 points) Results are well below state average for similar students (or District goals if no state test).	Reference attached table.

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

<assets/survey-uploads/5365/128071-lha0DogRNw/SVE 0-20 HEDI Conversion Chart for Growth on State Assessment or Comparable Measures.pdf>

7.4) Special Considerations for Comparable Growth Measures

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

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

We are not applying any locally developed controls to our choices of comparable growth measure.

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 Thursday, May 10, 2012

Updated Monday, September 10, 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
Elementary School PreK-4	(a) achievement on State assessments	ELA and Math Assessments for Grade 4.
Elementary School PreK-4	(d) measures used by district for teacher evaluation	K through 3rd Grade specific Local Assessments in ELA and Math using AIMSWEB and Measures of Academic Progress/Northwest Evaluation Association (NWEA) where applicable

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.	HEDI categories will be based on the results of students at each grade level as measured by their local measures. Principal's points will be based on the average of the student's points in the building. .
Highly Effective (14 - 15 points) Results are well above District- or BOCES-adopted expectations for growth or achievement for grade/subject.	Reference attached table.
Effective (8- 13 points) Results meet District- or BOCES-adopted expectations for growth or achievement for grade/subject.	Reference attached table.
Developing (3 - 7 points) Results are below District- or BOCES-adopted expectations for growth or achievement for grade/subject.	Reference attached table.
Ineffective (0 - 2 points) Results are well below District- or BOCES-adopted expectations for growth or achievement for	Reference attached table.

grade/subject.

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

(No response)

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

assets/survey-uploads/5366/128118-qBFVOWF7fC/AIMSWEB NWEA and LOCAL Assessment Conversion Charts for SVE.pdf

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
Middle School 5-8	(d) measures used by district for teacher evaluation	Same assessments as students using Measures of Academic Progress (ELA, Math) Northwest Evaluation Association(NWEA) where applicable. All other areas will be based on grade specific locally developed content tests as identified in teacher evaluation section.
High School 9-12	(d) measures used by district for teacher evaluation	Same assessments as students using Measures of Academic Progress (ELA, Math) Northwest Evaluation Association(NWEA) where applicable. All other areas will be based on grade specific locally developed content tests as identified in teacher evaluation section.

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.	HEDI categories will be based on the results of students at each grade level as measured by their local measures. Principal's points will be based on the average of the student's points in the building.
Highly Effective (18 - 20 points) Results are well above District- or BOCES-adopted expectations for growth or achievement for grade/subject.	Reference attached chart.
Effective (9- 17 points) Results meet District- or BOCES-adopted expectations for growth or achievement for grade/subject.	Reference attached chart.
Developing (3 - 8 points) Results are below District- or BOCES-adopted expectations for growth or achievement for grade/subject.	Reference attached chart.
Ineffective (0 - 2 points) Results are well below District- or BOCES-adopted expectations for growth or achievement for	Reference attached chart.

grade/subject.

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

(No response)

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

assets/survey-uploads/5366/128118-T8MIGWUVm1/AIMSWEB NWEA and LOCAL Assessment Conversion Charts for SVE.pdf

8.3) Locally Developed Controls

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

We are not applying any locally developed controls to our choices to the local measures.

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 Thursday, May 10, 2012

Updated Thursday, June 28, 2012

Page 1

9.1) Principal Practice Rubric

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

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

Multidimensional Principal Performance Rubric

(No response)

9.2) Points Within Other Measures

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

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

Is the following points assignment for all principals?

Yes

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

(No response)

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

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

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

(No response)

9.3) Assurances -- Goals

Please check the boxes below (if applicable):

9.3) Assurances -- Goals Assure that if any points are assigned to goals, at least one goal will address the principal's contribution to improving teacher effectiveness based on one or more of the following: improved retention of high performing teachers; correlation of student growth scores to teachers granted vs. denied tenure; or improvements in proficiency rating of the principal on specific teacher effectiveness standards in the principal practice rubric.	Checked
9.3) Assurances -- Goals Assure that any other goals, if applicable, shall address quantifiable and verifiable improvements in academic results or the school's learning environment (e.g. student or teacher attendance).	Checked

9.4) Sources of Evidence (if applicable)

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

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

9.5) Survey Tool(s) (if applicable)

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

(No response)

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

(No response)

(No response)

(No response)

9.6) Assurances

Please check all of the boxes below:

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

9.7) Process for Assigning Points and Determining HEDI Ratings

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

Please reference attached file in 9.7.

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

assets/survey-uploads/5143/128117-pMADJ4gk6R/SVE process for assigning HEDI ratings for principals.pdf

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

Highly Effective: Overall performance and results exceed standards.	Average rubric score ranges from 3.5 to 4.
Effective: Overall performance and results meet standards.	Average rubric score ranges from 2.5 to 3.4
Developing: Overall performance and results need improvement in order to meet standards.	Average rubric score ranges from 1.5 to 2.4
Ineffective: Overall performance and results do not meet standards.	Average rubric score ranges from 1.0 to 1.4

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

Tenured Principals

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

10. Composite Scoring (Principals)

Created Wednesday, June 27, 2012

Updated Monday, September 10, 2012

Page 1

Standards for Rating Categories

Growth or Comparable Measures

Locally-selected Measures of

growth or achievement

Other Measures of Effectiveness

(Teacher and Leader standards)

Highly

Effective

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

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

Overall performance and results exceed ISLLC leadership standards.

Effective

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

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

Overall performance and results meet ISLLC leadership standards.

Developing

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

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

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

Ineffective

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

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

Overall performance and results do not meet ISLLC leadership standards.

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

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

2012-13 where there is no Value-Added measure

Growth or Comparable Measures

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

Other Measures of Effectiveness

(60 points)

Overall

Composite Score

Highly Effective

18-20

18-20

Ranges determined locally--see below

91-100

Effective

9-17

9-17

75-90

Developing

3-8

3-8

65-74

Ineffective

0-2

0-2

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

Highly Effective	59-60
Effective	57-58.8
Developing	50-56.3
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, June 27, 2012
Updated Monday, September 10, 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/5276/146470-Df0w3Xx5v6/Teacher Improvement Plan.pdf](#)

11.3) Appeals Process

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

(1) the substance of the annual professional performance review

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

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

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

Appeal Process:

Appeals of annual performance reviews shall be limited to those performance reviews in which the administrator received the following:

- *A composite rating of "ineffective" or "developing"*

- Any administrator may appeal a PIP if the plan was generated as the result of an ineffective or developing composite rating, in accordance with the APPR.

The scope of the appeal will be limited to the following subjects:

- The substance of the annual summative evaluation.
- The District's adherence to the standards and methodologies required for such reviews, pursuant to Education law 3012-c.
- The adherence to Commissioner's regulations.
- Compliance with any locally negotiated procedures regarding annual professional growth plan or improvement plans.
- The District's issuance and/or implementation of the terms of the Principal Improvement Plan under Education law 3012-c in connection with an ineffective or developing rating.

Prohibition against more than one appeal: An administrator may not file multiple appeals regarding the same performance review or improvement plan. All grounds for appeal must be raised with specificity within one appeal. Any grounds not raised at the time the appeal is filed shall be deemed null and void.

Burden of proof: Except for procedural appeals for failure to follow timelines, the administrator has the burden of demonstrating a clear and legal right to the relief requested and the burden of establishing the facts upon which petitioner seeks relief.

Arbitration: With the exception of grievances based on failure to follow the procedural steps, the Superintendent's decision shall be final and binding and not subject to the grievance procedure.

Timelines:

All timelines shall be adhered to unless extended by mutual agreement. Failure of the petitioner to meet a timeline will nullify the appeal. Failure of the respondent to meet a timeline will allow movement of the appeal to the next level. In no event should the entire appeals process take longer than 65 days.

Level 1- Evaluator:

Informal- Following a qualifying event as defined in the above sections, the administrator may request a follow-up meeting with the Superintendent to informally discuss any and all related issues.

Formal- Any appeal must be submitted to the Superintendent in writing no later than ten (10) school days from the date when the administrator receives his/her annual performance professional review. If challenging the issuance, implementation or adherence of a principal improvement plan, the appeal must be submitted within ten (10) schools days of when the alleged breach of such plan occurred.

When submitting an appeal, a detailed written description of the specific grounds for the appeal as well as the performance review and/or improvement plan being challenged must be provided. Along with the appeal, all supporting documentation must be submitted, or specifically noted if pending.

Within ten (10) school days of receipt of an appeal, the Superintendent must submit a detailed written response to the appeal including all supporting documents, as well as any additional supporting documents or materials relevant to the response.

Any supporting documentation/information not submitted or noted by either party in the Stage 1 appeal shall not be considered at the further steps of the appeal.

Level 2- Review Board:

A Review Board, consisting of one tenured administrator (not the one being evaluated) appointed by the Superintendent and an additional neutral administrator (from neighboring school district, BOCES or BOCES superintendent), which may include retirees. The committee shall operate under the consensus model.

Within five (5) school days of the receipt of the written Level 1 response, if a principal is not satisfied with such response, the principal must submit a written appeal to the Review Panel.

Within ten (10) school days of receipt of the principal's appeal, the Review Panel will conduct a hearing at which the principal and the Superintendent will be allowed to present oral arguments in support of the appeal and the response, respectively.

Within five (5) school days of the Review Panels hearing, the review panel will issue a written determination to the principal and the Superintendent. The determination may be to deny the appeal; to sustain the appeal and grant the remedy sought; or sustain the appeal and modify the remedy. In the event, the parties cannot come to consensus; each member of the panel will issue a recommendation.

Level 3- BOCES Superintendent

Within five (5) school days of the receipt of the Review Panel's Level 2 response, if principal is not satisfied with such response, the principal must submit a written appeal to the BOCES Superintendent.

Within ten (10) school days of the receipt of the written level two (2) response, the BOCES Superintendent will conduct a hearing at which the principal and the Superintendent will be allowed to present oral arguments in support of the appeal and the response, respectively.

Within five (5) school days of the BOCES Superintendent's hearing, the BOCES Superintendent shall issue a written determination to the principal and Superintendent. The determination may be to deny the appeal; to sustain the appeal and grant the remedy sought; or sustain the appeal and modify the remedy.

Records

The entire appeals record will be part of the principal's unit member's permanent folder.

After entering or noting a document into the record at Stage 1 of the appeals process, the District shall maintain copies of all the documents/information for all further stages of the appeals process.

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.

Lead Evaluator Training:

1. The District will ensure that all Evaluators/Lead Evaluators are properly trained and certified. Lead evaluators are qualified to conduct teacher evaluations under 3012-c and Commissioner's Regulation 30-2. [30-2.9(a)].

2. The District will provide training to evaluators and lead evaluators through the GST BOCES RTTT Evaluator Training program. Training will include the following topics: NYS teaching and leadership standards, evidence-based observation techniques, application and use of student growth and value-added models, application and use of state approved teacher and principal rubrics, application and use of assessment tools, applications and use of state approved locally developed measures of student achievement, use of the statewide instructional reporting system, the scoring methodology that will be used and specific considerations in evaluating teachers and principals of English Language Learners and Students with Disabilities. We approximate that evaluators will receive at least twenty (20) hours of training annually.

The District will maintain records of certification of evaluators. Certified evaluators will be monitored and recertified on a periodic basis to be determined by the District.

3. Nothing herein shall be construed to prohibit an evaluator who is properly certified by the State as a school administrator from conducting classroom observations or school visits as part of an annual professional performance review under Chapter 103 prior to completion of the training required by said Chapter or the regulations thereunder, as long as such training is successfully completed prior to completion of the annual professional performance review.

Inter-Rater Reliability:

The District will establish a process to maintain inter-rater reliability over time in accordance to NYSED guidance and protocols. This aspect will be covered in the GST BOCES training.

11.5) Assurances -- Evaluators

Please check the boxes below:

-
- Checked
-

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

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

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

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

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

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

(7) use of the Statewide Instructional Reporting System

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

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

-
- Checked
-

11.6) Assurances -- Principals

Please check all of the boxes below:

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

11.7) Assurances -- Data

Please check all of the boxes below:

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

12. Joint Certification of APPR Plan

Created Thursday, May 10, 2012

Updated Friday, June 29, 2012

Page 1

12.1) Upload the Joint Certification of the APPR Plan

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

assets/survey-uploads/5581/128112-3Uqgn5g9Iu/DistrictCertification_1.pdf

File types supported for uploads

PDF (preferred)

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

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

Open Office (.odt, .ott)

Images (.jpg, .gif)

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

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

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

Conversion Chart: The percentage of students' whose progress meets expectations.

Highly Effective			Effective									Developing					Ineffective			
20	19	18	17	16	15	14	13	12	11	10	9	8	7	6	5	4	3	2	1	0
97-100%	93-96%	89-92%	88%	87%	86%	85%	84%	83%	82%	81%	80%	78-79%	76-77%	74-75%	72-73%	70-71%	68-69%	57-67%	46-56%	0-45%

NWEA MAP Assessment VARC Conversion Charts

The following chart represents a value added score that will be generated by NWEA and result in a growth score (“GS”) + or – from) as an indicator of a year’s worth of growth.

The chart below is a 20 point conversion.

Ineffective		Developing		Effective		Highly Effective	
Student Growth Score	Points	Student Growth Score	Points	Student Growth Score	Points	Student Growth Score	Points
$-2.3 < GS \leq -2.1$	2	$-1.1 < GS \leq -0.9$	8	$0.5 < GS \leq 0.9$	17	$GS > 1.3$	20
$-2.5 < GS \leq -2.3$	1	$-1.3 < GS \leq -1.1$	7	$0.1 < GS \leq 0.5$	16	$1.1 < GS \leq 1.3$	19
$GS \leq -2.5$	0	$-1.5 < GS \leq -1.3$	6	$-0.1 < GS \leq 0.1$	15	$0.9 < GS \leq 1.1$	18
		$-1.7 < GS \leq -1.5$	5	$-0.3 < GS \leq -0.1$	14		
		$-1.9 < GS \leq -1.7$	4	$-0.5 < GS \leq -0.3$	13		
		$-2.1 < GS \leq -1.9$	3	$-0.6 < GS \leq -0.5$	12		
				$-0.7 < GS \leq -0.6$	11		
				$-0.8 < GS \leq -0.7$	10		
				$-0.9 < GS \leq -0.8$	9		

The chart below is a 15 point conversion. (NWEA VARC Data)

Ineffective		Developing		Effective		Highly Effective	
Student Growth Score	Points	Student Growth Score	Points	Student Growth Score	Points	Student Growth Score	Points
$-2.3 < GS \leq -2.1$	2	$-1.3 < GS \leq -0.9$	7	$0.5 < GS \leq 0.9$	13	$GS > 1.3$	15
$-2.5 < GS \leq -2.3$	1	$-1.5 < GS \leq -1.3$	6	$0.1 < GS \leq 0.5$	12	$0.9 < GS \leq 1.3$	14
$GS \leq -2.5$	0	$-1.7 < GS \leq -1.5$	5	$-0.3 < GS \leq 0.1$	11		
		$-1.9 < GS \leq -1.7$	4	$-0.6 < GS \leq -0.3$	10		
		$-2.1 < GS \leq -1.9$	3	$-0.8 < GS \leq -0.6$	9		
				$-0.9 < GS \leq -0.8$	8		

AIMSWEB Assessment Conversion Charts

The following chart represents a value added score that will be generated by AIMSWEB and result in student growth percentile.

The chart below is a 20 point conversion.

Ineffective		Developing		Effective		Highly Effective	
Student Growth Percentile	Points						
27-24	2	51-48	8	87-84	17	99-96	20
23-20	1	47-44	7	83-80	16	95-92	19
19-0	0	43-40	6	79-76	15	91-88	18
		39-36	5	75-72	14		
		35-32	4	71-68	13		
		31-28	3	67-64	12		
				63-60	11		
				59-56	10		
				55-52	9		

The chart below is a 15 point conversion

Ineffective		Developing		Effective		Highly Effective	
Student Growth Percentile	Points						
34-30	2	59-55	7	89-85	13	99-95	15
29-25	1	54-50	6	84-80	12	94-90	14
24-0	0	49-45	5	79-75	11		
		44-40	4	74-70	10		
		39-35	3	69-65	9		
				64-60	8		

NWEA MAP Assessment VARC Conversion Charts

The following chart represents a value added score that will be generated by NWEA and result in a growth score (“GS”) + or – from) as an indicator of a year’s worth of growth.

The chart below is a 20 point conversion.

Ineffective		Developing		Effective		Highly Effective	
Student Growth Score	Points	Student Growth Score	Points	Student Growth Score	Points	Student Growth Score	Points
$-2.3 < GS \leq -2.1$	2	$-1.1 < GS \leq -0.9$	8	$0.5 < GS \leq 0.9$	17	$GS > 1.3$	20
$-2.5 < GS \leq -2.3$	1	$-1.3 < GS \leq -1.1$	7	$0.1 < GS \leq 0.5$	16	$1.1 < GS \leq 1.3$	19
$GS \leq -2.5$	0	$-1.5 < GS \leq -1.3$	6	$-0.1 < GS \leq 0.1$	15	$0.9 < GS \leq 1.1$	18
		$-1.7 < GS \leq -1.5$	5	$-0.3 < GS \leq -0.1$	14		
		$-1.9 < GS \leq -1.7$	4	$-0.5 < GS \leq -0.3$	13		
		$-2.1 < GS \leq -1.9$	3	$-0.6 < GS \leq -0.5$	12		
				$-0.7 < GS \leq -0.6$	11		
				$-0.8 < GS \leq -0.7$	10		
				$-0.9 < GS \leq -0.8$	9		

The chart below is a 15 point conversion. (NWEA VARC Data)

Ineffective		Developing		Effective		Highly Effective	
Student Growth Score	Points	Student Growth Score	Points	Student Growth Score	Points	Student Growth Score	Points
$-2.3 < GS \leq -2.1$	2	$-1.3 < GS \leq -0.9$	7	$0.5 < GS \leq 0.9$	13	$GS > 1.3$	15
$-2.5 < GS \leq -2.3$	1	$-1.5 < GS \leq -1.3$	6	$0.1 < GS \leq 0.5$	12	$0.9 < GS \leq 1.3$	14
$GS \leq -2.5$	0	$-1.7 < GS \leq -1.5$	5	$-0.3 < GS \leq 0.1$	11		
		$-1.9 < GS \leq -1.7$	4	$-0.6 < GS \leq -0.3$	10		
		$-2.1 < GS \leq -1.9$	3	$-0.8 < GS \leq -0.6$	9		
				$-0.9 < GS \leq -0.8$	8		

Physical Education, Music, Art, Technology, Health, Home and Careers, and any other local courses.

Student progress will be measured by the half to a hundred rule.							
Performance Level	End 1: Post-assessment score is at least 60	End 2: Post-assessment score is at least 65	End 3: Post-assessment score is at least 70	End 4: Post-assessment score is at least 75	End 5: Post-assessment score is at least 80	End 6: Post-assessment score is at least 85	End 7: Post-assessment score is at least 90
Start 1: Pre-assessment score is 0-29	Yes						
Start 2: Pre-assessment score is 30-39	No	Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes
Start 3: Pre-assessment score is 40-49	No	No	Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes
Start 4: Pre-assessment score is 50-59	No	No	No	Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes
Start 5: Pre-assessment score is 60-69	No	No	No	No	Yes	Yes	Yes
Start 6: Pre-assessment score is 70-79	No	No	No	No	No	Yes	Yes
Start 7: Pre-assessment score is 80 or higher	No	No	No	No	No	No	Yes

Conversion Chart: The percentage of students' whose progress meets expectations.																				
Highly Effective			Effective									Developing						Ineffective		
20	19	18	17	16	15	14	13	12	11	10	9	8	7	6	5	4	3	2	1	0
97-100%	93-96%	89-92%	88%	87%	86%	85%	84%	83%	82%	81%	80%	78-79%	76-77%	74-75%	72-73%	70-71%	68-69%	57-67%	46-56%	0-45%

PURPOSE:

The purpose of the Professional Growth Program is to:

- provide a process which facilitates the improvement and enhancement of instructional practices for all members of the Spencer-Van Etten Teachers Association;
- provide a basis for making justifiable decisions about tenure status and the retention of unit members;
- provide unit members with options to grow professionally

GOALS:

Our Professional Growth Program is a holistic approach utilizing best practices, research, conferences, and written feedback. Eight goals drive this program.

1. Promote shared values and assumptions about what constitutes good teaching
2. Connect a professional growth plan to a framework focused on student learning.
3. Increase awareness of the importance and complexity of teaching.
4. Ensure active collaborative teacher/administration involvement in an assessment process that utilizes multiple sources of evidence to ensure a comprehensive view of teacher effectiveness.
5. Provide alternate approaches for formative and summative assessment.
6. Utilize research - based practices.
7. Foster quality in teaching and evaluation.
8. View evaluation as a continuous improvement model.

The four domains of the Danielson Model (page 6) are aligned with the NYS Annual Professional Performance Review (APPR) Standards (Appendix A). The eight focus areas of the APPR are as follows:

Classroom Management	Preparation
Communication and Collaboration	Student Development
Content Knowledge	Student Assessment
Reflective and Responsive Practice	Instructional Delivery

TEACHERS, INSTRUCTIONAL SPECIALISTS, LIBRARY/MEDIA SPECIALISTS, AND SPEECH LANGUAGE PATHOLOGISTS

Process:

Since observation is viewed as only one aspect of the Professional Growth Program, this holistic approach utilizes best practices, research, conferences and written feedback. Key components of the process include:

1. Individual annual professional growth plan which is mutually agreed upon by the unit member and administrator (Appendix B). Non-tenured teachers will follow the schedule on page 7.
2. Formal and informal observations. Post conferences and written report will be completed within 15 school days from the date of observation (Appendix F). Unannounced walk-throughs will be a minimum of five minutes. (Appendix D)
3. Educational conversations (Appendix E)
4. End of Year Summative Evaluation (Appendix G)
 - Section I: Rubric/Self Reflection
 - Section II: State Assessment
 - Section III: Local Assessment – Multiple Measures
5. Satisfactory completion of all eight APPR standards before tenure may be considered.

Procedures:

Non -Tenured Teacher	Tenured Teacher
<p>1. Create an annual professional growth plan focusing on the eight APPR standards and review with administrator prior to October 15th. Professional growth plans will focus on a maximum of three APPR standards per year. (Refer to schedule on page seven).</p> <p>2. Participate in multiple observations (Appendix D, E, and F)</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Minimum of three formal observations of a lesson will occur during the first year with the first observation occurring prior to November 1st. The first observation requires a pre-observation meeting to review the observation procedure. All formal observations require a post-observation meeting. • Minimum of two formal observations will occur during each consecutive year until tenured. • Other observations will be based on a series (a minimum of 2) of unannounced walk-throughs (five or more minutes) occurring throughout the year. The form will be shared with the teacher after each walk-through (Appendix D) • The summative evaluation will include evidence from all observations and will be reflective of the Danielson Rubric (Appendix G) <p>3. Participate in an annual summative review (Appendix G)</p> <p style="margin-left: 40px;">Section I: Rubric/Self Reflection Section II: State Assessment Section III: Local Assessment – Multiple Measures</p> <p>4. Review yearly performance and review professional growth plan for upcoming year.</p>	<p>1. Create an annual professional growth plan focusing on the eight APPR standards and review with administrator prior to October 15th.</p> <p>2. Participate in multiple observations</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • At least one observation of a lesson annually. A pre-observation meeting is optional. The observation requires a post-observation meeting (Appendix E and F) • A second observation will be based on a series (a minimum of 2) of unannounced walk-throughs (five or more minutes) occurring throughout the year. The form will be shared with the teacher after each walk-through (Appendix D) • The summative evaluation will include evidence from all observations and will be reflective of the Danielson Rubric (Appendix G) <p>3. Participate in an annual summative review (Appendix G)</p> <p style="margin-left: 40px;">Section I: Rubric/Self Reflection Section II: State Assessment Section III: Local Assessment – Multiple Measures</p> <p>4. Review yearly performance and review professional growth plan for upcoming year.</p>

Conversion Chart					
Level	Measures of Student Growth	Local Measures of Student Achievement	Other 60 points		Overall Composite Score
Ineffective	0 - 2	0 - 2	0-49		0-64
Developing	3 - 8	3 - 8	50-56.3		65-74
Effective	9-17	9 - 17	57-58.8		75-90
Highly Effective	18 - 20	18 - 20	59-60		91-100

*NYS will determine the overall composite score; therefore the "other 60 points" may be adjusted

Annual Professional Performance Review (APPR) Standards for Non-Tenured Teachers to be used in the Professional Growth Plan

Focus Areas for the Professional Growth Plan						
Year 1						
<p style="text-align: center;">Classroom Management (Danielson: 2a,2b,2c,2d,2e)</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Creating an Environment of Respect and Rapport <ul style="list-style-type: none"> ▪ Teacher interaction with students ▪ Student interactions with other students • Establishing a Culture of Learning <ul style="list-style-type: none"> ▪ Importance of the content ▪ Student pride in work ▪ Expectations for learning and achievement • Managing Classroom Procedures <ul style="list-style-type: none"> ▪ Management of instructional groups ▪ Management of transitions ▪ Management of materials and supplies ▪ Performance of non-instructional duties ▪ Supervision of volunteers and paraprofessionals • Managing Student Behavior <ul style="list-style-type: none"> ▪ Expectations ▪ Monitoring of student behavior ▪ Response to student misbehavior • Organizing Physical Space <ul style="list-style-type: none"> ▪ Safety and accessibility ▪ Arrangement of furniture and use of physical resources 	<p style="text-align: center;">Communication / Collaboration (Danielson: 4c, 4d, 4f)</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Communicating with Families <ul style="list-style-type: none"> ▪ Information about the instructional program ▪ Information about individual students ▪ Engagement of families in the instructional program • Participating in a Professional Community <ul style="list-style-type: none"> ▪ Relationships with colleagues ▪ Involvement in a culture of professional inquiry ▪ Service to the school ▪ Participation in school and district projects • Showing Professionalism <ul style="list-style-type: none"> ▪ Integrity and ethical conduct ▪ Service to students ▪ Advocacy ▪ Decision making ▪ Compliance with school and district regulations 	<p style="text-align: center;">Content Knowledge (Danielson: 1a,4e)</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Demonstrating Knowledge of Content and Pedagogy <ul style="list-style-type: none"> ▪ Knowledge of content and the structure of discipline ▪ Knowledge of prerequisite relationships ▪ Knowledge of content-related pedagogy • Growing and Developing Professionally <ul style="list-style-type: none"> ▪ Enhancement of content knowledge and pedagogical skill ▪ Receptivity to feedback from colleagues ▪ Service to the profession 				
Year 2						
<p style="text-align: center;">Instructional Delivery (3a, 3b, 3c, 3d, 3e)</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Communicating with Students <ul style="list-style-type: none"> ▪ Expectations for learning ▪ Directions and procedures ▪ Explanations of content ▪ Oral and written language • Using Questioning and Discussion Techniques <ul style="list-style-type: none"> ▪ Quality of questions ▪ Discussion techniques ▪ Student participation • Engaging Students in Learning <ul style="list-style-type: none"> ▪ Activities and assignments ▪ Grouping of students ▪ Instructional materials and resources ▪ Structure and pacing • Using Assessment in Instruction <ul style="list-style-type: none"> ▪ Assessment criteria ▪ Monitoring of student learning ▪ Feedback to students ▪ Student self-assessment and monitoring of progress • Demonstrating Flexibility and Responsiveness <ul style="list-style-type: none"> ▪ Lesson adjustment ▪ Response to Students ▪ Persistence 	<p style="text-align: center;">Plus Two Additional Focus Areas (Options Below) or areas determined by the administrator.</p> <table border="1" style="width: 100%; border-collapse: collapse;"> <tr> <td style="width: 50%; vertical-align: top; padding: 5px;"> <p style="text-align: center;">Preparation (Danielson: 1c, 1d, 1e)</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Selecting Instructional Outcomes <ul style="list-style-type: none"> ▪ Value, sequence, and alignment ▪ Clarity ▪ Balance ▪ Suitability for diverse students • Demonstrating Knowledge of Resources <ul style="list-style-type: none"> ▪ Resources for classroom use ▪ Resources to extend content knowledge and pedagogy ▪ Resources for students • Designing Coherent Instruction <ul style="list-style-type: none"> ▪ Learning activities ▪ Instructional materials and resources ▪ Instructional groups ▪ Lesson and unit structure </td> <td style="width: 50%; vertical-align: top; padding: 5px;"> <p style="text-align: center;">Student Assessment (Danielson: 1f, 3d, 4b)</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Designing Student Assessments <ul style="list-style-type: none"> ▪ Congruence with instructional outcomes ▪ Criteria and standards ▪ Design of formative assessments ▪ Use for planning • Using Assessment in Instruction <ul style="list-style-type: none"> ▪ Assessment criteria ▪ Monitoring of student learning ▪ Feedback to students ▪ Student self-assessment and monitoring of progress • Maintaining Accurate Records <ul style="list-style-type: none"> ▪ Student completion of assignments ▪ Student progress in learning ▪ Non-instructional records </td> </tr> <tr> <td style="width: 50%; vertical-align: top; padding: 5px;"> <p style="text-align: center;">Student Development (Danielson: 1b)</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Demonstrating Knowledge of Students <ul style="list-style-type: none"> ▪ Knowledge of child and adolescent development ▪ Knowledge of the learning process ▪ Knowledge of students' skills and knowledge, and language proficiency ▪ Knowledge of students' interests and cultural heritage ▪ Knowledge of students' special needs </td> <td style="width: 50%; vertical-align: top; padding: 5px;"> <p style="text-align: center;">Reflective and Responsive Practice (Danielson: 4a)</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Reflecting on Teaching <ul style="list-style-type: none"> ▪ Accuracy ▪ Use in future teaching </td> </tr> </table>		<p style="text-align: center;">Preparation (Danielson: 1c, 1d, 1e)</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Selecting Instructional Outcomes <ul style="list-style-type: none"> ▪ Value, sequence, and alignment ▪ Clarity ▪ Balance ▪ Suitability for diverse students • Demonstrating Knowledge of Resources <ul style="list-style-type: none"> ▪ Resources for classroom use ▪ Resources to extend content knowledge and pedagogy ▪ Resources for students • Designing Coherent Instruction <ul style="list-style-type: none"> ▪ Learning activities ▪ Instructional materials and resources ▪ Instructional groups ▪ Lesson and unit structure 	<p style="text-align: center;">Student Assessment (Danielson: 1f, 3d, 4b)</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Designing Student Assessments <ul style="list-style-type: none"> ▪ Congruence with instructional outcomes ▪ Criteria and standards ▪ Design of formative assessments ▪ Use for planning • Using Assessment in Instruction <ul style="list-style-type: none"> ▪ Assessment criteria ▪ Monitoring of student learning ▪ Feedback to students ▪ Student self-assessment and monitoring of progress • Maintaining Accurate Records <ul style="list-style-type: none"> ▪ Student completion of assignments ▪ Student progress in learning ▪ Non-instructional records 	<p style="text-align: center;">Student Development (Danielson: 1b)</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Demonstrating Knowledge of Students <ul style="list-style-type: none"> ▪ Knowledge of child and adolescent development ▪ Knowledge of the learning process ▪ Knowledge of students' skills and knowledge, and language proficiency ▪ Knowledge of students' interests and cultural heritage ▪ Knowledge of students' special needs 	<p style="text-align: center;">Reflective and Responsive Practice (Danielson: 4a)</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Reflecting on Teaching <ul style="list-style-type: none"> ▪ Accuracy ▪ Use in future teaching
<p style="text-align: center;">Preparation (Danielson: 1c, 1d, 1e)</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Selecting Instructional Outcomes <ul style="list-style-type: none"> ▪ Value, sequence, and alignment ▪ Clarity ▪ Balance ▪ Suitability for diverse students • Demonstrating Knowledge of Resources <ul style="list-style-type: none"> ▪ Resources for classroom use ▪ Resources to extend content knowledge and pedagogy ▪ Resources for students • Designing Coherent Instruction <ul style="list-style-type: none"> ▪ Learning activities ▪ Instructional materials and resources ▪ Instructional groups ▪ Lesson and unit structure 	<p style="text-align: center;">Student Assessment (Danielson: 1f, 3d, 4b)</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Designing Student Assessments <ul style="list-style-type: none"> ▪ Congruence with instructional outcomes ▪ Criteria and standards ▪ Design of formative assessments ▪ Use for planning • Using Assessment in Instruction <ul style="list-style-type: none"> ▪ Assessment criteria ▪ Monitoring of student learning ▪ Feedback to students ▪ Student self-assessment and monitoring of progress • Maintaining Accurate Records <ul style="list-style-type: none"> ▪ Student completion of assignments ▪ Student progress in learning ▪ Non-instructional records 					
<p style="text-align: center;">Student Development (Danielson: 1b)</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Demonstrating Knowledge of Students <ul style="list-style-type: none"> ▪ Knowledge of child and adolescent development ▪ Knowledge of the learning process ▪ Knowledge of students' skills and knowledge, and language proficiency ▪ Knowledge of students' interests and cultural heritage ▪ Knowledge of students' special needs 	<p style="text-align: center;">Reflective and Responsive Practice (Danielson: 4a)</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Reflecting on Teaching <ul style="list-style-type: none"> ▪ Accuracy ▪ Use in future teaching 					
Year 3						
<p>Any of the remaining focus areas or areas determined by the administrator.</p>						

Annual Professional Performance Review (APPR) Standards

APPR Standard	Description
Content Knowledge *1a, 4e	The teacher shall demonstrate a thorough knowledge of the subject matter area and curriculum.
Preparation *1c, 1d, 1e	The teacher shall demonstrate appropriate preparation employing the necessary pedagogical practices to support instruction.
Instructional Delivery *3a, 3b, 3c, 3d, 3e	The teacher shall demonstrate that the delivery of instruction results in active student involvement, appropriate teacher/ student interaction and meaningful lesson plans resulting in student learning.
Classroom Management *2a, 2b, 2c, 2d, 2e	The teacher shall demonstrate classroom management skills supportive of diverse student learning needs which create an environment conducive to student learning.
Student Development *1b	The teacher shall demonstrate knowledge of student development, an understanding and appreciation of diversity and the regular application of developmentally appropriate instructional strategies for the benefit of all students.
Student Assessment *1f, 3d, 4b	The teacher shall demonstrate that he/she implements assessment techniques based on appropriate learning standards designed to measure students' progress in learning and that he or she successfully utilizes analysis of available student performance data (for example: State test results, student work, school- developed assessments, teacher-developed assessments, etc.); and other relevant information (for example: documented health or nutrition needs, or other student characteristics affecting learning when providing instruction.
Collaboration *4c, 4d, 4f	The teacher shall demonstrate that he or she develops effective collaborative relationships with students, parents, or caregivers, as needed and appropriate support personnel to meet the learning needs of students.
Reflective and Responsive Practice *4a, 3e	The teacher shall demonstrate that practice is reviewed; effectively assessed and appropriate adjustments are made on a continuing basis.

* Charlotte Danielson's *Enhancing Professional Practice: A Framework for Teaching* – 2nd edition

Appendix B

SPENCER-VAN ETTEN CENTRAL SCHOOL DISTRICT

Professional Growth Plan
(Complete with Administrator prior to October 15th)

Name: _____ Building: _____
Department: _____ Grade Level: _____

1. My **primary focus** is (see page 6 and 7)

- | | |
|---|---|
| <input type="checkbox"/> Classroom Management | <input type="checkbox"/> Preparation |
| <input type="checkbox"/> Communication and Collaboration | <input type="checkbox"/> Student Development |
| <input type="checkbox"/> Content Knowledge | <input type="checkbox"/> Student Assessment |
| <input type="checkbox"/> Reflective and Responsive Practice | <input type="checkbox"/> Instructional Delivery |
| <input type="checkbox"/> Other: _____ | |

2. My **rationale** for this selection is :

3. The **major action steps** I intend to take: (include activities such as training opportunities, observations, feedback mechanisms, portfolio development, student products, videotapes of teaching, readings, research, visitation, classroom projects, professional reports, research, mentoring and/or outreach to parents)

4. What **support** do you need to carry out your professional plan?

Date plan reviewed: _____

Unit Member: _____

Supervisory Administrator: _____

Appendix D

**Spencer-Van Etten Central School District
Walkthrough Form**

Teacher: _____

Grade/Subject: _____

Evaluator: _____

School Year: _____

Dates evidence gathered:

Pre-Conference (optional)

Observation

Post Conference

Evidence of Teaching

Domain 1: Planning and Preparation

Component	Ineffective	Developing	Effective	Highly Effective
<i>Ia: Demonstrating knowledge of content and pedagogy</i>	In planning and practice, teacher makes content errors or does not correct errors made by students. Teacher's plans and practice display little understanding of prerequisite relationships important to student learning of the content. Teacher displays little or no understanding of the range of pedagogical approaches suitable to student learning of the content.	Teacher is familiar with the important concepts in the discipline but displays lack of awareness of how these concepts relate to one another. Teacher's plans and practice indicate some awareness of prerequisite relationships, although such knowledge may be inaccurate or incomplete. Teacher's plans and practice reflect a limited range of pedagogical approaches to the discipline or to the students.	Teacher displays solid knowledge of the important concepts in the discipline and how these relate to one another. Teacher's plans and practice reflect accurate understanding of prerequisite relationships among topics and concepts. Teacher's plans and practice reflect familiarity with a wide range of effective pedagogical approaches in the discipline.	Teacher displays extensive knowledge of the important concepts in the discipline and how these relate both to one another and to other disciplines. Teacher's plans and practice reflect understanding of prerequisite relationships among topics and concepts and a link to necessary cognitive structures by students to ensure understanding. Teacher's plans and practice reflect familiarity with a wide range of effective pedagogical approaches in the discipline, anticipating student misconceptions.
<i>Evidence</i>				
<i>Ib: Demonstrating knowledge of students</i>	Teacher demonstrates little or no understanding of how students learn, and little knowledge of students' backgrounds, cultures, skills, language proficiency, interests, and special needs, and does not seek such understanding.	Teacher indicates the importance of understanding how students learn and the students' backgrounds, cultures, skills, language proficiency, interests, and special needs, and attains this knowledge for the class as a whole.	Teacher understands the active nature of student learning, and attains information about levels of development for groups of students. The teacher also purposefully seeks knowledge from several sources of students' backgrounds, cultures, skills, language proficiency, interests, and special needs, and attains this knowledge for groups of students.	Teacher actively seeks knowledge of students' levels of development and their backgrounds, cultures, skills, language proficiency, interests, and special needs from a variety of sources. This information is acquired for individual students.
<i>Evidence</i>				

Component	Ineffective	Developing	Effective	Highly Effective
<i>Ic: Setting instructional outcomes</i>	Outcomes represent low expectations for students and lack of rigor, nor do they all reflect important learning in the discipline. Outcomes are stated as activities, rather than as student learning. Outcomes reflect only one type of learning and only one discipline or strand, and are suitable for only some students.	Outcomes represent moderately high expectations and rigor. Some reflect important learning in the discipline, and consist of a combination of outcomes and activities. Outcomes reflect several types of learning, but teacher has made no attempt at coordination or integration. Most of the outcomes are suitable for most of the students in the class based on global assessments of student learning.	Most outcomes represent rigorous and important learning in the discipline. All the instructional outcomes are clear, written in the form of student learning, and suggest viable methods of assessment. Outcomes reflect several different types of learning and opportunities for coordination. Outcomes take into account the varying needs of groups of students.	All outcomes represent rigorous and important learning in the discipline. The outcomes are clear, written in the form of student learning, and permit viable methods of assessment. Outcomes reflect several different types of learning and, where appropriate, represent opportunities for both coordination and integration. Outcomes take into account the varying needs of individual students.
<i>Evidence</i>				
<i>Id: Demonstrating knowledge of resources</i>	Teacher is unaware of resources for classroom use, for expanding one's own knowledge, or for students available through the school or district.	Teacher displays basic awareness of resources available for classroom use, for expanding one's own knowledge, and for students through the school, but no knowledge of resources available more broadly.	Teacher displays awareness of resources available for classroom use, for expanding one's own knowledge, and for students through the school or district and external to the school and on the Internet.	Teacher's knowledge of resources for classroom use, for expanding one's own knowledge, and for students is extensive, including those available through the school or district, in the community, through professional organizations and universities, and on the Internet.
<i>Evidence</i>				

Component	Ineffective	Developing	Effective	Highly Effective
<i>Ie: Designing coherent instruction</i>	The series of learning experiences is poorly aligned with the instructional outcomes and does not represent a coherent structure. The activities and are not designed to engage students in active intellectual activity and have unrealistic time allocations. Instructional groups do not support the instructional outcomes and offer no variety.	Some of the learning activities and materials are suitable to the instructional outcomes, and represent a moderate cognitive challenge, but with no differentiation for different students. Instructional groups partially support the instructional outcomes, with an effort at providing some variety. The lesson or unit has a recognizable structure; the progression of activities is uneven, with most time allocations reasonable.	Teacher coordinates knowledge of content, of students, and of resources, to design a series of learning experiences aligned to instructional outcomes and suitable to groups of students. The learning activities have reasonable time allocations; they represent significant cognitive challenge, with some differentiation for different groups of students. The lesson or unit has a clear structure with appropriate and varied use of instructional groups.	Plans represent the coordination of in-depth content knowledge, understanding of different students' needs and available resources (including technology), resulting in a series of learning activities designed to engage students in high-level cognitive activity. These are differentiated, as appropriate, for individual learners. Instructional groups are varied as appropriate, with some opportunity for student choice. The lesson's or unit's structure is clear and allows for different pathways according to diverse student needs.
<i>Evidence</i>				
<i>If: Designing student assessments</i>	Assessment procedures are not congruent with instructional outcomes; the proposed approach contains no criteria or standards. Teacher has no plan to incorporate formative assessment in the lesson or unit, nor any plans to use assessment results in designing future instruction.	Some of the instructional outcomes are assessed through the proposed approach, but others are not. Assessment criteria and standards have been developed, but they are not clear. Approach to the use of formative assessment is rudimentary, including only some of the instructional outcomes. Teacher intends to use assessment results to plan for future instruction for the class as a whole.	Teacher's plan for student assessment is aligned with the instructional outcomes; assessment methodologies may have been adapted for groups of students. Assessment criteria and standards are clear. Teacher has a well-developed strategy for using formative assessment and has designed particular approaches to be used. Teacher intends to use assessment results to plan for future instruction for groups of students.	Teacher's plan for student assessment is fully aligned with the instructional outcomes, with clear criteria and standards that show evidence of student contribution to their development. Assessment methodologies have been adapted for individual students, as needed. The approach to using formative assessment is well designed and includes student as well as teacher use of the assessment information. Teacher intends to use assessment results to plan future instruction for individual students.
<i>Evidence</i>				

Evidence of Teaching

Domain 2: The Classroom Environment

Component	Ineffective	Developing	Effective	Highly Effective
<i>2a: Creating an environment of respect and rapport</i>	Patterns of classroom interactions, both between the teacher and students and among students, are mostly negative, inappropriate, or insensitive to students' ages, cultural backgrounds, and developmental levels. Interactions are characterized by sarcasm, putdowns, or conflict. Teacher does not deal with disrespectful behavior.	Patterns of classroom interactions, both between the teacher and student and among students, are generally appropriate but may reflect occasional inconsistencies, favoritism, and disregard for students' ages, cultures, and developmental levels. Students rarely demonstrate disrespect for one another. Teacher attempts to respond to disrespectful behavior, with uneven results. The net result of the interactions is neutral: conveying neither warmth nor conflict.	Teacher-student interactions are friendly and demonstrate general caring and respect. Such interactions are appropriate to the ages of the students. Students exhibit respect for the teacher. Interactions among students are generally polite and respectful. Teacher responds successfully to disrespectful behavior among students. The net result of the interactions is polite and respectful, but impersonal.	Classroom interactions among the teacher and individual students are highly respectful, reflecting genuine warmth, caring, and sensitivity to students as individuals. Students exhibit respect for the teacher and contribute to high levels of civility among all members of the class. The net result of interactions is that of connections with students as individuals
<i>Evidence</i>				
<i>2b: Establishing a culture for learning</i>	The classroom culture is characterized by a lack of teacher or student commitment to learning, and/or little or no investment of student energy into the task at hand. Hard work is not expected or valued. Medium to low expectations for student achievement are the norm with high expectations for learning reserved for only one or two students.	The classroom culture is characterized by little commitment to learning by teacher or students. The teacher appears to be only "going through the motions," and students indicate that they are interested in completion of a task, rather than quality. The teacher conveys that student success is the result of natural ability rather than hard work; high expectations for learning are reserved for those students thought to have a natural aptitude for the subject.	The classroom culture is a cognitively busy place where learning is valued by all with high expectations for learning the norm for most students. The teacher conveys that with hard work students can be successful; students understand their role as learners and consistently expend effort to learn. Classroom interactions support learning and hard work.	The classroom culture is a cognitively vibrant place, characterized by a shared belief in the importance of learning. The teacher conveys high expectations for learning by all students and insists on hard work; students assume responsibility for high quality by initiating improvements, making revisions, adding detail and/or helping peers.
<i>Evidence</i>				

Component	Ineffective	Developing	Effective	Highly Effective
<i>2c: Managing classroom procedures</i>	Much instructional time is lost due to inefficient classroom routines and procedures. There is little or no evidence of the teacher managing instructional groups, transitions, and/or the handling of materials and supplies effectively. There is little evidence that students know or follow established routines.	Some instructional time is lost due to only partially effective classroom routines and procedures. The teacher's management of instructional groups, transitions, and/or the handling of materials and supplies is inconsistent, leading to some disruption of learning. With regular guidance and prompting, students follow established routines.	There is little loss of instructional time due to effective classroom routines and procedures. The teacher's management of instructional groups and/or the handling of materials and supplies are consistently successful. With minimal guidance and prompting, students follow established classroom routines.	Instructional time is maximized due to efficient classroom routines and procedures. Students contribute to the management of instructional groups, transitions, and/or the handling of materials and supplies. Routines are well understood and may be initiated by students.
<i>Evidence</i>				
<i>2d: Managing student behavior</i>	There appear to be no established standards of conduct, and little or no teacher monitoring of student behavior. Students challenge the standards of conduct. Response to students' misbehavior is repressive, or disrespectful of student dignity.	Standards of conduct appear to have been established, but their implementation is inconsistent. Teacher tries, with uneven results, to monitor student behavior and respond to student misbehavior. There is inconsistent implementation of the standards of conduct.	Student behavior is generally appropriate. The teacher monitors student behavior against established standards of conduct. Teacher response to student misbehavior is consistent, proportionate and respectful to students and is effective.	Student behavior is entirely appropriate. Students take an active role in monitoring their own behavior and that of other students against standards of conduct. Teachers' monitoring of student behavior is subtle and preventive. Teacher's response to student misbehavior is sensitive to individual student needs and respects students
<i>Evidence</i>				

Component	Ineffective	Developing	Effective	Highly Effective
<i>2e: Organizing physical space</i>	The physical environment is unsafe, or many students don't have access to learning. There is poor alignment between the arrangement of furniture and resources, including computer technology, and the lesson activities.	The classroom is safe, and essential learning is accessible to most students. The teacher's use of physical resources, including computer technology, is moderately effective. Teacher may attempt to modify the physical arrangement to suit learning activities, with partial success.	The classroom is safe, and learning is accessible to all students; teacher ensures that the physical arrangement is appropriate to the learning activities. Teacher makes effective use of physical resources, including computer technology.	The classroom is safe, and learning is accessible to all students including those with special needs. Teacher makes effective use of physical resources, including computer technology. The teacher ensures that the physical arrangement is appropriate to the learning activities. Students contribute to the use or adaptation of the physical environment to advance learning.
<i>Evidence</i>				

Evidence of Teaching

Domain 3: Instruction

Component	Ineffective	Developing	Effective	Highly Effective
<i>3a: Communicating with students</i>	The instructional purpose of the lesson is unclear to students and the directions and procedures are confusing. Teacher's explanation of the content contains major errors. The teacher's spoken or written language contains errors of grammar or syntax. Vocabulary is inappropriate, vague, or used incorrectly, leaving students confused.	Teacher's attempt to explain the instructional purpose has only limited success, and/or directions and procedures must be clarified after initial student confusion. Teacher's explanation of the content may contain minor errors; some portions are clear; other portions are difficult to follow. Teacher's explanation consists of a monologue, with no invitation to the students for intellectual engagement. Teacher's spoken language is correct; however, vocabulary is limited, or not fully appropriate to the students' ages or backgrounds.	The instructional purpose of the lesson is clearly communicated to students, including where it is situated within broader learning; directions and procedures are explained clearly. Teacher's explanation of content is well scaffolded, clear and accurate, and connects with students' knowledge and experience. During the explanation of content, the teacher invites student intellectual engagement. Teacher's spoken and written language is clear and correct. Vocabulary is appropriate to the students' ages and interests.	The teacher links the instructional purpose of the lesson to student interests; the directions and procedures are clear and anticipate possible student misunderstanding. Teacher's explanation of content is thorough and clear, developing conceptual understanding through artful scaffolding and connecting with students' interests. Students contribute to extending the content, and in explaining concepts to their classmates. Teacher's spoken and written language is expressive, and the teacher finds opportunities to extend students' vocabularies.
<i>Evidence</i>				
<i>3b: Using questioning/prompts and discussion</i>	Teacher's questions are of low cognitive challenge, single correct responses, and asked in rapid succession. Interaction between teacher and students is predominantly recitation style, with the teacher mediating all questions and answers. A few students dominate the discussion.	Teacher's questions lead students through a single path of inquiry, with answers seemingly determined in advance. Alternatively the teacher attempts to frame some questions designed to promote student thinking and understanding, but only a few students are involved. Teacher attempts to engage all students in the discussion and to encourage them to respond to one another, with uneven results.	While the teacher may use some low-level questions, he or she poses questions to students designed to promote student thinking and understanding. Teacher creates a genuine discussion among students, providing adequate time for students to respond, and stepping aside when appropriate. Teacher successfully engages most students in the discussion, employing a range of strategies to ensure that most students are heard.	Teacher uses a variety or series of questions or prompts to challenge students cognitively, advance high level thinking and discourse, and promote meta-cognition. Students formulate many questions, initiate topics and make unsolicited contributions. Students themselves ensure that all voices are heard in the discussion.
<i>Evidence</i>				

Component	Ineffective	Developing	Effective	Highly Effective
<i>3c: Engaging students in learning</i>	The learning tasks and activities, materials, resources, instructional groups and technology are poorly aligned with the instructional outcomes, or require only rote responses. The pace of the lesson is too slow or rushed. Few students are intellectually engaged or interested.	The learning tasks or prompts are partially aligned with the instructional outcomes but require only minimal thinking by students, allowing most students to be passive or merely compliant. The pacing of the lesson may not provide students the time needed to be intellectually engaged.	The learning tasks and activities are aligned with the instructional outcomes and are designed to challenge student thinking, resulting in active intellectual engagement by most students with important and challenging content, and with teacher scaffolding to support that engagement. The pacing of the lesson is appropriate, providing most students the time needed to be intellectually engaged.	Virtually all students are intellectually engaged in challenging content, through well designed learning tasks, and suitable scaffolding by the teacher, and fully aligned with the instructional outcomes. In addition, there is evidence of some student initiation of inquiry, and student contributions to the exploration of important content. The pacing of the lesson provides students the time needed to intellectually engage with and reflect upon their learning, and to consolidate their understanding. Students may have some choice in how they complete tasks and may serve as resources for one another.
<i>Evidence</i>				
<i>3d: Using Assessment in Instruction</i>	There is little or no assessment or monitoring of student learning; feedback is absent, or of poor quality. Students do not appear to be aware of the assessment criteria and do not engage in self-assessment.	Assessment is used sporadically to support instruction, through some monitoring of progress of learning by teacher and/or students. Feedback to students is general, and students appear to be only partially aware of the assessment criteria used to evaluate their work but few assess their own work. Questions/prompts/assessments are rarely used to diagnose evidence of learning.	Assessment is regularly used during instruction, through monitoring of progress of learning by teacher and/or students, resulting in accurate, specific feedback that advances learning. Students appear to be aware of the assessment criteria; some of them engage in self assessment. Questions/prompts/assessments are used to diagnose evidence of learning.	Assessment is fully integrated into instruction, through extensive use of formative assessment. Students appear to be aware of, and there is some evidence that they have contributed to, the assessment criteria. Students self-assess and monitor their progress. A variety of feedback, from both the teacher and peers, is accurate, specific, and advances learning. Questions/prompts/assessments are used regularly to diagnose evidence of learning by individual students.
<i>Evidence</i>				

Component	Ineffective	Developing	Effective	Highly Effective
<i>3e: Demonstrating flexibility and responsiveness</i>	Teacher adheres to the instruction plan in spite of evidence of poor student understanding or students' lack of interest. Teacher ignores student questions; when students experience difficulty, the teacher blames the students or their home environment.	Teacher attempts to modify the lesson when needed and to respond to student questions and interests, with moderate success. Teacher accepts responsibility for student success, but has only a limited repertoire of strategies to draw upon.	Teacher promotes the successful learning of all students, making minor adjustments as needed to instruction plans and accommodating student questions, needs and interests. The teacher persists in seeking approaches for students who have difficulty learning, drawing on a broad repertoire of strategies.	Teacher seizes an opportunity to enhance learning, building on a spontaneous event or student interests or successfully adjusts and differentiates instruction to address individual student misunderstandings. Teacher persists in seeking effective approaches for students who need help, using an extensive repertoire of instructional strategies and soliciting additional resources from the school or community.
<i>Evidence</i>				

Evidence of Teaching

Domain 4: Professional Responsibilities

Component	Ineffective	Developing	Effective	Highly Ineffective
<i>4a: Reflecting on Teaching</i>	Teacher does not know whether a lesson was effective or achieved its instructional outcomes, or teacher profoundly misjudges the success of a lesson. Teacher has no suggestions for how a lesson could be improved.	Teacher has a generally accurate impression of a lesson's effectiveness and the extent to which instructional outcomes were met. Teacher makes general suggestions about how a lesson could be improved.	Teacher makes an accurate assessment of a lesson's effectiveness and the extent to which it achieved its instructional outcomes and can cite general references to support the judgment. Teacher makes a few specific suggestions of what could be tried another time the lesson is taught.	Teacher makes a thoughtful and accurate assessment of a lesson's effectiveness and the extent to which it achieved its instructional outcomes, citing many specific examples from the lesson and weighing the relative strengths of each. Drawing on an extensive repertoire of skills, teacher offers specific alternative actions, complete with the probable success of different courses of action.
<i>Evidence</i>				
<i>4b: Maintaining Accurate Records</i>	Teacher's system for maintaining information on student completion of assignments and student progress in learning is nonexistent or in disarray. Teacher's records for non-instructional activities are in disarray, resulting in errors and confusion.	Teacher's system for maintaining information on student completion of assignments and student progress in learning is rudimentary and only partially effective. Teacher's records for non instructional activities are adequate, but require frequent monitoring to avoid errors.	Teacher's system for maintaining information on student completion of assignments, student progress in learning, and non-instructional records, is fully effective.	Teacher's system for maintaining information on student completion of assignments, student progress in learning, and non-instructional records, is fully effective. Students contribute information and participate in maintaining the records.
<i>Evidence</i>				

Component	Ineffective	Developing	Effective	Highly Effective
<p><i>4c: Communicating with Families</i></p>	<p>Teacher communication with families, about the instructional program, or about individual students, is sporadic or culturally inappropriate. Teacher makes no attempt to engage families in the instructional program.</p>	<p>Teacher makes sporadic attempts to communicate with families about the instructional program and about the progress of individual students but does not attempt to engage families in the instructional program. But communications are one-way and not always appropriate to the cultural norms of those families.</p>	<p>Teacher communicates frequently with families about the instructional program and conveys information about individual student progress. Teacher makes some attempts to engage families in the instructional program; as appropriate information to families is conveyed in a culturally appropriate manner.</p>	<p>Teacher's communication with families is frequent and sensitive to cultural traditions, with students contributing to the communication. Response to family concerns is handled with professional and cultural sensitivity. Teacher's efforts to engage families in the instructional program are frequent and successful.</p>
<p><i>Evidence</i></p>				
<p><i>4d: Participating in a Professional Community</i></p>	<p>Teacher's relationships with colleagues are negative or self-serving. Teacher avoids participation in a professional culture of inquiry, resisting opportunities to become involved. Teacher avoids becoming involved in school events or school and district projects.</p>	<p>Teacher maintains cordial relationships with colleagues to fulfill duties that the school or district requires. Teacher becomes involved in the school's culture of professional inquiry when invited to do so. Teacher participates in school events and school and district projects when specifically asked.</p>	<p>Relationships with colleagues are characterized by mutual support and cooperation; teacher actively participates in a culture of professional inquiry. Teacher volunteers to participate in school events and in school and district projects, making a substantial contribution.</p>	<p>Relationships with colleagues are characterized by mutual support and cooperation, with the teacher taking initiative in assuming leadership among the faculty. Teacher takes a leadership role in promoting a culture of professional inquiry. Teacher volunteers to participate in school events and district projects, making a substantial contribution, and assuming a leadership role in at least one aspect of school or district life.</p>
<p><i>Evidence</i></p>				

Component	Ineffective	Developing	Effective	Highly Effective
<i>4e: Growing and Developing Professionally</i>	Teacher engages in no professional development activities to enhance knowledge or skill. Teacher resists feedback on teaching performance from either supervisors or more experienced colleagues. Teacher makes no effort to share knowledge with others or to assume professional responsibilities.	Teacher participates in professional activities to a limited extent when they are convenient. Teacher accepts, with some reluctance, feedback on teaching performance from both supervisors and professional colleagues. Teacher finds limited ways to contribute to the profession	Teacher seeks out opportunities for professional development to enhance content knowledge and pedagogical skill. Teacher welcomes feedback from colleagues when made by supervisors or when opportunities arise through professional collaboration. Teacher participates actively in assisting other educators	Teacher seeks out opportunities for professional development and makes a systematic effort to conduct action research. Teacher seeks out feedback on teaching from both supervisors and colleagues. Teacher initiates important activities to contribute to the profession.
<i>Evidence</i>				
<i>4f: Showing Professionalism</i>	Teacher displays dishonesty in interactions with colleagues, students, and the public. Teacher is not alert to students' needs and contributes to school practices that result in some students being ill served by the school. Teacher makes decisions and recommendations based on self-serving interests. Teacher does not comply with school and district regulations	Teacher is honest in interactions with colleagues, students, and the public. Teacher's attempts to serve students are inconsistent, and does not knowingly contribute to some students being ill served by the school. Teacher's decisions and recommendations are based on limited though genuinely professional considerations. Teacher complies minimally with school and district regulations, doing just enough to get by.	Teacher displays high standards of honesty, integrity, and confidentiality in interactions with colleagues, students, and the public. Teacher is active in serving students, working to ensure that all students receive a fair opportunity to succeed. Teacher maintains an open mind in team or departmental decision-making. Teacher complies fully with school and district regulations.	Teacher can be counted on to hold the highest standards of honesty, integrity, and confidentiality and takes a leadership role with colleagues. Teacher is highly proactive in serving students, seeking out resources when needed. Teacher makes a concerted effort to challenge negative attitudes or practices to ensure that all students, particularly those traditionally underserved, are honored in the school. Teacher takes a leadership role in team or departmental decision-making and helps ensure that such decisions are based on the highest professional standards. Teacher complies fully with school and district regulations, taking a leadership role with colleagues.
<i>Evidence</i>				

Lesson Observation Reflection Questions

1. How does the lesson content connect with major outcomes of the course?
2. How did you know that students had the prerequisite knowledge and skills to be successful in this unit?
3. How do you address the varied instructional levels of your students?
4. Why did you use the instructional strategies you selected?
5. How do you know if students achieved the intended outcomes?
6. What consistent structures do you see in your teaching?
7. What is your philosophy of classroom management and how is it demonstrated in your lesson?
8. What worked and what did not work in this lesson?
9. If you were to teach this lesson again, would you do anything differently? If so, what?
10. What steps are you taking to build relationships with your students, families and school community? Does the school environment support your efforts?

**Spencer Van Etten Central School District
Observation Review**

Unit Member:	Subject/ Grade Level:
Academic School Year:	Observation Date:
Evaluator:	
Date of Dialogue (if formal observation)	Date of Written Report:
Check One: <input type="checkbox"/> Tenured <input type="checkbox"/> Non-Tenured	

Evaluator Comments

Summary of Lesson:
Strengths:
Areas of Growth:

Unit Member Comments: (Optional)

Reviewer Signature: _____ Date: _____

Unit Member Signature: _____ Date: _____

Copy to Reviewer/Supervisor, Unit Member, File

Appendix G

Unit Member Summative Evaluation

Year: _____

Name: _____ Teaching Assignment: _____

Evaluator: _____ Date: _____

SECTION I: RUBRIC

	1	2	3	4
Content Knowledge <i>The teacher shall demonstrate a thorough knowledge of the subject matter area and curriculum.</i>	Ineffective	Developing	Effective	Highly Effective
a. Demonstrating Knowledge of Content and Pedagogy				
b. Growing and Developing Professionally				
Evidence:	Score:			
Preparation: <i>The teacher shall demonstrate appropriate preparation employing the necessary pedagogical practices to support instruction.</i>	Ineffective	Developing	Effective	Highly Effective
a. Setting Instructional Outcomes				
b. Demonstrating Knowledge of Resources				
c. Designing Coherent Instruction				
Evidence:	Score:			
Instructional Delivery: <i>The teacher shall demonstrate that the delivery of instruction results in active student involvement, appropriate teacher/ student interaction and meaningful lesson plans resulting in student learning.</i>	Ineffective	Developing	Effective	Highly Effective
a. Communicating with Students				
b. Using Questioning and Discussion Techniques				
c. Engaging Students in Learning				
d. Using Assessment in Instruction				
e. Demonstrating Flexibility and Responsiveness				
Evidence:	Score:			

<p><u>Classroom Management:</u> <i>The teacher shall demonstrate classroom management skills supportive of diverse student learning needs which create an environment conducive to student learning.</i></p>	Ineffective	Developing	Effective	Highly Effective
a. Creating an Environment of Respect and Rapport				
b. Establishing a Culture for Learning				
c. Managing Classroom Procedures				
d. Managing Student Behavior				
e. Organizing Physical Space				
Evidence:	Score:			
<p><u>Student Development:</u> <i>The teacher shall demonstrate knowledge of student development, an understanding and appreciation of diversity and the regular application of developmentally appropriate instructional strategies for the benefit of all students.</i></p>	Ineffective	Developing	Effective	Highly Effective
a. Demonstrating Knowledge of Students				
Evidence:	Score:			
<p><u>Student Assessment:</u> <i>The teacher shall demonstrate that he/she implements assessment techniques based on appropriate learning standards designed to measure students' progress in learning and that he or she successfully utilizes analysis of available student performance data (for example: State test results, student work, school- developed assessments, teacher-developed assessments, etc.); and other relevant information (for example: documented health or nutrition needs, or other student characteristics affecting learning when providing instruction.</i></p>	Ineffective	Developing	Effective	Highly Effective
a. Designing Student Assessments				
b. Using Assessment in Instruction				
c. Maintaining Accurate Records				
Evidence:	Score:			
<p><u>Collaboration:</u> <i>The teacher shall demonstrate that he or she develops effective collaborative relationships with students, parents, or caregivers, as needed and appropriate support personnel to meet the learning needs of students.</i></p>	Ineffective	Developing	Effective	Highly Effective
a. Communicating with Families				
b. Participating in a Professional Community				
c. Showing Professionalism				
Evidence:	Score:			

Reflective and Responsive Practice: <i>The teacher shall demonstrate that practice is reviewed; effectively assessed and appropriate adjustments are made on a continuing basis.</i>	Ineffective	Developing	Effective	Highly Effective
a. Reflecting on Teaching				
b. Demonstrating flexibility and responsiveness				
c. Completed Professional Growth Plan				
Evidence:	Score:			

Each standard receives a score between 1 and 4. All eight scores are totaled and divided by 8.

Assessment of Teacher Effectiveness Standards	Observation and Evidence Score
Content Knowledge	
Preparation	
Instructional Delivery	
Classroom Management	
Student Development	
Student Assessment	
Collaboration	
Reflective and Responsive Practice	
Total Score	
Total Score/8	
Conversion Score (Refer to Appendix H)	

SECTION II: STATE ASSESSMENT

Total: (maximum 20 points)

State Assessment / Student Learning Objective (SLO)	
--	--

SECTION III: LOCAL ASSESSMENT

Total: (maximum 20 points)

Local Assessment (NWEA / AIMSWEB ELA)	
Local Assessment (NWEA / AIMSWEB Math)	
Local Assessment (Content Related Assessment)	

- Pre-K will use DIAL screening
- K-3 will use AIMSWEB (ELA and Math)
- 4 will use NWEA (ELA and Math)
- 5-12 will use NWEA (Math/Science/Technology will use Math; ELA/Social Studies will use ELA)
- Special Education can use either NWEA or AIMSWEB based on student ability level (12:1:4 program will use IEP goals)
- Other areas will use regional/district developed assessments approved by the Superintendent. Departments may opt to use NWEA/AIMSWEB with approval from the Superintendent prior to September 1st of upcoming school year.

Overall Composite Score: (maximum 100 points)	Level:
--	---------------

Teacher Signature: _____ Date: _____
 Evaluator Signature: _____ Date: _____

Appendix H

Rubric Score to Sub-Component Conversion Chart

Ineffective 0-49		Developing 50-56		Effective 57-58		Highly Effective 59-60	
Total Average Rubric Score	Conversion Score for Composite						
1.000	0	1.5	50	2.5	57	3.5	59
1.008	1	1.6	50.7	2.6	57.2	3.6	59.3
1.017	2	1.7	51.4	2.7	57.4	3.7	59.5
1.025	3	1.8	52.1	2.8	57.6	3.8	59.8
1.033	4	1.9	52.8	2.9	57.8	3.9	60
1.042	5	2	53.5	3	58	4	60.25 (round to 60)
1.050	6	2.1	54.2	3.1	58.2		
1.058	7	2.2	54.9	3.2	58.4		
1.067	8	2.3	55.6	3.3	58.6		
1.075	9	2.4	56.3	3.4	58.8		
1.083	10						
1.092	11						
1.100	12						
1.108	13						
1.115	14						
1.123	15						
1.131	16						
1.138	17						
1.146	18						
1.154	19						
1.162	20						
1.169	21						
1.177	22						
1.185	23						
1.192	24						
1.200	25						
1.208	26						
1.217	27						
1.225	28						
1.233	29						
1.242	30						
1.250	31						
1.258	32						
1.267	33						
1.275	34						
1.283	35						
1.292	36						
1.300	37						
1.308	38						
1.317	39						
1.325	40						
1.333	41						
1.342	42						
1.350	43						
1.358	44						
1.367	45						
1.375	46						
1.383	47						
1.392	48						
1.400	49						

Conversion Chart					
Level	Measures of Student Growth	Local Measures of Student Achievement	Other 60 points		Overall Composite Score
Ineffective	0 - 2	0 - 2	0-49		0-64
Developing	3 - 8	3 - 8	50-56.3		65-74
Effective	9 - 17	9 - 17	57-58.8		75-90
Highly Effective	18 - 20	18 - 20	59-60		91-100

Teacher Improvement Plan:

The Teacher Improvement Plan (TIP) is designed to provide support through communication, discussion and collaboration in the area (s) of significant concern. The administrator and unit member will jointly determine the strategies to be taken to overcome the deficiencies, but it is agreed that the primary responsibility for correction of the deficiencies remains with the unit member. The administrator and unit member will agree on a mutual time-line to improve any noted deficiencies.

The purpose of the TIP is to:

- improve a unit member's performance;
- provide targeted, intensive assistance process;
- provide additional support; which may include professional development and release time to observe other teachers;
- provide information to determine tenure

Referral to TIP:

1. The APPR is to be a significant factor for termination and tenure determinations. In the event that an evaluator is concerned with the competence of a unit member, it is agreed that the unit member will be invited to a conference with the evaluator, appropriate administrator (if different from the evaluator), and the Association President or his/her designee as early in the school year as reasonable. The conference will result in an intervention and TIP being developed.

The administrator will recommend a unit member for a TIP component at any time during the year or when the concerns are such that an overall composite score of *ineffective* or *developing* score is calculated on the *End of the Year Summative Evaluation*. *TIPs as a result of an ineffective or developing rating on the APPR must be completed and initiated no later than 10 days after the beginning of the school year.*

A probationary teacher, who is disciplined, dismissed, not renewed, or denied tenure, based in whole or part upon classroom performance or any other factor measured by the APPR, shall have the right to appeal such action through the APPR Appeals procedure. Nothing herein relieves the District of its obligations under the New York State Education Law Sections 3012(2) and 3031.

2. The administrator will notify the unit member in writing describing the areas of concern as they relate to the member's proficiency in demonstrating the APPR standards as outlined in the Professional Growth Program. A copy will be provided to the unit member, Superintendent and SVETA President.
3. The administrator and unit member will meet to address the concerns, complete TIP worksheet (Appendix C) and begin implementation.
4. The unit member will participate in a year end summative review. The member must obtain at least an effective rating on the composite score. If an overall composite score is not at the *effective* or *highly effective* rating, the member will continue to have a TIP for the following year.
5. The member must satisfactorily complete the action steps and demonstrate he/she has successfully met the criteria outlined in the TIP.

Teacher Improvement Plan
(To be completed jointly by teacher and administrator)

Name _____ Building _____ Grade/Subject _____

—

Area of Concern	Action Steps (Provide detailed description- with measurable/attainable goals, including a description of the support and assistance provided)	Frequency (timeline for improvement)	Action Steps Completed	
			Yes	No

Member Comments:

Administrator Comments:

Member
Signature: _____ Date: _____

—

Administrator Signature: _____ Date: _____

—

End of the year review: (check all that apply)

- _____ Member has successfully met criteria outlined in the TIP.
- _____ Member has not successfully met criteria outlined in the TIP.
- _____ Member has received a composite score of effective or better
- _____ Member has not received a composite score of effective or better.

Member Signature: _____
Date: _____

Administrator Signature: _____
Date: _____

HEDI Criteria- District Adopted Expectations

ELA - Grades K through 2nd

What Student Progress Meets Expectations					
Performance Level	End 1: Reading at DRA level B	End 2: Reading at DRA level C	End 3: Reading at DRA level H/I	End 4: Reading at DRA level M	End 5: Reading at DRA level P/Q
Start 1: Reading at DRA level AA	No	Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes
Start 2: Reading at DRA level C	No	No	Yes	Yes	Yes
Start 3: Reading at DRA level H/I	No	No	No	Yes	Yes
Start 4: Reading at DRA level M	No	No	No	No	Yes

Math – Grades K through 2nd; Science Grade 7; Social Studies Grade 9 (Global I); ELA Grades 9 and 10; Physical Education, Music, Art, Technology, Health, Home and Careers, and any other local courses.

Student progress will be measured by the half to a hundred rule.							
Performance Level	End 1: Post-assessment score is at least 60	End 2: Post-assessment score is at least 65	End 3: Post-assessment score is at least 70	End 4: Post-assessment score is at least 75	End 5: Post-assessment score is at least 80	End 6: Post-assessment score is at least 85	End 7: Post-assessment score is at least 90
Start 1: Pre-assessment score is 0-29	Yes						
Start 2: Pre-assessment score is 30-39	No	Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes
Start 3: Pre-assessment score is 40-49	No	No	Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes
Start 4: Pre-assessment score is 50-59	No	No	No	Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes
Start 5: Pre-assessment score is 60-69	No	No	No	No	Yes	Yes	Yes
Start 6: Pre-assessment score is 70-79	No	No	No	No	No	Yes	Yes
Start 7: Pre-assessment score is 80 or higher	No	No	No	No	No	No	Yes

Conversion Chart: The percentage of students' whose progress meets expectations.

Highly Effective			Effective									Developing					Ineffective			
20	19	18	17	16	15	14	13	12	11	10	9	8	7	6	5	4	3	2	1	0
97-100%	93-96%	89-92%	88%	87%	86%	85%	84%	83%	82%	81%	80%	78-79%	76-77%	74-75%	72-73%	70-71%	68-69%	57-67%	46-56%	0-45%

AIMSWEB Assessment Conversion Charts

The following chart represents a value added score that will be generated by AIMSWEB and result in student growth percentile.

The chart below is a 20 point conversion.

Ineffective		Developing		Effective		Highly Effective	
Student Growth Percentile	Points						
27-24	2	51-48	8	87-84	17	99-96	20
23-20	1	47-44	7	83-80	16	95-92	19
19-0	0	43-40	6	79-76	15	91-88	18
		39-36	5	75-72	14		
		35-32	4	71-68	13		
		31-28	3	67-64	12		
				63-60	11		
				59-56	10		
				55-52	9		

The chart below is a 15 point conversion

Ineffective		Developing		Effective		Highly Effective	
Student Growth Percentile	Points						
34-30	2	59-55	7	89-85	13	99-95	15
29-25	1	54-50	6	84-80	12	94-90	14
24-0	0	49-45	5	79-75	11		
		44-40	4	74-70	10		
		39-35	3	69-65	9		
				64-60	8		

NWEA MAP Assessment VARC Conversion Charts

The following chart represents a value added score that will be generated by NWEA and result in a growth score (“GS”) + or – from) as an indicator of a year’s worth of growth.

The chart below is a 20 point conversion.

Ineffective		Developing		Effective		Highly Effective	
Student Growth Score	Points	Student Growth Score	Points	Student Growth Score	Points	Student Growth Score	Points
$-2.3 < GS \leq -2.1$	2	$-1.1 < GS \leq -0.9$	8	$0.5 < GS \leq 0.9$	17	$GS > 1.3$	20
$-2.5 < GS \leq -2.3$	1	$-1.3 < GS \leq -1.1$	7	$0.1 < GS \leq 0.5$	16	$1.1 < GS \leq 1.3$	19
$GS \leq -2.5$	0	$-1.5 < GS \leq -1.3$	6	$-0.1 < GS \leq 0.1$	15	$0.9 < GS \leq 1.1$	18
		$-1.7 < GS \leq -1.5$	5	$-0.3 < GS \leq -0.1$	14		
		$-1.9 < GS \leq -1.7$	4	$-0.5 < GS \leq -0.3$	13		
		$-2.1 < GS \leq -1.9$	3	$-0.6 < GS \leq -0.5$	12		
				$-0.7 < GS \leq -0.6$	11		
				$-0.8 < GS \leq -0.7$	10		
				$-0.9 < GS \leq -0.8$	9		

The chart below is a 15 point conversion. (NWEA VARC Data)

Ineffective		Developing		Effective		Highly Effective	
Student Growth Score	Points	Student Growth Score	Points	Student Growth Score	Points	Student Growth Score	Points
$-2.3 < GS \leq -2.1$	2	$-1.3 < GS \leq -0.9$	7	$0.5 < GS \leq 0.9$	13	$GS > 1.3$	15
$-2.5 < GS \leq -2.3$	1	$-1.5 < GS \leq -1.3$	6	$0.1 < GS \leq 0.5$	12	$0.9 < GS \leq 1.3$	14
$GS \leq -2.5$	0	$-1.7 < GS \leq -1.5$	5	$-0.3 < GS \leq 0.1$	11		
		$-1.9 < GS \leq -1.7$	4	$-0.6 < GS \leq -0.3$	10		
		$-2.1 < GS \leq -1.9$	3	$-0.8 < GS \leq -0.6$	9		
				$-0.9 < GS \leq -0.8$	8		

Physical Education, Music, Art, Technology, Health, Home and Careers, and any other local courses.

Student progress will be measured by the half to a hundred rule.							
Performance Level	End 1: Post-assessment score is at least 60	End 2: Post-assessment score is at least 65	End 3: Post-assessment score is at least 70	End 4: Post-assessment score is at least 75	End 5: Post-assessment score is at least 80	End 6: Post-assessment score is at least 85	End 7: Post-assessment score is at least 90
Start 1: Pre-assessment score is 0-29	Yes						
Start 2: Pre-assessment score is 30-39	No	Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes
Start 3: Pre-assessment score is 40-49	No	No	Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes
Start 4: Pre-assessment score is 50-59	No	No	No	Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes
Start 5: Pre-assessment score is 60-69	No	No	No	No	Yes	Yes	Yes
Start 6: Pre-assessment score is 70-79	No	No	No	No	No	Yes	Yes
Start 7: Pre-assessment score is 80 or higher	No	No	No	No	No	No	Yes

Conversion Chart: The percentage of students' whose progress meets expectations.																				
Highly Effective			Effective									Developing						Ineffective		
20	19	18	17	16	15	14	13	12	11	10	9	8	7	6	5	4	3	2	1	0
97-100%	93-96%	89-92%	88%	87%	86%	85%	84%	83%	82%	81%	80%	78-79%	76-77%	74-75%	72-73%	70-71%	68-69%	57-67%	46-56%	0-45%

AIMSWEB Assessment Conversion Charts

The following chart represents a value added score that will be generated by AIMSWEB and result in student growth percentile.

The chart below is a 20 point conversion.

Ineffective		Developing		Effective		Highly Effective	
Student Growth Percentile	Points						
27-24	2	51-48	8	87-84	17	99-96	20
23-20	1	47-44	7	83-80	16	95-92	19
19-0	0	43-40	6	79-76	15	91-88	18
		39-36	5	75-72	14		
		35-32	4	71-68	13		
		31-28	3	67-64	12		
				63-60	11		
				59-56	10		
				55-52	9		

The chart below is a 15 point conversion

Ineffective		Developing		Effective		Highly Effective	
Student Growth Percentile	Points						
34-30	2	59-55	7	89-85	13	99-95	15
29-25	1	54-50	6	84-80	12	94-90	14
24-0	0	49-45	5	79-75	11		
		44-40	4	74-70	10		
		39-35	3	69-65	9		
				64-60	8		

NWEA MAP Assessment VARC Conversion Charts

The following chart represents a value added score that will be generated by NWEA and result in a growth score (“GS”) + or – from) as an indicator of a year’s worth of growth.

The chart below is a 20 point conversion.

Ineffective		Developing		Effective		Highly Effective	
Student Growth Score	Points	Student Growth Score	Points	Student Growth Score	Points	Student Growth Score	Points
$-2.3 < GS \leq -2.1$	2	$-1.1 < GS \leq -0.9$	8	$0.5 < GS \leq 0.9$	17	$GS > 1.3$	20
$-2.5 < GS \leq -2.3$	1	$-1.3 < GS \leq -1.1$	7	$0.1 < GS \leq 0.5$	16	$1.1 < GS \leq 1.3$	19
$GS \leq -2.5$	0	$-1.5 < GS \leq -1.3$	6	$-0.1 < GS \leq 0.1$	15	$0.9 < GS \leq 1.1$	18
		$-1.7 < GS \leq -1.5$	5	$-0.3 < GS \leq -0.1$	14		
		$-1.9 < GS \leq -1.7$	4	$-0.5 < GS \leq -0.3$	13		
		$-2.1 < GS \leq -1.9$	3	$-0.6 < GS \leq -0.5$	12		
				$-0.7 < GS \leq -0.6$	11		
				$-0.8 < GS \leq -0.7$	10		
				$-0.9 < GS \leq -0.8$	9		

The chart below is a 15 point conversion. (NWEA VARC Data)

Ineffective		Developing		Effective		Highly Effective	
Student Growth Score	Points	Student Growth Score	Points	Student Growth Score	Points	Student Growth Score	Points
$-2.3 < GS \leq -2.1$	2	$-1.3 < GS \leq -0.9$	7	$0.5 < GS \leq 0.9$	13	$GS > 1.3$	15
$-2.5 < GS \leq -2.3$	1	$-1.5 < GS \leq -1.3$	6	$0.1 < GS \leq 0.5$	12	$0.9 < GS \leq 1.3$	14
$GS \leq -2.5$	0	$-1.7 < GS \leq -1.5$	5	$-0.3 < GS \leq 0.1$	11		
		$-1.9 < GS \leq -1.7$	4	$-0.6 < GS \leq -0.3$	10		
		$-2.1 < GS \leq -1.9$	3	$-0.8 < GS \leq -0.6$	9		
				$-0.9 < GS \leq -0.8$	8		

Physical Education, Music, Art, Technology, Health, Home and Careers, and any other local courses.

Student progress will be measured by the half to a hundred rule.							
Performance Level	End 1: Post-assessment score is at least 60	End 2: Post-assessment score is at least 65	End 3: Post-assessment score is at least 70	End 4: Post-assessment score is at least 75	End 5: Post-assessment score is at least 80	End 6: Post-assessment score is at least 85	End 7: Post-assessment score is at least 90
Start 1: Pre-assessment score is 0-29	Yes						
Start 2: Pre-assessment score is 30-39	No	Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes
Start 3: Pre-assessment score is 40-49	No	No	Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes
Start 4: Pre-assessment score is 50-59	No	No	No	Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes
Start 5: Pre-assessment score is 60-69	No	No	No	No	Yes	Yes	Yes
Start 6: Pre-assessment score is 70-79	No	No	No	No	No	Yes	Yes
Start 7: Pre-assessment score is 80 or higher	No	No	No	No	No	No	Yes

Conversion Chart: The percentage of students' whose progress meets expectations.																				
Highly Effective			Effective									Developing					Ineffective			
20	19	18	17	16	15	14	13	12	11	10	9	8	7	6	5	4	3	2	1	0
97-100%	93-96%	89-92%	88%	87%	86%	85%	84%	83%	82%	81%	80%	78-79%	76-77%	74-75%	72-73%	70-71%	68-69%	57-67%	46-56%	0-45%

PURPOSE:

To provide a process with facilitates the improvement of student achievement and enhancement of student learning by:

- Recognizing the importance of the administrator's role in improving the culture of the learning community
- Using research-based criteria about effective leadership behaviors which are substantiated by measureable data from multiple sources
- Providing opportunities for professional growth as a facilitator/leader of learning
- Creating and connecting building goals to school improvement goals
- Connecting academic, social, emotional, and developmental growth for all students
- Acknowledging strengths and improving performance

PROCESS:

Utilize a holistic approach with contains best practices, educational dialogues, research, conferences and written feedback. Key components of the process include:

1. Individual annual performance goal setting review focused on the follow areas:
 - Shared Vision of Learning
 - School Culture and Instructional Program
 - Safe, Efficient, Effective Learning Environment
 - Community
 - Integrity, Fairness, Ethics
 - Political, Social, Economic, Legal and Cultural Context
 - Other: Goal Setting and Attainment
2. Formal and informal reviews, one of which will be unannounced. Based on Multidimensional principal performance rubric (appendix A)
3. Mid-year Evaluation (appendix B). The Superintendent will meet with the principal to discuss progress in meeting goals established at the beginning of the year.
4. End of year self-reflection
5. Annual Summative Evaluation (appendix C)

PROCEDURES:

Timeline	Action
October 15 th	Administrator will submit annual performance goals to the Superintendent
January	Mid-year evaluation
June	Administrator will submit end of year self-reflection to Superintendent
August	Summative Evaluation

Appendix A

Annual Performance Goal Setting Form- Principal

Name: _____ Building: _____ School Year: _____

My primary focus is:

Check applicable area	Domain	Description
	1	Shared Vision of Learning
	2	School Culture and Instructional Program
	3	Safe, Efficient, Effective Learning Environment
	4	Community
	5	Integrity, Fairness, Ethics
	6	Political, Social, Economic, Legal and Cultural Context
	7	Other: Goals and Attainment

Below indicate the specific goals that you would like to accomplish, the major action steps that you intend to take, and tentative timeframe. As you accomplish your goals, please record the date you complete your action steps. Be prepared to discuss your progress in these areas with the Superintendent as part of the mid-year evaluation.

Goal:		
Tentative Timeline	Action Step	Date Completed

Goal:		
Tentative Timeline	Action Step	Date Completed

Date plan reviewed: _____

Principal Signature: _____

Superintendent Signature: _____

Appendix B

Mid-Year Evaluation

Name _____ School Year _____

Evaluator _____ Date _____

Domain
<i>Shared Vision of Learning</i>
Evidence:
<i>School Culture and Instructional Program</i>
Evidence:
<i>Safe, Efficient, Effective Learning Environment</i>
Evidence:
<i>Community</i>
Evidence:
<i>Integrity, Fairness, Ethics</i>
Evidence:
<i>Political, Social, Economic, Legal and Cultural Context</i>
Evidence:
<i>Other: Goal Setting and Attainment</i>
Evidence:

Other Artifacts (if applicable):

Recommendations (actions for improvement, revised goals, etc...):

Principal Signature: _____ Date _____

Superintendent Signature: _____ Date _____

Appendix C

Annual Principal Summative Evaluation

Year: _____

Name: _____ Administrative Position: _____

Evaluator: _____ Date: _____

Section I: Rubric

	1	2	3	4
<p>Shared Vision of Learning <i>An education leader promotes the success of every student by facilitating the development, articulation, implementation, and stewardship of a vision of learning that is shared and supported by all stakeholders.</i></p>	Ineffective	Developing	Effective	Highly Effective
Culture (attitudes, knowledge, behaviors and beliefs that characterize the school environment and are shared by its stakeholders)				
Sustainability (a focus on continuance and meaning beyond the present moment, contextualizing today's successes and improvements as the legacy of the future)				
Evidence:	Score:			
<p>School Culture and Instructional Program <i>An education leader promotes the success of every student by advocating, nurturing, and sustaining a school culture and instructional program conducive to student learning and staff professional growth.</i></p>	Ineffective	Developing	Effective	Highly Effective
Culture (attitudes, knowledge, behaviors and beliefs that characterize the school environment and are shared by its stakeholders)				
Instructional Program (design and delivery of high quality curriculum that produces clear evidence of learning)				
Capacity Building (developing potential and tapping existing internal expertise to promote learning and improve practice)				
Sustainability (a focus on continuance and meaning beyond the present moment, contextualizing today's successes and improvements as the legacy of the future)				
Strategic Planning Process- monitoring/inquiry (the implementation and stewardship of goals, decisions and actions)				
Evidence:	Score:			
<p>Safe, Efficient, Effective Learning Environment <i>An educational leader promotes the success of every student by ensuring management of the organization, operation, and resources for a safe, efficient, and effective learning environment.</i></p>	Ineffective	Developing	Effective	Highly Effective
Capacity Building (developing potential and tapping existing internal expertise to promote learning and improve practice)				
Culture (attitudes, knowledge, behaviors and beliefs that characterize the school environment and are shared by its stakeholders)				
Sustainability (a focus on continuance and meaning beyond the present moment, contextualizing today's successes and improvements as the legacy of the future)				
Instructional Program (design and delivery of high quality curriculum that produces clear evidence of learning)				
Evidence:	Score:			

Community <i>An education leader promotes the success of every student by collaborating with faculty and community members, responding to diverse community interests and needs, and mobilizing community resources.</i>	Ineffective	Developing	Effective	Highly Effective
Strategic Planning Process: Inquiry (gather and analyze data to monitor effects of actions and decisions on goal attainment and enable mid-course adjustments as needed to better enable success)				
Culture (attitudes, knowledge, behaviors and beliefs that characterize the school environment and are shared by its stakeholders)				
Sustainability (a focus on continuance and meaning beyond the present moment, contextualizing today's successes and improvements as the legacy of the future)				
Evidence:	Score:			
Integrity, Fairness, Ethics <i>An education leader promotes the success of every student by acting with integrity, fairness, and in an ethical manner.</i>	Ineffective	Developing	Effective	Highly Effective
Sustainability (a focus on continuance and meaning beyond the present moment, contextualizing today's successes and improvements as the legacy of the future)				
Culture (attitudes, knowledge, behaviors and beliefs that characterize the school environment and are shared by its stakeholders)				
Evidence:	Score:			
Political, Social, Economic, Legal and Cultural Context <i>An education leader promotes the success of every student by understanding, responding to, and influencing the political, social, economic, legal, and cultural context.</i>	Ineffective	Developing	Effective	Highly Effective
Sustainability (a focus on continuance and meaning beyond the present moment, contextualizing today's successes and improvements as the legacy of the future)				
Culture (attitudes, knowledge, behaviors and beliefs that characterize the school environment and are shared by its stakeholders)				
Evidence:	Score:			
Other: Goal Setting and Attainment	Ineffective	Developing	Effective	Highly Effective
Uncovering Goals (align and define)				
Strategic Planning (prioritize and strategize)				
Taking Action (mobilize, monitor and refine)				
Evaluating Attainment (document and next steps)				
Evidence:	Score:			

Each standard receives a score between 1 and 4. All seven scores are totaled and divided by 7.

Assessment of Principal Effectiveness Standards	Observation and Evidence Score
Shared Vision of Learning	
School Culture and Instructional Program	
Safe, Efficient, Effective Learning Environment	
Community	
Integrity, Fairness, Ethics	
Political, Social, Economic, Legal and Cultural Context	
Other: Goal Setting and Attainment	
	Total Score
	Total Score/7
	Conversion Score (Refer to Appendix D)

Section II: State Assessment

Total: (maximum 20 points)

State Provided Growth Score/Student Learning Objective (SLO)	
---	--

- Score will be based on the average teacher scores for the building.

Section III: Local Assessment

Total: (maximum 20 points)

Local Assessment (NWEA/AIMSWEB/Local Assessment)	
---	--

- Score will be based on the average teacher scores for the building.

Overall Composite Score: (maximum 100 points)	Level:
--	---------------

Principal Signature: _____ Date: _____

Superintendent Signature: _____ Date: _____

Conversion Chart					
Level	Measures of Student Growth	Local Measures of Student Achievement	Other 60 points		Overall Composite Score
Ineffective	0 - 2	0 - 2	0-49		0-64
Developing	3 - 8	3 - 8	50-56.3		65-74
Effective	9 - 17	9 - 17	57-58.8		75-90
Highly Effective	18 - 20	18 - 20	59-60		91-100

Appendix D

Rubric Score to Sub-Component Conversion Chart

Ineffective 0-49		Developing 50-56		Effective 57-58		Highly Effective 59-60	
Total Average Rubric Score	Conversion Score for Composite						
1.000	0	1.5	50	2.5	57	3.5	59
1.008	1	1.6	50.7	2.6	57.2	3.6	59.3
1.017	2	1.7	51.4	2.7	57.4	3.7	59.5
1.025	3	1.8	52.1	2.8	57.6	3.8	59.8
1.033	4	1.9	52.8	2.9	57.8	3.9	60
1.042	5	2	53.5	3	58	4	60.25 (round to 60)
1.050	6	2.1	54.2	3.1	58.2		
1.058	7	2.2	54.9	3.2	58.4		
1.067	8	2.3	55.6	3.3	58.6		
1.075	9	2.4	56.3	3.4	58.8		
1.083	10						
1.092	11						
1.100	12						
1.108	13						
1.115	14						
1.123	15						
1.131	16						
1.138	17						
1.146	18						
1.154	19						
1.162	20						
1.169	21						
1.177	22						
1.185	23						
1.192	24						
1.200	25						
1.208	26						
1.217	27						
1.225	28						
1.233	29						
1.242	30						
1.250	31						
1.258	32						
1.267	33						
1.275	34						
1.283	35						
1.292	36						
1.300	37						
1.308	38						
1.317	39						
1.325	40						
1.333	41						
1.342	42						
1.350	43						
1.358	44						
1.367	45						
1.375	46						
1.383	47						
1.392	48						
1.400	49						

Teacher Improvement Plan:

The Teacher Improvement Plan (TIP) is designed to provide support through communication, discussion and collaboration in the area (s) of significant concern. The administrator and unit member will jointly determine the strategies to be taken to overcome the deficiencies, but it is agreed that the primary responsibility for correction of the deficiencies remains with the unit member. The administrator and unit member will agree on a mutual time-line to improve any noted deficiencies.

The purpose of the TIP is to:

- improve a unit member's performance;
- provide targeted, intensive assistance process;
- provide additional support; which may include professional development and release time to observe other teachers;
- provide information to determine tenure

Referral to TIP:

1. The APPR is to be a significant factor for termination and tenure determinations. In the event that an evaluator is concerned with the competence of a unit member, it is agreed that the unit member will be invited to a conference with the evaluator, appropriate administrator (if different from the evaluator), and the Association President or his/her designee as early in the school year as reasonable. The conference will result in an intervention and TIP being developed.

The administrator will recommend a unit member for a TIP component at any time during the year or when the concerns are such that an overall composite score of *ineffective* or *developing* score is calculated on the *End of the Year Summative Evaluation*. *TIPs as a result of an ineffective or developing rating on the APPR must be completed and initiated no later than 10 days after the beginning of the school year.*

A probationary teacher, who is disciplined, dismissed, not renewed, or denied tenure, based in whole or part upon classroom performance or any other factor measured by the APPR, shall have the right to appeal such action through the APPR Appeals procedure. Nothing herein relieves the District of its obligations under the New York State Education Law Sections 3012(2) and 3031.

2. The administrator will notify the unit member in writing describing the areas of concern as they relate to the member's proficiency in demonstrating the APPR standards as outlined in the Professional Growth Program. A copy will be provided to the unit member, Superintendent and SVETA President.
3. The administrator and unit member will meet to address the concerns, complete TIP worksheet (Appendix C) and begin implementation.
4. The unit member will participate in a year end summative review. The member must obtain at least an effective rating on the composite score. If an overall composite score is not at the *effective* or *highly effective* rating, the member will continue to have a TIP for the following year.
5. The member must satisfactorily complete the action steps and demonstrate he/she has successfully met the criteria outlined in the TIP.

Teacher Improvement Plan

(To be completed jointly by teacher and administrator)

Name _____ Building _____ Grade/Subject _____

—

Area of Concern	Action Steps (Provide detailed description- with measurable/attainable goals, including a description of the support and assistance provided)	Frequency (timeline for improvement)	Action Steps Completed	
			Yes	No

Member Comments:

Administrator Comments:

Member
Signature: _____ Date: _____

—

Administrator Signature: _____ Date: _____

—

End of the year review: (check all that apply)

- _____ Member has successfully met criteria outlined in the TIP.
- _____ Member has not successfully met criteria outlined in the TIP.
- _____ Member has received a composite score of effective or better
- _____ Member has not received a composite score of effective or better.

Member Signature: _____
Date: _____

Administrator Signature: _____
Date: _____

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

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

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

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

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

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

Signatures, dates

Superintendent Signature: Date: 6/28/12

Joseph Moya

Teachers Union President Signature: Date: 6/28/12

Julary Strong

Administrative Union President Signature: Date:

Melissa Jewell 6-28-12

Board of Education President Signature: Date: 6-28-2012

James W. Rose