



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

December 13, 2012

Terry N. Fralick, Superintendent
Watertown City School District
1351 Washington Street, P.O. Box 586
Watertown, NY 13601

Dear Superintendent Fralick:

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: Jack Boak

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, May 08, 2012

Updated Tuesday, December 04, 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 : 222000010000

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

222000010000

1.2) School District Name: WATERTOWN CITY SD

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

WATERTOWN CITY SD

1.3) School Improvement Grant (SIG) Districts Only

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

(No response)

1.4) Award Classification

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

(No response)

1.5) Assurances

Please check all of the boxes below:

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

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

Re-submission to address deficiencies

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

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

Annual (2012-13)

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

Created Wednesday, October 17, 2012

Updated Wednesday, December 12, 2012

Page 1

STATE-PROVIDED MEASURES OF STUDENT GROWTH

(25 points with an approved value-added measure)

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

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

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

2.1) Assurances

Please check the boxes below:

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

STUDENT LEARNING OBJECTIVES AS COMPARABLE GROWTH MEASURES (20 points)

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

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

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

If no State assessment or Regents exam exists:

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

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

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

State assessments, *required if one exists*

List of State-approved 3rd party assessments

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

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

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

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

2.2) Grades K-3 ELA

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

	ELA	Assessment
K	District, regional, or BOCES-developed assessment	WCSD developed ELA K Assessment
1	District, regional, or BOCES-developed assessment	WCSD developed ELA 1 Assessment
2	District, regional, or BOCES-developed assessment	WCSD developed ELA 2 Assessment

	ELA	Assessment
3	State assessment	3rd Grade State Assessment

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

Use this box, if needed, to describe the general process for assigning HEDI categories for these grades/subjects in	Using baseline data established by pre-assessments or prior academic history, the teacher in collaboration with
---	---

this subcomponent. If needed, you may upload a table or graphic at 2.11, below.	the administrator will set individual growth targets and use summative assessments to determine the percentage of the class meeting their individual growth targets. The metric will be the percentage of the class meeting their established growth targets. (See Appendix 1 RS for locally developed assessments)
Highly Effective (18 - 20 points) Results are well-above state average for similar students (or District goals if no state test).	See attached Chart Appendix 1 RS. 80% or greater of the class will meet the established growth targets.
Effective (9 - 17 points) Results meet state average for similar students (or District goals if no state test).	See attached Chart Appendix 1 RS. 40-79% of the class will meet the established growth targets.
Developing (3 - 8 points) Results are below state average for similar students (or District goals if no state test).	See attached Chart Appendix 1 RS. 20-39% of the class will meet the established growth targets.
Ineffective (0 - 2 points) Results are well-below state average for similar students (or District goals if no state test).	See attached Chart Appendix 1 RS. 19% or less of the class will meet the established growth targets.

2.3) Grades K-3 Math

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

	Math	Assessment
K	District, regional, or BOCES-developed assessment	WCSD developed MATH K Assessment
1	District, regional, or BOCES-developed assessment	WCSD developed MATH 1 Assessment
2	District, regional, or BOCES-developed assessment	WCSD developed MATH 2 Assessment

	Math	Assessment
3	State assessment	3rd Grade State Assessment

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

Use this box, if needed, to describe the general process for assigning HEDI categories for these grades/subjects in this subcomponent. If needed, you may upload a table or graphic at 2.11, below.	Using baseline data established by pre-assessments or prior academic history, the teacher in collaboration with the administrator will set individual growth targets and use summative assessments to determine the percentage of the class meeting their individual growth targets. The metric will be the percentage of the class meeting their established growth targets. (See Appendix 1 RS for locally developed assessments)
Highly Effective (18 - 20 points) Results are well-above state average for similar students (or District goals if no state test).	See attached Chart Appendix 1 RS. 80% or greater of the class will meet the established growth target.
Effective (9 - 17 points) Results meet state average for similar students (or District goals if no state test).	See attached Chart Appendix 1 RS. 40-79% of the class will meet the established growth target.
Developing (3 - 8 points) Results are below state average for similar students (or District goals if no state test).	See attached Chart Appendix 1 RS. 20-39% of the class will meet the established growth target.

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

See attached Chart Appendix 1 RS. 19% or less of the class will meet the established growth target.

2.4) Grades 6-8 Science

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

	Science	Assessment
6	District, regional or BOCES-developed assessment	WCSD developed SCIENCE 6 Assessment
7	District, regional or BOCES-developed assessment	WCSD developed SCIENCE 7 Assessment

	Science	Assessment
8	State assessment	8th Grade State Science Assessment

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

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

Using baseline data established by pre-assessments or prior academic history, the teacher in collaboration with the administrator will set individual growth targets and use summative assessments to determine the percentage of the class meeting their individual growth targets. The metric will be the percentage of the class meeting their established growth targets. (See Appendix 1 RS for locally developed assessments)

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

See attached Chart Appendix 1 RS. 80% or greater of the class will meet the established growth target.

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

See attached Chart Appendix 1 RS. 40-79% of the class will meet the established growth target.

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

See attached Chart Appendix 1 RS. 20-39% of the class will meet the established growth target.

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

See attached Chart Appendix 1 RS. 19% or less of the class will meet the established growth target.

2.5) Grades 6-8 Social Studies

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

	Social Studies	Assessment
6	Not applicable	Not applicable
7	District, regional or BOCES-developed assessment	WCSD developed SS 7 Assessment
8	District, regional or BOCES-developed assessment	WCSD developed SS 8 Assessment

For Grades 6-8 Social Studies: describe the district-adopted expectations for the level of performance required for each HEDI rating category and the process for assigning points to teachers based on SLO results consistent with regulations and assurances in the Comparable Growth Measures subcomponent. Include any district-determined expectations for 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.	Using baseline data established by pre-assessments or prior academic history, the teacher in collaboration with the administrator will set individual growth targets and use summative assessments to determine the percentage of the class meeting their individual growth targets. The metric will be the percentage of the class meeting their established growth targets. (See Appendix 1 RS for locally developed assessments)
Highly Effective (18 - 20 points) Results are well-above District goals for similar students.	See attached Chart Appendix 1. 80% or greater of the class will meet the established growth target.
Effective (9 - 17 points) Results meet District goals for similar students.	See attached Chart Appendix 1. 40-79% of the class will meet the established growth target.
Developing (3 - 8 points) Results are below District goals for similar students.	See attached Chart Appendix 1. 20-39% of the class will meet the established growth target.
Ineffective (0 - 2 points) Results are well-below District goals for similar students.	See attached Chart Appendix 1. 19% or less of the class will meet the established growth target.

2.6) High School Social Studies Regents Courses

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

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

		Assessment
Global 1	District, regional, or BOCES-developed assessment	WCSD developed GLOBAL 1 Assessment
Social Studies Regents Courses		Assessment
Global 2	Regents assessment	Regents assessment
American History	Regents assessment	Regents assessment

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

Use this box, if needed, to describe the general process for assigning HEDI categories for these grades/subjects in this subcomponent. If needed, you may upload a table or graphic at 2.11, below.	Using baseline data established by pre-assessments or prior academic history, the teacher in collaboration with the administrator will set individual growth targets and use summative assessments to determine the percentage of the class meeting their individual growth targets. The metric will be the percentage of the class meeting their established growth targets. (See Appendix 1 RS for locally developed assessments)
---	---

Highly Effective (18 - 20 points) Results are well-above District goals for similar students.	80% or greater of the class will meet the established growth target.
Effective (9 - 17 points) Results meet District goals for similar students.	40-79% of the class will meet the established growth target.
Developing (3 - 8 points) Results are below District goals for similar students.	20-39% of the class will meet the established growth target.
Ineffective (0 - 2 points) Results are well-below District goals for similar students.	19% or less of the class will meet the established growth target.

2.7) High School Science Regents Courses

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

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

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

For High School Science Regents Courses: describe the district-adopted expectations for the level of performance required for each HEDI rating category and the process for assigning points to teachers based on SLO results consistent with regulations and assurances in the Comparable Growth Measures subcomponent. Include any district-determined expectations for 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.	Using baseline data established by pre-assessments or prior academic history, the teacher in collaboration with the administrator will set individual growth targets and use summative assessments to determine the percentage of the class meeting their individual growth targets. The metric will be the percentage of the class meeting their established growth targets.
Highly Effective (18 - 20 points) Results are well-above District goals for similar students.	80% or greater of the class will meet the established growth target.
Effective (9 - 17 points) Results meet District goals for similar students.	40-79% of the class will meet the established growth target.
Developing (3 - 8 points) Results are below District goals for similar students.	20-39% of the class will meet the established growth target.
Ineffective (0 - 2 points) Results are well-below District goals for similar students.	19% or less of the class will meet the established growth target.

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.	Using baseline data established by pre-assessments or prior academic history, the teacher in collaboration with the administrator will set individual growth targets and use summative assessments to determine the percentage of the class meeting their individual growth targets. The metric will be the percentage of the class meeting their established growth targets.
Highly Effective (18 - 20 points) Results are well-above District goals for similar students.	80% or greater of the class will meet the established growth target.
Effective (9 - 17 points) Results meet District goals for similar students.	40-79% of the class will meet the established growth target.
Developing (3 - 8 points) Results are below District goals for similar students.	20-39% of the class will meet the established growth target.
Ineffective (0 - 2 points) Results are well-below District goals for similar students.	19% or less of the class will meet the established growth target.

2.9) High School English Language Arts

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

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

	High School English Courses	Assessment
Grade 9 ELA	District, regional or BOCES-developed assessment	WCSD developed ELA 9 Assessment
Grade 10 ELA	District, regional or BOCES-developed assessment	WCSD developed ELA 10 Assessment
Grade 11 ELA	Regents assessment	NYS Comprehensive Regents Assessment

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

Effective (9 - 17 points) Results meet District goals for similar students.	40-79% of the class will meet the established growth target.
Developing (3 - 8 points) Results are below District goals for similar students.	20-39% of the class will meet the established growth target.
Ineffective (0 - 2 points) Results are well-below District goals for similar students.	19% or less of the class will meet the established growth target.

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/5364/198696-TXEttx9bQW/WEA Appendix 1 RS.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 controls utilized.

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 Saturday, October 20, 2012

Updated Wednesday, December 12, 2012

Page 1

Locally Selected Measures of Student Achievement or Growth

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

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

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

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

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

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

Growth or achievement measure(s) from these options.

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

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

Measures based on:

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

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

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

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

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

- 6) A school-wide measure of either student growth or achievement based on either:
 - (i) A State-provided student growth score covering all students in the school that took the State assessment in ELA or Math in Grades 4-8; or
 - (ii) A school-wide measure of student growth or achievement computed in a manner determined locally based on a State, State-approved 3rd party, or district, regional or BOCES developed assessment that is rigorous and comparable across classrooms.

3.1) Grades 4-8 ELA

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

	Locally-Selected Measure from List of Approved Measures	Assessment
4	5) District, regional, or BOCES–developed assessments	WCSD developed ELA 4 assessment
5	5) District, regional, or BOCES–developed assessments	WCSD developed ELA 5 assessment
6	5) District, regional, or BOCES–developed assessments	WCSD developed ELA 6 assessment
7	5) District, regional, or BOCES–developed assessments	WCSD developed ELA 7 assessment

8	5) District, regional, or BOCES–developed assessments	WCSD developed ELA 8 assessment
---	---	---------------------------------

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.	The 100 point scale (Percentage of Students Meeting Aspirational Goals) for similar students and classes has been converted to the 15 point value added expectation. This chart (Appendix A-1 RS) is attached. The district established aspirational goals for 85% of students to achieve between the 50th and 100th percentile on the locally developed assessment.
Highly Effective (14 - 15 points) Results are well above District- or BOCES-adopted expectations for growth or achievement for grade/subject.	The percent of students meeting the aspirational goal will be between 76%-100% for a highly effective teacher. (see Appendix A-1 RS)
Effective (8- 13 points) Results meet District- or BOCES-adopted expectations for growth or achievement for grade/subject.	The percent of students meeting the aspirational goal will be between 25-75% for an effective teacher. (see Appendix A-1 RS)
Developing (3 - 7 points) Results are below District- or BOCES-adopted expectations for growth or achievement for grade/subject.	The percent of students meeting the aspirational goal will be between 10-24% for a developing teacher. (see Appendix A-1 RS)
Ineffective (0 - 2 points) Results are well below District- or BOCES-adopted expectations for growth or achievement for grade/subject.	The percent of students meeting the aspirational goal will be between 0-9% for an ineffective teacher. (see Appendix A-1 RS)

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	5) District, regional, or BOCES–developed assessments	WCSD developed Math 4 assessment
5	5) District, regional, or BOCES–developed assessments	WCSD developed Math 5 assessment
6	5) District, regional, or BOCES–developed assessments	WCSD developed Math 6 assessment
7	5) District, regional, or BOCES–developed assessments	WCSD developed Math 7 assessment
8	5) District, regional, or BOCES–developed assessments	WCSD developed Math 8 assessment

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.	The 100 point scale (Percentage of Students Meeting Aspirational Goals) for similar students and classes has been converted to the 15 point value added expectation. This chart (Appendix A-1 RS) is attached. The district established aspirational goal is for 85% of students to achieve between the 50th and 100th percentile on the locally developed assessment.
Highly Effective (14 - 15 points) Results are well above District- or BOCES-adopted expectations for growth or achievement for grade/subject.	The percent of students meeting the aspirational goal will be between 76%-100% for a highly effective teacher. (see Appendix A-1 RS)
Effective (8- 13 points) Results meet District- or BOCES-adopted expectations for growth or achievement for grade/subject.	The percent of students meeting the aspirational goal will be between 25-75% for an effective teacher. (see Appendix A-1 RS)
Developing (3 - 7 points) Results are below District- or BOCES-adopted expectations for growth or achievement for grade/subject.	The percent of students meeting the aspirational goal will be between 10-24% for a developing teacher. (see Appendix A-1 RS)
Ineffective (0 - 2 points) Results are well below District- or BOCES-adopted expectations for growth or achievement for grade/subject.	The percent of students meeting the aspirational goal will be between 0-9% for an ineffective teacher. (see Appendix A-1 RS)

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/5139/201565-rhJdBgDruP/WEA Appendix A-1 RS.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	5) District, regional, or BOCES–developed assessments	WCSD developed ELA K assessment
1	5) District, regional, or BOCES–developed assessments	WCSD developed ELA 1 assessment
2	5) District, regional, or BOCES–developed assessments	WCSD developed ELA 2 assessment
3	5) District, regional, or BOCES–developed assessments	WCSD developed ELA 3 assessment

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.	The 100 point scale (Percentage of Students Meeting Aspirational Goals) for similar students and classes has been converted to the 20 point expectation. This chart (Appendix A RS) is attached. The district established aspirational goal is 85% of students to achieve between the 50th and 100th percentile on the locally developed assessment.
Highly Effective (18-20 points) Results are well above District- or BOCES-adopted expectations for growth or achievement for grade/subject.	The percent of students meeting the aspirational goal will be between 85%-100% for a highly effective teacher. (see Appendix A RS)
Effective (9-17 points) Results meet District- or BOCES-adopted expectations for growth or achievement for grade/subject.	The percent of students meeting the aspirational goal will be between 65-84% for an effective teacher. (see Appendix A RS)
Developing (3 - 8 points) Results are below District- or BOCES-adopted expectations for growth or achievement for grade/subject.	The percent of students meeting the aspirational goal will be between 55-64% for a developing teacher. (see Appendix A RS)
Ineffective (0 - 2 points) Results are well below District- or BOCES-adopted expectations for growth or achievement for grade/subject.	The percent of students meeting the aspirational goal will be between 0-54% for an ineffective teacher. (see Appendix A RS)

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	5) District, regional, or BOCES–developed assessments	WCSD developed Math K assessment
1	5) District, regional, or BOCES–developed assessments	WCSD developed Math 1 assessment
2	5) District, regional, or BOCES–developed assessments	WCSD developed Math 2 assessment
3	5) District, regional, or BOCES–developed assessments	WCSD developed Math 3 assessment

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.	The 100 point scale (Percentage of Students Meeting Aspirational Goals) for similar students and classes has been converted to the 20 point expectation. This chart (Appendix A RS) is attached. The district established aspirational goal is for 85% of students to achieve between 50th and 100th percentile on the locally developed assessment.
---	--

Highly Effective (18-20 points) Results are well above District- or BOCES-adopted expectations for growth or achievement for grade/subject.	The percent of students meeting the aspirational goal will be between 85%-100% for a highly effective teacher. (see Appendix A RS)
Effective (9-17 points) Results meet District- or BOCES-adopted expectations for growth or achievement for grade/subject.	The percent of students meeting the aspirational goal will be between 65-84% for an effective teacher. (see Appendix A RS)
Developing (3 - 8 points) Results are below District -or BOCES-adopted expectations for growth or achievement for grade/subject.	The percent of students meeting the aspirational goal will be between 55-64% for a developing teacher. (see Appendix A RS)
Ineffective (0 - 2 points) Results are well below District- or BOCES-adopted expectations for growth or achievement for grade/subject.	The percent of students meeting the aspirational goal will be between 0-54% for an ineffective teacher. (see Appendix A RS)

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	5) District, regional, or BOCES–developed assessments	WCSD developed Science 6 assessment
7	5) District, regional, or BOCES–developed assessments	WCSD developed Science 7 assessment
8	5) District, regional, or BOCES–developed assessments	WCSD developed Science 8 assessment

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

Use this box, if needed, to describe the general process for assigning HEDI categories for these grades/subjects in this subcomponent. If needed, you may upload a table or graphic at 3.13, below.	The 100 scale(Percentage of Students Meeting Aspirational Goals) ranking for similar students and classes has been converted to the 20 point expectation. This chart (Appendix A) is attached. The district established aspirational goal is for 85% of students to achieve between 50th and 100th percentile on the locally developed assessment.
Highly Effective (18 - 20 points) Results are well above District- or BOCES-adopted expectations for growth or achievement for grade/subject.	The percent of students meeting the aspirational goal will be between 85%-100% for a highly effective teacher. (see Appendix A RS)
Effective (9 - 17 points) Results meet District- or BOCES-adopted expectations for growth or achievement for grade/subject.	The percent of students meeting the aspirational goal will be between 65-84% for an effective teacher. (see Appendix A RS)
Developing (3 - 8 points) Results are below District- or BOCES-adopted expectations for growth or achievement for grade/subject.	The percent of students meeting the aspirational goal will be between 55-64% for a developing teacher. (see Appendix A RS)
Ineffective (0 - 2 points) Results are well below District- or BOCES-adopted expectations for growth or achievement for grade/subject.	The percent of students meeting the aspirational goal will be between 0-54% for an ineffective teacher. (see Appendix A RS)

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	5) District, regional, or BOCES–developed assessments	WCSD developed SS 6 assessment
7	5) District, regional, or BOCES–developed assessments	WCSD developed SS 7 assessment
8	5) District, regional, or BOCES–developed assessments	WCSD developed SS 8 assessment

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.	The 100 scale (Percentage of Students Meeting Aspirational Goals) ranking for similar students and classes has been converted to the 20 point expectation. This chart (Appendix A) is attached. The district established aspirational goal is for 85% of students to achieve between 50th and 100th percentile on the locally developed assessment.
Highly Effective (18 - 20 points) Results are well above District- or BOCES-adopted expectations for growth or achievement for grade/subject.	The percent of students meeting the aspirational goal will be between 85%-100% for a highly effective teacher. (see Appendix A RS)
Effective (9 - 17 points) Results meet District- or BOCES-adopted expectations for growth or achievement for grade/subject.	The percent of students meeting the aspirational goal will be between 65-84% for an effective teacher. (see Appendix A RS)
Developing (3 - 8 points) Results are below District- or BOCES-adopted expectations for growth or achievement for grade/subject.	The percent of students meeting the aspirational goal will be between 55-64% for a developing teacher. (see Appendix A RS)
Ineffective (0 - 2 points) Results are well below District- or BOCES-adopted expectations for growth or achievement for grade/subject.	The percent of students meeting the aspirational goal will be between 0-54% for an ineffective teacher. (see Appendix A RS)

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	WCSD developed Global 1 assessment

Global 2	3) Teacher specific achievement or growth score computed locally	Global 2 Regents
American History	3) Teacher specific achievement or growth score computed locally	American History Regents

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 Watertown CSD is setting the aspirational standard based on college and career readiness skills/levels. Teachers will establish achievement goals that the building principals will approve based on the percentage of students meeting or exceeding their achievement goals. HEDI points will be awarded based on the percentage of students meeting their established achievement goals.(see Appendix A RS)
Highly Effective (18 - 20 points) Results are well above District- or BOCES-adopted expectations for growth or achievement for grade/subject.	To be highly effective 85% of the class will meet or exceed their achievement goals. (see Appendix A RS)
Effective (9 - 17 points) Results meet District- or BOCES-adopted expectations for growth or achievement for grade/subject.	To be effective 65% of the class will meet or exceed their achievement goals. (see Appendix A RS)
Developing (3 - 8 points) Results are below District- or BOCES-adopted expectations for growth or achievement for grade/subject.	To be developing 55% of the class will meet or exceed their achievement goals. (see Appendix A RS)
Ineffective (0 - 2 points) Results are well below District- or BOCES-adopted expectations for growth or achievement for grade/subject.	Ineffective would mean that 28% or less of the class met their achievement goals. (see Appendix A RS)

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	3) Teacher specific achievement or growth score computed locally	Living Environment Regents
Earth Science	3) Teacher specific achievement or growth score computed locally	Earth Science Regents
Chemistry	3) Teacher specific achievement or growth score computed locally	Chemistry Regents

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

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 Watertown CSD is setting the aspirational standard based on college and career readiness skills/levels. Teachers will establish achievement goals that the building principals will approve based on the percentage of students meeting or exceeding their achievement goals. HEDI points will be awarded based on the percentage of students meeting their established achievement goals.(see Appendix A RS)
Highly Effective (18-20 points) Results are well above District- or BOCES-adopted expectations for growth or achievement for grade/subject.	To be highly effective 85% of the class will meet or exceed their achievement goals. (see Appendix A RS)
Developing (3 - 8 points) Results are below District- or BOCES-adopted expectations for growth or achievement for grade/subject.	To be developing 55% of the class will meet or exceed their achievement goals. (see Appendix A RS)
Effective (9 - 17points) Results meet District- or BOCES-adopted expectations for growth or achievement for grade/subject.	To be effective 65% of the class will meet or exceed their achievement goals. (see Appendix A RS)
Ineffective (0 - 2 points) Results are well below District- or BOCES-adopted expectations for growth or achievement for grade/subject.	Ineffective would mean that 28% or less of the class met their achievement goals. (see Appendix A RS)

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	3) Teacher specific achievement or growth score computed locally	Algebra 1 NYS Regents assessment
Geometry	3) Teacher specific achievement or growth score computed locally	Geometry NYS Regents assessment
Algebra 2	3) Teacher specific achievement or growth score computed locally	Algebra 2 NYS Regents assessment

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

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

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 Watertown CSD is setting the aspirational standard based on college and career readiness skills/levels. Teachers will establish achievement goals that the building principals will approve based on the percentage of students meeting or exceeding their achievement goals. HEDI points will be awarded based on the percentage of students meeting their established achievement goals.(see Appendix A RS)
Highly Effective (18 - 20 points) Results are well above District- or BOCES-adopted expectations for growth or achievement for grade/subject.	To be highly effective 85% of the class will meet or exceed their achievement goals. (see Appendix A RS)
Effective (9 - 17 points) Results meet District- or BOCES-adopted expectations for growth or achievement for grade/subject.	To be effective 65% of the class will meet or exceed their achievement goals. (see Appendix A RS)
Developing (3 - 8 points) Results are below District- or BOCES-adopted expectations for growth or achievement for grade/subject.	To be developing 55% of the class will meet or exceed their achievement goals. (see Appendix A RS)
Ineffective (0 - 2 points) Results are well below District- or BOCES-adopted expectations for growth or achievement for grade/subject.	Ineffective would mean that 28% or less of the class met their achievement goals. (see Appendix A RS)

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	WCSD developed ELA 9 assessment
Grade 10 ELA	5) District, regional, or BOCES–developed assessments	WCSD developed ELA 10 assessment
Grade 11 ELA	3) Teacher specific achievement or growth score computed locally	Grade 11 ELA

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 Watertown CSD is setting the aspirational standard based on college and career readiness skills/levels. Teachers will establish achievement goals that the building principals will approve based on the percentage of students meeting or exceeding their achievement goals. HEDI points will be awarded based on the percentage of students meeting their established achievement goals.(see Appendix A RS)
Highly Effective (18 - 20 points) Results are well above District- or BOCES-adopted expectations for growth or achievement for grade/subject.	To be highly effective 85% of the class will meet or exceed their achievement goals. (see Appendix A RS)
Effective (9 - 17 points) Results meet District- or BOCES-adopted expectations for growth or achievement for grade/subject.	To be effective 65% of the class will meet or exceed their achievement goals. (see Appendix A RS)
Developing (3 - 8 points) Results are below District- or BOCES-adopted expectations for growth or achievement for grade/subject.	To be developing 55% of the class will meet or exceed their achievement goals. (see Appendix A RS)
Ineffective (0 - 2 points) Results are well below District- or BOCES-adopted expectations for growth or achievement for grade/subject.	Ineffective would mean that 28% or less of the class met their achievement goals. (see Appendix A RS)

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
Foreign Language	5) District/regional/BOCES–developed	WCSD course and grade specific assessments
All Others	5) District/regional/BOCES–developed	WCSD course and grade 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 Watertown CSD is setting the aspirational standard based on college and career readiness skills/levels. Teachers will establish achievement goals that the building principals will approve based on the percentage of students meeting or exceeding their achievement goals. HEDI points will be awarded based on the percentage of students meeting their established achievement goals.(see Appendix A RS)
Highly Effective (18 - 20 points) Results are well above District- or BOCES -adopted expectations for growth or achievement for grade/subject.	To be highly effective 85% of the class will meet or exceed their achievement goals. (see Appendix A RS)
Effective (9 - 17 points) Results meet District- or BOCES-adopted expectations for growth or achievement for grade/subject.	To be effective 65% of the class will meet or exceed their achievement goals. (see Appendix A RS)
Developing (3 - 8 points) Results are below District- or BOCES-adopted expectations for growth or achievement for grade/subject.	To be developing 55% of the class will meet or exceed their achievement goals. (see Appendix A RS)
Ineffective (0 - 2 points) Results are well below District- or BOCES-adopted expectations for growth or achievement for grade/subject.	Ineffective would mean that 28% or less of the class met their achievement goals. (see Appendix A RS)

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/5139/201565-y92vNseFa4/WEA APPENDIX A RS.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 controls.

3.15) Teachers with More Than One Locally Selected Measure

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

Teachers with more than one locally selected measure will have their scores combined commensurate with the ratio of students tested or the number of assessments administered to the same population.

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 23, 2012

Updated Tuesday, December 11, 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.)

NYSUT Teacher Practice Rubric (2012 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]	60
One or more observation(s) by trained independent evaluators	0
Observations by trained in-school peer teachers	0
Feedback from students using State-approved survey tool	0
Feedback from parents/caregivers using State-approved survey tool	0
Structured reviews of lesson plans, student portfolios and other teacher artifacts	0

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

(No response)

4.3) Survey Tools (if applicable)

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

(No response)

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.

All 60 points will be an accumulation of evidence, observations, professional development and will be attributive to the NYSUT Teacher Practice Rubric. All elements will be rated 1-4 and averaged/converted into one composite score. Appendix B will then be utilized to determine the HEDI rating. All rounding rules apply when converting the rubric score to a HEDI rating.

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

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

Highly Effective: Overall performance and results exceed NYS Teaching Standards.	A score is calculated for each teaching standard. The scores are then totaled and averaged for one total score. A total of 59-60 is highly effective.
Effective: Overall performance and results meet NYS Teaching Standards.	A score is calculated for each teaching standard. The scores are then totaled and averaged for one total score. A total score of 57-58 is effective.
Developing: Overall performance and results need improvement in order to meet NYS Teaching Standards.	A score is calculated for each teaching standard. The scores are then totaled and averaged for one total score. A total score of 50-56 is developing.
Ineffective: Overall performance and results do not meet NYS Teaching Standards.	A score is calculated for each teaching standard. The scores are then totaled and averaged for one total score. A total score of 0-49 is ineffective.

Provide the ranges for the 60-point scoring bands.

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

4.6) Observations of Probationary Teachers

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

By building principals or other trained administrators

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

By trained in-school peer teachers or other trained reviewers

Formal/Long	0
Informal/Short	0

Independent evaluators

Formal/Long	0
Informal/Short	0

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

-
- In Person
-

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

-
- In Person
-

4.7) Observations of Tenured Teachers

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

By building principals or other trained administrators

4.7) Observations of Tenured Teachers Formal/Long	1
4.7) Observations of Tenured Teachers Informal/Short	2
4.7) Observations of Tenured Teachers Total	3

By trained in-school peer teachers or other trained reviewers

Formal/Long	0
Informal/Short	0

Independent evaluators

Formal/Long	0
Informal/Short	0

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

-
- In Person
-

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

-
- In Person
-

5. Composite Scoring (Teachers)

Created Saturday, October 20, 2012

Updated Tuesday, December 04, 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 Tuesday, October 23, 2012

Updated Tuesday, December 04, 2012

Page 1

6.1) Assurances -- Improvement Plans

Please check the boxes below:

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

6.2) Attachment: Teacher Improvement Plan Forms

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

<assets/survey-uploads/5265/204708-Df0w3Xx5v6/TEACHER IMPROVEMENT PLAN FORM.pdf>

6.3) Appeals Process

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

(1) the substance of the annual professional performance review

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

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

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

A. Appeals of Annual Professional Performance Reviews

To the extent that a teacher wishes to issue an appeal, the following appeals procedure is established. All steps, including the resolution of the appeal will occur in a timely and expeditious manner.

1. Appeals will be limited to the following situations:

a. A teacher completing the first year of a three-year probationary appointment may appeal only an Ineffective APPR composite rating;

b. Any other teacher may appeal only a Developing or Ineffective APPR composite rating;

c. Any teacher may appeal the implementation of a teacher improvement plan if and only if the plan was generated as the result of a Developing or Ineffective composite rating, in accordance with Section 2, below.

2. The scope of the appeal's process will be limited to substantive appeals; meaning the substance of the individual's annual professional performance review.

3. A teacher may not file multiple appeals regarding the same performance review or teacher improvement plan. All grounds for appeal must be raised with specificity within one appeal. Any grounds not raised at the time the appeal is filed shall be deemed waived.

4. In an appeal, the teacher has the burden of demonstrating a right to the relief requested and the burden of establishing the facts upon which petitioner seeks relief.

5. The following timelines will be strictly adhered to unless extended by mutual agreement. Any extensions will follow Education Law 3012c and will also be completed in a timely and expeditious manner. Failure of the petitioner to meet a timeline will nullify the appeal; failure of the respondent to meet a timeline will allow movement of the appeal to the next level.

Level 1 - Evaluator

a. (Informal) Following a qualifying event, as defined in Sections 1 and 2, above, the teacher is entitled to schedule a follow up meeting to informally discuss with the evaluator any and all related issues.

b. (Formal) Any appeal must be submitted to the evaluator in writing no later than ten (10) school days of the date when the teacher receives his/her annual professional performance review. If a teacher is challenging the issuance or implementation of a teacher improvement plan, the appeal must be submitted in writing within ten (10) school days of issuance or of the time when the teacher knew or should have known of an alleged implementation breach of such plan.

c. When filing an appeal, the teacher must submit a detailed written description of the specific grounds for the appeal as well as the performance review and/or improvement plan being challenged. Along with the appeal, all supporting documentation must be submitted, or specifically noted if pending. Any grounds for appeal or any supporting documentation/information not submitted or noted at the time the appeal is filed shall not be considered.

d. Within ten (10) school days of receipt of an appeal, the evaluator responsible for the issue(s) being appealed must submit a detailed written response to the appeal. Along with the response, all supporting documentation must be submitted, or specifically noted if pending, as well as any additional documents or materials relevant to the response. Any supporting documentation/ information not submitted or noted at the time the response is issued shall not be considered in the deliberations related to the resolution of the appeal. The teacher initiating the appeal, and the WEA president, shall receive copies of the response and any and all additional information submitted with the response.

Level 2 – Panel

a. Within five (5) school days of receipt of the Level 1 determination, if a teacher is not satisfied with such determination, the teacher will submit the appeal to a panel comprised of two (2) teacher representatives selected by the WEA president and one (1) administration representative selected by the superintendent. The panel will be provided the entire appeals record; however, any information identifying the appellant will be redacted prior to receipt by the panel. Further, the anonymity of the panel members will be protected to the extent possible throughout this procedure.

b. Within ten (10) school days of receipt of the appeal, the panel will jointly conduct a paper review and deliberation of the matter, and will issue a written recommendation for resolution to the WEA president and the superintendent of schools. The recommendation may be to deny the appeal, to sustain the appeal and grant the remedy sought, or to sustain the appeal and modify the remedy; further, reasoning for the recommendation, as well as dissenting opinions, if any, will be included with the recommendation. This panel's decision will be final and binding for all appeals on developing ratings. Appeals of ineffective ratings will proceed to level 3.

Level 3 – Superintendent

a. Within five (5) school days of receipt of the Level 2 recommendation for resolution, the superintendent of schools will give due consideration to the panel's recommendation and will issue a final and binding decision, in writing, to the appellant, to WEA, and to the panel members. Whether the appeal is denied, sustained, or modified, such decision will set forth the reasons and factual basis for each determination on each of the specific grounds raised in the appeal. If the appeal is sustained, the superintendent may set aside or modify a rating or improvement plan or order a new evaluation or improvement plan if procedures have been violated.

6. To enforce the implementation of the APPR, the following procedural issues will be subject to Article XVI (Grievance Procedure) of the Collective Bargaining Agreement:

a. The district's adherence to the standards and methodologies required for such reviews, pursuant to Education Law 3012-c;

b. The adherence to the commissioner's regulations, as applicable to such reviews;

c. Compliance with any applicable locally negotiated procedures regarding annual professional performance reviews or improvement plans, as limited by Section I, above; or,

d. The district's issuance and/or implementation of the terms of the teacher improvement plan under Education Law 3012-c in connection with a Developing or Ineffective rating.

7. The entire record of the substantive appeal or the procedural grievance will be included in the teacher's personnel file.

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.

A. Duration and Nature of Training Provided to Evaluators and Lead Evaluators as outlined in the Watertown City School District and Watertown Education Association APPR Memorandum of Agreement

a) The "lead evaluator" is the administrator who is primarily responsible for a teacher's APPR composite rating. The term "evaluator" shall include any administrator who conducts an observation or evaluation of a teacher.

b) All evaluators shall successfully complete a training course that meets the minimum requirements prescribed by the law and shall include application and use of teacher practice rubrics selected for use by the parties in evaluations.

c) To be deemed a district certified lead evaluator one must successfully complete a training course meeting the minimum requirements prescribed in the law and regulations.

d) Other details of the District's training for evaluators, lead evaluators, and appeals panel members, including the duration and nature of such training, the process for certifying lead evaluators, and issues related to the particular practice rubrics selected by the parties, may need to be negotiated at a later time.

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

f) As soon as practicable, but no later than ten (10) calendar days after successful completion of required training, the Superintendent will provide a training record to the WEA president. The training record will include name(s), date(s), topic(s) of those trained and proof of successful completion.

B. In addition, the Board of Education will ensure that all evaluators have been trained and that all lead evaluators have been trained and certified in accordance with regulation. the district will utilize the Jefferson-Lewis BOCES Network Team evaluator/lead evaluator training in accordance with SED procedures and processes. The training will occur on a monthly basis throughout the school year with the total training time commensurate with SED expectations. Lead evaluator training will include training on:

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 and the value-added growth model;

4) Application and use of the teacher or principal rubric(s), 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 locally selected measures of student achievement used by the district evaluate its teachers or principals;

7) Use of the Statewide Instructional reporting System;

8) The scoring methodology 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 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; and

9) Specific considerations in evaluating teachers and principals of English language learners and students with disabilities. Upon completion of the initial year-long training for evaluators/ lead evaluators, administrators will be certified as lead evaluators. Administrators responsible for teacher evaluation will continue training on an annual basis through participation in the annual follow-up training for evaluators/lead evaluators provided by the Jefferson-Lewis BOCES Network Team. This training will support the continued growth in the understanding of the nine elements of performance review listed above. Administrators who complete the annual follow-up training will be recertified as lead evaluators. The Board of Education designates the superintendent to ensure that lead evaluators participate in the initial year-long training for lead evaluators and then participate in ongoing training on an annual basis for purposes of continued growth in understanding of the teacher performance evaluation process. The Jefferson-Lewis BOCES Network Team will be utilized to provide the initial training as well as the ongoing annual training. The initial training for evaluators/lead evaluators and the annual training, thereafter, for purposes of continued growth, will maintain inter-rater reliability of evaluators over time.

6.5) Assurances -- Evaluators

Please check the boxes below:

-
- Checked
-

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

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

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

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

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

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

(7) use of the Statewide Instructional Reporting System

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

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

-
- Checked
-

6.6) Assurances -- Teachers

Please check all of the boxes below:

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

6.7) Assurances -- Data

Please check all of the boxes below:

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

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

Created Thursday, October 25, 2012

Updated Wednesday, December 12, 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):

5-6
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
Elementary K-4	District, regional, or BOCES-developed	WCSD developed ELA Math Assessments for Grades K-2
Elementary K-4	State assessment	NYS ELA Math Assessments for Grades 3 4

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

Use this box, if needed, to describe the process for assigning HEDI categories in this subcomponent. If needed, you may upload a table or graphic below.	The Watertown City School District is setting the aspirational standard based on college and career readiness skills/levels. Principals will establish growth targets that will be approved by the superintendent. Administrators will receive a growth score from NYS for 4th grade ELA and Math which will be combined with the grade K-3 ELA and Math growth scores and averaged to result in one HEDI rating. See Attachment below (Appendix 2) with tables.
Highly Effective (18 - 20 points) Results are well above state average for similar students (or District goals if no state test).	80%-100% of students meet growth target.
Effective (9 - 17 points) Results meet state average for similar students (or District goals if no state test).	40%-79% of students meet growth target.
Developing (3 - 8 points) Results are below state average for similar students (or District goals if no state test).	20%-39% of students meet growth target.
Ineffective (0 - 2 points) Results are well below state average for similar students (or District goals if no state test).	0-19% of students meet growth target.

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

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 special adjustments or controls established.

7.5) Principals with More Than One Growth Measure

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

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

7.6) Assurances -- Comparable Growth Measures

Please check all of the boxes below:

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

8. Local Measures (Principals)

Created Thursday, October 25, 2012
Updated Thursday, December 13, 2012

Page 1

Locally-Selected Measures of Student Achievement or Growth

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

Grade Configuration	Locally-Selected Measure from List of Approved Measures	Assessment
5-6	(d) measures used by district for teacher evaluation	WCSD developed ELA and Math 5-6 district-wide assessment.
7-8	(d) measures used by district for teacher evaluation	WCSD developed ELA and Math 7-8 district-wide assessment.
9-12	(d) measures used by district for teacher evaluation	WCSD developed ELA and Math 9-12 district-wide 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.	A scoring mechanism that scales assessment scores on the locally developed assessments to performance levels that are calculated the same for all 5-12 teachers will be used. If a value-added model is not approved by the Board of Regents, a 20 point conversion model as described below will be used. (see 8.2)
Highly Effective (14 - 15 points) Results are well above District- or BOCES-adopted expectations for growth or achievement for grade/subject.	The locally developed assessments will be scored as follows: Assessment Scores Performance Level 0-54 1 55-64 2 65-84 3 85-100 4 Calculation $((\# \text{students scoring } 2,3,4) + (\# \text{students scoring } 3,4)) \times 7.5$ divided by # students in building tested.

Total Score of 14-15 is Highly Effective

Effective (8- 13 points) Results meet District- or BOCES-adopted expectations for growth or achievement for grade/subject.

The locally developed assessments will be scored as follows:
Assessment Scores Performance Level
0-54 1
55-64 2
65-84 3
85-100 4
Calculation
 $((\#students \text{ scoring } 2,3,4) + (\#students \text{ scoring } 3,4)) \times 7.5$
divided by # students in building tested.
Total Score of 8-13 is Effective

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

The locally developed assessments will be scored as follows:
Assessment Scores Performance Level
0-54 1
55-64 2
65-84 3
85-100 4
Calculation
 $((\#students \text{ scoring } 2,3,4) + (\#students \text{ scoring } 3,4)) \times 7.5$
divided by # students in building tested.
Total Score of 3-7 is Developing

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

The locally developed assessments will be scored as follows:
Assessment Scores Performance Level
0-54 1
55-64 2
65-84 3
85-100 4
Calculation
 $((\#students \text{ scoring } 2,3,4) + (\#students \text{ scoring } 3,4)) \times 7.5$
divided by # students in building tested.
Total Score of 0-2 is Ineffective

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.

(No response)

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
K-4	(d) measures used by district for teacher evaluation	WCSD developed ELA and Math K-4 district-wide 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.

<p>Use this box, if needed, to describe the process for assigning HEDI categories. If needed, you may upload a table or graphic below.</p>	<p>The 20% Local Assessment portion of an individual building principal's composite score will be obtained by employing the scaled score average conversion or an average of the student population who participated in the exam from his or her building. The building principal will choose the method which will be employed. Principals local HEDI points will be calculated based on average scores in specific grade levels and converted to a rubric score. (rounding rules apply) (See Appendix E)</p>
<p>Highly Effective (18 - 20 points) Results are well above District- or BOCES-adopted expectations for growth or achievement for grade/subject.</p>	<p>Based on the Achievement Measure Conversion table, a total score of 18-20 is Highly Effective. (See Appendix E)</p>
<p>Effective (9- 17 points) Results meet District- or BOCES-adopted expectations for growth or achievement for grade/subject.</p>	<p>Based on the Achievement Measure Conversion table, a total score of 9-17 is Effective. (See Appendix E)</p>
<p>Developing (3 - 8 points) Results are below District- or BOCES-adopted expectations for growth or achievement for grade/subject.</p>	<p>Based on the Achievement Measure Conversion table, a total score of 3-8 is Developing. (See Appendix E)</p>
<p>Ineffective (0 - 2 points) Results are well below District- or BOCES-adopted expectations for growth or achievement for grade/subject.</p>	<p>Based on the Achievement Measure Conversion table, a total score of 0-2 is Ineffective. (See Appendix E)</p>

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

(No response)

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

assets/survey-uploads/5366/207163-T8MIGWUVm1/WASA Appendix E RS.pdf

8.3) Locally Developed Controls

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

No controls.

8.4) Principals with More Than One Locally Selected Measure

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

(No response)

8.5) Assurances

Please check all of the boxes below:

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

9. Other Measures of Effectiveness (Principals)

Created Tuesday, October 30, 2012

Updated Wednesday, December 12, 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.

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

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.

All 60 points will be an accumulation of evidence, observations, and professional development. All elements will be rated 1-4 and averaged together for one final standard score. The final standard scores will be averaged together for one final rubric score. A conversion chart is attached as Appendix B-1.

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/5143/212008-pMADJ4gk6R/WASA-APPENDIX B 1 RS_1.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.	A combined rubric score of 3.3-4 = Highly Effective. See Appendix B-1.
Effective: Overall performance and results meet standards.	A combined rubric score of 2.5-3.2 = Effective. See Appendix B-1.
Developing: Overall performance and results need improvement in order to meet standards.	A combined rubric score of 1.5-2.4 = Developing. See Appendix B-1.
Ineffective: Overall performance and results do not meet standards.	A combined rubric score of 0-1.4 = Ineffective. See Appendix B-1.

Please provide the locally-negotiated 60 point scoring bands.

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

9.8) School Visits

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

Probationary Principals

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

Tenured Principals

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

10. Composite Scoring (Principals)

Created Thursday, November 01, 2012

Updated Thursday, November 08, 2012

Page 1

Standards for Rating Categories

Growth or Comparable Measures

Locally-selected Measures of

growth or achievement

Other Measures of Effectiveness

(Teacher and Leader standards)

Highly

Effective

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

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

Overall performance and results exceed ISLLC leadership standards.

Effective

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

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

Overall performance and results meet ISLLC leadership standards.

Developing

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

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

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

Ineffective

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

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

Overall performance and results do not meet ISLLC leadership standards.

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

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

2012-13 where there is no Value-Added measure

Growth or Comparable Measures

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

Other Measures of Effectiveness

(60 points)

Overall

Composite Score

Highly Effective

18-20

18-20

Ranges determined locally--see below

91-100

Effective

9-17

9-17

75-90

Developing

3-8

3-8

65-74

Ineffective

0-2

0-2

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

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

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

2012-13 where Value-Added growth measure applies

Growth or Comparable Measures

Locally-selected Measures of growth or achievement

Other Measures of Effectiveness

(60 points)

Overall

Composite Score

Highly Effective

22-25

14-15

Ranges determined locally--see above

91-100

Effective

10-21

8-13

75-90

Developing

3-9

3-7

65-74

Ineffective

0-2

0-2

0-64

11. Additional Requirements - Principals

Created Thursday, November 01, 2012

Updated Thursday, November 08, 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/5276/213818-Df0w3Xx5v6/WASA-APPENDIX C D.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:

Appeals of Annual Professional Performance Reviews

a. To the extent that a building principal wishes to issue an appeal, the following appeals procedure is established.

1. Appeals will be limited to the following situations:

a. A non-tenured building principal may appeal only an Ineffective APPR composite rating;

b. Any other tenured building principal may appeal only a Developing or Ineffective APPR composite rating;

c. Any building principal may appeal the implementation of an improvement plan if and only if the plan was generated as the result of a

Developing or Ineffective composite rating, in accordance with Section 2, e, below.

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

- a.The substance of the individual’s annual professional performance review;*
- b.The District’s adherence to the standards and methodologies required for such reviews, pursuant to Education Law 3012-c;*
- c.The adherence to the Commissioner’s regulations, as applicable to such reviews;*
- d.Compliance with any applicable locally negotiated procedures regarding annual professional performance reviews or improvement plans, as limited by Section 1, above; or,*
- e.The District’s issuance and/or implementation of the terms of the principal improvement plan under Education Law 3012-c in connection with an ineffective or developing rating.*

3.A principal may not file multiple appeals regarding the same performance review or improvement plan. All grounds for appeal must be raised with specificity within one appeal. Any grounds not raised at the time the appeal is filed shall be deemed waived.

4.In an appeal, the building principal has the burden of demonstrating a right to the relief requested and the burden of establishing the facts upon which petitioner seeks relief.

The following timelines will be strictly adhered to unless extended by mutual agreement. Failure of the petitioner to meet a timeline will nullify the appeal; failure of the respondent to meet a timeline will allow movement of the appeal to the next level.

b.Level 1 – Evaluator

1.(Informal) Following a qualifying event, as defined in Sections 1 and 2, above, the building principal is entitled to schedule a follow up meeting to informally discuss with the superintendent any and all related issues.

2.(Formal) Any appeal must be submitted to the evaluator in writing no later than ten (10) business days of the date when the building principal receives his/her annual professional performance review. If a building principal is challenging the issuance or implementation of an improvement plan, the appeal must be submitted in writing within ten (10) business days of issuance or of the time when the building principal knew or should have known of an alleged implementation breach of such plan.

3.When filing an appeal, the building principal must submit a detailed written description of the specific grounds for the appeal as well as the performance review and/or improvement plan being challenged. Along with the appeal, all supporting documentation must be submitted, or specifically noted if pending. Any grounds for appeal or any supporting documentation/information not submitted or noted at the time the appeal is filed shall not be considered.

4.Within ten (10) business days of receipt of an appeal, the superintendent responsible for the issue(s) being appealed must submit a detailed written response to the appeal. Along with the response, all supporting documentation must be submitted, or specifically noted if pending, as well as any additional documents or materials relevant to the response. Any supporting documentation/ information not submitted or noted at the time the response is issued shall not be considered in the deliberations related to the resolution of the appeal. The building principal initiating the appeal, and the WASA president, shall receive copies of the response and any and all additional information submitted with the response.

c.Level 2 – Panel

1.Within ten (10) business days of receipt of the Level 1 response, if a principal is not satisfied with such response the building principal must submit the appeal to the Assistant Superintendent of Personnel. The Assistant Superintendent of Personnel will be provided all documentation submitted in both the appeal and the superintendent’s response.

2.Within ten (10) business days of receipt of the building principal’s appeal, a panel hearing will be conducted. The panel shall be composed of three members: a NYS certified administrator chosen by the superintendent (precluding the superintendent or assistant superintendents of WCSD), a member of the WASA administrative group chosen at the discretion of the principal who presented the appeal, and a current or retired NYS administrator chosen by WASA. The panel will be provided the entire appeals record; however, any information identifying the appellant will be redacted prior to receipt by the panel. Further, the anonymity of the panel members will be protected to the extent possible throughout this procedure.

3.The panel will jointly conduct a paper review and deliberation of the matter, and will issue a written recommendation for resolution to the president of WASA and the Assistant Superintendent of Personnel. The recommendation may be to deny the appeal, to sustain the appeal and grant the remedy sought, or to sustain the appeal and modify the remedy; further, reasoning for the recommendation, as well as dissenting opinions, if any, will be included with the recommendation.

4.The determination issued will be final and binding on all “developing” ratings. Appeals of “ineffective” ratings and split decisions on an appeal of a “developing” rating will proceed to level 3. Within ten (10) business days of the panel hearing, the panel will issue a written determination to the building principal, the WASA President, the Assistant Superintendent of Personnel, and the

Superintendent.

d. Level 3 – Third Party Arbitration

1. In the event the Building Principal and WASA are not satisfied with the determination from the level 2 panel, they may within fifteen (15) working days after receiving that statement, refer the grievance to arbitration by requesting that the American Arbitration Association or another sanctioned arbitration body propose the names of certified arbitrators. A copy of such request shall be forwarded to the Superintendent of Schools.

2. Within five (5) business days after such written notice of submission to arbitration, a request for a list of arbitrators will be made to American Arbitration Association (A.A.A.) or another sanctioned body by either party. The parties will then be bound by the rules and procedures of the chosen arbitration body in the selection of the arbitrator. The arbitrator would be chosen through the mutual agreement of WASA and the Watertown City School District.

3. The selected arbitrator will hear the matter promptly and will issue his decision not later than thirty (30) calendar days from the date of the close of the proceeding. The arbitrator's decision will be in writing and will set forth his findings of fact, reasoning and conclusions on the issue(s).

4. The arbitrator shall have no power or authority to make any decision which requires commission of an act prohibited by law, or which is violative of, or beyond the scope of, the terms of this Agreement.

5. The Arbitrator's Award shall not be contrary to or extend any provision of law, or any other rule or regulation having the force and effect of law.

6. The arbitrator shall have no power to alter, modify, add to or subtract from the provisions of this Agreement. The arbitrator shall not usurp the functions of the Board of Education under the law.

7. The decision of the arbitrator shall if within the scope of his authority be final and binding upon all parties.

8. All costs associated with or incurred through the Level 3—Third Party Arbitration process shall be paid for by WASA.

e. To enforce the implementation of the APPR, the following procedural issues will be subject to Article IV (Grievance Procedure) of the Collective Bargaining Agreement:

1. The 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 regarding annual professional performance reviews or improvement plans, as limited by Section I, above; or,

4. The district's issuance and/or implementation of the terms of the teacher improvement plan under Education Law 3012-c in connection with a Developing or Ineffective rating.

f. The entire record of the substantive appeal or the procedural grievance will be included in the principal's personnel file.

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.

Duration and Nature of Training Provided to Evaluators and Lead Evaluators

A.

a. The "lead evaluator" is the administrator who is primarily responsible for a teacher's or administrator's APPR composite rating. The term "evaluator" shall include any administrator who conducts an observation or evaluation of a teacher or administrator.

b. All evaluators shall successfully complete a training course that meets the minimum requirements prescribed by the law and shall include application and use of teacher practice rubrics and principal practice rubrics selected for use by the parties in evaluations.

c. To be deemed a district certified lead evaluator one must successfully complete a training course meeting the minimum requirements prescribed in the law and regulations.

d. The District will ensure that all new building principals are certified or have been provided training which meets the NYS

requirements for certification as a lead evaluator within 90 days from the date of hire.

e. The District will ensure that the superintendent of schools is certified or has been provided with training that meets the NYS requirements for certification as a lead evaluator prior to the annual summative evaluation.

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

B. In addition, the Board of Education will ensure that all evaluators have been trained and that all lead evaluators have been trained and certified in accordance with regulation. The district will utilize the Jefferson-Lewis BOCES Network Team evaluator/lead evaluator training in accordance with SED procedures and processes. The training will occur on a monthly basis throughout the school year with the total training time commensurate with SED expectations. Lead Evaluator training will include training on:

- 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 and the value added growth model.
- 4) Application and use of the teacher or principal rubric(s), 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 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 locally selected measures of student achievement used by the district to evaluate its teachers or principals.
- 7) Use of the Statewide Instructional Reporting System.
- 8) The scoring methodology 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 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. Upon completion of the initial year long training for evaluators/lead evaluators, administrators will be certified as lead evaluators. Administrators responsible for teacher evaluation will continue training on an annual basis through participation in the annual follow-up training for evaluators/lead evaluators provided by the Jefferson-Lewis BOCES Network Team. This training will support the continued growth in the understanding of the nine elements of performance review listed above. Administrators who complete the annual follow-up training will be re-certified as Lead Evaluators. The Board of Education designates the superintendent to ensure that lead evaluators participate in ongoing training on an annual basis for purposes of continued growth in understanding of the teacher evaluation process. The Jefferson-Lewis BOCES Network Team will be utilized to provide the initial training as well as the ongoing annual training. The initial training for evaluators/lead evaluators and the annual training, thereafter, for purposes of growth, will maintain inter-rater reliability of evaluators over time.

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, October 24, 2012

Updated Thursday, December 13, 2012

Page 1

12.1) Upload the Joint Certification of the APPR Plan

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

[assets/survey-uploads/5581/206722-3Uqgn5g9Iu/District Certification Form RS.pdf](assets/survey-uploads/5581/206722-3Uqgn5g9Iu/District%20Certification%20Form%20RS.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.

Appendix 1

Watertown City School District Student Growth Measure Conversion Scale

Percentage of Class Meeting Established Growth Target	Points for Composite Evaluation Scale	
94-100	20	Highly Effective
87-93	19	
80-86	18	
75-79	17	Effective
71-74	16	
66-70	15	
62-65	14	
57-61	13	
53-56	12	
49-52	11	
44-48	10	
40-43	9	
37-39	8	
33-36	7	
30-32	6	
26-29	5	
23-25	4	
20-22	3	
16-19	2	Ineffective
9-15	1	
0-8	0	

APPENDIX A-1
HEDI Conversion Chart – 15% Local Measures

Percentage of Students Meeting Goal	15 Point Conversion
Highly Effective	
88-100	15
76-87	14
Effective	
67-75	13
59-66	12
50-58	11
42-49	10
33-41	9
25-32	8
Developing	
22-24	7
19-21	6
16-18	5
13-15	4
10-12	3
Ineffective	
7-9	2
4-6	1
0-3	0

APPENDIX A
HEDI Conversion Chart – 20% Local Measures

Percentage of Students Meeting Goal	20 Point Conversion
Highly Effective	
97-100	20
91-96	19
85-90	18
Effective	
84	17
82-83	16
79-80	15
75-78	14
73-74	13
71-72	12
69-70	11
67-68	10
65-66	9
Developing	
63-64	8
61-62	7
60	6
58-59	5
56-57	4
55	3
Ineffective	
28-54	2
15-27	1
0-14	0

APPENDIX B
HEDI Conversion Chart– 60% Other Measures

Total Average Rubric Score	Conversion Score for Composite
Highly Effective (59-60)	
3.7-4	60
3.3-3.6	59
Effective (57-58)	
2.8-3.2	58
2.5-2.7	57
Developing (50-56)	
2.3-2.4	56
2.2	55
2-2.1	54
1.9	53
1.8	52
1.6-1.7	51
1.5	50
Ineffective (0-49)	
1.400	49
1.392	48
1.383	47
1.375	46
1.367	45
1.358	44
1.350	43
1.342	42
1.333	41
1.325	40
1.317	39
1.308	38
1.300	37
1.292	36
1.283	35
1.275	34
1.267	33
1.258	32

Total Average Rubric Score	Conversion Score for Composite
Ineffective (0-49) continued	
1.250	31
1.242	30
1.233	29
1.225	28
1.217	27
1.208	26
1.200	25
1.192	24
1.185	23
1.177	22
1.169	21
1.162	20
1.154	19
1.146	18
1.138	17
1.131	16
1.123	15
1.115	14
1.108	13
1.100	12
1.092	11
1.083	10
1.075	9
1.067	8
1.058	7
1.050	6
1.042	5
1.033	4
1.025	3
1.017	2
1.008	1
1.000	0

Student Learning Objective Structure

Population	Students assessed			
Learning Content	New York State Learning Standards			
Interval	Course duration			
Evidence	<ol style="list-style-type: none"> 1. Summative assessment results from students in previous year or 2. District-wide pre-assessment administered at the beginning of the school year 3. District-wide summative assessment administered at the end of the school year 			
Baseline	Summary of student results on 1 or 2 above.			
Target(s) and HEDI Scoring	<ol style="list-style-type: none"> 1. ___% of students scoring ___% on baseline assessment will score ___% or higher, as measured by the summative assessment or 2. ___% of students will score ___% or higher as measured by the summative assessment 			
	High Effective (18-20 points)	Effective (9-17 points)	Developing (3-8 points)	Ineffective (0-2 points)
	85-100% of students meet above targets	70-84% of students meet above targets	50-69% of students meet above targets	0-49% of students meet above targets
Rationale	<p>Previous work in _____ focused on _____. The diagnostic assessment is heavily focused on _____, which are essential components of the _____ curriculum. Current course _____ requires students build on their learning from past course _____ in order to acquire mastery in these areas to be prepared for next course _____. Since _____ students completed the past course _____ having achieved basic proficiency levels, I am confident they will achieve _____ mastery or above on at least ___% of the current course _____ materials.</p>			

Student Learning Objective Conversion Scale

HIGHLY EFFECTIVE			EFFECTIVE									DEVELOPING					INEFFECTIVE			
20	19	18	17	16	15	14	13	12	11	10	9	8	7	6	5	4	3	2	1	0
94-100%	93-87%	86-80%	79-75%	74-71%	70-66%	65-62%	61-57%	56-53%	52-49%	48-44%	43-40%	39-37%	36-33%	32-30%	29-26%	25-23%	22-20%	19-16%	15-9%	8-0%

APPENDIX B 1—Other Measures—Full Conversion Chart

(Rounding Rules Apply)

Total Average Rubric Score	Category	Conversion score for
Ineffective 0-49		
1.000		0
1.008		1
1.017		2
1.025		3
1.033		4
1.042		5
1.050		6
1.058		7
1.067		8
1.075		9
1.083		10
1.092		11
1.100		12
1.108		13
1.115		14
1.123		15
1.131		16
1.138		17
1.146		18
1.154		19
1.162		20
1.169		21
1.177		22
1.185		23
1.192		24
1.200		25
1.208		26
1.217		27
1.225		28
1.233		29
1.242		30
1.250		31
1.258		32
1.267		33
1.275		34
1.283		35
1.292		36
1.300		37
1.308		38

1.317		39
1.325		40
1.333		41
1.342		42
1.350		43
1.358		44
1.367		45
1.375		46
1.383		47
1.392		48
1.400		49
Developing 50-56		
1.5		50
1.6		50.7
1.7		51.4
1.8		52.1
1.9		52.8
2		53.5
2.1		54.2
2.2		54.9
2.3		55.6
2.4		56.3 (round to 56)
Effective 57-58		
2.5		57
2.6		57.2
2.7		57.4
2.8		57.6
2.9		57.8
3		58
3.1		58.2
3.2		58.4 (round to 58)
Highly Effective 59-60		
3.3		58.6 (round to 59)
3.4		58.8 (round to 59)
3.5		59
3.6		59.3
3.7		59.5
3.8		59.8
3.9		60
4		60.25 (round to 60)

APPENDIX C—Principal Improvement Plan Letter

Date

Inside Address

Dear _____,

Based on evaluations and observations completed in accordance with Section 30-2 of the Rules of the Board of Regents, the Superintendent of the Watertown City School district has determined that you need to be placed on a Principal Improvement Plan. In accordance with the approved APPR plan:

- 1 I am notifying you in a personal conference and in writing ten (10) days prior to the start of the school year.
- 2 You have the option of having the WASA involved as a partner in the development of an improvement plan.
- 3 This notice will be copied to the WASA President and your personnel file.
- 4 Your participation in this process is a requirement as a result of your rating as either Developing or Ineffective on last year's APPR.

Should you have any further questions, please do not hesitate to contact me or the WASA President.

Sincerely,

Superintendent

CC: WASA President

CC: Personnel

APPENDIX D—Principal Improvement Plan

Watertown City School District Principal Improvement Plan

Principal's Name: _____

Grade and/Subject Area: _____

Evaluator(s) Developing the Plan: _____

School: _____

School Year to Commence: _____

APPR Effective Category: _____

Briefly describe areas of strength the principal brings to the plan:

Briefly describe areas in need of improvement:

Goals	Action Steps (provide detailed description)	Needed Support/ Resources	Who is responsible for implementation and collection of evidence?	Expected dates of completion	Evidence of goal being met
A. Diagnosis and Planning					
B. Priority Management and Communication					
C. Curriculum and Data					
D. Supervision, Evaluation, and Professional Development					
E. Discipline and Parent Involvement					
F. Management and External Relations					
State Growth Measures/ SLO					
Locally Selected Measures					

APPENDIX E—20% Local Measures

The 20% Local Assessment portion of an individual building principal’s composite score will be obtained by employing the scaled score average conversion or an average of the student population who participated in the exam from his or her building. The building principal will chose the method which will be employed.

Scaled Score Average

Step 1: The average (mean) score of all students pertaining to the building for which the principal is responsible.

Table 1.1—Example of a set of student achievement scores:

Student Scores			
65	75	59	71
63	45	80	87
79	81	57	60
50	92	81	75
78	67	86	72
83	88	90	

Average score on assessment equals 73.217. (Rounding Rules Apply)

Step 2: Average teacher score is converted to the 20-point scale as indicated by Table 1.2.

Table 1.2—Scaled Score Average Conversion Table (20 points)

Achievement Measure Conversion Table	
Average Student Score on Assessment	Points for Building Principal Composite Score
0 – 17	0
18 – 35	1
36 – 49	2
50	3
51 – 52	4
53 – 54	5
55 – 56	6
57 – 58	7
59 – 60	8
61 – 62	9
63	10
64	11
65 – 67	12
68 – 70	13
71 – 72	14
73 – 76	15
77 – 80	16
81 – 84	17
85 – 90	18
91 – 96	19
97 – 100	20

Based on table 1.2, the building principal’s score is 15 out of 20 and is given a HEDI rating of Effective.

Student Population Average

The total number of students who participate in the exam is averaged through conventional means (the sum of the student scores divided by the number of students participating). The resulting average is then converted to the 20-point scale using Table 1.2 above.

Example: In building X, 100 students participated in the ELA Benchmark Exam used for the Local Measure. The average for the total student population was ascertained to be 89.1. According to the conversion chart, the principal would receive 18 out of 20 points and given a HEDI rating of Highly Effective.

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

Signatures, dates

Superintendent Signature: Date: 12/13/12

Ferry N. Fratello

Teachers Union President Signature: Date: 12/13/12

Dianne Loonan

Administrative Union President Signature: Date: 12/13/12

[Signature]

Board of Education President Signature: Date: 12/13/12

Michael Felt