



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

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

August 30, 2012

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 for the 2012-2013 school year. As a reminder, we are relying on the certification and assurances that are part of your approved APPR. If any material changes are made to your approved APPR plan, your district/BOCES must submit such material changes to us for approval.

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

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

Thank you again for your hard work.

Sincerely,



John B. King,  
Commissioner

c: Dean Lucera

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

# Annual Professional Performance Reviews: 2012-13

Created Tuesday, May 15, 2012

Updated Thursday, August 30, 2012

---

## 1

### Disclaimers

The Department will review the contents of each school district's or BOCES' APPR plan as submitted using this online form, including required attachments, to determine if the plan rigorously complies with Education Law section 3012-c and subpart 30-2 of the Rules of the Board of Regents. Department approval does not imply endorsement of specific educational approaches in a district's or BOCES' plan.

The Department will not review any attachments other than those required in the online form. Any additional attachments supplied by the school district or BOCES are for informational purposes only for the teachers and principals reviewed under this APPR plan. Statements and/or materials in such additional attachments have not been approved and/or endorsed by the Department. However, the Department reserves the right to request further information from the school district or BOCES, as necessary, as part of its review.

If the Department reasonably believes through investigation or otherwise that statements made in this APPR plan are not true or accurate, it reserves the right to reject this plan at any time and/or to request additional information to determine the truth and/or accuracy of such statements.

### 1. SCHOOL DISTRICT INFORMATION

#### 1.1) School District's BEDS Number : 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) School Improvement Grant (SIG) Districts Only

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

(No response)

#### 1.4) Award Classification

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

- 
- Governor's Management Efficiency Grant
-

## 1.5) Assurances

Please check all of the boxes below:

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

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

*Re-submission to address deficiencies*

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

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

*Annual (2012-13)*

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

Created Tuesday, May 15, 2012

Updated Thursday, August 30, 2012

---

### Page 1

#### STATE-PROVIDED MEASURES OF STUDENT GROWTH

(25 points with an approved value-added measure)

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

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

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

#### 2.1) Assurances

Please check the boxes below:

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

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

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

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

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

If no State assessment or Regents exam exists:

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

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

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

State assessments, *required if one exists*

List of State-approved 3rd party assessments

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

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

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

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

## 2.2) Grades K-3 ELA

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

	ELA	Assessment
K	School-or BOCES-wide, group or team results based on State assessments	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 student performance.

Use this box, if needed, to describe the general process for assigning HEDI categories for these grades/subjects in this subcomponent. If needed, you may upload a table or graphic at 2.11, below.	We are using historical ELA data from grades 4 through 6 to determine school-wide growth to passing/proficiency targets and assign HEDI categories to K-3 teachers. (Please see tables contained in section 2.11 for district-adopted percentages/expectations aligned to HEDI bands.) We will establish growth targets based on historical data.
Highly Effective (18 - 20 points) Results are well-above state average for similar students (or District goals if no state test).	We are using historical ELA data from grades 4 through 6 to determine school-wide growth to passing/proficiency targets and assign HEDI categories to K-3 teachers. (Please see tables contained in section 2.11 for district-adopted percentages/expectations aligned to HEDI bands.) We will establish growth targets based on historical data.
Effective (9 - 17 points) Results meet state average for similar students (or District goals if no state test).	We are using historical ELA data from grades 4 through 6 to determine school-wide growth to passing/proficiency targets and assign HEDI categories to K-3 teachers. (Please see tables contained in section 2.11 for district-adopted percentages/expectations aligned to HEDI bands.) We will establish growth targets based on historical data.
Developing (3 - 8 points) Results are below state average for similar students (or District goals if no state test).	We are using historical ELA data from grades 4 through 6 to determine school-wide growth to passing/proficiency targets and assign HEDI categories to K-3 teachers. (Please see tables contained in section 2.11 for district-adopted percentages/expectations aligned to HEDI bands.) We will establish growth targets based on historical data.
Ineffective (0 - 2 points) Results are well-below state average for similar students (or District goals if no state test).	We are using historical ELA data from grades 4 through 6 to determine school-wide growth to passing/proficiency targets and assign HEDI categories to K-3 teachers. (Please see tables contained in section 2.11 for district-adopted percentages/expectations aligned to HEDI bands.) We will establish growth targets based on historical data.

## 2.3) Grades K-3 Math

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

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

<p>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>	<p>We are using historical Math data from grades 4 through 6 to determine school-wide growth to passing/proficiency targets and assign HEDI categories to K-3 teachers. (Please see tables contained in section 2.11 for district-adopted percentages/expectations aligned to HEDI bands.) We are using historical ELA data from grades 4 through 6 to determine school-wide growth to passing/proficiency targets and assign HEDI categories to K-3 teachers. (Please see tables contained in section 2.11 for district-adopted percentages/expectations aligned to HEDI bands.) We will establish growth targets based on historical data.</p>
<p>Highly Effective (18 - 20 points) Results are well-above state average for similar students (or District goals if no state test).</p>	<p>We are using historical Math data from grades 4 through 6 to determine school-wide growth to passing/proficiency targets and assign HEDI categories to K-3 teachers. (Please see tables contained in section 2.11 for district-adopted percentages/expectations aligned to HEDI bands.) We are using historical ELA data from grades 4 through 6 to determine school-wide growth to passing/proficiency targets and assign HEDI categories to K-3 teachers. (Please see tables contained in section 2.11 for district-adopted percentages/expectations aligned to HEDI bands.) We will establish growth targets based on historical data.</p>
<p>Effective (9 - 17 points) Results meet state average for similar students (or District goals if no state test).</p>	<p>We are using historical Math data from grades 4 through 6 to determine school-wide growth to passing/proficiency targets and assign HEDI categories to K-3 teachers. (Please see tables contained in section 2.11 for district-adopted percentages/expectations aligned to HEDI bands.) We are using historical ELA data from grades 4 through 6 to determine school-wide growth to passing/proficiency targets and assign HEDI categories to K-3 teachers. (Please see tables contained in section 2.11 for district-adopted percentages/expectations aligned to HEDI bands.) We will establish growth targets based on historical data.</p>
<p>Developing (3 - 8 points) Results are below state average for similar students (or District goals if no state test).</p>	<p>We are using historical Math data from grades 4 through 6 to determine school-wide growth to passing/proficiency targets and assign HEDI categories to K-3 teachers. (Please see tables contained in section 2.11 for district-adopted percentages/expectations aligned to HEDI bands.) We are using historical ELA data from grades 4 through 6 to determine school-wide growth to passing/proficiency targets and assign HEDI categories to K-3 teachers. (Please see tables contained in section 2.11 for district-adopted percentages/expectations aligned to HEDI bands.) We will establish growth targets based on historical data.</p>
<p>Ineffective (0 - 2 points) Results are well-below state average for similar students (or District goals if no state test).</p>	<p>We are using historical Math data from grades 4 through 6 to determine school-wide growth to passing/proficiency targets and assign HEDI categories to K-3 teachers. (Please see tables contained in section 2.11 for district-adopted percentages/expectations aligned to HEDI bands.) We are using historical ELA data from grades 4 through 6 to determine school-wide growth to passing/proficiency targets and assign HEDI categories to K-3 teachers. (Please see tables contained in section 2.11 for district-adopted percentages/expectations aligned to HEDI bands.) We will establish growth targets based on historical data.</p>

## 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	We have an elementary school model (k-6). Grade 6 teachers provide instruction in a self contained classroom model.
7	District, regional or BOCES-developed assessment	7th Grade District Designed Science Pre-test and Summative Evaluation

  

	Science	Assessment
8	State assessment	8th Grade State Science Assessment

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

Use this box, if needed, to describe the general process for assigning HEDI categories for these grades/subjects in this subcomponent. If needed, you may upload a table or graphic at 2.11, below.	<p>The expectation for the level of performance required for each HEDI category will be based on the percentage of students who have demonstrated growth by comparing the fall benchmark assessment to the final benchmark assessment administered in the spring. Minimally 56% of the students must demonstrate growth on the final benchmark assessments.</p> <p>The district will analyze past performance and academic history of sub-groups, including students with disabilities and ELL learners. As a result, accommodations specified in the student's learning plan or IEP will be implemented during the test administration process.</p>
Highly Effective (18 - 20 points) Results are well-above state average for similar students (or District goals if no state test).	Evidence indicates exceptional student learning gain across SLO(s), including special populations. Expectations described in SLO(s) are well above District expectations. See tables in section 2.11 for specific district-adopted aligned HEDI bands.
Effective (9 - 17 points) Results meet state average for similar students (or District goals if no state test).	Evidence indicates significant student learning gain across SLO(s), including special populations. Expectations described in SLO(s) meet District expectations. See tables in section 2.11 for specific district-adopted aligned HEDI bands.
Developing (3 - 8 points) Results are below state average for similar students (or District goals if no state test).	Expectations described in SLO(s) are nearly met. The educator may have demonstrated an impact on student learning, but overall results are below district expectations. See tables in section 2.11 for specific district-adopted aligned HEDI bands.
Ineffective (0 - 2 points) Results are well-below state average for similar students (or District goals if no state test).	Evidence indicates little to no student learning gain across SLO(s). Expectations described in SLO(s) are not met. Results are well below District expectations. See tables in section 2.11 for specific district-adopted aligned HEDI bands.

## 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	We have an elementary school model (k-6). Grade 6 teachers provide instruction in a self contained classroom model.
7	District, regional or BOCES-developed assessment	7th Grade District Designed Social Studies Pre-test and Summative Evaluation
8	District, regional or BOCES-developed assessment	8th Grade District Designed Social Studies Pre-test and Summative Evaluation

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

Use this box, if needed, to describe the general process for assigning HEDI categories for these grades/subjects in this subcomponent. If needed, you may upload a table or graphic at 2.11, below.	<p>The expectation for the level of performance required for each HEDI category will be based on the percentage of students who have demonstrated growth by comparing the fall benchmark assessment to the final benchmark assessment administered in the spring. Minimally 56% of the students must demonstrate growth on the final benchmark assessments.</p> <p>The district will analyze past performance and academic history of sub-groups, including students with disabilities and ELL learners. As a result, accommodations specified in the student's learning plan or IEP will be implemented during the test administration process.</p>
Highly Effective (18 - 20 points) Results are well-above District goals for similar students.	Evidence indicates exceptional student learning gain across SLO(s), including special populations. Expectations described in SLO(s) are well-above District expectations. See tables in section 2.11 for specific district-adopted aligned HEDI bands.
Effective (9 - 17 points) Results meet District goals for similar students.	Evidence indicates significant student learning gain across SLO(s), including special populations. Expectations described in SLO(s) meet District expectations. See tables in section 2.11 for specific district-adopted aligned HEDI bands.
Developing (3 - 8 points) Results are below District goals for similar students.	Expectations described in SLO(s) are nearly met. The educator may have demonstrated an impact on student learning, but overall results are below District expectations. See tables in section 2.11 for specific district-adopted aligned HEDI bands.
Ineffective (0 - 2 points) Results are well-below District goals for similar students.	Evidence indicates little to no student learning gain across SLO(s). Expectations described in SLO(s) are not met. Results are well-below District expectations. See tables in section 2.11 for specific district-adopted aligned HEDI bands.

## 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	Regents Assessment	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 student performance.

Use this box, if needed, to describe the general process for assigning HEDI categories for these grades/subjects in this subcomponent. If needed, you may upload a table or graphic at 2.11, below.	We are using historical data from Global History and Geography assessments in grade 10 to determine school-wide growth to passing/proficiency targets and assign HEDI categories to grades 9-10 social studies teachers. (See tables contained in section 2.11 for specific district-adopted percentages/expectations aligned to HEDI bands). In addition, we are doing the same with school-wide growth regarding the U.S. History and Government Regents and assigning HEDI points to the U.S. History teachers in grade 11.
Highly Effective (18 - 20 points) Results are well-above District goals for similar students.	We are using historical data from Global History and Geography assessments in grade 10 to determine school-wide growth to passing/proficiency targets and assign HEDI categories to grades 9-10 social studies teachers. (See tables contained in section 2.11 for specific district-adopted percentages/expectations aligned to HEDI bands). In addition, we are doing the same with school-wide growth regarding the U.S. History and Government Regents and assigning HEDI points to the U.S. History teachers in grade 11.
Effective (9 - 17 points) Results meet District goals for similar students.	We are using historical data from Global History and Geography assessments in grade 10 to determine school-wide growth to passing/proficiency targets and assign HEDI categories to grades 9-10 social studies teachers. (See tables contained in section 2.11 for specific district-adopted percentages/expectations aligned to HEDI bands). In addition, we are doing the same with school-wide growth regarding the U.S. History and Government Regents and assigning HEDI points to the U.S. History teachers in grade 11.
Developing (3 - 8 points) Results are below District goals for similar students.	We are using historical data from Global History and Geography assessments in grade 10 to determine school-wide growth to passing/proficiency targets and assign HEDI categories to grades 9-10 social studies teachers. (See tables contained in section 2.11 for specific district-adopted percentages/expectations aligned to HEDI bands). In addition, we are doing the same with school-wide growth regarding the U.S. History and Government Regents and assigning HEDI points to the U.S. History teachers in grade 11.
Ineffective (0 - 2 points) Results are well-below District goals for similar students.	We are using historical data from Global History and Geography assessments in grade 10 to determine school-wide growth to passing/proficiency targets and assign HEDI categories to grades 9-10 social studies teachers. (See tables contained in section 2.11 for specific district-adopted percentages/expectations aligned to HEDI bands). In addition, we are doing the same with school-wide growth regarding the U.S. History and Government Regents and assigning HEDI points to the U.S. History teachers in grade 11.

## 2.7) High School Science Regents Courses

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

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

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

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

Use this box, if needed, to describe the general process for assigning HEDI categories for these grades/subjects in this subcomponent. If needed, you may upload a table or graphic at 2.11, below.	We are using discrete historical data from Regents assessments in Living Environment, Earth Science, Chemistry, and Physics in order to determine school-wide growth to passing/proficiency targets and assign HEDI categories of individual teachers in Living Environment, Earth Science, Chemistry and Physics. (See tables contained in section 2.11 for specific district-adopted percentages/expectations aligned to HEDI bands).
Highly Effective (18 - 20 points) Results are well-above District goals for similar students.	We are using discrete historical data from Regents assessments in Living Environment, Earth Science, Chemistry, and Physics in order to determine school-wide growth to passing/proficiency targets and assign HEDI categories of individual teachers in Living Environment, Earth Science, Chemistry and Physics. (See tables 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.	We are using discrete historical data from Regents assessments in Living Environment, Earth Science, Chemistry, and Physics in order to determine school-wide growth to passing/proficiency targets and assign HEDI categories of individual teachers in Living Environment, Earth Science, Chemistry and Physics. (See tables 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.	We are using discrete historical data from Regents assessments in Living Environment, Earth Science, Chemistry, and Physics in order to determine school-wide growth to passing/proficiency targets and assign HEDI categories of individual teachers in Living Environment, Earth Science, Chemistry and Physics. (See tables 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.	We are using discrete historical data from Regents assessments in Living Environment, Earth Science, Chemistry, and Physics in order to determine school-wide growth to passing/proficiency

targets and assign HEDI categories of individual teachers in Living Environment, Earth Science, Chemistry and Physics. (See tables contained in section 2.11 for specific district-adopted percentages/expectations aligned to HEDI bands).

## 2.8) High School Math Regents Courses

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

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

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

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

Use this box, if needed, to describe the general process for assigning HEDI categories for these grades/subjects in this subcomponent. If needed, you may upload a table or graphic at 2.11, below.	We are using discrete historical data from Regents assessments in Integrated Algebra, Geometry and Algebra 2/Trigometry in order to determine school-wide growth to passing/proficiency targets and assign HEDI categories of individual teachers in Algebra, Geometry and Algebra 2/Trigometry. (See tables contained in section 2.11 for specific district-adopted percentages/expectations aligned to HEDI bands).
Highly Effective (18 - 20 points) Results are well-above District goals for similar students.	We are using discrete historical data from Regents assessments in Integrated Algebra, Geometry and Algebra 2/Trigometry in order to determine school-wide growth to passing/proficiency targets and assign HEDI categories of individual teachers in Algebra, Geometry and Algebra 2/Trigometry. (See tables 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.	We are using discrete historical data from Regents assessments in Integrated Algebra, Geometry and Algebra 2/Trigometry in order to determine school-wide growth to passing/proficiency targets and assign HEDI categories of individual teachers in Algebra, Geometry and Algebra 2/Trigometry. (See tables 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.	We are using discrete historical data from Regents assessments in Integrated Algebra, Geometry and Algebra 2/Trigometry in order to determine school-wide growth to passing/proficiency targets and assign HEDI categories of individual teachers in Algebra, Geometry and Algebra 2/Trigometry. (See tables 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.

We are using discrete historical data from Regents assessments in Integrated Algebra, Geometry and Algebra 2/Trigometry in order to determine school-wide growth to passing/proficiency targets and assign HEDI categories of individual teachers in Algebra, Geometry and Algebra 2/Trigometry. (See tables contained in section 2.11 for specific district-adopted percentages/expectations aligned to HEDI bands).

## 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	Regents assessment	ELA Regents assessment
Grade 10 ELA	Regents assessment	ELA Regents assessment
Grade 11 ELA	Regents assessment	ELA Regents assessment

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

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

We are using discrete historical data from Regents assessments in ELA in order to determine school-wide growth to passing/proficiency targets and assign HEDI categories of individual teachers in grades 9, 10, and 11. (See tables contained in section 2.11 for specific district-adopted percentages/expectations aligned to HEDI bands).

Highly Effective (18 - 20 points) Results are well-above District goals for similar students.

We are using discrete historical data from Regents assessments in ELA in order to determine school-wide growth to passing/proficiency targets and assign HEDI categories of individual teachers in grades 9, 10, and 11. (See tables 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.

We are using discrete historical data from Regents assessments in ELA in order to determine school-wide growth to passing/proficiency targets and assign HEDI categories of individual teachers in grades 9, 10, and 11. (See tables 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.

We are using discrete historical data from Regents assessments in ELA in order to determine school-wide growth to passing/proficiency targets and assign HEDI categories of individual teachers in grades 9, 10, and 11. (See tables 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.

We are using discrete historical data from Regents assessments in ELA in order to determine school-wide growth to

passing/proficiency targets and assign HEDI categories of individual teachers in grades 9, 10, and 11. (See tables contained in section 2.11 for specific district-adopted percentages/expectations aligned to HEDI bands).

## 2.10) All Other Courses

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

Course(s) or Subject(s)	Option	Assessment
All other High School ELA courses	School/BOCES-wide/group/team results based on State	ELA Regents Assessment
All other High School Math courses	District, Regional or BOCES-developed	District Designed Mathematics Pretest and Summative Evaluation that are Grade and Subject Specific
All other High School Science courses	School/BOCES-wide/group/team results based on State	Composite scores of 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	Combined mean scores of grades 4-6 Mathematics State Assessment (grades K-6); Combined mean scores of grades 7-8 Mathematics State Assessment (grades 7-9); ELA Regents Assessment (grades 10-12)
All Business Courses	School/BOCES-wide/group/team results based on State	Combined mean scores of grades 7-8 Mathematics State Assessment (grades 7-9); ELA Regents Assessment (grades 10-12)
ELL, K -12	School/BOCES-wide/group/team results based on State	NYSESLAT
Enrichment 4-6	School/BOCES-wide/group/team results based on State	Combined mean scores of grades 4-6 Mathematics State Assessment
Family and Consumer Science	School/BOCES-wide/group/team results based on State	Combined mean scores of grades 7-8 Mathematics State Assessment (grades 7-9); ELA Regents Assessment (grades 10-12)
Foreign Languages (LOTE): Intro through Level III/Course B	District, Regional or BOCES-developed	Grade and Subject Specific District Designed checkpoint A or B Language Assessments
Foreign Languages (LOTE): Courses IV,V, VI and Course C,D, and AP	District, Regional or BOCES-developed	Grade and Subject Specific District Designed checkpoint A or B Language Assessments
Health, 4- 6 and Secondary	School/BOCES-wide/group/team results based on State	Combined mean scores of grades 4-6 Mathematics State Assessment (grades K-6); Combined mean scores of grades 7-8 Mathematics State Assessment (grades 7-9); ELA Regents Assessment (grades 10-12)
Library Media, K - 6	School/BOCES-wide/group/team results based on State	Combined mean scores of grades 4-6 ELA State Assessment (grades K-6)

Music, K -12	School/BOCES-wide/group/team results based on State	Combined mean scores of grades 4-6 Mathematics State Assessment (grades K-6); Combined mean scores of grades 7-8 Mathematics State Assessment (grades 7-9); ELA Regents Assessment (grades 10-12)
Physical Education K-12	School/BOCES-wide/group/team results based on State	Combined mean scores of grades 4-6 Mathematics State Assessment (grades K-6); Combined mean scores of grades 7-8 Mathematics State Assessment (grades 7-9); ELA Regents Assessment (grades 10-12)
Related Support Areas K-12	School/BOCES-wide/group/team results based on State	Combined mean scores of grades 4-6 Mathematics State Assessment (grades K-6); Combined mean scores of grades 7-8 Mathematics State Assessment (grades 7-9); ELA Regents Assessment (grades 10-12)
Special Education K -6	School/BOCES-wide/group/team results based on State	Combined mean scores of grades 4-6 Mathematics State Assessment (grades K-6)
Special Education 7-12	School/BOCES-wide/group/team results based on State	Combined mean scores of grades 7-8 Mathematics State Assessment (grades 7-9); ELA Regents Assessment (grades 10-12)
Technology 7-12	School/BOCES-wide/group/team results based on State	Combined mean scores of grades 7-8 Mathematics State Assessment (grades 7-9); ELA Regents Assessment (grades 10-12)

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

Use this box, if needed, to describe the general process for assigning HEDI categories for these grades/subjects in this subcomponent. If needed, you may upload a table or graphic at 2.11, below.	See table contained in section 2.11 for specific district-adopted percentages/expectations aligned to HEDI bands.
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)

*(No response)*

## 2.11) HEDI Tables or Graphics

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

*assets/survey-uploads/5364/129976-TXEttx9bQW/TeacherPointAllocation-HEDI-REV83012.pdf*

## 2.12) Locally Developed Controls

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

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

*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://usny.nysed.gov/rttt/teachers-leaders/slo/home.html">http://usny.nysed.gov/rttt/teachers-leaders/slo/home.html</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

### 3. Local Measures (Teachers)

Created Friday, May 18, 2012

Updated Thursday, August 30, 2012

---

#### Page 1

#### Locally Selected Measures of Student Achievement or Growth

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

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

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

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

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

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

**Growth or achievement measure(s) from these options.**

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

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

Measures based on:

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

### 3.1) Grades 4-8 ELA

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

	Locally-Selected Measure from List of Approved Measures	Assessment
4	6(i) School-wide measure based on State-provided measure	Combined mean scores of ELA Assessments in grades 4,5, and 6
5	6(i) School-wide measure based on State-provided measure	Combined mean scores of ELA Assessments in grades 4,5, and 6

6	6(i) School-wide measure based on State-provided measure	Combined mean scores of ELA Assessments in grades 4,5, and 6
7	6(i) School-wide measure based on State-provided measure	Combined mean scores of ELA Assessments in grades 7 and 8
8	6(i) School-wide measure based on State-provided measure	Combined mean scores of 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 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 district-wide achievement levels compared to the State achievement average 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.	We are using ELA State Assessment data from grades 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 district-wide achievement levels compared to the State achievement average and assigning HEDI categories to grades 4 through 6 and grades 7 through 8 teachers, respectively.
Effective (8- 13 points) Results meet District- or BOCES-adopted expectations for growth or achievement for grade/subject.	We are using ELA State Assessment data from grades 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 district-wide achievement levels compared to the State achievement average and assigning HEDI categories to grades 4 through 6 and grades 7 through 8 teachers, respectively.
Developing (3 - 7 points) Results are below District- or BOCES-adopted expectations for growth or achievement for grade/subject.	We are using ELA State Assessment data from grades 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 district-wide achievement levels compared to the State achievement average and assigning HEDI categories to grades 4 through 6 and grades 7 through 8 teachers, respectively.
Ineffective (0 - 2 points) Results are well below District- or BOCES-adopted expectations for growth or achievement for grade/subject.	We are using ELA State Assessment data from grades 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 district-wide achievement levels compared to the State achievement average and assigning HEDI categories to grades 4 through 6 and grades 7 through 8 teachers, respectively.

### 3.2) Grades 4-8 Math

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

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

4	6(i) School-wide measure based on State-provided measure	Combined mean scores of Math Assessments in grades 4,5, and 6
5	6(i) School-wide measure based on State-provided measure	Combined mean scores of Math Assessments in grades 4, 5 and 6.
6	6(i) School-wide measure based on State-provided measure	Combined mean scores of Math Assessments in grades 4, 5 and 6.
7	6(i) School-wide measure based on State-provided measure	Combined mean scores of Math Assessments in grades 7 and 8
8	6(i) School-wide measure based on State-provided measure	Combined mean scores of Math 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 Math State Assessment data from grades 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 district-wide achievement levels compared to the State achievement average 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.	We are using Math State Assessment data from grades 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 district-wide achievement levels compared to the State achievement average and assigning HEDI categories to grades 4 through 6 and grades 7 through 8 teachers, respectively.
Effective (8- 13 points) Results meet District- or BOCES-adopted expectations for growth or achievement for grade/subject.	We are using Math State Assessment data from grades 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 district-wide achievement levels compared to the State achievement average and assigning HEDI categories to grades 4 through 6 and grades 7 through 8 teachers, respectively.
Developing (3 - 7 points) Results are below District- or BOCES-adopted expectations for growth or achievement for grade/subject.	We are using Math State Assessment data from grades 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 district-wide achievement levels compared to the State achievement average and assigning HEDI categories to grades 4 through 6 and grades 7 through 8 teachers, respectively.
Ineffective (0 - 2 points) Results are well below District- or BOCES-adopted expectations for growth or achievement for grade/subject.	We are using Math State Assessment data from grades 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 district-wide achievement levels compared to the State achievement average and assigning HEDI categories to grades 4 through 6 and grades 7 through 8 teachers, respectively.

### 3.3) HEDI Tables or Graphics

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

*assets/survey-uploads/5139/131097-rhJdBgDruP/TeacherPointAllocation-HEDI-REV83012.pdf*

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

**Growth or achievement measure(s) from these options.**

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

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

Measures based on:

- 1) The change in percentage of a teacher's students who achieve a specific level of performance as determined locally, on such assessments/examinations compared to those students' level of performance on such assessments/examinations in the previous school year (e.g., a three percentage point increase in students earning the proficient level (three) or better performance level on the 7th grade math State assessment compared to those same students' performance levels on the 6th grade math State assessment, or an increase in the percentage of a teacher's students earning the advanced performance level (four) on the 4th grade ELA or math State assessments compared to those students' performance levels on the 3rd grade ELA or math State assessments)
- 2) Teacher specific growth score computed by the Department based on the percent of the teacher's students earning a State determined level of growth. The methodology to translate such growth into the State-established sub-component scoring ranges shall be determined locally
- 3) Teacher specific achievement or growth score computed in a manner determined locally based on a measure of student performance on the State assessments, Regents examinations and/or Department approved alternative examinations other than the measure described in 1) or 2), above
- 4) Student growth or achievement computed in a manner determined locally based on a State-approved 3rd party assessment
- 5) Student growth or achievement computed in a manner determined locally based on a district, regional or BOCES-developed assessment that is rigorous and comparable across classrooms
- 6) A school-wide measure of either student growth or achievement based on either:
  - (i) A State-provided student growth score covering all students in the school that took the State assessment in ELA or Math in Grades 4-8; or

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

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

### 3.4) Grades K-3 ELA

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

	Locally-Selected Measure from List of Approved Measures	Assessment
K	6(ii) School-wide measure computed locally	AIMSweb
1	6(ii) School-wide measure computed locally	AIMSweb
2	6(ii) School-wide measure computed locally	AIMSweb
3	6(ii) School-wide measure computed locally	AIMSweb

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

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

Use this box, if needed, to describe the general process for assigning HEDI categories for these grades/subjects in this subcomponent. If needed, you may upload a table or graphic at 3.13, below.	For grades K-3, we selected a NYSED third party assessment, AIMSweb for ELA and Math, for the local assessment. The assessment will be administered to students in grades K-3 and will measure Reading, Early Literacy, and Early Numeracy. The local assignment of points will be based upon the student growth scores resulting from the comparison of the fall (Sept. 19-Oct. 1), winter (Jan. 14-25), and spring (May 21-June 1) administrations.
Highly Effective (18-20 points) Results are well above District- or BOCES-adopted expectations for growth or achievement for grade/subject.	For grades K-3, we selected a NYSED third party assessment, AIMSweb for ELA and Math, for the local assessment. The assessment will be administered to students in grades K-3 and will measure Reading, Early Literacy, and Early Numeracy. The local assignment of points will be based upon the student growth scores resulting from the comparison of the fall (Sept. 19-Oct. 1), winter (Jan. 14-25), and spring (May 21-June 1) administrations.
Effective (9-17 points) Results meet District- or BOCES-adopted expectations for growth or achievement for grade/subject.	For grades K-3, we selected a NYSED third party assessment, AIMSweb for ELA and Math, for the local assessment. The assessment will be administered to students in grades K-3 and will measure Reading, Early Literacy, and Early Numeracy. The local assignment of points will be based upon the student growth scores resulting from the comparison of the fall (Sept. 19-Oct. 1), winter (Jan. 14-25), and spring (May 21-June 1) administrations.

Developing (3 - 8 points) Results are below District- or BOCES-adopted expectations for growth or achievement for grade/subject.	For grades K-3, we selected a NYSED third party assessment, AIMSweb for ELA and Math, for the local assessment. The assessment will be administered to students in grades K-3 and will measure Reading, Early Literacy, and Early Numeracy. The local assignment of points will be based upon the student growth scores resulting from the comparison of the fall (Sept. 19-Oct. 1), winter (Jan. 14-25), and spring (May 21-June 1) administrations.
--	---

Ineffective (0 - 2 points) Results are well below District- or BOCES-adopted expectations for growth or achievement for grade/subject.	For grades K-3, we selected a NYSED third party assessment, AIMSweb for ELA and Math, for the local assessment. The assessment will be administered to students in grades K-3 and will measure Reading, Early Literacy, and Early Numeracy. The local assignment of points will be based upon the student growth scores resulting from the comparison of the fall (Sept. 19-Oct. 1), winter (Jan. 14-25), and spring (May 21-June 1) administrations.
--	---

### 3.5) Grades K-3 Math

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

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

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

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

Use this box, if needed, to describe the general process for assigning HEDI categories for these grades/subjects in this subcomponent. If needed, you may upload a table or graphic at 3.13, below.	For grades K-3, we selected a NYSED third party assessment, AIMSweb for ELA and Math, for the local assessment. The assessment will be administered to students in grades K-3 and will measure Reading, Early Literacy, and Early Numeracy. The local assignment of points will be based upon the student growth scores resulting from the comparison of the fall (Sept. 19-Oct. 1), winter (Jan. 14-25), and spring (May 21-June 1) administrations.
---	---

Highly Effective (18-20 points) Results are well above District- or BOCES-adopted expectations for growth or achievement for grade/subject.	For grades K-3, we selected a NYSED third party assessment, AIMSweb for ELA and Math, for the local assessment. The assessment will be administered to students in grades K-3 and will measure Reading, Early Literacy, and Early Numeracy. The local assignment of points will be based upon the student growth scores resulting from the comparison of the fall (Sept. 19-Oct. 1), winter (Jan. 14-25), and spring (May 21-June 1) administrations.
---	---

Effective (9-17 points) Results meet District- or BOCES-adopted expectations for growth or achievement for grade/subject.	For grades K-3, we selected a NYSED third party assessment, AIMSweb for ELA and Math, for the local assessment. The assessment will be administered to students in grades K-3 and will measure Reading, Early Literacy, and Early Numeracy. The local assignment of points will be based upon the student growth scores resulting from the comparison of the fall (Sept. 19-Oct. 1), winter (Jan. 14-25), and spring (May 21-June 1) administrations.
Developing (3 - 8 points) Results are below District -or BOCES-adopted expectations for growth or achievement for grade/subject.	For grades K-3, we selected a NYSED third party assessment, AIMSweb for ELA and Math, for the local assessment. The assessment will be administered to students in grades K-3 and will measure Reading, Early Literacy, and Early Numeracy. The local assignment of points will be based upon the student growth scores resulting from the comparison of the fall (Sept. 19-Oct. 1), winter (Jan. 14-25), and spring (May 21-June 1) administrations.
Ineffective (0 - 2 points) Results are well below District- or BOCES-adopted expectations for growth or achievement for grade/subject.	For grades K-3, we selected a NYSED third party assessment, AIMSweb for ELA and Math, for the local assessment. The assessment will be administered to students in grades K-3 and will measure Reading, Early Literacy, and Early Numeracy. The local assignment of points will be based upon the student growth scores resulting from the comparison of the fall (Sept. 19-Oct. 1), winter (Jan. 14-25), and spring (May 21-June 1) administrations.

### 3.6) Grades 6-8 Science

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

	Locally-Selected Measure from List of Approved Measures	Assessment
6	Not applicable	We have an elementary school model (k -6). Grade 6 teachers provided instruction in a self contained classroom model.
7	5) District, regional, or BOCES–developed assessments	7th Grade State Science District Designed pretest and summative evaluation.
8	6(i) School-wide measure based on State-provided measure	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 district-designed science pre-test and summative evaluation For 8th grade, we are using 8th grade Science State assessment data for grades 7 through 8 teachers in order to determine district-wide achievement levels compared to the State achievement average and assigning HEDI categories to grades 7 through 8 teachers.
Highly Effective (18 - 20 points) Results are well above District- or BOCES-adopted expectations for growth or achievement for grade/subject.	For the 7th grade science, we will use a district-designed science pre-test and summative evaluation For 8th grade, we are using 8th grade Science State assessment data for grades 7 through 8 teachers in order to determine district-wide achievement levels compared to the State achievement average and assigning HEDI

categories to grades 7 through 8 teachers.

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

For the 7th grade science, we will use a district-designed science pre-test and summative evaluation For 8th grade, we are using 8th grade Science State assessment data for grades 7 through 8 teachers in order to determine district-wide achievement levels compared to the State achievement average and assigning HEDI categories to grades 7 through 8 teachers.

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

For the 7th grade science, we will use a district-designed science pre-test and summative evaluation For 8th grade, we are using 8th grade Science State assessment data for grades 7 through 8 teachers in order to determine district-wide achievement levels compared to the State achievement average and assigning HEDI categories to grades 7 through 8 teachers.

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

For the 7th grade science, we will use a district-designed science pre-test and summative evaluation For 8th grade, we are using 8th grade Science State assessment data for grades 7 through 8 teachers in order to determine district-wide achievement levels compared to the State achievement average and assigning HEDI categories to grades 7 through 8 teachers.

### 3.7) Grades 6-8 Social Studies

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

	Locally-Selected Measure from List of Approved Measures	Assessment
6	Not applicable	We have an elementary school model (k -6). Grade 6 teachers provided instruction in
7	5) District, regional, or BOCES–developed assessments	7th Grade Social Studies District Designed pretest and summative evaluation
8	5) District, regional, or BOCES–developed assessments	8th Grade Social Studies District Designed pretest and summative evaluation

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 are using 8th grade Social Studies State assessment data for grades 7 through 8 teachers in order to determine district-wide achievement levels compared to the State achievement average and assigning HEDI categories to grades 7 through 8 teachers.

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

For the 7th and 8th grade social studies, we are using 8th grade Social Studies State assessment data for grades 7 through 8 teachers in order to determine district-wide achievement levels compared to the State achievement average and assigning HEDI categories to grades 7 through 8 teachers.

Effective (9 - 17 points) Results meet District- or BOCES-adopted expectations for growth or achievement for grade/subject.	For the 7th and 8th grade social studies, we are using 8th grade Social Studies State assessment data for grades 7 through 8 teachers in order to determine district-wide achievement levels compared to the State achievement average and assigning HEDI categories to grades 7 through 8 teachers.
Developing (3 - 8 points) Results are below District- or BOCES-adopted expectations for growth or achievement for grade/subject.	For the 7th and 8th grade social studies, we are using 8th grade Social Studies State assessment data for grades 7 through 8 teachers in order to determine district-wide achievement levels compared to the State achievement average and assigning HEDI categories to grades 7 through 8 teachers.
Ineffective (0 - 2 points) Results are well below District- or BOCES-adopted expectations for growth or achievement for grade/subject.	For the 7th and 8th grade social studies, we are using 8th grade Social Studies State assessment data for grades 7 through 8 teachers in order to determine district-wide achievement levels compared to the State achievement average and assigning HEDI categories to grades 7 through 8 teachers.

### 3.8) High School Social Studies

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

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

	Locally-Selected Measure from List of Approved Measures	Assessment
Global 1	6(i) School-wide measure based on State-provided measure	Global History and Geography Regents Assessment
Global 2	6(i) School-wide measure based on State-provided measure	Global History and Geography Regents Assessment
American History	6(i) School-wide measure based on State-provided measure	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 Geography Regents data for grade 11 teachers. The data from each Regents, we be used to determine district-wide achievement levels compared to the State Regents average and assigning HEDI categories to grades 9 and 10 and grade 11, respectively. Achievement targets will be set after gathering historical data.
Highly Effective (18 - 20 points) Results are well above District- or BOCES-adopted expectations for growth or achievement for grade/subject.	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 Geography

Regents data for grade 11 teachers. The data from each Regents, we be used to determine district-wide achievement levels compared to the State Regents average and assigning HEDI categories to grades 9 and 10 and grade 11, respectively. Achievement targets will be set after gathering historical data.

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

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 Geography Regents data for grade 11 teachers. The data from each Regents, we be used to determine district-wide achievement levels compared to the State Regents average and assigning HEDI categories to grades 9 and 10 and grade 11, respectively. Achievement targets will be set after gathering historical data.

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

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 Geography Regents data for grade 11 teachers. The data from each Regents, we be used to determine district-wide achievement levels compared to the State Regents average and assigning HEDI categories to grades 9 and 10 and grade 11, respectively. Achievement targets will be set after gathering historical data.

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

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 Geography Regents data for grade 11 teachers. The data from each Regents, we be used to determine district-wide achievement levels compared to the State Regents average and assigning HEDI categories to grades 9 and 10 and grade 11, respectively. Achievement targets will be set after gathering historical data.

### 3.9) High School Science

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

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

	Locally-Selected Measure from List of Approved Measures	Assessment
Living Environment	6(i) School-wide measure based on State-provided measure	Living Environment Regents Assessment
Earth Science	6(i) School-wide measure based on State-provided measure	Earth Science Regents Assessment
Chemistry	6(i) School-wide measure based on State-provided measure	Chemistry Regents Assessment
Physics	6(i) School-wide measure based on State-provided measure	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.

<p>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.</p>	<p>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 Geography Regents data for grade 11 teachers. The data from each Regents, we be used to determine district-wide achievement levels compared to the State Regents average and assigning HEDI categories to grades 9 and 10 and grade 11, respectively.</p>
<p>Highly Effective (18-20 points) Results are well above District- or BOCES-adopted expectations for growth or achievement for grade/subject.</p>	<p>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 Geography Regents data for grade 11 teachers. The data from each Regents, we be used to determine district-wide achievement levels compared to the State Regents average and assigning HEDI categories to grades 9 and 10 and grade 11, respectively.</p>
<p>Developing (3 - 8 points) Results are below District- or BOCES-adopted expectations for growth or achievement for grade/subject.</p>	<p>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 Geography Regents data for grade 11 teachers. The data from each Regents, we be used to determine district-wide achievement levels compared to the State Regents average and assigning HEDI categories to grades 9 and 10 and grade 11, respectively.</p>
<p>Effective (9 - 17points) Results meet District- or BOCES-adopted expectations for growth or achievement for grade/subject.</p>	<p>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 Geography Regents data for grade 11 teachers. The data from each Regents, we be used to determine district-wide achievement levels compared to the State Regents average and assigning HEDI categories to grades 9 and 10 and grade 11, respectively.</p>
<p>Ineffective (0 - 2 points) Results are well below District- or BOCES-adopted expectations for growth or achievement for grade/subject.</p>	<p>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 Geography Regents data for grade 11 teachers. The data from each Regents, we be used to determine district-wide achievement levels compared to the State Regents average and assigning HEDI categories to grades 9 and 10 and grade 11, respectively.</p>

### 3.10) High School Math

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

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

	Locally-Selected Measure from List of Approved Measures	Assessment
Algebra 1	6(i) School-wide measure based on State-provided measure	Algebra I Regents Assessment
Geometry	6(i) School-wide measure based on State-provided measure	Geometry Regents Assessment

Algebra 2	5) District, regional, or BOCES–developed assessments	Algebra 2 District Designed Pretest and Summative Evaluation
-----------	---	--

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

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

Use this box, if needed, to describe the general process for assigning HEDI categories for these grades/subjects in this subcomponent. If needed, you may upload a table or graphic at 3.13, below.	For the Algebra I, we will use the Algebra I Regents. For Geometry, we will use the Geometry Regents. For Algebra 2/Trigometry, we will use a District designed pretest and summative evaluation. The data from each Regents and the District evaluation will be used to determine district-wide achievement levels compared to the State Regents average and assigning HEDI categories to grades 9, 10 and 11.
Highly Effective (18 - 20 points) Results are well above District- or BOCES-adopted expectations for growth or achievement for grade/subject.	For the Algebra I, we will use the Algebra I Regents. For Geometry, we will use the Geometry Regents. For Algebra 2/Trigometry, we will use a District designed pretest and summative evaluation. The data from each Regents and the District evaluation will be used to determine district-wide achievement levels compared to the State Regents average and assigning HEDI categories to grades 9, 10 and 11.
Effective (9 - 17 points) Results meet District- or BOCES-adopted expectations for growth or achievement for grade/subject.	For the Algebra I, we will use the Algebra I Regents. For Geometry, we will use the Geometry Regents. For Algebra 2/Trigometry, we will use a District designed pretest and summative evaluation. The data from each Regents and the District evaluation will be used to determine district-wide achievement levels compared to the State Regents average and assigning HEDI categories to grades 9, 10 and 11.
Developing (3 - 8 points) Results are below District- or BOCES-adopted expectations for growth or achievement for grade/subject.	For the Algebra I, we will use the Algebra I Regents. For Geometry, we will use the Geometry Regents. For Algebra 2/Trigometry, we will use a District designed pretest and summative evaluation. The data from each Regents and the District evaluation will be used to determine district-wide achievement levels compared to the State Regents average and assigning HEDI categories to grades 9, 10 and 11.
Ineffective (0 - 2 points) Results are well below District- or BOCES-adopted expectations for growth or achievement for grade/subject.	For the Algebra I, we will use the Algebra I Regents. For Geometry, we will use the Geometry Regents. For Algebra 2/Trigometry, we will use a District designed pretest and summative evaluation. The data from each Regents and the District evaluation will be used to determine district-wide achievement levels compared to the State Regents average and assigning HEDI categories to grades 9, 10 and 11.

### 3.11) High School English Language Arts

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

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

	Locally-Selected Measure from List of Approved Measures	Assessment
Grade 9 ELA	6(i) School-wide measure based on State-provided measure	ELA Regents Assessment
Grade 10 ELA	6(i) School-wide measure based on State-provided measure	ELA Regents Assessment
Grade 11 ELA	6(i) School-wide measure based on State-provided measure	ELA Regents Assessment

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

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

Use this box, if needed, to describe the general process for assigning HEDI categories for these grades/subjects in this subcomponent. If needed, you may upload a table or graphic at 3.13, below.	We are using ELA Regents data for grades 9 through 11 teachers in order to determine district-wide achievement levels compared to the State achievement average and assigning HEDI categories to grades 9 through 11.
Highly Effective (18 - 20 points) Results are well above District- or BOCES-adopted expectations for growth or achievement for grade/subject.	We are using ELA Regents data for grades 9 through 11 teachers in order to determine district-wide achievement levels compared to the State achievement average and assigning HEDI categories to grades 9 through 11.
Effective (9 - 17 points) Results meet District- or BOCES-adopted expectations for growth or achievement for grade/subject.	We are using ELA Regents data for grades 9 through 11 teachers in order to determine district-wide achievement levels compared to the State achievement average and assigning HEDI categories to grades 9 through 11.
Developing (3 - 8 points) Results are below District- or BOCES-adopted expectations for growth or achievement for grade/subject.	We are using ELA Regents data for grades 9 through 11 teachers in order to determine district-wide achievement levels compared to the State achievement average and assigning HEDI categories to grades 9 through 11.
Ineffective (0 - 2 points) Results are well below District- or BOCES-adopted expectations for growth or achievement for grade/subject.	We are using ELA Regents data for grades 9 through 11 teachers in order to determine district-wide achievement levels compared to the State achievement average and assigning HEDI categories to grades 9 through 11.

### 3.12) All Other Courses

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

Course(s) or Subject(s)	Locally-Selected Measure from List of Approved Measures	Assessment
All other High School ELA courses	6(i) School-wide measure based on State-provided measure	ELA Regents Assessment
All other High School Math courses	5) District/regional/BOCES-developed	District Designed Mathematics Pretest and Summative Evaluation that are Grade and Subject Specific

All other High School Science courses	6(i) School-wide measure based on State-provided measure	Composite scores of Chemistry and Physics Regents Assessments
All other High School Social Studies courses	6(i) School-wide measure based on State-provided measure	United States History and Government Regents Assessment
Art, K -12	6(i) School-wide measure based on State-provided measure	Combined mean scores of grades 4-6 Mathematics State Assessment (grades K-6); Combined mean scores of grades 7-8 Mathematics State Assessment (grades 7-9); ELA Regents Assessment (grades 10-12)
All Business Courses	6(i) School-wide measure based on State-provided measure	Combined mean scores of grades 7-8 Mathematics State Assessment (grades 7-9); ELA Regents Assessment (grades 10-12)
ELL, K-12	6(i) School-wide measure based on State-provided measure	Combined mean scores of grades 4-6 Mathematics State Assessment (grades K-6); Combined mean scores of grades 7-8 Mathematics State Assessment (grades 7-9); ELA Regents Assessment (grades 10-12)
Enrichment 4-6	7) Student Learning Objectives	Combined mean scores of grades 4-6 Mathematics State Assessment
Family and Consumer Science	6(i) School-wide measure based on State-provided measure	Combined mean scores of grades 7-8 Mathematics State Assessment (grades 7-9); ELA Regents Assessment (grades 10-12)
Foreign Languages (LOTE): Intro through Level III/Course B	5) District/regional/BOCES-developed	Grade and Subject Specific District Designed checkpoint A or B Language Assessments
Foreign Languages (LOTE):	5) District/regional/BOCES-developed	Grade and Subject Specific District Designed checkpoint A or B Language Assessments
Health 4-6 and Secondary	6(i) School-wide measure based on State-provided measure	Combined mean scores of grades 4-6 Mathematics State Assessment (grades K-6); Combined mean scores of grades 7-8 Mathematics State Assessment (grades 7-9); ELA Regents Assessment (grades 10-12)
Library Media, K-6	6(i) School-wide measure based on State-provided measure	Combined mean scores of grades 4-6 ELA State Assessment (grades K-6)
Music, K-12	6(i) School-wide measure based on State-provided measure	Combined mean scores of grades 4-6 Mathematics State Assessment (grades K-6); Combined mean scores of grades 7-8 Mathematics State Assessment (grades 7-9); ELA Regents Assessment (grades 10-12)
Physical Education, K-12	6(i) School-wide measure based on State-provided measure	Combined mean scores of grades 4-6 Mathematics State Assessment (grades K-6); Combined mean scores of grades 7-8 Mathematics State Assessment (grades 7-9); ELA Regents Assessment (grades 10-12)
Related Support Areas, K-12	7) Student Learning Objectives	Combined mean scores of grades 4-6 Mathematics State Assessment (grades K-6); Combined mean scores of grades 7-8 Mathematics State Assessment (grades 7-9); ELA Regents Assessment (grades 10-12)
Special Education, K-6	6(i) School-wide measure based on State-provided measure	Combined mean scores of grades 4-6 Mathematics State Assessment (grades K-6)
Special Education, 7-12	6(i) School-wide measure based on State-provided measure	Combined mean scores of grades 7-8 Mathematics State Assessment (grades 7-9); ELA Regents Assessment (grades 10-12)

Technology, 7-12	6(i) School-wide measure based on State-provided measure	Combined mean scores of grades 7-8 Mathematics State Assessment (grades 7-9); ELA 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 all courses above, using State Assessment data, we will target District-wide achievement levels compared to the state achievement average and assign HEDI categories to the teachers. For the Foreign Language (LOTE) and Math, a local achievement calculator will be in place in order to determine teachers' HEDI scores.
Highly Effective (18 - 20 points) Results are well above District- or BOCES -adopted expectations for growth or achievement for grade/subject.	For all courses above, using State Assessment data, we will target District-wide achievement levels compared to the state achievement average and assign HEDI categories to the teachers. For the Foreign Language (LOTE) and Math, a local achievement calculator will be in place in order to determine teachers' HEDI scores.
Effective (9 - 17 points) Results meet District- or BOCES-adopted expectations for growth or achievement for grade/subject.	For all courses above, using State Assessment data, we will target District-wide achievement levels compared to the state achievement average and assign HEDI categories to the teachers. For the Foreign Language (LOTE) and Math, a local achievement calculator will be in place in order to determine teachers' HEDI scores.
Developing (3 - 8 points) Results are below District- or BOCES-adopted expectations for growth or achievement for grade/subject.	For all courses above, using State Assessment data, we will target District-wide achievement levels compared to the state achievement average and assign HEDI categories to the teachers. For the Foreign Language (LOTE) and Math, a local achievement calculator will be in place in order to determine teachers' HEDI scores. .
Ineffective (0 - 2 points) Results are well below District- or BOCES-adopted expectations for growth or achievement for grade/subject.	For all courses above, using State Assessment data, we will target District-wide achievement levels compared to the state achievement average and assign HEDI categories to the teachers. For the Foreign Language (LOTE) and Math, a local achievement calculator will be in place in order to determine teachers' HEDI scores.

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

*(No response)*

### 3.13) HEDI Tables or Graphics

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

*assets/survey-uploads/5139/131097-y92vNseFa4/TeacherPointAllocation-HEDI-REV83012.pdf*

### 3.14) Locally Developed Controls

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

*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

## 4. Other Measures of Effectiveness (Teachers)

Created Friday, May 18, 2012

Updated Monday, July 02, 2012

---

### Page 1

#### 4.1) Teacher Practice Rubric

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

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

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

*Danielson's Framework for Teaching*

*(No response)*

#### 4.2) Points Within Other Measures

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

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

Is the following points assignment applicable to all teachers?

*Yes*

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

*(No response)*

Multiple (at least two) classroom observations by principal or other trained administrator, at least one of which must be unannounced [at least 31 points]	40
One or more observation(s) by trained independent evaluators	(No response)
Observations by trained in-school peer teachers	(No response)
Feedback from students using State-approved survey tool	(No response)
Feedback from parents/caregivers using State-approved survey tool	(No response)
Structured reviews of lesson plans, student portfolios and other teacher artifacts	20

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

(No response)

### 4.3) Survey Tools (if applicable)

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

(No response)

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

(No response)

(No response)

### 4.4) Assurances

Please check all of the boxes below:

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

### 4.5) Process for Assigning Points and Determining HEDI Ratings

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

*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/5091/131050-eka9yMJ855/APPRprocessforassigningpoints.docm](#)

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

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

By trained in-school peer teachers or other trained reviewers

Formal/Long	0
Informal/Short	0

Independent evaluators

Formal/Long	0
Informal/Short	0

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

- 
- In Person
- 

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

- 
- In Person
- 

## 4.7) Observations of Tenured Teachers

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

By building principals or other trained administrators

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

By trained in-school peer teachers or other trained reviewers

Formal/Long	0
Informal/Short	0

Independent evaluators

Formal/Long	0
Informal/Short	0

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

- 
- In Person
- 

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

- 
- In Person
-

# 5. Composite Scoring (Teachers)

Created Friday, May 18, 2012

Updated Monday, July 02, 2012

---

## Page 1

### **Standards for Rating Categories**

#### **Growth or Comparable Measures**

#### **Locally-selected Measures of**

#### **growth or achievement**

#### **Other Measures of Effectiveness**

#### **(Teacher and Leader standards)**

#### **Highly**

#### **Effective**

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

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

Overall performance and results exceed NYS Teaching Standards.

#### **Effective**

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

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

Overall performance and results meet NYS Teaching Standards.

#### **Developing**

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

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

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

#### **Ineffective**

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

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

Overall performance and results do not meet NYS Teaching Standards.

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

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

**2012-13 where there is no Value-Added measure**

**Growth or Comparable Measures**

**Locally-selected Measures of**

**growth or achievement**

**Other Measures of Effectiveness**

**(60 points)**

**Overall**

**Composite Score**

**Highly Effective**

**18-20**

**18-20**

**Ranges determined locally--see below**

**91-100**

**Effective**

**9-17**

**9-17**

**75-90**

**Developing**

**3-8**

**3-8**

**65-74**

**Ineffective**

**0-2**

**0-2**

**0-64**

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

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

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

**2012-13 where Value-Added growth measure applies**

**Growth or Comparable Measures**

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

**Other Measures of Effectiveness**

**(60 points)**

**Overall**

**Composite Score**

**Highly Effective**

**22-25**

**14-15**

**Ranges determined locally--see above**

**91-100**

**Effective**

**10-21**

**8-13**

**75-90**

**Developing**

**3-9**

**3-7**

**65-74**

**Ineffective**

**0-2**

**0-2**

**0-64**

## 6. Additional Requirements - Teachers

Created Friday, May 18, 2012

Updated Tuesday, August 28, 2012

---

### Page 1

#### 6.1) Assurances -- Improvement Plans

Please check the boxes below:

6.1) Assurances -- Improvement Plans   Assure that teachers who receive a Developing or Ineffective rating will receive a Teacher Improvement Plan (TIP) within 10 school days from the opening of classes in the school year following the performance year	Checked
6.1) Assurances -- Improvement Plans   Assure that TIP plans shall include: identification of needed areas of improvement, a timeline for achieving improvement, the manner in which the improvement will be assessed, and, where appropriate, differentiated activities to support a teacher's improvement in those areas	Checked

#### 6.2) Attachment: Teacher Improvement Plan Forms

As a required attachment to this APPR plan, upload the TIP forms that are used in the school district or BOCES. For a list of supported file types, go to the Resources folder (above) and click Technical Tips.

[assets/survey-uploads/5265/131147-Df0w3Xx5v6/Three Village Central School Districttipforms.docm](#)

#### 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 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 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.

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 and Certification of Lead Evaluators and Evaluators

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

*The district has an obligation to provide the appropriate training for all lead evaluators prior to the completion of any 2012-2013 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 April 2012 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 participated in intensive APPR training offered by BOCES. 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.*

*Throughout the 2012-2013 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

---

• Checked

---

## 6.6) Assurances -- Teachers

Please check all of the boxes below:

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

## 6.7) Assurances -- Data

Please check all of the boxes below:

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

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

Created Wednesday, June 06, 2012  
Updated Wednesday, August 15, 2012

## Page 1

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

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

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

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

K-6
7-9
10-12
(No response)
(No response)
(No response)
(No response)

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

Please check the boxes below:

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

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

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

State assessments, *required if one exists*

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

List of State-approved 3rd party assessments

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

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

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

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

Use this box, if needed, to describe the process for assigning HEDI categories in this subcomponent. If needed, you may upload a table or graphic below.	(No response)
Highly Effective (18 - 20 points) Results are well above state average for similar students (or District goals if no state test).	Evidence indicates that principal performance results in student learning that exceeds district expectations.
Effective (9 - 17 points) Results meet state average for similar students (or District goals if no state test).	Evidence indicates that principal performance results in student learning that meets district expectations.
Developing (3 - 8 points) Results are below state average for similar students (or District goals if no state test).	Evidence indicates that principal performance results in student learning that approaches, but does not fully meet district expectations.
Ineffective (0 - 2 points) Results are well below state average for similar students (or District goals if no state test).	Evidence indicates that principal performance results in student learning that does not meet district expectations.

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

*(No response)*

## 7.4) Special Considerations for Comparable Growth Measures

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

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

(No response)

## 7.5) Principals with More Than One Growth Measure

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

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

## 7.6) Assurances -- Comparable Growth Measures

Please check all of the boxes below:

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

# 8. Local Measures (Principals)

Created Friday, June 08, 2012

Updated Thursday, August 30, 2012

---

## Page 1

### Locally-Selected Measures of Student Achievement or Growth

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

Grade Configuration	Locally-Selected Measure from List of Approved Measures	Assessment
K-6	(d) measures used by district for teacher evaluation	AIMSWeb
7-9	(a) achievement on State assessments	Combined State Math Assessments for grades 7 and 8
10-12	(f) % of students with advanced Regents or honors	Regents Assessments

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.	(No response)
Highly Effective (14 - 15 points) Results are well above District- or BOCES-adopted expectations for growth or achievement for grade/subject.	Evidence indicates that principal performance results in student learning that exceeds district expectations.
Effective (8- 13 points) Results meet District- or BOCES-adopted expectations for growth or achievement for grade/subject.	Evidence indicates that principal performance results in student learning that meets district expectations.
Developing (3 - 7 points) Results are below District- or BOCES-adopted expectations for growth or achievement for grade/subject.	Evidence indicates that principal performance results in student learning that approaches, but does not fully meet district expectations.
Ineffective (0 - 2 points) Results are well below District- or BOCES-adopted expectations for growth or achievement for grade/subject.	Evidence indicates that principal performance results in student learning that does not meet district expectations.

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

(No response)

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

[assets/survey-uploads/5366/140574-qBFVOWF7fC/PrincipalPointAllocation-HEDI\(REV8-30-12\).pdf](#)

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

*(i) student learning objectives (only allowable for principals in programs/buildings without a Value-Added measure for the State*

Growth subcomponent). Used with one of the following assessments: State, State-approved 3rd party, or a District, regional, or BOCES-developed assessment that is rigorous and comparable across classrooms

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

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

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.	(No response)
Highly Effective (18 - 20 points) Results are well above District- or BOCES-adopted expectations for growth or achievement for grade/subject.	Evidence indicates that principal performance results in student learning that exceeds district expectations.
Effective (9- 17 points) Results meet District- or BOCES-adopted expectations for growth or achievement for grade/subject.	Evidence indicates that principal performance results in student learning that meets district expectations.
Developing (3 - 8 points) Results are below District- or BOCES-adopted expectations for growth or achievement for grade/subject.	Evidence indicates that principal performance results in student learning that approaches, but does not fully meet district expectations.
Ineffective (0 - 2 points) Results are well below District- or BOCES-adopted expectations for growth or achievement for grade/subject.	Evidence indicates that principal performance results in student learning that does not meet district expectations.

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.

### 8.3) Locally Developed Controls

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

*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

# 9. Other Measures of Effectiveness (Principals)

Created Thursday, July 05, 2012

## Page 1

### 9.1) Principal Practice Rubric

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

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

*Multidimensional Principal Performance Rubric*

*(No response)*

### 9.2) Points Within Other Measures

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

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

Is the following points assignment for all principals?

*Yes*

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

*(No response)*

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

Broad assessment of principal leadership and management actions based on the practice rubric by the supervisor, a trained administrator or a trained independent evaluator. This must incorporate multiple school visits by supervisor, trained administrator, or trained independent evaluator, at least one of which must be from a supervisor, and at least one of which must be unannounced. [At least 31 points]	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, combine them into a single file, and upload as an attachment for review. Click here for a downloadable copy of Form 9.2. (MS Word)

(No response)

### 9.3) Assurances -- Goals

Please check the boxes below (if applicable):

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

### 9.4) Sources of Evidence (if applicable)

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

9.4) Sources of Evidence (if applicable)   Structured feedback from teachers using a State-approved tool	(No response)
9.4) Sources of Evidence (if applicable)   Structured feedback from students using a State-approved tool	(No response)
9.4) Sources of Evidence (if applicable)   Structured feedback from families using a State-approved tool	(No response)
9.4) Sources of Evidence (if applicable)   School visits by other trained evaluators	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 posted, this form will be updated with dropdown menus of approved survey tools.

(No response)

(No response)

(No response)

### 9.6) Assurances

Please check all of the boxes below:

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

## 9.7) Process for Assigning Points and Determining HEDI Ratings

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

*Utilizing the MMPR- Multidimensional Professional Performance Review, the six domains will be provided with a score as follows:*  
*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*  
*In the seventh domain, which is based on goal setting and attainment a maximum of ten points may be achieved.*  
*The total score will be derived by adding up the scores for each domain. A MMPR point distribution chart is attached.*

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

<assets/survey-uploads/5143/148713-pMADJ4gk6R/MPPRpointdistributionchart.docm>

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

## 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 Friday, May 18, 2012

Updated Thursday, July 05, 2012

---

## Page 1

### **Standards for Rating Categories**

#### **Growth or Comparable Measures**

#### **Locally-selected Measures of**

#### **growth or achievement**

#### **Other Measures of Effectiveness**

#### **(Teacher and Leader standards)**

#### **Highly**

#### **Effective**

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

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

Overall performance and results exceed ISLLC leadership standards.

#### **Effective**

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

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

Overall performance and results meet ISLLC leadership standards.

#### **Developing**

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

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

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

#### **Ineffective**

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

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

Overall performance and results do not meet ISLLC leadership standards.

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

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

**2012-13 where there is no Value-Added measure**

**Growth or Comparable Measures**

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

**Other Measures of Effectiveness**

**(60 points)**

**Overall**

**Composite Score**

**Highly Effective**

**18-20**

**18-20**

**Ranges determined locally--see below**

**91-100**

**Effective**

**9-17**

**9-17**

**75-90**

**Developing**

**3-8**

**3-8**

**65-74**

**Ineffective**

**0-2**

**0-2**

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

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

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

**2012-13 where Value-Added growth measure applies**

**Growth or Comparable Measures**

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

**Other Measures of Effectiveness**

**(60 points)**

**Overall**

**Composite Score**

**Highly Effective**

22-25

14-15

Ranges determined locally--see above

91-100

**Effective**

10-21

8-13

75-90

**Developing**

3-9

3-7

**65-74**

**Ineffective**

**0-2**

**0-2**

**0-64**

# 11. Additional Requirements - Principals

Created Friday, June 08, 2012

Updated Thursday, August 30, 2012

## Page 1

### 11.1) Assurances -- Improvement Plans

Please check the boxes below.

11.1) Assurances -- Improvement Plans   Assure that principals who receive a Developing or Ineffective rating will receive a Principal Improvement Plan (PIP) within 10 school days from the opening of classes in the school year following the performance year	Checked
11.1) Assurances -- Improvement Plans   Assure that PIPs shall include: identification of needed areas of improvement, a timeline for achieving improvement, the manner in which the improvement will be assessed, and, where appropriate, differentiated activities to support a principal's improvement in those areas	Checked

### 11.2) Attachment: Principal Improvement Plan Forms

As a required attachment to this APPR plan, upload the PIP forms that are used in your school district or BOCES. For a list of supported file types, go to the Resources folder (above) and click Technical Tips.

*assets/survey-uploads/5276/140576-Df0w3Xx5v6/Three Village Central School Districtpip.docm*

### 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 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. The district hereby agrees that due to the uncertainty that exists surrounding the initial introduction of this evaluation process that they will not use an "ineffective" rating received in the 2012-13 school year as the basis, or as evidence, in an expedited 3020-a hearing as outlined in Education Law 3012-c.*

*9. 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. The District agrees that no ineffective rating appealed under the terms of the expired appeals process decided by the Assistant Superintendent for Educational Services shall be used as a basis, or as evidence, in an expedited 3020-a hearing brought pursuant to 3012-c of the Education Law. Nothing herein shall preclude the District from using an evaluation that has been appealed under an expired process.*

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

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

*The district has an obligation to provide the appropriate training for all lead evaluators prior to the completion of any 2012-2013 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 April 2012 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 participated in intensive APPR training offered by BOCES. In the early fall, further extensive training will occur. 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.*

*Throughout the 2012-2013 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 Thursday, July 05, 2012

Updated Thursday, August 30, 2012

---

### Page 1

#### 12.1) Upload the Joint Certification of the APPR Plan

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

<assets/survey-uploads/5581/148712-3Uqgn5g9Iu/MOA-REV-83012.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.

*THREE VILLAGE CENTRAL SCHOOL DISTRICT*

**ANNUAL PROFESSIONAL PERFORMANCE REVIEW**

**Point Allocation for Local Component**

**Overview**

The following two charts depict the point allocation for the local component for K-12 teachers, which is based on the designated State assessments.

**Chart 1**

The point allocation on the following chart will be applied for teachers who receive a Value-Added Student Growth measure from NYSED. The local component score will be given in a range from 0 to 15 points.

<b>Rating</b>	<b>Growth on Locally-Selected Measures</b>
Highly Effective	14-15
Effective	8-13
Developing	3-7
Ineffective	0-2

<b>Point Allocation</b>	<b>Percentage Based on 0-100% scale</b>	<b>Percentage Based on 1-4 scale</b>
15	92-100%	3.8 - 4.0
14	85-91%	3.5 - 3.7
13	70-84%	3.1 - 3.4
12	60-69%	2.9 -3.0
11	59%	2.8
10	58%	2.7
9	57%	2.6
8	56%	2.5
7	36-55%	2.0 - 2.4
6	26-35%	1.8 – 1.9
5	25%	1.7
4	24%	1.6
3	23%	1.5
2	10-22%	1.2 -1.4
1	5-9%	1.0 – 1.1
0	0-4%	0 -.5

**Chart 2**

The point allocation on the following chart will be applied for teachers who DO NOT receive a Value-Added Student Growth measure from NYSED. The local component score will be given in a range from 0 to 20 points.

<b>Rating</b>	<b>Growth on Locally-Selected Measures</b>
Highly Effective	18-20
Effective	9-17
Developing	3-8
Ineffective	0-2

<b>Point Allocation</b>	<b>Percentage Based on 0-100% scale</b>	<b>Percentage Based on 1-4 scale</b>
20	95-100%	3.9 - 4.0
19	90-94%	3.7 - 3.8
18	85-89%	3.5 - 3.6
17	72-84%	3.3- 3.4
16	63-71%	3.2
15	62%	3.1
14	61%	3.0
13	60%	2.9
12	59%	2.8
11	58%	2.7
10	57%	2.6
9	56%	2.5
8	36-55%	2.1- 2.4
7	27-35%	1.9 -2.0
6	26%	1.8
5	25%	1.7
4	24%	1.6
3	23%	1.5
2	10-22%	1.2 -1.4
1	5-9%	1.0 -1.1
0	0-4%	0 -.5

**THREE VILLAGE CENTRAL SCHOOL DISTRICT**

**HEDI Translation Template for Local Scores Counting as 15% of Com**

Teachers will be awarded points based on % of students that attain targets.

Enter HEDI anchor point (range 8-13) and anticipated Target Percent (as a percent) in the green boxes.

The chart below will automatically change to reflect the entries.

HEDI Anchor Point - 8 to 13

**11**

Target Percent - as %

**75%**

**Note: The point values and ranges on the HEDI point scale(from zero**

	HEDI Points	Percent Mastery Achieved	HEDI scores and Mastery Range	
Highly Effective	15	100%	97%	to 100%
	14	94%	94%	to 96%
Effective	13	88%	88%	to 93%
	12	81%	81%	to 87%
	11	75%	75%	to 80%
	10	69%	69%	to 74%
	9	63%	63%	to 68%
	8	56%	56%	to 62%
Developing	7	49%	49%	to 55%
	6	42%	42%	to 48%
	5	35%	35%	to 41%
	4	28%	28%	to 34%
	3	21%	21%	to 27%
Ineffective	2	14%	14%	to 20%
	1	7%	7%	to 13%
	0	0%	0%	to 6%

This tem  
HEDI sco  
and the l

HEDI sco  
are defin  
selected  
are four  
"Highly E  
diference

HEDI scc  
defined b  
is dimini

For a giv  
useful tr  
and targ

## THREE VILLAGE CENTRAL SCHOOL DISTRICT

posite

### HEDI Calculator

HEDI Calculator	Number of students	SLO Target or		HEDI score	HEDI Points Awarded
		Percent Mastery Selected	Percent Mastery Achieved		
SLO 1	30	90%	92	14	5.7
SLO 2	21	65%	70	14	4.0
SLO 3	23	80%	78	12	3.7
SLO 4					0.0
SLO 5					0.0
SLO 6					0.0
<b>Total</b>	<b>74</b>				<b>13.4</b>

**Calculated values are printed in red.**

plate translates a percent mastery achieved into a score. Each translation is based on the target required HEDI Anchor Point (from 9 to 17) selected.

Scores in the "Highly Effective" and "Effective" ranges are calculated by the number of steps between the Anchor Point and 100%. For example, at Anchor Point 11, there are 10 equal steps to 100%. Thus, all steps in the "Highly Effective" and "Effective" ranges represent 1/4 of the distance between the Anchor Point and 100%.

Scores in the "Developing" and "Ineffective" ranges are calculated by the eight scores (0 to 7) in these ranges. Each step represents 1/8th of the score cited for HEDI level 9.

For each Anchor Point, only certain targets will result in specific translation templates. Always check the Anchor Point and target combination before using this template.

**THREE VILLAGE CENTRAL SCHOOL DISTRICT**

**HEDI Translation Template for SLO Scores Counting as 20% of Comp**

Teachers will be awarded points based on % of students that attain targets.

Enter HEDI Anchor Point (range 9-17) and anticipated SLO Target Percent (as a percent) in the green boxes.

The chart below will automatically change to reflect the entries.

HEDI Anchor Point - 9 to 17

15

SLO Target Percent - as %

70%

Note: The point values and ranges on the HEDI point scale (from zero to 20) are determined by SED regulations.

	HEDI Points	SLO Target or Percent Mastery Achieved	HEDI scores and Mastery Range		
Highly Effective	20	100%	98%	to	100%
	19	94%	94%	to	97%
	18	88%	88%	to	93%
Effective	17	82%	82%	to	87%
	16	76%	76%	to	81%
	15	70%	70%	to	75%
	14	64%	64%	to	69%
	13	58%	58%	to	63%
	12	52%	52%	to	57%
	11	46%	46%	to	51%
	10	40%	40%	to	45%
Developing	9	34%	34%	to	39%
	8	30%	30%	to	33%
	7	26%	26%	to	29%
	6	23%	23%	to	25%
	5	19%	19%	to	22%
	4	15%	15%	to	18%
Ineffective	3	11%	11%	to	14%
	2	8%	8%	to	10%
	1	4%	4%	to	7%
	0	0%	0%	to	3%

Tl  
tc  
re  
se  
  
H  
di  
se  
fi  
El  
br  
  
F  
di  
di  
  
Fo  
u:  
ar  
  
So

## THREE VILLAGE CENTRAL SCHOOL DISTRICT

posite

### HEDI Calculator

HEDI Calculator	Number of students	SLO Target or		HEDI score	HEDI Points Awarded
		Percent Mastery Selected	Percent Mastery Achieved		
SLO 1	30	70%	70	15	15.0
SLO 2					0.0
SLO 3					0.0
SLO 4					0.0
SLO 5					0.0
SLO 6					0.0
<b>Total</b>	<b>30</b>				<b>15.0</b>

Calculated values are printed in red.

This template translates a percent mastery achieved on an SLO to a HEDI score. Each translation is based on the target required for that SLO and the HEDI Anchor Point (from 9 to 17) selected.

HEDI scores in the “Highly Effective” and “Effective” ranges are defined by the number of steps between the Anchor Point selected and 100%. For example, at Anchor Point 15, there are five equal steps to 100%. Thus, all steps in the the “Highly effective” and “Effective” ranges represent 1/5 of the difference between the Anchor Point and 100%.

HEDI scores in the “Developing” and “Ineffective” ranges are defined by the nine scores (0 to 8) in these ranges. Each step is diminished by 1/9th of the score cited for HEDI level 9.

For a given Anchor Point, only certain targets will result in useful translation templates. Always check the Anchor Point and target combination before using this template.

See other tab for 15 pt variable calculator.

## Breakdown of Points for APPR

	State	Local	Other			Total Score
Points:	20 pts.	20 pts.	60 pts.			
Weighting:	100%	100%	50%	16%	34%	<b>After obtaining a total score from all three components, use the scoring bands below to determine overall Composite Effectiveness Score.</b>
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>	Teacher will receive a score based on the average points calculated using the Danielson rubric (ranging from 1-4).	Teacher will receive a score based on the average points calculated using the Danielson rubric (ranging from 1-4).	Teacher will receive a score of 0, .5, or 1 based on the quality of work submitted for each of the four domains in the Danielson rubric. (Total score will range from 1-4.)	
How Score is Calculated:	Score provided by SED or district	Score provided by district	<i>The weighted scores from each section will be combined to equal a total score ranging from 1-4. That score will then be converted into a score ranging from 0-60, using the NYSUT conversion chart. (See attached.)</i>			
Highly Effective	18-20	18-20	59-60			
Effective	9-17	9-17	57-58			
Developing	3-8	3-8	50-56			
Ineffective	0-2	0-2	0-49			

## Breakdown of Points for APPR

*Rubric Score to Sub-Component Conversion Chart*

Total Average Rubric Score	Category	Conversion Score for Composite
Ineffective 0-49		
1.000		0
1.008		1
1.017		2
1.025		3
1.033		4
1.042		5
1.050		6
1.058		7
1.067		8
1.075		9
1.083		10
1.092		11

## Breakdown of Points for APPR

Total Average Rubric Score	Category	Conversion Score for Composite
1.100		12
1.108		13
1.115		14
1.123		15
1.131		16
1.138		17
1.146		18
1.154		19
1.162		20
1.169		21
1.177		22
1.185		23
1.192		24
1.200		25
1.208		26
1.217		27

## Breakdown of Points for APPR

Total Average Rubric Score	Category	Conversion Score for Composite
1.225		28
1.233		29
1.242		30
1.250		31
1.258		32
1.267		33
1.275		34
1.283		35
1.292		36
1.300		37
1.308		38
1.317		39
1.325		40
1.333		41
1.342		42
1.350		43

## Breakdown of Points for APPR

Total Average Rubric Score	Category	Conversion Score for Composite
1.358		44
1.367		45
1.375		46
1.383		47
1.392		48
1.400		49
<b>Developing 50-56</b>		
1.5		50
1.6		50.7
1.7		51.4
1.8		52.1
1.9		52.8
2		53.5
2.1		54.2
2.2		54.9
2.3		55.6

## Breakdown of Points for APPR

Total Average Rubric Score	Category	Conversion Score for Composite
2.4		56.3
<b>Effective 57-58</b>		
2.5		57
2.6		57.2
2.7		57.4
2.8		57.6
2.9		57.8
3		58
3.1		58.2
3.2		58.4
3.3		58.6
3.4		58.8
<b>Highly Effective 59-60</b>		
3.5		59
3.6		59.3
3.7		59.5

## Breakdown of Points for APPR

Total Average Rubric Score	Category	Conversion Score for Composite
3.8		59.8
3.9		60
4		60.25 (round to 60)

*THREE VILLAGE CENTRAL SCHOOL DISTRICT*

**ANNUAL PROFESSIONAL PERFORMANCE REVIEW**

**Point Allocation for Local Component**

**Overview**

The following two charts depict the point allocation for the local component for K-12 teachers, which is based on the designated State assessments.

**Chart 1**

The point allocation on the following chart will be applied for teachers who receive a Value-Added Student Growth measure from NYSED. The local component score will be given in a range from 0 to 15 points.

<b>Rating</b>	<b>Growth on Locally-Selected Measures</b>
Highly Effective	14-15
Effective	8-13
Developing	3-7
Ineffective	0-2

<b>Point Allocation</b>	<b>Percentage Based on 0-100% scale</b>	<b>Percentage Based on 1-4 scale</b>
15	92-100%	3.8 - 4.0
14	85-91%	3.5 - 3.7
13	70-84%	3.1 - 3.4
12	60-69%	2.9 -3.0
11	59%	2.8
10	58%	2.7
9	57%	2.6
8	56%	2.5
7	36-55%	2.0 - 2.4
6	26-35%	1.8 – 1.9
5	25%	1.7
4	24%	1.6
3	23%	1.5
2	10-22%	1.2 -1.4
1	5-9%	1.0 – 1.1
0	0-4%	0 -.5

**Chart 2**

The point allocation on the following chart will be applied for teachers who DO NOT receive a Value-Added Student Growth measure from NYSED. The local component score will be given in a range from 0 to 20 points.

<b>Rating</b>	<b>Growth on Locally-Selected Measures</b>
Highly Effective	18-20
Effective	9-17
Developing	3-8
Ineffective	0-2

<b>Point Allocation</b>	<b>Percentage Based on 0-100% scale</b>	<b>Percentage Based on 1-4 scale</b>
20	95-100%	3.9 - 4.0
19	90-94%	3.7 - 3.8
18	85-89%	3.5 - 3.6
17	72-84%	3.3- 3.4
16	63-71%	3.2
15	62%	3.1
14	61%	3.0
13	60%	2.9
12	59%	2.8
11	58%	2.7
10	57%	2.6
9	56%	2.5
8	36-55%	2.1- 2.4
7	27-35%	1.9 -2.0
6	26%	1.8
5	25%	1.7
4	24%	1.6
3	23%	1.5
2	10-22%	1.2 -1.4
1	5-9%	1.0 -1.1
0	0-4%	0 -.5

**THREE VILLAGE CENTRAL SCHOOL DISTRICT**

**HEDI Translation Template for Local Scores Counting as 15% of Com**

Teachers will be awarded points based on % of students that attain targets.

Enter HEDI anchor point (range 8-13) and anticipated Target Percent (as a percent) in the green boxes.

The chart below will automatically change to reflect the entries.

HEDI Anchor Point - 8 to 13

**11**

Target Percent - as %

**75%**

**Note: The point values and ranges on the HEDI point scale(from zero**

	HEDI Points	Percent Mastery Achieved	HEDI scores and Mastery Range	
Highly Effective	15	100%	97%	to 100%
	14	94%	94%	to 96%
Effective	13	88%	88%	to 93%
	12	81%	81%	to 87%
	11	75%	75%	to 80%
	10	69%	69%	to 74%
	9	63%	63%	to 68%
	8	56%	56%	to 62%
Developing	7	49%	49%	to 55%
	6	42%	42%	to 48%
	5	35%	35%	to 41%
	4	28%	28%	to 34%
	3	21%	21%	to 27%
Ineffective	2	14%	14%	to 20%
	1	7%	7%	to 13%
	0	0%	0%	to 6%

This tem  
HEDI sco  
and the l

HEDI sco  
are defin  
selected  
are four  
"Highly E  
diference

HEDI scc  
defined t  
is dimini

For a giv  
useful tr  
and targ

## THREE VILLAGE CENTRAL SCHOOL DISTRICT

posite

### HEDI Calculator

HEDI Calculator	Number of students	SLO Target or		HEDI score	HEDI Points Awarded
		Percent Mastery Selected	Percent Mastery Achieved		
SLO 1	30	90%	92	14	5.7
SLO 2	21	65%	70	14	4.0
SLO 3	23	80%	78	12	3.7
SLO 4					0.0
SLO 5					0.0
SLO 6					0.0
<b>Total</b>	<b>74</b>				<b>13.4</b>

**Calculated values are printed in red.**

plate translates a percent mastery achieved into a score. Each translation is based on the target required HEDI Anchor Point (from 9 to 17) selected.

Scores in the "Highly Effective" and "Effective" ranges are calculated by the number of steps between the Anchor Point and 100%. For example, at Anchor Point 11, there are 10 equal steps to 100%. Thus, all steps in the "Highly Effective" and "Effective" ranges represent 1/4 of the distance between the Anchor Point and 100%.

Scores in the "Developing" and "Ineffective" ranges are calculated by the eight scores (0 to 7) in these ranges. Each step is represented by 1/8th of the score cited for HEDI level 9.

For each Anchor Point, only certain targets will result in specific translation templates. Always check the Anchor Point and target combination before using this template.

**THREE VILLAGE CENTRAL SCHOOL DISTRICT**

**HEDI Translation Template for SLO Scores Counting as 20% of Comp**

Teachers will be awarded points based on % of students that attain targets.

Enter HEDI Anchor Point (range 9-17) and anticipated SLO Target Percent (as a percent) in the green boxes.

The chart below will automatically change to reflect the entries.

HEDI Anchor Point - 9 to 17

15

SLO Target Percent - as %

70%

Note: The point values and ranges on the HEDI point scale (from zero to 20) are determined by SED regulations.

	HEDI Points	SLO Target or Percent Mastery Achieved	HEDI scores and Mastery Range		
Highly Effective	20	100%	98%	to	100%
	19	94%	94%	to	97%
	18	88%	88%	to	93%
Effective	17	82%	82%	to	87%
	16	76%	76%	to	81%
	15	70%	70%	to	75%
	14	64%	64%	to	69%
	13	58%	58%	to	63%
	12	52%	52%	to	57%
	11	46%	46%	to	51%
	10	40%	40%	to	45%
Developing	9	34%	34%	to	39%
	8	30%	30%	to	33%
	7	26%	26%	to	29%
	6	23%	23%	to	25%
	5	19%	19%	to	22%
	4	15%	15%	to	18%
Ineffective	3	11%	11%	to	14%
	2	8%	8%	to	10%
	1	4%	4%	to	7%
	0	0%	0%	to	3%

Tl  
tc  
re  
se  
  
H  
di  
se  
fi  
El  
br  
  
F  
di  
di  
  
Fo  
u:  
ar  
  
So

## THREE VILLAGE CENTRAL SCHOOL DISTRICT

posite

### HEDI Calculator

HEDI Calculator	Number of students	SLO Target or		HEDI score	HEDI Points Awarded
		Percent Mastery Selected	Percent Mastery Achieved		
SLO 1	30	70%	70	15	15.0
SLO 2					0.0
SLO 3					0.0
SLO 4					0.0
SLO 5					0.0
SLO 6					0.0
<b>Total</b>	<b>30</b>				<b>15.0</b>

Calculated values are printed in red.

This template translates a percent mastery achieved on an SLO to a HEDI score. Each translation is based on the target required for that SLO and the HEDI Anchor Point (from 9 to 17) selected.

HEDI scores in the “Highly Effective” and “Effective” ranges are defined by the number of steps between the Anchor Point selected and 100%. For example, at Anchor Point 15, there are five equal steps to 100%. Thus, all steps in the the “Highly effective” and “Effective” ranges represent 1/5 of the difference between the Anchor Point and 100%.

HEDI scores in the “Developing” and “Ineffective” ranges are defined by the nine scores (0 to 8) in these ranges. Each step is diminished by 1/9th of the score cited for HEDI level 9.

For a given Anchor Point, only certain targets will result in useful translation templates. Always check the Anchor Point and target combination before using this template.

See other tab for 15 pt variable calculator.

*THREE VILLAGE CENTRAL SCHOOL DISTRICT*

**ANNUAL PROFESSIONAL PERFORMANCE REVIEW**

**Point Allocation for Local Component**

**Overview**

The following two charts depict the point allocation for the local component for K-12 teachers, which is based on the designated State assessments.

**Chart 1**

The point allocation on the following chart will be applied for teachers who receive a Value-Added Student Growth measure from NYSED. The local component score will be given in a range from 0 to 15 points.

<b>Rating</b>	<b>Growth on Locally-Selected Measures</b>
Highly Effective	14-15
Effective	8-13
Developing	3-7
Ineffective	0-2

<b>Point Allocation</b>	<b>Percentage Based on 0-100% scale</b>	<b>Percentage Based on 1-4 scale</b>
15	92-100%	3.8 - 4.0
14	85-91%	3.5 - 3.7
13	70-84%	3.1 - 3.4
12	60-69%	2.9 -3.0
11	59%	2.8
10	58%	2.7
9	57%	2.6
8	56%	2.5
7	36-55%	2.0 - 2.4
6	26-35%	1.8 – 1.9
5	25%	1.7
4	24%	1.6
3	23%	1.5
2	10-22%	1.2 -1.4
1	5-9%	1.0 – 1.1
0	0-4%	0 -.5

**Chart 2**

The point allocation on the following chart will be applied for teachers who DO NOT receive a Value-Added Student Growth measure from NYSED. The local component score will be given in a range from 0 to 20 points.

<b>Rating</b>	<b>Growth on Locally-Selected Measures</b>
Highly Effective	18-20
Effective	9-17
Developing	3-8
Ineffective	0-2

<b>Point Allocation</b>	<b>Percentage Based on 0-100% scale</b>	<b>Percentage Based on 1-4 scale</b>
20	95-100%	3.9 - 4.0
19	90-94%	3.7 - 3.8
18	85-89%	3.5 - 3.6
17	72-84%	3.3- 3.4
16	63-71%	3.2
15	62%	3.1
14	61%	3.0
13	60%	2.9
12	59%	2.8
11	58%	2.7
10	57%	2.6
9	56%	2.5
8	36-55%	2.1- 2.4
7	27-35%	1.9 -2.0
6	26%	1.8
5	25%	1.7
4	24%	1.6
3	23%	1.5
2	10-22%	1.2 -1.4
1	5-9%	1.0 -1.1
0	0-4%	0 -.5

**THREE VILLAGE CENTRAL SCHOOL DISTRICT**

**HEDI Translation Template for Local Scores Counting as 15% of Com**

Teachers will be awarded points based on % of students that attain targets.

Enter HEDI anchor point (range 8-13) and anticipated Target Percent (as a percent) in the green boxes.

The chart below will automatically change to reflect the entries.

HEDI Anchor Point - 8 to 13

**11**

Target Percent - as %

**75%**

**Note: The point values and ranges on the HEDI point scale(from zero**

	HEDI Points	Percent Mastery Achieved	HEDI scores and Mastery Range	
Highly Effective	15	100%	97%	to 100%
	14	94%	94%	to 96%
Effective	13	88%	88%	to 93%
	12	81%	81%	to 87%
	11	75%	75%	to 80%
	10	69%	69%	to 74%
	9	63%	63%	to 68%
	8	56%	56%	to 62%
Developing	7	49%	49%	to 55%
	6	42%	42%	to 48%
	5	35%	35%	to 41%
	4	28%	28%	to 34%
	3	21%	21%	to 27%
Ineffective	2	14%	14%	to 20%
	1	7%	7%	to 13%
	0	0%	0%	to 6%

This tem  
HEDI sco  
and the l

HEDI sco  
are defin  
selected  
are four  
"Highly E  
diference

HEDI scc  
defined b  
is dimini

For a giv  
useful tr  
and targ

## THREE VILLAGE CENTRAL SCHOOL DISTRICT

posite

### HEDI Calculator

HEDI Calculator	Number of students	SLO Target or		HEDI score	HEDI Points Awarded
		Percent Mastery Selected	Percent Mastery Achieved		
SLO 1	30	90%	92	14	5.7
SLO 2	21	65%	70	14	4.0
SLO 3	23	80%	78	12	3.7
SLO 4					0.0
SLO 5					0.0
SLO 6					0.0
<b>Total</b>	<b>74</b>				<b>13.4</b>

**Calculated values are printed in red.**

plate translates a percent mastery achieved into a score. Each translation is based on the target required HEDI Anchor Point (from 9 to 17) selected.

Scores in the "Highly Effective" and "Effective" ranges are calculated by the number of steps between the Anchor Point and 100%. For example, at Anchor Point 11, there are 10 equal steps to 100%. Thus, all steps in the "Highly Effective" and "Effective" ranges represent 1/4 of the distance between the Anchor Point and 100%.

Scores in the "Developing" and "Ineffective" ranges are calculated by the eight scores (0 to 7) in these ranges. Each step represents 1/8th of the score cited for HEDI level 9.

For each Anchor Point, only certain targets will result in specific translation templates. Always check the Anchor Point and target combination before using this template.

**THREE VILLAGE CENTRAL SCHOOL DISTRICT**

**HEDI Translation Template for SLO Scores Counting as 20% of Comp**

Teachers will be awarded points based on % of students that attain targets.

Enter HEDI Anchor Point (range 9-17) and anticipated SLO Target Percent (as a percent) in the green boxes.

The chart below will automatically change to reflect the entries.

HEDI Anchor Point - 9 to 17

15

SLO Target Percent - as %

70%

Note: The point values and ranges on the HEDI point scale (from zero to 20) are determined by SED regulations.

	HEDI Points	SLO Target or Percent Mastery Achieved	HEDI scores and Mastery Range		
Highly Effective	20	100%	98%	to	100%
	19	94%	94%	to	97%
	18	88%	88%	to	93%
Effective	17	82%	82%	to	87%
	16	76%	76%	to	81%
	15	70%	70%	to	75%
	14	64%	64%	to	69%
	13	58%	58%	to	63%
	12	52%	52%	to	57%
	11	46%	46%	to	51%
	10	40%	40%	to	45%
Developing	9	34%	34%	to	39%
	8	30%	30%	to	33%
	7	26%	26%	to	29%
	6	23%	23%	to	25%
	5	19%	19%	to	22%
	4	15%	15%	to	18%
Ineffective	3	11%	11%	to	14%
	2	8%	8%	to	10%
	1	4%	4%	to	7%
	0	0%	0%	to	3%

Tl  
tc  
re  
se  
  
H  
di  
se  
fi  
El  
br  
  
F  
di  
di  
  
Fo  
u:  
ar  
  
So

## THREE VILLAGE CENTRAL SCHOOL DISTRICT

posite

### HEDI Calculator

HEDI Calculator	Number of students	SLO Target or		HEDI score	HEDI Points Awarded
		Percent Mastery Selected	Percent Mastery Achieved		
SLO 1	30	70%	70	15	15.0
SLO 2					0.0
SLO 3					0.0
SLO 4					0.0
SLO 5					0.0
SLO 6					0.0
<b>Total</b>	<b>30</b>				<b>15.0</b>

Calculated values are printed in red.

This template translates a percent mastery achieved on an SLO to a HEDI score. Each translation is based on the target required for that SLO and the HEDI Anchor Point (from 9 to 17) selected.

HEDI scores in the “Highly Effective” and “Effective” ranges are defined by the number of steps between the Anchor Point selected and 100%. For example, at Anchor Point 15, there are five equal steps to 100%. Thus, all steps in the the “Highly effective” and “Effective” ranges represent 1/5 of the difference between the Anchor Point and 100%.

HEDI scores in the “Developing” and “Ineffective” ranges are defined by the nine scores (0 to 8) in these ranges. Each step is diminished by 1/9th of the score cited for HEDI level 9.

For a given Anchor Point, only certain targets will result in useful translation templates. Always check the Anchor Point and target combination before using this template.

See other tab for 15 pt variable calculator.

**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:**

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

**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*



*THREE VILLAGE CENTRAL SCHOOL DISTRICT*

**ANNUAL PROFESSIONAL PERFORMANCE REVIEW**

**Point Allocation for Local Component**

**Overview**

The following two charts depict the point allocation for the local component for Principals K-12, which is based on the designated State assessments.

**Chart 1**

The point allocation on the following chart will be applied for principals who receive a Value-Added Student Growth measure from NYSED. The local component score will be given in a range from 0 to 15 points.

<b>Rating</b>	<b>Growth on Locally-Selected Measures</b>
Highly Effective	14-15
Effective	8-13
Developing	3-7
Ineffective	0-2

<b>Point Allocation</b>	<b>Percentage Based on 0-100% scale</b>	<b>Percentage Based on 1-4 scale</b>
15	92-100%	3.8 - 4.0
14	85-91%	3.5 - 3.7
13	70-84%	3.1 - 3.4
12	60-69%	2.9 - 3.0
11	59%	2.8
10	58%	2.7
9	57%	2.6
8	56%	2.5
7	36-55%	2.0 - 2.4
6	26-35%	1.8 - 1.9
5	25%	1.7
4	24%	1.6
3	23%	1.5
2	10-22%	1.2 - 1.4
1	5-9%	1.0 - 1.1
0	0-4%	0 - .5

**Chart 2**

The point allocation on the following chart will be applied for principals who DO NOT receive a Value-Added Student Growth measure from NYSED. The local component score will be given in a range from 0 to 20 points.

<b>Rating</b>	<b>Growth on Locally-Selected Measures</b>
Highly Effective	18-20
Effective	9-17
Developing	3-8
Ineffective	0-2

<b>Point Allocation</b>	<b>Percentage Based on 0-100% scale</b>	<b>Percentage Based on 1-4 scale</b>
20	95-100%	3.9 - 4.0
19	90-94%	3.7 - 3.8
18	85-89%	3.5 - 3.6
17	72-84%	3.3- 3.4
16	63-71%	3.2
15	62%	3.1
14	61%	3.0
13	60%	2.9
12	59%	2.8
11	58%	2.7
10	57%	2.6
9	56%	2.5
8	36-55%	2.1- 2.4
7	27-35%	1.9 -2.0
6	26%	1.8
5	25%	1.7
4	24%	1.6
3	23%	1.5
2	10-22%	1.2 -1.4
1	5-9%	1.0 -1.1
0	0-4%	0 -.5

**THREE VILLAGE CENTRAL SCHOOL DISTRICT**

**HEDI Translation Template for Local Scores Counting as 15% of Com**

Principals will be awarded points based on % of students that attain targets.

Enter HEDI anchor point (range 8-13) and anticipated Target Percent (as a percent) in the green boxes.

The chart below will automatically change to reflect the entries.

HEDI Anchor Point - 8 to 13 11

Target Percent - as % 75%

**Note: The point values and ranges on the HEDI point scale(from zero**

	HEDI Points	Percent Mastery Achieved	HEDI scores and Mastery Range
Highly Effective	15	100%	97% to 100%
	14	94%	94% to 96%
Effective	13	88%	88% to 93%
	12	81%	81% to 87%
	11	75%	75% to 80%
	10	69%	69% to 74%
	9	63%	63% to 68%
	8	56%	56% to 62%
Developing	7	49%	49% to 55%
	6	42%	42% to 48%
	5	35%	35% to 41%
	4	28%	28% to 34%
	3	21%	21% to 27%
Ineffective	2	14%	14% to 20%
	1	7%	7% to 13%
	0	0%	0% to 6%

This tem  
HEDI sco  
and the l

HEDI sco  
are defin  
selected  
are four  
"Highly E  
diference

HEDI sco  
defined k  
is dimini

For a giv  
useful tr  
and targ

## THREE VILLAGE CENTRAL SCHOOL DISTRICT

posite

### HEDI Calculator

HEDI Calculator	Number of students	SLO Target or		HEDI score	HEDI Points Awarded
		Percent Mastery Selected	Percent Mastery Achieved		
SLO 1	30	90%	92	14	5.7
SLO 2	21	65%	70	14	4.0
SLO 3	23	80%	78	12	3.7
SLO 4					0.0
SLO 5					0.0
SLO 6					0.0
<b>Total</b>	<b>74</b>				<b>13.4</b>

**Calculated values are printed in red.**

plate translates a percent mastery achieved into a re. Each translation is based on the target required HEDI Anchor Point (from 9 to 17) selected.

res in the “Highly Effective” and “Effective” ranges ed by the number of steps between the Anchor Point and 100%. For example, at Anchor Point 11, there equal steps to 100%. Thus, all steps in the the :ffective” and “Effective” ranges represent 1/4 of the e between the Anchor Point and 100%.

ores in the “Developing” and “Ineffective” ranges are oy the eight scores (0 to 7) in these ranges. Each step ished by 1/8th of the score cited for HEDI level 9.

en Anchor Point, only certain targets will result in anslation templates. Always check the Anchor Point et combination before using this template.

**THREE VILLAGE CENTRAL SCHOOL DISTRICT**

**HEDI Translation Template for SLO Scores Counting as 20% of Comp**

Principals will be awarded points based on % of students that attain targets.

Enter HEDI Anchor Point (range 9-17) and anticipated SLO Target Percent (as a percent) in the green boxes.

The chart below will automatically change to reflect the entries.

HEDI Anchor Point - 9 to 17

**15**

SLO Target Percent - as %

**70%**

**Note: The point values and ranges on the HEDI point scale (from zero to 20) are determined by SED regulations.**

	HEDI Points	SLO Target or Percent Achieved	HEDI scores and Mastery Range		
<b>Highly Effective</b>	20	100%	98%	to	100%
	19	94%	94%	to	97%
	18	88%	88%	to	93%
<b>Effective</b>	17	82%	82%	to	87%
	16	76%	76%	to	81%
	15	70%	70%	to	75%
	14	64%	64%	to	69%
	13	58%	58%	to	63%
	12	52%	52%	to	57%
	11	46%	46%	to	51%
	10	40%	40%	to	45%
<b>Developing</b>	9	34%	34%	to	39%
	8	30%	30%	to	33%
	7	26%	26%	to	29%
	6	23%	23%	to	25%
	5	19%	19%	to	22%
	4	15%	15%	to	18%
<b>Ineffective</b>	3	11%	11%	to	14%
	2	8%	8%	to	10%
	1	4%	4%	to	7%
	0	0%	0%	to	3%

TI  
tc  
re  
se  
  
H  
di  
se  
fi  
El  
br  
  
F  
di  
  
Fu  
u:  
ar  
  
St

## THREE VILLAGE CENTRAL SCHOOL DISTRICT

posite

### HEDI Calculator

HEDI Calculator	Number of students	SLO Target or		HEDI score	HEDI Points Awarded
		Percent Mastery Selected	Percent Mastery Achieved		
SLO 1	30	70%	70	15	15.0
SLO 2					0.0
SLO 3					0.0
SLO 4					0.0
SLO 5					0.0
SLO 6					0.0
<b>Total</b>	<b>30</b>				<b>15.0</b>

Calculated values are printed in red.

This template translates a percent mastery achieved on an SLO to a HEDI score. Each translation is based on the target required for that SLO and the HEDI Anchor Point (from 9 to 17) selected.

HEDI scores in the “Highly Effective” and “Effective” ranges are defined by the number of steps between the Anchor Point selected and 100%. For example, at Anchor Point 15, there are five equal steps to 100%. Thus, all steps in the the “Highly effective” and “Effective” ranges represent 1/5 of the difference between the Anchor Point and 100%.

HEDI scores in the “Developing” and “Ineffective” ranges are defined by the nine scores (0 to 8) in these ranges. Each step is diminished by 1/9th of the score cited for HEDI level 9.

For a given Anchor Point, only certain targets will result in useful translation templates. Always check the Anchor Point and target combination before using this template.

See other tab for 15 pt variable calculator.

*THREE VILLAGE CENTRAL SCHOOL DISTRICT*

**ANNUAL PROFESSIONAL PERFORMANCE REVIEW**

**Point Allocation for Local Component**

**Overview**

The following two charts depict the point allocation for the local component for Principals K-12, which is based on the designated State assessments.

**Chart 1**

The point allocation on the following chart will be applied for principals who receive a Value-Added Student Growth measure from NYSED. The local component score will be given in a range from 0 to 15 points.

<b>Rating</b>	<b>Growth on Locally-Selected Measures</b>
Highly Effective	14-15
Effective	8-13
Developing	3-7
Ineffective	0-2

<b>Point Allocation</b>	<b>Percentage Based on 0-100% scale</b>	<b>Percentage Based on 1-4 scale</b>
15	92-100%	3.8 - 4.0
14	85-91%	3.5 - 3.7
13	70-84%	3.1 - 3.4
12	60-69%	2.9 - 3.0
11	59%	2.8
10	58%	2.7
9	57%	2.6
8	56%	2.5
7	36-55%	2.0 - 2.4
6	26-35%	1.8 - 1.9
5	25%	1.7
4	24%	1.6
3	23%	1.5
2	10-22%	1.2 - 1.4
1	5-9%	1.0 - 1.1
0	0-4%	0 - .5

**Chart 2**

The point allocation on the following chart will be applied for principals who DO NOT receive a Value-Added Student Growth measure from NYSED. The local component score will be given in a range from 0 to 20 points.

<b>Rating</b>	<b>Growth on Locally-Selected Measures</b>
Highly Effective	18-20
Effective	9-17
Developing	3-8
Ineffective	0-2

<b>Point Allocation</b>	<b>Percentage Based on 0-100% scale</b>	<b>Percentage Based on 1-4 scale</b>
20	95-100%	3.9 - 4.0
19	90-94%	3.7 - 3.8
18	85-89%	3.5 - 3.6
17	72-84%	3.3- 3.4
16	63-71%	3.2
15	62%	3.1
14	61%	3.0
13	60%	2.9
12	59%	2.8
11	58%	2.7
10	57%	2.6
9	56%	2.5
8	36-55%	2.1- 2.4
7	27-35%	1.9 -2.0
6	26%	1.8
5	25%	1.7
4	24%	1.6
3	23%	1.5
2	10-22%	1.2 -1.4
1	5-9%	1.0 -1.1
0	0-4%	0 -.5

**THREE VILLAGE CENTRAL SCHOOL DISTRICT**

**HEDI Translation Template for Local Scores Counting as 15% of Com**

Principals will be awarded points based on % of students that attain targets.

Enter HEDI anchor point (range 8-13) and anticipated Target Percent (as a percent) in the green boxes.

The chart below will automatically change to reflect the entries.

HEDI Anchor Point - 8 to 13 11

Target Percent - as % 75%

**Note: The point values and ranges on the HEDI point scale(from zero**

	HEDI Points	Percent Mastery Achieved	HEDI scores and Mastery Range
Highly Effective	15	100%	97% to 100%
	14	94%	94% to 96%
Effective	13	88%	88% to 93%
	12	81%	81% to 87%
	11	75%	75% to 80%
	10	69%	69% to 74%
	9	63%	63% to 68%
	8	56%	56% to 62%
Developing	7	49%	49% to 55%
	6	42%	42% to 48%
	5	35%	35% to 41%
	4	28%	28% to 34%
	3	21%	21% to 27%
Ineffective	2	14%	14% to 20%
	1	7%	7% to 13%
	0	0%	0% to 6%

This tem  
HEDI sco  
and the l

HEDI sco  
are defin  
selected  
are four  
"Highly E  
diference

HEDI sco  
defined k  
is dimini

For a giv  
useful tr  
and targ

**THREE VILLAGE CENTRAL SCHOOL DISTRICT**

**posite**

**HEDI Calculator**

HEDI Calculator	Number of students	SLO Target or		HEDI score	HEDI Points Awarded
		Percent Mastery Selected	Percent Mastery Achieved		
SLO 1	30	90%	92	14	<b>5.7</b>
SLO 2	21	65%	70	14	<b>4.0</b>
SLO 3	23	80%	78	12	<b>3.7</b>
SLO 4					<b>0.0</b>
SLO 5					<b>0.0</b>
SLO 6					<b>0.0</b>
<b>Total</b>	<b>74</b>				<b>13.4</b>

**Calculated values are printed in red.**

plate translates a percent mastery achieved into a re. Each translation is based on the target required HEDI Anchor Point (from 9 to 17) selected.

res in the “Highly Effective” and “Effective” ranges ed by the number of steps between the Anchor Point and 100%. For example, at Anchor Point 11, there equal steps to 100%. Thus, all steps in the the :ffective” and “Effective” ranges represent 1/4 of the e between the Anchor Point and 100%.

ores in the “Developing” and “Ineffective” ranges are oy the eight scores (0 to 7) in these ranges. Each step ished by 1/8th of the score cited for HEDI level 9.

**en Anchor Point, only certain targets will result in anslation templates. Always check the Anchor Point et combination before using this template.**

**THREE VILLAGE CENTRAL SCHOOL DISTRICT**

**HEDI Translation Template for SLO Scores Counting as 20% of Comp**

Principals will be awarded points based on % of students that attain targets.

Enter HEDI Anchor Point (range 9-17) and anticipated SLO Target Percent (as a percent) in the green boxes.

The chart below will automatically change to reflect the entries.

HEDI Anchor Point - 9 to 17

15

SLO Target Percent - as %

70%

Note: The point values and ranges on the HEDI point scale (from zero to 20) are determined by SED regulations.

	HEDI Points	SLO Target or Percent Achieved	HEDI scores and Mastery Range		
Highly Effective	20	100%	98%	to	100%
	19	94%	94%	to	97%
	18	88%	88%	to	93%
Effective	17	82%	82%	to	87%
	16	76%	76%	to	81%
	15	70%	70%	to	75%
	14	64%	64%	to	69%
	13	58%	58%	to	63%
	12	52%	52%	to	57%
	11	46%	46%	to	51%
	10	40%	40%	to	45%
Developing	9	34%	34%	to	39%
	8	30%	30%	to	33%
	7	26%	26%	to	29%
	6	23%	23%	to	25%
	5	19%	19%	to	22%
	4	15%	15%	to	18%
Ineffective	3	11%	11%	to	14%
	2	8%	8%	to	10%
	1	4%	4%	to	7%
	0	0%	0%	to	3%

T  
t  
r  
e  
s  
  
H  
d  
s  
f  
E  
b  
  
f  
d  
d  
  
F  
u  
a  
  
S

## THREE VILLAGE CENTRAL SCHOOL DISTRICT

posite

### HEDI Calculator

HEDI Calculator	Number of students	SLO Target or		HEDI score	HEDI Points Awarded
		Percent Mastery Selected	Percent Mastery Achieved		
SLO 1	30	70%	70	15	15.0
SLO 2					0.0
SLO 3					0.0
SLO 4					0.0
SLO 5					0.0
SLO 6					0.0
<b>Total</b>	<b>30</b>				<b>15.0</b>

Calculated values are printed in red.

This template translates a percent mastery achieved on an SLO to a HEDI score. Each translation is based on the target required for that SLO and the HEDI Anchor Point (from 9 to 17) selected.

HEDI scores in the “Highly Effective” and “Effective” ranges are defined by the number of steps between the Anchor Point selected and 100%. For example, at Anchor Point 15, there are five equal steps to 100%. Thus, all steps in the the “Highly effective” and “Effective” ranges represent 1/5 of the difference between the Anchor Point and 100%.

HEDI scores in the “Developing” and “Ineffective” ranges are defined by the nine scores (0 to 8) in these ranges. Each step is diminished by 1/9th of the score cited for HEDI level 9.

For a given Anchor Point, only certain targets will result in useful translation templates. Always check the Anchor Point and target combination before using this template.

See other tab for 15 pt variable calculator.

**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



*Three Village Central School District*

**PRINCIPAL 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**

\_\_\_\_\_  
**Date**

*Three Village Central School District*

**PRINCIPAL IMPROVEMENT PLAN  
PROGRESS RECORD FORM**

	<b>SUMMARY OF MEETING (SUPERINTENDENT</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 make the following specific certifications with respect to their APPR Plan:**

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

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

**Signatures, dates**

Superintendent Signature:      Date:

Cheryl Pedvich      8-30-2012

Teachers Union President Signature:      Date:

Claudia J. Runkart      8-30-12

Administrative Union President Signature:      Date:

Wendy Wujcik      8/30/12

Board of Education President Signature:      Date: 8/30/12

Jeffy Sherman