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

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

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

January 7, 2013

William Hecht, Superintendent
Wallkill Central School District
19 Main Street
Wallkill, NY 12589

Dear Superintendent Hecht:

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

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

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

Thank you again for your hard work.

Sincerely,

John B. King, Jr.
Commissioner

Attachment

c: Charles Khoury

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

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

Annual Professional Performance Reviews: 2012-13

Created Tuesday, August 07, 2012
Updated Friday, December 14, 2012

1

Disclaimers

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

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

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

1. SCHOOL DISTRICT INFORMATION

1.1) School District's BEDS Number : 621801060000

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

621801060000

1.2) School District Name: WALLKILL CSD

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

WALLKILL CSD

1.3) School Improvement Grant (SIG) Districts Only

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

Not applicable

1.4) Award Classification

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

- Governor’s Management Efficiency Grant

1.5) Assurances

Please check all of the boxes below:

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

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

Re-submission to address deficiencies

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

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

Annual (2012-13)

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

Created Tuesday, August 07, 2012
Updated Friday, January 04, 2013

Page 1

STATE-PROVIDED MEASURES OF STUDENT GROWTH

(25 points with an approved value-added measure)

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

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

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

2.1) Assurances

Please check the boxes below:

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

STUDENT LEARNING OBJECTIVES AS COMPARABLE GROWTH MEASURES (20 points)

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

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

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

If no State assessment or Regents exam exists:

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

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

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

State assessments, *required if one exists*

List of State-approved 3rd party assessments

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

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

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

2.2) Grades K-3 ELA

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

	ELA	Assessment
K	School-or BOCES-wide, group or team results based on State assessments	3-6 NYS ELA and 3-6 NYS Math
1	School-or BOCES-wide, group or team results based on State assessments	3-6 NYS ELA and 3-6 NYS Math
2	School-or BOCES-wide, group or team results based on State assessments	3-6 NYS ELA and 3-6 NYS Math

	ELA	Assessment
3	State assessment	3rd Grade State Assessment

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

Use this box, if needed, to describe the general process for assigning HEDI categories for these grades/subjects in this subcomponent. If needed, you may upload a table or graphic at 2.11, below.	Growth in ELA and Math will be determined using a mean scaled score calculation on the NYS assessments. A previous 3 year mean scaled score for ELA and Math will be calculated by the Assistant Superintendent for Educational Services. The previous 3 year mean scaled scores will be compared to the current year's mean scaled scores. The administrators and teachers will work collaboratively to review baseline data and set appropriate growth score targets based on the analyzed data. The Math and ELA scores will be determined using the 10 point chart and these scores will be combined into a composite score up to 20 points. For grade 3 (only), the administrators and teachers will review data collaboratively and predict a growth score target on the ELA and Math assessments. The final assessement score is based on the 20 point chart. The standard rules of rounding will be followed for composite scores ending in a decimal. Please refer to uploaded table 2.11.1 (10 points of the 20 point scale), table 2.11.2 (10 points of the 20 point scale), table 2.11.3 (20 point scale).
Highly Effective (18 - 20 points) Results are well-above state average for similar students (or District goals if no state test).	Please refer to uploaded tables.
Effective (9 - 17 points) Results meet state average for similar students (or District goals if no state test).	Please refer to uploaded tables.
Developing (3 - 8 points) Results are below state average for similar students (or District goals if no state test).	Please refer to uploaded tables.
Ineffective (0 - 2 points) Results are well-below state average for similar students (or District goals if no state test).	Please refer to uploaded tables.

2.3) Grades K-3 Math

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

	Math	Assessment
K	School-or BOCES-wide, group or team results based on State assessments	3-6 NYS ELA 3-6 NYS Math
1	School-or BOCES-wide, group or team results based on State assessments	3-6 NYS ELA 3-6 NYS Math
2	School-or BOCES-wide, group or team results based on State assessments	3-6 NYS ELA 3-6 NYS Math

	Math	Assessment
3	State assessment	3rd Grade State Assessment

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

Use this box, if needed, to describe the general process for assigning HEDI categories for these grades/subjects in this subcomponent. If needed, you may upload a table or graphic at 2.11, below.	Growth in ELA and Math will be determined using a mean scaled score calculation on the NYS assessments. A previous 3 year mean scaled score will be calculated by the Assistant Superintendent for Educational Services . The previous 3 year mean scaled scores will be compared to the current year's mean scaled scores. The administrators and teachers will work collaboratively to review baseline data and set appropriate growth score targets based on the analyzed data. The Math and ELA scores will be determined using the 10 point chart and these scores will be combined into a composite score up to 20 points. For grade 3 (only), the adminstrators and teachers will review data collaboratively and predict a growth score target on the ELA and Math assessments. The final assessment score is based on the 20 point chart. The standard rules of rounding will be followed for scores ending in a decimal. Please refer to uploaded table 2.11.1 (10 points out of 20 point scale), table 2.11.2 (10 points out of 20 point scale), and table 2.11.3 (20 point scale).
Highly Effective (18 - 20 points) Results are well-above state average for similar students (or District goals if no state test).	Please refer to uploaded tables.
Effective (9 - 17 points) Results meet state average for similar students (or District goals if no state test).	Please refer to uploaded tables.
Developing (3 - 8 points) Results are below state average for similar students (or District goals if no state test).	Please refer to uploaded tables.
Ineffective (0 - 2 points) Results are well-below state average for similar students (or District goals if no state test).	Please refer to uploaded tables.

2.4) Grades 6-8 Science

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

	Science	Assessment
6	Not applicable	Grade 6 is not in our middle school
7	District, regional or BOCES-developed assessment	Wallkill CSD developed science assessement grade 7

	Science	Assessment
8	State assessment	8th Grade State Science Assessment

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

Use this box, if needed, to describe the general process for assigning HEDI categories for these grades/subjects in this subcomponent. If needed, you may upload a table or graphic at 2.11, below.	The administrators and teachers will collaboratively review preassessment (baseline) data and establish minimum growth expectations. HEDI points will be determined based on the percentage of students who score 75 or above on the district summative assessment or a minimum of 3 or above on the state assessement. The standard rules of rounding will be followed for scores ending in a decimal. Please refer to uploaded table 2.11.4. (20 point scale)
Highly Effective (18 - 20 points) Results are well-above state average for similar students (or District goals if no state test).	80-100%
Effective (9 - 17 points) Results meet state average for similar students (or District goals if no state test).	35-79%
Developing (3 - 8 points) Results are below state average for similar students (or District goals if no state test).	11-34%
Ineffective (0 - 2 points) Results are well-below state average for similar students (or District goals if no state test).	0-10%

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	Grade 6 is not in our middle school
7	District, regional or BOCES-developed assessment	Wallkill CSD developed Social Studies assessment for grade 7
8	District, regional or BOCES-developed assessment	Wallkill CSD developed Social Studies assessment for grade 8

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

Use this box, if needed, to describe the general process for assigning HEDI categories for these grades/subjects in this subcomponent. If needed, you may upload a table or graphic at 2.11, below.	The administrators and teachers will collaboratively review pre-assessment (baseline) data and establish minimum growth expectations. HEDI points will be determined based on the percentage of students who score 75 or above on the summative assessment. The standard rules of rounding will be followed for scores ending in a decimal. Please refer to table 2.11.4 (20 point scale)

Highly Effective (18 - 20 points) Results are well-above District goals for similar students.	80-100% of students score 75 or above on the summative assessment.
Effective (9 - 17 points) Results meet District goals for similar students.	35-79% of students score 75 or above on the summative assessment.
Developing (3 - 8 points) Results are below District goals for similar students.	11-34% of students score 75 or above on the summative assessment.
Ineffective (0 - 2 points) Results are well-below District goals for similar students.	0-10% of students score 75 or above on the summative assessment.

2.6) High School Social Studies Regents Courses

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

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

		Assessment
Global 1	School-/BOCES-wide group/team results based on State assessments	Global II Regents Exam results

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

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

Use this box, if needed, to describe the general process for assigning HEDI categories for these grades/subjects in this subcomponent. If needed, you may upload a table or graphic at 2.11, below.	The administrators and teachers will collaboratively review pre-assessment (baseline) data and establish minimum growth expectations. HEDI points will be determined based on the percentage of students who score 75 or above on the summative assessment. The standard rules of rounding will be followed for scores ending in a decimal. Please refer to uploaded table 2.11.4 (20 point scale)
Highly Effective (18 - 20 points) Results are well-above District goals for similar students.	80-100% of students score 75 or above on the summative assessement.
Effective (9 - 17 points) Results meet District goals for similar students.	35-79% of students score 75 or above on the summative assessment.
Developing (3 - 8 points) Results are below District goals for similar students.	11-34% of students score 75 or above on the summative assessment.
Ineffective (0 - 2 points) Results are well-below District goals for similar students.	0-10% of students score 75 or above on the summative assessment.

2.7) High School Science Regents Courses

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

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

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

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

Use this box, if needed, to describe the general process for assigning HEDI categories for these grades/subjects in this subcomponent. If needed, you may upload a table or graphic at 2.11, below.	The administrators and teachers will collaboratively review pre-assessment (baseline) data and establish minimum growth expectations. HEDI points will be determined based on the percentage of students who score 75 or above on the summative assessment. The standard rules of rounding will be followed for scores ending in a decimal. Please see uploaded table 2.11.4 (20 point scale).
Highly Effective (18 - 20 points) Results are well-above District goals for similar students.	80-100% of students score 75 or above on the summative assessment.
Effective (9 - 17 points) Results meet District goals for similar students.	35-79% of students score 75 or above on the summative assessment.
Developing (3 - 8 points) Results are below District goals for similar students.	11-34% of students score 75 or above on the summative assessment.
Ineffective (0 - 2 points) Results are well-below District goals for similar students.	0-10% of students score 75 or above on the summative assessment.

2.8) High School Math Regents Courses

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

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

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

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

Use this box, if needed, to describe the general process for assigning HEDI categories for these grades/subjects in this subcomponent. If needed, you may upload a table or graphic at 2.11, below.	The administrators and teachers will collaboratively review pre-assessment (baseline) data and establish minimum growth expectations. HEDI points will be determined based on the percentage of students who score 75 or above on the summative assessment. The standard rules of rounding will be followed for scores ending in a decimal. Please refer to uploaded table 2.11.4 (20 point scale).
Highly Effective (18 - 20 points) Results are well-above District goals for similar students.	80-100% of students score 75 or above on the summative assessment.
Effective (9 - 17 points) Results meet District goals for similar students.	35-79% of students score 75 or above on the summative assessment.
Developing (3 - 8 points) Results are below District goals for similar students.	11-34% of students score 75 or above on the summative assessment.
Ineffective (0 - 2 points) Results are well-below District goals for similar students.	0-10% of students score 75 or above on the summative assessment.

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	ELA 11 Regents Exam
Grade 10 ELA	School-/BOCES-wide group/team results based on State assessments	ELA 11 Regents Exam
Grade 11 ELA	Regents assessment	ELA 11 Regents Exam

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

Use this box, if needed, to describe the general process for assigning HEDI categories for these grades/subjects in this subcomponent. If needed, you may upload a table or graphic at 2.11, below.	The administrators and teachers will collaboratively review pre-assessment (baseline) data and establish minimum growth expectations. HEDI points will be determined based on the percentage of students who score 75 or above on the summative assessment. The standard rules of rounding will be followed for scores ending in a decimal.

	Please refer to uploaded table 2.11.4 (20 point scale).
Highly Effective (18 - 20 points) Results are well-above District goals for similar students.	80-100% of students score 75 or above on the summative assessment.
Effective (9 - 17 points) Results meet District goals for similar students.	35-79% of students score 75 or above on the summative assessment.
Developing (3 - 8 points) Results are below District goals for similar students.	11-34% of students score 75 or above on the summative assessment.
Ineffective (0 - 2 points) Results are well-below District goals for similar students.	0-10% of students score 75 or above on the summative assessment.

2.10) All Other Courses

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

	Course(s) or Subject(s)	Option	Assessment
	High School Art	School/BOCES-wide/group/team results based on State	English 11 and Integrated Algebra Regents Exams
	High School Business	School/BOCES-wide/group/team results based on State	English 11 and Integrated Algebra Regents Exams
	High School Foreign Language	School/BOCES-wide/group/team results based on State	English 11 and Integrated Algebra Regents Exams
	High School Physical Education	School/BOCES-wide/group/team results based on State	English 11 and Integrated Algebra Regents Exams
	High School Music	School/BOCES-wide/group/team results based on State	English 11 and Integrated Algebra Regents Exams
	High School Health	School/BOCES-wide/group/team results based on State	English 11 and Integrated Algebra Regents Exams
	High School Technology	School/BOCES-wide/group/team results based on State	English 11 and Integrated Algebra Regents Exams
	College Level Courses	School/BOCES-wide/group/team results based on State	English 11 and Integrated Algebra Regents Exams
	Classroom Teachers K-2	School/BOCES-wide/group/team results based on State	3-6 NYS ELA 3-6 NYS Math
	Special Areas K-6	School/BOCES-wide/group/team results based on State	3-6 NYS ELA 3-6 NYS Math
	Special Areas 7-8	School/BOCES-wide/group/team results based on State	7-8 NYS ELA 7 7-8 NYS Math
	Health 7	School/BOCES-wide/group/team results based on State	Grade 7 NYS ELA NYS Math
	Technology grade 8	School/BOCES-wide/group/team results based on State	Grade 8 NYS ELA NYS Math
	Foreign Language grade 8	School/BOCES-wide/group/team results based on State	Grade 8 NYS ELA NYS Math
	ESL K-12	State Assessment	NYSESLAT
	Reading K-6	School/BOCES-wide/group/team results based on State	3-6 NYS ELA 3-6 NYS Math

Reading 7-8	School/BOCES-wide/group/team results based on State	7-8 NYS ELA 7-8 NYS Math
AIS Math 7-8	School/BOCES-wide/group/team results based on State	7-8 NYS ELA 7-8 NYS Math
AIS ELA 7-8	School/BOCES-wide/group/team results based on State	7-8 NYS ELA 7-8 NYS Math
All others teachers not named above	School/BOCES-wide/group/team results based on State	3-6 NYS exams will apply to K-6 and 7-8 NYS exams to 7-8

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

Use this box, if needed, to describe the general process for assigning HEDI categories for these grades/subjects in this subcomponent. If needed, you may upload a table or graphic at 2.11, below.	The administrators and teachers will collaboratively review pre-assessment (baseline) data and establish minimum growth expectations. HEDI points will be determined using the appropriate chart. The standard rules of rounding will be followed for scores ending in a decimal. Please refer to uploaded table 2.11.1(10 points out of 20 point scale), table 2.11.2 (10 points out of 20 point scale), table 2.11.3 (20 point scale), table 2.11.4 (20 point scale).
Highly Effective (18 - 20 points) Results are well-above District goals for similar students.	See specific table for HEDI ranges.
Effective (9 - 17 points) Results meet District goals for similar students.	See specific table for HEDI ranges.
Developing (3 - 8 points) Results are below District goals for similar students.	See specific table for HEDI ranges.
Ineffective (0 - 2 points) Results are well-below District goals for similar students.	See specific table for HEDI ranges.

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

(No response)

2.11) HEDI Tables or Graphics

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

assets/survey-uploads/5364/160065-TXEtxx9bQW/APPR Tables 1-3-13.pdf

2.12) Locally Developed Controls

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

associated with the controls or adjustments.

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

(No response)

2.13) Teachers with more than one growth measure

If educators have more than one state-provided growth or value-added measure, those measures will be combined into one HEDI rating and score for the growth subcomponent according to a formula determined by the Commissioner. (Examples: Common branch teacher with state-provided value-added measures for both ELA and Math in 4th grades; Middle school math teacher with both 7th and 8th grade math courses.)

If educators have more than one SLO for comparable growth (or a State-provided growth measure and an SLO for comparable growth), the measures will each earn a score from 0-20 points which Districts must weight proportionately based on the number of students in each SLO.

2.14) Assurances

Please check all of the boxes below:

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

3. Local Measures (Teachers)

Created Wednesday, August 08, 2012
Updated Friday, January 04, 2013

Page 1

Locally Selected Measures of Student Achievement or Growth

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

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

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

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

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

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

Growth or achievement measure(s) from these options.

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

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

Measures based on:

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

3.1) Grades 4-8 ELA

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

	Locally-Selected Measure from List of Approved Measures	Assessment
4	6(ii) School wide measure computed locally	STAR Reading Enterprise
5	6(ii) School wide measure computed locally	STAR Reading Enterprise
6	6(ii) School wide measure computed locally	STAR Reading Enterprise
7	6(ii) School wide measure computed locally	STAR Reading Enterprise
8	6(ii) School wide measure computed locally	STAR Reading Enterprise

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.	HEDI points will be awarded to a teacher based on the Median Growth Percentile score for the building on the listed assessments. A corresponding 0-15 point HEDI scale will be assigned. The scores assigned to the Student Growth Percentile (SGP) for ELA and Math into a composite score is the responsibility of the Assistant Superintendent for Educational Services. The standard rules of rounding will be followed for composite scores ending in a decimal. Please refer to uploaded tables.
Highly Effective (14 - 15 points) Results are well above District- or BOCES-adopted expectations for growth or achievement for grade/subject.	Evidence indicates student learning gain well above District expectations. Please refer to table 3.3.1 (10 points out of 20 point scale), table 3.3.1A (7.5 points out of 15 point scale), table 3.3.2 (10 points out of 20 point scale), table 3.3.2A (7.5 points out of 15 point scale), table 3.3.3 (20 point scale), table 3.3.3A (15 point scale).
Effective (8- 13 points) Results meet District- or BOCES-adopted expectations for growth or achievement for grade/subject.	Evidence indicates significant student learning gain that meets the District's expectations. Please refer to table 3.3.1 (10 points out of 20 point scale), table 3.3.1A (7.5 points out of 15 point scale), table 3.3.2 (10 points out of 20 point scale), table 3.3.2A (7.5 points out of 15 point scale), table 3.3.3 (20 point scale), table 3.3.3A (15 point scale).
Developing (3 - 7 points) Results are below District- or BOCES-adopted expectations for growth or achievement for grade/subject.	Evidence indicates an impact on student learning that is below District expectations. Please refer to table 3.3.1 (10 points out of 20 point scale), table 3.3.1A (7.5 points out of 15 point scale), table 3.3.2 (10 points out of 20 point scale, table 3.3.2A (7.5 points out of 15 point scale), table 3.3.3 (20 point scale), table 3.3.3A (15 point scale).
Ineffective (0 - 2 points) Results are well below District- or BOCES-adopted expectations for growth or achievement for grade/subject.	Evidence indicates little to no student learning gain and results that are below District expectations. Please refer to table 3.3.1 (10 points out of 20 point scale), table 3.3.1A (7.5 points out of 15 point scale) table 3.3.2 (10 points out of 20 point scale), table 3.3.2A (7.5 points out of 15 point scale), table 3.3.3 (20 point scale), table 3.3.3A (15 point scale).

3.2) Grades 4-8 Math

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

	Locally-Selected Measure from List of Approved Measures	Assessment
4	6(ii) School wide measure computed locally	STAR Math Enterprise

5	6(ii) School wide measure computed locally	STAR Math Enterprise
6	6(ii) School wide measure computed locally	STAR Math Enterprise
7	6(ii) School wide measure computed locally	STAR Math Enterprise
8	6(ii) School wide measure computed locally	STAR Math Enterprise

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.	HEDI points will be awarded to a teacher based on the Median Growth Percentile score for the building on the listed assessments. A corresponding 0-15 point HEDI scale will be assigned. The scores assigned to the Student Growth Percentile (SGP) for ELA and Math into a composite score is the responsibility of the Assistant Superintendent for Educational Services. The standard rules of rounding will be followed for composite scores ending in a decimal. Please refer to uploaded tables.
Highly Effective (14 - 15 points) Results are well above District- or BOCES-adopted expectations for growth or achievement for grade/subject.	Evidence indicates student learning gain well above District expectations. Please refer to table 3.3.1 (10 points out of 20 point scale), table 3.3.1A (7.5 points out of 15 point scale), table 3.3.2 (10 points out of 20 point scale), table 3.3.2A (7.5 ponts out of 15 point scale), table 3.3.3 (20 point scale), table 3.3.3A (15 point scale).
Effective (8- 13 points) Results meet District- or BOCES-adopted expectations for growth or achievement for grade/subject.	Evidence indicates significant student learning gain that meets the District's expectations. Please refer to table 3.3.1 (10 points out of 20 point scale), table 3.3.1A (7.5 points out of 15 point scale), table 3.3.2 (10 points out of 20 point scale), table 3.3.2A (7.5 points out of 15 point scale), table 3.3.3 (20 point scale), table 3.3.3A (15 point scale).
Developing (3 - 7 points) Results are below District- or BOCES-adopted expectations for growth or achievement for grade/subject.	Evidence indicates an impact on student learning that is below District expectations. Please refer to table 3.3.1 (10 points out of 20 point scale), table 3.3.1A (7.5 points out of 15 point scale), table 3.3.2 (10 points out of 20 point scale), table 3.3.2A (7.5 points out of 15 point scale), table 3.3.3 (20 point scale), table 3.3.3A (15 point scale).
Ineffective (0 - 2 points) Results are well below District- or BOCES-adopted expectations for growth or achievement for grade/subject.	Evidence indicates little to no student learning gain and results that are well below District expectations. Please refer to table 3.3.1 (10 points out of 20 point scale), table 3.3.1A (7.5 points out of 15 point scale), table 3.3.2 (10 points out of 20 point scale), table 3.3.2A (7.5 points out of 15 point scale), table 3.3.3 (20 point scale), table 3.3.3A (15 point scale).

3.3) HEDI Tables or Graphics

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

assets/survey-uploads/5139/160588-rhJdBgDruP/Table 3 12-13-12.pdf

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

Growth or achievement measure(s) from these options.

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

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

Measures based on:

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

3.4) Grades K-3 ELA

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

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

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

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

Use this box, if needed, to describe the general process for assigning HEDI categories for these grades/subjects in this subcomponent. If needed, you may upload a table or graphic at 3.13, below.	HEDI points will be awarded to a teacher based on the Median Growth Percentile score for the building on the listed assessments. The process for combining the scores assigned to the Student Growth Percentile (SGP) for ELA and Math into a composite score is the responsibility of the Assistant Superintendent for Educational Services. The standard rules of rounding will be followed for composite scores ending in a decimal. Please refer to uploaded table 3.13.1 (10 points out of 20 point scale), table 3.13.1A (7.5 points out of 15 point scale), table 3.13.2 (10 points out of 20 point scale), table 3.13.2A (7.5 points out of 15 point scale).
Highly Effective (18-20 points) Results are well above District- or BOCES-adopted expectations for growth or achievement for grade/subject.	Evidence indicates student learning gain well above District expectations. Please refer to table 3.13.1 (10 points out of 20 point scale), table 3.13.1A (7.5 points out of 15 point scale), table 3.13.2 (10 points out of 20 point scale), table 3.13.2A (7.5 points out of 15 point scale).
Effective (9-17 points) Results meet District- or BOCES-adopted expectations for growth or achievement for grade/subject.	Evidence indicates significant student learning gain that meets the District's expectations. Please refer to table 3.13.1 (10 points out of 20 point scale), table 3.13.1A (7.5

	points out of 15 point scale), table 3.13.2 (10 points out of 20 point scale), table 3.13.2A (7.5 points out of 15 point scale).
Developing (3 - 8 points) Results are below District- or BOCES-adopted expectations for growth or achievement for grade/subject.	Evidence indicates an impact on student learning that is below District expectations. Please refer to table 3.13.1 (10 points out of 20 point scale), table 3.13.1A (7.5 0ut of 15 point scale), table 3.13.2 (10 points out of 20 point scale), table 3.13.2A (7.5 points out of 15 point scale).
Ineffective (0 - 2 points) Results are well below District- or BOCES-adopted expectations for growth or achievement for grade/subject.	Evidence indicates little to no student learning gain and results that are below District expectations. Please refer to table 3.13.1 (10 points out of 20 point scale), table 3.13.1A (7.5 points out of 15 point scale), table 3.13.2 (10 point out of 20 point scale), table 3.13.2A (7.5 points out of 15 point scale).

3.5) Grades K-3 Math

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

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

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

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

Use this box, if needed, to describe the general process for assigning HEDI categories for these grades/subjects in this subcomponent. If needed, you may upload a table or graphic at 3.13, below.	HEDI points will be awarded to a teacher based on the Median Growth Percentile score for the building on the listed assessments. The process for combining the scores assigned to the Student Growth Percentile (SGP) for ELA and Math into a composite score is the responsibility of the Assistant Superintendent for Educational Services. The standard rules of rounding will be followed for composite scores ending in a decimal. Please refer to uploaded table 3.13.1 (10 point out of 20 point scale), table 3.13.1A (7.5 points out of 15 point scale), table 3.13.2 (10 points out of 20 point scale), table 3.13.2A (7.5 points out of 15 point scale).
Highly Effective (18-20 points) Results are well above District- or BOCES-adopted expectations for growth or achievement for grade/subject.	Evidence indicates student learning gain well above the District expectations. Please refer to table 3.13.1 (10 points out of 20 point scale), table 3.13.1A (7.5 points out of 15 point scale), table 3.13.2 (10 points out of 20 point

	scale), table 3.13.2A (7.5 points out of 15 point scale).
Effective (9-17 points) Results meet District- or BOCES-adopted expectations for growth or achievement for grade/subject.	Evidence indicates significant student learning gain that meets the District's expectations. Please refer to table 3.13.1 (10 point out of 20 point scale), table 3.13.1A (7.5 points out of 15 point scale), table 3.13.2 (10 points out of 20 point scale), table 3.13.2A (7.5 points out of 15 point scale).
Developing (3 - 8 points) Results are below District -or BOCES-adopted expectations for growth or achievement for grade/subject.	Evidence indicates an impact on student learning that is below District expectations. Please refer to table 3.13.1 (10 points out of 20 point scale), table 3.13.1A (7.5 points out of 15 point scale), table 3.13.2 (10 points out of 20 point scale), table 3.13.2A (7.5 points out of 15 point scale).
Ineffective (0 - 2 points) Results are well below District- or BOCES-adopted expectations for growth or achievement for grade/subject.	Evidence indicates little to no student learning gain and results that are below District expectations. Please refer to table 3.13.1 (10 points out of 20 point scale), table 3.13.1A (7.5 points out of 15 point scale), table 3.13.2 (10 points out of 20 point scale), table 3.13.2A (7.5 points out of 15 point scale).

3.6) Grades 6-8 Science

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

	Locally-Selected Measure from List of Approved Measures	Assessment
6	Not applicable	6th grade is not in the middle school
7	6(ii) School wide measure computed locally	STAR Math and STAR Reading Enterprise
8	6(ii) School wide measure computed locally	STAR Math and STAR Reading Enterprise

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

Use this box, if needed, to describe the general process for assigning HEDI categories for these grades/subjects in this subcomponent. If needed, you may upload a table or graphic at 3.13, below.	HEDI points will be awarded to a teacher based on the Median Growth Percentile score for the building on the listed assessments. The process for combining the scores assigned to the Student Growth Percentile (SGP) for ELA and Math is the responsibility of the Assistant Superintendent for Educational Services. The standard rules of rounding will be followed for composite scores ending in a decimal. Please refer to uploaded table 3.13.1 (10 points out of 20 point scale), table 3.13.1A(7.5 points out of 15 point scale) , table 3.13.2 (10 points out of 20 point scale), table 3.13.2A (7.5 points out of 15 point scale).
Highly Effective (18 - 20 points) Results are well above District- or BOCES-adopted expectations for growth or achievement for grade/subject.	Evidence indicates student learning gain well-above District expectations. Please refer to table 3.13.1 (10 points out of 20 point scale), table 3.13.1A (7.5 points points out of 15 point scale), table 3.13.2 (10 points out of

	20 point scale), table 3.13.2A (7.5 points out of 15 point scale).
Effective (9 - 17 points) Results meet District- or BOCES-adopted expectations for growth or achievement for grade/subject.	Evidence indicates significant student learning gain that meets district expectations. Please refer to table 3.13.1 (10 points out of 20 point scale), table 3.13.1A (7.5 points out of 15 point scale), table 3.13.2 (10 points out of 20 point scale), table 3.13.2A (7.5 points out of 15 point scale).
Developing (3 - 8 points) Results are below District- or BOCES-adopted expectations for growth or achievement for grade/subject.	Evidence indicates an impact on student learning that is below District expectations. Please refer to table 3.13.1 (10 points out of 20 point scale), table 3.13.1A (7.5 points out of 15 point scale), table 3.13.2 (10 points out of 20 point scale), table 3.13.2A (7.5 points out of 15 point scale).
Ineffective (0 - 2 points) Results are well below District- or BOCES-adopted expectations for growth or achievement for grade/subject.	Evidence indicates little to no student learning gain and results that are well below District expectations. Please refer to table 3.13.1 (10 points out of 20 point scale), table 3.13.1A (7.5 points out of 15 point scale), table 3.13.2 (10 points out of 20 point scale), table 3.13.2A (7.5 points out of 15 point scale).

3.7) Grades 6-8 Social Studies

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

	Locally-Selected Measure from List of Approved Measures	Assessment
6	Not applicable	6th grade is not in the middle school
7	6(ii) School wide measure computed locally	STAR Reading Enterprise
8	6(ii) School wide measure computed locally	STAR Reading Enterprise

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.	HEDI points will be awarded to a teacher based on the Median Growth Percentile score for the building on the listed assessments. The process for determining the Student Growth Percentile rates will be the responsibility of the Assistant Superintendent for Educational Services. The standard rules of rounding will be followed for composite scores ending in a decimal. Please refer to uploaded table 3.13.3 (20 point scale), table 3.13.3A (15 point scale).

Highly Effective (18 - 20 points) Results are well above District- or BOCES-adopted expectations for growth or achievement for grade/subject.	Evidence indicates student learning gain well above District expectations. Please refer to table 3.13.3 (20 point scale), table 3.13A (15 point scale).
Effective (9 - 17 points) Results meet District- or BOCES-adopted expectations for growth or achievement for grade/subject.	Evidence indicates significant student learning gain that meets the District's expectations. Please refer to table 3.13.3 (20 point scale), table 3.13A (15 point scale).
Developing (3 - 8 points) Results are below District- or BOCES-adopted expectations for growth or achievement for grade/subject.	Evidence indicates an impact on student learning that is below District expectations. Please refer to table 3.13.3 (20 point scale), table 3.13A (15 point scale).
Ineffective (0 - 2 points) Results are well below District- or BOCES-adopted expectations for growth or achievement for grade/subject.	Evidence indicates little to no student learning gain and results that are below District expectations. Please refer to table 3.13.3 (20 point scale), table 3.13A (15 point scale).

3.8) High School Social Studies

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

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

	Locally-Selected Measure from List of Approved Measures	Assessment
Global 1	5) District, regional, or BOCES–developed assessments	Wallkill CSD developed Global 1 Assessment
Global 2	5) District, regional, or BOCES–developed assessments	Wallkill CSD developed Global 2 Assessment
American History	5) District, regional, or BOCES–developed assessments	Wallkill CSD developed American History Assessment

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

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

Use this box, if needed, to describe the general process for assigning HEDI categories for these grades/subjects in this subcomponent. If needed, you may upload a table or graphic at 3.13, below.	The administrators and teachers will collaboratively examine baseline data and establish achievement targets. HEDI points will be determined based on the percentage of students who score 75 or above on the summative assessment. Standard rules of rounding will be followed for scores ending in a decimal. Please refer to uploaded table 3.13.4 (20 point scale), table 3.13.4A (15 point scale).
Highly Effective (18 - 20 points) Results are well above District- or BOCES-adopted expectations for growth or	71-100% of students score 75 or above on the summative assessments. Please refer to table 3.13.4 (20 point scale),

achievement for grade/subject.	table 3.13.4A (15 point scale).
Effective (9 - 17 points) Results meet District- or BOCES-adopted expectations for growth or achievement for grade/subject.	25-70% of students score 75 or above on the summative assessments. Please refer to table 3.13.4 (20 point scale), table 3.13.4A (15 point scale).
Developing (3 - 8 points) Results are below District- or BOCES-adopted expectations for growth or achievement for grade/subject.	6-24% of students score 75 or above on the summative assessments. Please refer to table 3.13.4 (20 point scale), table 3.13.4A (15 point scale).
Ineffective (0 - 2 points) Results are well below District- or BOCES-adopted expectations for growth or achievement for grade/subject.	0-5% of students score 75 or above on the summative assessments. Please refer to table 3.13.4 (20 point scale), table 3.13.4A (15 point scale).

3.9) High School Science

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

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

	Locally-Selected Measure from List of Approved Measures	Assessment
Living Environment	5) District, regional, or BOCES–developed assessments	Wallkill CSD developed Living Environment Assessment
Earth Science	5) District, regional, or BOCES–developed assessments	Wallkill CSD developed Earth Science Assessment
Chemistry	5) District, regional, or BOCES–developed assessments	Wallkill CSD developed Chemistry Assessment
Physics	5) District, regional, or BOCES–developed assessments	Wallkill CSD developed Physics Assessment

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

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

Use this box, if needed, to describe the general process for assigning HEDI categories for these grades/subjects in this subcomponent. If needed, you may upload a table or graphic at 3.13, below.	The administrators and teachers will collaboratively examine baseline data and establish achievement targets. HEDI points will be determined based on the percentage of students who score 75 or above on the summative assessments. The standard rules of rounding will be followed for scores ending in a decimal. Please refer to uploaded table 3.13.4 (20 point scale), table 3.13.4A (15 point scale).
Highly Effective (18-20 points) Results are well above District- or BOCES-adopted expectations for growth or	71-100% of students score 75 or above on the summative assessments. Please refer to table 3.13.4 (20 point scale),

achievement for grade/subject.	table 3.13.4A (15 point scale).
Developing (3 - 8 points) Results are below District- or BOCES-adopted expectations for growth or achievement for grade/subject.	6-24% of students score 75 or above on the summative assessments. Please refer to table 3.13.4 (20 point scale), table 3.13.4A (15 point scale).
Effective (9 - 17points) Results meet District- or BOCES-adopted expectations for growth or achievement for grade/subject.	25-70% of students score 75 or above on the summative assessments. Please refer to table 3.13.4 (20 point scale), table 3.13.4A (15 point scale).
Ineffective (0 - 2 points) Results are well below District- or BOCES-adopted expectations for growth or achievement for grade/subject.	0-5% of students score 75 or above on the summative assessments. Please refer to table 3.13.4 (20 point scale), table 3.13.4A (15 point scale).

3.10) High School Math

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

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

	Locally-Selected Measure from List of Approved Measures	Assessment
Algebra 1	5) District, regional, or BOCES–developed assessments	Wallkill CSD developed Algebra 1 Assessment
Geometry	5) District, regional, or BOCES–developed assessments	Wallkill CSD developed Geometry Assessment
Algebra 2	5) District, regional, or BOCES–developed assessments	Wallkill CSD developed Algebra 2 Assessment

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

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

Use this box, if needed, to describe the general process for assigning HEDI categories for these grades/subjects in this subcomponent. If needed, you may upload a table or graphic at 3.13, below.	The administrators and teachers will collaboratively examine baseline data and establish achievement targets . HEDI points will be determined based on the percentage of students who score 75 or above on the summative assessments. The standard rules of rounding will be followed for scores ending in a decimal. Please refer to uploaded table 3.13.4 (20 point scale), table 3.13.4A (15 point scale).
Highly Effective (18 - 20 points) Results are well above District- or BOCES-adopted expectations for growth or achievement for grade/subject.	71-100% of students score 75 or above on the summative assessments. Please refer to table 3.13.4 (20 point scale), table 3.13.4A (15 point scale).

Effective (9 - 17 points) Results meet District- or BOCES-adopted expectations for growth or achievement for grade/subject.	25-70% of students score 75 or above on the summative assessments. Please refer to table 3.13.4 (20 point scale), table 3.13.4A (15 point scale).
Developing (3 - 8 points) Results are below District- or BOCES-adopted expectations for growth or achievement for grade/subject.	6-24% of students score 75 or above on the summative assessments. Please refer to table 3.13.4 (20 point scale), table 3.13.4A (15 point scale).
Ineffective (0 - 2 points) Results are well below District- or BOCES-adopted expectations for growth or achievement for grade/subject.	0-5% of students score 75 or above on the summative assessments. Please refer to table 3.13.4 (20 point scale), table 3.13.4A (15 point scale).

3.11) High School English Language Arts

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

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

	Locally-Selected Measure from List of Approved Measures	Assessment
Grade 9 ELA	5) District, regional, or BOCES–developed assessments	Wallkill CSD developed ELA 9 Assessment
Grade 10 ELA	5) District, regional, or BOCES–developed assessments	Wallkill CSD developed ELA 10 Assessment
Grade 11 ELA	5) District, regional, or BOCES–developed assessments	Wallkill CSD developed ELA 11 Assessment

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

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

Use this box, if needed, to describe the general process for assigning HEDI categories for these grades/subjects in this subcomponent. If needed, you may upload a table or graphic at 3.13, below.	The administrators and teachers will collaboratively examine baseline data and establish achievement targets. HEDI points will be determined based on the percentage of students who score 75 or above on the summative assessments. The standard rules of rounding will be followed for scores ending in a decimal. Please refer to uploaded table 3.13.4 (20 point scale), table 3.13.4A (15 point scale).
Highly Effective (18 - 20 points) Results are well above District- or BOCES-adopted expectations for growth or achievement for grade/subject.	71-100% of students score 75 or above on the summative assessments. Please refer to table 3.13.4 (20 point scale), table 3.13.4A (15 point scale).
Effective (9 - 17 points) Results meet District- or BOCES-adopted expectations for growth or achievement	25-70% of students score 75 or above on the summative assessments. Please refer to table 3.13.4 (20 point scale),

for grade/subject.	table 3.13.4A (15 point scale).
Developing (3 - 8 points) Results are below District- or BOCES-adopted expectations for growth or achievement for grade/subject.	6-24% of students score 75 or above on the summative assessments. Please refer to table 3.13.4 (20 point scale), table 3.13.4A (15 point scale).
Ineffective (0 - 2 points) Results are well below District- or BOCES-adopted expectations for growth or achievement for grade/subject.	0-5% of students score 75 or above on the summative assessments. Please refer to table 3.13.4 (20 point scale), table 3.13.4A (15 point scale).

3.12) All Other Courses

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

	Course(s) or Subject(s)	Locally-Selected Measure from List of Approved Measures	Assessment
	ESL 9-12	6(ii) School wide measure computed locally	English 11 Regents Exam
	Art K-12	5) District/regional/BOCES–developed	Wallkill CSD developed Art Assessment grades K-12
	Physical Education K-8	6(ii) School wide measure computed locally	STAR Reading and STAR Math Enterprise
	Music K-8	6(ii) School wide measure computed locally	STAR Reading and STAR Math Enterprise
	High School Health	5) District/regional/BOCES–developed	Wallkill CSD developed Health Assessment grades 9-12
	High School Technology	5) District/regional/BOCES–developed	Wallkill CSD developed Technology Assessment grades 9-12
	Foreign Language 8-12	5) District/regional/BOCES–developed	Wallkill CSD developed Foreign Language Assessment grades 8-12
	High School Business	5) District/regional/BOCES–developed	Wallkill CSD developed Business Assessment grades 9-12
	ESL K-8	6(ii) School wide measure computed locally	STAR Reading and Math Enterprise
	College Level Courses	5) District/regional/BOCES–developed	Wallkill CSD developed Assessments for College Level Courses
	Reading K-6	6(ii) School wide measure computed locally	STAR Reading and STAR Math Enterprise
	AIS Math 7-8	6(ii) School wide measure computed locally	STAR Math Enterprise
	AIS ELA 7-8	6(ii) School wide measure computed locally	STAR Reading Enterprise
	Physical Education 9-12	5) District/regional/BOCES–developed	Wallkill CSD developed PE assessments grades 9-12
	Music 9-12	5) District/regional/BOCES–developed	Wallkill CSD developed Music assessment grades 9-12
	Home and Career grade 7	6(ii) School wide measure computed locally	STAR Reading Enterprise
	Health grade 7	6(ii) School wide measure computed locally	STAR Reading Enterprise

	Technology grade 8	6(ii) School wide measure computed locally	STAR Reading and STAR Math Enterprise
	All other Courses not named above	5) District/regional/BOCES–developed	Wallkill CSD developed grade and subject specific assessments

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.	The administrators and teachers will collaboratively examine baseline data and establish achievement targets. For Courses using STAR Reading and STAR Math, HEDI points will be awarded to a teacher based on the Median Growth Percentile for the building on the listed assessments. The process for combining the scores assigned to the Student Growth Percentile (SGP) for ELA and Math is the responsibility of the Assistant Superintendent for Educational Services. For courses using a WCSD developed assessement, the HEDI points will be determined based on the percentage of students who score 75 or above on the summative assessments. The standard rules of rounding will be followed for composite scores ending in a decimal. Please refer to uploaded table 3.13.1 (10 points out of 20 point scale), table 3.13.1A, (7.5 points out of 15 point scale) table 3.13.2, (10 points out of 20 point scale) table 3.13.2A,(7.5 points out of 15 point scale) table 3.13.3 (20 point scale), table 3.13.3A, (15 point scale) table 3.13.4, (20 point scale), table 3.13.4A (15 point scale).
Highly Effective (18 - 20 points) Results are well above District- or BOCES -adopted expectations for growth or achievement for grade/subject.	For courses using STAR Reading and STAR Math, evidence indicates student learning gain well above District expectations. Refer to table 3.13.1, (10 points out of 20 point scale), table 3.13.1A, (7.5 points out of 15 point scale)table 3.13.2, (10 points out of 20 point scale), table 3.13.2A, (7.5 points out of 15 point scale), table 3.13.3, (20 point scale), table 3.13.3A (15 point scale). For courses using Wallkill CSD developed assessments, 71-100% of students score 75 or above on the summative assessments. Refer to table 3.13.4, (20 point scale),table 3.13.4A (15 point scale).
Effective (9 - 17 points) Results meet District- or BOCES-adopted expectations for growth or achievement for grade/subject.	For courses using STAR Reading and STAR Math, evidence indicates student learning gain that meets the District's expectations. Refer to table 3.13.1, (10 point out of 20 point scale), table 3.13.1A (7.5 points out of 15 point scale), table 3.13.2, (10 points out of 20 point scale) table

	3.13.2A.(7.5 points out of 15 point scale), table 3.13.3 (20 point scale), table 3.13.3A (15 point scale) For courses using Wallkill CSD developed assessments, 25-70% of students score 75 or above on the summative assessments. Refer to table 3.13.4 (20 point scale), table 3.13.4A (15 point scale).
Developing (3 - 8 points) Results are below District- or BOCES-adopted expectations for growth or achievement for grade/subject.	For courses using STAR Reading and STAR Math, evidence indicates student learning that is below District expectations. Refer to table 3.13.1 (10 points out of 20 point scale) table 3.13.1A (7.5 points out of 15 point scale), table 3.13.2 (10 points out of 20 point scale), table 3.13.2A (7.5 points out of 15 point scale), table 3.13.3 (20 point scale), table 3.13.3A (15 point scale). For courses using Wallkill CSD developed assessments, 6-24% of students score 75 or above on the summative assessments. Refer to table 3.13.4 (20 point scale), table 3.13.4A (15 point scale).
Ineffective (0 - 2 points) Results are well below District- or BOCES-adopted expectations for growth or achievement for grade/subject.	For courses using STAR Reading and STAR Math, evidence indicates student learning well below District expectations. Please refer to table 3.13.1 (10 points out of 20 point scale), table 3.13.1A (7.5 points out of 15 point scale), table 3.13.2 (10 points out of 20 point scale), table 3.13.2A (7.5 points out of 15 point scale), table 3.13.3 (20 point scale), table 3.13.3A (15 point scale). For courses using Wallkill CSD developed assessements, 0-5% of students score 75 or above on the summative assessments, Refer to table 3.13.4 (20 point scale), table 3.13.4A (15 point scale).

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

(No response)

3.13) HEDI Tables or Graphics

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

assets/survey-uploads/5139/160588-y92vNseFa4/Tables 3 13 1 - 3 13 4.pdf

3.14) Locally Developed Controls

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

(No response)

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.

When applicable, the district administrators will combine ELA and Math scores using tables in 3.3 and 3.13 to determine a composite score totaling 20 points (15 points). We will add the two number scores together to determine the composite score. For teachers with multiple measures, the HEDI scores will be averaged together.

3.16) Assurances

Please check all of the boxes below:

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

4. Other Measures of Effectiveness (Teachers)

Created Tuesday, October 02, 2012
Updated Friday, December 21, 2012

Page 1

4.1) Teacher Practice Rubric

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

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

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

Danielson's Framework for Teaching (2011 Revised Edition)

(No response)

4.2) Points Within Other Measures

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

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

Is the following points assignment applicable to all teachers?

Yes

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

(No response)

Multiple (at least two) classroom observations by principal or other trained administrator, at least one of which must be unannounced [at least 31 points]	35
One or more observation(s) by trained independent evaluators	0
Observations by trained in-school peer teachers	0
Feedback from students using State-approved survey tool	0
Feedback from parents/caregivers using State-approved survey tool	0
Structured reviews of lesson plans, student portfolios and other teacher artifacts	25

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

(No response)

4.3) Survey Tools (if applicable)

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

(No response)

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

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

4.4) Assurances

Please check all of the boxes below:

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

4.5) Process for Assigning Points and Determining HEDI Ratings

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

See Table 4.5 (Appendix A) : Danielson 2011 Framework - Local 60%

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

assets/survey-uploads/5091/186582-eka9yMJ855/Table 4 5 12-21-12.pdf

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

Highly Effective: Overall performance and results exceed NYS Teaching Standards.	Evidence indicates teacher's performance is well-above the District's expectatons. Based on the standard chart attached (table 4.5), a teacher will earn a Highly Effective rating if their converted score is between the 59-60 scoring band. The standard rules of rounding will be followed for scores ending in a decimal.
Effective: Overall performance and results meet NYS Teaching Standards.	Evidence indicates teacher's performance meets District's expectations. Based on the standard chart attached (table 4.5), a teacher will earn an Effective rating if their converted score is between 57-58 scoring band. The standard rules of rounding will be followed for scores ending in a decimal.
Developing: Overall performance and results need improvement in order to meet NYS Teaching Standards.	Evidence indicates teacher's performance is below District's expectations. Based on the standards chart attached (table 4.5), a teacher will earn a Developing rating if their converted score is between the 50-56 scoring band. The standard rules of rounding will be followed for scores ending in a decimal.
Ineffective: Overall performance and results do not meet NYS Teaching Standards.	Evidence indicates teacher's performance is well-below District's expectations. Based on the standards chart attached (table 4.5), a teacher will earn an Ineffective rating if their converted score is between the 0-49 scoring band. The standard rules of rounding will be followed for scores ending in a decimal.

Provide the ranges for the 60-point scoring bands.

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

4.6) Observations of Probationary Teachers

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

By building principals or other trained administrators

4.6) Observations of Probationary Teachers | Formal/Long	2

4.6) Observations of Probationary Teachers | Informal/Short	3
4.6) Observations of Probationary Teachers | Enter Total	5

By trained in-school peer teachers or other trained reviewers

Formal/Long	0
Informal/Short	0

Independent evaluators

Formal/Long	0
Informal/Short	0

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

- In Person

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

- In Person

4.7) Observations of Tenured Teachers

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

By building principals or other trained administrators

4.7) Observations of Tenured Teachers | Formal/Long	1
4.7) Observations of Tenured Teachers | Informal/Short	4
4.7) Observations of Tenured Teachers | Total	5

By trained in-school peer teachers or other trained reviewers

Formal/Long	0
Informal/Short	0

Independent evaluators

Formal/Long	0

Informal/Short	0

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

- In Person

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

- In Person

5. Composite Scoring (Teachers)

Created Thursday, September 27, 2012
Updated Friday, December 14, 2012

Page 1

Standards for Rating Categories

Growth or Comparable Measures

Locally-selected Measures of

growth or achievement

Other Measures of Effectiveness

(Teacher and Leader standards)

Highly

Effective

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

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

Overall performance and results exceed NYS Teaching Standards.

Effective

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

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

Overall performance and results meet NYS Teaching Standards.

Developing

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

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

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

Ineffective

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

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

Overall performance and results do not meet NYS Teaching Standards.

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

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

2012-13 where there is no Value-Added measure

Growth or Comparable Measures

Locally-selected Measures of

growth or achievement

Other Measures of Effectiveness

(60 points)

Overall

Composite Score

Highly Effective

18-20

18-20

Ranges determined locally--see below

91-100

Effective

9-17

9-17

75-90

Developing

3-8

3-8

65-74

Ineffective

0-2

0-2

0-64

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

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

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

2012-13 where Value-Added growth measure applies

Growth or Comparable Measures

Locally-selected Measures of

growth or achievement

Other Measures of Effectiveness

(60 points)

Overall

Composite Score

Highly Effective

22-25

14-15

Ranges determined locally--see above

91-100

Effective

10-21

8-13

75-90

Developing

3-9

3-7

65-74

Ineffective

0-2

0-2

0-64

6. Additional Requirements - Teachers

Created Thursday, September 27, 2012
Updated Friday, January 04, 2013

Page 1

6.1) Assurances -- Improvement Plans

Please check the boxes below:

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

6.2) Attachment: Teacher Improvement Plan Forms

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

assets/survey-uploads/5265/182890-Df0w3Xx5v6/Teacher Improvement Plan APPR 10-22-12 xls.xlsx

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:

Appeal Procedure for Annual Performance Evaluations:

A. A probationary teacher may only appeal a composite score of "Ineffective", and a tenured teacher may only appeal a composite score of "Developing" or "Ineffective". The basis for an appeal shall be limited to the following: a) the substance of the APPR; b) the District's adherence to the standards and methodologies required for such review; and 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).

B. The District's adherence to any locally negotiated procedures shall be appealed through the grievance procedure of the collective bargaining agreement between the parties. The Arbitrator in this appeal shall have the authority to void any evaluation if a procedural defect is found to be a material breach of the locally negotiated procedures. Such decision shall be made within thirty (30) calendar days of receipt of appeal.

C. All other appeals shall be processed as follows:

1. An appeal alleging a substantive disagreement with the conclusion of any summative rating drawn by the evaluator may challenge both the cumulative score of the evaluation, as well as the scores of the subcomponents which make up that rating.

a) First Level Appeal: An appeal of a composite rating on an evaluation that was performed by an Assistant Principal must be submitted within fourteen (14) days of the receipt of the evaluation to the Principal (if the evaluation was performed by somebody other than the Principal). An unsuccessful appeal (any appeal that does not result in a composite rating of effective or highly effective) may then be submitted to the Superintendent or the Superintendent's designee, as described in the Second Level Appeal procedure below.

If a teacher is challenging the issuance of a TIP, appeals must be filed within fourteen (14) school days of issuance of such plan. The failure to file an appeal within these timeframes shall be deemed a waiver of the right to appeal and the appeal shall be deemed abandoned.

b) Second Level Appeal: An appeal of a composite rating of an evaluation that was performed by a Principal must be submitted within fourteen (14) school days of receipt of the evaluation to the Superintendent or the Superintendent's designee (if the initial evaluation was performed by the Principal, unit memebers shall proceed directly to the Second Level Appeal).

If the teacher is challenging the issuance of a TIP, appeals must be filed within fourteen (14) school days of issuance of such plan. The failure to file an appeal within these timeframes shall be deemed a waiver of the right to appeal and the appeal shall be deemed abandoned.

For both the First and Second Level Appeals, when filing an appeal, the teacher must submit a detailed written description of the specific areas of disagreement over his or her performance review, or the issuance and/or implementation of the terms of his or her improvement plan and any additional documents or materials relevant to the appeal. The performance review and/or improvement plan being challenged must be submitted with the appeal. Any information not submitted at the time the appeal is filed shall not be considered. All grounds for appeal must be raised with specificity within one appeal. Any grounds not raised at the time of the appeal is filed shall be deemed waived. In an appeal, the teacher has the burden of demonstrating by the preponderance of evidence a clear legal right to the relief requested and the burden of establishing the facts upon which the relief is sought.

For both the First and Second Level Appeals, a written decision on the merits of the appeal shall be rendered no later than thirty (30) days from the date upon which the teacher filed his or her appeal. The appeal shall be based solely on the written record. Such decision shall be final, except as provided for below.

D. The parties agree to establish an alternate 3020-a procedure ("Alternate 3020-a Procedure"), goverend by Education Law 3012-c, which shall apply only if:

a) The District seeks to bring disciplinary charges against a tenured unit member based on pedagogical incompetence; and

b) The District intends to use "Developing" or "Ineffective" evaluations to meet its burden of demonstrating that the tenured unit member should be disciplined.

1. The appeal shall be conducted by an arbitrator in accordance with the grievance procedure outlined in the teacher's collective bargaining agreement. The arbitrator shall be selected from the list: Ira Lobal, Susan Mackenzie, Jay Siegel or Janet Spencer. If none of the arbitrators are available to schedule the hearing within sixty (60) calendar days from the date the demand is filed, then either party may process the demand for arbitration with the American Arbitration Association.

2. 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 as otherwise authorized by law.

E. Alternate 3020-a Procedure:

a) The Arbitrator who presided over the appeal of the Superintendent's determination shall be the Arbitrator for the Alternate 3020-a Procedure.

b) This Alternate 3020-a Procedure shall be implemented upon the filing of 3020-a charges against a tenured unit member based on pedagogical incompetence.

c) The Hearing on any disciplinary proceeding shall be conducted in accordance with Education Law 3020-a.

d) The Arbitrator assigned to the unit member's Alternate 3020-a proceeding shall bifurcate the hearing as follows:

Stage 1:

1) The Arbitrator shall preside over the substantive appeal of the evaluation(s). The Arbitrator shall have complete authority to void or modify the evaluation(s) at issue.

2) The parties further agree that such Arbitrator (a) shall hear appeals in a timely manner after the appeal is made (b) shall issue a decision regarding the appeal within thirty (30) calendar days after the appeal meeting and (c) shall make final and binding determinations regarding the appeal based on the totality of information that was presented at the appeal meeting.

3) The Arbitrator's final determination shall not be subject to the grievance procedure or challengeable in any other forum.

4) If the Arbitrator voids or modifies the evaluation(s) such that it is no longer "Developing" or "Ineffective", the Alternate 3020-a proceeding shall end and the 3020-a charges shall be dismissed with prejudice. An evaluation will still be conducted for that individual if the evaluation is voided.

Stage 2:

5) If the Arbitrator sustains the evaluation(s) such that it is still "Developing" or "Ineffective", the matter shall be conducted in accordance with the rules and procedures in Section 3020-a of the Education Law. The same Arbitrator will preside over the remainder of the Section 3020-a proceeding.

6) In order to take advantage of the procedure outlined in this subsection, the teacher must consent to the use of an Arbitrator should the District proceed to find probable cause under Section 3020-a of the Education Law. If the teacher is unwilling to do so, the second tier appeal shall be heard by the Superintendent and the Superintendent's determination shall be final and not subject to appeal.

6.4) Training and Certification of Lead Evaluators and Evaluators

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

All Wallkill administrators are trained as Lead Evaluators. These positions include the Superintendent of Schools, Assistant Superintendent for Support Services, Assistant Superintendent for Educational Services, Director of Pupil Personnel Services, Coordinator of Special Education, High School Principal, two (2) Assistant Principals, Middle School Principal and three (3) Elementary School Principals.

Ulster County BOCES and other approved staff developers have provided training of Lead Evaluators in compliance with all State regulations. Lead Evaluators will complete a minimum of 20 hours of training within the course of a 12 month period to be cerified. The nature of the training includes Teaching and Common Core Standards, Evidence Based Observations, Growth and Value Added, Rubric Specific Training, Assessment Tools and Procedures, Locally Selected Measures, Instructional Reporting Systems, Scoring Methodology, English Language Learners and Students with Disabilities The Superintendent of Schools upon receipt of proof of successful completion of the Ulster BOCES training will certify individual evaluators as Lead Evaluators.

The District will ensure the training and certification of its Lead Evaluators in accordance with the requirements prescribed in the Commissioner's Regulations. The District will further ensure that Lead Evaluators maintain inter-rater reliability over time and they are recertified on an annual basis. All administrators will be involved in a common process, providing a common approach for observing teacher practice utilizing the Danielson 2011 rubric, providing specific feedback, supported by evidence and aligned to consistent expectations.

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 Tuesday, August 07, 2012
Updated Monday, October 29, 2012

Page 1

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

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

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

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

K - 6
7 - 8
9 - 12
(No response)
(No response)
(No response)
(No response)

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

Please check the boxes below:

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

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

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

State assessments, *required if one exists*

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

List of State-approved 3rd party assessments

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

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

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

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

Use this box, if needed, to describe the process for assigning HEDI categories in this subcomponent. If needed, you may upload a table or graphic below.	(No response)
Highly Effective (18 - 20 points) Results are well above state average for similar students (or District goals if no state test).	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 setting targets for Comparable Growth Measures, the rationale for including such factors, and the processes that will be used to mitigate potentially problematic incentives associated with the controls or adjustments.

Note: The only allowable controls or adjustments for Comparable Growth Measures are those used in State Growth measures, which include: prior student achievement results, students with disabilities, English language learners, students in poverty, and, in the future,

any other student-, classroom-, and school-level characteristics approved by the Board of Regents.

(No response)

7.5) Principals with More Than One Growth Measure

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

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

7.6) Assurances -- Comparable Growth Measures

Please check all of the boxes below:

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

8. Local Measures (Principals)

Created Tuesday, September 11, 2012
Updated Friday, January 04, 2013

Page 1

Locally-Selected Measures of Student Achievement or Growth

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

	Grade Configuration	Locally-Selected Measure from List of Approved Measures	Assessment
	K-6	(d) measures used by district for teacher evaluation	STAR Reading and STAR Math Enterprise
	7-8	(d) measures used by district for teacher evaluation	STAR Reading and STAR Math Enterprise
	9-12	(e) 4, 5, and/or 6-year high school grad and/or dropout rates	Four year cohort graduation rate

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

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

Use this box, if needed, to describe the process for assigning HEDI categories. If needed, you may upload a table or graphic below.	HEDI points will be awarded to a principal based on the Median Growth Percentile score for the building on the listed assessments. A corresponding 0-15 point HEDI scale will be assigned. The process for combining the Student Growth Percentile (SGP) for ELA and Math into a composite score is the responsibility of the Assistant Superintendent for Educational Services. The standard rules of rounding will be followed for composite scores ending in a decimal. Please refer to uploaded tables. The Superintendent and High School Principal will collaboratively examine baseline data and establish achievement targets. HEDI points will be determined based on the increase or decrease in the percentage

	points for cohort graduation rates. The standard rules for rounding will be followed for composite scores endng in a decimal. Please refer to uploaded table 8.1.3 (20 point scale), table 8.1.3A (15 point scale).
Highly Effective (14 - 15 points) Results are well above District- or BOCES-adopted expectations for growth or achievement for grade/subject.	Please refer to table 8.1.1 (10 points out of 20 point scale), table 8.1.1A (7.5 points out of 15 point scale), table 8.1.2 (10 points out of 20 point scale), table 8.1.2A (7.5 points out of 15 point scale). For high school graduation rate HEDI point distribution, please see uploaded table 8.1.3 (20 point scale), table 8.1.3A (15 point scale).
Effective (8- 13 points) Results meet District- or BOCES-adopted expectations for growth or achievement for grade/subject.	Please refer to table 8.1.1 (10 points out of 20 point scale), table 8.1.1A (7.5 points out of 15 point scale), table 8.1.2 (10 points out of 20 point scale), table 8.1.2A (7.5 points out of 15 point scale). For high school graduation rate HEDI distribution, please see uploaded table 8.1.3 (20 point scale), table 8.1.3A (15 point scale).
Developing (3 - 7 points) Results are below District- or BOCES-adopted expectations for growth or achievement for grade/subject.	Please refer to table 8.1.1 (10 points out of 20 point scale), table 8.1.1A (7.5 points out of 15 point scale), table 8.1.2 (10 points out of 20 point scale), table 8.1.2A (7.5 points out of 15 point scale). For high school graduation rate HEDI point distribution, please see uploaded table 8.1.3 (20 point scale), table 8.1.3A (15 point scale).
Ineffective (0 - 2 points) Results are well below District- or BOCES-adopted expectations for growth or achievement for grade/subject.	Please refer to table 8.1.1 (10 points out of 20 point scale), table 8.1.1A (7.5 points out of 15 point scale), table 8.12 (10 points out of 20 point scale), table 8.1.2A (7.5 points out of 15 point scale). For high school graduation rate HEDI distribution, please see uploaded table 8.1.3 (20 point scale), table 8.1.3A (15 point scale).

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

(No response)

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

assets/survey-uploads/5366/175098-qBFVOWF7fC/APPR Table 8 12-13-12.pdf

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

Use this box, if needed, to describe the process for assigning HEDI categories. If needed, you may upload a table or graphic below.	(No response)
Highly Effective (18 - 20 points) Results are well above District- or BOCES-adopted expectations for growth or achievement for grade/subject.	N/A
Effective (9- 17 points) Results meet District- or BOCES-adopted expectations for growth or achievement for grade/subject.	N/A
Developing (3 - 8 points) Results are below District- or BOCES-adopted expectations for growth or achievement for grade/subject.	N/A
Ineffective (0 - 2 points) Results are well below District- or BOCES-adopted expectations for growth or achievement for grade/subject.	N/A

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

(No response)

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

(No response)

8.3) Locally Developed Controls

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

(No response)

8.4) Principals with More Than One Locally Selected Measure

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

When applicable, the district administrators will combine ELA and math scores using tables in 8.1 to determine a composite score totaling 20 points. We will add the two number scores together to determine the composite score. For principals with multiple measures, the HEDI scores will be averaged together.

8.5) Assurances

Please check all of the boxes below:

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

9. Other Measures of Effectiveness (Principals)

Created Tuesday, September 11, 2012
Updated Monday, October 29, 2012

Page 1

9.1) Principal Practice Rubric

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

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

Marshall's Principal Evaluation Rubric

(No response)

9.2) Points Within Other Measures

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

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

Is the following points assignment for all principals?

Yes

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

(No response)

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

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

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

(No response)

9.3) Assurances -- Goals

Please check the boxes below (if applicable):

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

9.4) Sources of Evidence (if applicable)

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

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

9.5) Survey Tool(s) (if applicable)

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

(No response)

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

(No response)

(No response)

(No response)

9.6) Assurances

Please check all of the boxes below:

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

9.7) Process for Assigning Points and Determining HEDI Ratings

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

The Lead Evaluator will be using the Marshall Rubric as his/her only instrument in determining the HEDI ratings for the "other measure" for principals. Prior to the summative evaluation meeting the evaluator will add up all points under each standard. Rubric scores are as follow:

Domain Ineffective Developing Effective Highly Effective

A 0 points 1 - 4 points 5 - 8 points 9 - 10 points

B 0 points 1 - 4 points 5 - 9 points 10 - 11 points

C 0 points 1 - 5 points 6 - 9 points 10 points

D 0 points 1 - 7 points 8 - 9 points 10 points

E 0 points 1 - 3 points 4 - 7 points 8 - 9 points

F 0 points 1 - 6 points 7 - 8 points 9 - 10 points

Converted Rating 0 - 54 55 - 56 57 - 58 59 - 60

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

assets/survey-uploads/5143/175195-pMADJ4gk6R/Appendix B1.pdf

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

Highly Effective: Overall performance and results exceed standards.	Evidence indicates that the principal's performance is well above the district's expectations. Based on the standards chart above a principal will earn a Highly Effective rating if their overall converted score is between 59 - 60 points.
Effective: Overall performance and results meet standards.	Evidence indicates that the principal's performance meets the district's expectations. Based on the standards chart above a principal will earn an Effective rating if their overall converted score is between 57 - 58 points.

Developing: Overall performance and results need improvement in order to meet standards.	Evidence indicates that the principal's performance is below the district's expectations. Based on the standards chart a principal will earn a Developing rating if their overall converted score is between 55 - 56 points.
Ineffective: Overall performance and results do not meet standards.	Evidence indicates that the principal's performance is well - below the district's expectations. Based on the standards chart above a principal will earn an Ineffective rating if their overall converted score is between 0 - 54 points.

Please provide the locally-negotiated 60 point scoring bands.

Highly Effective	59 - 60
Effective	57 - 58
Developing	55 - 56
Ineffective	0 - 54

9.8) School Visits

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

Probationary Principals

By supervisor	2
By trained administrator	2
By trained independent evaluator	0
Enter Total	4

Tenured Principals

By supervisor	2
By trained administrator	2
By trained independent evaluator	0
Enter Total	4

10. Composite Scoring (Principals)

Created Wednesday, September 12, 2012
Updated Friday, December 14, 2012

Page 1

Standards for Rating Categories

Growth or Comparable Measures

Locally-selected Measures of

growth or achievement

Other Measures of Effectiveness

(Teacher and Leader standards)

Highly

Effective

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

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

Overall performance and results exceed ISLLC leadership standards.

Effective

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

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

Overall performance and results meet ISLLC leadership standards.

Developing

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

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

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

Ineffective

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

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

Overall performance and results do not meet ISLLC leadership standards.

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

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

2012-13 where there is no Value-Added measure

Growth or Comparable Measures

Locally-selected Measures of

growth or achievement

Other Measures of Effectiveness

(60 points)

Overall

Composite Score

Highly Effective

18-20

18-20

Ranges determined locally--see below

91-100

Effective

9-17

9-17

75-90

Developing

3-8

3-8

65-74

Ineffective

0-2

0-2

0-64

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

Highly Effective	59 - 60
Effective	57 -58
Developing	55 - 56
Ineffective	0 - 54

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

2012-13 where Value-Added growth measure applies

Growth or Comparable Measures

Locally-selected Measures of

growth or achievement

Other Measures of Effectiveness

(60 points)

Overall

Composite Score

Highly Effective

22-25

14-15

Ranges determined locally--see above

91-100

Effective

10-21

8-13

75-90

Developing

3-9

3-7

65-74

Ineffective

0-2

0-2

0-64

11. Additional Requirements - Principals

Created Wednesday, September 12, 2012
Updated Friday, December 14, 2012

Page 1

11.1) Assurances -- Improvement Plans

Please check the boxes below.

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

11.2) Attachment: Principal Improvement Plan Forms

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

assets/survey-uploads/5276/175687-Df0w3Xx5v6/Appendix C.pdf

11.3) Appeals Process

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

(1) the substance of the annual professional performance review

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

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

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

Wallkill CSD Principal APPR Appeal Process:

A. A principal who received a composite score of "ineffective" on his/her APPR shall be entitled to appeal his/her annual APPR rating based upon a paper submission to the individual identified in Paragraph D, who shall be trained in accordance with the requirements of statute and regulations and also possesses a district-wide administrative certification.

B. The appeal must be brought in writing, specifying the area(s) of concern, but limited to those matters that may be appealed as prescribed in Section 3012-c of the Education Law. Section 3012-c limits appeals to the following areas: 1) the school district's adherence to the standards and methodologies required for such reviews pursuant to Education Law 3012-c; 2) the adherence to the Commissioner's Regulations, as applicable to such reviews; 3) compliance with any applicable locally negotiated procedures applicable to APPRs or improvement plans; and 4) the school district's issuance and/or implementation of the terms of the principal improvement plan under Education Law 3012-c. Except for appeals brought pursuant to Paragraph E below, all appeals under this section shall be processed in accordance with Paragraphs C and D below.

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 shall be deemed waived.

C. Except for an appeal filed under Paragraph E below, an appeal of an APPR must be commenced by the later of September 15, or ten (10) calendar days from receipt of the PIP or year end evaluation for a probationary principal, and fifteen (15) calendar days or year end evaluation for a tenured principal. The principal may submit documents or materials in support of his/her position in conjunction with the appeal. Any a) written document prepared by the Assistant Superintendent(s), and b) any written complaint used by the Superintendent in formulating the APPR shall be provided to the principal upon request. A copy of any documents submitted by either party to the Superintendent's designee in support of its postion shall be provided to the other party at the time that it is submitted to the Superintendent's designee. If the appeal is not filed within that time period, the right to appeal shall not be deemed waived in all regards.

D. The Superintendent's designee (who may be a sitting superintendent from a different district, or BOCES superintendent) shall respond to the appeal with a written answer. The designee shall have the right to grant or deny the appeal in whole or in part. Such decision shall be made within thirty (30) calendar days of receipt of the appeal. The decision of the Superintendent's designee shall be final and binding in all regards and shall not be subject to review at arbitration, before an administrative agency or in any court of law, unless the decision is not rendered within thirty (30) calendar days of receipt of the appeal. In the event the decision is not rendered within thirty (30) calendar days of receipt of the appeal, the employee may avail him/herself of the appeal procedure set forth in Paragraph E below, and such determination shall be limited to whether or not the "ineffective" rating accurately reflected the principal's performance during the period covered.

E. A tenured principal who received 2 consecutive "ineffective" ratings and who the district has notified in writing that it intended to proffer 3020-a disciplinary charges for pedagogical incompetence shall have the option to appeal the second ineffective rating directly to an independent arbitrator agreed to by the district and the WAA. The sole issue before the arbitrator shall be whether or not the second consecutive ineffective rating accurately reflected the principal's performance during the period it covered. The tenured principal shall have thirty (30) calendar days from receipt of written notification of the district's intent to proffer charges based upon pedagogical incompetence to file a demand for arbitration. The parties agree that at least ten (10) days prior to the commencement of the hearing, witness lists shall be exchanged. However, any new names added should be provided to opposing counsel as soon as possible after they become known. All matters will be governed by Education Law 3012-c. Any decision shall be made within thirty (30) days of receipt of appeal.

F. The agreed upon list of arbitrators shall be as follows: James Markowitz, Louis Patak, Thomas Rinaldo. If none of the arbitrators are available to schedule the hearing within sixty (60) calendar days from the date the demand is filed, then either party may process the demand for arbitration with the American Arbitration Association. Alternatively, the parties may agree to the selection of another arbitrator. All matters will be governed by Education Law 3012-c. It is anticipated that the arbitration will be complete within ninety (90) calendar days.

G. An evaluation shall not be placed in the principal's personnel file until ten (10) days after the conclusion of the appeal process described herein.

H. A principal who invokes the appeals process described herein does not waive his/her right to submit a written rebuttal to the final evaluation. A principal shall always have the right to submit a written rebuttal to his/her evaluation which will be attached to the evaluation.

11.4) Training and Certification of Lead Evaluators and Evaluators

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

A. All Wallkill Administrators will be trained as Lead Evaluators.

B. Ulster County BOCES will provide training as Lead Evaluators in compliance with all state regulations. Lead Evaluators will complete a minimum of 20 hours of training within the course of a 12 month period to be certified. The nature of the training includes Teaching and Common Core Standards, Evidence Based Observations, Growth and Value Added, Rubric Specific Training, Assessment Tools and Procedures, Locally Selected Measures, Instructional Reporting Systems, Scoring Methodology, English Language Learners and Students with Disabilities.

C. The Superintendent of Schools upon receipt of proof of successful completion of the Ulster County BOCES training of Lead Evaluator's training will certify individual evaluators as Lead Evaluators.

D. Inter-rater reliability of Lead Evaluators over time will be conducted by the Superintendent of Schools. The process will involve the maintenance of a database of evaluators on their respective assessments.

E. The Wallkill Central School District will fully participate in the periodic re-certification conducted by Ulster County BOCES.

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 Wednesday, September 12, 2012
Updated Friday, January 04, 2013

Page 1

12.1)Upload the Joint Certification of the APPR Plan

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

assets/survey-uploads/5581/175823-3Uqgn5g9Iu/APPR Signature Page 1-4-13.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.

Table 3.3.1 Local Measure [10 Points out of the 20 Point Scale]

School-Wide Student Growth Percentile on the STAR Reading for classroom teachers in Grades 4-6.

HEDI Score (Points)	Median SGP* Range
10	85-99
9.5	75-84
9	61-74
8.5	59-60
8	57-58
7.5	55-56
7	53-54
6.5	51-52
6	49-50
5.5	47-48
5	45-46
4.5	41-44
4	40
3.5	38-39
3	35-37
2.5	31-34
2	26-30
1.5	21-25
1	16-20
.5	11-15
0	0-10

*Student Growth Percentile

18-20	Highly Effective
9-17	Effective
3-8	Developing
0-2	Ineffective

This chart (3.3.1) will be combined with chart 3.3.2 to determine a composite score out of 20. The rules of rounding will apply.

Table 3.3.1A Local Measure [7.5 Points out of 15 Point Scale]

School-Wide Student Growth Percentile on the STAR Reading for classroom teachers in Grades 4-6.

HEDI Score (Points)	Median SGP* Range
7.5	85-99
7	75-84
6.5	61-74
6	56-60
5.5	51-55
5	46-50
4.5	41-45
4	36-40
3.5	31-35
3	26-30
2.5	21-25
2	16-20
1.5	11-15
1	7-10
.5	3-6
0	0-2

*Student Growth Percentile

14-15	Highly Effective
8-13	Effective
3-7	Developing
0-2	Ineffective

This chart (3.3.1A) will be combined with chart 3.3.2A to determine a composite score out of 15. The rules of rounding will apply.

Table 3.3.2 Local Measure [10 Points out of 20 Point Scale]

School-wide Student Growth Percentile on the STAR Mathematics for classroom teachers in Grades 4-6.

HEDI Score (Points)	Median SGP* Range
10	85-99
9.5	75-84
9	61-74
8.5	59-60
8	57-58
7.5	55-56
7	53-54
6.5	51-52
6	49-50
5.5	47-48
5	45-46
4.5	41-44
4	40
3.5	38-39
3	35-37
2.5	31-34
2	26-30
1.5	21-25
1	16-20
.5	11-15
0	0-10

*Student Growth Percentile

18-20	Highly Effective
9-17	Effective
3-8	Developing
0-2	Ineffective

This chart (3.3.2) will be combined with chart 3.3.1 to determine a composite score out of 20. The rules of rounding will apply.

Table 3.3.2A Local Measure [7.5 Points out of 15 Point Scale]

School-Wide Student Growth Percentile on the STAR Mathematics for classroom teachers in Grades 4-6.

HEDI Score (Points)	Median SGP* Range
7.5	85-99
7	75-84
6.5	61-74
6	56-60
5.5	51-55
5	46-50
4.5	41-45
4	36-40
3.5	31-35
3	26-30
2.5	21-25
2	16-20
1.5	11-15
1	7-10
.5	3-6
0	0-2

*Student Growth Percentile

14-15	Highly Effective
8-13	Effective
3-7	Developing
0-2	Ineffective

This chart (3.3.2A) will be combined with chart 3.3.1A to determine a composite score out of 15. The rules of rounding will apply.

Table 3.3.3 Local Measure [20 Point Scale]

School-Wide Student Growth Percentile on STAR Reading or STAR Math for classroom teachers of ELA in Grade 7 and 8, teachers of Mathematics 7 and 8.

HEDI Score (Points)	Median SGP* Range
20	85-99
19	75-84
18	61-74
17	56-60
16	57-58
15	55-56
14	53-54
13	51-52
12	49-50
11	47-48
10	45-46
9	41-44
8	40
7	38-39
6	35-37
5	31-34
4	26-30
3	21-25
2	16-20
1	11-15
0	0-10

*Student Growth Percentile

18-20	Highly Effective
9-17	Effective
3-8	Developing
0-2	Ineffective

Table 3.3.3A Local Measure [15 Point Scale]

School-Wide Student Growth Percentile on STAR Reading or STAR Math for classroom teachers of ELA in Grade 7 and 8, teachers of Mathematics 7 and 8.

HEDI Score (Points)	Median SGP* Range
15	85-99
14	75-84
13	61-74
12	56-60
11	51-55
10	46-50
9	41-45
8	36-40
7	31-35
6	26-30
5	21-25
4	16-20
3	11-15
2	7-10
1	3-6
0	0-2

*Student Growth Percentile

14-15	Highly Effective
8-13	Effective
3-7	Developing
0-2	Ineffective

Table 3.13.1 Local Measure [10 Points out of 20 Point Scale]

School-wide student growth percentile on STAR Reading for classroom teachers in Grades K-3 and ESL Teachers Grades K-8, Science Teachers Grades 7-8, Physical Education Grades K-8, and Music Grades K-8, Reading Grades K-6 and Grade 8 Technology.

HEDI Score (Points)	Median SGP* Range
10	85-99
9.5	75-84
9	61-74
8.5	59-60
8	57-58
7.5	55-56
7	53-54
6.5	51-52
6	49-50
5.5	47-48
5	45-46
4.5	41-44
4	40
3.5	38-39
3	35-37
2.5	31-34
2	26-30
1.5	21-25
1	16-20
.5	11-15
0	0-10

*Student Growth Percentile

18-20	Highly Effective
9-17	Effective
3-8	Developing
0-2	Ineffective

This chart (3.13.1) will be combined with chart 3.13.2 to determine a composite score of 20. The rules of rounding will apply.

Table 3.13.1A Local Measure [7.5 Points out of 15 Point Scale]

School-wide student growth percentile on STAR Reading for classroom teachers in Grades K-3 and ESL Teachers Grades K-8, Science Teachers Grades 7-8, Physical Education Grades K-8, and Music Grades K-8, Reading Grades K-6 and Grade 8 Technology.

HEDI Score (Points)	Median SGP* Range
7.5	85-99
7	75-84
6.5	61-74
6	56-60
5.5	51-55
5	46-50
4.5	41-45
4	36-40
3.5	31-35
3	26-30
2.5	21-25
2	16-20
1.5	11-15
1	7-10
.5	3-6
0	0-2

*Student Growth Percentile

14-15	Highly Effective
8-13	Effective
3-7	Developing
0-2	Ineffective

This chart (3.13.1A) will be combined with chart 3.13.2A to determine a composite score of 15. The rules of rounding will apply.

Table 3.13.2 Local Measure [10 Points out of 20 Point Scale]

School-wide Student Growth Percentile on the STAR Mathematics for classroom teachers in Grades K-3 and ESL teachers in Grades K-8, Science Teachers Grades 7-8, Physical Education Grades K-8, and Music Grades K-8, Reading Grades K-6 and Grade 8 Technology.

HEDI Score (Points)	Median SGP* Range
10	85-99
9.5	75-84
9	61-74
8.5	59-60
8	57-58
7.5	55-56
7	53-54
6.5	51-52
6	49-50
5.5	47-48
5	45-46
4.5	41-44
4	40
3.5	38-39
3	35-37
2.5	31-34
2	26-30
1.5	21-25
1	16-20
.5	11-15
0	0-10

*Student Growth Percentile

18-20	Highly Effective
9-17	Effective
3-8	Developing
0-2	Ineffective

This chart (3.13.2) will be combined with chart 3.13.1 to determine a composite score of 20. The rules of rounding will apply.

Table 3.13.2A Local Measure [7.5 Points out of 15 Point Scale]

School-wide Student Growth Percentile on the STAR Mathematics for Classroom Teachers in Grades K-3 and ESL Teachers in Grades K-8, Science Teachers Grade 7-8, Physical Education Grades K-8, and Music Grades K-8, Reading Grades K-6 and Grade 8 Technology.

HEDI Score (Points)	Median SGP* Range
7.5	85-99
7	75-84
6.5	61-74
6	56-60
5.5	51-55
5	46-50
4.5	41-45
4	36-40
3.5	31-35
3	26-30
2.5	21-25
2	16-20
1.5	11-15
1	7-10
.5	3-6
0	0-2

*Student Growth Percentile

14-15	Highly Effective
8-13	Effective
3-7	Developing
0-2	Ineffective

This chart (3.13.2A) will be combined with chart 3.13.1A to determine a composite score of 15. The rules of rounding will apply.

Table 3.13.3 Local Measure [20 Point Scale]
Grades 7-8

1. School-wide Student Growth Percentile on STAR Reading:
   a. ELA AIS (ELA 7 and 8 combined)
   b. Home and Careers (Grade 7 only)
   c. Health (Grade 7 only)
   d. Reading (ELA 7 and 8 combined)
   e. Social Studies (ELA 7 and 8 combined)
2. School-wide Student Growth Percentile on STAR Math:
   a. Math AIS (Math 7 and 8 combined)

HEDI Score (Points)	Median SGP* Range
20	85-99
19	75-84
18	61-74
17	59-60
16	57-58
15	55-56
14	53-54
13	51-52
12	49-50
11	47-48
10	45-46
9	41-44
8	40
7	38-39
6	35-37
5	31-34
4	26-30
3	21-25
2	16-20
1	11-15
0	0-10

*Student Growth Percentile

18-20	Highly Effective
9-17	Effective
3-8	Developing
0-2	Ineffective

Table 3.13.3A Local Measure [15 Point Scale]
Grades 7-8

1. School-wide Student Growth Percentile on STAR Reading:
   a. ELA AIS (ELA 7 and 8 combined)
   b. Home and Careers (Grade 7 only)
   c. Health (Grade 7 only)
   d. Reading (ELA 7 and 8 combined)
   e. Social Studies (ELA 7 and 8 combined)
2. School-wide Student Growth Percentile on STAR Math:
   a. Math AIS (Math 7 and 8 combined)

HEDI Score (Points)	Median SGP* Range
15	85-99
14.25	75-84
13.5	61-74
12.75	59-60
12	57-58
11.25	55-56
10.5	53-54
9.75	51-52
9	49-50
8.25	47-48
7.5	45-46
6.75	41-44
6	40
5.25	38-39
4.5	35-37
3.75	31-34
3	26-30
2.25	21-25
1.5	16-20
.75	11-15
0	0-10

*Student Growth Percentile

14-15	Highly Effective
8-13	Effective
3-7	Developing
0-2	Ineffective

Table: 3.13.4 Local Assessment [20 Points]

Global I, Global II, American History, Living Environment, Earth Science, Chemistry, Physics, Algebra I, Geometry, Algebra II, Grade 9 ELA, Grade 10 ELA and Grade 11 ELA, ESL 9-12, Art K-12, Physical Education K-12, Music K-12, High School Health, High School Technology, Foreign Language 8-12, High School Business, College Courses, Grade 7 Science Teachers (Grade 8 NYS Assessment Results)

Category Rating	Highly Effective			Effective									Developing						Ineffective		
Category Point Value	20	19	18	17	16	15	14	13	12	11	10	9	8	7	6	5	4	3	2	1	0
% of students attaining proficiency (Score of 75 or above)	91-100	81-90	71-80	61-70	51-60	41-50	31-40	30	29	28	27	25-26	22-24	19-21	16-18	13-15	10-12	6-9	2-5	1	0

Table 8.1.1 Local Measure [10 Points out of 20 Point Scale]

School-wide student growth percentile on STAR Reading

HEDI Score (Points)	Median SGP* Range
10	85-99
9.5	75-84
9	61-74
8.5	59-60
8	57-58
7.5	55-56
7	53-54
6.5	51-52
6	49-50
5.5	47-48
5	45-46
4.5	41-44
4	40
3.5	38-39
3	35-37
2.5	31-34
2	26-30
1.5	21-25
1	16-20
.5	11-15
0	0-10

*Student Growth Percentile

18-20	Highly Effective
9-17	Effective
3-8	Developing
0-2	Ineffective

This chart (8.1.1) will be combined with chart 8.1.2 to determine a composite score out of 20. The rules of rounding will apply.

Table 8.1.1A Local Measure [7.5 Points out of 15 Point Scale]

School-wide student growth percentile on STAR Reading

HEDI Score (Points)	Median SGP* Range
7.5	85-99
7	75-84
6.5	61-74
6	56-60
5.5	51-55
5	46-50
4.5	41-45
4	36-40
3.5	31-35
3	26-30
2.5	21-25
2	16-20
1.5	11-15
1	7-10
.5	3-6
0	0-2

*Student Growth Percentile

14-15	Highly Effective
8-13	Effective
3-7	Developing
0-2	Ineffective

This chart (8.1.1A) will be combined with chart 8.1.2A to determine a composite score out of 15. The rules of rounding will apply.

Table 8.1.2 Local Measure [10 Points out of 20 Point Scale]

School-wide student growth percentile on STAR Mathematics

HEDI Score (Points)	Median SGP* Range
10	85-99
9.5	75-84
9	61-74
8.5	59-60
8	57-58
7.5	55-56
7	53-54
6.5	51-52
6	49-50
5.5	47-48
5	45-46
4.5	41-44
4	40
3.5	38-39
3	35-37
2.5	31-34
2	26-30
1.5	21-25
1	16-20
.5	11-15
0	0-10

*Student Growth Percentile

18-20	Highly Effective
9-17	Effective
3-8	Developing
0-2	Ineffective

This chart (8.1.2) will be combined with chart 8.1.1 to determine a composite score out of 20. The rules of rounding will apply.

Table 8.1.2A Local Measure [7.5 Points out of 15 Point Scale]

School-wide student growth percentile on STAR Mathematics

HEDI Score (Points)	Median SGP* Range
7.5	85-99
7	75-84
6.5	61-74
6	56-60
5.5	51-55
5	46-50
4.5	41-45
4	36-40
3.5	31-35
3	26-30
2.5	21-25
2	16-20
1.5	11-15
1	7-10
.5	3-6
0	0-2

*Student Growth Percentile

14-15	Highly Effective
8-13	Effective
3-7	Developing
0-2	Ineffective

This chart (8.1.2A) will be combined with chart 8.1.1A to determine a composite score out of 15. The rules of rounding will apply.

Table 8.1.3 [Cohort Graduation Rate] [20 Point Scale]

APPENDIX A

HEDI Score (Points)	Graduation Rate (Percentage Points)
20	$4 \leq X \leq 3.75$
19	$3.75 < X \leq 3.25$
18	$3.25 < X \leq 2.75$
17	$2.75 < X \leq 2.25$
16	$2.25 < X \leq 1.75$
15	$1.75 < X \leq 1.25$
14	$1.25 < X \leq .75$
13	$.75 < X \leq .25$
12	$.25 < X \leq -.25$
11	$-.25 < X \leq -.75$
10	$-.75 < X \leq -1.25$
9	$-1.25 < X \leq -1.75$
8	$-1.75 < X \leq -2.25$
7	$-2.25 < X \leq -2.75$
6	$-2.75 < X \leq -3.25$
5	$-3.25 < X \leq -3.75$
4	$-3.75 < X \leq -4.25$
3	$-4.25 < X \leq -4.75$
2	$-4.75 < X \leq -5.25$
1	$-5.25 < X \leq -5.75$
0	$-5.75 < X \leq -6$

Example: The Graduation Rate increases from 56% to 60%, which equates to 4 percentage points. As a result the HEDI score is 20 points.

Table 8.1.3A [Cohort Graduation Rate] [15 Point Scale]

APPENDIX A

HEDI Score (Points)	Graduation Rate (Percentage Points)
15	$4 \leq X \leq 3.75$
14	$3.75 < X \leq 3.25$
13	$3.25 < X \leq 2.75$
12	$2.75 < X \leq 2.25$
11	$2.25 < X \leq 1.75$
10	$1.75 < X \leq 1.25$
9	$1.25 < X \leq .75$
8	$.75 < X \leq .25$
7	$.25 < X \leq -.25$
6	$-.25 < X \leq -.75$
5	$-.75 < X \leq -1.25$
4	$-1.25 < X \leq -1.75$
3	$-1.75 < X \leq -2.25$
2	$-2.25 < X \leq -2.75$
1	$-2.75 < X \leq -3.25$
0	$-3.25 < X \leq -4$

Example: The Graduation Rate increases from 56% to 60%, which equates to 4 percentage points. As a result the HEDI score is 15 points.

APPENDIX B1

MARSHALL PRINCIPAL EVALUATION RUBRICS FOR ADMINISTRATORS IN COMMON BRANCH SUBJECTS IN GRADES 4 THROUGH 8 – APPR

DOMAIN A. (DIAGNOSIS AND PLANNING)	**INEFFECTIVE**	**DEVELOPING**	**EFFECTIVE**	**HIGHLY EFFECTIVE**
	(0 pts.)	(1 – 4 pts.)	(5 – 8 pts.)	(9 – 10 pts.)
Overall Rating:				
Comments:				
DOMAIN B. (PRIORITY MANAGEMENT AND COMMUNICATION)	**INEFFECTIVE**	**DEVELOPING**	**EFFECTIVE**	**HIGHLY EFFECTIVE**
	(0 pts.)	(1 – 4 pts.)	(5 – 9 pts.)	(10 – 11 pts.)
Overall Rating:				
Comments:				
DOMAIN C. (CURRICULUM AND DATA)	**INEFFECTIVE**	**DEVELOPING**	**EFFECTIVE**	**HIGHLY EFFECTIVE**
	(0 pts.)	(1 – 5 pts.)	(6 – 9 pts.)	(10 pts.)
Overall Rating:				
Comments:				
DOMAIN D. (SUPERVISION, EVALUATION AND PROFESSIONAL DEVELOPMENT)	**INEFFECTIVE**	**DEVELOPING**	**EFFECTIVE**	**HIGHLY EFFECTIVE**
	(0 pts.)	(1 – 7 pts.)	(8 – 9 pts.)	(10 pts.)
Overall Rating:				
Comments:				
DOMAIN E. (DISCIPLINE AND PARENT INVOLVEMENT)	**INEFFECTIVE**	**DEVELOPING**	**EFFECTIVE**	**HIGHLY EFFECTIVE**
	(0 pts.)	(1 – 3 pts.)	(4 – 7 pts.)	(8 – 9 pts.)
Overall Rating:				
Comments:				
DOMAIN F. (MANAGEMENT AND EXTERNAL RELATIONS)	**INEFFECTIVE**	**DEVELOPING**	**EFFECTIVE**	**HIGHLY EFFECTIVE**
	(0 pts.)	(1 – 6 pts.)	(7 – 8 pts.)	(9 – 10 pts.)
Overall Rating:				
Comments:				
////////////

Appendix B1

A. Diagnosis and Planning				
The Principal:	**Highly Effective [9-10 Points]**	**Effective [5-8 Points]**	**Developing [1-4 Points]**	**Ineffective [0 Points]**
a. Team	Recruits a strong leadership team and develops its skills and commitment to a high level.	Recruits and develops a leadership team with a balance of skills.	Enlists one or two like-minded colleagues to provide advice and support.	Works solo with little or no support from colleagues.
b. Diagnosis	Involves stakeholders in a comprehensive diagnosis of the school's strengths and weaknesses.	Carefully assesses the school's strengths and areas for development.	Makes a quick assessment of the school's strengths and weaknesses.	Is unable to gather much information on the school's strong and weak points.
c. Gap	Challenges colleagues by presenting the gap between current student data and a vision for college success.	Motivates colleagues by comparing students' current achievement with rigorous expectations.	Presents data without a vision or a vision without data.	Bemoans students' low achievement and shows fatalism about bringing about significant change.
d. Mission	Wins staff and student buy-in for a succinct, inspiring, results-oriented mission statement.	Produces a memorable, succinct, results-oriented mission statement that's known by all staff.	Distributes a boiler-plate mission statement that few colleagues remember.	Does not share a mission statement.
e. Target	Gets strong staff commitment on a bold, ambitious 3-4 year student achievement target.	Builds staff support for a 3-4 year student achievement target.	Expresses confidence that student achievement will improve each year through hard work.	Takes one year at a time and does not provide an achievement target.
f. Theory	Wins staff ownership for a robust, research-based theory of action for improving achievement.	Researches and writes a convincing theory of action for improving achievement.	Accepts colleagues' current notions of how student achievement is improved.	Says that hard work improves achievement-but shows doubts that progress can be made.
g. Strategy	Collaboratively crafts a lean, comprehensive, results-oriented strategic plan with annual goals.	Gets input and writes a comprehensive, measurable strategic plan for the current year.	Writes a cumbersome, non-accountable strategic plan.	Recycles the previous year's cumbersome, non-accountable strategic plan.
h. Support	Fosters a sense of urgency and responsibility among all stakeholders for achieving annual goals.	Builds ownership and support among stakeholders for achieving annual goals.	Presents the annual plan to stakeholders and asks them to support it.	Gets the necessary signatures for the annual plan, but there is little ownership or support.
i. Enlisting	Masterfully wins over resistant staff members who feared change and/or harbored low expectations.	Manages resistance, low expectations, and fear of change.	Works on persuading resistant staff members to get on board with the plan.	Is discouraged and immobilized by staff resistance, fear of change, and low expectations.
j. Revision	Regularly tracks progress, gives and takes feedback, and continuously improves performance.	Periodically measures progress, listens to feedback, and revises the strategic plan.	Occasionally focuses on key data points and prods colleagues to improve.	Is too caught up in daily crises to focus on emerging data.

Overall Rating: _____

Comments:

B. Priority Management and Communication				
The Principal:	Highly Effective [10-11 Points]	Effective [5-9 Points]	Developing [1-4 Points]	Ineffective [0 Points]
a. Planning	Plans for the year, month, week, and day, relentlessly getting the highest-leverage activities done.	Plans for the year, month, week, and day, keeping the highest-leverage activities front and center.	Comes to work with a list of tasks that need to be accomplished that day but is often distracted from them.	Has a list in his or her head of tasks to be accomplished each day, but often loses track.
b. Communication	Successfully communicates goals to all constituencies by skillfully using a variety of channels.	Uses a variety of means (e.g., face-to face, newsletters, websites) to communicate goals to others.	Has a limited communication repertoire and some key stakeholders are not aware of school goals.	Is not an effective communicator, and others are often left guessing about policies and directions.
c. Outreach	Frequently solicits and uses feedback and help from staff, students, parents, and external partners.	Regularly reaches out to staff, students, parents, and external partners for feedback and help.	Occasionally asks staff, students, parents, or external partners for feedback.	Rarely or never reaches out to others for feedback or help.
d. Follow-Up	Has a foolproof system for capturing key information, remembering, prioritizing, and following up.	Writes down important information, remembers, prioritizes, and almost always follows up.	Writes things down but is swamped by events and sometimes doesn't follow up.	Trusts his or her memory to retain important information, but often forgets and fails to follow up.
e. Expectations	Has total staff buy-in on exactly what is expected for management procedures and discipline.	Makes sure staff know what is expected for management procedures and discipline.	Periodically reminds teachers of policies on management procedures and discipline.	Is constantly reminding staff what they should be doing in management and discipline.
f. Delegation	Has highly competent people in all key roles and is able to entrust them with maximum responsibility.	Delegates appropriate tasks to competent staff members and checks on progress.	Doesn't delegate some tasks that should be done by others.	Does almost everything himself or herself.
g. Meetings	Successfully gets all key teams meeting regularly and taking responsibility for productive agendas.	Ensures that key teams (e.g., leadership, grade level, student support) meet regularly.	Needs to call key team meetings because they are not in people's calendars.	Convenes grade-level, leadership, and other teams only when there is a crisis or an immediate need.
h. Prevention	Takes the initiative so that time-wasting activities and crises are almost always prevented or deflected.	Is effective at preventing and/or deflecting many time-wasting crises and activities.	Tries to prevent them, but crises and time-wasters sometimes eat up lots of time.	Finds that large portions of each day are consumed by crises and time-wasting activities.
i. Efficiency	Deals quickly and decisively with the highest-priority e-mail and paperwork, delegating the rest.	Has a system for dealing with e-mail, paperwork, and administrative chores.	Tries to stay on top of e-mail, paperwork, and administrative chores but is often behind.	Is way behind on e-mail, paperwork, and administrative chores, to the detriment of the school's mission.
j. Balance	Remains sharp and fresh by tending to family, friends, fun, exercise, nutrition, sleep, and vacations.	Is healthy and focused by balancing work demands with healthy habits.	Is sometimes unfocused and inattentive because of fatigue and stress.	Is unproductive and irritable because of fatigue and stress.

Overall Rating: _____

Comments:

C. Curriculum and Data				
The Principal:	Highly Effective [10 Points]	Effective [6-9 Points]	Developing [1-5 Points]	Ineffective [0 Points]
a. Expectations	Gets all teachers to buy into clear, manageable, standards-aligned grade-level goals with exemplars of proficient work.	Tells teachers exactly what students should know and be able to do by the end of each grade level.	Refers teachers to district or national scope-and-sequence documents for curriculum direction.	Leaves teachers without clear direction on student learning outcomes for each grade level.
b. Baselines	Ensures that all teams use summative data from the previous year and fresh diagnostic data to plan instruction.	Provides teacher teams with previous-year test data and asks them to assess students' current levels.	Refers teachers to previous-year test data as a baseline for current-year instruction.	Does not provide historical test data to teachers.
c. Targets	Gets each grade-level/subject team invested in reaching measurable, results-oriented year-end goals.	Works with grade-level and subject-area teams to set measurable student goals for the current year.	Urges grade-level/subject teams to set measurable student learning goals for the current year.	Urges teachers to improve student achievement, but without measurable outcome goals.
d. Materials	Ensures that all teachers have high-quality curriculum materials, technology, and training on how to use them.	Gets teachers effective literacy, math, science, and social studies materials and technology.	Works to procure good curriculum materials in literacy and math.	Leaves teachers to fend for themselves with curriculum materials.
e. Interims	Ensures that high-quality, aligned, common interim assessments are given by all teacher teams at least four times each year.	Orchestrates common interim assessments to monitor student learning several times a year.	Suggests that teacher teams give common interim assessments to check on student-learning.	Doesn't insist on common interim assessments, allowing teachers to use their own classroom tests.
f. Analysis	Orchestrates high-quality data/action team meetings after each round of assessments.	Monitors teacher teams as they analyze interim assessment results and formulate action plans.	Suggests that teacher teams work together to draw lessons from the tests they give.	Does not see the value of analyzing tests given during the year.
g. Causes	Gets data meetings engaged in a no-blame, highly productive search for root causes and hypothesis-testing.	Asks that data meetings go beyond what students go wrong and delve into why.	Suggests that teachers focus on the areas in which students had the most difficulty.	Does not exercise leadership in looking for underlying causes of student difficulties.
h. Follow-Up	Gets teams invested in following up assessments with effective reteaching, tutoring, and other interventions.	Asks teams to follow up each interim assessment with reteaching and remediation.	Suggests that teachers use interim assessment data to help struggling students.	Does not provide time or leadership for follow-up after tests.
i. Monitoring	Uses data on grades, attendance, behavior, and other variables to monitor and drive continuous improvement toward goals.	Monitors data in several key areas and uses them to inform improvement efforts.	Monitors attendance and discipline data to inform decisions.	Is inattentive to important school data.
j. Celebration	Boots morale and a sense of efficacy by getting colleagues to celebrate and own measurable student gains.	Draws attention to student, classroom, and school-wide successes, giving credit where credit	Congratulates individuals on successes.	Takes credit for improvements in school performance or misses opportunities to celebrate success.

Overall Rating: _____

Comments:

D. Supervision, Evaluation and Professional Development				
The Principal:	Highly Effective [10 Points]	Effective [8-9 Points]	Developing [1-7 Points]	Ineffective [0 Points]
a. Meetings	In all-staff meetings, gets teachers highly invested in discussing results, learning best strategies, and building trust and respect.	Uses all-staff meetings to get teachers sharing strategies and becoming more cohesive.	Uses staff meetings primarily to announce decisions, clarify policies, and listen to staff concerns.	Rarely convenes staff members and/or uses meetings for one-way lectures on policies.
b. Ideas	Ensures that the whole staff is current on professional literature and constantly exploring best practices.	Reads and shares research and fosters an on-going, school-wide discussion of best practices.	Occasionally passes along interesting articles and ideas to colleagues.	Rarely reads professional literature or discusses best practices.
c. Development	Orchestrates aligned, high-quality coaching, mentoring, workshops, school visits, and other professional learning tuned to staff needs.	Organizes aligned, on-going coaching and training that builds classroom proficiency.	Provides staff development workshops that rarely engage staff or improve instruction.	Provides occasional workshops, leaving teachers mostly on their own in terms of professional development.
d. Empowerment	Gets teams to take ownership for using data and student work to drive constant refinement of teaching.	Orchestrates regular teacher team meetings as the prime focus for professional learning.	Suggests that teacher teams work together to address students' learning problems.	Does not emphasize teamwork and teachers work mostly in isolation from colleagues.
e. Support	Gives teacher teams the training, facilitation, and resources they need to make their meetings highly effective.	Ensures that teacher teams have facilitators so meetings are focused and substantive.	Has teacher teams appoint a leader to chair meetings and file reports.	Leaves teacher teams to fend for themselves in terms of leadership and direction.
f. Units	Ensures that teachers backwards-design high-quality, aligned units and provides feedback on drafts.	Asks teacher teams to cooperatively plan curriculum units following a common format.	Occasionally reviews teachers' lesson plans but not unit plans.	Does not review lesson or unit plans.
g. Evaluation	Visits 2-4 classrooms a day and gives helpful, face-to-face feedback to each teacher within 24 hours.	Makes unannounced visits to a few classrooms every day and gives helpful feedback to teachers.	Tries to get into classrooms but is often distracted by other events and rarely provides feedback.	Only observes teachers in annual or bi-annual formal observation visits.
h. Criticism	Courageously engages in difficult conversations with below-proficient teachers, helping them improve.	Provides redirection and support to teachers who are less than proficient.	Criticizes struggling teachers but does not give them much help improving their performance.	Shies away from giving honest feedback and redirection to teachers who are not performing well.
i. Housecleaning	Counsels out or dismisses all ineffective teachers, scrupulously following contractual requirements.	Counsels out or dismisses most ineffective teachers, following contractual requirements.	Tries to dismiss one or two ineffective teachers, but is stymied by procedural errors.	Does not initiate dismissal procedures, despite evidence that some teachers are ineffective.
j. Hiring	Recruits, hires, and supports highly effective teachers who share the school's vision.	Recruits and hires effective teachers.	Hires teachers who seem to fit his or her philosophy of teaching.	Makes last-minute appointments to teaching vacancies based on candidates who are available.

Overall Rating: _____

Comments:

E. Discipline and Family Involvement				
The Principal:	Highly Effective [8-9 Points]	Effective [4-7 Points]	Developing [1-3 Points]	Ineffective [0 Points]
a. Expectations	Gets staff buy-in for clear, school-wide student-behavior standards, routines, and consequences.	Sets expectations for student behavior and establishes school-wide routines and consequences.	Urges staff to demand good student behavior, but allows different standards in different classrooms.	Often tolerates discipline violations and enforces the rules inconsistently.
b. Effectiveness	Deals effectively with any disruptions to teaching and learning, analyzes patterns, and works on prevention.	Deals quickly with disruptions to learning and looks for underlying causes.	Deals firmly with students who are disruptive in classrooms, but doesn't get to the root causes.	Tries to deal with disruptive students but is swamped by the number of problems.
c. Celebration	Publicly celebrates kindness, effort, and improvement and builds students' pride in their school.	Praises student achievement and works to build school spirit.	Praises well-behaved students and good grades.	Rarely praises students and fails to build school pride.
d. Training	Ensures that staff are skilled in positive discipline and sensitive handling of student issues.	Organizes workshops and suggests articles and books on classroom management.	Urges teachers to get better at classroom management.	Does little to build teachers' skills in classroom management.
e. Support	Is highly effective getting counseling, mentoring, and other supports for high-need students.	Identifies struggling students and works to get support services to meet their needs.	Tries to get crisis counseling for highly disruptive and troubled students.	Focuses mainly on discipline and punishment with highly disruptive and troubled students.
f. Openness	Makes families feel welcome and respected, responds to concerns, and gets a number of them actively involved in the school.	Makes parents feel welcome, listens to their concerns, and tries to get them involved.	Reaches out to parents and tries to understand when they are critical.	Makes little effort to reach out to families and is defensive when parents express concerns.
g. Curriculum	Informs parents of monthly learning expectations and specific ways they can support their children's learning.	Sends home information on the grade-level learning expectations and ways parents can help at home.	Sends home an annual list of grade-level learning expectations.	Does not send home the school's learning expectations.
h. Conferences	Orchestrates productive parent/teacher report card conferences in which parents and students get specific suggestions on next steps.	Works to maximize the number of face-to-face parent/teacher report card conferences.	Makes sure that report cards are filled out correctly and provided to all parents.	Provides little or no monitoring of the report card process.
i. Communication	Sends home a weekly school newsletter, gets all teachers sending substantive updates, and organizes a user-friendly electronic grading program.	Sends home a periodic school newsletter and asks teachers to have regular channels of communication of their own.	Suggests that teachers communicate regularly with parents.	Leaves parent contact and communication up to individual teachers.
j. Safety-Bet	Provides effective programs for all students with inadequate home support.	Provides programs for most students whose parents do not provide adequate support.	Provides ad hoc, occasional support for students who are not adequately supported at home.	Does not provide assistance for students with inadequate home support.

Overall Rating: _____

Comments:

F. Management and External Relations				
The Principal:	Highly Effective [9-10 Points]	Effective [7-8 Points]	Developing [1-6 Points]	Ineffective [0 Points]
a. Strategies	Implements proven macro strategies (e.g., looping, class size reduction) that boost student learning.	Suggests effective macro strategies (e.g., looping, team teaching) to improve student learning.	Explores macro strategies that might improve achievement.	Plays it safe and sticks with the status quo.
b. Scheduling	Creates an equitable schedule that maximizes learning, teacher collaboration, and smooth transitions.	Creates a schedule that provides meeting times for all key teams.	Creates a schedule with some flaws and a few opportunities for team meetings.	Creates a schedule with inequities, technical flaws, and little time for teacher teams to meet.
c. Movement	Ensures efficient, friendly student entry, dismissal, meal times, transitions, and recesses every day.	Supervises orderly student entry, dismissal, meals, class transitions, and recesses.	Intermittently supervises student entry, dismissal, transitions and meal times.	Rarely supervises student entry, dismissal, and common spaces and there are frequent problems.
d. Custodians	Leads staff to ensure effective, creative use of space and a clean, safe, and inviting campus.	Supervises staff to keep the campus clean, attractive, and safe.	Works with custodial staff to keep the campus clean and safe, but there are occasional lapses.	Leaves campus cleanliness and safety to custodial staff and there are frequent lapses.
e. Transparency	Is transparent about how and why decisions were made, involving stakeholders whenever possible.	Ensures that staff members know how and why key decisions are being made.	Tries to be transparent about decision-making, but stakeholders sometimes feel shut out.	Makes decisions with little or no consultation, causing frequent resentment and morale problems.
f. Bureaucracy	Deftly handles bureaucratic, contractual, and legal issues so they never detract from, and sometimes contribute to teaching and learning.	Manages bureaucratic, contractual, and legal issues efficiently and effectively.	Sometimes allows bureaucratic, contractual, and legal issues to distract teachers from their work.	Frequently mishandles bureaucratic, contractual, and legal issues in ways that disrupt teaching and learning.
g. Budget	Skillfully manages the budget and finances to maximize student achievement and staff growth.	Manages the school's budget and finances to support the strategic plan.	Manages budget and finances with few errors, but misses opportunities to support the strategic plan.	Makes errors in managing the budget and finances and misses opportunities to further the mission.
h. Compliance	Fulfills all compliance and reporting requirements and creates new opportunities to support learning.	Fulfills compliance and reporting responsibilities to the district and beyond.	Meets minimum compliance and reporting responsibilities with occasional lapses.	Has difficulty keeping the school in compliance and district and other external requirements.
i. Relationships	Builds strong relationships with key district and external personnel and gets them excited about the school's mission.	Builds relationships with district and external staffers so they will be helpful with paperwork and process.	Is correct and professional with district and external staff but does not enlist their active support.	Neglects relationship-building with district and external staff and doesn't have their support to get things done.
j. Resources	Taps all possible human and financial resources to support the school's mission and strategic plan.	Is effective in bringing additional human and financial resources into the school.	Occasionally raises additional funds or finds volunteers to help out.	Is resigned to working with the standard school budget, which doesn't seem adequate.

Overall Rating: _____

Comments:

APPENDIX B2

RAW SCORE	CONVERSION SCORE
60	60
59	59
57-58	58
50-56	57
43-49	56
35-42	55
31-34	54
28-30	53
24-27	52
21-23	51
14-20	50
7-13	49
6	48
5	40
4	32
3	24
2	16
1	8
0	0

CONVERSION SCORE RANGE	LEVEL
59-60	HIGHLY EFFECTIVE
57-58	EFFECTIVE
55-56	DEVELOPING
0-54	INEFFECTIVE

APPENDIX C

Principal Improvement Plan

(Completed Jointly by Principal and Superintendent of Schools/Designee)

Name: **School:** **Current School Year:**

Date of Related APPR/Evaluation: **Date of PIP Conference:**

Area(s) Needing Improvement	Action Plan (Steps to be Taken)	Timeline for Completion	Evidence to be Collected	Satisfactory Progress	Plan Completed
1.	1.			☐ Yes ☐ No Date:	☐ Yes ☐ No Date:
2.	2.			☐ Yes ☐ No Date:	☐ Yes ☐ No Date:
3.	3.			☐ Yes ☐ No Date:	☐ Yes ☐ No Date:

Principal's Comments:

Superintendent/Designee's Comments:

PIP Satisfied? ☐ Yes ☐ No Date:

Principal's Signature:
Date:

Superintendent/Designee's Signature:
Date:

	Table 4.5: Based on the 2011 Danielson model					
1	**Planning and Preparation 13**	**sub domain**		rating	Points	Rating
1a	Demonstrating Knowledge of Content and pedagc	3		e	2.90	
1b	Demonstrating Knowledge of Students	2		e	1.90	
1c	Setting Instruction Outcomes	2		e	1.90	
1d	Demonstrating Knowledge of Resources	1		e	0.90	
1e	Designing Coherent Instruction	3		e	2.90	
1f	Designing Student Assessments	2	13	e	1.90	12.40
2	**The Classroom Environment 16**					
2a	Creating an Environment of Respect and Rapport	4		e	3.90	
2b	Establishing A Culture of Learning	4		e	3.90	
2c	Managing Classroom Procedures	3		e	2.90	
2d	Managing Student Behavior	4		e	3.90	
2e	Organizing Physical Space	1	16	e	0.90	15.50
3	**Instruction 19**					
3a	Communicating with Students	4		e	3.90	
3b	Using Questioning with Discussion Techniques	4		e	3.90	
3c	Engaging Student in Learning	4		e	3.90	
3d	Using Assessment in Instruction	3		e	2.90	
3e	Demonstrating Flexibility and Responsiveness	4	19	e	3.90	18.50
4	**Professional Responsibilities 12**					
4a	Reflecting on Teaching	2		e	1.90	
4b	Maintaining Accurate Records	3		e	2.90	
4c	Communicating with Families	2		e	1.90	
4d	Participating in a professional Community	1		e	0.90	
4e	Growing and Developing Professionally	1		e	0.90	
4f	Showing Professionalism	3	12	e	2.90	11.40
		60	60			57.80
	4 points	4	3.9	3.3	0	
	3 points	3	2.9	2.5	0	
	2 points	2	1.9	1.7	0	
	1 point	1	0.9	0.8	0	
	Highly Effective	59-60				
	Effective	57-58				
	Developing	50-56				
	Ineffective	0-49				

Appendix A
Table 4.5

	Local 60 Point Final Summative Score					
	Domain 1	12.40				
	Domain 2	15.50				
	Domain 3	18.50				
	Domain 4	11.40				
	Total	57.80				
	State Assessments	9				
	Locally Selected Measure	9				
	Total Score	75.80				
	NYS APPR HEDI Band (Purple memo)					
	Highly Effective	91-100				
	Effective	75-90				
	Developing	65-74				
	Ineffective	0-64				

Table 2.11.1: Conversion Chart for ELA Mean Scaled Score to HEDI Points: (10 Points of the 20 Point Scale)

The previous 3 year Mean Scaled Score is calculated and placed on the X in the chart. HEDI points are then determined based on growth or regression from one year to the next based on the current year's Mean Scaled Score

For Classroom Teachers Grades K-2, Special Area Teachers Grades K-6, Special Area Teachers Grades 7-8, Health Teacher Grade 7, Technology Teachers Grade 8, Foreign Language Teachers Grade 8, Reading Teachers Grades K-6. All other courses High School

10	9	8	7	6	5	4	3	2	1	0
5 points or more above the Mean	4 points above the Mean	3 points above the Mean	2 points above the Mean	1 point above the Mean	X	1 point below the Mean	2 points below the Mean	3 points below the Mean	4 points below the Mean	5 points or more below the Mean

This chart (2.11.1) will be combined with Chart 2.11.2 to determine a composite score out of 20. The rules of rounding will apply.

Table 2.11.2: Conversion Chart for Math Mean Scaled Score to HEDI Points: (10 Points of the 20 Point Scale)

The previous 3 year Mean Scaled Score is calculated and placed on the X in the chart. HEDI points are then determined based on growth or regression from one year to the next based on the current year's Mean Scaled Score.

For Classroom Teachers Grades K-2, Special Area Teachers Grades K-6, Special Area Teachers Grades 7-8, Health Teacher Grade 7, Technology Teachers Grade 8, Foreign Language Teachers Grade 8, Reading Teachers Grades K-6. All other courses High School

10	9	8	7	6	5	4	3	2	1	0
5 points or more above the Mean	4 points above the Mean	3 points above the Mean	2 points above the Mean	1 point above the Mean	X	1 point below the Mean	2 points below the Mean	3 points below the Mean	4 points below the Mean	5 points or more below the Mean

This chart (2.11.2) will be combined with chart 2.11.1 to determine a composite score out of 20. The rules of rounding will apply.

Table 2.11.3 Conversion Chart for Classroom Teachers in Grade 3 (20 Point Scale): The percentage of students meeting the growth score target

20	19	18	17	16	15	14	13	12	11	10
94-100 The percentage of students meeting the growth score target	87-93 The percentage of students meeting the growth score target	80-86 The percentage of students meeting the growth score target	75-79 The percentage of students meeting the growth score target	70-74 The percentage of students meeting the growth score target	65-69 The percentage of students meeting the growth score target	60-64 The percentage of students meeting the growth score target	55-59 The percentage of students meeting the growth score target	50-54 The percentage of students meeting the growth score target	45-49 The percentage of students meeting the growth score target	40-44 The percentage of students meeting the growth score target
9	8	7	6	5	4	3	2	1	0	
35-39 The percentage of students meeting the growth score target	31-34 The percentage of students meeting the growth score target	27-30 The percentage of students meeting the growth score target	23-26 The percentage of students meeting the growth score target	19-22 The percentage of students meeting the growth score target	15-18 The percentage of students meeting the growth score target	11-14 The percentage of students meeting the growth score target	7-10 The percentage of students meeting the growth score target	3-6 The percentage of students meeting the growth score target	0-2 The percentage of students meeting the growth score target	

Table 2.11.4: SLO (20 Point Scale)

For Social Studies Teachers Grades 7 and 8, Global I, Global II, American History, Living Environment, Earth Science, Chemistry, Physics, Algebra I, Geometry, Algebra II, Grade 9 ELA, Grade 10 ELA, Grade 11 ELA, Grade 8 NYS Science Assessment, Science Teachers in Grade 7, ESL Grades K-12.

Category Rating	Highly Effective			Effective									Developing						Ineffective		
Category Point Value	20	19	18	17	16	15	14	13	12	11	10	9	8	7	6	5	4	3	2	1	0
% of Students Attaining Proficiency (Score of 75 or above)	94-100	87-93	80-86	75-79	70-74	65-69	60-64	55-59	50-54	45-49	40-44	35-39	31-34	27-30	23-26	19-22	15-18	11-14	7-10	3-6	0-2

Teacher Improvement Plan

(Completed Jointly by Principal and Teacher)

Name: **School:** **Current School Year:**

Date of Related APPR/Evaluation: **Date of TIP Conference:**

Area(s) Needing Improvement	Action Plan (Steps to be Taken)	Timeline for Completion	Evidence to be Collected	Satisfactory Progress	Plan Completed
1.	1.			☐ Yes ☐ No Date:	☐ Yes ☐ No Date:
2.	2.			☐ Yes ☐ No Date:	☐ Yes ☐ No Date:
3.	3.			☐ Yes ☐ No Date:	☐ Yes ☐ No Date:

Teacher's Comments:

Principal's Comments:

TIP Satisfied? ☐ Yes ☐ No Date:

Teacher's Signature:
Date:

Principal's Signature:
Date:

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

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

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

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

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

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

* This document contains two Administrative Union President Signatures as they are co-presidents.

Signatures, dates

Superintendent Signature: Date: 10/29/12

William J. Hecht 12/12/12
William J. Hecht
William J. Hecht 1/4/13
William J. Hecht 12/21/12

Teachers Union President Signature: Date: 10/29/12

Donna Carr
Donna Carr 12/12/12
Donna Carr 12/21/12
Donna Carr 1/4/13

Administrative Union President Signature: Date: 10/29/12

*
Maureen Dart 12/13/12
Maureen Dart 12/21/12
1/4/13 Maureen Dart 1/4/13
12/21/12

Board of Education President Signature: Date: 10/29/12

12/12/12
1/4/13
12/21/12