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

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

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

February 10, 2015

Revised

Thomas Palmer, Superintendent
Tri-Valley Central School District
34 Moore Hill Road
Grahamsville, NY 12740

Dear Superintendent Palmer:

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

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

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

Thank you again for your hard work.

Sincerely,

Elizabeth R. Berlin
Acting Commissioner

Attachment

c: Charles Khoury

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

Annual Professional Performance Reviews

Created Wednesday, August 21, 2013
Updated Saturday, September 07, 2013

1

Disclaimers

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

The Department will not review any attachments other than those required in the online form. Any additional attachments supplied by the school district or BOCES are for informational purposes only for the teachers and principals reviewed under this APPR plan. Statements and/or materials in such additional attachments have not been approved and/or endorsed by the Department. However, the Department considers void any other signed agreements between and among parties in any form that prevent, conflict, or interfere with full implementation of the APPR Plan approved by the Department. The Department also reserves the right to request further information from the school district or BOCES, as necessary, as part of its review.

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

1. SCHOOL DISTRICT INFORMATION

1.1) School District's BEDS Number : 591201040000

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

591201040000

1.2) School District Name: TRI-VALLEY CSD

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

TRI-VALLEY CSD

1.3) Assurances

Please check all of the boxes below:

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

1.3) Assurances | Assure that it is understood that this district/BOCES' APPR plan will be posted in its entirety on the NYSED website following approval	Checked

1.4) Submission Status

For BOCES or charter schools that did not have an approved APPR plan for the 2012-13 school year only, is this a first-time submission, a re-submission, or a submission of material changes to an approved APPR plan? For districts, BOCES or charter schools that did have an approved APPR plan for the 2012-13 school year, this must be listed as a submission of material changes to the approved APPR plan.

Submission of material changes to an approved APPR plan

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

Created Wednesday, August 21, 2013
Updated Friday, January 16, 2015

Page 1

STATE-PROVIDED MEASURES OF STUDENT GROWTH (25 points with an approved value-added measure)

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

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

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

2.1) Assurances

Please check the boxes below:

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

STUDENT LEARNING OBJECTIVES AS COMPARABLE GROWTH MEASURES (20 points)

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

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

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

If no State assessment or Regents exam exists:

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

2.2) Grades K-3 ELA

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

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

	ELA	Assessment
3	State assessment	3rd Grade State Assessment

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

Use this box, if needed, to describe the general process for assigning HEDI categories for these grades/subjects in this subcomponent. If needed, you may upload a table or graphic at 2.11, below.	Grade K-2 - NYS building wide ELA growth scores for grades 4-6 will be weighted proportionately by the number of students and combine to determine a HEDI score of each K-2 teacher. The state provided growth scores will be converted from a 20 to 25 point scale using the chart in 2.11 after value added implementation. Grade 3 - Rigorous individual growth targets to be measured by the Grade 3 NYS ELA Assessment will be set by the principal

	and grade level team based on grade level pre-assessment data. HEDI points will be allocated to each teacher based on the percentage of students that meet the established growth targets according to the uploaded HEDI chart.
Highly Effective (18 - 20 points) Results are well-above state average for similar students (or District goals if no state test).	See uploaded chart in Task 2.11
Effective (9 - 17 points) Results meet state average for similar students (or District goals if no state test).	See uploaded chart in Task 2.11
Developing (3 - 8 points) Results are below state average for similar students (or District goals if no state test).	See uploaded chart in Task 2.11
Ineffective (0 - 2 points) Results are well-below state average for similar students (or District goals if no state test).	See uploaded chart in Task 2.11

2.3) Grades K-3 Math

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

	Math	Assessment
K	School-or BOCES-wide, group or team results based on State assessments	4-6 NYS Math Assessments
1	School-or BOCES-wide, group or team results based on State assessments	4-6 NYS Math Assessments
2	School-or BOCES-wide, group or team results based on State assessments	4-6 NYS Math Assessments

	Math	Assessment
3	State assessment	3rd Grade State Assessment

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

Use this box, if needed, to describe the general process for assigning HEDI categories for these grades/subjects in this subcomponent. If needed, you may upload a table or graphic at 2.11, below.	Grade K-2 - NYS building wide Math growth scores for grades 4-6 will be weighted proportionately by the number of students and combine to determine a HEDI score of each K-2 teacher. The state provided growth scores will be converted from a 20 to 25 point scale using the chart in 2.11 after value added implementation. Grade 3 - Rigorous individual growth targets to be measured by the Grade 3 NYS Math Assessment will be set by the principal and grade level team based on grade level pre-assessment data. HEDI points will be allocated to each teacher based on the percentage of students that meet the established growth targets according to the uploaded HEDI chart.

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

2.4) Grades 6-8 Science

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

	Science	Assessment
6	District, regional or BOCES-developed assessment	Tri-Valley CSD developed Grade 6 Science Assessment
7	District, regional or BOCES-developed assessment	SC BOCES developed Grade 7 Science Assessment

	Science	Assessment
8	State assessment	8th Grade State Science Assessment

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

Use this box, if needed, to describe the general process for assigning HEDI categories for these grades/subjects in this subcomponent. If needed, you may upload a table or graphic at 2.11, below.	Teachers and Principals will set rigorous individual growth targets based on pre-assessments. HEDI points will be allocated to each teacher based on the percentage of students who meet their growth targets on identified post assessments.
Highly Effective (18 - 20 points) Results are well-above state average for similar students (or District goals if no state test).	See uploaded chart in Task 2.11
Effective (9 - 17 points) Results meet state average for similar students (or District goals if no state test).	See uploaded chart in Task 2.11
Developing (3 - 8 points) Results are below state average for similar students (or District goals if no state test).	See uploaded chart in Task 2.11
Ineffective (0 - 2 points) Results are well-below state average for similar students (or District goals if no state test).	See uploaded chart in Task 2.11

2.5) Grades 6-8 Social Studies

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

	Social Studies	Assessment
6	Not applicable	Common Branch

7	District, regional or BOCES-developed assessment	SC BOCES developed Grade 7 Social Studies Assessment
8	District, regional or BOCES-developed assessment	SC BOCES developed Grade 8 Social Studies Assessment

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

Use this box, if needed, to describe the general process for assigning HEDI categories for these grades/subjects in this subcomponent. If needed, you may upload a table or graphic at 2.11, below.	Teachers and Principals will set rigorous individual growth targets based on pre-assessments. HEDI points will be allocated to each teacher based on the percentage of students who meet their growth targets on identified post assessments.
Highly Effective (18 - 20 points) Results are well-above District goals for similar students.	See uploaded chart in Task 2.11
Effective (9 - 17 points) Results meet District goals for similar students.	See uploaded chart in Task 2.11
Developing (3 - 8 points) Results are below District goals for similar students.	See uploaded chart in Task 2.11
Ineffective (0 - 2 points) Results are well-below District goals for similar students.	See uploaded chart in Task 2.11

2.6) High School Social Studies Regents Courses

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

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

		Assessment
Global 1	School-/BOCES-wide group/team results based on State assessments	NYS Regents exams - Algebra, Geometry, Alg. II/Trig., Living Environment, Earth Science, Chemistry, Physics, Global Studies, U. S. History, English

	Social Studies Regents Courses	Assessment
Global 2	Regents assessment	Regents assessment
American History	Regents assessment	Regents assessment

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

Use this box, if needed, to describe the general process for assigning HEDI categories for these grades/subjects in this subcomponent. If needed, you may upload a table or graphic at 2.11, below.	Teachers who teach courses not ending in a NYS Regents will have a school wide growth expectation target. The District has set a minimum rigor expectation that 89% of students will grow at least 45% of the difference between their pre-assessment score and 100 on the Regents' Exams. The growth of all students

	taking each Regents will be weighted proportionately based on the number of students in each SLO to determine an overall percentage. Note: If a student fails to take the pre-test for reasons outside the District's control, the District will set a minimum rigor expectation for growth based on historical trends and patterns. The HEDI score for each teacher in this task will be awarded based on overall percentage of students who meet or exceed the District's minimum growth expectations. See uploaded document for HEDI allocations. Teachers with courses ending in a Regents' Exam will have a school wide growth expectation target. The District has set a minimum rigor expectation that 89% of a teacher's students will grow at least 45% of the difference between their pre-assessment score and 100 as measured by their Regents' exam. A HEDI score will be awarded based on percentage of students who meet or exceed the District's minimum growth expectations. See uploaded document for HEDI allocations. Note: If a student fails to take the pre-test for reasons outside the District's control, the District will set a minimum rigor expectation for growth based on historical trends and patterns. When both the 2005 and CC Standards Algebra, Geometry and/or English are administered in a Common Core course, the higher of the two scores will be used to assign HEDI points.
Highly Effective (18 - 20 points) Results are well-above District goals for similar students.	See uploaded chart in Task 2.11
Effective (9 - 17 points) Results meet District goals for similar students.	See uploaded chart in Task 2.11
Developing (3 - 8 points) Results are below District goals for similar students.	See uploaded chart in Task 2.11
Ineffective (0 - 2 points) Results are well-below District goals for similar students.	See uploaded chart in Task 2.11

2.7) High School Science Regents Courses

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

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

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

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

Use this box, if needed, to describe the general process for assigning HEDI categories for these grades/subjects in this	Teachers with courses ending in Regents' Exams will have a school wide growth expectation target. The District has set a

subcomponent. If needed, you may upload a table or graphic at 2.11, below.	minimum rigor expectation that 89% of a teacher's students will grow at least 45% of the difference between their pre-assessment score and 100. Note: If a student fails to take the pre-test for reasons outside the District's control, the District will set a minimum rigor expectation for growth based on historical trends and patterns. A HEDI score will be awarded based on percentage of students who meet or exceed the District's minimum growth expectations. See uploaded document for HEDI allocations.
Highly Effective (18 - 20 points) Results are well-above District goals for similar students.	See uploaded chart in Task 2.11
Effective (9 - 17 points) Results meet District goals for similar students.	See uploaded chart in Task 2.11
Developing (3 - 8 points) Results are below District goals for similar students.	See uploaded chart in Task 2.11
Ineffective (0 - 2 points) Results are well-below District goals for similar students.	See uploaded chart in Task 2.11

2.8) High School Math Regents Courses

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

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

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

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

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

Use this box, if needed, to describe the general process for assigning HEDI categories for these grades/subjects in this subcomponent. If needed, you may upload a table or graphic at 2.11, below.	Teachers with courses ending in Regents' Exams will have a school wide growth expectation target. The District has set a minimum rigor expectation that 89% of a teacher's students will grow at least 45% of the difference between their pre-assessment score and 100. Note: If a student fails to take the pre-test for reasons outside the District's control, the District will set a minimum rigor expectation for growth based on historical trends and patterns. When both the 2005 and CC Standards Algebra & Geometry are administered in a Common Core course, the higher of the two scores will be used to assign HEDI points. A HEDI score will be awarded based on percentage of students who meet or exceed the District's minimum growth expectations. See uploaded document for HEDI allocations.

Highly Effective (18 - 20 points) Results are well-above District goals for similar students.	See uploaded chart in Task 2.11
Effective (9 - 17 points) Results meet District goals for similar students.	See uploaded chart in Task 2.11
Developing (3 - 8 points) Results are below District goals for similar students.	See uploaded chart in Task 2.11
Ineffective (0 - 2 points) Results are well-below District goals for similar students.	See uploaded chart in Task 2.11

2.9) High School English Language Arts

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

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

	High School English Courses	Assessment
Grade 9 ELA	School-/BOCES-wide group/team results based on State assessments	NYS Regents exams - Algebra, Geometry, Alg. II/Trig., Living Environment, Earth Science, Chemistry, Physics, Global Studies, U. S. History, Comprehensive English
Grade 10 ELA	School-/BOCES-wide group/team results based on State assessments	NYS Regents exams - Algebra, Geometry, Alg. II/Trig., Living Environment, Earth Science, Chemistry, Physics, Global Studies, U. S. History, Comprehensive English
Grade 11 ELA	Regents assessment	NYS English 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 measuring student growth on the assessments listed for this Task.

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

Use this box, if needed, to describe the general process for assigning HEDI categories for these grades/subjects in this subcomponent. If needed, you may upload a table or graphic at 2.11, below.	Teachers who teach courses not ending in a NYS Regents will have a school wide growth expectation target. The District has set a minimum rigor expectation that 89% of students will grow at least 45% of the difference between their pre-assessment score and 100 on the Regents' Exams. Note: If a student fails to take the pre-test for reasons outside the District's control, the District will set a minimum rigor expectation for growth based on historical trends and patterns. The growth of all students taking each Regents will be weighted proportionately based on the number of students in each SLO to determine an overall percentage. The HEDI score for each teacher in this task will be awarded based on overall percentage of students who meet or exceed the District's minimum growth expectations. See uploaded document for HEDI allocations. Teachers with courses ending in a Regents' Exam will have a school wide growth expectation target. The District has set a minimum rigor expectation that 89% of a teacher's students will grow at least 45% of the difference between their pre-assessment score and 100 as measured by their Regents'

	exam. Note: If a student fails to take the pre-test for reasons outside the District's control, the District will set a minimum rigor expectation for growth based on historical trends and patterns. A HEDI score will be awarded based on percentage of students who meet or exceed the District's minimum growth expectations. See uploaded document for HEDI allocations. When both the 2005 and CC Standards Algebra, Geometry and/or English are administered in a Common Core course, the higher of the two scores will be used to assign HEDI points.
Highly Effective (18 - 20 points) Results are well-above District goals for similar students.	See uploaded chart in Task 2.11
Effective (9 - 17 points) Results meet District goals for similar students.	See uploaded chart in Task 2.11
Developing (3 - 8 points) Results are below District goals for similar students.	See uploaded chart in Task 2.11
Ineffective (0 - 2 points) Results are well-below District goals for similar students.	See uploaded chart in Task 2.11

2.10) All Other Courses

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

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

	Course(s) or Subject(s)	Option	Assessment
	All other Secondary School (7-12) courses	School/BOCES-wide/group/team results based on State	NYS Regents exams - Algebra, Geometry, Alg. II/Trig., Living Environment, Earth Science, Chemistry, Physics, Global Studies, U. S. History, English
	All other Elementary School (K-6) courses	District, Regional or BOCES-developed	Tri-Valley District Developed specific course assessments

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

Use this box, if needed, to describe the general process for assigning HEDI categories for these grades/subjects in this subcomponent. If needed, you may upload a table or graphic at 2.11, below.	Gr. K-6: Teachers will develop growth targets based on course pre-assessment baseline data and approved by the Principal. HEDI points will be assigned based on the percentage of students who meet their individual growth targets. See uploaded document for HEDI point allocations. Gr. 7-12: Teachers who teach courses not ending in a NYS Regents will have a school wide growth expectation target. The District has set a minimum rigor expectation that 89% of students will grow at least 45% of the difference between their pre-assessment score and 100 on the Regents' Exams. The

	growth of all students taking each Regents will be weighted proportionately based on the number of students in each SLO to determine an overall percentage. Note: If a student fails to take the pre-test for reasons outside the District's control, the District will set a minimum rigor expectation for growth based on historical trends and patterns. When both the 2005 and CC Standards Algebra, Geometry and/or English are administered in a Common Core course, the higher of the two scores will be used to assign HEDI points. A HEDI score will be awarded based on percentage of students who meet or exceed the District's minimum growth expectations. See uploaded document for HEDI allocations.
Highly Effective (18 - 20 points) Results are well-above District goals for similar students.	See uploaded chart in Task 2.11
Effective (9 - 17 points) Results meet District goals for similar students.	See uploaded chart in Task 2.11
Developing (3 - 8 points) Results are below District goals for similar students.	See uploaded chart in Task 2.11
Ineffective (0 - 2 points) Results are well-below District goals for similar students.	See uploaded chart in Task 2.11

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/12186/599360-TXEtxx9bQW/2014-15Teacher CompositeFinal_1.docx

2.12) Locally Developed Controls

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

Note: The only allowable controls or adjustments for Comparable Growth Measures are the following: student prior academic history, students with disabilities, English language learners, and students in poverty.

Teachers who have student rosters which are comprised of more than 30% students with disabilities will have one point added to their teacher effectiveness score.

Teachers who have student rosters which are comprised of more than 50% students with disabilities will have two point added to their teacher effectiveness score.

In no instance will a teacher be awarded more than 2 points due to classroom enrollment of students with disabilities.

Tri-Valley is including these adjusment factors to support teachers working with students with disabilities. Due to their disabilities, classified students often do not grow at the same rate and/or on the same trajectory as students who are not classified. When a class has a roster with equal to or greater than the percentages of students with disabilities listed above, overall growth scores of teachers may be

suppressed.

Tri-Valley teachers are assigned classes/rosters by building administration. General Education and Special Education teachers rotate through general education classes, inclusion and special class assignments as IEP requirements demand and as allowed by certification. The District uses this process to ensure a level playing field for all students. This District process does not allow any teacher to negatively impact student achievement thus mitigating the potential for this allowance to be a problematic incentive.

2.13) Teachers with more than one growth measure

If educators have more than one state-provided growth or value-added measure, those measures will be combined into one HEDI rating and score for the growth subcomponent according to a formula determined by the Commissioner. (Examples: Common branch teacher with state-provided value-added measures for both ELA and Math in 4th grades; Middle school math teacher with both 7th and 8th grade math courses.)
If educators have more than one SLO for comparable growth (or a State-provided growth measure and an SLO for comparable growth), the measures will each earn a score from 0-20 points which Districts must weight proportionately based on the number of students in each SLO.

2.14) Assurances

Please check all of the boxes below:

2.14) Assurances | Assure the application of locally developed controls will be rigorous, fair, and transparent and only those used for State Growth will be used for Comparable Growth Measures.	Checked
2.14) Assurances | Assure that use of locally developed controls will not have a disparate impact on underrepresented students in accordance with applicable civil rights laws.	Checked
2.14) Assurances | Assure that enrolled students in accordance with teacher of record policies are included and may not be excluded.	Checked
2.14) Assurances | Assure that procedures for ensuring data accuracy and integrity are being utilized.	Checked
2.14) Assurances | Assure that district will develop SLOs according to the rules established by SED (see: http://www.engageny.org/resource/student-learning-objectives-guidance-document).	Checked
2.14) Assurances | Assure that past academic performance and/or baseline academic data of students will be taken into account when developing an SLO.	Checked
2.14) Assurances | Assure that the process for assigning points for SLOs for the Growth Subcomponent will use the narrative HEDI descriptions described in the regulations to effectively differentiate educators in ways that improve student learning and instruction.	Checked
2.14) Assurances | Assure that it is possible for an educator to earn each point, including 0, for SLOs in the Growth subcomponent scoring range.	Checked
2.14) Assurances | Assure that processes are in place to monitor SLOs to ensure rigor and comparability across classrooms.	Checked
2.14) Assurances | Assure that the amount of time devoted to traditional standardized assessments that are not specifically required by state or federal law for each classroom or program within a grade level does not exceed, in the aggregate, one percent of the minimum required annual instructional hours for the grade.	Checked
2.14) Assurances | Assure that, as applicable, any third party assessment that is administered to students in kindergarten, first, or second grade, and being used for APPR purposes, is consistent with the State's APPR Assessment Guidance and is not a traditional standardized assessment.	Checked

3. Local Measures (Teachers)

Created Wednesday, August 21, 2013
Updated Friday, January 16, 2015

Page 1

Locally Selected Measures of Student Achievement or Growth

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

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

Locally selected measures for common branch teachers: This form calls for locally selected measures in both ELA and math in grades typically served by common branch teachers. Districts may select local measures for common branch teachers that involve subjects other than ELA and math. Whatever local measure is selected for common branch teachers, please enter it under ELA and/or math and describe the assessment used, including the subject. Use N/A for other lines in that grade level that are served by common branch teachers. Describe the HEDI criteria for the measure in the same section where you identified the locally selected measure and assessment. Additionally, please provide a brief explanation in the HEDI general description box of why you have listed the grade/course as “Not Applicable” (e.g., district/BOCES does not offer this grade/subject; common branch teacher).

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

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

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

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

Growth or achievement measure(s) from these options.

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

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

Measures based on:

1) The change in percentage of a teacher’s students who achieve a specific level of performance as determined locally, on such assessments/examinations compared to those students’ level of performance on such assessments/examinations in the previous school year (e.g., a three percentage point increase in students earning the proficient level (three) or better performance level on the 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 measure that will be used as the locally-selected measure of student achievement. Then name the specific assessment that will be used with the locally-selected measure, listing the full name of the assessment.

	Locally-Selected Measure from List of Approved Measures	Assessment
4	4) State-approved 3rd party assessments	Measures of Academic Progress - (ELA)
5	4) State-approved 3rd party assessments	Measures of Academic Progress - (ELA)
6	4) State-approved 3rd party assessments	Measures of Academic Progress - (ELA)
7	4) State-approved 3rd party assessments	Measures of Academic Progress - (ELA)
8	4) State-approved 3rd party assessments	Measures of Academic Progress - (ELA)

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.	Grades 4-8 will use a measure based on the national norms derived from the Measure of Academic Progress assessment. A HEDI score will be awarded based on the overall percentage of individual teachers' students achieving expected Spring to Spring growth as published in the NWEA 2011 Normative Data Reference Table.
Highly Effective (14 - 15 points) Results are well above District- or BOCES-adopted expectations for growth or achievement for grade/subject.	See uploaded chart in Task 3.3

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

3.2) Grades 4-8 Math

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

	Locally-Selected Measure from List of Approved Measures	Assessment
4	4) State-approved 3rd party assessments	Measures of Academic Progress - (Math)
5	4) State-approved 3rd party assessments	Measures of Academic Progress - (Math)
6	4) State-approved 3rd party assessments	Measures of Academic Progress - (Math)
7	4) State-approved 3rd party assessments	Measures of Academic Progress - (Math)
8	4) State-approved 3rd party assessments	Measures of Academic Progress - (Math)

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.	Grades 4-8 will use a measure based on the national norms derived from the Measure of Academic Progress assessment. A HEDI score will be awarded based on the overall percentage of individual teachers' students achieving expected Spring to Spring growth as published in the NWEA 2011 Normative Data Reference Table.
Highly Effective (14 - 15 points) Results are well above District- or BOCES-adopted expectations for growth or achievement for grade/subject.	See uploaded document in Task 3.3
Effective (8- 13 points) Results meet District- or BOCES-adopted expectations for growth or achievement for grade/subject.	See uploaded document in Task 3.3
Developing (3 - 7 points) Results are below District- or BOCES-adopted expectations for growth or achievement for grade/subject.	See uploaded document in Task 3.3
Ineffective (0 - 2 points) Results are well below District- or BOCES-adopted expectations for growth or achievement for grade/subject.	See uploaded document in Task 3.3

3.3) HEDI Tables or Graphics

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

assets/survey-uploads/12149/599384-rhJdBgDruP/2014-15Teacher CompositeFinal_1.docx

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

	Locally-Selected Measure from List of Approved Measures	Assessment
K	4) Grades K-2: 3rd party non-“traditional standardized” assessment that meets NYSED guidance requirements	Map for Primary Grades - (ELA)
1	4) Grades K-2: 3rd party non-“traditional standardized” assessment that meets NYSED guidance requirements	Map for Primary Grades - (ELA)
2	4) Grades K-2: 3rd party non-“traditional standardized” assessment that meets NYSED guidance requirements	Measures of Academic Progress - (ELA)
3	9) Grades 3 and up: State-approved 3rd party assessments	Measures of Academic Progress - (ELA)

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.	Grades K-3 will use a measure based on the national norms derived from the Measure of Academic Progress assessment. A HEDI score will be awarded based on the overall percentage of individual teachers' students achieving expected Spring to Spring growth as published in the NWEA 2011 Normative Data Reference Table.
Highly Effective (18-20 points) Results are well above District- or BOCES-adopted expectations for growth or achievement for grade/subject.	See uploaded document in Task 3.13
Effective (9-17 points) Results meet District- or BOCES-adopted expectations for growth or achievement for grade/subject.	See uploaded document in Task 3.13
Developing (3 - 8 points) Results are below District- or BOCES-adopted expectations for growth or achievement for grade/subject.	See uploaded document in Task 3.13
Ineffective (0 - 2 points) Results are well below District- or BOCES-adopted expectations for growth or achievement for grade/subject.	See uploaded document in Task 3.13

3.5) Grades K-3 Math

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

	Locally-Selected Measure from List of Approved Measures	Assessment
K	4) Grades K-2: 3rd party non-“traditional standardized” assessment that meets NYSED guidance requirements	Map for Primary Grades - (Math)
1	4) Grades K-2: 3rd party non-“traditional standardized” assessment that meets NYSED guidance requirements	Map for Primary Grades - (Math)
2	4) Grades K-2: 3rd party non-“traditional standardized” assessment that meets NYSED guidance requirements	Measures of Academic Progress - (Math)

3	9) Grades 3 and up: State-approved 3rd party assessments	Measures of Academic Progress - (Math)

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.	Grades K-3 will use a measure based on the national norms derived from the Measure of Academic Progress assessment. A HEDI score will be awarded based on the overall percentage of individual teachers' students achieving expected Spring to Spring growth as published in the NWEA 2011 Normative Data Reference Table.
Highly Effective (18-20 points) Results are well above District- or BOCES-adopted expectations for growth or achievement for grade/subject.	See uploaded document in Task 3.13
Effective (9-17 points) Results meet District- or BOCES-adopted expectations for growth or achievement for grade/subject.	See uploaded document in Task 3.13
Developing (3 - 8 points) Results are below District -or BOCES-adopted expectations for growth or achievement for grade/subject.	See uploaded document in Task 3.13
Ineffective (0 - 2 points) Results are well below District- or BOCES-adopted expectations for growth or achievement for grade/subject.	See uploaded document in Task 3.13

3.6) Grades 6-8 Science

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

	Locally-Selected Measure from List of Approved Measures	Assessment
6	6(ii) School wide measure computed locally	Measure of Academic Progress - (ELA, Math)
7	6(ii) School wide measure computed locally	NYS Regents Exams - Algebra, Geometry, Algebra II/Trigonometry, Living Environment, Earth Science, Chemistry, Physics, Global Studies, U.S. History, English
8	6(ii) School wide measure computed locally	NYS Regents Exams - Algebra, Geometry, Algebra II/Trigonometry, Living Environment, Earth Science, Chemistry, Physics, Global Studies, U.S. History, English

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	Gr. 6 Science will use a school wide measure based on the national norms derived from the Measure of Academic Progress

subcomponent. If needed, you may upload a table or graphic at 3.13, below.	assessment averaging the percentages of grade 6 student who reach expected Spring to Spring growth as published in the NWEA 2011 Normative Data Reference Table. Gr. 7-12 teachers who teach courses not ending in a NYS Regents' exam will have a school wide growth expectation target. The District has set a minimum rigor expectation that 89% of students will grow at least 45% of the difference between their pre-assessment score and 100. The growth of all students taking each Regents will be averaged to determine an overall percentage. The HEDI score for each teacher in this task will be awarded based on the overall percentage of student who meet or exceed the District's minimum growth expectations. Note: If a student fails to take the pre-test for reasons outside the District's control, the District will set a minimum rigor expectation for growth based on historical trends and patterns. When both the 2005 and CC standards Algebra, Geometry and/or English Regents are administered in a common core course the higher of the two scores will be used to assign HEDI points.
Highly Effective (18 - 20 points) Results are well above District- or BOCES-adopted expectations for growth or achievement for grade/subject.	See uploaded document in Task 3.13
Effective (9 - 17 points) Results meet District- or BOCES-adopted expectations for growth or achievement for grade/subject.	See uploaded document in Task 3.13
Developing (3 - 8 points) Results are below District- or BOCES-adopted expectations for growth or achievement for grade/subject.	See uploaded document in Task 3.13
Ineffective (0 - 2 points) Results are well below District- or BOCES-adopted expectations for growth or achievement for grade/subject.	See uploaded document in Task 3.13

3.7) Grades 6-8 Social Studies

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

	Locally-Selected Measure from List of Approved Measures	Assessment
6	Not applicable	Common Branch
7	6(ii) School wide measure computed locally	NYS Regents Exams - Algebra, Geometry, Algebra II/Trigonometry, Living Environment, Earth Science, Chemistry, Physics, Global Studies, U.S. History, English
8	6(ii) School wide measure computed locally	NYS Regents Exams - Algebra, Geometry, Algebra II/Trigonometry, Living Environment, Earth Science, Chemistry, Physics, Global Studies, U.S. History, English

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.	Gr. 7-12 teachers who teach courses not ending in a NYS Regents' exam will have a school wide growth expectation target. The District has set a minimum rigor expectation that 89% of students will grow at least 45% of the difference between their pre-assessment score and 100. The growth of all students taking each Regents will be averaged to determine an overall percentage. The HEDI score for each teacher in this task will be awarded based on the overall percentage of students who meet or exceed the District's minimum growth expectations. Note: If a student fails to take the pre-test for reasons outside the District's control, the District will set a minimum rigor expectation for growth based on historical trends and patterns. When both the 2005 and CC Standards Algebra, Geometry and/or English are administered in a Common Core course, the higher of the two scores will be used to assign HEDI points. A HEDI score will be awarded based on percentage of students who meet or exceed the District's minimum growth expectations.
Highly Effective (18 - 20 points) Results are well above District- or BOCES-adopted expectations for growth or achievement for grade/subject.	See uploaded document in Task 3.13
Effective (9 - 17 points) Results meet District- or BOCES-adopted expectations for growth or achievement for grade/subject.	See uploaded document in Task 3.13
Developing (3 - 8 points) Results are below District- or BOCES-adopted expectations for growth or achievement for grade/subject.	See uploaded document in Task 3.13
Ineffective (0 - 2 points) Results are well below District- or BOCES-adopted expectations for growth or achievement for grade/subject.	See uploaded document in Task 3.13

3.8) High School Social Studies

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

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

	Locally-Selected Measure from List of Approved Measures	Assessment
Global 1	5) District, regional, or BOCES–developed assessments	TV District Developed Global 1 Assessment
Global 2	3) Teacher specific achievement or growth score computed locally	NYS Global 2 Regents Exam
American History	3) Teacher specific achievement or growth score computed locally	NYS United States History Regents Exam

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.	Teachers will set achievement targets with Principal's approval. HEDI points will be awarded based on the percentage of students meeting or exceeding their individual achievement targets.
Highly Effective (18 - 20 points) Results are well above District- or BOCES-adopted expectations for growth or achievement for grade/subject.	See uploaded document in Task 3.13
Effective (9 - 17 points) Results meet District- or BOCES-adopted expectations for growth or achievement for grade/subject.	See uploaded document in Task 3.13
Developing (3 - 8 points) Results are below District- or BOCES-adopted expectations for growth or achievement for grade/subject.	See uploaded document in Task 3.13
Ineffective (0 - 2 points) Results are well below District- or BOCES-adopted expectations for growth or achievement for grade/subject.	See uploaded document in Task 3.13

3.9) High School Science

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

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

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

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

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

Use this box, if needed, to describe the general process for assigning HEDI categories for these grades/subjects in this subcomponent. If needed, you may upload a table or graphic at 3.13, below.	Teachers will set achievement targets with Principal's approval. HEDI points will be awarded based on the percentage of students meeting or exceeding their individual achievement targets.
Highly Effective (18-20 points) Results are well above District- or BOCES-adopted expectations for growth or achievement for grade/subject.	See uploaded document in Task 3.13
Developing (3 - 8 points) Results are below District- or BOCES-adopted expectations for growth or achievement for grade/subject.	See uploaded document in Task 3.13

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

3.10) High School Math

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

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

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

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

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

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

Use this box, if needed, to describe the general process for assigning HEDI categories for these grades/subjects in this subcomponent. If needed, you may upload a table or graphic at 3.13, below.	Teachers will set achievement targets with Principal's approval. HEDI points will be awarded based on the percentage of students meeting or exceeding their individual achievement targets. A HEDI (0-20) score will be determined using the uploaded chart. When both the 2005 and CC Standards Algebra and/or Geometry are administered in a Common Core course, the higher of the two scores will be used to assign HEDI points.
Highly Effective (18 - 20 points) Results are well above District- or BOCES-adopted expectations for growth or achievement for grade/subject.	See uploaded document in Task 3.13
Effective (9 - 17 points) Results meet District- or BOCES-adopted expectations for growth or achievement for grade/subject.	See uploaded document in Task 3.13
Developing (3 - 8 points) Results are below District- or BOCES-adopted expectations for growth or achievement for grade/subject.	See uploaded document in Task 3.13
Ineffective (0 - 2 points) Results are well below District- or BOCES-adopted expectations for growth or achievement for grade/subject.	See uploaded document in Task 3.13

3.11) High School English Language Arts

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

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

	Locally-Selected Measure from List of Approved Measures	Assessment
Grade 9 ELA	5) District, regional, or BOCES–developed assessments	T-V District Developed English 9 Assessment
Grade 10 ELA	5) District, regional, or BOCES–developed assessments	T-V District Developed English 10 Assessment
Grade 11 ELA	3) Teacher specific achievement or growth score computed locally	NYS English Regents Exam

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

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

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

Use this box, if needed, to describe the general process for assigning HEDI categories for these grades/subjects in this subcomponent. If needed, you may upload a table or graphic at 3.13, below.	Teachers will set achievement targets with Principal's approval. HEDI points will be awarded based on the percentage of students meeting or exceeding their individual achievement targets. When both the 2005 and CC Standards English are administered in a Common Core course, the higher of the two scores will be used to assign HEDI points.
Highly Effective (18 - 20 points) Results are well above District- or BOCES-adopted expectations for growth or achievement for grade/subject.	See uploaded document in Task 3.13
Effective (9 - 17 points) Results meet District- or BOCES-adopted expectations for growth or achievement for grade/subject.	See uploaded document for Task 3.13
Developing (3 - 8 points) Results are below District- or BOCES-adopted expectations for growth or achievement for grade/subject.	See uploaded document for Task 3.13
Ineffective (0 - 2 points) Results are well below District- or BOCES-adopted expectations for growth or achievement for grade/subject.	See uploaded document for Task 3.13

3.12) All Other Courses

Fill in for additional grades/subjects, as applicable. If you need additional space, complete additional copies of this form and upload (below) as attachments. Please note that no APPR plan shall be approved by the Commissioner for use in the 2014-2015 school year or thereafter that provides for the administration of traditional standardized assessments for use with students in kindergarten through grade two for APPR purposes (see: http://www.engageny.org/resource/guidance-on-the-approved-regulatory-amendments-to-appr-to-help-reduce-local-testing).

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

drop-down option #8 applies to grades K-2.

	Course(s) or Subject(s)	Locally-Selected Measure from List of Approved Measures	Assessment
	All other Secondary School (7-12) courses	5) District/regional/BOCES–developed	T-V District developed course specific assessment
	All other Elementary School (K-6) courses	6(ii) School wide measure computed locally	Measure of Academic Progress (ELA, Math, Primary Grades),

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.	Secondary School 7-12: Teachers will set achievement targets with Principal's approval. HEDI points will be awarded based on the percentage of students meeting or exceeding their individual achievement targets. ES - All other courses - The District will use a measure based on averaging the percentages of students who reach expected Spring to Spring growth as published in the NWEA 2011 Normative Data Reference Table. A HEDI score will be awarded using an average of the percentage of students meeting Spring to Spring growth in ELA and Math in each grade level.
Highly Effective (18 - 20 points) Results are well above District- or BOCES -adopted expectations for growth or achievement for grade/subject.	See uploaded document for Task 3.13
Effective (9 - 17 points) Results meet District- or BOCES-adopted expectations for growth or achievement for grade/subject.	See uploaded document for Task 3.13
Developing (3 - 8 points) Results are below District- or BOCES-adopted expectations for growth or achievement for grade/subject.	See uploaded document for Task 3.13
Ineffective (0 - 2 points) Results are well below District- or BOCES-adopted expectations for growth or achievement for grade/subject.	See uploaded document for Task 3.13

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

(No response)

3.13) HEDI Tables or Graphics

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

assets/survey-uploads/12149/599384-y92vNseFa4/2014-15Teacher CompositeFinal_1.docx

3.14) Locally Developed Controls

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

Not applicable

3.15) Teachers with More Than One Locally Selected Measure

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

Results for teachers with multiple locally selected measures will result in a single score using the following process
1. Individual measures will be calculated to determine HEDI scores,
2, HEDI scores will be weighted based on total student count and number of students in each local measure
3. Standard rounding rules will be applied to determine single HEDI category and score from the combination of multiple measures.

3.16) Assurances

Please check all of the boxes below:

3.16) Assurances | Assure the application of locally-developed controls will be rigorous, fair, and transparent.	Checked
3.16) Assurances | Assure that use of locally-developed controls will not have a disparate impact on underrepresented students in accordance with any applicable civil rights laws.	Checked
3.16) Assurances | Assure that enrolled students in accordance with teacher of record policies are included and may not be excluded.	Checked
3.16) Assurances | Assure that procedures for ensuring data accuracy and integrity are being utilized.	Checked
3.16) Assurances | Assure that the process for assigning points for locally selected measures will use the narrative HEDI descriptions described in the regulations to effectively differentiate educators' performance in ways that improve student learning and instruction.	Checked
3.16) Assurances | Assure that it is possible for an educator to earn each point, including 0, for the locally-selected measures subcomponent.	Checked
3.16) Assurances | Assure that locally-selected measures are rigorous and comparable across all classrooms in the same grade/subject in the district.	Checked
3.16) Assurances | If more than one type of locally-selected measure is used for different groups of teachers within a grade/subject, certify that the measures are comparable based on the Standards of Educational and Psychological Testing.	Checked
3.16) Assurances | Assure that all locally-selected measures for a teacher are different than any measures used for the State assessment or other comparable measures subcomponent.	Checked
3.16) Assurances | Assure that the amount of time devoted to traditional standardized assessments that are not specifically required by state or federal law for each classroom or program within a grade level does not exceed, in the aggregate, one percent of the minimum in required annual instructional hours for the grade.	Checked
3.16) Assurances | Assure that, as applicable, any third party assessment that is administered to students in kindergarten, first, or second grade, and being used for APPR purposes, is consistent with the State's APPR Assessment Guidance and is not a traditional standardized assessment.	Checked

4. Other Measures of Effectiveness (Teachers)

Created Friday, August 23, 2013
Updated Friday, January 16, 2015

Page 1

4.1) Teacher Practice Rubric

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

The "Second Rubric" space is required for districts that have chosen an observation-only rubric (CLASS or NYSTCE) from the State-approved list. (Note: Any district may use multiple rubrics, as long as the same rubric(s) is used for all classroom teachers in a grade/subject across the district.)

4.1) Teacher Practice Rubric | Rubric	Marshall's Teacher Evaluation Rubric (2012 Revised Edition)

Second Rubric, if applicable	Not Applicable

4.2) Points Within Other Measures

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

Yes

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

(No response)

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

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

(No response)

4.3) Survey Tools (if applicable)

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

(No response)

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

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

4.4) Assurances

Please check all of the boxes below:

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

4.5) Process for Assigning Points and Determining HEDI Ratings

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

Teachers will be assigned a HEDI score from 0-60 based on multiple classroom observations using the Marshall rubric. The process for determining a score of 0-60 is as follows: during each classroom observation, each observed subcomponent of Domains A, B, C will receive a Highly Effective, Effective, Developing, or Ineffective rating. At the end of the year summative conference between the teacher and the evaluator, the H,E,D,I rating for each subcomponent will be converted to a 1-4 score (H =4, E = 3, D = 2, I=1). If a subcomponent is observed in multiple observations, the individual subcomponent scores will be averaged to achieve an overall subcomponent score. The teacher and evaluator will present evidence of practice to score the subcomponents in Domains D, E, and F, 1-4. The subcomponent scores for each domains will be averaged to compute a domain score for each domain A - F. Each domain score will be weighted by the corresponding multiplier indicated in the uploaded conversion chart. The weighted domain scores will then be summed and divided by the total multiplier of 13 to compute an average rubric score. The average rubric score will then be converted to a 0-60 HEDI score using the uploaded conversion chart.
Standard rounding rules will apply but in no case will rounding permit a teacher's score to move from one scoring band to another. Overall points were calculated to insure that each of the 60 points is available to every teacher. The average rubric scores listed in the

uploaded conversion chart are the minimum scores necessary to achieve the corresponding HEDI point value."

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

assets/survey-uploads/12179/601078-eka9yMJ855/2014-15Teacher CompositeFinal_1.docx

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

Highly Effective: Overall performance and results exceed NYS Teaching Standards.	Teachers achieving a value of 3.8-4.0 based on the Marshall Rubric domains.
Effective: Overall performance and results meet NYS Teaching Standards.	Teachers achieving a value of 2.95-3.79 based on the Marshall Rubric domains.
Developing: Overall performance and results need improvement in order to meet NYS Teaching Standards.	Teachers achieving a value of 1.5-2.94 based on the Marshall Rubric domains.
Ineffective: Overall performance and results do not meet NYS Teaching Standards.	Teachers achieving a value of 1.0-1.49 based on the Marshall Rubric domains.

Provide the ranges for the 60-point scoring bands.

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

4.6) Observations of Probationary Teachers

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

By building principals or other trained administrators

Formal/Long	2
Informal/Short	2
Enter Total	4

By trained in-school peer teachers or other trained reviewers

Formal/Long	0
Informal/Short	0

Independent evaluators

Formal/Long	0
Informal/Short	0

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

- In Person

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

- In Person

4.7) Observations of Tenured Teachers

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

By building principals or other trained administrators

Formal/Long	0
Informal/Short	3
Total	3

By trained in-school peer teachers or other trained reviewers

Formal/Long	0
Informal/Short	0

Independent evaluators

Formal/Long	0
Informal/Short	0

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

- Not Applicable

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

- In Person

5. Composite Scoring (Teachers)

Created Friday, August 23, 2013
Updated Friday, January 16, 2015

Page 1

Standards for Rating Categories

Growth or Comparable Measures

Locally-selected Measures of growth or achievement

Other Measures of Effectiveness (Teacher and Leader standards)

Highly Effective

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

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

Overall performance and results exceed NYS Teaching Standards.

Effective

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

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

Overall performance and results meet NYS Teaching Standards.

Developing

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

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

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

Ineffective

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

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

Overall performance and results do not meet NYS Teaching Standards.

The Commissioner shall review the specific scoring ranges for each of the rating categories annually before the start of each school year and shall recommend any changes to the Board of Regents for consideration.

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

Where there is no Value-Added measure

	Growth or Comparable Measures	Locally-selected Measures of growth or achievement	Other Measures of Effectiveness (60 points)	Overall Composite Score
Highly Effective	18-20	18-20	Ranges determined locally--see below	91-100
Effective	9-17	9-17		75-90
Developing	3-8	3-8		65-74
Ineffective	0-2	0-2		0-64

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

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

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

Where Value-Added growth measure applies
Growth or Comparable Measures
Locally-selected Measures of
growth or achievement
Other Measures of Effectiveness
(60 points)

Overall
Composite Score

Highly Effective
22-25
14-15
Ranges determined locally--see above
91-100

Effective
10-21
8-13
75-90

Developing
3-9
3-7
65-74

Ineffective
0-2
0-2
0-64

6. Additional Requirements - Teachers

Created Friday, August 23, 2013
Updated Monday, December 15, 2014

Page 1

6.1) Assurances -- Improvement Plans

Please check the boxes below:

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

6.2) Attachment: Teacher Improvement Plan Forms

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

assets/survey-uploads/12193/601094-Df0w3Xx5v6/Teacher Improvement Plan.doc

6.3) Appeals Process

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

(1) the substance of the annual professional performance review

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

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

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

Appeals Procedure for the Annual Professional Performance Review
1. Appeals of annual professional reviews will be limited to the following situations:
a. A teacher completing the first year of a three-year probationary appointment may appeal only an ineffective APPR composite rating.
b. Any other teacher may appeal an ineffective APPR composite rating
c. A teacher may appeal two consecutive developing APPR composite ratings.

d. Any teacher may appeal an improvement plan if and only if the plan were generated as a result of an ineffective or developing composite rating

2. In accordance with the law and regulations, a teacher may only appeal the following in conjunction with his/her APPR:
a. The substance of the individual's annual professional performance review
b. The district's adherence to the standards and methodologies required for such reviews
c. The district's adherence to the regulations and compliance with any locally negotiated procedures, as well as the District's issuance and/or implementation of the terms of the Teacher Improvement Plan (TIP)

3. A teacher may not file multiple appeals regarding the same performance review or TIP. All grounds for appeal must be raised with specificity within one appeal. Any grounds not raised at the time the appeal is filed may be waived. An appeal must state the nature of the remedy or relief sought.

4. In an appeal, the teacher has the burden of demonstrating by a preponderance of the evidence a clear legal right to the relief requested and the burden of establishing the facts upon which relief is sought.

5. All appeals must be submitted in writing to the Superintendent no later than 10 school days from the date when the teacher receives his/her annual professional review. If a teacher is challenging the issuance of a TIP, appeals must be filed no later than 10 business days of issuance of such plan. The failure to file an appeal within these timeframes shall constitute a waiver of the right to appeal and the appeal shall be abandoned.

6. When filing an appeal, the teacher must submit a detailed, written description of the specific areas of disagreement over his/her performance review, or the issuance and/or implementation of the terms of his/her improvement plan, and any additional documents or materials relevant to the appeal. The performance review and/or improvement plan being challenged must also be submitted with the appeal. Any information submitted after the time the appeal is filed must be support and be germane to the grounds of the appeal.

7. Within 10 business days of the receipt of the appeal, it will be submitted to a panel consisting of two teacher representatives appointed by the Association and two administrative representatives appointed by the Superintendent. The panel will be provided the entire appeals record. However, any information identifying the appellant or the appellant's evaluator will be redacted prior to receipt by the panel. Further, the anonymity of the panel members will be protected to the extent possible throughout this procedure. The panel reserves the right to request an interview with the appellant to gather further information, clarification, or explanation. The appellant may choose to forgo this interview without prejudice regarding the merits of the appeal.

8. A written decision of the panel's findings on the merits of the appeal shall be rendered no later than 30 days from the date upon which the teacher filed his/her appeal. The appeal shall be based on a written record, comprised of the teacher's appeal papers and any documentary evidence accompanying the appeal, as well as the panel's response, if any, to the appeal and additional documentary evidence submitted with such papers. Such decision shall be final except as provided for in paragraph 9 below.

9. The decision shall set forth the reasons and factual basis for the determination on each of the specific issues raised in the teacher's appeal.
a. If the appeal is sustained, the panel may set aside a rating, modify a rating, or order a new evaluation based on the panel's recommendation. A copy of the decision shall be provided to the teacher and the evaluator or the person responsible for either issuing or implementing the terms of an improvement plan, if that person is different.
b. In the event that a teacher receives and unsuccessfully appeals two consecutive "ineffective" ratings, he/she may appeal the determination of the second consecutive "ineffective" rating to the superintendent within 10 business days of receiving the decision. The appeal shall be conducted by the superintendent who shall render a decision within 10 business days of receiving the appeal. The sole issue before the superintendent shall be whether or not the second "ineffective" rating accurately reflected the teacher's performance during the period it covered.

10. This appeal procedure shall constitute the exclusive means for initiating, reviewing, and resolving any and all challenges and appeals related to a teacher's performance review and/or improvement plan. A teacher may not resort to any other contractual grievance procedures for the resolution of challenges and appeals related to a professional performance review and/or teacher improvement plan, except otherwise authorized by law. All steps and the resolution of the appeal will occur in a timely and expeditious manner.

11. Nothing herein shall limit the right of a non-tenured teacher to exercise his/her right pursuant to Education Law 3031 and bring a grievance charging procedural violation of the provisions of the collective bargaining agreement and APPR procedures.

12. In the event that the APPR is repealed, the parties agree to reopen the contract for the limited purpose of negotiating an alternative procedure.

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

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

To qualify for certification as a lead evaluator or evaluator, the individuals must successfully complete professional development courses that meet the requirements prescribed below. This training varies in length from 2 days to 1-2 hour refresh sessions depending upon the topic. Workshops are provided by qualified professional developers from Sullivan County and Orange/Ulster BOCES and Dutchess Network Teams, The Council of School Superintendents (LEAF), NYSSBA, NYSED Network Team Training as well as highly qualified consultants. District staff who complete the necessary instruction to become "turn-key" trainers, or other qualified trainers or on-line courses provided by one of the aforementioned professional developers and/or review of the resources from EngageNY facilitated by a district of BOCES administrator of professional development specialist. Ongoing training will occur throughout the school year with the total training thereafter, for purposes of continued growth, will maintain inter-rater reliability of evaluators over time.
The series of workshops which constitutes the course needed for initial certification includes the following elements:
1. The New York State Teaching Standards, and their related elements and performance indicators and the Leadership Standards
2. Evidence-based observation techniques that are grounded in research provided during ,
3. Application and use of the student growth percentile model and the value-added growth model as defined in section 30-2.2 of the Commissioner's Regulation, Subpart,
4. Application and use of the State-approved teacher or principal rubric(s) selected by the district 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 the assessment tools that the district utilizes to evaluate classroom teachers or building principals, including but not limited t student, parent, teacher and/or community surveys; mini-observations; walk-throughs; professional growth goals and reflections.
6. Application and use of any State-approved locally selected measures of student achievement used by the district to evaluate teachers and principals,
7. Use of the Statewide Instructional Reporting System,
8. The scoring methodology utilized by the Department and/or the district to evaluate a teacher or principal, 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, and
10. Inter-rater reliability such as data analysis to detect disparities on the part of one or more evaluators, periodic comparisons of lead evaluator's assessment with another evaluator's assessment of the same classroom teacher or building principal, in addition to annual calibration sessions across evaluators. This will be completed on an annual basis at the annual summer retreat and multiple times in classrooms during the first two months of school.
11. Evaluators and lead evaluators who complete the series of in-service education workshops, seminars, or on-line courses must provide evidence of attendance and successful completion in order to be certified by the superintendent of schools and approved by the Board of Education. This professional development will consist of the aforementioned components and is subject to change as may be determined by new information shared with the districts from the Department.

Each evaluator and lead evaluator documents their training dates and time on a form which is submitted to the Superintendent in September. The superintendent will provide evidence of recertification and/or certification activities depending on the administrator, to the Board of Education each September for approval via BOE resolution.

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 Friday, August 23, 2013
Updated Tuesday, January 06, 2015

Page 1

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

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

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

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

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

K-6
7-12

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

Please check the boxes below:

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

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

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

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

State assessments, required if one exists
District, regional, or BOCES-developed assessments that are rigorous and comparable across classrooms
List of State-approved 3rd party assessments

First, list the grade configuration of the school or program the SLO applies to. Then, using the drop-down boxes below, please select the type of assessment that will be used for SLOs for the school/program listed. Finally, name the specific assessment listing the full name of the assessment. Districts or BOCES that intend to use a district, regional, or BOCES-developed assessment must include the name, grade, and subject of the assessment in the following format: "[Name of your District/Region/BOCES] developed [Grade] [Subject] Assessment." For example, a BOCES-developed 7th grade Social Studies assessment would be written as follows: "GVEP-Developed Grade 7 Social Studies Assessment." For State-approved 3rd party assessments, please include the name of the assessment exactly as it appears in RED on the State-approved list. For State assessments or Regents examinations, please indicate as such in the assessment name.

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

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

School or Program Type	SLO with Assessment Option	Name of the Assessment
Not Applicable		Not Applicable

Describe the district-adopted expectations for the level of performance required for each HEDI rating category and the process for assigning points to principals based on SLO results, consistent with regulations and assurances in the Comparable Growth Measures subcomponent. Include any district-determined expectations for student performance. Please describe the process your district is using to measure student growth on the assessments listed for this Task. If applicable, please also include a description of the process for combining the State-provided growth score with the SLO(s) for this Task.

Use this box, if needed, to describe the process for assigning HEDI categories in this subcomponent. If needed, you may upload a table or graphic below.	
Highly Effective (18 - 20 points) Results are well above state average for similar students (or District goals if no state test).	N/A
Effective (9 - 17 points) Results meet state average for similar students (or District goals if no state test).	N/A
Developing (3 - 8 points) Results are below state average for similar students (or District goals if no state test).	N/A

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

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

Note: The only allowable controls or adjustments for Comparable Growth Measures are the following: prior student achievement results, students with disabilities, English language learners, and students in poverty.

None

7.5) Principals with More Than One Growth Measure

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

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

7.6) Assurances -- Comparable Growth Measures

Please check all of the boxes below:

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

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

8. Local Measures (Principals)

Created Friday, August 23, 2013
Updated Thursday, January 15, 2015

Page 1

Locally-Selected Measures of Student Achievement or Growth

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

(h) students' progress toward graduation in the school using strong predictive indicators, including but not limited to 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/Program	Locally-Selected Measure from List of Approved Measures	Assessment
	K-6	(d) measures used by district for teacher evaluation	Measures of Academic Progress (ELA, Math)
	7-12	(d) measures used by district for teacher evaluation	NYS Regents exams - Algebra, Geometry, Alg. II/Trig., Living Environment, Earth Science, Chemistry, Physics, Global Studies, U. S. History, English
	7-12	(d) measures used by district for teacher evaluation	Measures of Academic Progress (ELA, Math)

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.	Consultations between the Superintendent and each principal resulted in targets based on an analysis of student data for identified grade(s). Principals will be allocated HEDI points based on the decisions below and according to uploaded charts. K-6 Principal: A HEDI score will be awarded based on an average of the overall percentage of students who achieve expected Spring to Spring growth as published in the NWEA 2011 Normative Data Reference Table. 7-12 Principal: The principal will receive an average of the HEDI scores derived from the following two measures. Measure 1: A HEDI score will be awarded based on an average of the percentage of grade 7 and grade 8 students achieving expected Spring to Spring growth as published in the NWEA 2011 Normative Data Reference Table. Measure 2: The District set school wide minimum rigor expectation for growth. Students will demonstrate a 45%

	increase between pre-assessment score and a score of 100 on the NYS Regents' Exam - Algebra, Geometry, Alg. II/Trig., Living Environment, Earth Science, Chemistry, Physics, Global Studies, U. S. History, English. When both the 2005 and CC Standards Algebra & Geometry and English are administered in a Common Core course, the higher of the two scores will be used to assign HEDI points. Note: If a student fails to take the pre-test for reasons outside the District's control, the District will set a minimum rigor expectation for growth based on historical trends and patterns. HEDI points will be assigned based on the overall percentage of students who meet or exceed the minimum rigor growth target.
Highly Effective (14 - 15 points) Results are well above District- or BOCES-adopted expectations for growth or achievement for grade/subject.	See uploaded document in Task 8.1
Effective (8- 13 points) Results meet District- or BOCES-adopted expectations for growth or achievement for grade/subject.	See uploaded document in Task 8.1
Developing (3 - 7 points) Results are below District- or BOCES-adopted expectations for growth or achievement for grade/subject.	See uploaded document in Task 8.1
Ineffective (0 - 2 points) Results are well below District- or BOCES-adopted expectations for growth or achievement for grade/subject.	See uploaded document in Task 8.1

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

(No response)

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

assets/survey-uploads/12190/601114-qBFVOWF7fC/2014-15PrincipalCompositeFinal_1.docx

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

(h) students' progress toward graduation in the school using strong predictive indicators, including but not limited to 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
	Not Applicable		Not Applicable

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

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

Use this box, if needed, to describe the process for assigning HEDI categories. If needed, you may upload a table or graphic below.	Not applicable
Highly Effective (18 - 20 points) Results are well above District- or BOCES-adopted expectations for growth or achievement for grade/subject.	Not applicable
Effective (9- 17 points) Results meet District- or BOCES-adopted expectations for growth or achievement for grade/subject.	Not applicable
Developing (3 - 8 points) Results are below District- or BOCES-adopted expectations for growth or achievement for grade/subject.	Not applicable

Ineffective (0 - 2 points) Results are well below District- or BOCES-adopted expectations for growth or achievement for grade/subject.	Not applicable

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

(No response)

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

assets/survey-uploads/12190/601114-T8MlGWUVm1/2014-15PrincipalCompositeFinal.docx

8.3) Locally Developed Controls

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

All students are included in targets

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.

7-12 Principal: HEDI scores will be calculated for each measure (2) and averaged to achieve one score that will be used to assign a HEDI rating from the available HEDI points. The general rounding rule will apply except when it leads to a principal moving from one HEDI band to a higher one.

8.5) Assurances

Please check all of the boxes below:

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

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

9. Other Measures of Effectiveness (Principals)

Created Friday, August 23, 2013
Updated Wednesday, January 21, 2015

Page 1

9.1) Principal Practice Rubric

Select the choice of principal practice rubric from the menu of State-approved rubrics to assess performance based on ISLLC 2008 Standards. If your district has been granted a variance by NYSED through the variance process, select "district variance" from the menu.The "Second Rubric" space is optional. A district may use multiple rubrics, as long as the same rubric(s) is used for all principals in the same or similar programs or grade configurations across the district.

9.1) Principal Practice Rubric | Rubric	Marshall's Principal Evaluation Rubric (2012 Revised Edition with 2013 Updates)

Second rubric (if applicable)	(No response)

9.2) Points Within Other Measures

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

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

Is the following point assignment for all principals?

Yes

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

(No response)

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

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

If the above points assignment is not for "all principals," fill out an additional copy of "Form 9.2: Points Within Other Measures" for each group of principals, label accordingly, 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 assigning any points to "ambitious and measurable goals":

9.3) Assurances -- Goals | Assure that if any points are assigned to goals, at least one goal will address the principal's contribution to improving teacher effectiveness based on one or more of the following: improved retention of high performing teachers; correlation of student growth scores to teachers granted vs. denied tenure; or improvements in proficiency rating of the principal on specific teacher effectiveness standards in the principal practice rubric.	(No response)
9.3) Assurances -- Goals | Assure that any other goals, if applicable, shall address quantifiable and verifiable improvements in academic results or the school's learning environment (e.g. student or teacher attendance).	(No response)

9.4) Sources of Evidence (if applicable)

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

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

9.5) Survey Tool(s) (if applicable)

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

(No response)

Note: When the State-approved survey list is updated, this list will be updated within the drop-down menu of approved survey tools.

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

NYC School Survey-2012 Teacher Survey	(No response)

9.6) Assurances

Please check all of the boxes below:

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

9.7) Process for Assigning Points and Determining HEDI Ratings

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

The Marshall Principal Practice Rubric shall be used as the principal practice rubric. The Marshall Principal Practice Rubric will be assigned 60 points of the total 60 points for Other Measures

Determination of a principal's domain score for Domains A, B, C and D is based on evidence gathered from multiple school visits and evidence obtained from principal interactions with teachers -individually and in groups. Domains E and F are used for observation of professional practice in areas other than those that related to teaching and learning in the classroom.

For the end of year summative conference, the subcomponents in each domain will be rated 1-4 to determine a score for each domain based on the totality of the evidence collected from school visits regarding classroom teaching and learning and observation of other professional practice. When the summative conference between the Evaluator and Principal concludes, domain points will be tallied for each domain, and added together to calculate a rubric score prior to conversion to a 0-60 HEDI score. The general rounding rule will apply except when it leads to a principal moving from one HEDI band to a higher one using uploaded conversion chart. Overall points were calculated to insure that each of the 60 points is available to every principal. The rubric scores listed on the uploaded conversion chart are the minimum scores necessary to achieve the corresponding HEDI point value.
Domain Weights:
~Domain 1 - Diagnosis and Planning - 15 pts.
~Domain 2 - Priority Management and Communication - 5 pts.
~Domain 3 - Curriculum and Data - 15 pts.
~Domain 4 - Supervision, Evaluation and Professional Development - 15 pts.
~Domain 5 - Discipline and Family Involvement - 5 pts.
~Domain 6 - Management and External Relations - 5 pts.

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/12205/601153-pMADJ4gk6R/2014-15PrincipalCompositeFinal_2.docx

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

Highly Effective: Overall performance and results exceed standards.	Principal achieves 44.2 or more of the possible points on the principal practice rubric, well above district expectations.
Effective: Overall performance and results meet standards.	Principal achieves between 25.4-44.1 of the possible points on the principal practice rubric, meeting district expectations.
Developing: Overall performance and results need improvement in order to meet standards.	Principal achieves between 16.6-25.3 of the possible points on the principal practice rubric, performing below district expectations.
Ineffective: Overall performance and results do not meet standards.	Principal achieves between 0-16.5 of the possible points on the principal practice rubric, performing well below district expectations

Please provide the locally-negotiated 60 point scoring bands.

Highly Effective	59-60
Effective	54-58
Developing	50-53
Ineffective	0-49

9.8) School Visits

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

Probationary Principals

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

Tenured Principals

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

10. Composite Scoring (Principals)

Created Friday, August 23, 2013
Updated Friday, January 09, 2015

Page 1

Standards for Rating Categories

Growth or Comparable Measures

Locally-selected Measures of growth or achievement

Other Measures of Effectiveness (Teacher and Leader standards)

Highly Effective

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

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

Overall performance and results exceed ISLLC leadership standards.

Effective

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

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

Overall performance and results meet ISLLC leadership standards.

Developing

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

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

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

Ineffective

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

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

Overall performance and results do not meet ISLLC leadership standards.

The Commissioner shall review the specific scoring ranges for each of the rating categories annually before the start of each school year and shall recommend any changes to the Board of Regents for consideration.

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

Where there is no Value-Added measure

	Growth or Comparable Measures	Locally-selected Measures of growth or achievement	Other Measures of Effectiveness (60 points)	Overall Composite Score
Highly Effective	18-20	18-20	Ranges determined locally--see below	91-100
Effective	9-17	9-17		75-90
Developing	3-8	3-8		65-74
Ineffective	0-2	0-2		0-64

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

Highly Effective	59-60
Effective	54-58
Developing	50-53
Ineffective	0-49

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

Where Value-Added growth measure applies
Growth or Comparable Measures
Locally-selected Measures of
growth or achievement
Other Measures of Effectiveness
(60 points)

Overall
Composite Score

Highly Effective
22-25
14-15
Ranges determined locally--see above
91-100

Effective
10-21
8-13
75-90

Developing
3-9
3-7
65-74

Ineffective
0-2
0-2
0-64

11. Additional Requirements - Principals

Created Friday, August 23, 2013
Updated Friday, January 09, 2015

Page 1

11.1) Assurances -- Improvement Plans

Please check the boxes below.

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

11.2) Attachment: Principal Improvement Plan Forms

As a required attachment to this APPR plan, upload the PIP forms that are used in the school district or BOCES. All PIP plans must include: 1) identification of needed areas of improvement, 2) a timeline for achieving improvement, 3) the manner in which the improvement will be assessed, and, where appropriate, 4) differentiated activities to support a principal's improvement in those areas.

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

assets/survey-uploads/12168/601173-Df0w3Xx5v6/12.9.1Principal PIP.docx

11.3) Appeals Process

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

(1) the substance of the annual professional performance review

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

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

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

Appeals Procedure for the Annual Professional Performance Review - Principals

1. Appeals of annual professional reviews will be limited to the following situations:
a. Any principal may appeal an ineffective APPR composite rating
b. A principal may appeal two consecutive developing APPR composite ratings.

c. Any principal may appeal an improvement plan if and only if the plan were generated as a result of an ineffective or developing composite rating

2. In accordance with the law and regulations, a principal may only appeal the following in conjunction with his/her APPR:
a. The substance of the individual's annual professional performance review
b. The district's adherence to the standards and methodologies required for such reviews
c. The district's adherence to the regulations and compliance with the District's issuance and/or implementation of the terms of the Principal Improvement Plan (PIP)

3. A principal may not file multiple appeals regarding the same performance review or PIP. All grounds for appeal must be raised with specificity within one appeal. Any grounds not raised at the time the appeal is filed may be waived. An appeal must state the nature of the remedy or relief sought.

4. In an appeal, the principal has the burden of demonstrating by a preponderance of the evidence a clear legal right to the relief requested and the burden of establishing the facts upon which relief is sought.

5. All appeals must be submitted in writing to the Superintendent no later than 10 school days from the date when the principal receives his/her annual professional review. If a principal is challenging the issuance of a PIP, appeals must be filed no later than 10 school days of issuance of such plan. The failure to file an appeal within these timeframes shall constitute a waiver of the right to appeal and the appeal shall be abandoned.

6. When filing an appeal, the principal must submit a detailed, written description of the specific areas of disagreement over his/her performance review, or the issuance and/or implementation of the terms of his/her improvement plan, and any additional documents or materials relevant to the appeal. The performance review and/or improvement plan being challenged must also be submitted with the appeal. Any information submitted after the time the appeal is filed must be support and be germane to the grounds of the appeal.

7. Within 10 school days of the receipt of the appeal, it will be submitted to the Superintendent. The Superintendent will be provided the entire appeals record. The Superintendent may meet with the appellant to gather further information, clarification, or explanation. The appellant may choose to forgo this interview without prejudice regarding the merits of the appeal.

8. A written decision of the Superintendent's findings on the merits of the appeal shall be rendered no later than 30 days from the date upon which the principal filed his/her appeal. The appeal shall be based on a written record, comprised of the principal's appeal papers and any documentary evidence accompanying the appeal, if any, to the appeal and additional documentary evidence submitted with such papers.

9. The decision shall set forth the reasons and factual basis for the determination on each of the specific issues raised in the principal's appeal. If the appeal is sustained, the Superintendent may set aside a rating, modify a rating, or order a new evaluation based on the panel's recommendation. A copy of the decision shall be provided to the principal and the evaluator or the person responsible for either issuing or implementing the terms of an improvement plan, if that person is different.

10. This appeal procedure shall constitute the exclusive means for initiating, reviewing, and resolving any and all challenges and appeals related to a principal's performance review and/or improvement plan. A principal may not resort to any other contractual grievance procedures for the resolution of challenges and appeals related to a professional performance review and/or principal improvement plan, except otherwise authorized by law.

11. In the event that the APPR is repealed, the parties agree to reopen the contract for the limited purpose of negotiating an alternative procedure.

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

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

Lead evaluators and evaluators participate in training throughout the year. Training will consist of the 9 required elements outline in Regents Rules section 30-2.9. Administrators will participate in a minimum of 30 hours of training per year.

Training occurs through professional development providers including but not limited to: Sullivan & Ulster BOCES; NYCOSS; LEAF, Kim Marshall, NYS Network Team . Training that leads to increasing understanding of evaluation elements continues to be integrated in regional Superintendent's Council Meetings, Principal's Meetings, regional trainings on components of the APPR system

through the RTTT Network Team and in local consistancy assurance training and practice.

Inter-rater reliability is sustained through collaborative intra-District work as well as in training outlined above. The process of ensuring inter-rater reliability is ongoing through above trainings and meetings.

Lead evaluators record and verify the required training on a District form. This documentation will be submitted to the Superintendent who will review the training for the purpose of certifying or recertifying District evaluators and lead evaluators at a Board of Education meeting in September. This process will apply to both lead evaluators and evaluators.

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 Sunday, August 25, 2013
Updated Tuesday, February 10, 2015

Page 1

12.1)Upload the Joint Certification of the APPR Plan

Please obtain the required signatures, create a PDF file, and upload your joint certification of the APPR Plan using this form: APPR District Certification Form. Please note that Review Room timestamps each revision and signatures cannot be dated earlier than the last revision.

assets/survey-uploads/12158/602840-3Uqgn5g9Iu/2014-15 APPR Cert..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.

Tri-Valley Central School District
Conversion Charts for Assigning Points - Teachers

Task 2.2 – Grade 3, 2.3 – Grade 3, Task 2.4-2.10

Ineffective	Developing	Effective	Highly Effective
2 points: 65-67% of students met target 1 point: 43-64% of students met target 0 points: less than 43% of students met target	8 points: 77-79% of met target 7 points: 74-76% of students met target 6 points: 72-73% of students met target 5 points: 71% of students met target 4 points: 70% of students met target 3 points: 68-69% of students met target	17 points: 95-96% of students met target 16 points: 94% of students met target 15 points: 92-93% of students met target 14 points: 90-91% of students met target 13 points: 89% of students met target 12 points: 86-88% of students met target 11 points: 84-85% of students met target 10 points: 82-83% of students met target 9 points: 80-81% of students met target	20 points: 100% of students met target 19 points: 98-99% met target 18 points: 97% met target

Task 2.2 , 2.3 – Grades K-2

H			E									D						I		
20 pts	19	18	17	16	15	14	13	12	11	10	9	8	7	6	5	4	3	2	1	0 pts
25 24 pts	23	22	21 20	19 18	17 16	15	14	13	12	11	10	9 8	7	6	5	4	3	2	1	0 pts

Task 3.1, 3.2, 3.4, 3.5, 3.6-Gr. 6, 3.12 ES Teachers

H			E									D						I		
20	19	18	17	16	15	14	13	12	11	10	9	8	7	6	5	4	3	2	1	0
>68 %*	65-68 %	61-64 %	59-60 %	57-58 %	55-56 %	53-54 %	51-52 %	49-50 %	47-48 %	45-46 %	44 %	42-43 %	40-41 %	38-39 %	36-37 %	34-35 %	32-33 %	30-31 %	28-29 %	<28 %

3.1, 3.2 (4-8 ELA, Math)

H		E						D					I		
15	14	13	12	11	10	9	8	7	6	5	4	3	2	1	0
96-100%	90-95%	87-89%	86%	84-85%	82-83%	80-81%	78-79%	76-77%	74-75%	72-73%	70-71%	68-69%	65-67%	43-64%	<43%

<u>Task 3.6 – 3.12 SS Teachers</u>
20 point chart

Ineffective	Developing	Effective	Highly Effective
2 points: 65-67% of students achieve target 1 point: 43-64% of students achieve target 0 points: less than 43% of students achieve target	8 points: 76-77% of achieve target 7 points: 74-75% of students achieve target 6 points: 72-73% of students achieve target 5 points: 71% of students achieve target 4 points: 70% of students achieve target 3 points: 68-69% of students achieve target	17 points: 89% of students achieve target 16 points: 87-88% of students achieve target 15 points: 85-86% of students achieve target 14 points: 84% of students achieve target 13 points: 83% of students achieve target 12 points: 82% of students achieve target 11 points: 80-81% of students achieve target 10 points: 79% of students achieve target 9 points: 78% of students achieve target	20 points: 95-100% of students achieve target 19 points: 92-94% of students achieve target 18 points: 90-91% % of students achieve target

Task – 4.5

Marshall Teacher Practice Rubric Weight Allocations

Domain	A	B	C	D	E	F
Name	Planning & Preparation for Learning	Classroom Management	Delivery of Instruction	Monitoring, Assessment and Follow-Up	Family & Community Outreach	Professional Responsibilities
Multiplier	3	2	3	2	1	2

Marshall Teacher Practice Rubric – 60 pt. scale

HEDI Rating	**Points**	**Value derived from Marshall Teacher Practice Rubric**	**Points**	**HEDI Rating**	**Value derived from Marshall Teacher Practice Rubric**	**Points**	**HEDI Rating**	**Value derived from Marshall Teacher Practice Rubric**
H	60	3.9-4.0	39	**I**	1.39	18	**I**	1.18
H	59	3.8-3.89	38	**I**	1.38	17	**I**	1.17
E	58	3.4-3.79	37	**I**	1.37	16	**I**	1.16
E	57	2.95-3.39	36	**I**	1.36	15	**I**	1.15
D	56	2.73-2.94	35	**I**	1.35	14	**I**	1.14
D	55	2.52-2.72	34	**I**	1.34	13	**I**	1.13
D	54	2.31-2.51	33	**I**	1.33	12	**I**	1.12
D	53	2.10-2.30	32	**I**	1.32	11	**I**	1.11
D	52	1.88-2.09	31	**I**	1.31	10	**I**	1.10
D	51	1.67-1.87	30	**I**	1.30	9	**I**	1.09
D	50	1.5-1.66	29	**I**	1.29	8	**I**	1.08
I	49	1.49	28	**I**	1.28	7	**I**	1.07
I	48	1.48	27	**I**	1.27	6	**I**	1.06
I	47	1.47	26	**I**	1.26	5	**I**	1.05
I	46	1.46	25	**I**	1.25	4	**I**	1.04
I	45	1.45	24	**I**	1.24	3	**I**	1.03
I	44	1.44	23	**I**	1.23	2	**I**	1.02
I	43	1.43	22	**I**	1.22	1	**I**	1.01
I	42	1.42	21	**I**	1.21	0	**I**	1.0
I	41	1.41	20	**I**	1.20			
I	40	1.40	19	**I**	1.19			

HEDI Rating - overall effectiveness

HEDI Rating	**HEDI Range**
Highly Effective	91-100
Effective	75-90
Developing	65-74
Ineffective	0-64

Tri-Valley Central School District
Conversion Charts for Assigning Points - Teachers

Task 2.2 – Grade 3, 2.3 – Grade 3, Task 2.4-2.10

Ineffective	Developing	Effective	Highly Effective
2 points: 65-67% of students met target 1 point: 43-64% of students met target 0 points: less than 43% of students met target	8 points: 77-79% of met target 7 points: 74-76% of students met target 6 points: 72-73% of students met target 5 points: 71% of students met target 4 points: 70% of students met target 3 points: 68-69% of students met target	17 points: 95-96% of students met target 16 points: 94% of students met target 15 points: 92-93% of students met target 14 points: 90-91% of students met target 13 points: 89% of students met target 12 points: 86-88% of students met target 11 points: 84-85% of students met target 10 points: 82-83% of students met target 9 points: 80-81% of students met target	20 points: 100% of students met target 19 points: 98-99% met target 18 points: 97% met target

Task 2.2 , 2.3 – Grades K-2

H			E									D						I		
20 pts	19	18	17	16	15	14	13	12	11	10	9	8	7	6	5	4	3	2	1	0 pts
25 24 pts	23	22	21 20	19 18	17 16	15	14	13	12	11	10	9 8	7	6	5	4	3	2	1	0 pts

Task 3.1, 3.2, 3.4, 3.5, 3.6-Gr. 6, 3.12 ES Teachers

H			E									D						I		
20	19	18	17	16	15	14	13	12	11	10	9	8	7	6	5	4	3	2	1	0
>68 %*	65-68 %	61-64 %	59-60 %	57-58 %	55-56 %	53-54 %	51-52 %	49-50 %	47-48 %	45-46 %	44 %	42-43 %	40-41 %	38-39 %	36-37 %	34-35 %	32-33 %	30-31 %	28-29 %	<28 %

3.1, 3.2 (4-8 ELA, Math)

H		E						D					I		
15	14	13	12	11	10	9	8	7	6	5	4	3	2	1	0
96-100%	90-95%	87-89%	86%	84-85%	82-83%	80-81%	78-79%	76-77%	74-75%	72-73%	70-71%	68-69%	65-67%	43-64%	<43%

<u>Task 3.6 – 3.12 SS Teachers</u>
20 point chart

Ineffective	Developing	Effective	Highly Effective
2 points: 65-67% of students achieve target 1 point: 43-64% of students achieve target 0 points: less than 43% of students achieve target	8 points: 76-77% of achieve target 7 points: 74-75% of students achieve target 6 points: 72-73% of students achieve target 5 points: 71% of students achieve target 4 points: 70% of students achieve target 3 points: 68-69% of students achieve target	17 points: 89% of students achieve target 16 points: 87-88% of students achieve target 15 points: 85-86% of students achieve target 14 points: 84% of students achieve target 13 points: 83% of students achieve target 12 points: 82% of students achieve target 11 points: 80-81% of students achieve target 10 points: 79% of students achieve target 9 points: 78% of students achieve target	20 points: 95-100% of students achieve target 19 points: 92-94% of students achieve target 18 points: 90-91% % of students achieve target

Task – 4.5

Marshall Teacher Practice Rubric Weight Allocations

Domain	A	B	C	D	E	F
Name	Planning & Preparation for Learning	Classroom Management	Delivery of Instruction	Monitoring, Assessment and Follow-Up	Family & Community Outreach	Professional Responsibilities
Multiplier	3	2	3	2	1	2

Marshall Teacher Practice Rubric – 60 pt. scale

HEDI Rating	**Points**	**Value derived from Marshall Teacher Practice Rubric**	**Points**	**HEDI Rating**	**Value derived from Marshall Teacher Practice Rubric**	**Points**	**HEDI Rating**	**Value derived from Marshall Teacher Practice Rubric**
H	60	3.9-4.0	39	**I**	1.39	18	**I**	1.18
H	59	3.8-3.89	38	**I**	1.38	17	**I**	1.17
E	58	3.4-3.79	37	**I**	1.37	16	**I**	1.16
E	57	2.95-3.39	36	**I**	1.36	15	**I**	1.15
D	56	2.73-2.94	35	**I**	1.35	14	**I**	1.14
D	55	2.52-2.72	34	**I**	1.34	13	**I**	1.13
D	54	2.31-2.51	33	**I**	1.33	12	**I**	1.12
D	53	2.10-2.30	32	**I**	1.32	11	**I**	1.11
D	52	1.88-2.09	31	**I**	1.31	10	**I**	1.10
D	51	1.67-1.87	30	**I**	1.30	9	**I**	1.09
D	50	1.5-1.66	29	**I**	1.29	8	**I**	1.08
I	49	1.49	28	**I**	1.28	7	**I**	1.07
I	48	1.48	27	**I**	1.27	6	**I**	1.06
I	47	1.47	26	**I**	1.26	5	**I**	1.05
I	46	1.46	25	**I**	1.25	4	**I**	1.04
I	45	1.45	24	**I**	1.24	3	**I**	1.03
I	44	1.44	23	**I**	1.23	2	**I**	1.02
I	43	1.43	22	**I**	1.22	1	**I**	1.01
I	42	1.42	21	**I**	1.21	0	**I**	1.0
I	41	1.41	20	**I**	1.20			
I	40	1.40	19	**I**	1.19			

HEDI Rating - overall effectiveness

HEDI Rating	**HEDI Range**
Highly Effective	91-100
Effective	75-90
Developing	65-74
Ineffective	0-64

Tri-Valley Central School District
Conversion Charts for Assigning Points - Teachers

Task 2.2 – Grade 3, 2.3 – Grade 3, Task 2.4-2.10

Ineffective	Developing	Effective	Highly Effective
2 points: 65-67% of students met target 1 point: 43-64% of students met target 0 points: less than 43% of students met target	8 points: 77-79% of met target 7 points: 74-76% of students met target 6 points: 72-73% of students met target 5 points: 71% of students met target 4 points: 70% of students met target 3 points: 68-69% of students met target	17 points: 95-96% of students met target 16 points: 94% of students met target 15 points: 92-93% of students met target 14 points: 90-91% of students met target 13 points: 89% of students met target 12 points: 86-88% of students met target 11 points: 84-85% of students met target 10 points: 82-83% of students met target 9 points: 80-81% of students met target	20 points: 100% of students met target 19 points: 98-99% met target 18 points: 97% met target

Task 2.2 , 2.3 – Grades K-2

H			E									D						I		
20 pts	19	18	17	16	15	14	13	12	11	10	9	8	7	6	5	4	3	2	1	0 pts
25 24 pts	23	22	21 20	19 18	17 16	15	14	13	12	11	10	9 8	7	6	5	4	3	2	1	0 pts

Task 3.1, 3.2, 3.4, 3.5, 3.6-Gr. 6, 3.12 ES Teachers

H			E									D						I		
20	19	18	17	16	15	14	13	12	11	10	9	8	7	6	5	4	3	2	1	0
>68 %*	65-68 %	61-64 %	59-60 %	57-58 %	55-56 %	53-54 %	51-52 %	49-50 %	47-48 %	45-46 %	44 %	42-43 %	40-41 %	38-39 %	36-37 %	34-35 %	32-33 %	30-31 %	28-29 %	<28 %

3.1, 3.2 (4-8 ELA, Math)

H		E						D					I		
15	14	13	12	11	10	9	8	7	6	5	4	3	2	1	0
96-100%	90-95%	87-89%	86%	84-85%	82-83%	80-81%	78-79%	76-77%	74-75%	72-73%	70-71%	68-69%	65-67%	43-64%	<43%

<u>Task 3.6 – 3.12 SS Teachers</u>
20 point chart

Ineffective	Developing	Effective	Highly Effective
2 points: 65-67% of students achieve target 1 point: 43-64% of students achieve target 0 points: less than 43% of students achieve target	8 points: 76-77% of achieve target 7 points: 74-75% of students achieve target 6 points: 72-73% of students achieve target 5 points: 71% of students achieve target 4 points: 70% of students achieve target 3 points: 68-69% of students achieve target	17 points: 89% of students achieve target 16 points: 87-88% of students achieve target 15 points: 85-86% of students achieve target 14 points: 84% of students achieve target 13 points: 83% of students achieve target 12 points: 82% of students achieve target 11 points: 80-81% of students achieve target 10 points: 79% of students achieve target 9 points: 78% of students achieve target	20 points: 95-100% of students achieve target 19 points: 92-94% of students achieve target 18 points: 90-91% % of students achieve target

Task – 4.5

Marshall Teacher Practice Rubric Weight Allocations

Domain	A	B	C	D	E	F
Name	Planning & Preparation for Learning	Classroom Management	Delivery of Instruction	Monitoring, Assessment and Follow-Up	Family & Community Outreach	Professional Responsibilities
Multiplier	3	2	3	2	1	2

Marshall Teacher Practice Rubric – 60 pt. scale

HEDI Rating	**Points**	**Value derived from Marshall Teacher Practice Rubric**	**Points**	**HEDI Rating**	**Value derived from Marshall Teacher Practice Rubric**	**Points**	**HEDI Rating**	**Value derived from Marshall Teacher Practice Rubric**
H	60	3.9-4.0	39	**I**	1.39	18	**I**	1.18
H	59	3.8-3.89	38	**I**	1.38	17	**I**	1.17
E	58	3.4-3.79	37	**I**	1.37	16	**I**	1.16
E	57	2.95-3.39	36	**I**	1.36	15	**I**	1.15
D	56	2.73-2.94	35	**I**	1.35	14	**I**	1.14
D	55	2.52-2.72	34	**I**	1.34	13	**I**	1.13
D	54	2.31-2.51	33	**I**	1.33	12	**I**	1.12
D	53	2.10-2.30	32	**I**	1.32	11	**I**	1.11
D	52	1.88-2.09	31	**I**	1.31	10	**I**	1.10
D	51	1.67-1.87	30	**I**	1.30	9	**I**	1.09
D	50	1.5-1.66	29	**I**	1.29	8	**I**	1.08
I	49	1.49	28	**I**	1.28	7	**I**	1.07
I	48	1.48	27	**I**	1.27	6	**I**	1.06
I	47	1.47	26	**I**	1.26	5	**I**	1.05
I	46	1.46	25	**I**	1.25	4	**I**	1.04
I	45	1.45	24	**I**	1.24	3	**I**	1.03
I	44	1.44	23	**I**	1.23	2	**I**	1.02
I	43	1.43	22	**I**	1.22	1	**I**	1.01
I	42	1.42	21	**I**	1.21	0	**I**	1.0
I	41	1.41	20	**I**	1.20			
I	40	1.40	19	**I**	1.19			

HEDI Rating - overall effectiveness

HEDI Rating	**HEDI Range**
Highly Effective	91-100
Effective	75-90
Developing	65-74
Ineffective	0-64

Tri-Valley Central School District
Conversion Charts for Assigning Points - Teachers

Task 2.2 – Grade 3, 2.3 – Grade 3, Task 2.4-2.10

Ineffective	Developing	Effective	Highly Effective
2 points: 65-67% of students met target 1 point: 43-64% of students met target 0 points: less than 43% of students met target	8 points: 77-79% of met target 7 points: 74-76% of students met target 6 points: 72-73% of students met target 5 points: 71% of students met target 4 points: 70% of students met target 3 points: 68-69% of students met target	17 points: 95-96% of students met target 16 points: 94% of students met target 15 points: 92-93% of students met target 14 points: 90-91% of students met target 13 points: 89% of students met target 12 points: 86-88% of students met target 11 points: 84-85% of students met target 10 points: 82-83% of students met target 9 points: 80-81% of students met target	20 points: 100% of students met target 19 points: 98-99% met target 18 points: 97% met target

Task 2.2 , 2.3 – Grades K-2

H			E									D						I		
20 pts	19	18	17	16	15	14	13	12	11	10	9	8	7	6	5	4	3	2	1	0 pts
25 24 pts	23	22	21 20	19 18	17 16	15	14	13	12	11	10	9 8	7	6	5	4	3	2	1	0 pts

Task 3.1, 3.2, 3.4, 3.5, 3.6-Gr. 6, 3.12 ES Teachers

H			E									D						I		
20	19	18	17	16	15	14	13	12	11	10	9	8	7	6	5	4	3	2	1	0
>68 %*	65-68 %	61-64 %	59-60 %	57-58 %	55-56 %	53-54 %	51-52 %	49-50 %	47-48 %	45-46 %	44 %	42-43 %	40-41 %	38-39 %	36-37 %	34-35 %	32-33 %	30-31 %	28-29 %	<28 %

3.1, 3.2 (4-8 ELA, Math)

H		E						D					I		
15	14	13	12	11	10	9	8	7	6	5	4	3	2	1	0
96-100%	90-95%	87-89%	86%	84-85%	82-83%	80-81%	78-79%	76-77%	74-75%	72-73%	70-71%	68-69%	65-67%	43-64%	<43%

<u>Task 3.6 – 3.12 SS Teachers</u>
20 point chart

Ineffective	Developing	Effective	Highly Effective
2 points: 65-67% of students achieve target 1 point: 43-64% of students achieve target 0 points: less than 43% of students achieve target	8 points: 76-77% of achieve target 7 points: 74-75% of students achieve target 6 points: 72-73% of students achieve target 5 points: 71% of students achieve target 4 points: 70% of students achieve target 3 points: 68-69% of students achieve target	17 points: 89% of students achieve target 16 points: 87-88% of students achieve target 15 points: 85-86% of students achieve target 14 points: 84% of students achieve target 13 points: 83% of students achieve target 12 points: 82% of students achieve target 11 points: 80-81% of students achieve target 10 points: 79% of students achieve target 9 points: 78% of students achieve target	20 points: 95-100% of students achieve target 19 points: 92-94% of students achieve target 18 points: 90-91% % of students achieve target

Task – 4.5

Marshall Teacher Practice Rubric Weight Allocations

Domain	A	B	C	D	E	F
Name	Planning & Preparation for Learning	Classroom Management	Delivery of Instruction	Monitoring, Assessment and Follow-Up	Family & Community Outreach	Professional Responsibilities
Multiplier	3	2	3	2	1	2

Marshall Teacher Practice Rubric – 60 pt. scale

HEDI Rating	**Points**	**Value derived from Marshall Teacher Practice Rubric**	**Points**	**HEDI Rating**	**Value derived from Marshall Teacher Practice Rubric**	**Points**	**HEDI Rating**	**Value derived from Marshall Teacher Practice Rubric**
H	60	3.9-4.0	39	**I**	1.39	18	**I**	1.18
H	59	3.8-3.89	38	**I**	1.38	17	**I**	1.17
E	58	3.4-3.79	37	**I**	1.37	16	**I**	1.16
E	57	2.95-3.39	36	**I**	1.36	15	**I**	1.15
D	56	2.73-2.94	35	**I**	1.35	14	**I**	1.14
D	55	2.52-2.72	34	**I**	1.34	13	**I**	1.13
D	54	2.31-2.51	33	**I**	1.33	12	**I**	1.12
D	53	2.10-2.30	32	**I**	1.32	11	**I**	1.11
D	52	1.88-2.09	31	**I**	1.31	10	**I**	1.10
D	51	1.67-1.87	30	**I**	1.30	9	**I**	1.09
D	50	1.5-1.66	29	**I**	1.29	8	**I**	1.08
I	49	1.49	28	**I**	1.28	7	**I**	1.07
I	48	1.48	27	**I**	1.27	6	**I**	1.06
I	47	1.47	26	**I**	1.26	5	**I**	1.05
I	46	1.46	25	**I**	1.25	4	**I**	1.04
I	45	1.45	24	**I**	1.24	3	**I**	1.03
I	44	1.44	23	**I**	1.23	2	**I**	1.02
I	43	1.43	22	**I**	1.22	1	**I**	1.01
I	42	1.42	21	**I**	1.21	0	**I**	1.0
I	41	1.41	20	**I**	1.20			
I	40	1.40	19	**I**	1.19			

HEDI Rating - overall effectiveness

HEDI Rating	**HEDI Range**
Highly Effective	91-100
Effective	75-90
Developing	65-74
Ineffective	0-64

Tri-Valley Central School
Professional Improvement Plan

_____	_____	_____
Teacher	**Date**	**Evaluator**

Specific Expectation to be addressed (check):

☐Lesson Implementation ☐Lesson Evaluation ☐Use of Assessment for Planning
☐Classroom Management ☐Collaboration ☐Communication
☐Showing Professionalism

Professional Expectation:

Steps to Achieve Results: (Include resources, individuals providing assistance, time frame, evaluation method)

End results anticipated:

_____	_____	_____
Signature of Professional Staff Member	Date	Evaluator

Observations of performance:

Date	Observations/Review	☑	☒
Week 1			
Week 2			
Week 3			
Week 4			
Week 5			
Week 5			
Week 6			
Week 7			
Week			
Week			

☑ - Meets standard
☒ - Does not meet standard

Comments:

_____	_____	_____	_____
Signature of Professional Staff Member*	Date	Evaluator	Date

The signature* acknowledges that s/he has read the performance report. Such signature merely signifies that he has read the material to be filed and does not necessarily indicate agreement with its contents.

Original: Teacher

Copies: Evaluator, Superintendent (Personnel File)

Tri-Valley Central School District -- Principals' Conversion Charts

Task 8.1, Gr. K-8 (Measures of Academic Progress)
20 pt. Chart -

H			E									D						I		
20 pts	19	18	17	16	15	14	13	12	11	10	9	8	7	6	5	4	3	2	1	0 pts
>68 %*	65-68 %	61-64 %	59-60 %	57-58 %	55-56 %	53-54 %	51-52 %	49-50 %	47-48 %	45-46 %	44 %	42-43 %	40-41 %	38-39 %	36-37 %	34-35 %	32-33 %	30-31 %	28-29 %	<28 %

Task 8.1, K-6
Task 8.1, Gr. 7-12
20 pt. chart

Ineffective	Developing	Effective	Highly Effective
2 points: 65-67% of students achieve target 1 point: 43-64% of students achieve target 0 points: less than 43% of students achieve target	8 points: 76-77% of achieve target 7 points: 74-75% of students achieve target 6 points: 72-73% of students achieve target 5 points: 71% of students achieve target 4 points: 70% of students achieve target 3 points: 68-69% of students achieve target	17 points: 89% of students achieve target 16 points: 87-88% of students achieve target 15 points: 85-86% of students achieve target 14 points: 84% of students achieve target 13 points: 83% of students achieve target 12 points: 82% of students achieve target 11 points: 80-81% of students achieve target 10 points: 79% of students achieve target 9 points: 78% of students achieve target	20 points: 95-100% of students achieve target 19 points: 92-94% of students achieve target 18 points: 90-91% of students achieve target

15 point chart

Ineffective	Developing	Effective	Highly Effective
2 points: : 65-67% of students achieve target 1 point: : 43-64% of students achieve target 0 points: less than 43% of students achieve target.	7 points: 76-77% of students achieve target 6 points: 74-75% of students achieve target 5 points: 72-73% of students achieve target 4 points: 70-71% of students achieve target 3 points: 68-69% of students achieve target	13 points: 87-89% of students achieve target 12 points: 86% of students achieve target 11 points: 84-85% of students achieve target 10 points: 82-83% of students achieve target 9 points: - 80-81% of students achieve target 8 points: 78-79% of students achieve target	15 points: 96-100% of students achieve target 14 points: 90-95% of students achieve target

`

Principal Practice Rubric – Section 9

Marshall Principal Practice Rubric Weighting						
Domain	**A**	**B**	**C**	**D**	**E**	**F**
Name	Diagnosis and Planning	Priority Management and Communication	Curriculum and Data	Supervision, Evaluation and Professional Development	Discipline and Family Involvement	Management and External Relations
Weight	15 pts.	5 pts.	15 pts.	15 pts.	5 pts.	5 pts.
Points assigned for each subcomponent within a Domain. Score is total of all points.	Ineffective (1) = 0 pts. Developing (2) = .5 pt. Effective (3) = 1 pt. Highly Effective (4) = 1.5pts.	Ineffective (1) = 0 pts. Developing (2) = .2 pts. Effective (3) = .35 pts. Highly Effective (4) = .5pts.	Ineffective (1) = 0 pts. Developing (2) = .5 pt. Effective (3) = 1 pt. Highly Effective (4) = 1.5pts.	Ineffective (1) = 0 pts. Developing (2) = .5 pt. Effective (3) = 1 pt. Highly Effective (4) = 1.5pts.	Ineffective (1)= 0 pts. Developing (2) = .2 pts. Effective (3) = .35 pts. Highly Effective (4) = .5pts.	Ineffective (1) = 0 pts. Developing (2) = .2 pts. Effective (3) = .35 pts. Highly Effective (4) = .5pts.

Marshall Principal Practice Rubric – 60 pt. scale

HEDI Rating	Points	Composite Score Marshall Rubric	HEDI Rating	Points	Composite Score Marshall Rubric	HEDI Rating	Points	Composite Score Marshall Rubric
H	60	55-60	I	39	13.4-13.6	I	18	7.0-7.2
H	59	44.2-54.9	I	38	13.1-13.3	I	17	6.7-6.9-
E	58	33.6-44.1	I	37	12.7-13.0	I	16	6.4-6.6
E	57	32-33.5	I	36	12.4-12.6	I	15	6.1-6.3
E	56	29.8-31.9	I	35	12.1-12.3	I	14	5.8-6.0
E	55	27.6-29.7	I	34	11.8-12.0	I	13	5.5-5.7
E	54	25.4-27.5	I	33	11.5-11.7	I	12	5.2-5.4
D	53	23.2-25.3	I	32	11.2-11.4	I	11	4.9-5.1
D	52	21-23.1	I	31	10.9-11.1	I	10	4.6-4.8
D	51	18.8-20.9	I	30	10.6-10.8	I	9	4.3-4.5
D	50	16.6-18.7	I	29	10.3-10.5	I	8	4.0-4.2
I	49	16.4-16.5	I	28	10.-10.2	I	7	3.7-3.9
I	48	16.1-16.3	I	27	9.7-9.9	I	6	3.4-3.6
I	47	15.8-16.0	I	26	9.4-9.6	I	5	3.1-3.3
I	46	15.5-15.7	I	25	9.1-9.3	I	4	2.8-3.0
I	45	15.2-15.4	I	24	8.8-9.0	I	3	2.5-2.7
I	44	14.9-15.1	I	23	8.5-8.7	I	2	2.2-2.4
I	43	14.6-14.8	I	22	8.2-8.4	I	1	1.9-2.1
I	42	14.3-14.5	I	21	7.9-8.1	I	0	0-1.8
I	41	14.0-14.2	I	20	7.6-7.8			
I	40	13.7-13.9	I	19	7.3-7.5			

HEDI Rating for Overall effectiveness

HEDI Rating	HEDI Range
Highly Effective	91-100
Effective	75-90
Developing	65-74
Ineffective	0-64

Tri-Valley Central School District -- Principals' Conversion Charts

Task 8.1, Gr. K-8 (Measures of Academic Progress)
20 pt. Chart -

H			E									D						I		
20 pts	19	18	17	16	15	14	13	12	11	10	9	8	7	6	5	4	3	2	1	0 pts
>68 %*	65-68 %	61-64 %	59-60 %	57-58 %	55-56 %	53-54 %	51-52 %	49-50 %	47-48 %	45-46 %	44 %	42-43 %	40-41 %	38-39 %	36-37 %	34-35 %	32-33 %	30-31 %	28-29 %	<28 %

Task 8.1, K-6
Task 8.1, Gr. 7-12
20 pt. chart

Ineffective	Developing	Effective	Highly Effective
2 points: 65-67% of students achieve target 1 point: 43-64% of students achieve target 0 points: less than 43% of students achieve target	8 points: 76-77% of achieve target 7 points: 74-75% of students achieve target 6 points: 72-73% of students achieve target 5 points: 71% of students achieve target 4 points: 70% of students achieve target 3 points: 68-69% of students achieve target	17 points: 89% of students achieve target 16 points: 87-88% of students achieve target 15 points: 85-86% of students achieve target 14 points: 84% of students achieve target 13 points: 83% of students achieve target 12 points: 82% of students achieve target 11 points: 80-81% of students achieve target 10 points: 79% of students achieve target 9 points: 78% of students achieve target	20 points: 95-100% of students achieve target 19 points: 92-94% of students achieve target 18 points: 90-91% of students achieve target

15 point chart

Ineffective	Developing	Effective	Highly Effective
2 points: : 65-67% of students achieve target 1 point: : 43-64% of students achieve target 0 points: less than 43% of students achieve target.	7 points: 76-77% of students achieve target 6 points: 74-75% of students achieve target 5 points: 72-73% of students achieve target 4 points: 70-71% of students achieve target 3 points: 68-69% of students achieve target	13 points: 87-89% of students achieve target 12 points: 86% of students achieve target 11 points: 84-85% of students achieve target 10 points: 82-83% of students achieve target 9 points: - 80-81% of students achieve target 8 points: 78-79% of students achieve target	15 points: 96-100% of students achieve target 14 points: 90-95% of students achieve target

`

Principal Practice Rubric – Section 9

Marshall Principal Practice Rubric Weighting						
Domain	**A**	**B**	**C**	**D**	**E**	**F**
Name	Diagnosis and Planning	Priority Management and Communication	Curriculum and Data	Supervision, Evaluation and Professional Development	Discipline and Family Involvement	Management and External Relations
Weight	15 pts.	5 pts.	15 pts.	15 pts.	5 pts.	5 pts.
Points assigned for each subcomponent within a Domain. Score is total of all points.	Ineffective (1) = 0 pts. Developing (2) = .5 pt. Effective (3) = 1 pt. Highly Effective (4) = 1.5pts.	Ineffective (1) = 0 pts. Developing (2) = .2 pts. Effective (3) = .35 pts. Highly Effective (4) = .5pts.	Ineffective (1) = 0 pts. Developing (2) = .5 pt. Effective (3) = 1 pt. Highly Effective (4) = 1.5pts.	Ineffective (1) = 0 pts. Developing (2) = .5 pt. Effective (3) = 1 pt. Highly Effective (4) = 1.5pts.	Ineffective (1)= 0 pts. Developing (2) = .2 pts. Effective (3) = .35 pts. Highly Effective (4) = .5pts.	Ineffective (1) = 0 pts. Developing (2) = .2 pts. Effective (3) = .35 pts. Highly Effective (4) = .5pts.

Marshall Principal Practice Rubric – 60 pt. scale

HEDI Rating	Points	Composite Score Marshall Rubric	HEDI Rating	Points	Composite Score Marshall Rubric	HEDI Rating	Points	Composite Score Marshall Rubric
H	60	55-60	I	39	13.4-13.6	I	18	7.0-7.2
H	59	44.2-54.9	I	38	13.1-13.3	I	17	6.7-6.9-
E	58	33.6-44.1	I	37	12.7-13.0	I	16	6.4-6.6
E	57	32-33.5	I	36	12.4-12.6	I	15	6.1-6.3
E	56	29.8-31.9	I	35	12.1-12.3	I	14	5.8-6.0
E	55	27.6-29.7	I	34	11.8-12.0	I	13	5.5-5.7
E	54	25.4-27.5	I	33	11.5-11.7	I	12	5.2-5.4
D	53	23.2-25.3	I	32	11.2-11.4	I	11	4.9-5.1
D	52	21-23.1	I	31	10.9-11.1	I	10	4.6-4.8
D	51	18.8-20.9	I	30	10.6-10.8	I	9	4.3-4.5
D	50	16.6-18.7	I	29	10.3-10.5	I	8	4.0-4.2
I	49	16.4-16.5	I	28	10.-10.2	I	7	3.7-3.9
I	48	16.1-16.3	I	27	9.7-9.9	I	6	3.4-3.6
I	47	15.8-16.0	I	26	9.4-9.6	I	5	3.1-3.3
I	46	15.5-15.7	I	25	9.1-9.3	I	4	2.8-3.0
I	45	15.2-15.4	I	24	8.8-9.0	I	3	2.5-2.7
I	44	14.9-15.1	I	23	8.5-8.7	I	2	2.2-2.4
I	43	14.6-14.8	I	22	8.2-8.4	I	1	1.9-2.1
I	42	14.3-14.5	I	21	7.9-8.1	I	0	0-1.8
I	41	14.0-14.2	I	20	7.6-7.8			
I	40	13.7-13.9	I	19	7.3-7.5			

HEDI Rating for Overall effectiveness

HEDI Rating	HEDI Range
Highly Effective	91-100
Effective	75-90
Developing	65-74
Ineffective	0-64

Tri-Valley Central School District -- Principals' Conversion Charts

Task 8.1, Gr. K-8 (Measures of Academic Progress)
20 pt. Chart -

H			E									D						I		
20 pts	19	18	17	16	15	14	13	12	11	10	9	8	7	6	5	4	3	2	1	0 pts
>68 %*	65-68 %	61-64 %	59-60 %	57-58 %	55-56 %	53-54 %	51-52 %	49-50 %	47-48 %	45-46 %	44 %	42-43 %	40-41 %	38-39 %	36-37 %	34-35 %	32-33 %	30-31 %	28-29 %	<28 %

Task 8.1, K-6
Task 8.1, Gr. 7-12
20 pt. chart

Ineffective	Developing	Effective	Highly Effective
2 points: 65-67% of students achieve target 1 point: 43-64% of students achieve target 0 points: less than 43% of students achieve target	8 points: 76-77% of achieve target 7 points: 74-75% of students achieve target 6 points: 72-73% of students achieve target 5 points: 71% of students achieve target 4 points: 70% of students achieve target 3 points: 68-69% of students achieve target	17 points: 89% of students achieve target 16 points: 87-88% of students achieve target 15 points: 85-86% of students achieve target 14 points: 84% of students achieve target 13 points: 83% of students achieve target 12 points: 82% of students achieve target 11 points: 80-81% of students achieve target 10 points: 79% of students achieve target 9 points: 78% of students achieve target	20 points: 95-100% of students achieve target 19 points: 92-94% of students achieve target 18 points: 90-91% of students achieve target

15 point chart

Ineffective	Developing	Effective	Highly Effective
2 points: : 65-67% of students achieve target 1 point: : 43-64% of students achieve target 0 points: less than 43% of students achieve target.	7 points: 76-77% of students achieve target 6 points: 74-75% of students achieve target 5 points: 72-73% of students achieve target 4 points: 70-71% of students achieve target 3 points: 68-69% of students achieve target	13 points: 87-89% of students achieve target 12 points: 86% of students achieve target 11 points: 84-85% of students achieve target 10 points: 82-83% of students achieve target 9 points: - 80-81% of students achieve target 8 points: 78-79% of students achieve target	15 points: 96-100% of students achieve target 14 points: 90-95% of students achieve target

`

Principal Practice Rubric – Section 9

Marshall Principal Practice Rubric Weighting						
Domain	**A**	**B**	**C**	**D**	**E**	**F**
Name	Diagnosis and Planning	Priority Management and Communication	Curriculum and Data	Supervision, Evaluation and Professional Development	Discipline and Family Involvement	Management and External Relations
Weight	15 pts.	5 pts.	15 pts.	15 pts.	5 pts.	5 pts.
Points assigned for each subcomponent within a Domain. Score is total of all points.	Ineffective (1) = 0 pts. Developing (2) = .5 pt. Effective (3) = 1 pt. Highly Effective (4) = 1.5pts.	Ineffective (1) = 0 pts. Developing (2) = .2 pts. Effective (3) = .35 pts. Highly Effective (4) = .5pts.	Ineffective (1) = 0 pts. Developing (2) = .5 pt. Effective (3) = 1 pt. Highly Effective (4) = 1.5pts.	Ineffective (1) = 0 pts. Developing (2) = .5 pt. Effective (3) = 1 pt. Highly Effective (4) = 1.5pts.	Ineffective (1)= 0 pts. Developing (2) = .2 pts. Effective (3) = .35 pts. Highly Effective (4) = .5pts.	Ineffective (1) = 0 pts. Developing (2) = .2 pts. Effective (3) = .35 pts. Highly Effective (4) = .5pts.

Marshall Principal Practice Rubric – 60 pt. scale

HEDI Rating	Points	Composite Score Marshall Rubric	HEDI Rating	Points	Composite Score Marshall Rubric	HEDI Rating	Points	Composite Score Marshall Rubric
H	60	55-60	I	39	13.4-13.6	I	18	7.0-7.2
H	59	44.2-54.9	I	38	13.1-13.3	I	17	6.7-6.9-
E	58	33.6-44.1	I	37	12.7-13.0	I	16	6.4-6.6
E	57	32-33.5	I	36	12.4-12.6	I	15	6.1-6.3
E	56	29.8-31.9	I	35	12.1-12.3	I	14	5.8-6.0
E	55	27.6-29.7	I	34	11.8-12.0	I	13	5.5-5.7
E	54	25.4-27.5	I	33	11.5-11.7	I	12	5.2-5.4
D	53	23.2-25.3	I	32	11.2-11.4	I	11	4.9-5.1
D	52	21-23.1	I	31	10.9-11.1	I	10	4.6-4.8
D	51	18.8-20.9	I	30	10.6-10.8	I	9	4.3-4.5
D	50	16.6-18.7	I	29	10.3-10.5	I	8	4.0-4.2
I	49	16.4-16.5	I	28	10.-10.2	I	7	3.7-3.9
I	48	16.1-16.3	I	27	9.7-9.9	I	6	3.4-3.6
I	47	15.8-16.0	I	26	9.4-9.6	I	5	3.1-3.3
I	46	15.5-15.7	I	25	9.1-9.3	I	4	2.8-3.0
I	45	15.2-15.4	I	24	8.8-9.0	I	3	2.5-2.7
I	44	14.9-15.1	I	23	8.5-8.7	I	2	2.2-2.4
I	43	14.6-14.8	I	22	8.2-8.4	I	1	1.9-2.1
I	42	14.3-14.5	I	21	7.9-8.1	I	0	0-1.8
I	41	14.0-14.2	I	20	7.6-7.8			
I	40	13.7-13.9	I	19	7.3-7.5			

HEDI Rating for Overall effectiveness

HEDI Rating	HEDI Range
Highly Effective	91-100
Effective	75-90
Developing	65-74
Ineffective	0-64

Principal Improvement Plans (PIPs)

A. Upon a principal rating of "Developing" or "Ineffective" through the APPR, the District shall develop and commence implementation of a Principal Improvement Plan (PIP) for the individual principal.

B. The PIP shall be developed locally. PIPs must be implemented no later than 10 days after the date on which principals are required to report prior to the opening of classes for the school year.

C. In accordance with Commissioner's regulations, each individual PIP must include at least:

1. Identification of needed areas of improvement;
2. A timeline for achieving improvement;
3. The manner in which improvement will be assessed; and
4. Where appropriate, differentiated activities to support the individual's improvement in those areas.

D. The PIP shall describe the professional learning activities the principal is expected to complete and these shall be connected to the areas needing improvement.

E. "Artifacts" that the principal must produce should be described to serve as benchmarks of his or her improvement and as evidence for the final stage of the improvement plan.

F. The supervisor shall state in the PIP the additional support and assistance that the principal will receive.

G. In the final stages of the PIP, the principal shall meet with his or her supervisor to review the plan alongside any artifacts and evidence from evaluations in order to provide a final, summative rating for the principal.

Tri-Valley CSD Principal Improvement Plan (PIP)

The purpose of the PIP is the improvement of principal practice. The goal is to provide resources and support for principals who have been rated as "developing" or "ineffective." The Superintendent, or his designee, and the principal will jointly determine the strategies to be undertaken to correct the deficiencies.

Principal:
Building:
Lead Evaluator:
Date:

List the area(s) needing improvement. If there are several, indicate the priority order for addressing them.

Priority	Area needing improvement	Performance goal

Describe the plan for improvement with specific, measurable objectives, timeline and process the principal must meet in order to achieve an effective rating.

Describe the supporting resources (i.e. professional development, time, people/mentor, and materials) that will be directed in support of the plan outlined above:

The principal, Lead Evaluator shall meet to assess the effectiveness and appropriateness of the PIP in assisting the principal to achieve the goals set forth in the PIP. Based on the outcome of this assessment, the PIP shall be modified accordingly.

Superintendent's Signature: Date:

Principal's Signature: Date:

____ The principal has met the performance goals identified in the PIP.

____ The principal has not met the performance goals identified in the PIP.

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

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

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

The school district or BOCES and its collective bargaining agent(s), where applicable, also certify that this APPR Plan is the district's or BOCES' complete APPR Plan and that such plan will be fully implemented by the school district or BOCES; that there are no collective bargaining agreements, memoranda of understanding or any other agreements in any form that prevent, conflict or interfere with full implementation of the APPR Plan; and that no material changes will be made to the Plan through collective bargaining or otherwise except with the approval of the Commissioner in accordance with Subpart 30-2 of the Rules of the Board of Regents.

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

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

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

- Assure that, for teachers, all NYS Teaching Standards are assessed at least once per year, and, for principals, all Leadership Standards are assessed at least once per year
- Assure that it is possible for a teacher or principal to obtain each point in the scoring ranges, including 0 for each subcomponent and that the APPR Plan describes the process for assigning points for each subcomponent
- Assure that locally-selected measures are rigorous and comparable across all classrooms (for teachers, the same locally-selected measure is used across a subject and/or grade level; for principals, the same locally-selected measure must be used for all principals in the same or similar program or grade configuration)
- Assure that, if more than one type of locally-selected measure is used for different groups of teachers within a grade/subject, the measures are comparable based on the Standards of Educational and Psychological Testing
- Assure that, if more than one type of locally-selected measure is used for principals in the same or similar grade configuration or program, the measures are comparable based on the Standards of Educational and Psychological Testing
- Assure that the process for assigning points for all subcomponents and the composite scores will use the narrative HEDI descriptions described in the regulations to effectively differentiate educators' performance in ways that improve student learning and instruction
- Assure that district or BOCES will develop SLOs according to the rules and/or guidance established by SED and that past academic performance and / or baseline academic data of students is taken into account when developing an SLO
- Assure that Student Growth/Value Added Measure will be used where applicable
- Assure that any material changes to this APPR Plan will be submitted to the Commissioner for approval as soon as practicable and/or in a timeframe prescribed by the Commissioner
- Assure that this APPR Plan applies to all classroom teachers and building principals as defined in the statute, regulations and SED guidance
- Assure that the district or BOCES will provide the Department with any information necessary to conduct annual monitoring pursuant to the regulations
- Assure that any third party assessment that is administered for use to students in kindergarten, first, or second grade, and being used for APPR purposes, is consistent with the State's APPR Assessment Guidance and is not a traditional standardized assessment.

Signatures, dates

Superintendent Signature: Date: 1/20/15

Teachers Union President Signature: Date: 1/20/15

April Jackson

Administrative Union President Signature: Date:

N/A

Board of Education President Signature: Date: 1-20-15

Michael Brooks

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

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

Superintendent / District Superintendent / Chancellor Signature: Date:

1/20/15