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

October 24, 2012

Adele Bovard, Superintendent
Webster Central School District
119 South Ave.
Webster, NY 14580

Dear Superintendent Bovard:

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: Daniel T. White

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 Thursday, August 16, 2012
Updated Friday, October 19, 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 :

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

261901060000

1.2) School District Name:

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

WEBSTER CSD

1.3) School Improvement Grant (SIG) Districts Only

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

(No response)

1.4) Award Classification

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

(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 Thursday, August 16, 2012
Updated Tuesday, October 23, 2012

Page 1

STATE-PROVIDED MEASURES OF STUDENT GROWTH

(25 points with an approved value-added measure)

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

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

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

2.1) Assurances

Please check the boxes below:

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

STUDENT LEARNING OBJECTIVES AS COMPARABLE GROWTH MEASURES (20 points)

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

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

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

If no State assessment or Regents exam exists:

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

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

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

State assessments, *required if one exists*

List of State-approved 3rd party assessments

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

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

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

2.2) Grades K-3 ELA

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

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

	ELA	Assessment
3	State assessment	3rd Grade State Assessment

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

Use this box, if needed, to describe the general process for assigning HEDI categories for these grades/subjects in this	See attached chart in 2.11. Using data from baseline pre-assessments and an analysis of historical trends, the District

subcomponent. If needed, you may upload a table or graphic at 2.11, below.	will set minimum growth expectations of a score of 3 or higher on the 3rd Grade NYS ELA Assessment.
Highly Effective (18 - 20 points) Results are well-above state average for similar students (or District goals if no state test).	70 - 100% meet or exceed the target
Effective (9 - 17 points) Results meet state average for similar students (or District goals if no state test).	60 - 69%meet or exceed the target
Developing (3 - 8 points) Results are below state average for similar students (or District goals if no state test).	50 - 59% meet or exceed the target
Ineffective (0 - 2 points) Results are well-below state average for similar students (or District goals if no state test).	0 - 49% meet or exceed the target

2.3) Grades K-3 Math

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

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

	Math	Assessment
3	State assessment	3rd Grade State Assessment

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

Use this box, if needed, to describe the general process for assigning HEDI categories for these grades/subjects in this subcomponent. If needed, you may upload a table or graphic at 2.11, below.	See attached chart in 2.11. Using data from baseline pre-assessments and an analysis of historical trends, the District will set minimum growth expectations of a score of 3 or higher on the 3rd Grade NYS Math Assessment.
Highly Effective (18 - 20 points) Results are well-above state average for similar students (or District goals if no state test).	70 - 100% meet or exceed the target.
Effective (9 - 17 points) Results meet state average for similar students (or District goals if no state test).	60 - 69% meet or exceed the target.
Developing (3 - 8 points) Results are below state average for similar students (or District goals if no state test).	50 - 59% meet or exceed the target.
Ineffective (0 - 2 points) Results are well-below state average for similar students (or District goals if no state test).	0 - 49% meet or exceed the 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	Webster Locally Developed Science 6 Assessment
7	District, regional or BOCES-developed assessment	Webster Locally 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.	See attached chart in 2.11. Using data from baseline pre-assessments and an analysis of historical trends, cross district grade level teams will set differentiated growth targets for students. Based on student rosters, teachers and building principals will meet to confirm established targets for student growth.
Highly Effective (18 - 20 points) Results are well-above state average for similar students (or District goals if no state test).	90-100% of students met target
Effective (9 - 17 points) Results meet state average for similar students (or District goals if no state test).	75-89% of students met target
Developing (3 - 8 points) Results are below state average for similar students (or District goals if no state test).	50-74% of students met target
Ineffective (0 - 2 points) Results are well-below state average for similar students (or District goals if no state test).	0-49% of students met 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	District, regional or BOCES-developed assessment	Webster Locally Developed Social Studies 6 Assessment
7	District, regional or BOCES-developed assessment	Webster Locally Developed Social Studies 7 Assessment
8	District, regional or BOCES-developed assessment	Webster Locally Developed Social Studies 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.	See attached chart in 2.11. Using data from baseline pre-assessments and an analysis of historical trends, cross district grade level teams will set differentiated growth targets for students. Based on student rosters, teachers and building principals will meet to confirm established targets for student growth.
Highly Effective (18 - 20 points) Results are well-above District goals for similar students.	90-100% of students met target

Effective (9 - 17 points) Results meet District goals for similar students.	75-89% of students met target
Developing (3 - 8 points) Results are below District goals for similar students.	50-74% of students met target
Ineffective (0 - 2 points) Results are well-below District goals for similar students.	0-49% of students met 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	Webster Locally 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.	See attached chart in 2.11. Using data from baseline pre-assessments and an analysis of historical trends, cross district grade level teams will set differentiated growth targets for students. Based on student rosters, teachers and building principals will meet to confirm established targets for student growth.
Highly Effective (18 - 20 points) Results are well-above District goals for similar students.	90-100% of students met target
Effective (9 - 17 points) Results meet District goals for similar students.	75-89% of students met target
Developing (3 - 8 points) Results are below District goals for similar students.	50-74% of students met target
Ineffective (0 - 2 points) Results are well-below District goals for similar students.	0-49% of students met 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.	See attached chart in 2.11. Using data from baseline pre-assessments and an analysis of historical trends, cross district grade level teams will set differentiated growth targets for students. Based on student rosters, teachers and building principals will meet to confirm established targets for student growth.
Highly Effective (18 - 20 points) Results are well-above District goals for similar students.	90-100% of students met target
Effective (9 - 17 points) Results meet District goals for similar students.	75-89% of students met target
Developing (3 - 8 points) Results are below District goals for similar students.	50-74% of students met target
Ineffective (0 - 2 points) Results are well-below District goals for similar students.	0-49% of students met 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.	See attached chart in 2.11.Using data from baseline pre-assessments and an analysis of historical trends, cross district grade level teams will set differentiated growth targets for students. Based on student rosters, teachers and building

	principals will meet to confirm established targets for student growth.
Highly Effective (18 - 20 points) Results are well-above District goals for similar students.	90-100% of students met target
Effective (9 - 17 points) Results meet District goals for similar students.	75-89% of students met target
Developing (3 - 8 points) Results are below District goals for similar students.	50-74% of students met target
Ineffective (0 - 2 points) Results are well-below District goals for similar students.	0-49% of students met 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	Webster Locally Developed English 9 Assessment
Grade 10 ELA	District, regional or BOCES-developed assessment	Webster Locally Developed English 10 Assessment
Grade 11 ELA	Regents assessment	ELA 11 Regents

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

Use this box, if needed, to describe the general process for assigning HEDI categories for these grades/subjects in this subcomponent. If needed, you may upload a table or graphic at 2.11, below.	See attached chart in 2.11. Using data from baseline pre-assessments and an analysis of historical trends, cross district grade level teams will set differentiated growth targets for students. Based on student rosters, teachers and building principals will meet to confirm established targets for student growth.
Highly Effective (18 - 20 points) Results are well-above District goals for similar students.	90-100% of students met target
Effective (9 - 17 points) Results meet District goals for similar students.	75-89% of students met target
Developing (3 - 8 points) Results are below District goals for similar students.	50-74% of students met target
Ineffective (0 - 2 points) Results are well-below District goals for similar students.	0-49% of students met target

2.10) All Other Courses

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

Course(s) or Subject(s)	Option	Assessment
All other courses not named above	District, Regional or BOCES-developed	Webster Developed Grade & Subject Specific Assessment for each course
K-12 Art	District, Regional or BOCES-developed	Webster Developed Grade & Subject Specific Art Assessment
K-12 Physical Education	District, Regional or BOCES-developed	Webster Developed Grade & Subject Specific Physical Education Assessment
K-12 Music	District, Regional or BOCES-developed	Webster Developed Grade & Subject Specific Music Assessment
Special Education K - 3	State Assessment	3rd grade ELA and Math
Special Education 4 - 5	State Assessment	5th grade ELA and Math
Special Education 6 - 8	State Assessment	8 grade ELA
Special Education 9 - 12	State Assessment	11 Grade ELA Regents

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

Use this box, if needed, to describe the general process for assigning HEDI categories for these grades/subjects in this subcomponent. If needed, you may upload a table or graphic at 2.11, below.	Using data from baseline pre-assessments and an analysis of historical trends, cross district grade level teams will set differentiated growth targets for students. Based on student rosters, teachers and building principals will meet to confirm established targets for student growth. A student's growth will then be determined at the end of the school year by comparing their pre-assessement and post-assessment scores.
Highly Effective (18 - 20 points) Results are well-above District goals for similar students.	90-100% of students met target
Effective (9 - 17 points) Results meet District goals for similar students.	75-89% of students met target
Developing (3 - 8 points) Results are below District goals for similar students.	50-74% of students met target
Ineffective (0 - 2 points) Results are well-below District goals for similar students.	0-49% of students met 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/5364/163775-TXEtxx9bQW/Teacher - SLO SCORING SHEET for Elem, Middle, High_2.docx

2.12) Locally Developed Controls

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

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

(No response)

2.13) Teachers with more than one growth measure

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

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

2.14) Assurances

Please check all of the boxes below:

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

3. Local Measures (Teachers)

Created Tuesday, August 28, 2012
Updated Tuesday, October 23, 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	Webster's 4th grade ELA Assessment
5	5) District, regional, or BOCES–developed assessments	Webster's 5th grade ELA Assessment
6	5) District, regional, or BOCES–developed assessments	Webster Locally Developed ELA 6 Assessment
7	5) District, regional, or BOCES–developed assessments	Webster Locally Developed ELA 7 Assessment
8	5) District, regional, or BOCES–developed assessments	Webster Locally 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.	See attached charts in 3.3. For 4th and 5th grade, students will be administered the locally developed grade-level end-of-year assessment in ELA that measures students' academic achievement. In each grade, 6,7 and 8, specific grade-level teachers and principals meet to establish individual growth targets for each student based on ELA pre-assessment data and historical trends. Student growth is measured by comparing their fall benchmark ELA assessment scores with the final benchmark assessment administered in the spring.
Highly Effective (14 - 15 points) Results are well above District- or BOCES-adopted expectations for growth or achievement for grade/subject.	For 4th and 5th, 70 - 100% of students are proficient. For 6-8, 90-100% of the students meet or exceed their individualized growth targets.
Effective (8- 13 points) Results meet District- or BOCES-adopted expectations for growth or achievement for grade/subject.	For 4th and 5th, 60 - 69% of students are proficient. For 6-8, 75-89% of the students meet or exceed their individualized growth targets.
Developing (3 - 7 points) Results are below District- or BOCES-adopted expectations for growth or achievement for grade/subject.	For 4th and 5th, 50 - 59% of students are proficient. For 6-8, 50-74% of the students meet or exceed their individualized growth targets.
Ineffective (0 - 2 points) Results are well below District- or BOCES-adopted expectations for growth or achievement for grade/subject.	For 4th and 5th, 0-49% of students are proficient. For 6-8, 0-49% of the students meet or exceed their individualized growth targets.

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	Webster's 4th grade Math Assessment
5	5) District, regional, or BOCES–developed assessments	Webster's 5th grade Math Assessment
6	5) District, regional, or BOCES–developed assessments	Webster Locally Developed Math 6 Assessment
7	5) District, regional, or BOCES–developed assessments	Webster Locally Developed Math 7 Assessment
8	5) District, regional, or BOCES–developed assessments	Webster Locally 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.	See attached charts in 3.3. For 4th and 5th grade, students will be administered the locally developed grade-level end-of-year assessment in Math that measures students' academic achievement. In grades 6,7 and 8, teachers and principals meet to establish individual growth targets for each student based on Math pre-assessment data and historical trends. Student growth is measured by comparing their fall benchmark Math assessment scores with the final benchmark assessment administered in the spring.
Highly Effective (14 - 15 points) Results are well above District- or BOCES-adopted expectations for growth or achievement for grade/subject.	For 4th and 5th, 70 - 100% of students are proficient. For 6-8, 90-100% of the students meet or exceed their individualized growth targets.
Effective (8- 13 points) Results meet District- or BOCES-adopted expectations for growth or achievement for grade/subject.	For 4th and 5th, 60 - 69% of students are proficient. For 6-8, 75-89% of the students meet or exceed their individualized growth targets.
Developing (3 - 7 points) Results are below District- or BOCES-adopted expectations for growth or achievement for grade/subject.	For 4th and 5th, 50 - 59% of students are proficient. For 6-8, 50-74% of the students meet or exceed their individualized growth targets.
Ineffective (0 - 2 points) Results are well below District- or BOCES-adopted expectations for growth or achievement for grade/subject.	For 4th and 5th, 0-49% of students are proficient. For 6-8, 0-49% of the students meet or exceed their individualized growth targets.

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/5139/169201-rhJdBgDruP/Teacher - Local Assessment Scoring-4-8 Teachers w Value Added Score- 15pts max_2.docx

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

Growth or achievement measure(s) from these options.

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

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

Measures based on:

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

3.4) Grades K-3 ELA

Using the drop-down boxes below, select the 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	Webster's Kindergarten ELA Assessment
1	5) District, regional, or BOCES–developed assessments	Webster's 1st Grade ELA Assessment
2	5) District, regional, or BOCES–developed assessments	Webster's 2nd Grade ELA Assessment
3	5) District, regional, or BOCES–developed assessments	Webster's 3rd Grade ELA 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.	See attached charts in 3.13. Achievement is measured by Webster's locally developed grade-specific assessments in ELA. The specific target for each assessment will be a score of 65.
Highly Effective (18-20 points) Results are well above District- or BOCES-adopted expectations for growth or achievement for grade/subject.	70 - 100% are at or above 65.
Effective (9-17 points) Results meet District- or BOCES-adopted expectations for growth or achievement for grade/subject.	60 - 69% are at or above 65.
Developing (3 - 8 points) Results are below District- or BOCES-adopted expectations for growth or achievement for grade/subject.	50 - 59% are at or above 65.
Ineffective (0 - 2 points) Results are well below District- or BOCES-adopted expectations for growth or achievement for grade/subject.	0 - 49% are at or above 65.

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	Webster's Kindergarten Math Assessment
1	5) District, regional, or BOCES–developed assessments	Webster's 1st Grade Math Assessment
2	5) District, regional, or BOCES–developed assessments	Webster's 2nd grade Math Assessment
3	5) District, regional, or BOCES–developed assessments	Webster's 3rd grade Math 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.	See attached charts in 3.13. Achievement is measured by Webster's locally developed grade-specific assessments in Math. The specific target for each assessment will be a score of 65.
Highly Effective (18-20 points) Results are well above District- or BOCES-adopted expectations for growth or achievement for grade/subject.	70 - 100% are at or above 65.
Effective (9-17 points) Results meet District- or BOCES-adopted expectations for growth or achievement for grade/subject.	60 - 69% are at or above 65.
Developing (3 - 8 points) Results are below District -or BOCES-adopted expectations for growth or achievement for grade/subject.	50 - 59% are at or above 65.

Ineffective (0 - 2 points) Results are well below District- or BOCES-adopted expectations for growth or achievement for grade/subject.	0 - 49% are at or above 65.

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	Webster Locally Developed Science 6 Assessment
7	5) District, regional, or BOCES–developed assessments	Webster Locally Developed Science 7 Assessment
8	5) District, regional, or BOCES–developed assessments	Webster Locally 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.	See attached charts in 3.13. Achievement is measured by Webster's locally developed course- and grade-specific assessments in Science that are different from those in the growth subcomponent. Students will meet or exceed a score of "65" on these assessments.
Highly Effective (18 - 20 points) Results are well above District- or BOCES-adopted expectations for growth or achievement for grade/subject.	90 - 100% of students score at or above 65.
Effective (9 - 17 points) Results meet District- or BOCES-adopted expectations for growth or achievement for grade/subject.	75 - 89% of students score at or above 65.
Developing (3 - 8 points) Results are below District- or BOCES-adopted expectations for growth or achievement for grade/subject.	50 - 74% of students score at or above 65.
Ineffective (0 - 2 points) Results are well below District- or BOCES-adopted expectations for growth or achievement for grade/subject.	0 - 49% of students score at or above 65.

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	Webster Locally Developed Social Studies 6 Assessment
7	5) District, regional, or BOCES–developed assessments	Webster Locally Developed Social Studies 7 Assessment
8	5) District, regional, or BOCES–developed assessments	Webster Locally Developed Social Studies 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.	See attached charts in 3.13. Achievement is measured by Webster's locally developed course- and grade-specific assessments in Social Studies that are different from those in the growth subcomponent. Students will meet or exceed a score of "65" on these assessments.
Highly Effective (18 - 20 points) Results are well above District- or BOCES-adopted expectations for growth or achievement for grade/subject.	90 - 100% of students score at or above 65.
Effective (9 - 17 points) Results meet District- or BOCES-adopted expectations for growth or achievement for grade/subject.	75 - 89% of students score at or above 65.
Developing (3 - 8 points) Results are below District- or BOCES-adopted expectations for growth or achievement for grade/subject.	50 - 74% of students score at or above 65.
Ineffective (0 - 2 points) Results are well below District- or BOCES-adopted expectations for growth or achievement for grade/subject.	0 - 49% of students score at or above 65.

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	Webster Locally Developed Global 1 Assessment
Global 2	5) District, regional, or BOCES–developed assessments	Webster Locally Developed Global 2 Assessment
American History	5) District, regional, or BOCES–developed assessments	Webster Locally Developed American History Assessment

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

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

Use this box, if needed, to describe the general process for assigning HEDI categories for these grades/subjects in this subcomponent. If needed, you may upload a table or graphic at 3.13, below.	See attached charts in 3.13. Achievement is measured by Webster's locally developed course- and grade-specific assessments in Social Studies that are different from those in the growth subcomponent. Students will meet or exceed a score of "65" on these assessments.
Highly Effective (18 - 20 points) Results are well above District- or BOCES-adopted expectations for growth or achievement for grade/subject.	90- 100% of students score at or above 65.
Effective (9 - 17 points) Results meet District- or BOCES-adopted expectations for growth or achievement for grade/subject.	75 - 89% of students score at or above 65.
Developing (3 - 8 points) Results are below District- or BOCES-adopted expectations for growth or achievement for grade/subject.	50 - 74% of students score at or above 65.
Ineffective (0 - 2 points) Results are well below District- or BOCES-adopted expectations for growth or achievement for grade/subject.	0 - 49% of students score at or above 65.

3.9) High School Science

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

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

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

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

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

Use this box, if needed, to describe the general process for assigning HEDI categories for these grades/subjects in this subcomponent. If needed, you may upload a table or graphic at 3.13, below.	See attached charts in 3.13. Achievement is measured by Webster's locally developed course- and grade-specific assessments in Science that are different from those in the growth subcomponent. Students will meet or exceed a score of "65" on these assessments.

Highly Effective (18-20 points) Results are well above District- or BOCES-adopted expectations for growth or achievement for grade/subject.	90 - 100% of students score at or above 65.
Developing (3 - 8 points) Results are below District- or BOCES-adopted expectations for growth or achievement for grade/subject.	75 - 89% of students score at or above 65
Effective (9 - 17points) Results meet District- or BOCES-adopted expectations for growth or achievement for grade/subject.	50 - 74% of students score at or above 65
Ineffective (0 - 2 points) Results are well below District- or BOCES-adopted expectations for growth or achievement for grade/subject.	0- 49% of students score at or above 65

3.10) High School Math

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

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

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

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

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

Use this box, if needed, to describe the general process for assigning HEDI categories for these grades/subjects in this subcomponent. If needed, you may upload a table or graphic at 3.13, below.	See attached charts in 3.13. Achievement is measured by Webster's locally developed course- and grade-specific assessments in Math that are different from those in the growth subcomponent. Students will meet or exceed a score of "65" on these assessments.
Highly Effective (18 - 20 points) Results are well above District- or BOCES-adopted expectations for growth or achievement for grade/subject.	90 - 100% of students score at or above 65
Effective (9 - 17 points) Results meet District- or BOCES-adopted expectations for growth or achievement for grade/subject.	75 - 89% of students score at or above 65

Developing (3 - 8 points) Results are below District- or BOCES-adopted expectations for growth or achievement for grade/subject.	50 - 74% of students score at or above 65
Ineffective (0 - 2 points) Results are well below District- or BOCES-adopted expectations for growth or achievement for grade/subject.	0 - 49% of students score at or above 65

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	Webster Locally Developed ELA 9 Assessment
Grade 10 ELA	5) District, regional, or BOCES–developed assessments	Webster Locally Developed ELA 10 Assessment
Grade 11 ELA	5) District, regional, or BOCES–developed assessments	Webster Locally Developed ELA 11 Assessment

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

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

Use this box, if needed, to describe the general process for assigning HEDI categories for these grades/subjects in this subcomponent. If needed, you may upload a table or graphic at 3.13, below.	See attached charts in 3.13. Achievement is measured by Webster's locally developed course- and grade-specific assessments in ELA that are different from those in the growth subcomponent. Students will meet or exceed a score of "65" on these assessments.
Highly Effective (18 - 20 points) Results are well above District- or BOCES-adopted expectations for growth or achievement for grade/subject.	90 - 100% of students score at or above 65
Effective (9 - 17 points) Results meet District- or BOCES-adopted expectations for growth or achievement for grade/subject.	75 - 89% of students score at or above 65
Developing (3 - 8 points) Results are below District- or BOCES-adopted expectations for growth or achievement for grade/subject.	50 - 74% of students score at or above 65
Ineffective (0 - 2 points) Results are well below District- or BOCES-adopted expectations for growth or achievement for grade/subject.	0 - 49% of students score at or above 65

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
K-12 Art	5) District/regional/BOCES–developed	Webster's Locally Developed Grade & Course Specific Art Assessments
K-12 Music	5) District/regional/BOCES–developed	Webster's Locally Developed Grade & Course Specific Music Assessments
K-12 Physical Education	5) District/regional/BOCES–developed	Webster's Locally Developed Grade & Course Specific PE Assessments
Special Education - K-3	5) District/regional/BOCES–developed	Webster's Locally Developed Grade 3 ELA Assessment
Special Education - 4-5	5) District/regional/BOCES–developed	Webster's Locally Developed Grade 5 ELA Assessment
Speical Education - 6-8	5) District/regional/BOCES–developed	Webster's Locally Developed Grade 8 ELA Assessment
Special Education - 9-12	5) District/regional/BOCES–developed	Webster's Locally Developed Grade 11 ELA Assessment
All other courses not named above	5) District/regional/BOCES–developed	Webster Locally Developed Assessment for Each Course

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.	See attached charts in 3.13. Achievement is measured by Webster's locally developed course- and grade-specific assessments that are different from those in the growth subcomponent. Students will meet or exceed a score of "65" on these assessments.
Highly Effective (18 - 20 points) Results are well above District- or BOCES -adopted expectations for growth or achievement for grade/subject.	90 - 100% of students score at or above 65
Effective (9 - 17 points) Results meet District- or BOCES-adopted expectations for growth or achievement for grade/subject.	75 - 89% of students score at or above 65
Developing (3 - 8 points) Results are below District- or BOCES-adopted expectations for growth or achievement for grade/subject.	50 - 74% of students score at or above 65

Ineffective (0 - 2 points) Results are well below District- or BOCES-adopted expectations for growth or achievement for grade/subject.	0 - 49% of students score at or above 65

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/5139/169201-y92vNseFa4/Teacher - Local Assessment Scoring- All Other Teachers -Elem, Middle, High_2.docx

3.14) Locally Developed Controls

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

(No response)

3.15) Teachers with More Than One Locally Selected Measure

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

We have only one locally selected measure for all teachers.

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, August 28, 2012
Updated Friday, October 19, 2012

Page 1

4.1) Teacher Practice Rubric

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

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

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

Danielson's Framework for Teaching (2011 Revised Edition)

(No response)

4.2) Points Within Other Measures

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

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

Is the following points assignment applicable to all teachers?

Yes

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

(No response)

Multiple (at least two) classroom observations by principal or other trained administrator, at least one of which must be unannounced [at least 31 points]	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.

Each of the Domains of the Danielson Teachscape Rubric (2011) must be evidenced annually. A rating of 4 (Distinguished), 3 (Proficient), 2 (Developing), 1 (Unsatisfactory) will be assigned to identified components within each Domain. Each of the NYS Teaching Standards will be evidenced annually through this process. An attached table illustrates the conversion process from rubric scores to points.

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 rating of highly effective is achieved by earning a rating of 59-60 points, equaling a rubric socre of 3.5-4.0 across the four domains of the Danielson Teachscape Rubric.
Effective: Overall performance and results meet NYS Teaching Standards.	A rating of effective is achieved by earning a rating of 57-58 points, equaling a rubric socre of 2.5-3.4 across the four domains of the Danielson Teachscape Rubric.
Developing: Overall performance and results need improvement in order to meet NYS Teaching Standards.	A rating of developing is achieved by earning a rating of 55-56 points, equaling a rubric socre of 1.5-2.4 across the four domains of the Danielson Teachscape Rubric.
Ineffective: Overall performance and results do not meet NYS Teaching Standards.	A rating of ineffective is achieved by earning a rating of 0-54 points, equaling a rubric socre of 1.0-1.4 across the four domains of the Danielson Teachscape Rubric.

Provide the ranges for the 60-point scoring bands.

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

4.6) Observations of Probationary Teachers

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

By building principals or other trained administrators

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

By trained in-school peer teachers or other trained reviewers

Formal/Long	0
Informal/Short	0

Independent evaluators

Formal/Long	0
Informal/Short	0

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

- In Person

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

- In Person

4.7) Observations of Tenured Teachers

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

By building principals or other trained administrators

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

By trained in-school peer teachers or other trained reviewers

Formal/Long	0
Informal/Short	0

Independent evaluators

Formal/Long	0
Informal/Short	0

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

- In Person

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

- In Person

5. Composite Scoring (Teachers)

Created Wednesday, August 22, 2012
Updated Tuesday, October 23, 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	55-56
Ineffective	0-54

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

2012-13 where Value-Added growth measure applies

Growth or Comparable Measures

Locally-selected Measures of

growth or achievement

Other Measures of Effectiveness

(60 points)

Overall

Composite Score

Highly Effective

22-25

14-15

Ranges determined locally--see above

91-100

Effective

10-21

8-13

75-90

Developing

3-9

3-7

65-74

Ineffective

0-2

0-2

0-64

6. Additional Requirements - Teachers

Created Thursday, August 16, 2012
Updated Monday, October 15, 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/5265/163776-Df0w3Xx5v6/Teacher - Improvement Plan and Form.docx

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:

12. Appeals Procedures

A. Grounds for an Appeal of an APPR or TIP

1. Appeal of the decisions made in assigning a rating for an Annual Evaluation through the proper application of the forms and

procedures outlined in the APPR documents shall be handled through the Appeals Process.
2. Only ratings of "Ineffective" and "Developing" shall be subject to the Appeals Process, unless the District adopts any kind of "pay for performance" plan in which financial benefits of any kind are linked to APPR performance scores, in which case "Effective" ratings shall also be subject to appeal. This caveat for "Effective" ratings does not apply to the appointment to auxiliary assignments such as Lead Teacher.
3. The appeal procedures shall provide for the timely and expeditious resolution of the appeal.
4. During the Appeals Process, additional supporting evidence will be accepted for the evaluated components. Supporting evidence may include testimony by the teacher, the evaluator, and the teacher's mentor (if applicable). No additional witnesses may be called except by mutual agreement of the teacher, evaluator, and the adjudicator(s) of the appeal. All other submitted evidence must be in written, printed, or electronic format.
5. A teacher may not file multiple appeals regarding the same performance review or TIP. All substantive grounds for appeal must be raised within one appeal, provided that the teacher knew or could reasonably have known the grounds existed at the time the appeal was initiated, in which case a further appeal may be filed only based upon such previously unknown grounds.
6. A TIP may only be appealed upon an appeal of the APPR rating for the school year during which the TIP was implemented.

B. Appeal Procedures

1. The notification of an APPR or improvement plan appeal shall be filed, in writing, within ten (10) school days after the teacher has received a written copy of the Annual Evaluation with completed Composite Rating Score, or a improvement plan. Notification of the appeal shall be provided to the superintendent of schools or his/her designee.
2. Within ten (10) school days of receipt of an appeal, the supervising administrator must submit a written response to the teacher and the superintendent (or designee). This written response will be accompanied by a Conference as described below. The response must include any and all additional documents or written materials that are specific to the point(s) of disagreement and/or are relevant to the resolution of the appeal. Material not submitted at the time the response is filed shall not be considered in the deliberations related to the resolution of the appeal.

C. Decisions on Appeals

Step 1: Conference with the Supervising Administrator. Within ten (10) school days of the filing of the appeal, the teacher shall have a conference with the supervising administrator to discuss the evaluation and areas of dispute. The teacher is entitled to have an Association representative present. If the teacher is not satisfied with the outcome of this conference, he/she may proceed to the second step. The second step shall be initiated by the teacher notifying the Superintendent or his/her designee in writing, within five (5) school days of the Conference.

Step 2: The appeal shall be heard by the APPR Review Committee. More than one APPR Review Committee may be formed (to hear different cases). The Review Committee shall include the following members:
1. One or two tenured administrators, certified to conduct evaluations, appointed by the Superintendent or his/her designee. The administrator(s) appointed shall not include the administrator who authored the evaluation, nor shall they include any administrator who has received an APPR rating of developing or ineffective for either of the previous two (2) years.
2. One or two tenured teachers appointed by the Association, who have not received an APPR rating of developing or ineffective for either of the previous two (2) years.

A response to the written appeal is due no more than twenty (20) school days after the receipt of the written appeal. The Review Committee may conduct an interview with the teacher and/or the evaluator and may request additional documentation. The teacher and evaluator shall have the opportunity to respond to any additional documentation provided to the Review Committee. The teacher may have an Association representative present at any interview and/or may decline an interview.

Upon conclusion of its consideration of an appeal, each member of the Review Committee shall vote to rescind, modify, or affirm the rating or improvement plan. If the Review Committee unanimously agrees upon one of these choices, the Committee shall give written notice of its decision to the appealing teacher, the Association president, and the Superintendent, and the decision of the Committee shall be final. The decision of the Committee shall set forth the reasons and factual basis for each of the specific issues raised in the appeal.

In the event the Review Committee is not unanimous in its decision on an appeal, each member of the Committee shall write a brief statement setting forth and explaining his or her recommendation for disposition of the appeal. The Review Committee members' written statements, together with the full record of the appeal, shall then be forwarded to the Association president, and the Superintendent, and the appeal progresses automatically to Step 3.

Step 3: Within ten (10) school days of receipt of the report from the Review Committee, the Superintendent shall issue a written decision affirming, modifying, or rejecting the rating or improvement plan. The decision of the Superintendent shall set forth the reasons and factual basis for the determination on each of the specific issues raised in the appeal. The decision of the superintendent

shall be final and binding.

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.

During the 2010 -2012 school years Webster Administrators (60) received extensive professional development from a Danielson Consultant in understanding and implementating the Danielson Framework for Teaching, 2011. This PD included: Overview and assumptions of the Framework for Teaching, collecting evidence, processes for observation and coaching teachers. Administrators viewed classroom videoes, gathered and compared evidence with peers, and participated in learning walks with the Danielson consultant to practice gathering and comparing evidence from classroom observations. Over a two year period administrators participated in 10 administrative meetings (75 min each) and two days of classroom learnig walks, learning about and praciticing the skils of evidence based observations.
During the 2012-13 school year Lead Evaluators (Principals) and all other district administrators will participate in Administrative leadership meetings (10) to build inter-rater reliability, practice determiing composite scores and setting targets for SLO and local assessments. In addition, the Danielson consultant will return to work with administrtors(6 days, including off-site coaching) to build district evaluators' capacitiy for inter -rater reliability, provide feedback on completed observation reports and differentiated coaching for administrators as needed based on review of completed reports. Adminstrators also received professional development during July 2012 on using teacher artifacts as evidence of teacher performance in Domanins 1 and 4.
Lead evaluator will continue to receive support in using the State Reporting System, devloping common assessment for SLOs and Local Achievements and setting targets for student growth.
The District Network Team - Assistant Superintendent and others attend professional development sessions in Albany and within BOCES to support and provde turnkey learning for all administrative staff.
All administrators conducting observations and writing evaluations have been provided with Ipads and training using Teachscape software to ensure consistency in implementtion of the observation process.
All Webster Administrators will recieve yearly training to ensure inter-rater reliability. A Teachscape evaluators assessment will be used to support all evaluators to ensure quality of observations against the Danielson rubrics.

Moving forward, this process will be followed for certifying and re-certifying lead evaluators in our district.

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, August 16, 2012
Updated Monday, October 15, 2012

Page 1

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

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

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

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

K - 5
6 - 8
9 - 12
(No response)
(No response)
(No response)
(No response)

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

Please check the boxes below:

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

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

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

State assessments, *required if one exists*

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

List of State-approved 3rd party assessments

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

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

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

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

Use this box, if needed, to describe the process for assigning HEDI categories in this subcomponent. If needed, you may upload a table or graphic below.	not applicable
Highly Effective (18 - 20 points) Results are well above state average for similar students (or District goals if no state test).	not applicable
Effective (9 - 17 points) Results meet state average for similar students (or District goals if no state test).	not applicable
Developing (3 - 8 points) Results are below state average for similar students (or District goals if no state test).	not applicable
Ineffective (0 - 2 points) Results are well below state average for similar students (or District goals if no state test).	not applicable

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

(No response)

7.4) Special Considerations for Comparable Growth Measures

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

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

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

(No response)

7.5) Principals with More Than One Growth Measure

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

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

7.6) Assurances -- Comparable Growth Measures

Please check all of the boxes below:

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

8. Local Measures (Principals)

Created Thursday, August 16, 2012
Updated Friday, October 19, 2012

Page 1

Locally-Selected Measures of Student Achievement or Growth

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

	Grade Configuration	Locally-Selected Measure from List of Approved Measures	Assessment
	K -5	(a) achievement on State assessments	4 & 5 NYS ELA & NYS Math
	6 -8	(a) achievement on State assessments	6,7,8 NYS ELA & NYS Math
	9-12	(e) 4, 5, and/or 6-year high school grad and/or dropout rates	5 year high school graduation rate

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

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

Use this box, if needed, to describe the process for assigning HEDI categories. If needed, you may upload a table or graphic below.	See attached chart. Hedi bands for Elementary and MS principals are determined by student proficiency on 4-8 NYS assessments. HEDI bands for high school principals will be based on 5-year graduation rates.
Highly Effective (14 - 15 points) Results are well above District- or BOCES-adopted expectations for growth or achievement for grade/subject.	For elementary and Middle School principals, 74- 100% of students in grades 4-8 are proficient in ELA and Math. For HS principals, the 5-year graduation rate is 94-100%.
Effective (8- 13 points) Results meet District- or BOCES-adopted expectations for growth or achievement for grade/subject.	For elementary and Middle School principals, 53-73% of students in grades 4-8 are proficient in ELA and Math. For HS principals, the 5-year graduation rate is 82-93%.
Developing (3 - 7 points) Results are below District- or BOCES-adopted expectations for growth or achievement for grade/subject.	For elementary and Middle School principals, 43-52% of students in grades 4-8 are proficient in ELA and Math. For HS principals, the 5-year graduation rate is 76-81%.
Ineffective (0 - 2 points) Results are well below District- or BOCES-adopted expectations for growth or achievement for grade/subject.	For elementary and Middle School principals, 0-42% of students in grades 4-8 are proficient in ELA and Math. For HS principals, the 5-year graduation rate is 0-75%.

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

(No response)

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

assets/survey-uploads/5366/163779-qBFVOWF7fC/Principal - Local Measures_2.docx

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

Use this box, if needed, to describe the process for assigning HEDI categories. If needed, you may upload a table or graphic below.	not applicable
Highly Effective (18 - 20 points) Results are well above District- or BOCES-adopted expectations for growth or achievement for grade/subject.	not applicable
Effective (9- 17 points) Results meet District- or BOCES-adopted expectations for growth or achievement for grade/subject.	not applicable
Developing (3 - 8 points) Results are below District- or BOCES-adopted expectations for growth or achievement for grade/subject.	not applicable
Ineffective (0 - 2 points) Results are well below District- or BOCES-adopted expectations for growth or achievement for grade/subject.	not applicable

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

(No response)

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

(No response)

8.3) Locally Developed Controls

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

(No response)

8.4) Principals with More Than One Locally Selected Measure

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

There are no principals with more than one locally selected measure.

8.5) Assurances

Please check all of the boxes below:

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

9. Other Measures of Effectiveness (Principals)

Created Thursday, August 16, 2012
Updated Tuesday, October 23, 2012

Page 1

9.1) Principal Practice Rubric

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

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

Multidimensional Principal Performance Rubric

(No response)

9.2) Points Within Other Measures

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

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

Is the following points assignment for all principals?

Yes

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

(No response)

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

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

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

(No response)

9.3) Assurances -- Goals

Please check the boxes below (if applicable):

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

9.4) Sources of Evidence (if applicable)

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

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

9.5) Survey Tool(s) (if applicable)

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

(No response)

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

(No response)

(No response)

(No response)

9.6) Assurances

Please check all of the boxes below:

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

9.7) Process for Assigning Points and Determining HEDI Ratings

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

The following steps outline the process used to calculate the HEDI principal evaluation score. The score aggregates principals' ratings across all ovserved elements within the framework to result in a single score.
1. Determine the rating for each indicator under each of the 7 Domains on the Multidimensional Principal Practice Rubric. A performance score for each domain will be calculated based on a scoring scale from 0-12 points.
2. Each resulting column is then added, resulting in a total number of points (60 points maximum). See conversions chart labeled "Principal Other Measures Practice Rubric" which will be used to convert the rubric score to a HEDI score from 0-60 points. This HEDI score will be the principal's score for the "Other Measures" portion of the APPR.

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/5143/163780-pMADJ4gk6R/Principal -Other Measures- version 3- oct 22.docx

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

Highly Effective: Overall performance and results exceed standards.	Based on District's goals and priorities, the principal's overall performance and documented results exceeds the expectations of the ISLLC 2008 Standards as measured across the 7 domains of the Multi-Dimensional Principal Rubric. The overall composite score for a rating of highly effective will range from 59 - 60 points.
Effective: Overall performance and results meet standards.	Based on District's goals and priorities, the principal's overall performance and documented results meets the expectations of the ISLLC 2008 Standards as measured across the 7 domains of the Multi-Dimensional Principal Rubric. The overall composite score for a rating of highly effective will range from 57 - 58 points.
Developing: Overall performance and results need improvement in order to meet standards.	Based on District's goals and priorities, the principal's overall performance and documented results needs improvement in order to reach the expectations of the ISLLC 2008 Standards as measured across the 7 domains of the Multi-Dimensional Principal Rubric. The overall composite score for a rating of highly effective will range from 55 - 56 points.
Ineffective: Overall performance and results do not meet standards.	Based on District's goals and priorities, the principal's overall performance and documented results does not meet the expectations of the ISLLC 2008 Standards as measured across the 7 domains of the Multi-Dimensional Principal Rubric. The overall composite score for a

	rating of highly effective will range from 0 - 54 points.

Please provide the locally-negotiated 60 point scoring bands.

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

9.8) School Visits

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

Probationary Principals

By supervisor	2
By trained administrator	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 Wednesday, September 05, 2012
Updated Wednesday, September 19, 2012

Page 1

Standards for Rating Categories

Growth or Comparable Measures

Locally-selected Measures of

growth or achievement

Other Measures of Effectiveness

(Teacher and Leader standards)

Highly

Effective

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

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

Overall performance and results exceed ISLLC leadership standards.

Effective

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

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

Overall performance and results meet ISLLC leadership standards.

Developing

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

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

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

Ineffective

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

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

Overall performance and results do not meet ISLLC leadership standards.

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

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

2012-13 where there is no Value-Added measure

Growth or Comparable Measures

Locally-selected Measures of

growth or achievement

Other Measures of Effectiveness

(60 points)

Overall

Composite Score

Highly Effective

18-20

18-20

Ranges determined locally--see below

91-100

Effective

9-17

9-17

75-90

Developing

3-8

3-8

65-74

Ineffective

0-2

0-2

0-64

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

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

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

2012-13 where Value-Added growth measure applies

Growth or Comparable Measures

Locally-selected Measures of

growth or achievement

Other Measures of Effectiveness

(60 points)

Overall

Composite Score

Highly Effective

22-25

14-15

Ranges determined locally--see above

91-100

Effective

10-21

8-13

75-90

Developing

3-9

3-7

65-74

Ineffective

0-2

0-2

0-64

11. Additional Requirements - Principals

Created Thursday, August 16, 2012
Updated Friday, October 19, 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/5276/163782-Df0w3Xx5v6/Principal - Improvement Plan and Form.docx

11.3) Appeals Process

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

(1) the substance of the annual professional performance review

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

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

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

CHALLENGES IN AN APPEAL:

Appeals are limited to those identified by Education Law §3012-c, as follows:
(1) The substance of the annual professional performance review;
(2) The school district's adherence to the standards and methodologies required for such reviews;

(3) The adherence to Commissioner's Regulations, as applicable to such reviews;

(4) Compliance with any applicable locally negotiated procedures applicable to annual professional performance reviews or improvement plans; and

(5) The school district's issuance and/or implementation of the terms of the principal improvement plan.

RATINGS THAT MAY BE APPEALED:

Appeals of annual professional performance reviews may be brought for overall ratings of ineffective or developing. An appeal may only be initiated once a principal receives the overall composite score and rating.

PROHIBITION AGAINST MORE THAN ONE APPEAL:

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 such appeal. Any grounds not raised at the time the appeal is filed shall be deemed null and void.

TIME FRAME FOR FILING APPEAL:

All appeals must be submitted in writing no later than ten (10) business days of the date when the principal receives their final and complete annual professional performance review. If a principal is challenging the issuance of an improvement plan, appeals must be filed within five (5) business days of issuance of such plan.

The failure to file an appeal within these timeframes shall be deemed a waiver of the right to appeal and the appeal shall be deemed abandoned.

APPEAL PROCESS:
When filing an appeal, the principal must submit a detailed written description of the specific areas of disagreement over his or her performance review, or the issuance and/or implementation of the terms of his or her improvement plan and any additional documents or materials relevant to the appeal. The performance review and/or improvement plan being challenged must also be submitted with the appeal. Any information not submitted at the time the appeal is filed shall not be considered.

Within five (5) business days after receiving a principal's appeal, the superintendent will convene a Review Team comprised of two administrators appointed by the superintendent and two administrators appointed by the WELA president.
The role of the Review Team will be to evaluate the facts and evidence submitted by the principal and ultimately render a decision or submit written responses within twenty(20) school days from the time the team is convened by the Superintendent.

Each member of the Review Team shall vote to either uphold the APPR rating or improvement plan or modify the APPR rating or improvement plan. If the Review Team unanimously agrees on one of these choices, the Team shall give written notice of its decision to the appealing principal and superintendent, and the decision of the Review Team shall be final.

In the event the Review Team is not unanimous in its decision on an appeal, each member of the Team can write a brief statement setting forth and explaining his or her recommendation for disposition of the appeal. The Team members' written statements, together with the full record of the appeal, shall then be forwarded to the superintendent and the WELA president.

Within ten (10) business days of receipt of the written statements from the Review Team members, an outside evaluator selected by the superintendent (in consultation with the WELA president) shall review the Team's submissions. The outside evaluator shall then issue a written decision within ten (10) business days. The decision of the outside evaluator shall be final and binding and shall not be subject to further appeal under the collective bargaining agreement or in any administrative or judicial forum.

11.4) Training and Certification of Lead Evaluators and Evaluators

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

The superintendent of schools if the direct supervisor for the principals and will be the lead evaluator for APPR. She has received training on the Multi Dimensional Rubric from Giselle Martn-Kniep (1 day) as well as training on the rubric from other members of Learner Centered Initiatives (1 day). She attended multiple LEAF training sessions which covered all ISLC standards and has been an active participant in the LEAF subscription service ongoing leadership development. She has presented a workshop at the Mid Hudson Principal's Academy on domain 7 of the rubric: goal setting and attainment.
The superintendent has participated in 7 training sessions with administrators on gathering evidence-based overvations with Candi

McKay (trainer for Charlotte Danielson).

Ongoing training will include continued participation in the ongoing LEAF subscription service. Contiued training with adminstration from Candi McKay on evidence based observations and inter-reliability, differentiated coaching, and developing professional learning plans. She will also work directly with Michael Murphy: Educational Coach and Consultant- Success Sytems on coaching strategies for principal growth. She will participate in ongoing training as offered by NYSCOSS, SED, and BOCES.

The above process will continue to be followed for certifying and periodic recertification of the lead evaluator.

11.5) Assurances -- Evaluators

Please check the boxes below:

- Checked

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

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

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

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

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

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

(7) use of the Statewide Instructional Reporting System

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

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

- Checked

11.6) Assurances -- Principals

Please check all of the boxes below:

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

11.7) Assurances -- Data

Please check all of the boxes below:

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

12. Joint Certification of APPR Plan

Created Wednesday, September 05, 2012
Updated Tuesday, October 23, 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/5581/172525-3Uqgn5g9Iu/APPR Certification Form 10-23-12.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.

SLO SCORING SHEET for Elementary Schools

HEDI Criteria: Translating % of students hitting targets into points

Note: These percentages will be the same for all K-3 classroom and intervention teachers.

Highly Effective 70-100% of students		**Effective 60-69% of students**		**Developing 50-59% of students**		**Ineffective 0-49% of students**	
HEDI Points	% of students meeting or exceeding growth target	HEDI Points	% of students meeting or exceeding growth target	HEDI Points	% of students meeting or exceeding growth target	HEDI Points	% of students meeting or exceeding growth target
20	80-100	17	69	8	58-59	2	33-49
19	75-79	16	68	7	56-57	1	16-32
18	70-74	15	67	6	55	0	0-15
		14	66	5	54		
		13	65	4	52-53		
		12	64	3	50-51		
		11	63				
		10	61-62				
		9	60				

SLO SCORING SHEET for Middle & High Schools

HEDI Criteria: Translating % of students hitting targets into points

Note: These percentages will be the same for all teachers regardless of grade level & content area.

Highly Effective 90-100% of students		**Effective 75-89% of students**		**Developing 50-74% of students**		**Ineffective 0-49% of students**	
HEDI Points	% of students meeting individualized growth target	HEDI Points	% of students meeting individualized growth target	HEDI Points	% of students meeting individualized growth target	HEDI Points	% of students meeting individualized growth target
20	96-100	17	88-89	8	70-74	2	33-49
19	93-95	16	86-87	7	66-69	1	16-32
18	90-92	15	85	6	62-65	0	0-15
		14	83-84	5	58-61		
		13	81-82	4	54-57		
		12	80	3	50-53		
		11	78-79				
		10	76-77				
		9	75				

3.3 - LOCAL ASSESSMENT SCORING

Elementary School Teachers (4TH-5TH) with an Approved Value-Added Measure

HEDI Criteria: Translating % of students hitting targets into points

Note: These percentages will be the same for all teachers regardless of grade level & content area.

Highly Effective 70-100% of students		**Effective 60-69% of students**		**Developing 50-59% of students**		**Ineffective 0-49% of students**	
HEDI Points	% of students meeting target	HEDI Points	% of students meeting target	HEDI Points	% of students meeting target	HEDI Points	% of students meeting target
15	80-100	13	68-69	7	58-59	2	33-49
14	70-79	12	67	6	56-57	1	16-32
		11	66	5	55	0	0-15
		10	64-65	4	53-54		
		9	62-63	3	50-52		
		8	60-61				

Middle School Teachers (6TH-8TH) with an Approved Value-Added Measure

HEDI Criteria: Translating % of students hitting targets into points

Note: These percentages will be the same for all teachers regardless of grade level & content area.

Highly Effective 90-100% of students		**Effective 75-89% of students**		**Developing 50-74% of students**		**Ineffective 0-49% of students**	
HEDI Points	% of students meeting target	HEDI Points	% of students meeting target	HEDI Points	% of students meeting target	HEDI Points	% of students meeting target
15	94-100	13	87-89	7	70-74	2	33-49
14	90-93	12	85-86	6	65-69	1	16-32
		11	83-84	5	60-64	0	0-15
		10	80-82	4	55-59		
		9	78-79	3	50-54		
		8	75-77				

3.13 - LOCAL ASSESSMENT SCORING for Elementary Schools - Teachers Without An Approved Value-Added Measure

HEDI Criteria: Translating % of students hitting targets into points

Note: These percentages will be the same for all teachers regardless of grade level & content area.

Highly Effective 70-100% of students		**Effective 60-69% of students**		**Developing 50-59% of students**		**Ineffective 0-49% of students**	
HEDI Points	% of students meeting target ("65" on Locally Developed Assessment)	HEDI Points	% of students meeting target ("65" on Locally Developed Assessment)	HEDI Points	% of students meeting target ("65" on Locally Developed Assessment)	HEDI Points	% of students meeting target ("65" on Locally Developed Assessment)
20	80-100	17	69	8	58-59	2	33-49
19	75-79	16	68	7	56-57	1	16-32
18	70-74	15	67	6	55	0	0-15
		14	66	5	54		
		13	65	4	52-53		
		12	64	3	50-51		
		11	63				
		10	61-62				
		9	60				

LOCAL ASSESSMENT SCORING for Middle & High Schools – Teachers Without An Approved Value-Added Measure

HEDI Criteria: Translating % of students hitting targets into points

Note: These percentages will be the same for all teachers regardless of grade level & content area.

Highly Effective 90-100% of students		**Effective 75-89% of students**		**Developing 50-74% of students**		**Ineffective 0-49% of students**	
HEDI Points	% of students meeting target ("65" on Locally Developed Assessment)	HEDI Points	% of students meeting target ("65" on Locally Developed Assessment)	HEDI Points	% of students meeting target ("65" on Locally Developed Assessment)	HEDI Points	% of students meeting target ("65" on Locally Developed Assessment)
20	96-100	17	88-89	8	70-74	2	33-49
19	93-95	16	86-87	7	66-69	1	16-32
18	90-92	15	85	6	62-65	0	0-15
		14	83-84	5	58-61		
		13	81-82	4	54-57		
		12	80	3	50-53		
		11	78-79				
		10	76-77				
		9	75				

WEBSTER CENTRAL SCHOOL DISTRICT

ANNUAL PERFORMANCE REVIEW

SCORING SHEETS

Evaluation Guidelines for Multiple Measures of Teacher Effectiveness – 60 points

1) All four of the "Domains of Teaching" will be included in the teacher Annual Professional Performance Review every year, thereby ensuring that all 7 of the NYS Standards are addressed on an annual basis.
2) Each component will be evaluated using the Danielson Teachscape rubric. Rubric scores will then be converted to points using these score sheets and conversion tables.

Rubric Ranges for HEDI Rating Categories

HEDI Rating	Rubric Ranges
Ineffective	1.0 -- 1.4
Developing	1.5 -- 2.4
Effective	2.5 -- 3.4
Highly Effective	3.5 -- 4.0

Point Ranges for HEDI Rating Categories

NYS Rating Category	Corresponding Points (x/60)	Corresponding Danielson Category
Ineffective	0 – 54	Unsatisfactory
Developing	55 – 56	Basic
Effective	57 – 58	Proficient
Highly Effective	59 – 60	Distinguished

PROFESSIONAL LEARNING PLAN

Teacher _____

Curriculum area _____

I. OTHER MEASURES of EFFECTIVENESS – 60 points

Domain 1: Planning & Preparation		Included Yes = X	Rubric score	Measures used – certified evaluator observation, teacher portfolio, student work, etc
1a	Demonstrating knowledge of content & pedagogy			Artifacts:
1b	Demonstrating knowledge of students	X		Artifacts:
1c	Setting instructional outcomes	X		Artifacts:
1d	Demonstrating knowledge of resources			Artifacts:
1e	Designing coherent instruction	X		Artifacts:
1f	Designing student assessments			Artifacts:
Domain 4: Professional Responsibilities				
4a	Reflecting on teaching	X		Artifacts:
4b	Maintaining accurate records			Artifacts:
4c	Communicating with families			Artifacts:
4d	Participating in a professional community			Artifacts:
4e	Growing and developing professionally			Artifacts:
4f	Demonstrating professionalism			Artifacts:

Domain 2: Classroom Environment		Included Yes = X	Rubric score	Measures used – certified evaluator observation, teacher portfolio, student work, etc
2a	Creating an environment of respect & rapport			Certified evaluator observation
2b	Establishing a culture for learning	X		Certified evaluator observation
2c	Managing classroom procedures	X		Certified evaluator observation
2d	Managing student behavior			Certified evaluator observation
2e	Organizing physical space	X		Certified evaluator observation
Domain 3: Instruction				
3a	Communicating with students			Certified evaluator observation
3b	Using questioning & discussion techniques		X	Certified evaluator observation
3c	Engaging students in learning		X	Certified evaluator observation
3d	Using assessment in instruction		X	Certified evaluator observation
3e	Demonstrating flexibility and responsiveness		X	Certified evaluator observation

X = District Required Components **✓ = Teacher/Identified Components**

II. Rubric Score and Composite Points

Rubric Score Evidence Binder: Domains 1 & 4		**Rubric Score for Classroom Observation: Domains 2 & 3**	
Total rubric points divided by number of measured components:	Total points from Evidence Binder Conversion Table A:	Total rubric points divided by number of measured components:	Total points from Observation Conversion Table B:

III. Tables for Conversion of Rubric Score to Composite Points

A. Evidence Binder Conversion Table from Final Rubric Score to Points (Domains 1 & 4)

Highly Effective		Effective		Developing		Ineffective	
Rubric	Points	Rubric	Points	Rubric	Points	Rubric	Points
4	27	3.4	26.4	2.4	25.4	1.40	24.0
3.9	26.9	3.3	26.3	2.3	25.3	1.39	23.4
3.8	26.8	3.2	26.2	2.2	25.2	1.38	22.8
3.7	26.7	3.1	26.1	2.1	25.1	1.37	22.2
3.6	26.6	3.0	26.0	2.0	25.0	1.36	21.6
3.5	26.5	2.9	25.9	1.9	24.9	1.35	21.0
		2.8	25.8	1.8	24.8	1.34	20.4
		2.7	25.7	1.7	24.7	1.33	19.8
		2.6	25.6	1.6	24.6	1.32	19.2
		2.5	25.5	1.5	24.5	1.31	18.6
						1.30	18.0
						1.29	17.4
						1.28	16.8
						1.27	16.2
						1.26	15.6
						1.25	15.0
						1.24	14.4
						1.23	13.8
						1.22	13.2
						1.21	12.6
						1.20	12.0
						1.19	11.4
						1.18	10.8
						1.17	10.2
						1.16	9.6
						1.15	9.0
						1.14	8.4
						1.13	7.8
						1.12	7.2
						1.11	6.6
						1.10	6.0
						1.09	5.4
						1.08	4.8
						1.07	4.2
						1.06	3.6
						1.05	3.0
						1.04	2.4
						1.03	1.8
						1.02	1.2
						1.01	0.6
						1.00	0

B. Classroom Observations Conversion Table from Final Rubric Score to Points (Domains 2 & 3)

Highly Effective		Effective		Developing		Ineffective	
Rubric	Points	Rubric	Points	Rubric	Points	Rubric	Points
4	33	3.4	32.4	2.4	31.4	1.40	30.0
3.9	32.9	3.3	32.3	2.3	31.3	1.39	29.3
3.8	32.8	3.2	32.2	2.2	31.2	1.38	28.5
3.7	32.7	3.1	32.1	2.1	31.1	1.37	27.8
3.6	32.6	3.0	32.0	2.0	31.0	1.36	27.0
3.5	32.5	2.9	31.9	1.9	30.9	1.35	26.3
		2.8	31.8	1.8	30.8	1.34	25.5
		2.7	31.7	1.7	30.7	1.33	24.8
		2.6	31.6	1.6	30.6	1.32	24.0
		2.5	31.5	1.5	30.5	1.31	23.3
						1.30	22.5
						1.29	21.8
						1.28	20.0
						1.27	19.3
						1.26	19.5
						1.25	18.8
						1.24	18.0
						1.23	17.3
						1.22	16.5
						1.21	15.8
						1.20	15.0
						1.19	14.2
						1.18	13.1
						1.17	12.8
						1.16	12.0
						1.15	11.3
						1.14	10.5
						1.13	9.8
						1.12	9.0
						1.11	8.3
						1.10	7.5
						1.09	6.8
						1.08	6.0
						1.07	5.3
						1.06	4.5
						1.05	3.8
						1.04	3.0
						1.03	2.3
						1.02	1.5
						1.01	0.8
						1.00	0

Points totals for Other Measures of Teacher Effectiveness

Classroom Observation Points (from conversion table)	Evidence Binder Points (from conversion table)	Total Points (Other Measures of Effectiveness; 60 maximum)

IV. Scoring Bands - Other Measures of Effectiveness – 60 points

Rubric Ranges for HEDI Rating Categories

HEDI Rating	Rubric Ranges
Ineffective	1.0 – 1.4
Developing	1.5 – 2.4
Effective	2.5 – 3.4
Highly Effective	3.5 – 4.0

Point Ranges for HEDI Rating Categories

NYS Rating Category	Corresponding Points (x/60)	Corresponding Danielson Category
Ineffective	0 - 54	Unsatisfactory
Developing	55 - 56	Basic
Effective	57 - 58	Proficient
Highly Effective	59 - 60	Distinguished

Date Su

8.1 - LOCAL ACHIEVEMENT MEASURES FOR PRINCIPALS (15 PTS.)

Local Achievement Target:

1) 70 % of Webster CSD's 4th and 5th grade students will score Proficient on the current school year's ELA and Math exams.
2) 70% of our District's 6th, 7th and 8th grade students will score Proficient on the current school year's NYS ELA and Math assessments.
3) Webster CSD's 5-year graduation rate will be 93%

Assessment used to measure achievement:

1) NYS Assessments in 4th and 5th grade ELA and Math
2) NYS Assessments in 6th, 7th, and 8th grade ELA and Math
3) Five Year District Graduation Rate

Scoring Methodology (Target attainment categories with related points and HEDI designations (see page 2), including relative value if multiple targets are utilized):

Proficiency on NYS ELA and Math Assessments (%)	Points Earned by Elementary & Middle School Principals (max of 15 points)	Five year graduation rate	Points Earned by High School (Grades 9-12) Principals (max of 15)
85-100%	15	96-100	15
74-84%	14	94-95	14
69-73%	13	92-93	13
64-68%	12	90-91	12
59-63%	11	88-89	11
57-58%	10	86-87	10
55-56%	9	84-85	9
53-54%	8	82-83	8
51-52%	7	80-81	7
49-50%	6	79	6
47-48%	5	78	5
45-46%	4	77	4
43-44%	3	76	3
41-42%	2	74-75	2
31-40%	1	72-73	1
0-30%	0	0-71	0

SECTION III: "OTHER" MEASURES OF EFFECTIVENESS (60 POINTS)

Webster Central School District

Principal's Leadership and Management

Assessment Summary: LCI Multidimensional Rubric

Using the rubric, the superintendent will circle the descriptor for each item that best matches the principal's performance. Using a holistic approach, a HEDI rating shall then be determined for each domain. Based on the rating on the rubric, points will be assigned according to the ranges below.

Name of Principal _____

School Year _____

Domain	Highly Effective	Effective	Developing	Ineffective
Shared Vision of Learning	**10**	**7.5**	**5**	**0-1**
School Culture and Instructional Program	**12**	**9**	**5.5**	**0-1**
Safe, Efficient, Effective Learning Environment	**6**	**5**	**3.5**	**0-1**
Community	**10**	**7.5**	**5**	**0-1**
Integrity, Fairness, Ethics	**6**	**5**	**3.5**	**0-1**
Political, Social, Economic, Legal and Cultural Context	**4**	**3**	**2**	**0-1**
OPTIONAL –Other: Goal Setting and Attainment	**12**	**9**	**5.5**	**0-1**

Total Points From Rubric = _____

Rubric Performance Levels and Score Scale	
Total Points from Rubric above:	**Points Earned (60 max)**
55.5-60	60
49.5-55	59
41.5-49	58
34-41	57
30-33.5	56
28.5-29.5	55
27-28	54
26.5	53
26	52
25.5	51
25	50
24.5	49
24	48
23.5	47
23	46
22.5	45
22	44
21.5	43
21	42
20.5	41
20	40
19.5	39
19	38
18.5	37
18	36
17.5	35
17	34
16.5	33
16	32
15.5	31
15	30
14.5	29
14	28
13.5	27
13	26
12.5	25
12	24
11.5	23
11	22
10.5	21
10	20
9.5	19
9	18
8.5	17

8	**16**
7.5	**15**
7	**14**
6.5	**13**
6	**12**
5.5	**11**
5	**10**
4.5	**9**
4	**8**
3.5	**7**
3	**6**
2.5	**5**
2	**4**
1.5	**3**
1	**2**
0.5	**1**
0	**0**

Points Awarded 0-60: _____

SECTION V – IMPROVEMENT PLAN

Webster Central School District
Principal Improvement Plan Process

Upon a final composite rating of ineffective or developing, an improvement plan designed to rectify perceived or demonstrated deficiencies must be developed and commenced no later than ten (10) school days after the receipt of the evaluation document. The superintendent, or designee, shall be responsible for the final drafting of a Principal Improvement Plan. The superintendent, or designee, in conjunction with the principal, will develop an improvement plan that contains:

1. A clear delineation of the deficiencies that resulted in the ineffective or developing assessment.
2. Specific improvement goal/outcome statements.
3. Specific improvement action steps/activities.
4. A reasonable timeline for achieving improvement.
5. Required and accessible resources to achieve goal.
6. A formative evaluation process documenting meetings strategically scheduled throughout the year to assess progress. These meetings shall occur at least twice during the year, one per semester. A written summary of feedback on progress shall be given within 15 business days of each meeting.
7. A clear manner in which improvement efforts will be assessed, including evidence demonstrating improvement.
8. A formal, final written summative assessment delineating progress made with an opportunity for comments by the principal.

Principal Improvement Plan

Name of Principal _____

School Building _____ Academic Year _____

Deficiency that promulgated the “ineffective” or “developing” performance rating:

Improvement Goal/Outcome:

Action Steps/Activities:

Timeline for completion:

Required and Accessible Resources, including identification of responsibility for provision:

Dates of formative evaluation on progress (lead evaluator and principal initial each date to confirm the meeting):

1st Semester:

2nd Semester:

Other:

Evidence to be provided for Goal Achievement:

Assessment Summary: Superintendent is to attach a narrative summary of improvement progress, including verification of the provision of support and resources as outlined above no later than 20 business days after the identified completion date. Such summary shall be signed by the superintendent and principal with the opportunity for the principal to attach comments.

Teacher Improvement Plans

It is recognized that in certain situations, it will be necessary for a teacher to be placed upon a Teacher Improvement Plan (TIP). The District and the Association understand and agree that the exclusive purpose of a TIP is the improvement of teaching practice and that the issuance of a TIP is not a disciplinary action. At any time that the decision is made to implement a TIP, the District shall promptly notify the Association president in writing (such as e-mail) identifying the specific member in need of improvement, and accommodations will be made for union representation.

If a teacher's performance is evaluated as "ineffective" or "developing", the supervisor will be required to develop a Teacher Improvement Plan in consultation with the teacher. The teacher shall be entitled to WTA representation for the development of this Plan. Such Plan will be provided to the staff member and implemented within ten days of the start of the school year within which the Plan will be applied. The Plan shall include, but not be limited to, an identification of the areas in need of improvement, a timeline for achieving improvement, suggestions for improvement, support to be provided, and measurable outcomes to be evaluated.

The Plan will describe the professional learning activities that the teacher must complete. These activities will be connected to the areas needing improvement. The artifacts that the teacher must produce that could serve as benchmarks for improvement and as evidence for the successful completion of their improvement plan will be described and could include such items as lessons, student work, or unit plans for a teacher and for a principal. The Plan will include the additional support and assistance that will be provided to the teacher. Upon completion of the improvement plan, the supervisor will meet with the teacher to review the plan, including artifacts and evidence in order to provide a final, summative rating fort the staff member. A supervisor may, at any time during the school year, place a teacher on an improvement plan if the supervisor believes that such plan will improve the performance of the teacher. The Association will be notified of this intent, and the teacher will be given the opportunity for WTA representation at all related meetings.

The TIP must consist of the following components:

1. Specific Areas for Improvement: Identify specific areas in need of improvement , referenced to components within the four domains of the Danielson Framework for Teaching. Develop specific, behaviorally written goals for the teacher to accomplish during the period of the Plan.
2. Expected Outcomes: Identify specific recommendations for what the teacher/principal is expected to do to improve in the identified areas. Delineate specific, realistic achievable activities for the teacher/principal.
3. Resources: Identify specific resources and support systems available to assist the teacher to improve performance. Examples: colleagues; coaches, role playing activities, visitations; courses; workshops; peer visits; materials; etc.
4. Responsibilities: Identify responsible administrator(s) and steps to be taken by administrator(s) and the teacher/principal throughout the Plan. Examples: classroom observations of the teacher; supervisory conferences between the teacher/principal and administrator(s); written reports and/or evaluations, etc.

5. Evidence of Achievement: Identify how progress will be measured and assessed. Specify next steps to be taken based upon whether the teacher is successful, partially successful or unsuccessful in efforts to improve performance.
6. Timeline: Provide a specific timeline for implementation of the various components for the TIP for its final completion. Identify the dates for preparation of written documentation regarding the completion of the Plan.

Sample Components Of A Teacher Improvement Plan

1. Targeted Goals: Areas For Improvement
   a. Instructional Planning
   b. Student Assessment
   c. Classroom Management
   d. Fulfillment of Professional responsibilities
      - Attendance
      - Communication with colleagues/administration
      - Communication with home

2. Expected Outcomes

List of specific expectations related to targeting goals identified in Section 1.

3. Recommended Activities

List of specific activities related to target goals identified in Section 1.

   a. Observe colleagues identified by Principal
   b. Attend workshops related to targeted goals
   c. Meeting with designated members of administration team on a defined schedule

4. Recommended Resources

   a. Identify the lead evaluator who has oversight of the TIP
   b. List specific materials, people, workshop to be used to support the TIP
   c. Identify the instrument or rubrics used to monitor progress

5. Evidence of Achievement

   a. Identify how progress will be measured and assessed
   b. Specify next steps to be taken based upon progress or lack thereof

6. Timeline for Measuring Achievement of Expected Outcomes

   a. Identify dates for classroom observations consistent with APPR Plan
   b. Identify dates for progress meetings with administrators related to each identified targeted goal

c. Identify dates for quarterly assessment of overall progress

All costs associated with the implementation of a TIP, including, but not limited to, tuition, fees, books and travel shall be borne by the District in their entirety. No disciplinary action predicated upon Ineffective performance shall be taken by the District against a teacher until the first improvement plan has been fully implemented and its effectiveness at improving the teacher's performance has been evaluated. If circumstances dictate, a revised improvement plan shall be developed in accordance with the above specified procedures.

A teacher who believes that the District has failed to meet its obligation to properly adhere to the procedures or implement the requirements of an improvement plan may seek relief through the contractual grievance processes. If a teacher believes that the terms of a TIP are inappropriate or defective, remedy shall be pursued through the Appeals Process.

Violations of the Evaluation procedures and timelines remain subject to the grievance process under the terms of contractual articles 6010 and 6020. Therefore the following conditions are subject to grievance:

1. The District's failure to adhere to the standards and methodologies required for the Annual Professional Performance Review, pursuant to Education Law §3012-c and applicable rules and regulations.
2. The District's failure to comply with either the applicable regulations of the Commissioner of Education, or locally negotiated procedures.
3. The District's failure to issue and/or implement the terms of the Teacher Improvement Plan (TIP) where applicable, as required under Education Law §3012-c.

Teacher Improvement Plan
Webster CSD

Name of Teacher _____
School Building _____ Academic Year_____

1. **Specific Area for Improvement (**i.e. Instructional Planning, Student Assessment, Classroom Management/Environment, Fulfillment of Professional Responsibilities such as Attendance, Communication with Colleagues/administration, Communication with home**):**

2. **Improvement Goal/Outcome -** List of specific expectations related to areas outlined in #1 above:

3. **Action Steps/Activities**: (i.e. Observe colleagues identified by principal and/or teacher, attend workshops related to targeted goals, meeting with designated members of administration team or PLC on a defined schedule)

4. **Required and Accessible Resources**:
    a. Identify the lead evaluator who has oversight of the TIP
    b. List specific materials, people, workshop to be used to support the TIP
    c. Identify the instrument or rubrics used to monitor progress

5. **Evidence of Achievement**:
    a. Identify how progress will be measured and assessed
    b. Specify next steps to be taken based upon progress or lack thereof

6. **Timeline for Measuring Achievement of Expected Outcomes**:
    a. Identify dates for classroom observations consistent with APPR plan
    b. Identify dates for progress meetings with administrators related to each identified targeted goal
    c. Identify dates for quarterly assessment of overall progress

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

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

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

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

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

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

Signatures, dates

Superintendent Signature: Date: 10/23/2012

Adell Bovard

Teachers Union President Signature: Date: 10/23/2012

Administrative Union President Signature: Date: 10/23/12

Board of Education President Signature: Date: 10/23/12