



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

---

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

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

January 15, 2015

**Revised**

Cheryl Pedisich, Superintendent  
Three Village Central School District  
P.O. Box 9050  
East Setaukey, NY 11733-9050

Dear Superintendent Pedisich:

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. As a reminder, we are relying on the information you provided on your APPR form, including the certifications and assurances that are part of your approved APPR. If any material changes are made to your approved APPR plan, your district/BOCES must submit such material changes to us for approval. Please see the attached notes for further information.

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

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

Thank you again for your hard work.

Sincerely,

Elizabeth R. Berlin  
Acting Commissioner

Attachment

c: Dean Lucera

**NOTE:**

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

# Annual Professional Performance Reviews

Created Tuesday, April 30, 2013

Updated Tuesday, July 08, 2014

---

## 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 considers void any other signed agreements between and among parties in any form that prevent, conflict, or interfere with full implementation of the APPR Plan approved by the Department. The Department also 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 : 580201060000

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

580201060000

#### 1.2) School District Name: THREE VILLAGE CSD

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

THREE VILLAGE CSD

#### 1.3) Assurances

Please check all of the boxes below:

1.3) 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
1.3) 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
1.3) 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

#### 1.4) Submission Status

For districts, BOCES, or charter schools that did not have an approved APPR plan in the previous school year, is this a first-time submission, a re-submission, or a submission of material changes to an approved APPR plan? For districts, BOCES, or charter schools that did have an approved APPR plan for the previous school year, this must be listed as a submission of material changes to the approved APPR plan.

Submission of material changes to an approved APPR plan

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

Created Tuesday, April 30, 2013

Updated Friday, January 09, 2015

### 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 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, 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.	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: grade 8 Science, 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 3<sup>rd</sup> 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 3<sup>rd</sup> 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 in the following format: “[Name of your District/Region/BOCES] developed [Grade] [Subject] Assessment.” For example, a BOCES-developed 7th grade Social Studies assessment would be written as follows: “GVEP-Developed Grade 7 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. Please note that no APPR plan shall be approved by the Commissioner for use in the 2014-2015 school year or thereafter that provides for the administration of traditional standardized assessments for use with students in kindergarten through grade two for APPR purposes (see: <http://www.engageny.org/resource/guidance-on-the-approved-regulatory-amendments-to-appr-to-help-reduce-local-testing>).

	ELA	Assessment
K	School-or BOCES-wide, group or team results based on State assessments	ELA State Assessments from grades 4, 5, and 6
1	School-or BOCES-wide, group or team results based on State assessments	ELA State Assessments from grades 4, 5, and 6
2	School-or BOCES-wide, group or team results based on State assessments	ELA State Assessments from grades 4, 5, and 6

	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 measuring student growth on the assessments listed for this Task.

Use this box, if needed, to describe the general process for assigning HEDI categories for these grades/subjects in this subcomponent. If needed, you may upload a table or graphic at 2.11, below.

The Three Village Central School District is committed to working collaboratively to provide high quality instruction, aligned to the Common Core State Standards. To measure school-wide growth, we will utilize the State-provided Mean Growth Percentiles (MGPs). A building HEDI score will be awarded based on the grade 4-6 mean growth percentiles from the NYS ELA Assessment weighted proportionately based on the numbers of students.

To measure individual student growth, the grade 3 teachers in collaboration with administration will use students' pre-assessment scores (AIMSweb) and prior academic history to use a matrix and award points to teachers based on individual student growth.

Highly Effective (18 - 20 points) Results are well-above state average for similar students (or District goals if no state test).	See uploaded charts in Task 2.11.
Effective (9 - 17 points) Results meet state average for similar students (or District goals if no state test).	See uploaded charts in Task 2.11.
Developing (3 - 8 points) Results are below state average for similar students (or District goals if no state test).	See uploaded charts in Task 2.11.
Ineffective (0 - 2 points) Results are well-below state average for similar students (or District goals if no state test).	See uploaded charts in Task 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. Please note that no APPR plan shall be approved by the Commissioner for use in the 2014-2015 school year or thereafter that provides for the administration of traditional standardized assessments for use with students in kindergarten through grade two for APPR purposes (see: <http://www.engageny.org/resource/guidance-on-the-approved-regulatory-amendments-to-appr-to-help-reduce-local-testing>).

	Math	Assessment
K	School-or BOCES-wide, group or team results based on State assessments	Mathematics State Assessments from grades 4, 5, and 6
1	School-or BOCES-wide, group or team results based on State assessments	Mathematics State Assessments from grades 4, 5, and 6
2	School-or BOCES-wide, group or team results based on State assessments	Mathematics State Assessments from grades 4, 5, and 6

	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 measuring student growth on the assessments listed for this Task.

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.	<p>The Three Village Central School District is committed to working collaboratively to provide high quality instruction, aligned to the Common Core State Standards. To measure school-wide growth, we will utilize the State-provided Mean Growth Percentiles (MGPs). A building HEDI score will be awarded based on the grade 4-6 mean growth percentiles from the NYS Math Assessment weighted proportionately based on the numbers of students.</p> <p>To measure individual student growth, the grade 3 teachers in collaboration with administration will use each student's pre-assessment score (NYReady Assessment) and prior</p>
---	---

academic history to use a matrix and award points to teachers based on the amount of individual student growth.

Highly Effective (18 - 20 points) Results are well-above state average for similar students (or District goals if no state test).

See uploaded charts in Task 2.11.

Effective (9 - 17 points) Results meet state average for similar students (or District goals if no state test).

See uploaded charts in Task 2.11.

Developing (3 - 8 points) Results are below state average for similar students (or District goals if no state test).

See uploaded charts in Task 2.11.

Ineffective (0 - 2 points) Results are well-below state average for similar students (or District goals if no state test).

See uploaded charts in Task 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	Common Branch
7	School- or BOCES-wide, group or team results based on State assessments	Grades 7 and 8 ELA and Mathematics State Assessments
	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 measuring student growth on the assessments listed for this Task.

Use this box, if needed, to describe the general process for assigning HEDI categories for these grades/subjects in this subcomponent. If needed, you may upload a table or graphic at 2.11, below.

The Three Village Central School District is committed to working collaboratively to provide high quality instruction, aligned to the Common Core State Standards. To measure school-wide growth, we will utilize the State-provided Mean Growth Percentiles (MGPs). A building HEDI score will be awarded based on the grade 7 and 8 mean growth percentiles from the NYS ELA and Math Assessment weighted proportionately based on the numbers of students.

For Grade 8 Science: Teachers in collaboration with administration will review historical data to set individual student targets. 70% of students will meet or exceed their individual targets.

Highly Effective (18 - 20 points) Results are well-above state average for similar students (or District goals if no state test).

See uploaded charts in Task 2.11.

Effective (9 - 17 points) Results meet state average for similar students (or District goals if no state test).

See uploaded charts in Task 2.11.

Developing (3 - 8 points) Results are below state average for similar students (or District goals if no state test).

See uploaded charts in Task 2.11.

Ineffective (0 - 2 points) Results are well-below state average for similar students (or District goals if no state test).

See uploaded charts in Task 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	Common Branch
7	School- or BOCES-wide, group or team results based on State assessments	Grades 7 and 8 ELA and Mathematics State Assessments
8	School- or BOCES-wide, group or team results based on State assessments	Grades 7 and 8 ELA and Mathematics State Assessments

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 measuring student growth on the assessments listed for this Task.

Use this box, if needed, to describe the general process for assigning HEDI categories for these grades/subjects in this subcomponent. If needed, you may upload a table or graphic at 2.11, below.	The Three Village Central School District is committed to working collaboratively to provide high quality instruction, aligned to the Common Core State Standards. To measure school-wide growth, we will utilize the State-provided Mean Growth Percentiles (MGPs). A building HEDI score will be awarded based on the grade 7-8 mean growth percentiles from the NYS ELA and Math Assessment weighted proportionately based on the numbers of students.
Highly Effective (18 - 20 points) Results are well-above District goals for similar students.	See uploaded chart in Task 2.11.
Effective (9 - 17 points) Results meet District goals for similar students.	See uploaded chart in Task 2.11.
Developing (3 - 8 points) Results are below District goals for similar students.	See uploaded chart in Task 2.11.
Ineffective (0 - 2 points) Results are well-below District goals for similar students.	See uploaded chart in Task 2.11.

## 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 School-/BOCES-wide group/team results based on State assessments	Global 2 Regents 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 measuring student growth on the assessments listed for this Task.

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.	To measure individual student growth, the social studies teachers in collaboration with administration will use each student's pre-assessment score and prior academic history to set individual growth targets.  80% of students will meet or exceed their individual growth target.
Highly Effective (18 - 20 points) Results are well-above District goals for similar students.	85-100% of students meet or exceed their individual growth target.
Effective (9 - 17 points) Results meet District goals for similar students.	70-84% of students meet or exceed their individual growth target.
Developing (3 - 8 points) Results are below District goals for similar students.	30-69% of students meet or exceed their individual growth target.
Ineffective (0 - 2 points) Results are well-below District goals for similar students.	0-29% of students meet or exceed their individual growth target.

## 2.7) High School Science Regents Courses

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

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

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

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

Use this box, if needed, to describe the general process for assigning HEDI categories for these grades/subjects in this subcomponent. If needed, you may upload a table or graphic at 2.11, below.	The Three Village Central School District, in collaboration with Eastern Suffolk BOCES, will utilize the BOCES Score Projection Report to determine individual student growth compared to other students county-wide with the same baseline starting point and special education, English as a Second Language and poverty status.
Highly Effective (18 - 20 points) Results are well-above District goals for similar students.	See uploaded charts by course in Task 2.11.

Effective (9 - 17 points) Results meet District goals for similar students.	See uploaded charts by course in Task 2.11.
Developing (3 - 8 points) Results are below District goals for similar students.	See uploaded charts by course in Task 2.11.
Ineffective (0 - 2 points) Results are well-below District goals for similar students.	See uploaded charts by course in Task 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 measuring student growth on the assessments listed for this Task.

NOTE: For Algebra 1 and Geometry, please specify whether your district will be offering the 2005 Learning Standards version of the assessment in addition to the Common Core version, or just the latter, and how the HEDI process will be adjusted accordingly.

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.	Our district administers both the 2005 Standards and the Common Core Regents, so long as permitted by NYSED, and teachers will use the higher of the two scores. To measure individual student growth, the math teachers in collaboration with administration will use each student's pre-assessment score and prior academic history to set individual growth targets.
Highly Effective (18 - 20 points) Results are well-above District goals for similar students.	See uploaded charts by course in Task 2.11.
Effective (9 - 17 points) Results meet District goals for similar students.	See uploaded charts by course in Task 2.11.
Developing (3 - 8 points) Results are below District goals for similar students.	See uploaded charts by course in Task 2.11.
Ineffective (0 - 2 points) Results are well-below District goals for similar students.	See uploaded charts by course in Task 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	School-/BOCES-wide group/team results based on State assessments	Comprehensive English Regents
Grade 10 ELA	School-/BOCES-wide group/team results based on State assessments	Comprehensive English Regents
Grade 11 ELA	Regents assessment	Comprehensive English Regents

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 measuring student growth on the assessments listed for this Task.

NOTE: For Grade 11 ELA, please specify whether your district will be offering the Comprehensive English Regents in addition to the Common Core English Regents, or just the latter, how the HEDI process will be adjusted accordingly.

Use this box, if needed, to describe the general process for assigning HEDI categories for these grades/subjects in this subcomponent. If needed, you may upload a table or graphic at 2.11, below.	The Three Village Central School District, in collaboration with Eastern Suffolk BOCES, will utilize the BOCES Score Projection Report to determine individual student growth compared to other students county-wide with the same baseline assessment score, as well as special education, English as a Second Language and poverty status. For the 15-16 school year and beyond, we will be administering both the Common Core and Comprehensive English Regents, so long as permitted by SED and the teachers will use the higher of the two scores.
Highly Effective (18 - 20 points) Results are well-above District goals for similar students.	85-100% of students meet or exceed their individual growth target.
Effective (9 - 17 points) Results meet District goals for similar students.	70-84% of students meet or exceed their individual growth target.
Developing (3 - 8 points) Results are below District goals for similar students.	30-69% of students meet or exceed their individual growth target.
Ineffective (0 - 2 points) Results are well-below District goals for similar students.	0-29% of students meet or exceed their individual growth target.

## 2.10) All Other Courses

Fill in, as applicable, for all other teachers in additional grades/subjects that have Student Learning Objectives. If you need additional space, duplicate this form and upload (below) as an attachment to your APPR plan. You may combine into one line any groups of teachers for whom the answers in the boxes are the same including, for example, "all other teachers not named above". Please note that no APPR plan shall be approved by the Commissioner for use in the 2014-2015 school year or thereafter that provides for the administration of traditional standardized assessments for use with students in kindergarten through grade two for APPR purposes (see: <http://www.engageny.org/resource/guidance-on-the-approved-regulatory-amendments-to-appr-to-help-reduce-local-testing>).

Please also note that, for students using 3d party assessments in this Task, the 2<sup>nd</sup> drop-down option applies to grades 3 and above and the 5<sup>th</sup> drop-down option applies to grades K-2.

Course(s) or Subject(s)	Option	Assessment
All other High School ELA courses	School/BOCES-wide/group/team results based on State	Comprehensive English Regents
All other High School Math courses	School/BOCES-wide/group/team results based on State	Geometry Regents Assessment

All other High School Science courses	School/BOCES-wide/group/team results based on State	Chemistry and Physics Regents Assessments
All other High School Social Studies courses	School/BOCES-wide/group/team results based on State	United States History and Government Regents Assessment
Art, K - 12	School/BOCES-wide/group/team results based on State	Grades 4-6 ELA and Mathematics State Assessment (grades K-6); Grades 7-8 ELA and Mathematics State Assessment (grades 7-9); Comprehensive English Regents Assessment (grades 10-12)
All Business Courses	School/BOCES-wide/group/team results based on State	Comprehensive English Regents Assessment (grades 10-12)
ELL, K -12	School/BOCES-wide/group/team results based on State	Grades 4-6 ELA and Mathematics State Assessment (grades K-6); Grades 7-8 ELA and Mathematics State Assessment (grades 7-9); Comprehensive English Regents Assessment (grades 10-12)
Enrichment 4-6	School/BOCES-wide/group/team results based on State	Grades 4-6 ELA and Mathematics State Assessment (grades 4-6)
Family and Consumer Science	School/BOCES-wide/group/team results based on State	Grades 7-8 ELA and Mathematics State Assessment (grades 7-9)
Foreign Languages (LOTE): Intro through Level III/Course B	School/BOCES-wide/group/team results based on State	Grades 7-8 ELA and Mathematics State Assessment (grades 7-9); Comprehensive English Regents Assessment (grades 10-12)
Foreign Languages (LOTE): Courses IV, V, VI and Course C,D, and AP	School/BOCES-wide/group/team results based on State	Grades 7-8 ELA and Mathematics State Assessment (grades 7-9); Comprehensive English Regents Assessment (grades 10-12)
Health, 4- 6 and Secondary	School/BOCES-wide/group/team results based on State	Grades 4-6 ELA and Mathematics State Assessment (grades 4-6); Grades 7-8 ELA and Mathematics State Assessment (grades 7-9); Comprehensive English Regents Assessment (grades 10-12)
Library Media, K - 6	School/BOCES-wide/group/team results based on State	Grades 4-6 ELA and Mathematics State Assessment (grades K-6)
Music, K -12	School/BOCES-wide/group/team results based on State	Grades 4-6 ELA and Mathematics State Assessment (grades 4-6); Grades 7-8 ELA and Mathematics State Assessment (grades 7-9); Comprehensive English Regents Assessment (grades 10-12)
Physical Education K-12	School/BOCES-wide/group/team results based on State	Grades 4-6 ELA and Mathematics State Assessment (grades 4-6); Grades 7-8 ELA and Mathematics State Assessment (grades 7-9); Comprehensive English Regents Assessment (grades 10-12)
Related Support Areas K-12	School/BOCES-wide/group/team results based on State	Grades 4-6 ELA and Mathematics State Assessment (grades 4-6); Grades 7-8 ELA and Mathematics State Assessment (grades 7-9); Comprehensive English Regents Assessment (grades 10-12)
Special Education K -6	School/BOCES-wide/group/team results based on State	Grades 4-6 ELA and Mathematics State Assessment (grades K-6)
Special Education 7-12	School/BOCES-wide/group/team results based on	Grades 7-8 ELA and Mathematics State Assessment (grades 7-9); Comprehensive English Regents

	State	Assessment (grades 10-12)
Technology 7-12	School/BOCES-wide/group/team results based on State	Grades 7-8 ELA and Mathematics State Assessment (grades 7-9); Comprehensive English Regents Assessment (grades 10-12)
Special Education 3-8 (Alternately Assessed)	State Assessment	Grades 3-8 New York State Alternate 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 measuring student growth on the assessments listed for this Task.

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.	<p>For Math, our district administers both the 2005 Standards and the Common Core Regents, so long as permitted by NYSED, and teachers will use the higher of the two scores. For the 15-16 school year and beyond, we will be administering both the Common Core and Comprehensive English Regents, so long as permitted by NYSED and the teachers will use the higher of the two scores.</p> <p>Regents Exams: For any course using a Regents exam, the HEDI measure will be a school-wide measure based on what is described in the task above.</p> <p>4-8 State Assessment For any course using the 4-8 NYS ELA and Math State Assessments, will use an MGP measure based on the listed assessments weighted proportionately, based on the number of students.</p> <p>Special Education 3-8: Teachers in collaboration with administration will use baseline data to set individual growth targets.</p>
---	---

Highly Effective (18 - 20 points) Results are well-above District goals for similar students.	See table contained in section 2.11 for specific district-adopted percentages/expectations aligned to HEDI bands.
Effective (9 - 17 points) Results meet District goals for similar students.	See table contained in section 2.11 for specific district-adopted percentages/expectations aligned to HEDI bands.
Developing (3 - 8 points) Results are below District goals for similar students.	See table contained in section 2.11 for specific district-adopted percentages/expectations aligned to HEDI bands.
Ineffective (0 - 2 points) Results are well-below District goals for similar students.	See table contained in section 2.11 for specific district-adopted percentages/expectations aligned to HEDI bands.

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. \(MS Word\)](#)

assets/survey-uploads/12186/1446426-avH4IQNZMh/Task 2.10\_AllOtherCourses.docx

## 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/12186/1446426-TXEttx9bQW/Task 2.11\_Revised1-9.doc

## 2.12) Locally Developed Controls

Describe any adjustments, controls, or other special considerations that will be used assigning points to a teacher's score for this subcomponent, 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 the following: student prior academic history, students with disabilities, English language learners, and students in poverty.

The district is cognizant of the guidelines established by the New York State Education Department and has instituted procedures to ensure the integrity of all assessments. All final assessments will be scored by an educator with no vested interest in the score.

Targets will be established based on the profile of the class. The measures that will be taken into consideration will include: the percentage of students with indicators of poverty, ELL students, students with a disability, and prior academic history.

## 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: <a href="http://www.engageny.org/resource/student-learning-objectives-guidance-document">http://www.engageny.org/resource/student-learning-objectives-guidance-document</a> ).	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
2.14) Assurances   Assure that the amount of time devoted to traditional standardized assessments that are not specifically required by state or federal law for each classroom or program within a grade level does	Checked

not exceed, in the aggregate, one percent of the minimum required annual instructional hours for the grade.

2.14) Assurances | Assure that, as applicable, any third party assessment that is administered to students in kindergarten, first, or second grade, and being used for APPR purposes, is consistent with the State's APPR Assessment Guidance and is not a traditional standardized assessment. Checked

### 3. Local Measures (Teachers)

Created Tuesday, April 30, 2013

Updated Thursday, January 15, 2015

---

#### 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. Additionally, please provide a brief explanation in the HEDI general description box of why you have listed the grade/course as "Not Applicable" (e.g., district/BOCES does not offer this grade/subject; common branch teacher).

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 in the following format: "[Name of your District/Region/BOCES] developed [Grade] [Subject] Assessment." For example, a BOCES-developed 7th grade Social Studies assessment would be written as follows: "GVEP-Developed Grade 7 Social Studies Assessment."

NOTE: If your district/BOCES is using the same assessment for both the State growth and other comparable measures subcomponent and the locally-selected measures subcomponent, be sure that a different measure of student performance is being used with the assessment (e.g., achievement rather than growth; growth measured in a different manner).

#### 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 7<sup>th</sup> grade math State assessment compared to those same students' performance levels on the 6<sup>th</sup> grade math State assessment, or an increase in

the percentage of a teacher’s students earning the advanced performance level (four) on the 4<sup>th</sup> grade ELA or math State assessments compared to those students’ performance levels on the 3<sup>rd</sup> 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 measure that will be used as the locally-selected measure of student achievement. Then name the specific assessment that will be used with the locally-selected measure, listing the full name of the assessment.

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

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

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

Use this box, if needed, to describe the general process for assigning HEDI categories for these grades/subjects in this subcomponent. If needed, you may upload a table or graphic at 3.3, below.	We are using ELA State Assessment data from grades 3, 4, 5, and 6 for grades 4 through 6 as well as grades 7 and 8 for grades 7 through 8 teachers in order to determine building-wide achievement levels based on historical data and assigning HEDI categories to grades 4 through 6 and grades 7 through 8 teachers, respectively.
Highly Effective (14 - 15 points) Results are well above District- or BOCES-adopted expectations for growth or achievement for grade/subject.	See uploaded charts by building in Task 3.3.

Effective (8- 13 points) Results meet District- or BOCES-adopted expectations for growth or achievement for grade/subject.	See uploaded charts by building in Task 3.3.
Developing (3 - 7 points) Results are below District- or BOCES-adopted expectations for growth or achievement for grade/subject.	See uploaded charts by building in Task 3.3.
Ineffective (0 - 2 points) Results are well below District- or BOCES-adopted expectations for growth or achievement for grade/subject.	See uploaded charts by building in Task 3.3.

### 3.2) Grades 4-8 Math

Using the drop-down boxes below, select the measure that will be used as the locally-selected measure of student achievement. Then name the specific assessment that will be used with the locally-selected measure, listing the full name of the assessment.

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

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

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

Use this box, if needed, to describe the general process for assigning HEDI categories for these grades/subjects in this subcomponent. If needed, you may upload a table or graphic at 3.3, below.	We are using Mathematics State Assessment data from grades 3, 4, 5, and 6 for grades 4 through 6 as well as grades 7 and 8 for grades 7 through 8 teachers in order to determine building-wide achievement levels based on historical data and assigning HEDI categories to grades 4 through 6 and grades 7 through 8 teachers, respectively.
Highly Effective (14 - 15 points) Results are well above District- or BOCES-adopted expectations for growth or achievement for grade/subject.	See uploaded charts by building in Task 3.3.
Effective (8- 13 points) Results meet District- or BOCES-adopted expectations for growth or achievement for grade/subject.	See uploaded charts by building in Task 3.3.
Developing (3 - 7 points) Results are below District- or BOCES-adopted expectations for growth or achievement for grade/subject.	See uploaded charts by building in Task 3.3.
Ineffective (0 - 2 points) Results are well below District- or BOCES-adopted expectations for growth or achievement for grade/subject.	See uploaded charts by building in Task 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/12149/1446427-rhJdBgDruP/Task 3.3\_Revised1-9.doc

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

Growth or achievement measure(s) from these options.

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

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

Measures based on:

- 1) The change in percentage of a teacher's students who achieve a specific level of performance as determined locally, on such assessments/examinations compared to those students' level of performance on such assessments/examinations in the previous school year (e.g., a three percentage point increase in students earning the proficient level (three) or better performance level on the 7<sup>th</sup> grade math State assessment compared to those same students' performance levels on the 6<sup>th</sup> grade math State assessment, or an increase in the percentage of a teacher's students earning the advanced performance level (four) on the 4<sup>th</sup> grade ELA or math State assessments compared to those students' performance levels on the 3<sup>rd</sup> 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 measure that will be used as the locally-selected measure of student achievement. Then name the specific assessment that will be used with the locally-selected measure, listing the full name of the assessment. Please note that no APPR plan shall be approved by the Commissioner for use in the 2014-2015 school year or thereafter that provides for the

administration of traditional standardized assessments for use with students in kindergarten through grade two for APPR purposes (see: <http://www.engageny.org/resource/guidance-on-the-approved-regulatory-amendments-to-appr-to-help-reduce-local-testing>).

	Locally-Selected Measure from List of Approved Measures	Assessment
K	6(ii) School-wide measure computed locally	ELA Assessments in grades 3, 4, 5, and 6
1	6(ii) School-wide measure computed locally	ELA Assessments in grades 3, 4, 5, and 6
2	6(ii) School-wide measure computed locally	ELA Assessments in grades 3, 4, 5, and 6
3	6(ii) School-wide measure computed locally	ELA Assessments in grades 3, 4, 5, and 6

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

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

Use this box, if needed, to describe the general process for assigning HEDI categories for these grades/subjects in this subcomponent. If needed, you may upload a table or graphic at 3.13, below.	We are using ELA State Assessment data from grades 3, 4, 5, and 6 for grades K through 3 teachers in order to determine building-wide achievement levels based on historical data and assigning HEDI categories to grades K through 3 teachers.
Highly Effective (18-20 points) Results are well above District- or BOCES-adopted expectations for growth or achievement for grade/subject.	See uploaded charts by building in Task 3.13.
Effective (9-17 points) Results meet District- or BOCES-adopted expectations for growth or achievement for grade/subject.	See uploaded charts by building in Task 3.13.
Developing (3 - 8 points) Results are below District- or BOCES-adopted expectations for growth or achievement for grade/subject.	See uploaded charts by building in Task 3.13.
Ineffective (0 - 2 points) Results are well below District- or BOCES-adopted expectations for growth or achievement for grade/subject.	See uploaded charts by building in Task 3.13.

### 3.5) Grades K-3 Math

Using the drop-down boxes below, select the measure that will be used as the locally-selected measure of student achievement. Then name the specific assessment that will be used with the locally-selected measure, listing the full name of the assessment. Please note that no APPR plan shall be approved by the Commissioner for use in the 2014-2015 school year or thereafter that provides for the administration of traditional standardized assessments for use with students in kindergarten through grade two for APPR purposes (see: <http://www.engageny.org/resource/guidance-on-the-approved-regulatory-amendments-to-appr-to-help-reduce-local-testing>).

	Locally-Selected Measure from List of Approved Measures	Assessment
K	6(ii) School-wide measure computed locally	Mathematics Assessments in grades 3, 4, 5, and 6
1	6(ii) School-wide measure computed locally	Mathematics Assessments in grades 3, 4, 5, and 6
2	6(ii) School-wide measure computed locally	Mathematics Assessments in grades 3, 4, 5, and 6
3	6(ii) School-wide measure computed locally	Mathematics Assessments in grades 3, 4, 5, and 6

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

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

Use this box, if needed, to describe the general process for assigning HEDI categories for these grades/subjects in this subcomponent. If needed, you may upload a table or graphic at 3.13, below.	We are using Mathematics State Assessment data from grades 3, 4, 5, and 6 for grades K through 3 teachers in order to determine building-wide achievement levels based on historical data and assigning HEDI categories to grades K through 3 teachers.
Highly Effective (18-20 points) Results are well above District- or BOCES-adopted expectations for growth or achievement for grade/subject.	See uploaded charts by building in Task 3.13.
Effective (9-17 points) Results meet District- or BOCES-adopted expectations for growth or achievement for grade/subject.	See uploaded charts by building in Task 3.13.
Developing (3 - 8 points) Results are below District -or BOCES-adopted expectations for growth or achievement for grade/subject.	See uploaded charts by building in Task 3.13.
Ineffective (0 - 2 points) Results are well below District- or BOCES-adopted expectations for growth or achievement for grade/subject.	See uploaded charts by building in Task 3.13.

### 3.6) Grades 6-8 Science

Using the drop-down boxes below, select the measure that will be used as the locally-selected measure of student achievement. Then name the specific assessment that will be used with the locally-selected measure, listing the full name of the assessment.

	Locally-Selected Measure from List of Approved Measures	Assessment
6	Not applicable	Common Branch
7	6(ii) School wide measure computed locally	Earth Science and Living Environment State Regents exams
8	3) Teacher specific achievement or growth score computed locally	8th Grade State Science Assessment

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

Use this box, if needed, to describe the general process for assigning HEDI categories for these grades/subjects in this subcomponent. If needed, you may upload a table or graphic at 3.13, below.	For the 7th grade science, we will use a school-wide measure based on the Earth Science and Living Environment State Regents exams. For 8th grade, we are using 8th grade Science State assessment data. Teachers in collaboration with administration will set achievement targets based on historical data.
Highly Effective (18 - 20 points) Results are well above District- or BOCES-adopted expectations for growth or achievement for grade/subject.	See uploaded charts by course in Task 3.13.

Effective (9 - 17 points) Results meet District- or BOCES-adopted expectations for growth or achievement for grade/subject.	See uploaded charts by course in Task 3.13.
Developing (3 - 8 points) Results are below District- or BOCES-adopted expectations for growth or achievement for grade/subject.	See uploaded charts by course in Task 3.13.
Ineffective (0 - 2 points) Results are well below District- or BOCES-adopted expectations for growth or achievement for grade/subject.	See uploaded charts by course in Task 3.13.

### 3.7) Grades 6-8 Social Studies

Using the drop-down boxes below, select the measure that will be used as the locally-selected measure of student achievement. Then name the specific assessment that will be used with the locally-selected measure, listing the full name of the assessment.

	Locally-Selected Measure from List of Approved Measures	Assessment
6	Not applicable	Common Branch
7	6(ii) School wide measure computed locally	NYS ELA and Mathematics Assessments in grades 7 and 8
8	6(ii) School wide measure computed locally	NYS ELA and Mathematics Assessments in grades 7 and 8

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.	For the 7th and 8th grade social studies, we will use a school-wide measure based on the NYS ELA and Math Assessments. Teachers in collaboration with administration will set achievement targets based on historical data.
Highly Effective (18 - 20 points) Results are well above District- or BOCES-adopted expectations for growth or achievement for grade/subject.	See building-specific HEDI charts in Task 3.3.
Effective (9 - 17 points) Results meet District- or BOCES-adopted expectations for growth or achievement for grade/subject.	See building-specific HEDI charts in Task 3.3.
Developing (3 - 8 points) Results are below District- or BOCES-adopted expectations for growth or achievement for grade/subject.	See building-specific HEDI charts in Task 3.3.
Ineffective (0 - 2 points) Results are well below District- or BOCES-adopted expectations for growth or achievement for grade/subject.	See building-specific HEDI charts in Task 3.3.

### 3.8) High School Social Studies

Using the drop-down boxes below, select the measure that will be used as the locally-selected measure of student achievement. Then name the specific assessment that will be used with the locally-selected measure, listing the full name of the assessment.

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

	Locally-Selected Measure from List of Approved Measures	Assessment
Global 1	6(ii) School wide measure computed locally	Global History and Geography Regents Assessment
Global 2	3) Teacher specific achievement or growth score computed locally	Global History and Geography Regents Assessment
American History	3) Teacher specific achievement or growth score computed locally	United States History and Government Regents Assessment

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

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

Use this box, if needed, to describe the general process for assigning HEDI categories for these grades/subjects in this subcomponent. If needed, you may upload a table or graphic at 3.13, below.	For Global History 1 and 2, we are using the Global History and Geography Regents data from grade 10 for grades 9 and 10. For American History, we are using the U.S. History and Government Regents data for grade 11 teachers. The data from each Regents will be used to determine school-wide achievement levels (grade 9). For grades 10 and 11, teachers in collaboration with administration will set achievement targets based on historical data. Historical data will be used to set achievement targets
Highly Effective (18 - 20 points) Results are well above District- or BOCES-adopted expectations for growth or achievement for grade/subject.	See uploaded charts by course in Task 3.13.
Effective (9 - 17 points) Results meet District- or BOCES-adopted expectations for growth or achievement for grade/subject.	See uploaded charts by course in Task 3.13.
Developing (3 - 8 points) Results are below District- or BOCES-adopted expectations for growth or achievement for grade/subject.	See uploaded charts by course in Task 3.13.
Ineffective (0 - 2 points) Results are well below District- or BOCES-adopted expectations for growth or achievement for grade/subject.	See uploaded charts by building in Task 3.13.

### 3.9) High School Science

Using the drop-down boxes below, select the measure that will be used as the locally-selected measure of student achievement. Then name the specific assessment that will be used with the locally-selected measure, listing the full name of the assessment.

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

	Locally-Selected Measure from List of Approved Measures	Assessment
Living Environment	3) Teacher specific achievement or growth score computed locally	Living Environment Regents Assessment
Earth Science	3) Teacher specific achievement or growth score computed locally	Earth Science Regents Assessment

Chemistry	3) Teacher specific achievement or growth score computed locally	Chemistry Regents Assessment
Physics	3) Teacher specific achievement or growth score computed locally	Physics Regents Assessment

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

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

Use this box, if needed, to describe the general process for assigning HEDI categories for these grades/subjects in this subcomponent. If needed, you may upload a table or graphic at 3.13, below.	For Living Environment, Earth Science, Chemistry, and Physics, we are using State Regents assessment data for Living Environment, Earth Science, Chemistry, and Physics teachers. Teachers in collaboration with administration will set achievement targets based on historical data and assign HEDI categories to each of these teachers.
Highly Effective (18-20 points) Results are well above District- or BOCES-adopted expectations for growth or achievement for grade/subject.	See uploaded charts by course in Task 3.13.
Developing (3 - 8 points) Results are below District- or BOCES-adopted expectations for growth or achievement for grade/subject.	See uploaded charts by course in Task 3.13.
Effective (9 - 17points) Results meet District- or BOCES-adopted expectations for growth or achievement for grade/subject.	See uploaded charts by course in Task 3.13.
Ineffective (0 - 2 points) Results are well below District- or BOCES-adopted expectations for growth or achievement for grade/subject.	See uploaded charts by course in Task 3.13.

### 3.10) High School Math

Using the drop-down boxes below, select the measure that will be used as the locally-selected measure of student achievement. Then name the specific assessment that will be used with the locally-selected measure, listing the full name of the assessment.

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

	Locally-Selected Measure from List of Approved Measures	Assessment
Algebra 1	3) Teacher specific achievement or growth score computed locally	Algebra I and Algebra I CC Regents Assessment
Geometry	3) Teacher specific achievement or growth score computed locally	Geometry and Geometry CC Regents Assessment
Algebra 2	3) Teacher specific achievement or growth score computed locally	Alegbra 2 Regents Assessment

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

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

NOTE: As applicable, for Algebra 1 and Geometry, please specify whether your district will be offering the 2005 Learning Standards version of the assessment in addition to the Common Core version, or just the latter, and how the HEDI process will be adjusted accordingly.

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.	Our district administers both Algebra I and Algebra I CC Regents as well as the Geometry and Geometry CC Regents, so long as permitted by NYSED, and teachers will use the higher of the two scores. For the Algebra I, we will use the Algebra I Regents. For Geometry, we will use the Geometry Regents. For Algebra 2, we will use Algebra 2 Regents Assessment. Teachers in collaboration with administration will set achievement targets based on historical data and assign HEDI categories to these teachers.
Highly Effective (18 - 20 points) Results are well above District- or BOCES-adopted expectations for growth or achievement for grade/subject.	See uploaded charts by course in Task 3.13.
Effective (9 - 17 points) Results meet District- or BOCES-adopted expectations for growth or achievement for grade/subject.	See uploaded charts by course in Task 3.13.
Developing (3 - 8 points) Results are below District- or BOCES-adopted expectations for growth or achievement for grade/subject.	See uploaded charts by course in Task 3.13.
Ineffective (0 - 2 points) Results are well below District- or BOCES-adopted expectations for growth or achievement for grade/subject.	See uploaded charts by course in Task 3.13.

### 3.11) High School English Language Arts

Using the drop-down boxes below, select the measure that will be used as the locally-selected measure of student achievement. Then name the specific assessment that will be used with the locally-selected measure, listing the full name of the assessment.

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

	Locally-Selected Measure from List of Approved Measures	Assessment
Grade 9 ELA	6(ii) School wide measure computed locally	Comprehensive English Regents Assessment
Grade 10 ELA	6(ii) School wide measure computed locally	Comprehensive English Regents Assessment
Grade 11 ELA	3) Teacher specific achievement or growth score computed locally	Comprehensive English Regents Assessment

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

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

NOTE: As applicable, please specify whether your district will be offering the Comprehensive English Regents in addition to the Common Core English Regents, or just the latter, and how the HEDI process will be adjusted accordingly.

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.	For the 2015-2016 school year and beyond, we will administer the Comprehensive English Regents and Common Core English Regents, so long as permitted by NYSED, and teachers will use the higher of the two scores. We are using Comprehensive English Regents data for grades 9 and 10 teachers in order to determine school-wide achievement levels based on historical data and assigning HEDI categories to grades 9 and 10. This measure will focus on the subgroup of students in the AP and honors classes.  We are using ELA Regents data for grade 11 teachers in order to determine individual teacher achievement levels based on historical data and assigning HEDI categories to grade 11 teachers.
Highly Effective (18 - 20 points) Results are well above District- or BOCES-adopted expectations for growth or achievement for grade/subject.	See uploaded charts by course in Task 3.13.
Effective (9 - 17 points) Results meet District- or BOCES-adopted expectations for growth or achievement for grade/subject.	See uploaded charts by course in Task 3.13.
Developing (3 - 8 points) Results are below District- or BOCES-adopted expectations for growth or achievement for grade/subject.	See uploaded charts by course in Task 3.13.
Ineffective (0 - 2 points) Results are well below District- or BOCES-adopted expectations for growth or achievement for grade/subject.	See uploaded charts by course in Task 3.13.

### 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. Please note that no APPR plan shall be approved by the Commissioner for use in the 2014-2015 school year or thereafter that provides for the administration of traditional standardized assessments for use with students in kindergarten through grade two for APPR purposes (see:

<http://www.engageny.org/resource/guidance-on-the-approved-regulatory-amendments-to-appr-to-help-reduce-local-testing>).

Please also note that, for students using 3d party assessments in this Task, drop-down option #4 applies to grades 3 and above and drop-down option #8 applies to grades K-2.

Course(s) or Subject(s)	Locally-Selected Measure from List of Approved Measures	Assessment
All other High School ELA courses	6(ii) School wide measure computed locally	Comprehensive English Regents Assessment
All other High School Math courses	6(ii) School wide measure computed locally	Geometry Regents Assessment
All other High School Science courses	6(ii) School wide measure computed locally	Chemistry and Physics Regents Assessments
All other High School Social Studies courses	6(ii) School wide measure computed locally	United States History and Government Regents Assessment
Art, K -12	6(ii) School wide measure computed locally	Grades 3-6 ELA and Mathematics State Assessment (grades K-6); Grades 7-8 ELA and Mathematics State Assessment (grades 7-9); Comprehensive English Regents Assessment (grades 10-12)

All Business Courses	6(ii) School wide measure computed locally	Grades 7-8 ELA and Mathematics State Assessment (grades 7-9); Comprehensive English Regents Assessment (grades 10-12)
ELL, K-12	6(ii) School wide measure computed locally	Grades 3-6 ELA and Mathematics State Assessment (grades K-6); Grades 7-8 ELA and Mathematics State Assessment (grades 7-9); Comprehensive English Regents Assessment (grades 10-12)
Enrichment 4-6	6(ii) School wide measure computed locally	Grades 3-6 ELA and Mathematics State Assessment (grades K-6)
Family and Consumer Science	6(ii) School wide measure computed locally	Grades 7-8 ELA and Mathematics State Assessment (grades 7-9)
Foreign Languages (LOTE): Intro through Level III/Course B	6(ii) School wide measure computed locally	Grades 7-8 ELA and Mathematics State Assessment (grades 7-9); Comprehensive English Regents Assessment (grades 10-12)
Foreign Languages (LOTE):	6(ii) School wide measure computed locally	Grades 7-8 ELA and Mathematics State Assessment (grades 7-9); Comprehensive English Regents Assessment (grades 10-12)
Health Elementary and Secondary	6(ii) School wide measure computed locally	Grades 3-6 ELA and Mathematics State Assessment (grades K-6); Grades 7-8 ELA and Mathematics State Assessment (grades 7-9); Comprehensive English Regents Assessment (grades 10-12)
Library Media, K-6	6(ii) School wide measure computed locally	Grades 3-6 ELA and Mathematics State Assessment (grades K-6)
Music, K-12	6(ii) School wide measure computed locally	Grades 3-6 ELA and Mathematics State Assessment (grades K-6); Grades 7-8 ELA and Mathematics State Assessment (grades 7-9); Comprehensive English Regents Assessment (grades 10-12)
Physical Education, K-12	6(ii) School wide measure computed locally	Grades 3-6 ELA and Mathematics State Assessment (grades K-6); Grades 7-8 ELA and Mathematics State Assessment (grades 7-9); Comprehensive English Regents Assessment (grades 10-12)
Related Support Areas, K-12	6(ii) School wide measure computed locally	Grades 3-6 ELA and Mathematics State Assessment (grades K-6); Grades 7-8 ELA and Mathematics State Assessment (grades 7-9); Comprehensive English Regents Assessment (grades 10-12)
Special Education, K-6	6(ii) School wide measure computed locally	Grades 3-6 ELA and Mathematics State Assessment (grades K-6)
Special Education, 7-12	6(ii) School wide measure computed locally	Grades 7-8 ELA and Mathematics State Assessment (grades 7-9); Comprehensive English Regents Assessment (grades 10-12)
Technology, 7-12	6(ii) School wide measure computed locally	Grades 7-8 ELA and Mathematics State Assessment (grades 7-9); Comprehensive English Regents Assessment (grades 10-12)

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.	For the 2015-2016 school year and beyond, we will administer the Comprehensive English Regents and Common Core English Regents, so long as permitted by NYSED, and teachers will use the higher of the two scores. Our district administers both Algebra I and Algebra I CC Regents as well as the Geometry and Geometry CC Regents, so long as permitted by NYSED, and teachers will use the higher of the two scores. For all courses above, using State Assessment data, the district will set school-wide achievement levels based on historical data and assign HEDI categories to the teachers.
Highly Effective (18 - 20 points) Results are well above District- or BOCES -adopted expectations for growth or achievement for grade/subject.	See uploaded charts by course in Task 3.13.
Effective (9 - 17 points) Results meet District- or BOCES-adopted expectations for growth or achievement for grade/subject.	See uploaded charts by course in Task 3.13.
Developing (3 - 8 points) Results are below District- or BOCES-adopted expectations for growth or achievement for grade/subject.	See uploaded charts by course in Task 3.13.
Ineffective (0 - 2 points) Results are well below District- or BOCES-adopted expectations for growth or achievement for grade/subject.	See uploaded charts by course in Task 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/12149/1446427-y92vNseFa4/Task 3.13\_Revised1-14.doc

### 3.14) Locally Developed Controls

Describe any adjustments, controls, or other special considerations that will be used in assigning points to a teacher's score for this subcomponent, the rationale for including such factors, and the processes that will be used to mitigate potentially problematic incentives associated with the controls or adjustments.

The district is cognizant of the guidelines established by the New York State Education Department and has instituted procedures to ensure the integrity of all assessments. All final assessments will be scored by an educator with no vested interest in the score.

Targets will be established based on the profile of the class. The measures that will be taken into consideration will include: the percentage of students with indicators of poverty, ELL students, students with a disability, and prior academic history.

### 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.

The district will utilize a weighted average determined by the number of students in each course for which the teacher is responsible.

### 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
3.16) Assurances   Assure that the amount of time devoted to traditional standardized assessments that are not specifically required by state or federal law for each classroom or program within a grade level does not exceed, in the aggregate, one percent of the minimum in required annual instructional hours for the grade.	Checked
3.16) Assurances   Assure that, as applicable, any third party assessment that is administered to students in kindergarten, first, or second grade, and being used for APPR purposes, is consistent with the State's APPR Assessment Guidance and is not a traditional standardized assessment.	Checked

# 4. Other Measures of Effectiveness (Teachers)

Created Tuesday, April 30, 2013  
Updated Friday, January 09, 2015

## 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.)

4.1) Teacher Practice Rubric   Rubric	Danielson's Framework for Teaching
---------------------------------------	------------------------------------

Second Rubric, if applicable	(No response)
------------------------------	---------------

### 4.2) Points Within Other Measures

State the number of points (if any) that will be assigned to each of the following measures, making sure that the points total 60. If you are not using a particular measure, enter 0. This APPR form only provides one space for assigning points within other measures for teachers. If your district/BOCES prefers to assign points differently for different groups of teachers, enter the points assignment for one group of teachers below. For the other group(s) of teachers, fill out copies of this form and upload as an attachment for review. Is the following points assignment applicable to all teachers?

Yes

If you checked "no" above, fill in the group of teachers covered by the points assignment indicated immediately below (e.g., "probationary teachers"):

(No response)

Multiple (at least two) classroom observations by principal or other trained administrator, at least one of which must be unannounced [at least 31 points]	40
One or more observation(s) by trained independent evaluators	
Observations by trained in-school peer teachers	
Feedback from students using State-approved survey tool	
Feedback from parents/caregivers using State-approved survey tool	
Structured reviews of lesson plans, student portfolios and other teacher artifacts	20

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

(No response)

### 4.3) Survey Tools (if applicable)

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

(No response)

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

[SurveyTools.0] Tripod Early Elementary Student Perception Survey K-2	(No response)
[SurveyTools.1] Tripod Elementary Student Perception Survey 3-5	(No response)
[SurveyTools.2] Tripod Secondary Student Perception Survey	(No response)
[SurveyTools.3] District Variance	(No response)
[SurveyTools.4] My Student Survey, LLC's Survey of Teacher Practice (STeP) survey for use in grades 3-12	(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.

Teachers will receive a score based on the average points calculated using the Danielson Framework (ranging from 1-4). The average of those scores will be converted to a 60 point scale, which is attached below. Highly Effective = 59-60, Effective = 57-58, Developing = 50-56, Ineffective = 0-49.

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/12179/1446428-eka9yMJ855/Breakdown of Points\_Updated1-9-2015.doc

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

Highly Effective: Overall performance and results exceed NYS Teaching Standards.	Evidence indicates exceptional student learning gain that is well-above District expectations. This includes special populations.
Effective: Overall performance and results meet NYS Teaching Standards.	Evidence indicates significant student learning gain that meets District expectations. This includes special populations.
Developing: Overall performance and results need improvement in order to meet NYS Teaching Standards.	The educator may have had some impact on student learning; however, evidence indicates that expectations approach, but do not fully meet District expectations. This includes special populations.
Ineffective: Overall performance and results do not meet NYS Teaching Standards.	Evidence indicates little to no student learning; expectations are well-below District expectations. This includes special populations.

Provide the ranges for the 60-point scoring bands.

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

#### 4.6) Observations of Probationary Teachers

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

By building principals or other trained administrators

Formal/Long	2
Informal/Short	1
Enter Total	3

By trained in-school peer teachers or other trained reviewers

Formal/Long	0
Informal/Short	0

Independent evaluators

Formal/Long	0
Informal/Short	0

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

- 
- In Person
- 

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

- 
- In Person
- 

#### 4.7) Observations of Tenured Teachers

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

By building principals or other trained administrators

Formal/Long	1
Informal/Short	1
Total	2

By trained in-school peer teachers or other trained reviewers

Formal/Long	0
Informal/Short	0

Independent evaluators

Formal/Long	0
Informal/Short	0

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

- 
- In Person
- 

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

- 
- In Person
-

# 5. Composite Scoring (Teachers)

Created Tuesday, April 30, 2013

Updated Thursday, July 10, 2014

---

## 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.

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 scoring ranges for educators for whom there is no approved Value-Added measure of student growth will be:

Where there is no Value-Added measure

Growth or Comparable Measures  
Locally-selected Measures of  
growth or achievement  
Other Measures of Effectiveness  
(60 points)

Overall  
Composite Score

Highly Effective  
18-20  
18-20  
Ranges determined locally--see below  
91-100

Effective  
9-17  
9-17  
75-90

Developing  
3-8  
3-8  
65-74

Ineffective  
0-2  
0-2  
0-64

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

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

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

Where Value-Added growth measure applies

Growth or Comparable Measures

Locally-selected Measures of growth or achievement

Other Measures of Effectiveness

(60 points)

Overall

Composite Score

Highly Effective

22-25

14-15

Ranges determined locally--see above

91-100

Effective

10-21

8-13

75-90

Developing

3-9

3-7

65-74

Ineffective

0-2

0-2

0-64

# 6. Additional Requirements - Teachers

Created Tuesday, April 30, 2013

Updated Wednesday, January 07, 2015

## 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. All TIP plans must include: 1) identification of needed areas of improvement, 2) a timeline for achieving improvement, 3) the manner in which the improvement will be assessed, and, where appropriate, 4) differentiated activities to support a teacher's improvement in those areas. For a list of supported file types, go to the Resources folder (above) and click Technical Tips. Please be sure to update a document with a form layout, with fillable spaces and not just a narrative.

[assets/survey-uploads/12193/1446430-Df0w3Xx5v6/TIP\\_Revised1-7-2015.pdf](assets/survey-uploads/12193/1446430-Df0w3Xx5v6/TIP_Revised1-7-2015.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:

1. The annual evaluation of a teacher shall be presented to the teacher by the principal/lead evaluator.

2. Within ten (10) school days of receipt of an ineffective evaluation the teacher may request, in writing, review by the Superintendent of Schools.

3. The appeal writing shall articulate in detail the basis of the appeal. Failure to articulate a particular basis for the appeal in the aforesaid appeal writing shall be deemed a waiver of that claim. The evaluated teacher may only challenge the substance, rating and/or adherence to the parties' annual professional performance review plan adopted pursuant to 8 NYCRR 30-2 and Education Law 3012-c.

4. Within ten (10) school days, of receipt of the appeal, the Superintendent of Schools shall render an initial determination, in writing, respecting the appeal. Thereafter, the affected teacher may elect review of the appeal papers within 10 days by one outside expert who will be chosen from a panel of at least three persons selected by the District and TVTA, which panel shall be established by the parties.

5. The panel composition shall be reviewed annually. The panelists shall customarily be selected in rotating order; if a panelist is unavailable, the next listed panelist will be chosen. However, the parties may elect to deviate from the customary rotation depending upon the circumstances of the specific appeal. In the event that none of the panelists are available to review an appeal, the parties shall select a mutually agreeable expert. The cost of the expert review shall be borne by the District.

6. The expert may recommend a modification of the TIP, or a modification of the rating, along with his/her rationale for the same. Expert review shall be completed within ten (10) school days of delivery of the written request for review to the panel member. No hearing shall be held and the review shall be based solely upon the original appeal, the Superintendent's initial determination, supporting papers submitted by the teacher and/or a response to the appeal by the teacher's evaluator. The expert's written review recommendation shall be transmitted to the Superintendent and the appellant upon completion. The superintendent shall consider the written review recommendation of the expert and shall issue a written decision within ten (10) school days thereof. The determination of the Superintendent shall be final and shall not be grievable, arbitral, nor reviewable in any other forum; however, the failure of either party to abide by the above agreed-upon process shall be subject to the grievance procedure.

7. In the event that Cheryl Pedisich is no longer the Superintendent, the parties shall jointly select a replacement for Ms. Pedisich in the APPR appeals process. Pending the outcome of those negotiations, Ms. Pedisich's role in the appeals process shall be filled by the Assistant Superintendent for Educational Services.

8. An overall performance rating of "ineffective" on the annual evaluation is the only rating subject to appeal. Teachers, who receive a rating of "highly effective" or "effective" or "developing" shall not be permitted to appeal their rating. Tenured teachers who are rated effective, highly effective or developing may elect to submit a written response to their overall rating, which response shall be appended to the APPR evaluation and filed in the teacher's personnel file. Such response shall be filed within ten (10) school days year including summer recess, of the teachers of the APPR evaluation.

9. Non-tenured teachers shall not be permitted to appeal any aspect of their annual evaluation, or the school district's issuance and/or implementation of the terms of a teacher improvement plan. Probationary teachers who are rated ineffective, effective, highly effective or developing may elect to submit a written response to their overall rating, which response shall be appended to the APPR evaluation and filed in the teacher's personnel file. Such response shall be filed within ten (10) school days of the teacher's receipt of the APPR evaluation.

## 6.4) Training of Lead Evaluators and Evaluators and Certification of Lead Evaluators

Describe the process for training lead evaluators and evaluators. Your description must include 1) the process for training lead evaluators and evaluators, 2) the process for the certification and re-certification of lead evaluators, 3) the process for ensuring inter-rater reliability, 4) the nature (content) and the duration (how many hours, days) of such training.

The district has an obligation to provide the appropriate training for all lead evaluators prior to the completion of any school year evaluations. For the purpose of this plan, all personnel involved in the writing of an annual evaluation for teachers shall be included in such training.

Training will be arranged through the office of the superintendent and will follow prescribed guidelines as recommended in the updated New York State Education Department APPR Guidance document. Resources for this training must be included annually in the district's budget development process to ensure ongoing re-certification as needed.

All lead evaluators and evaluators have participated in intensive APPR training offered by BOCES. Training occurred over several days for up to a total of 30 hours. The components of this training included the application and utilization of State Approved Teacher Rubrics with a particular focus on inter-rater reliability; application and use of student growth percentile and value-added growth model data; application and use of state-approved locally selected measures of student achievement; scoring methodology to evaluate teachers; and evidenced based observations.

To qualify for certification as a lead evaluator under this section, individuals successfully completed a training course meeting the minimum requirements prescribed

by SED. The training course provided training on the New York State Teaching Standards, and related elements and performance indicators and the Leadership Standards and related functions, as applicable.

This training included the following Requirements for Lead Evaluators/Evaluators:

1. New York State Teaching Standards and ISLLC Standards
2. Evidence-based observation
3. Application and use of Student Growth Percentile and Value Added Growth Model data
4. Application and use of the State-approved teacher or principal rubrics
5. Application and use of any assessment tools used to evaluate teachers and principals
6. Application and use of State-approved locally selected measures of student achievement
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

Throughout each school year administrative staff will continue to engage in training, designed to ensure inter-rater reliability and address the need for re-certification of the lead evaluators. Administrators will have the opportunity to practice skills in effectively identifying rubric components, determining levels of performance and gathering evidence. Training will be provided by recognized experts in the field.

## 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

## 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 Tuesday, April 30, 2013  
Updated Friday, January 09, 2015

## 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.

Please list the grade configurations of the school(s)/program(s) in your district/BOCES where it is expected that 30-100% of a principal's students are taking assessments with a State-provided growth or value-added measure, (e.g., K-5, PK-6, 6-8, 6-12, 9-12, etc.).

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

K-6
7-9

### 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(s) 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	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 assessments 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. The district must select the type of assessment that will be used with the SLO from the options below.

If any grade/course in the building has a State-provided growth measure AND the principal must have SLOs because fewer than 30% of students in the building are covered, then the SLOs will begin first with the SGP/VA results. Additional SLOs will then be set based on grades/subjects with State assessments, where applicable. If additional SLOs are necessary, principals must begin with the grade(s)/course(s) that have the largest number of students using school-wide student results from one of the following assessment options: State-approved 3rd party or district/regional/BOCES-developed assessments that are rigorous and comparable across classrooms.

State assessments, required if one exists

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

List of State-approved 3<sup>rd</sup> party assessments

First, list the grade configuration of the school or program the SLO applies to. Then, using the drop-down boxes below, please select the type of 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 in the following format: “[Name of your District/Region/BOCES] developed [Grade] [Subject] Assessment.” For example, a BOCES-developed 7th grade Social Studies assessment would be written as follows: “GVEP-Developed Grade 7 Social Studies Assessment.” For State-approved 3rd party assessments, please include the name of the assessment exactly as it appears in RED on the State-approved list. For State assessments or Regents examinations, please indicate as such in the assessment name.

Please note that no APPR plan shall be approved by the Commissioner for use in the 2014-2015 school year or thereafter that provides for the administration of traditional standardized assessments for use with students in kindergarten through grade two for APPR purposes (see:

<http://www.engageny.org/resource/guidance-on-the-approved-regulatory-amendments-to-appr-to-help-reduce-local-testing>).

Please also note that, for students using 3d party assessments in this Task, the 2nd drop-down option applies to grades 3 and above and the 4th drop-down option applies to grades K-2.

School or Program Type	SLO with Assessment Option	Name of the Assessment
High School Grades 10-12	State assessment	Comprehensive English Regents and Geometry or Algebra 2/Trigonometry Regents

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. Please describe the process your district is using to measure student growth on the assessments listed for this Task. If applicable, please also include a description of the process for combining the State-provided growth score with the SLO(s) for this Task.

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.

Our district administers both the 2005 Standards and the Common Core Regents, so long as permitted by NYSED, and principals will use the higher of the two scores. Depending on student enrollment, either the Algebra 2/Trigonometry or the Geometry Regents will be used. The Three Village Central School District, in collaboration with Eastern Suffolk BOCES, will utilize the BOCES Score Projection Report to determine individual student growth on the Comprehensive English

Regents compared to other students county-wide with the same baseline assessment score, as well as special education, English as a Second Language and poverty status.

Highly Effective (18 - 20 points) Results are well above state average for similar students (or District goals if no state test).	85-100% of students meet or exceed their individual growth target.
Effective (9 - 17 points) Results meet state average for similar students (or District goals if no state test).	70-84% of students meet or exceed their individual growth target.
Developing (3 - 8 points) Results are below state average for similar students (or District goals if no state test).	30-69% of students meet or exceed their individual growth target.
Ineffective (0 - 2 points) Results are well below state average for similar students (or District goals if no state test).	0-29% of students meet or exceed their individual growth target.

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

assets/survey-uploads/12156/1446431-lha0DogRNw/Task 7.3\_Revised1-9.doc

#### 7.4) Special Considerations for Comparable Growth Measures

Describe any adjustments, controls, or other special considerations that will be used in assigning points to a principal's score for this subcomponent, 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 the following: prior student achievement results, students with disabilities, English language learners, and students in poverty.

(No response)

#### 7.5) Principals with More Than One Growth Measure

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

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

#### 7.6) Assurances -- Comparable Growth Measures

Please check all of the boxes below:

7.6) Assurances -- Comparable Growth Measures   Assure the application of locally developed controls will be rigorous, fair, and transparent and only those used for State Growth will be used for Comparable Growth Measures.	Checked
7.6) Assurances -- Comparable Growth Measures   Assure that use of locally developed controls will not have a disparate impact on underrepresented students in accordance with applicable civil rights laws.	Checked
7.6) Assurances -- Comparable Growth Measures   Assure that procedures for ensuring data accuracy and integrity are being utilized.	Checked
7.6) Assurances -- Comparable Growth Measures   Assure that district will develop SLOs according to the rules established by NYSED for principal SLOs:	Checked

<http://www.engageny.org/resource/student-learning-objectives-guidance-document>.

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

7.6) Assurances -- Comparable Growth Measures | Assure that the amount of time devoted to traditional standardized assessments that are not specifically required by state or federal law for each classroom or program within a grade level does not exceed, in the aggregate, one percent of the minimum required annual instructional hours for the grade. Checked

7.6) Assurances -- Comparable Growth Measures | Assure that, as applicable, any third party assessment that is administered to students in kindergarten, first, or second grade, and being used for APPR purposes, is consistent with the State's APPR Assessment Guidance and is not a traditional standardized assessment. Checked

# 8. Local Measures (Principals)

Created Tuesday, April 30, 2013

Updated Friday, January 09, 2015

---

## 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.

Districts or BOCES that intend to use a district, regional, or BOCES-developed assessment must include the name, grade, and subject of the assessment in the following format: “[Name of your District/Region/BOCES] developed [Grade] [Subject] Assessment.” For example, a BOCES-developed 7th grade Social Studies assessment would be written as follows: “GVEP-Developed Grade 7 Social Studies Assessment.”

Also note: if your district/BOCES is using the same assessment for both the State growth or other comparable measures subcomponent and the locally-selected measures subcomponents, be sure that a different measure of student performance is being used with the assessment (e.g., achievement rather than growth; growth measured in a different manner).

Also note: no APPR plan shall be approved by the Commissioner for use in the 2014-2015 school year or thereafter that provides for the administration of traditional standardized assessments for use with students in kindergarten through grade two for APPR purposes (see: <http://www.engageny.org/resource/guidance-on-the-approved-regulatory-amendments-to-appr-to-help-reduce-local-testing>).

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

In the table below, please list the grade configurations of the school(s)/program(s) in your district/BOCES where it is expected that 30-100% of a principal’s students are taking assessments with a State-provided growth or value-added measure (e.g., K-5, 6-8, 9-12). Then for each grade configuration, select a measure of growth or achievement from the drop-down menu. As a reminder, the grade configurations/programs listed in Task 8.1 should be the same as those listed in Task 7.1.

***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 9<sup>th</sup> and/or 10<sup>th</sup> grade credit accumulation and/or the percentage of students that pass 9<sup>th</sup> and/or 10<sup>th</sup> 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/Program	Locally-Selected Measure from List of Approved Measures	Assessment
K-6	(a) achievement on State assessments	Grade 3-6 Mathematics State Assessment
7-9	(d) measures used by district for teacher evaluation	Grade 7-8 Mathematics State Assessment

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

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

Use this box, if needed, to describe the process for assigning HEDI categories. If needed, you may upload a table or graphic below.	<p>We are using Mathematics assessment data from grades 3, 4, 5, and 6 to determine building-wide achievement levels based on historical data and assigning HEDI categories to each building principal.</p> <p>For junior high school building principals, we are using Mathematics assessment data from grades 7 and 8 to determine school-wide achievement levels based on historical data and assigning HEDI categories to each building principal.</p> <p>The HEDI points are awarded based on a percentage of students achieving proficiency (Level 3 or higher) on the above assessments.</p>
Highly Effective (14 - 15 points) Results are well above District- or BOCES-adopted expectations for growth or achievement for grade/subject.	See uploaded charts by building in Task 8.1.
Effective (8- 13 points) Results meet District- or BOCES-adopted expectations for growth or achievement for grade/subject.	See uploaded charts by building in Task 8.1.

---

Developing (3 - 7 points) Results are below District- or BOCES-adopted expectations for growth or achievement for grade/subject.

See uploaded charts by building in Task 8.1.

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

See uploaded charts by building in Task 8.1.

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/12190/1446432-qBFVOWF7fC/Task 8.1\_Revised1-9.doc

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

In the table below, list all of the grade configurations/programs used in your district or BOCES in which the district/BOCES expects that fewer than 30% of students will receive a State-provided growth score (e.g., K-2, K-3, CTE). Then for each grade configuration, select a measure from the drop-down menu. As a reminder, the grade configurations/programs listed in Task 8.2 should be the same as those listed in Task 7.3.

**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.**

Also note: no APPR plan shall be approved by the Commissioner for use in the 2014-2015 school year or thereafter that provides for the administration of traditional standardized assessments for use with students in kindergarten through grade two for APPR purposes (see: <http://www.engageny.org/resource/guidance-on-the-approved-regulatory-amendments-to-appr-to-help-reduce-local-testing>).

**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 9<sup>th</sup> and/or 10<sup>th</sup> grade credit accumulation and/or the percentage of students that pass 9<sup>th</sup> and/or 10<sup>th</sup> 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
Grades 10-12	(d) measures used by district for teacher evaluation	Comprehensive English Regents

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.	For the 2015-2016 school year and beyond, we will administer the Comprehensive English Regents and Common Core English Regents, so long as permitted by NYSED, and principals will use the higher of the two scores. For high school building principals, we are using Comprehensive English Regents assessment data to determine school-wide achievement levels based on historical data and assigning HEDI categories to each building principal. HEDI Points are awarded based on a percentage of students receiving mastery (score of 85 or better). This measure will focus on the subgroup of students in the AP and honors classes.
Highly Effective (18 - 20 points) Results are well above District- or BOCES-adopted expectations for growth or achievement for grade/subject.	92-100% of students score mastery or higher.
Effective (9- 17 points) Results meet District- or BOCES-adopted expectations for growth or achievement for grade/subject.	70-91% of students score mastery or higher.
Developing (3 - 8 points) Results are below District- or BOCES-adopted expectations for growth or achievement for grade/subject.	40-69% of students score mastery or higher.
Ineffective (0 - 2 points) Results are well below District- or BOCES-adopted expectations for growth or achievement for grade/subject.	0-39% of students score mastery or higher.

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/12190/1446432-T8MIGWUVm1/Task 8.2\_Revised1-9.doc

### 8.3) Locally Developed Controls

Describe any adjustments, controls, or other special considerations that will be used in assigning points to a principal's score for this subcomponent, the rationale for including such factors, and the processes that will be used to mitigate potentially problematic incentives associated with the controls or adjustments.

Guidelines established by the State Education Department will be implemented to ensure the integrity of all assessments. All final assessments will be scored by an educator with no vested interest in the final scores.

Targets will be established based on the school profile. Measures taken into consideration will include: Percentage of students with indicators of poverty, ELL, students with disabilities and prior academic history.

### 8.4) Principals with More Than One Locally Selected Measure

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

(No response)

### 8.5) Assurances

Please check all of the boxes below:

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

8.5) Assurances   Assure that all locally-selected measures for a principal are different than any measures used for the State assessment or other comparable measures subcomponent.	Check
8.5) Assurances   Assure that the amount of time devoted to traditional standardized assessments that are not specifically required by state or federal law for each classroom or program within a grade level does not exceed, in the aggregate, one percent of the minimum required annual instructional hours for the grade.	Check
8.5) Assurances   Assure that, as applicable, any third party assessment that is administered to students in kindergarten, first, or second grade, and being used for APPR purposes, is consistent with the State's APPR Assessment Guidance and is not a traditional standardized assessment.	Check

# 9. Other Measures of Effectiveness (Principals)

Created Tuesday, April 30, 2013  
Updated Friday, January 09, 2015

## 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.

9.1) Principal Practice Rubric   Rubric	Multidimensional Principal Performance Rubric
---	---

Second rubric (if applicable)	(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 point 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 point 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]	50
---	----

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. 10

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, label accordingly, combine them into a single file, and upload as an attachment for review. [Click here for a](#)

(No response)

### 9.3) Assurances -- Goals

Please check the boxes below if assigning any points to "ambitious and measurable goals":

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	Checked
9.4) Sources of Evidence (if applicable)   Review of school documents, records, and/or State accountability processes (all count as one source)	Checked

### 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 updated, this list will be updated within the drop-down menu of approved survey tools.

Principal Evaluation Tripod School Perception Survey for Teachers	(No response)
K12 Insight Student Survey (Grades 3-5) for Principal Evaluation in New York	(No response)
K12 Insight Student Survey (Grades 6-12) for Principal Evaluation in New York	(No response)
K12 Insight Parent Survey for Principal Evaluation in New York	(No response)
K12 Insight Teacher/Staff Survey for Principal Evaluation in New York	(No response)
District variance	(No response)
Principal Evaluation Tripod School Perception Survey (Combined Parent Survey)	(No response)
Principal Evaluation Tripod School Perception Survey (Combined Student Surveys)	(No response)
NYC School Survey-2012 Parent Survey	(No response)
NYC School Survey-2012 Student Survey	(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.

Utilizing the MPPR- Multidimensional Professional Performance Review, the six domains will be provided with a score as follows: (Each domain score will be averaged)

Domain 1 – Shared Vision of Learning - up to a maximum of six points

Domain 2 – School Culture and Instructional Program - up to a maximum of sixteen points

Domain 3 – Safe, Efficient, Effective Learning Environment - up to a maximum of six points

Domain 4 – Community - up to a maximum of eight points

Domain 5 – Integrity, Fairness, Ethics - up to a maximum of eight points

Domain 6 – Political, Social, Economic, Legal, and Cultural Context - up to a maximum of six points

Domain 7 – Based on goal setting and attainment - a maximum of ten points may be achieved

The composite score (0-100) is based on three components:

A. Student growth on state assessments (20%)

B. Locally selected measures of student achievement (20%), as outlined in section 3 of this document.

C. The remaining 60% of the evaluations, ratings, and effectiveness scores shall be locally developed using the following guidelines:

(1) At least 50 of 60 points based on supervisor's broad assessment of principal leadership and management actions, as defined by ISLLC, 2008 standards.

A goal setting conference will be held in order to determine specific areas of focus for the year.

(2) The remaining points (no more than 10 points) will be based on established goals.

Goal 1: Administrator'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 teacher's granted versus denied tenure or
- Improvements in proficiency rating of the administrator on specific teacher effectiveness standards in the practice rubric

Goal 2: shall address quantifiable and verifiable improvements in academic results or the school's learning environment (e.g. student or teacher attendance)

The total score will be derived by adding up the scores for each domain. A MPPR point distribution chart is attached.

Normal rounding rules will apply but will not move an educator between HEDI bands.

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.

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.	Evidence indicates that principal performance results in student learning that exceeds district expectations.
Effective: Overall performance and results meet standards.	Evidence indicates that principal performance results in student learning that meets district expectations.
Developing: Overall performance and results need improvement in order to meet standards.	Evidence indicates that principal performance results in student learning that approaches, but does not fully meet district expectations.
Ineffective: Overall performance and results do not meet standards.	Evidence indicates that principal performance results in student learning that does not meet district expectations.

Please provide the locally-negotiated 60 point scoring bands.

Highly Effective	58-60
Effective	55-57
Developing	50-54
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	1
By trained independent evaluator	0
Enter Total	3

### Tenured Principals

By supervisor	2
By trained administrator	1
By trained independent evaluator	0
Enter Total	3

# 10. Composite Scoring (Principals)

Created Tuesday, April 30, 2013

Updated Thursday, July 10, 2014

---

## 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.

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 scoring ranges for principals for whom there is no approved Value-Added measure of student growth will be:

Where there is no Value-Added measure

Growth or Comparable Measures

Locally-selected Measures of  
growth or achievement

Other Measures of Effectiveness

(60 points)

Overall

Composite Score

Highly Effective

18-20

18-20

Ranges determined locally--see below

91-100

Effective

9-17

9-17

75-90

Developing

3-8

3-8

65-74

Ineffective

0-2

0-2

0-64

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

Highly Effective	58-60
Effective	55-57
Developing	50-54
Ineffective	0-49

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

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 Tuesday, April 30, 2013

Updated Monday, January 05, 2015

## 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 the school district or BOCES. All PIP plans must include: 1) identification of needed areas of improvement, 2) a timeline for achieving improvement, 3) the manner in which the improvement will be assessed, and, where appropriate, 4) differentiated activities to support a principal's improvement in those areas.

For a list of supported file types, go to the Resources folder (above) and click Technical Tips. Please be sure to update a document with a form layout, with fillable spaces and not just a narrative.

[assets/survey-uploads/12168/1446435-Df0w3Xx5v6/ThreeVillage\\_PIP\\_14-15.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:

1. Any principal who receives an ineffective rating on their annual total composite APPR shall be entitled to appeal their annual APPR rating, based upon a paper submission to the Superintendent of Schools, who shall be trained in accordance with the requirements of the statute and regulations.

2. The appeal must be brought in writing, specifying the area(s) of concern, but limited to those matters that may be appealed as

prescribed in Section 3012-c of the Education Law. Further, a principal who is placed on a Principal Improvement Plan (“PIP”) shall have a corresponding right to appeal concerns regarding the PIP in accordance with the requirements set forth in Section 3012-c of the Education Law.

3. An appeal of an APPR evaluation or a PIP must be commenced within ten (10) school days of the presentation of the final document to the principal, in the case of a tenured principal, and fifteen business days of the presentation of the final document to a probationary principal (extended by an additional period of up to 10 calendar days if he or she is going to be on a planned vacation during the 15 business days as referenced above) or else the right to appeal shall be deemed waived in all regards; provided, however, that in the case of a PIP appeal, there shall be a second fifteen business day period for a PIP appeal following the end date of the PIP. In the event that the PIP has an ending date after June 1st, the time for appealing the PIP shall be extended until no later than the 10th day after classes begin during the September immediately following the last day of the PIP.

4. The superintendent shall respond within ten (10) days to the appeal with a written answer granting the appeal and directing further administrative action, or a written answer denying the appeal that must include explanation and rationale behind that decision. The superintendent shall review the evidence underlying the observations of the principal along with all other evidence submitted by the principal prior to rendering a decision. Such decision shall be made within fifteen business days of the receipt of the appeal and shall be considered preliminary.

5. If not satisfied by the preliminary decision of the superintendent, the building principal shall, within three (3) school days, request a review be performed by a mutually agreed upon retired administrator. The cost of the retired administrator shall be borne by the District and shall be consistent with prevailing rates. The parties agree that they will annually review the above list of retired administrators and mutually agree to modifications when necessary.

6. The review, conducted by the retired administrator, shall consist of reviewing the preliminary decision, the evidence underlying the observations/evaluations of the principal, and all other evidence submitted by the principal and/or the District. The evidence and all arguments shall be presented to the retired administrator for review within ten (10) business days after his/her selection. Upon completion of the review, the retired administrator shall render a written advisory opinion within ten (10) business days after receipt of the evidence and arguments from both sides. The advisory opinion may recommend upholding, reversing, or modifying the preliminary determination and may also provide recommendations, including but not limited to, adjustments to the Principal Improvement Plan or other corrective actions.

7. Upon receipt of the advisory decision, the superintendent shall, within five (5) school days, review said advisory opinion and in her sole discretion either adopt, reject, in whole, or in part, the advisory opinion. The decision of the superintendent, upon review of the advisory opinion, shall be final and binding in all regards and shall not be subject to review at arbitration, before any administrative agency, or in any court of law. Notwithstanding the aforementioned language, nothing herein shall be construed as limiting the right of the employee to challenge any evaluation including the second consecutive ineffective annual composite APPR evaluation in any proceeding brought pursuant to Education Law Section 3020-a.

8. In the event that Cheryl Pedisich is no longer the Superintendent, the parties shall jointly select a replacement for Ms. Pedisich in the APPR appeals process. Pending the outcome of those negotiations, Ms. Pedisich’s role in the appeals process shall be filled by the Assistant Superintendent for Educational Services.

## 11.4) Training of Lead Evaluators and Evaluators and Certification of Lead Evaluators

Describe the process for training lead evaluators and evaluators. Your description must include 1) the process for training lead evaluators and evaluators, 2) the process for the certification and re-certification of lead evaluators, 3) the process for ensuring inter-rater reliability, 4) the nature (content) and the duration (how many hours, days) of such training.

The district has an obligation to provide the appropriate training for all lead evaluators prior to the completion of any school year evaluations. For the purpose of this plan, all personnel involved in the writing of an annual evaluation for principals shall be included in such training.

All lead evaluators were first certified in July of 2012. Training is arranged through the office of the superintendent and will follow prescribed guidelines as recommended in the updated New York State Education Department APPR Guidance document. Resources for this training must be included annually in the district's budget development process to ensure ongoing re-certification as needed.

All lead evaluators and evaluators have participated in intensive APPR training offered by BOCES. Training occurred over several days for up to a total of 30 hours. In the early fall, further extensive training occurs annually. The components of this training will include the application and utilization of State Approved Principal Rubrics with a particular focus on inter-rater reliability; application and use of student growth percentile and value-added growth model data; application and use of state-approved locally selected

measures of student achievement; scoring methodology to evaluate principals; and evidenced based observations. Each lead evaluator receives up to a minimum 25 hours of professional training annually. In addition, issues regarding inter-rater reliability, and scoring methodology are topics of discussion during administrative meetings.

To qualify for certification as a lead evaluator under this section, individuals successfully completed a training course meeting the minimum requirements prescribed by SED. The training course shall provide training on:

The New York State Teaching Standards, and related elements and performance indicators and the Leadership Standards and related functions, as applicable. This training included the following Requirements for Lead Evaluators/Evaluators:

1. New York State Teaching Standards and ISLLC Standards
2. Evidence-based observation
3. Application and use of Student Growth Percentile and Value Added Growth Model data
4. Application and use of the State-approved teacher or principal rubrics
5. Application and use of any assessment tools used to evaluate teachers and principals
6. Application and use of State-approved locally selected measures of student achievement
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

Throughout each school year, lead evaluators will continue to engage in training, designed to ensure inter-rater reliability and address the need for re-certification. Administrators will have the opportunity to practice skills in effectively identifying rubric components, determining levels of performance and gathering evidence. Training will be provided by recognized experts in the field.

## 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 Tuesday, April 30, 2013

Updated Thursday, January 15, 2015

---

### 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. Please note that Review Room timestamps each revision and signatures cannot be dated earlier than the last revision.

[assets/survey-uploads/12158/1446436-3Uqgn5g9Iu/District Certification Form-1.15.15.pdf](assets/survey-uploads/12158/1446436-3Uqgn5g9Iu/District%20Certification%20Form-1.15.15.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.

## Form 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." Please note that no APPR plan shall be approved by the Commissioner for use in the 2014-2015 school year or thereafter that provides for the administration of traditional standardized assessments for use with students in kindergarten through grade two for APPR purposes (see: <http://www.engageny.org/resource/guidance-on-the-approved-regulatory-amendments-to-appr-to-help-reduce-local-testing>).

Please also note that, for students using 3d party assessments in this Task, the 2<sup>nd</sup> drop-down option applies to grades 3 and above and the 5<sup>th</sup> drop-down option applies to grades K-2.

Course(s) or Subject(s)	Option	Assessment
All other courses using the Algebra I Regents	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li><input checked="" type="radio"/> State Assessment</li> <li><input type="radio"/> Grades 3 and up: State-approved 3rd party assessment</li> <li><input type="radio"/> District, Regional or BOCES-developed</li> <li><input type="radio"/> School/BOCES-wide/group/team results based on State</li> <li><input type="radio"/> Grades K-2: 3rd party non-“traditional standardized” assessment that meets NYSED guidance requirements</li> </ul>	Algebra I CC Regents
All other courses using the Geometry Regents	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li><input checked="" type="radio"/> State Assessment</li> <li><input type="radio"/> Grades 3 and up: State-approved 3rd party assessment</li> <li><input type="radio"/> District, Regional or BOCES-developed</li> <li><input type="radio"/> School/BOCES-wide/group/team results based on State</li> <li><input type="radio"/> Grades K-2: 3rd party non-“traditional standardized” assessment that meets NYSED guidance requirements</li> </ul>	Geometry Regents

All other courses using the Living Environment Regents	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>● State Assessment</li> <li>○ Grades 3 and up: State-approved 3rd party assessment</li> <li>○ District, Regional or BOCES-developed</li> <li>○ School/BOCES-wide/group/team results based on State</li> <li>○ Grades K-2: 3rd party non-“traditional standardized” assessment that meets NYSED guidance requirements</li> </ul>	Living Environment
All other courses using the Earth Science Regents	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>● State Assessment</li> <li>○ Grades 3 and up: State-approved 3rd party assessment</li> <li>○ District, Regional or BOCES-developed</li> <li>○ School/BOCES-wide/group/team results based on State</li> <li>○ Grades K-2: 3rd party non-“traditional standardized” assessment that meets NYSED guidance requirements</li> </ul>	Earth Science Regents

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.	The Three Village Central School District, in collaboration with Eastern Suffolk BOCES, will utilize the BOCES Score Projection Report to determine individual student growth compared to other students county-wide with the same baseline assessment score, as well as special education, English as a Second Language and poverty status. (see uploaded chart in Task 2.11 for HEDI scales)
Highly Effective (18 - 20 points) Results are well-above District goals for similar students.	

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

### Task 2.11

For all of the below scales, the values listed are the minimum necessary to achieve the corresponding HEDI point value.

#### 2.2) Grades K-2 ELA

The Three Village Central School District is committed to working collaboratively to provide high quality instruction, aligned to the Common Core State Standards. To measure school-wide growth, we will utilize the State-provided Mean Growth Percentiles (MGPs). A building HEDI score will be awarded based on the grade 4-6 mean growth percentiles from the NYS ELA Assessment weighted proportionately based on the numbers of students.

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
69	68	67	61	57	53	49	45	42	39	37	36	34	33	32	31	30	29	15	5	1

Highly Effective: Students demonstrated growth greater than 67-99% of similar students in NYS.

Effective: Students demonstrated growth greater than 36-66% of similar students in NYS.

Developing: Students demonstrated growth greater than 29-35% of similar students in NYS.

Ineffective: Students demonstrated growth greater than 1-28% of similar students in NYS.

#### Grade 3 ELA

To measure individual student growth, the grade 3 teachers in collaboration with administration will use students' pre-assessment scores (AIMSweb) and prior academic history to use a matrix and award points to teachers based on individual student growth.

	End: 1	End: 2	End: 3	End: 4
Start: 1	0	1	2	3
Start: 2	0	.5	2	3
Start: 3	0	0	1.5	3
Start: 4	0	0	1	2

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
2.5	2.2	2.0	1.9	1.8	1.7	1.6	1.5	1.0	.95	.90	.85	.80	.75	.65	.55	.45	.35	.30	.20	0

## Task 2.11

### 2.3) Grades K-2 Math

The Three Village Central School District is committed to working collaboratively to provide high quality instruction, aligned to the Common Core State Standards. To measure school-wide growth, we will utilize the State-provided Mean Growth Percentiles (MGPs). A building HEDI score will be awarded based on the grade 4-6 mean growth percentiles from the NYS Math Assessment weighted proportionately based on the numbers of students.

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
69	68	67	61	57	53	49	45	42	39	37	36	34	33	32	31	30	29	15	5	1

Highly Effective: Students demonstrated growth greater than 67-99% of similar students in NYS.

Effective: Students demonstrated growth greater than 36-66% of similar students in NYS.

Developing: Students demonstrated growth greater than 29-35% of similar students in NYS.

Ineffective: Students demonstrated growth greater than 1-28% of similar students in NYS.

### Grade 3 Math

To measure individual student growth, the grade 3 teachers in collaboration with administration will use each student's pre-assessment score (NYReady Assessment) and prior academic history to use a matrix and award points to teachers based on the amount of individual student growth.

	End: 1	End: 2	End: 3	End: 4
Start: 1	0	1	2	3
Start: 2	0	.5	2	3
Start: 3	0	0	1.5	3
Start: 4	0	0	1	2

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
2.5	2.2	2.0	1.9	1.8	1.7	1.6	1.5	1.0	.95	.90	.85	.80	.75	.65	.55	.45	.35	.30	.20	0

## Task 2.11

### 2.4) Grades 6-8 Science

#### Grade 7 Science:

The Three Village Central School District is committed to working collaboratively to provide high quality instruction, aligned to the Common Core State Standards. To measure school-wide growth, we will utilize the State-provided Mean Growth Percentiles (MGPs). A building HEDI score will be awarded based on the grade 7-8 mean growth percentiles from the NYS ELA and Math Assessment weighted proportionately based on the numbers of students.

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
69	68	67	61	57	53	49	45	42	39	37	36	34	33	32	31	30	29	15	5	1

Highly Effective: Students demonstrated growth greater than 67-99% of similar students in NYS.

Effective: Students demonstrated growth greater than 36-66% of similar students in NYS.

Developing: Students demonstrated growth greater than 29-35% of similar students in NYS.

Ineffective: Students demonstrated growth greater than 1-28% of similar students in NYS.

#### Grade 8 Science:

Teachers in collaboration with administration will review historical data to set individual student targets. 70% of students will meet or exceed their individual targets.

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
98	94	90	86	82	78	74	70	66	63	60	57	54	51	48	45	42	40	38	36	0

Highly Effective: 90-100% of students meet or exceed their individual growth target.

Effective: 57-89% of students meet or exceed their individual growth target.

Developing: 40-56% of students meet or exceed their individual growth target.

Ineffective: 0-39% of students meet or exceed their individual growth target.

## Task 2.11

### 2.5) Grades 6-8 Social Studies

**Grade 6 Social Studies:** Not applicable.

#### **Grade 7 & 8 Social Studies:**

The Three Village Central School District is committed to working collaboratively to provide high quality instruction, aligned to the Common Core State Standards. To measure school-wide growth, we will utilize the State-provided Mean Growth Percentiles (MGPs). A building HEDI score will be awarded based on the grade 7-8 mean growth percentiles from the NYS ELA and Math Assessment weighted proportionately based on the numbers of students.

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
69	68	67	61	57	53	49	45	42	39	37	36	34	33	32	31	30	29	15	5	1

Highly Effective: Students demonstrated growth greater than 67-99% of similar students in NYS.

Effective: Students demonstrated growth greater than 36-66% of similar students in NYS.

Developing: Students demonstrated growth greater than 29-35% of similar students in NYS.

Ineffective: Students demonstrated growth greater than 1-28% of similar students in NYS.

## Task 2.11

### 2.6) High School Social Studies Regents Courses

To measure individual student growth, the social studies teachers in collaboration with administration will use each student's pre-assessment score and prior academic history to set individual growth targets.

#### Global 2:

80% of students will meet or exceed their individual growth target.

Highly Effective			Effective									Developing					Ineffective			
20	19	18	17	16	15	14	13	12	11	10	9	8	7	6	5	4	3	2	1	0
95	91	85	84	83	82	81	80	78	76	74	70	64	57	50	43	37	30	21	11	0

Highly Effective: 85-100% of students meet or exceed their individual growth target.

Effective: 70-84% of students meet or exceed their individual growth target.

Developing: 30-69% of students meet or exceed their individual growth target.

Ineffective: 0-29% of students meet or exceed their individual growth target.

#### American History:

80% of students will meet or exceed their individual growth target.

Highly Effective			Effective									Developing					Ineffective			
20	19	18	17	16	15	14	13	12	11	10	9	8	7	6	5	4	3	2	1	0
95	91	85	84	83	82	81	80	78	76	74	70	64	57	50	43	37	30	21	11	0

Highly Effective: 85-100% of students meet or exceed their individual growth target.

Effective: 70-84% of students meet or exceed their individual growth target.

Developing: 30-69% of students meet or exceed their individual growth target.

Ineffective: 0-29% of students meet or exceed their individual growth target.

**Task 2.11**

**2.7) High School Science Regents Courses**

The Three Village Central School District, in collaboration with Eastern Suffolk BOCES, will utilize the BOCES Score Projection Report to determine individual student growth compared to other students county-wide with the same baseline starting point and special education, English as a Second Language and poverty status.

**Living Environment:**

**High School Level (All Other Courses)**

80% of students will meet or exceed their individual growth target.

Highly Effective			Effective									Developing					Ineffective			
20	19	18	17	16	15	14	13	12	11	10	9	8	7	6	5	4	3	2	1	0
95	91	85	84	83	82	81	80	78	76	74	70	64	57	50	43	37	30	21	11	0

Highly Effective: 85-100% of students meet or exceed their individual growth target.

Effective: 70-84% of students meet or exceed their individual growth target.

Developing: 30-69% of students meet or exceed their individual growth target.

Ineffective: 0-29% of students meet or exceed their individual growth target.

**Junior High School Level**

80% of students will meet or exceed their individual growth target.

Highly Effective			Effective									Developing					Ineffective			
20	19	18	17	16	15	14	13	12	11	10	9	8	7	6	5	4	3	2	1	0
95	91	85	84	83	82	81	80	78	76	74	70	64	57	50	43	37	30	21	11	0

Highly Effective: 85-100% of students meet or exceed their individual growth target.

Effective: 70-84% of students meet or exceed their individual growth target.

Developing: 30-69% of students meet or exceed their individual growth target.

Ineffective: 0-29% of students meet or exceed their individual growth target.

## Task 2.11

### Earth Science:

#### Junior High School Level - Honors

80% of students will meet or exceed their individual growth target.

Highly Effective			Effective									Developing					Ineffective			
20	19	18	17	16	15	14	13	12	11	10	9	8	7	6	5	4	3	2	1	0
95	91	85	84	83	82	81	80	78	76	74	70	64	57	50	43	37	30	21	11	0

Highly Effective: 85-100% of students meet or exceed their individual growth target.

Effective: 70-84% of students meet or exceed their individual growth target.

Developing: 30-69% of students meet or exceed their individual growth target.

Ineffective: 0-29% of students meet or exceed their individual growth target.

#### Junior High School Level – Regents (All Other Courses)

70% of students will meet or exceed their individual growth target.

Highly Effective			Effective									Developing					Ineffective			
20	19	18	17	16	15	14	13	12	11	10	9	8	7	6	5	4	3	2	1	0
98	94	90	86	82	78	74	70	66	63	60	57	54	51	48	45	42	40	38	36	0

Highly Effective: 90-100% of students meet or exceed their individual growth target.

Effective: 57-89% of students meet or exceed their individual growth target.

Developing: 40-56% of students meet or exceed their individual growth target.

Ineffective: 0-39% of students meet or exceed their individual growth target.

### Chemistry:

#### High School Level

80% of students will meet or exceed their individual growth target.

Highly Effective			Effective									Developing					Ineffective			
20	19	18	17	16	15	14	13	12	11	10	9	8	7	6	5	4	3	2	1	0
95	91	85	84	83	82	81	80	78	76	74	70	64	57	50	43	37	30	21	11	0

Highly Effective: 85-100% of students meet or exceed their individual growth target.

Effective: 70-84% of students meet or exceed their individual growth target.

Developing: 30-69% of students meet or exceed their individual growth target.

Ineffective: 0-29% of students meet or exceed their individual growth target.

## Task 2.11

### Physics:

#### High School Level

80% of students will meet or exceed their individual growth target.

Highly Effective			Effective									Developing					Ineffective			
20	19	18	17	16	15	14	13	12	11	10	9	8	7	6	5	4	3	2	1	0
95	91	85	84	83	82	81	80	78	76	74	70	64	57	50	43	37	30	21	11	0

Highly Effective: 85-100% of students meet or exceed their individual growth target.

Effective: 70-84% of students meet or exceed their individual growth target.

Developing: 30-69% of students meet or exceed their individual growth target.

Ineffective: 0-29% of students meet or exceed their individual growth target.

Task 2.11

**2.8) High School Math Regents Courses**

**Algebra I:**

**High School Level (Algebra I CC Regents) – All Other Courses**

60% of students will meet or exceed their individual growth target.

Highly Effective			Effective									Developing					Ineffective			
20	19	18	17	16	15	14	13	12	11	10	9	8	7	6	5	4	3	2	1	0
92	82	75	70	68	65	62	60	54	51	48	45	40	35	30	25	20	15	7	3	0

Highly Effective: 75-100% of students meet or exceed their individual growth target.

Effective: 45-74% of students meet or exceed their individual growth target.

Developing: 15-44% of students meet or exceed their individual growth target.

Ineffective: 0-14% of students meet or exceed their individual growth target.

**Junior High School Level – Regents (Integrated Algebra Regents or Algebra ICC Regents – Max Score)**

70% of students will meet or exceed their individual growth target.

Highly Effective			Effective									Developing					Ineffective			
20	19	18	17	16	15	14	13	12	11	10	9	8	7	6	5	4	3	2	1	0
98	94	90	86	82	78	74	70	66	63	60	57	54	51	48	45	42	40	38	36	0

Highly Effective: 90-100% of students meet or exceed their individual growth target.

Effective: 57-89% of students meet or exceed their individual growth target.

Developing: 40-56% of students meet or exceed their individual growth target.

Ineffective: 0-39% of students meet or exceed their individual growth target.

**Junior High School Level – Honors – All Other Courses**

80% of students will meet or exceed their individual growth target.

Highly Effective			Effective									Developing					Ineffective			
20	19	18	17	16	15	14	13	12	11	10	9	8	7	6	5	4	3	2	1	0
95	91	85	84	83	82	81	80	78	76	74	70	64	57	50	43	37	30	21	11	0

Highly Effective: 85-100% of students meet or exceed their individual growth target.

Effective: 70-84% of students meet or exceed their individual growth target.

Developing: 30-69% of students meet or exceed their individual growth target.

Ineffective: 0-29% of students meet or exceed their individual growth target.

## Task 2.11

### Geometry:

#### High School Level – All Other Courses

50% of students will meet or exceed their individual growth target.

Highly Effective			Effective									Developing					Ineffective			
20	19	18	17	16	15	14	13	12	11	10	9	8	7	6	5	4	3	2	1	0
97	91	85	78	71	64	57	50	44	41	38	35	32	28	24	20	16	12	8	4	0

Highly Effective: 85-100% of students meet or exceed their individual growth target.

Effective: 35-84% of students meet or exceed their individual growth target.

Developing: 12-34% of students meet or exceed their individual growth target.

Ineffective: 0-11% of students meet or exceed their individual growth target.

#### Junior High School Level

70% of students will meet or exceed their individual growth target.

Highly Effective			Effective									Developing					Ineffective			
20	19	18	17	16	15	14	13	12	11	10	9	8	7	6	5	4	3	2	1	0
98	94	90	86	82	78	74	70	66	63	60	57	54	51	48	45	42	40	38	36	0

Highly Effective: 90-100% of students meet or exceed their individual growth target.

Effective: 57-89% of students meet or exceed their individual growth target.

Developing: 40-56% of students meet or exceed their individual growth target.

Ineffective: 0-39% of students meet or exceed their individual growth target.

### Algebra II/ Trigonometry:

#### High School Level

60% of students will meet or exceed their individual growth target.

Highly Effective			Effective									Developing					Ineffective			
20	19	18	17	16	15	14	13	12	11	10	9	8	7	6	5	4	3	2	1	0
92	82	75	70	68	65	62	60	54	51	48	45	40	35	30	25	20	15	7	3	0

Highly Effective: 75-100% of students meet or exceed their individual growth target.

Effective: 45-74% of students meet or exceed their individual growth target.

Developing: 15-44% of students meet or exceed their individual growth target.

Ineffective: 0-14% of students meet or exceed their individual growth target.

**Task 2.11**

**2.9) High School English Regents Courses**

The Three Village Central School District, in collaboration with Eastern Suffolk BOCES, will utilize the BOCES Score Projection Report to determine individual student growth compared to other students county-wide with the same baseline assessment score, as well as special education, English as a Second Language and poverty status.

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
95	91	85	84	83	82	81	80	78	76	74	70	64	57	50	43	37	30	21	11	0

Highly Effective: 85-100% of students meet or exceed their individual growth target.

Effective: 70-84% of students meet or exceed their individual growth target.

Developing: 30-69% of students meet or exceed their individual growth target.

Ineffective: 0-29% of students meet or exceed their individual growth target.

## Task 2.11

### 2.10) All Other Courses

#### Regents Exams:

For any course using a Regents exam, the HEDI measure will be the same measure as described in the task above.

#### 4-8 State Assessment:

For any course using the 4-8 NYS ELA and Math State Assessments, refer to the scale in 2.2.

#### Special Education 3-8:

For any course using the NYSAA, use the scale below.

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
95	91	85	84	83	82	81	80	78	76	74	70	64	57	50	43	37	30	21	11	0

### Task 3.3

For all of the below scales, the values listed are the minimum necessary to achieve the corresponding HEDI point value. Proficiency is defined as a performance level 3 or 4 for grades 3-8 NYS Assessments.

#### 3.1) Grades 4-8 ELA

##### Arrowhead Elementary School

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
47	46	45	44	43	42	41	40	39	38	37	36	21	11	9	7	5	3	2	1	0

**Highly Effective:** 45-100% of students score proficient or higher

**Effective:** 36-44% of students score proficient or higher

**Developing:** 3-35% of students score proficient or higher

**Ineffective:** 0-2% of students score proficient or higher

##### Minnesauke Elementary School

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
58	57	56	55	54	53	52	51	50	49	48	47	32	22	17	12	7	3	2	1	0

**Highly Effective:** 56-100% of students score proficient or higher

**Effective:** 47-55% of students score proficient or higher

**Developing:** 3-46% of students score proficient or higher

**Ineffective:** 0-2% of students score proficient or higher

##### Nassakeag Elementary School

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
54	53	52	51	50	49	48	47	46	45	44	43	28	18	13	8	5	3	2	1	0

**Highly Effective:** 52-100% of students score proficient or higher

**Effective:** 43-51% of students score proficient or higher

**Developing:** 3-42% of students score proficient or higher

**Ineffective:** 0-2% of students score proficient or higher

##### Setauket Elementary School

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
62	61	60	59	58	57	56	55	54	53	52	51	36	26	20	14	8	3	2	1	0

**Highly Effective:** 60-100% of students score proficient or higher

**Effective:** 51-59% of students score proficient or higher

**Developing:** 3-50% of students score proficient or higher

**Ineffective:** 0-2% of students score proficient or higher

### Task 3.3

#### W.S. Mount Elementary School

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
65	64	63	62	61	60	59	58	57	56	55	54	39	29	20	14	8	3	2	1	0

**Highly Effective:** 63-100% of students score proficient or higher

**Effective:** 54-62% of students score proficient or higher

**Developing:** 3-53% of students score proficient or higher

**Ineffective:** 0-2% of students score proficient or higher

#### PJ Gelinas Junior High School

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
71	70	69	68	67	66	65	64	63	62	61	60	40	30	20	10	5	3	2	1	0

**Highly Effective:** 69-100% of students score proficient or higher

**Effective:** 60-68% of students score proficient or higher

**Developing:** 3-59% of students score proficient or higher

**Ineffective:** 0-2% of students score proficient or higher

#### RC Murphy Junior High School

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
55	54	53	52	51	50	49	48	47	46	45	44	29	19	15	10	5	3	2	1	0

**Highly Effective:** 53-100% of students score proficient or higher

**Effective:** 44-52% of students score proficient or higher

**Developing:** 3-43% of students score proficient or higher

**Ineffective:** 0-2% of students score proficient or higher

### Task 3.3

#### 3.2) Grades 4-8 Math

##### Arrowhead Elementary School

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
67	66	65	64	63	62	61	60	59	58	57	56	31	21	15	8	5	3	2	1	0

**Highly Effective:** 65-100% of students score proficient or higher

**Effective:** 56-64% of students score proficient or higher

**Developing:** 3-55% of students score proficient or higher

**Ineffective:** 0-2% of students score proficient or higher

##### Minnesauke Elementary School

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
79	78	77	76	75	74	73	72	71	70	69	68	43	33	23	13	8	3	2	1	0

**Highly Effective:** 77-100% of students score proficient or higher

**Effective:** 68-76% of students score proficient or higher

**Developing:** 3-67% of students score proficient or higher

**Ineffective:** 0-2% of students score proficient or higher

##### Nassakeag Elementary School

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
76	75	74	73	72	71	70	69	68	67	66	65	40	30	20	15	8	3	2	1	0

**Highly Effective:** 74-100% of students score proficient or higher

**Effective:** 65-73% of students score proficient or higher

**Developing:** 3-64% of students score proficient or higher

**Ineffective:** 0-2% of students score proficient or higher

##### Setauket Elementary School

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
72	71	70	69	68	67	66	65	64	63	62	61	46	36	26	15	8	3	2	1	0

**Highly Effective:** 70-100% of students score proficient or higher

**Effective:** 61-69% of students score proficient or higher

**Developing:** 3-60% of students score proficient or higher

**Ineffective:** 0-2% of students score proficient or higher

### Task 3.3

#### W.S. Mount Elementary School

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
78	77	76	75	74	73	72	71	70	69	68	67	42	32	22	15	8	3	2	1	0

**Highly Effective:** 76-100% of students score proficient or higher

**Effective:** 67-75% of students score proficient or higher

**Developing:** 3-66% of students score proficient or higher

**Ineffective:** 0-2% of students score proficient or higher

#### PJ Gelinas Junior High School

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
59	58	57	56	55	54	53	52	51	50	49	48	38	28	18	10	5	3	2	1	0

**Highly Effective:** 57-100% of students score proficient or higher

**Effective:** 48-56% of students score proficient or higher

**Developing:** 3-47% of students score proficient or higher

**Ineffective:** 0-2% of students score proficient or higher

#### RC Murphy Junior High School

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
59	58	57	56	55	54	53	52	51	50	49	48	38	28	18	10	5	3	2	1	0

**Highly Effective:** 57-100% of students score proficient or higher

**Effective:** 48-56% of students score proficient or higher

**Developing:** 3-47% of students score proficient or higher

**Ineffective:** 0-2% of students score proficient or higher

### Task 3.3

#### Conversion Chart: 20 pt. HEDI Scale Converted to 15 pt. HEDI Scale

	20 pt. conversion	15 pt. conversion
Highly Effective	20	15
	20	15
	19	14
	18	14
Effective	17	13
	17	13
	16	12
	16	12
	15	11
	15	11
	14	10
	13	10
	12	9
	11	9
Developing	10	8
	9	8
	8	7
	8	7
	7	6
	6	6
Ineffective	5	5
	4	4
	3	3
	2	2
	1	1
	0	0
	0	0

### Task 3.13

For all of the below scales, the values listed are the minimum necessary to achieve the corresponding HEDI point value. Proficiency is defined as a performance level 3 or 4 for grades 3-8 NYS Assessments.

#### 3.4) Grades K-3 ELA

##### Arrowhead Elementary School

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
47	46	45	44	43	42	41	40	39	38	37	36	21	11	9	7	5	3	2	1	0

**Highly Effective:** 45-100% of students score proficient or higher

**Effective:** 36-44% of students score proficient or higher

**Developing:** 3-35% of students score proficient or higher

**Ineffective:** 0-2% of students score proficient or higher

##### Minnesauke Elementary School

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
58	57	56	55	54	53	52	51	50	49	48	47	32	22	17	12	7	3	2	1	0

**Highly Effective:** 56-100% of students score proficient or higher

**Effective:** 47-55% of students score proficient or higher

**Developing:** 3-46% of students score proficient or higher

**Ineffective:** 0-2% of students score proficient or higher

##### Nassakeag Elementary School

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
54	53	52	51	50	49	48	47	46	45	44	43	28	18	13	8	5	3	2	1	0

**Highly Effective:** 52-100% of students score proficient or higher

**Effective:** 43-51% of students score proficient or higher

**Developing:** 3-42% of students score proficient or higher

**Ineffective:** 0-2% of students score proficient or higher

##### Setauket Elementary School

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
62	61	60	59	58	57	56	55	54	53	52	51	36	26	20	14	8	3	2	1	0

**Highly Effective:** 60-100% of students score proficient or higher

**Effective:** 51-59% of students score proficient or higher

**Developing:** 3-50% of students score proficient or higher

**Ineffective:** 0-2% of students score proficient or higher

### Task 3.13

#### W.S. Mount Elementary School

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
65	64	63	62	61	60	59	58	57	56	55	54	39	29	20	14	8	3	2	1	0

**Highly Effective:** 63-100% of students score proficient or higher

**Effective:** 54-62% of students score proficient or higher

**Developing:** 3-53% of students score proficient or higher

**Ineffective:** 0-2% of students score proficient or higher

#### PJ Gelinas Junior High School

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
71	70	69	68	67	66	65	64	63	62	61	60	40	30	20	10	5	3	2	1	0

**Highly Effective:** 69-100% of students score proficient or higher

**Effective:** 60-68% of students score proficient or higher

**Developing:** 3-59% of students score proficient or higher

**Ineffective:** 0-2% of students score proficient or higher

#### RC Murphy Junior High School

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
55	54	53	52	51	50	49	48	47	46	45	44	29	19	15	10	5	3	2	1	0

**Highly Effective:** 53-100% of students score proficient or higher

**Effective:** 44-52% of students score proficient or higher

**Developing:** 3-43% of students score proficient or higher

**Ineffective:** 0-2% of students score proficient or higher

Task 3.13

3.5) Grades K-3 Math

Arrowhead Elementary School

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
67	66	65	64	63	62	61	60	59	58	57	56	31	21	15	8	5	3	2	1	0

**Highly Effective:** 65-100% of students score proficient or higher

**Effective:** 56-64% of students score proficient or higher

**Developing:** 3-55% of students score proficient or higher

**Ineffective:** 0-2% of students score proficient or higher

Minnesauke Elementary School

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
79	78	77	76	75	74	73	72	71	70	69	68	43	33	23	13	8	3	2	1	0

**Highly Effective:** 77-100% of students score proficient or higher

**Effective:** 68-76% of students score proficient or higher

**Developing:** 3-67% of students score proficient or higher

**Ineffective:** 0-2% of students score proficient or higher

Nassakeag Elementary School

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
76	75	74	73	72	71	70	69	68	67	66	65	40	30	20	15	8	3	2	1	0

**Highly Effective:** 74-100% of students score proficient or higher

**Effective:** 65-73% of students score proficient or higher

**Developing:** 3-64% of students score proficient or higher

**Ineffective:** 0-2% of students score proficient or higher

Setauket Elementary School

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
72	71	70	69	68	67	66	65	64	63	62	61	46	36	26	15	8	3	2	1	0

**Highly Effective:** 70-100% of students score proficient or higher

**Effective:** 61-69% of students score proficient or higher

**Developing:** 3-60% of students score proficient or higher

**Ineffective:** 0-2% of students score proficient or higher

### Task 3.13

#### W.S. Mount Elementary School

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
78	77	76	75	74	73	72	71	70	69	68	67	42	32	22	15	8	3	2	1	0

**Highly Effective:** 76-100% of students score proficient or higher

**Effective:** 67-75% of students score proficient or higher

**Developing:** 3-66% of students score proficient or higher

**Ineffective:** 0-2% of students score proficient or higher

#### PJ Gelinas Junior High School

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
59	58	57	56	55	54	53	52	51	50	49	48	38	28	18	10	5	3	2	1	0

**Highly Effective:** 57-100% of students score proficient or higher

**Effective:** 48-56% of students score proficient or higher

**Developing:** 3-47% of students score proficient or higher

**Ineffective:** 0-2% of students score proficient or higher

#### RC Murphy Junior High School

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
59	58	57	56	55	54	53	52	51	50	49	48	38	28	18	10	5	3	2	1	0

**Highly Effective:** 57-100% of students score proficient or higher

**Effective:** 48-56% of students score proficient or higher

**Developing:** 3-47% of students score proficient or higher

**Ineffective:** 0-2% of students score proficient or higher

### Task 3.13

#### 3.6) Grades 6-8 Science

To measure student achievement, the teachers in collaboration with administration, will set an achievement target for each science course. A HEDI score will be awarded based on the overall percentage of students who meet or exceed the achievement target. A corresponding 0-20 HEDI score will be determined using the uploaded HEDI chart in task 3.13.

**Grade 6:** Not applicable

**Grade 7:** See targets in Task 3.9.

**Grade 8:**

#### General Education Students

70% will meet or exceed the achievement target on the 8<sup>th</sup> Grade State Science Assessment.

Highly Effective			Effective									Developing					Ineffective			
20	19	18	17	16	15	14	13	12	11	10	9	8	7	6	5	4	3	2	1	0
98	94	90	86	82	78	74	70	66	63	60	57	54	51	48	45	42	40	38	36	0

#### 3.7) Grades 6-8 Social Studies

**Grade 6:** Not applicable

**Grade 7:** See uploaded charts by building in Task 3.3.

**Grade 8:** See uploaded charts by building in Task 3.3.

### Task 3.13

#### 3.8) High School Social Studies

To measure student achievement, the teachers in collaboration with administration, will set an achievement target for each social studies course. A HEDI score will be awarded based on the overall percentage of students who meet or exceed the achievement target. A corresponding 0-20 HEDI score will be determined using the uploaded HEDI chart in task 3.13.

#### Global 2:

##### High School Level – AP (All other courses)

80% will meet or exceed the achievement target on the Global History Regents.

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
95	91	85	84	83	82	81	80	78	76	74	70	64	57	50	43	37	30	21	11	0

##### High School Level – Regents

80% will meet or exceed the achievement target on the Global History Regents.

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
95	91	85	84	83	82	81	80	78	76	74	70	64	57	50	43	37	30	21	11	0

#### American History:

##### High School Level – AP (All other courses)

80% will meet or exceed the achievement target on the US History Regents.

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
95	91	85	84	83	82	81	80	78	76	74	70	64	57	50	43	37	30	21	11	0

##### High School Level – Regents

80% will meet or exceed the achievement target on the US History Regents.

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
95	91	85	84	83	82	81	80	78	76	74	70	64	57	50	43	37	30	21	11	0

### Task 3.13

#### 3.9) High School Science

To measure student achievement, the teachers in collaboration with administration, will set an achievement target for each science course. A HEDI score will be awarded based on the overall percentage of students who meet or exceed the achievement target. A corresponding 0-20 HEDI score will be determined using the uploaded HEDI chart in task 3.13.

#### Living Environment:

##### High School Level – Regents

70% will meet or exceed the achievement target on the Living Environment Regents.

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
98	94	90	86	82	78	74	70	66	63	60	57	54	51	48	45	42	40	38	36	0

#### Earth Science:

##### Junior High School Level – Honors (All other courses)

70% will meet or exceed the achievement target on the Earth Science Regents.

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
98	94	90	86	82	78	74	70	66	63	60	57	54	51	48	45	42	40	38	36	0

##### Junior High School Level – Regents

70% will meet or exceed the achievement target on the Earth Science Regents.

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
98	94	90	86	82	78	74	70	66	63	60	57	54	51	48	45	42	40	38	36	0

#### Chemistry:

##### High School Level – Honors (All other courses)

70% will meet or exceed the achievement target on the Chemistry Regents.

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
98	94	90	86	82	78	74	70	66	63	60	57	54	51	48	45	42	40	38	36	0

##### High School Level – Regents

70% will meet or exceed the achievement target on the Chemistry Regents.

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
98	94	90	86	82	78	74	70	66	63	60	57	54	51	48	45	42	40	38	36	0

### Task 3.13

#### Physics:

##### High School Level – AP (All other courses)

70% will meet or exceed the achievement target on the Physics Regents.

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
98	94	90	86	82	78	74	70	66	63	60	57	54	51	48	45	42	40	38	36	0

##### High School Level – Honors (All other courses)

70% will meet or exceed the achievement target on the Physics Regents.

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
98	94	90	86	82	78	74	70	66	63	60	57	54	51	48	45	42	40	38	36	0

##### High School Level – Regents

70% will meet or exceed the achievement target on the Physics Regents.

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
98	94	90	86	82	78	74	70	66	63	60	57	54	51	48	45	42	40	38	36	0

### Task 3.13

#### 3.10) High School Math

To measure student achievement, the teachers in collaboration with administration, will set an achievement target for each math course. A HEDI score will be awarded based on the overall percentage of students who meet or exceed the achievement target. A corresponding 0-20 HEDI score will be determined using the uploaded HEDI chart in task 3.13.

#### Algebra 1:

##### High School Level

60% will meet or exceed the achievement target on the Integrated Algebra or Common Core Algebra Regents.

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
92	82	75	70	68	65	62	60	54	51	48	45	40	35	30	25	20	15	7	3	0

#### Geometry:

##### High School Level

70% will meet or exceed the achievement target on the Geometry Regents.

Highly Effective			Effective									Developing					Ineffective			
20	19	18	17	16	15	14	13	12	11	10	9	8	7	6	5	4	3	2	1	0
96	92	85	82	79	76	73	70	62	56	50	45	40	35	30	25	20	15	8	4	0

#### Algebra 2:

##### High School Level – Honors (All other courses)

60% will meet or exceed the achievement target on the Algebra II/Trigonometry Regents.

Highly Effective			Effective									Developing					Ineffective			
20	19	18	17	16	15	14	13	12	11	10	9	8	7	6	5	4	3	2	1	0
96	92	85	82	79	76	73	70	62	56	50	45	40	35	30	25	20	15	8	4	0

##### High School Level – Regents

60% will meet or exceed the achievement target on the Algebra II/Trigonometry Regents.

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
92	82	75	70	68	65	62	60	54	51	48	45	40	35	30	25	20	15	7	3	0

##### High School Level – Lab (All other courses)

60% will meet or exceed the achievement target on the Algebra II/Trigonometry Regents.

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
92	82	75	70	68	65	62	60	54	51	48	45	40	35	30	25	20	15	7	3	0

### Task 3.13

#### 3.11) High School English Language Arts

To measure student achievement, the teachers in collaboration with administration, will set an achievement target for each English course. A HEDI score will be awarded based on the overall percentage of students who meet or exceed the achievement target. A corresponding 0-20 HEDI score will be determined using the uploaded HEDI chart in task 3.13.

#### Grades 9-11 ELA:

##### High School Level – AP and Honors (All other Courses)

87% will meet or exceed the achievement target on the Comprehensive English Regents.

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
98	95	92	91	90	89	88	87	84	80	75	70	65	60	55	50	45	40	30	20	0

##### High School Level – Regents

80% will meet or exceed the achievement target on the Comprehensive English Regents.

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
95	91	85	84	83	82	81	80	78	76	74	70	64	57	50	43	37	30	21	11	0

## Task 3.13

### 3.12) All Other Courses

#### **Regents Exams:**

For any course using a Regents exam, the HEDI measure will be the same measure as described in the task above.

#### **3-8 State Assessment:**

For any course using the 3-8 NYS ELA and Math State Assessments, refer to the scales in 3.3.

## Breakdown of Points for APPR

For all of the below scales, the values listed are the minimum necessary to achieve the corresponding HEDI point value. Normal rounding rules apply and will not move an educator within HEDI bands.

	State	Local	Other			Total Score
Points:	20 pts.	20 pts.	60 pts.			
Weighting:	100%	100%	50%	16%	34%	After obtaining a total score from all three components, use the scoring bands below to determine overall Composite Effectiveness Score.
Evaluation Tool:	(1) State Assessment; or (2) If no state Assessment, then SLO	(1) SLO; (2) State Assessment; or (3) 3 <sup>rd</sup> Party Assessment	<b>Formal Observations</b> Tenured Teachers (1 observation)  Untenured Teachers (2 or more observations)	<b>Unannounced Observation</b>	<b>Other Evidence</b>  Portfolio or Professional Instruction	
	<b>Growth</b>	<b>Growth or Achievement</b>				
How Score is Calculated:	Score provided by SED or district	Score provided by district	Teacher will receive a score based on the average points calculated using the Danielson rubric (ranging from 1-4) for each domain.	Teacher will receive a score based on the average points calculated using the Danielson rubric (ranging from 1-4) for each domain.	Teacher will receive a score of 0 (I), .5 (D), or 1 (HE,E) based on the quality of work submitted for each of the four domains in the Danielson rubric (Total score will range from 0-4.) for each domain.	
			<i>The weighted scores from each section will be combined to equal a total score ranging from 0-4. That score will then be converted into a score ranging from 0-60, using the NYSUT conversion chart. (See attached.)</i>			
Ineffective	0-2	0-2	0-49			0-64
Developing	3-8	3-8	50-56			65-74
Effective	9-17	9-17	57-58			75-90
Highly Effective	18-20	18-20	59-60			91-100

## Breakdown of Points for APPR

For all of the below scales, the values listed are the minimum necessary to achieve the corresponding HEDI point value. Normal rounding rules apply and will not move an educator within HEDI bands.

### NYSUT Conversion Chart

Min	Max	Range Value	Range Rating
0.0000	1.0070	0	Ineffective
1.0080	1.0160	1	Ineffective
1.0170	1.0240	2	Ineffective
1.0250	1.0320	3	Ineffective
1.0330	1.0410	4	Ineffective
1.0420	1.0490	5	Ineffective
1.0500	1.0570	6	Ineffective
1.0580	1.0660	7	Ineffective
1.0670	1.0740	8	Ineffective
1.0750	1.0820	9	Ineffective
1.0830	1.0910	10	Ineffective
1.0920	1.0990	11	Ineffective
1.1000	1.1070	12	Ineffective
1.1080	1.1140	13	Ineffective
1.1150	1.1220	14	Ineffective
1.1230	1.1300	15	Ineffective
1.1310	1.1370	16	Ineffective
1.1380	1.1450	17	Ineffective
1.1460	1.1530	18	Ineffective
1.1540	1.1610	19	Ineffective
1.1620	1.1680	20	Ineffective
1.1690	1.1760	21	Ineffective
1.1770	1.1840	22	Ineffective
1.1850	1.1910	23	Ineffective
1.1920	1.1990	24	Ineffective
1.2000	1.2070	25	Ineffective
1.2080	1.2160	26	Ineffective
1.2170	1.2240	27	Ineffective
1.2250	1.2320	28	Ineffective

## Breakdown of Points for APPR

For all of the below scales, the values listed are the minimum necessary to achieve the corresponding HEDI point value. Normal rounding rules apply and will not move an educator within HEDI bands.

1.2330	1.2410	29	Ineffective
1.2420	1.2490	30	Ineffective
1.2500	1.2570	31	Ineffective
1.2580	1.2660	32	Ineffective
1.2670	1.2740	33	Ineffective
1.2750	1.2820	34	Ineffective
1.2830	1.2910	35	Ineffective
1.2920	1.2990	36	Ineffective
1.3000	1.3070	37	Ineffective
1.3080	1.3160	38	Ineffective
1.3170	1.3240	39	Ineffective
1.3250	1.3320	40	Ineffective
1.3330	1.3410	41	Ineffective
1.3420	1.3490	42	Ineffective
1.3500	1.3570	43	Ineffective
1.3580	1.3660	44	Ineffective
1.3670	1.3740	45	Ineffective
1.3750	1.3820	46	Ineffective
1.3830	1.3910	47	Ineffective
1.3920	1.3990	48	Ineffective
1.4000	1.4990	49	Ineffective
1.5000	1.5990	50	Developing
1.6000	1.6990	50.7	Developing
1.7000	1.7990	51.4	Developing
1.8000	1.8990	52.1	Developing
1.9000	1.9990	52.8	Developing
2.0000	2.0990	53.5	Developing
2.1000	2.1990	54.2	Developing
2.2000	2.2990	54.9	Developing
2.3000	2.3990	55.6	Developing
2.4000	2.4990	56.3	Developing
2.5000	2.5990	57	Effective

## Breakdown of Points for APPR

For all of the below scales, the values listed are the minimum necessary to achieve the corresponding HEDI point value. Normal rounding rules apply and will not move an educator within HEDI bands.

2.6000	2.6990	57.2	Effective
2.7000	2.7990	57.4	Effective
2.8000	2.8990	57.6	Effective
2.9000	2.9990	57.8	Effective
3.0000	3.0990	58	Effective
3.1000	3.1990	58.2	Effective
3.2000	3.2990	58.4	Effective
3.3000	3.3990	58.6	Effective
3.4000	3.4990	58.8	Effective
3.5000	3.5990	59	Highly Effective
3.6000	3.6990	59.3	Highly Effective
3.7000	3.7990	59.5	Highly Effective
3.8000	3.8990	59.8	Highly Effective
3.9000	4.0000	60	Highly Effective

## IX. TEACHER IMPROVEMENT PLAN (TIP) PROCESS

The NYS Commissioner's Regulation (30-2.10) requires that any teacher with an annual professional performance review rated as *developing* or *ineffective* shall receive a Teacher Improvement Plan (TIP). A TIP is not a disciplinary action. A TIP shall be developed by the Professional Support Team. At the end of the timeline set forth in the TIP, the Professional Support Team shall meet to assess the teacher's performance and ability to achieve the goals set forth in the TIP. Based on the outcome of this assessment, the TIP may be deemed satisfied, modified and continued, or deemed as having been unsuccessfully completed by the teacher.

The TIP is used for those teachers whose ***annual teacher evaluation composite score*** is rated *developing* or *ineffective* or to address concerns identified by the District in the "Concerns and Recommendations Worksheet" or by an administrator in conjunction with The Office of Human Resources.

A TIP is completed collegially by the Professional Support Team. They set professional goals to ensure growth toward improved student outcomes. Working towards this growth in an environment of professional respect is an expectation for all parties.

The TIP should be developed as soon as is practical after the final evaluation has been completed, but in no case later than ten (10) school days after the date on which teachers are required to report prior to opening of classes for the new school year. The TIP should be structured around each teacher rubric components. TIP goals/activities should be structured so that no more than four or five at a time are addressed. The following should be included on the TIP:

- Definition of the Problem (i.e. areas in need of improvement)
- Statement of the Goals
- Intervention Strategies (i.e. where appropriate, differentiated activities to support the teacher's improvement)
- Resources
- Sample Indicators of Success
- Timeline for Achieving Improvement

**Teachers will be placed on a Teacher Improvement Plan (TIP) for low evaluation scores and/or administrative concerns. If due to the latter, a teacher can be placed on a (TIP) at any point throughout the year.**

## TEACHER IMPROVEMENT PLAN (TIP) PROCEDURES

- In consultation with appropriate administrators, the administrator directly in charge of supervision for the staff member will indicate a need for a TIP because of low evaluation scores or little or no improvement in areas indicated by evaluations and/or the optional *Concerns and Recommendations Worksheet* or for other documented administrative concerns.
- The Building Administrator/Supervisor discusses this decision with the Union President.
- The Building Administrator and the Union President will:
  - Designate a person to inform the teacher in need of a TIP;
  - Set a date for the TIP meeting.
- The teacher is informed by the designee that his/her Building Administrator/Supervisor is placing him/her on a TIP and is asked to attend the Initial TIP meeting.
- The Professional Support Team is formed. The group will report to the Assistant Superintendent for Educational Services and the Assistant Superintendent for Human Resources and will be responsible for recommending strategies for instructional change.

### **The Initial TIP meeting is held**

- Participants: The Professional Support Team
  - The teacher in need of a TIP
  - Building Administrator and/or Supervisor
  - District Mentor, if available and appropriate
  - Union Representation
    - Union President and/or designee
    - TVTA Building Representative or designee
  - Additional participants, if agreed upon by all other participants
- Agenda:
  - A union representative distributes copies of the Professional Support section and a blank TIP from the Performance Appraisal System to all participants.
  - Union representation explains that administration prepares their suggestions for completion of the TIP in advance, prior to the next TIP meeting.
  - The meeting participants mutually agree upon an 'Exemplary Teacher'. (The District Mentor, when available, is preferred.) This 'Exemplary Teacher' will become a member of the Professional Support Team, attend all other subsequent TIP meetings, and work closely with the teacher in need of support to address the Building Administrator's concerns.
  - A date is chosen for the next meeting with the purpose of initiating the TIP.
  - A procedure for inviting the 'Exemplary Teacher' to participate in the support process and informing him/her of the next meeting date is agreed upon.

## The meeting to initiate the TIP is held

- Participants: The Professional Support Team
  - The teacher in need of Professional Support
  - Building Administrator and/or Supervisor
  - Exemplary Teacher
  - Union Representation
    - Union President and/or designee
    - TVTA Building Representative or designee
  - Additional participants, if agreed upon by all other participants listed above
  
- Agenda:
  - The Exemplary Teacher's role is explained and clarified to all participants by Union Representation.
  
  - The components of the TIP are addressed by the Building Administrator and discussed by the entire Professional Support Team.
  
  - Subsequent meeting dates are identified and the TIP is modified, as needed. All formal meetings between the teacher in need of support and the Building Administrator and/or Supervisor will be scheduled with the entire Professional Support Team.

### **Official Record:**

- The Union President or designee (see above) will record the Minutes of each TIP meeting. The Minutes and the TIP are approved by the entire team at the beginning of each subsequent meeting.
  
- The Minutes will be filed at the building level and only maintained in paper copies. Minutes will not be sent electronically.
  
- The TIP and subsequent modifications will be filed at the building and the Office of Human Resources.

**X.** The Progress Report will be filed at the building and the Office of Human Resources.

## **XI. APPEAL PROCESS**

- A. The annual evaluation of a teacher shall be presented to the teacher by the principal/lead evaluator.
  
- B. Within ten (10) school days of receipt of an ineffective evaluation the teacher may request, in writing, review by the Superintendent of Schools, Cheryl Pedisich.
  
- C. The appeal writing shall articulate in detail the basis of the appeal. Failure to articulate a particular basis for the appeal in the aforesaid appeal writing shall be deemed a waiver of that claim. The evaluated teacher may only challenge the substance, rating and/or adherence to the parties' annual professional performance review plan adopted pursuant to 8 NYCRR 30-2 and Education Law 3012-c.

- D. Within ten (10) school days, of receipt of the appeal, the Superintendent of Schools, Ms. Pedisich, shall render an initial determination, in writing, respecting the appeal. Thereafter, the affected teacher may elect review of the appeal papers, within 10 days, by one outside expert who will be chosen from a panel of at least three persons selected by the District and TVTA, which panel shall be established by the parties.
- E. The initial panel shall include Laurie DeVore, Neil Lederer and Lorna Lewis. The panel composition shall be reviewed annually beginning on July 1, 2013. The panelists shall customarily be selected in rotating order; if a panelist is unavailable, the next listed panelist will be chosen. However, the parties may elect to deviate from the customary rotation depending upon the circumstances of the specific appeal. In the event that none of the panelists are available to review an appeal, the parties shall select a mutually agreeable expert. The cost of the expert review shall be borne by the District.
- F. The expert may recommend a modification of the TIP, or a modification of the rating, along with his/her rationale for the same. Expert review shall be completed within ten (10) school days of delivery of the written request for review to the panel member. No hearing shall be held and the review shall be based solely upon the original appeal, Superintendent Pedisich's initial determination, supporting papers submitted by the teacher and/or a response to the appeal by the teacher's evaluator. The expert's written review recommendation shall be transmitted to Superintendent Pedisich and the appellant upon completion. Superintendent Pedisich shall consider the written review recommendation of the expert and shall issue a written decision within ten (10) school days thereof. The determination of Superintendent Pedisich shall be final and shall not be grievable, arbitral, nor reviewable in any other forum; however, the failure of either party to abide by the above agreed-upon process shall be subject to the grievance procedure.
- G. In the event that Cheryl Pedisich is no longer the Superintendent, the parties shall jointly select a replacement for Ms. Pedisich in the APPR appeals process. Pending the outcome of those negotiations, Ms. Pedisich's role in the appeals process shall be filled by the Assistant Superintendent for Educational Services.
- H. An overall performance rating of "ineffective" on the annual evaluation is the only rating subject to appeal. Teachers, who receive a rating of "highly effective" or "effective" or "developing" shall not be permitted to appeal their rating. Tenured teachers who are rated effective, highly effective or developing may elect to submit a written response to their overall rating, which response shall be appended to the APPR evaluation and filed in the teacher's personnel file. Such response shall be filed within ten (10) school days year including summer recess, of the teachers of the APPR evaluation.
- I. Non-tenured teachers shall not be permitted to appeal any aspect of their annual evaluation, or the school district's issuance and/or implementation of the terms of a teacher improvement plan. Probationary teachers who are rated ineffective, effective, highly effective or developing may elect to submit a written response to their overall rating, which response shall be appended to the APPR evaluation and filed in the teacher's personnel file. Such response shall be filed within ten (10) school days of the teacher's receipt of the APPR evaluation.

**APPENDIX 15.0**



**Three Village Central School District**

**TEACHER IMPROVEMENT PLAN**

**Faculty Member:**

**Administrator:**

**TVTA Representative:**

**Additional Participants:**

**Date:**

The following refers to the Components of Professional Practice as listed within the Domains of the Appraisal Framework of the Three Village Central School District:

**Components of Strength**

**Areas in Need of Improvement**

**1.**

**2.**

**3.**

**4.**

**5.**

**Statement of Goals:**

**APPENDIX 15.0 (continued)**

Intervention/Action/Strategies	Component Number(s) from Above	Sample Success Indicators	Progress/Outcome

RESOURCES TO BE ALLOCATED FOR PLAN IMPLEMENTATION  
 (STAFF DEVELOPMENT, COLLEGIAL VISITS, WORKSHOPS, COURSES, VIDEOTAPES, ETC.)

\_\_\_\_\_

\_\_\_\_\_

\_\_\_\_\_

Timeline for Achieving Improvement: \_\_\_\_\_

Next Meeting Date: \_\_\_\_\_

FACULTY SIGNATURE: \_\_\_\_\_

ADMINISTRATOR SIGNATURE: \_\_\_\_\_

TVTA REPRESENTATIVE SIGNATURE: \_\_\_\_\_

For additional comments (*if applicable*) use a separate page.



**APPENDIX 15.1**

**TEACHER IMPROVEMENT (TIP)**

**PROGRESS REPORT**

*(PLEASE ATTACH A COPY OF THE TIP)*

**ADMINISTRATOR(S):**

**FACULTY MEMBER:**

**DATE:**

---

Areas in need of Improvement, as identified in the TIP:

Progress Noted:

Administrator Concern(s):

Faculty Concern(s)

Action Plan Modifications (if applicable):

Recommendation:

- 1. TIP deemed satisfied; removal from TIP
- 2. Progress Noted; TIP will be modified and continued
- 3. Deemed unsuccessfully completed by teacher; referred to Office of Human Resources

ADMINISTRATOR SIGNATURE \_\_\_\_\_ DATE \_\_\_\_\_

ADMINISTRATOR SIGNATURE \_\_\_\_\_ DATE \_\_\_\_\_

FACULTY SIGNATURE \_\_\_\_\_ DATE \_\_\_\_\_

*This form will be filed at the building and the Office of Human Resources*

### Task 7.3

For all of the below scales, the values listed are the minimum necessary to achieve the corresponding HEDI point value.

#### **7.3) Student Learning Objectives as Comparable Growth Measures**

The Three Village Central School District, in collaboration with Eastern Suffolk BOCES, will utilize the BOCES Score Projection Report to determine individual student growth on the Comprehensive English Regents compared to other students county-wide with the same baseline assessment score, as well as special education, English as a Second Language and poverty status.

#### **Comprehensive English Regents:**

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
95	91	85	84	83	82	81	80	78	76	74	70	64	57	50	43	37	30	21	11	0

Highly Effective: 85-100% of students meet or exceed their individual growth target.

Effective: 70-84% of students meet or exceed their individual growth target.

Developing: 30-69% of students meet or exceed their individual growth target.

Ineffective: 0-29% of students meet or exceed their individual growth target.

#### **Geometry:**

##### **High School Level – All Other Courses**

50% of students will meet or exceed their individual growth target.

Highly Effective			Effective									Developing					Ineffective			
20	19	18	17	16	15	14	13	12	11	10	9	8	7	6	5	4	3	2	1	0
97	91	85	78	71	64	57	50	44	41	38	35	32	28	24	20	16	12	8	4	0

Highly Effective: 85-100% of students meet or exceed their individual growth target.

Effective: 35-84% of students meet or exceed their individual growth target.

Developing: 12-34% of students meet or exceed their individual growth target.

Ineffective: 0-11% of students meet or exceed their individual growth target.

### Task 7.3

#### Algebra II/ Trigonometry:

##### High School Level

60% of students will meet or exceed their individual growth target.

Highly Effective			Effective									Developing					Ineffective			
20	19	18	17	16	15	14	13	12	11	10	9	8	7	6	5	4	3	2	1	0
92	82	75	70	68	65	62	60	54	51	48	45	40	35	30	25	20	15	7	3	0

Highly Effective: 75-100% of students meet or exceed their individual growth target.

Effective: 45-74% of students meet or exceed their individual growth target.

Developing: 15-44% of students meet or exceed their individual growth target.

Ineffective: 0-14% of students meet or exceed their individual growth target.

### Task 8.1

For all of the below scales, the values listed are the minimum necessary to achieve the corresponding HEDI point value. Proficiency is defined as a performance level 3 or 4 for grades 3-8 NYS Assessments.

#### 8.1) Locally Selected Measures of Student Achievement for Principals with an Approved Value-Added Measure

##### Arrowhead Elementary School

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
67	66	65	64	63	62	61	60	59	58	57	56	48	40	32	25	18	11	4	2	0

**Highly Effective:** 65-100% of students score proficient or higher

**Effective:** 56-64% of students score proficient or higher

**Developing:** 11-55% of students score proficient or higher

**Ineffective:** 0-10% of students score proficient or higher

##### Minnesauke Elementary School

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
79	78	77	76	75	74	73	72	71	70	69	68	59	50	41	33	25	17	9	4	0

**Highly Effective:** 77-100% of students score proficient or higher

**Effective:** 68-76% of students score proficient or higher

**Developing:** 17-67% of students score proficient or higher

**Ineffective:** 0-16% of students score proficient or higher

##### Nassakeag Elementary School

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
76	75	74	73	72	71	70	69	68	67	66	65	56	47	38	30	22	14	6	3	0

**Highly Effective:** 74-100% of students score proficient or higher

**Effective:** 65-73% of students score proficient or higher

**Developing:** 14-64% of students score proficient or higher

**Ineffective:** 0-13% of students score proficient or higher

## Task 8.1

### Setauket Elementary School

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
72	71	70	69	68	67	66	65	64	63	62	61	53	45	37	30	23	16	9	4	0

**Highly Effective:** 70-100% of students score proficient or higher

**Effective:** 61-69% of students score proficient or higher

**Developing:** 16-60% of students score proficient or higher

**Ineffective:** 0-15% of students score proficient or higher

### W.S. Mount Elementary School

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
78	77	76	75	74	73	72	71	70	69	68	67	58	49	40	32	24	16	8	4	0

**Highly Effective:** 76-100% of students score proficient or higher

**Effective:** 67-75% of students score proficient or higher

**Developing:** 16-66% of students score proficient or higher

**Ineffective:** 0-15% of students score proficient or higher

### PJ Gelinas Junior High School

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
59	58	57	56	55	54	53	52	51	50	49	48	45	40	35	30	25	20	15	10	0

**Highly Effective:** 57-100% of students score proficient or higher

**Effective:** 48-56% of students score proficient or higher

**Developing:** 20-47% of students score proficient or higher

**Ineffective:** 0-19% of students score proficient or higher

### RC Murphy Junior High School

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
59	58	57	56	55	54	53	52	51	50	49	48	45	40	35	30	25	20	15	10	0

**Highly Effective:** 57-100% of students score proficient or higher

**Effective:** 48-56% of students score proficient or higher

**Developing:** 20-47% of students score proficient or higher

**Ineffective:** 0-19% of students score proficient or higher

### Task 8.1

#### Conversion Chart: 20 pt. HEDI Scale Converted to 15 pt. HEDI Scale

	20 pt. conversion	15 pt. conversion
Highly Effective	20	15
	20	15
	19	14
	18	14
Effective	17	13
	17	13
	16	12
	16	12
	15	11
	15	11
	14	10
	13	10
	12	9
	11	9
Developing	10	8
	9	8
	8	7
	8	7
	7	6
	6	6
Ineffective	6	6
	5	5
	4	4
	4	4
	3	3
Ineffective	3	3
	2	2
	2	2
Ineffective	1	1
	1	1
Ineffective	0	0
	0	0

## Task 8.2

For all of the below scales, the values listed are the minimum necessary to achieve the corresponding HEDI point value.

### 8.2) Locally Selected Measures of Student Achievement for All Other Principals

For high school building principals, a HEDI score will be awarded based on the overall percentage of students who meet or exceed the Comprehensive English Regents achievement target for AP and honors courses. Achievement targets will be based on historical data.

#### Grade 11 ELA:

##### High School Level – AP and Honors

87% will meet or exceed the achievement target on the Comprehensive English Regents.

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
98	95	92	91	90	89	88	87	84	80	75	70	65	60	55	50	45	40	30	20	0

MPPR - POINT DISTRIBUTION FOR EACH DOMAIN

DOMAIN	Item	Highly Effective	Effective	Developing	Ineffective
1 (6 pts)	A	2	1.9	1.8	0
	B	2	1.9	1.8	0
	C	2	1.9	1.8	0
2 (16 pts)	A	2	1.9	1.8	0
	B	2	1.9	1.8	0
	C	2	1.9	1.8	0
	D	2	1.9	1.8	0
	E	2	1.9	1.8	0
	F	2	1.9	1.8	0
	G	2	1.9	1.8	0
	H	2	1.9	1.8	0
3 (6 pts)	A	2	1.9	1.8	0
	B	2	1.9	1.8	0
	C	2	1.9	1.8	0
4 (8 pts)	A	2	1.9	1.8	0
	B	2	1.9	1.8	0
	C	2	1.9	1.8	0
	D	2	1.9	1.8	0
5 (8 pts)	A	2	1.9	1.8	0
	B	2	1.9	1.8	0
	C	2	1.9	1.8	0
	D	2	1.9	1.8	0
6 (6 pts)	A	2	1.9	1.8	0
	B	2	1.9	1.8	0
	C	2	1.9	1.8	0
7 (10 pts)	A	2.50	2.25	2.20	0
	B	2.50	2.25	2.20	0
	C	2.50	2.25	2.20	0
	D	2.50	2.25	2.20	0





## VI. Principal/Administrator Improvement Plan

**\* THIS PLAN APPLIES TO ALL ADMINISTRATIVE STAFF \***

The **Principal/Administrator Improvement Plan (PIP)** is a structured plan designed to identify specific concerns in leadership and outlines a plan of action to address these concerns. The purpose of a PIP is to assist principals/administrators to work to their fullest potential. The PIP provides assistance and feedback to the principal/administrator and establishes a timeline for assessing its overall effectiveness.

A PIP must be initiated whenever a principal/administrator receives a rating of *developing or ineffective* in a year-end evaluation or when there is evidence of little or no improvement in areas indicated by evaluations and/or overall performance. The PIP must be in place no later than 10 school days after the opening of classes for the school year". Prior to its implementation, the PIP will be signed and dated by all parties. The principal's/administrator's signature confirms receipt only, and agreement is not required for implementation. The area or areas in need of improvement will be drawn from the evaluation criteria contained in the agreed upon rubric. The attached forms will be used during the PIP plan.

A PIP shall be designed by the principal/administrator and the superintendent and his/her designee in collaboration with the president of the *Three Village Schools Administrators Association (TVSAA)* or his/her designee, with any differences to be resolved by a consensus determination. The TVSAA president will be notified when the district notifies the principal of an *ineffective or developing* rating.

The principal/administrator must be offered the opportunity for a volunteer peer mentor chosen from the TVSAA. The principal/administrator will select the mentor, with the approval of the superintendent and the TVSAA President. All dealings between the mentor and principal/administrator will be confidential. If there are no suitable mentors and/or no volunteers from the TVSAA, the parties shall consider other options. If the parties cannot agree, the final determination will be made by the Superintendent.

A statement of differentiated activities to support improvement shall be developed by the Superintendent of Schools or Assistant Superintendent for Educational Services after consultation with the principal/administrator on the PIP and may include, but shall not be limited to: working with mentors, in-service training, education conferences and reference to professional writings based upon scientific research, collaboration with administrative colleagues. All costs associated with the aforementioned shall be borne by the District upon the prior approval of the Superintendent.

No later than November 15<sup>th</sup>, the superintendent shall meet with the building principal/administrator and the support team on the PIP to discuss and assess the building principal's/administrator's progress and provide written feedback to the principal/administrator regarding his/her progress on the PIP; on or before February 15<sup>th</sup>, the superintendent shall again meet with the building principal/administrator on the PIP to discuss and assess the building principal's /administrator's progress and provide written feedback to the principal/administrator regarding his/her progress on the PIP; on or before April 15<sup>th</sup>, the superintendent shall once again meet with the building principal/administrator on the PIP to discuss and assess the building principal's/administrator's progress and provide written feedback to the principal/administrator regarding his/her progress on the PIP. If at any time the superintendent believes that the goals have been met by the principal/administrator, (s)he shall sign a written acknowledgement of attainment. Timelines, as indicated above, may be altered and modified if agreed in writing by the parties.

In addition, the above meetings with the superintendent the building principal/administrator shall meet with the Assistant Superintendent for Educational Services periodically, throughout the school year, in order to discuss and assess the building principal's/administrator's progress on the PIP and to be provided written feedback regarding his/her progress on the PIP. All meetings shall be documented on the attached form.

If at the end of the year the PIP goals are met and the principal/administrator is rated "effective", the PIP will terminate.

If the principal/administrator is rated as *developing or ineffective* for any school year in which a PIP was in effect, a new plan will be developed by the principal and the superintendent in collaboration with the TVSAA adhering to the guidelines and requirements below. Continued concerns regarding a principal's/administrator's performance may warrant consideration of disciplinary procedures.

The Principal/Administrator Improvement Plan (PIP), set forth herein, will be used only for principals/administrators rated *ineffective* or *developing*. All aspects of the PIP shall be reviewed; however, only those aspects subject to negotiations shall be renegotiated as appropriate.

**Any PIP created must consist of the following components:**

- I. **SPECIFIC AREAS FOR IMPROVEMENT**: Identify specific areas in need of improvement. Develop specific, behaviorally written goals for the principal/administrator to accomplish during the period of the Plan.
- II. **EXPECTED OUTCOMES OF THE PIP**: Identify specific recommendations for what the principal is expected to do to improve in the identified areas. Delineate specific, realistic, achievable activities for the principal/administrator.
- III. **RESPONSIBILITIES**: Identify steps to be taken by the superintendent and the principal/administrator throughout the plan. Examples: school visits by the superintendent; supervisory conferences between the principal/administrator and superintendent; written reports and/or evaluations, etc.
- IV. **RESOURCES/ACTIVITIES**: Identify specific resources available to assist the principal/administrator to improve performance. Examples: colleagues; courses; workshops; peer visits; materials; etc.
- V. **EVIDENCE OF ACHIEVEMENT**: Identify how progress will be measured and assessed. Specify next steps to be taken based upon whether the principal/administrator is successful, partially successful, or unsuccessful in efforts to improve performance.
- VI. **TIMELINE**: Provide a specific timeline for implementation of the various components of the PIP and for the final completion of the PIP. Identify the dates for preparation of written documentation regarding the completion of the Plan and finalize the dates as to required meetings and/or school visits, and/or workshops, etc.

*Three Village Central School District*

**PRINCIPAL/ADMINISTRATOR IMPROVEMENT PLAN**

<b>I. Specific Area(s) of Improvement</b> <i>(Identify applicable Domains)</i>	<b>II. Expected Outcomes</b>	<b>III. Responsibilities</b>	<b>IV. Resources / Activities</b>	<b>V. Evidence of Achievement</b>	<b>VI. Timeline</b>

\_\_\_\_\_

**Superintendent**

\_\_\_\_\_

**Date**

\_\_\_\_\_

**Principal/Administrator**

\_\_\_\_\_

**Date**

*Three Village Central School District*

**PRINCIPAL/ADMINISTRATOR IMPROVEMENT PLAN  
PROGRESS RECORD FORM**

	<b>SUMMARY OF MEETING</b>	<b>SIGN-OFF BY ALL PARTIES</b>
Meeting #1 Date _____		_____ _____
Meeting #2 Date _____		_____ _____
Meeting #3 Date _____		_____ _____
Meeting #4 Date _____		_____ _____
Meeting #5 Date _____		_____ _____
Meeting #6 Date _____		_____ _____
Meeting #7 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 certify that this APPR Plan is the district's or BOCES' complete APPR Plan and that such plan will be fully implemented by the school district or BOCES; that there are no collective bargaining agreements, memoranda of understanding or any other agreements in any form that prevent, conflict or interfere with full implementation of the APPR Plan; and that no material changes will be made to the Plan through collective bargaining or otherwise except with the approval of the Commissioner in accordance with Subpart 30-2 of the Rules of the Board of Regents.

The school district and its collective bargaining agent(s), where applicable, also acknowledge that if approval of this APPR Plan is rejected or rescinded for any reason, any State aid increases received as a result of the Commissioner's approval of this APPR Plan will be returned or forfeited to the State pursuant to Chapter 57 of the Laws of 2012 and/or 2013, as applicable.

**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 Teacher Improvement Plan (TIP) or Principal Improvement Plan (PIP), in accordance with all applicable statutes and 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 all applicable statutes and regulations
- Assure that the district or BOCES has appeal procedures that are consistent with the statute and 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 statute, regulations 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
- Assure that any third party assessment that is administered for use to students in kindergarten, first, or second grade, and being used for APPR purposes, is consistent with the State's APPR Assessment Guidance and is not a traditional standardized assessment.

**Signatures, dates**

Superintendent Signature:      Date:

*Cheryl Plavich*      1/15/2015

Teachers Union President Signature:      Date:

*Claudia R. Hart*      1/15/15

Administrative Union President Signature:      Date:

*Wen & Weiss*      1/15/15

Board of Education President Signature:      Date:

*William D. Connor, Jr.*      1/15/15

**For APPR plans submitted to the Commissioner on or after March 2, 2014 for use in the 2014-15 school year and thereafter the school district or BOCES also makes the following specific assurance with respect to their APPR plan:**

Pursuant to Section 30-2.3(a)(4) of the Rules of the Board of Regents, the Superintendent, District Superintendent or Chancellor attests that for the 2014-15 school year and thereafter the amount of time devoted to traditional standardized assessments that are not specifically required by state or federal law for each classroom or program within a grade level does not exceed, in the aggregate, one percent of the minimum in required annual instructional hours for the grade; and the amount of time devoted to test preparation using traditional standardized assessments under standardized testing conditions for each classroom or program within a grade level does not exceed, in the aggregate, two percent of the minimum required annual instructional hours for the grade. Time devoted to teacher administered classroom quizzes or exams, portfolio reviews, performance assessments, formative assessments, and diagnostic assessments is not included in this calculation. Additionally, these calculations do not supersede the requirements of a section of the 504 plan of a qualified student with a disability or federal law relating to English language learners or the individualized education program (IEP) of a student with a disability.

Superintendent / District Superintendent / Chancellor Signature:      Date:

*Cheryl Pudinch*      1/15/2015