



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

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

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

January 3, 2013

John J. Hogan, Superintendent
West Hempstead Union Free School District
252 Chestnut Street
West Hempstead, NY 11552

Dear Superintendent Hogan:

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: Thomas Rogers

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 Monday, May 14, 2012

Updated Thursday, December 27, 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 : 280227030000

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

280227030000

1.2) School District Name: WEST HEMPSTEAD UFSD

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

WEST HEMPSTEAD UFSD

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 Monday, May 14, 2012

Updated Thursday, January 03, 2013

Page 1

STATE-PROVIDED MEASURES OF STUDENT GROWTH

(25 points with an approved value-added measure)

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

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

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

2.1) Assurances

Please check the boxes below:

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

STUDENT LEARNING OBJECTIVES AS COMPARABLE GROWTH MEASURES (20 points)

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

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

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

If no State assessment or Regents exam exists:

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

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

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

State assessments, *required if one exists*

List of State-approved 3rd party assessments

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

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

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

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

2.2) Grades K-3 ELA

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

	ELA	Assessment
K	State-approved 3rd party assessment	STAR Early Literacy Enterprise
1	State-approved 3rd party assessment	STAR Reading Enterprise
2	State-approved 3rd party assessment	STAR Reading Enterprise

	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	Teachers in each grade level will develop individual SLOs. The SLOs for K-3 ELA will utilize State approved 3rd party
---	---

this subcomponent. If needed, you may upload a table or graphic at 2.11, below.	<p>assessments. For grade 3, the STAR assessment will be used as a pretest, and targets will be set for the 3rd Grade State Assessment. The same assessments will be used across all classrooms in the same grade level. Growth targets will be set based on the pretest of the students assigned to the teacher. Students' pretest scores will be the baseline and will be compared to the final assessment score to determine growth. The percentage of students meeting the growth target will be converted to a scale score of 0 to 20. The scale is shown in 2.11. Teachers can achieve all scale points from 0 to 20.</p>
Highly Effective (18 - 20 points) Results are well-above state average for similar students (or District goals if no state test).	If 85% to 100% of students meet SLO target, the teacher is rated Highly Effective.
Effective (9 - 17 points) Results meet state average for similar students (or District goals if no state test).	If 60% to 84% of students meet SLO target, the teacher is rated Effective.
Developing (3 - 8 points) Results are below state average for similar students (or District goals if no state test).	If 20% to 59% of students meet SLO target, the teacher is rated Developing.
Ineffective (0 - 2 points) Results are well-below state average for similar students (or District goals if no state test).	If 0% to 19% of students meet SLO target, the teacher is rated Ineffective.

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	State-approved 3rd party assessment	STAR Early Literacy Enterprise
1	State-approved 3rd party assessment	STAR Math Enterprise
2	State-approved 3rd party assessment	STAR Math Enterprise
	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.	<p>Teachers in each grade level will develop individual SLOs The SLOs for K-3 Math will utilize State approved 3rd party assessments. For grade 3, the STAR assessment will be used as a pretest, and targets will be set for the 3rd Grade State</p>
---	---

Assessment. The same assessments will be used across all classrooms in the same grade level. Growth targets will be set based on the pretest of the students assigned to the teacher. Students' pretest scores will be the baseline and will be compared to the final assessment score to determine growth. The percentage of students meeting the growth target will be converted to a scale score of 0 to 20. The scale is shown in 2.11. Teachers can achieve all scale points from 0 to 20.

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

If 85% to 100% of students meet SLO target, the teacher is rated Highly Effective.

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

If 60% to 84% of students meet SLO target, the teacher is rated Effective.

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

If 20% to 59% of students meet SLO target, the teacher is rated Developing.

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

If 0% to 19% of students meet SLO target, the teacher is rated Ineffective.

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	West Hempstead UFSD-developed 6th grade science summative assessment
7	District, regional or BOCES-developed assessment	West Hempstead UFSD-developed 7th grade science summative 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.

Teachers in each grade level will develop individual SLOs. The SLOs for Grades 6-7 Science will utilize the West Hempstead developed summative Science assessment. The SLO for 8th grade Science will utilize the 8th Grade State Science assessment. The same assessments will be used across all classrooms in the same

grade level. Growth targets will be set based on the West Hempstead developed Science benchmark assessment administered at the beginning of the school year. All teachers will administer the same benchmark in classes across the grade level. The benchmark assessment will be the baseline and will be compared to the summative assessment score to determine growth. The percentage of students meeting the growth target will be converted to scale points from 0 to 20. The scale is shown in 2.11. Teachers can achieve all scale points from 0 to 20.

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

If 85% to 100% of students meet SLO target, the teacher is rated Highly Effective.

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

If 60% to 84% of students meet SLO target, the teacher is rated Effective.

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

If 20% to 59% of students meet SLO target, the teacher is rated Developing.

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

If 0% to 19% of students meet SLO target, the teacher is rated Ineffective.

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	West Hempstead UFSD-developed 6th grade Social Studies summative assessment
7	District, regional or BOCES-developed assessment	West Hempstead UFSD-developed 7th grade Social Studies summative assessment
8	District, regional or BOCES-developed assessment	West Hempstead UFSD-developed 8th grade Social Studies summative 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.

Teachers in each grade level will develop individual SLOs. The SLOs for Grades 6-8 Social Studies will utilize the West Hempstead developed summative Social Studies assessment. The same assessments will be used across all classrooms in the same grade level. Growth targets will be set based on the West Hempstead developed benchmark Social Studies assessment administered at the beginning of the school year. All teachers will administer the same benchmark in classes across the grade level. The benchmark assessment will be the baseline and will be

compared to the summative assessment score to determine growth. The percentage of students meeting the growth target will be converted to a scale score of 0 to 20. The scale is shown in 2.11. Teachers can achieve all scale points from 0 to 20.

Highly Effective (18 - 20 points) Results are well-above District goals for similar students.	If 85% to 100% of students meet SLO target, the teacher is rated Highly Effective.
Effective (9 - 17 points) Results meet District goals for similar students.	If 60% to 84% of students meet SLO target, the teacher is rated Effective.
Developing (3 - 8 points) Results are below District goals for similar students.	If 20% to 59% of students meet SLO target, the teacher is rated Developing.
Ineffective (0 - 2 points) Results are well-below District goals for similar students.	If 0% to 19% of students meet SLO target, the teacher is rated Ineffective.

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	West Hempstead developed summative 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.	Teachers in each grade level will develop individual SLOs. The SLOs for high school Social Studies Regents Courses will be rigorous and comparable. The same assessment will be used across all classrooms in the same course. Growth targets will be set based on the West Hempstead developed baseline Social Studies assessments. This benchmark assessment will be the baseline and will be compared to the Regents assessment score or the District Developed Assessment for Global 1 score to determine growth. The percentage of students meeting
---	--

the growth target will be converted to a scale score of 0 to 20. The scale is shown in 2.11. Teachers can achieve all scale points from 0 to 20.

Highly Effective (18 - 20 points) Results are well-above District goals for similar students.	If 85% to 100% of students meet SLO target, the teacher is rated Highly Effective.
Effective (9 - 17 points) Results meet District goals for similar students.	If 60% to 84% of students meet SLO target, the teacher is rated Effective.
Developing (3 - 8 points) Results are below District goals for similar students.	If 20% to 59% of students meet SLO target, the teacher is rated Developing.
Ineffective (0 - 2 points) Results are well-below District goals for similar students.	If 0% to 19% of students meet SLO target, the teacher is rated Ineffective.

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.	Teachers in each grade level will develop individual SLOs. The SLOs for high school Science Regents Courses will be rigorous and comparable. The same assessment will be used across all classrooms in the same course. Growth targets will be set based on the West Hempstead developed baseline Science assessments. These benchmark assessments will be the baseline and will be compared to the Regents assessment score. The percentage of students meeting the growth target will be converted to a scale score of 0 to 20. The scale is shown in 2.11. Teachers can achieve all scale points from 0 to 20.
Highly Effective (18 - 20 points) Results are well-above District goals for similar students.	If 85% to 100% of students meet SLO target, the teacher is rated Highly Effective.
Effective (9 - 17 points) Results meet District goals for similar students.	If 60% to 84% of students meet SLO target, the teacher is rated Effective.

Developing (3 - 8 points) Results are below District goals for similar students.	If 20% to 59% of students meet SLO target, the teacher is rated Developing.
Ineffective (0 - 2 points) Results are well-below District goals for similar students.	If 0% to 19% of students meet SLO target, the teacher is rated Ineffective.

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.	Teachers in each grade level will develop individual SLOs. The SLOs for high school Math Regents Courses will be rigorous and comparable. The same assessment will be used across all classrooms in the same course. Growth targets will be set based on the West Hempstead developed baseline Math assessments. These benchmark assessments will be the baseline and will be compared to the Regents assessment scores. The percentage of students meeting the growth target will be converted to a scale score of 0 to 20. The scale is shown in 2.11. Teachers can achieve all scale points from 0 to 20.
Highly Effective (18 - 20 points) Results are well-above District goals for similar students.	If 85% to 100% of students meet SLO target, the teacher is rated Highly Effective.
Effective (9 - 17 points) Results meet District goals for similar students.	If 60% to 84% of students meet SLO target, the teacher is rated Effective.
Developing (3 - 8 points) Results are below District goals for similar students.	If 20% to 59% of students meet SLO target, the teacher is rated Developing.
Ineffective (0 - 2 points) Results are well-below District goals for similar students.	If 0% to 19% of students meet SLO target, the teacher is rated Ineffective.

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	West Hempstead UFSD-developed 9th grade ELA summative assessment
Grade 10 ELA	District, regional or BOCES-developed assessment	West Hempstead UFSD-developed 10th grade ELA summative assessment
Grade 11 ELA	Regents assessment	English 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.	Teachers in each grade level will develop individual SLOs. The SLOs for Grades 9-10 ELA will utilize the West Hempstead developed summative ELA assessment. The SLO for 11th grade ELA will utilize the English Regents. The same assessments will be used across all classrooms in the same grade level. Growth targets will be set based on the West Hempstead developed ELA benchmark assessments administered at the beginning of the school year. All teachers will administer the same benchmark in classes across the grade level. The benchmark assessment will be the baseline and will be compared to the summative assessment score to determine growth. The percentage of students meeting the growth target will be converted to a scale score from 0 to 20. The scale is shown in 2.11. Teachers can achieve a score from 0 to 20.
Highly Effective (18 - 20 points) Results are well-above District goals for similar students.	If 85% to 100% of students meet SLO target, the teacher is rated Highly Effective.
Effective (9 - 17 points) Results meet District goals for similar students.	If 60% to 84% of students meet SLO target, the teacher is rated Effective.
Developing (3 - 8 points) Results are below District goals for similar students.	If 20% to 59% of students meet SLO target, the teacher is rated Developing.
Ineffective (0 - 2 points) Results are well-below District goals for similar students.	If 0% to 19% of students meet SLO target, the teacher is rated Ineffective.

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
-------------------------	--------	------------

Physical Education K-12	District, Regional or BOCES-developed	West Hempstead UFSD-developed grade specific Physical Education summative assessment
General Music K-8	District, Regional or BOCES-developed	West Hempstead UFSD-developed grade specific General Music summative assessment
Performance Music 4-12	District, Regional or BOCES-developed	West Hempstead UFSD-developed grade specific Performance Music summative assessment
Art K-12	District, Regional or BOCES-developed	West Hempstead UFSD-developed grade specific Art summative assessment
Library/Media K-5	District, Regional or BOCES-developed	West Hempstead UFSD-developed grade specific Library/Media summative assessment
Family and Consumer Science 7-12	District, Regional or BOCES-developed	West Hempstead UFSD-developed grade specific Family and Consumer Science summative assessment
Technology Education 7-8	District, Regional or BOCES-developed	West Hempstead UFSD-developed 7-8 Technology Education summative assessment
World Languages 6-12	District, Regional or BOCES-developed	West Hempstead UFSD-developed grade specific World Languages summative assessment
Business Education 9-12	District, Regional or BOCES-developed	West Hempstead UFSD-developed 9-12 Business Education summative assessment
Health 7-12	District, Regional or BOCES-developed	West Hempstead UFSD-developed grade specific Health summative assessment
English electives 9-12	District, Regional or BOCES-developed	West Hempstead UFSD-developed 9-12 English elective summative assessment
Math electives 9-12	District, Regional or BOCES-developed	West Hempstead UFSD-developed 9-12 Math elective summative assessment
Science electives 9-12	District, Regional or BOCES-developed	West Hempstead UFSD-developed 9-12 Science elective summative assessment
Social Studies electives 9-12	District, Regional or BOCES-developed	West Hempstead UFSD-developed 9-12 Social Studies elective summative assessment
Reading 9-12	District, Regional or BOCES-developed	West Hempstead UFSD-developed 9-12 Reading summative assessment
Reading K-2	District, Regional or BOCES-developed	West Hempstead UFSD-developed grade specific AIS summative assessment
ESL K-12	State Assessment	NYSESLAT K-12

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

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

Teachers in each grade level will develop individual SLOs. The SLOs for all courses will utilize a West Hempstead developed summative assessment. The same assessments will be used across all classrooms in the same course. Growth targets will be set based on a West Hempstead developed benchmark assessment administered at the beginning of the school year. All teachers will administer the same benchmark in each course. The benchmark assessment will be the baseline and will be

compared to the summative assessment score to determine growth.
The percentage of students meeting the growth target will be converted to a scale score from 0 to 20. The scale is shown in 2.11.
Teachers can achieve a score from 0 to 20.

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

If 85% to 100% of students meet SLO target, the teacher is rated Highly Effective.

Effective (9 - 17 points) Results meet District goals for similar students.

If 60% to 84% of students meet SLO target, the teacher is rated Effective.

Developing (3 - 8 points) Results are below District goals for similar students.

If 20% to 59% of students meet SLO target, the teacher is rated Developing.

Ineffective (0 - 2 points) Results are well-below District goals for similar students.

If 0% to 19% of students meet SLO target, the teacher is rated Ineffective.

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/5364/129138-TXEttx9bQW/HEDI Conversion Charts for Subcomponents A and B_1.pdf

2.12) Locally Developed Controls

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

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

(No response)

2.13) Teachers with more than one growth measure

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

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

students in each SLO.

2.14) Assurances

Please check all of the boxes below:

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

3. Local Measures (Teachers)

Created Monday, May 14, 2012

Updated Thursday, January 03, 2013

Page 1

Locally Selected Measures of Student Achievement or Growth

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

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

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

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

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

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

Growth or achievement measure(s) from these options.

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

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

Measures based on:

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

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

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

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

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

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

3.1) Grades 4-8 ELA

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

	Locally-Selected Measure from List of Approved Measures	Assessment
4	6(ii) School wide measure computed locally	NYS 3-5 ELA Assessment
5	6(ii) School wide measure computed locally	NYS 3-5 ELA Assessment
6	6(ii) School wide measure computed locally	NYS 6-8 ELA Assessment
7	6(ii) School wide measure computed locally	NYS 6-8 ELA Assessment
8	6(ii) School wide measure computed locally	NYS 6-8 ELA 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.

<p>Use this box, if needed, to describe the general process for assigning HEDI categories for these grades/subjects in this subcomponent. If needed, you may upload a table or graphic at 3.3, below.</p>	<p>We are using a school-wide measure based on the performance of the grade specific students taking the assessment listed above. In order to hold all teachers of every subject to the expectation of the Common Core Standards that every teacher is a teacher of literacy, the difference between the three year average of the School's Performance Index in ELA and the three year average of the New York State Performance Index in ELA will be computed individually for each school. The chart below delineates the conversion from difference in Performance Index, as noted above, to the HEDI score for teachers in the building. This score will be used as the second 20% (15%) for all teachers in the building.</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> -The Performance Index is a value from 0 to 200 that is assigned to an accountability group (in this case the group used will be "all students") indicating how that group performed on the State ELA tests. -At the elementary level, the PI is calculated using the following equation: $100 \times [(Count\ of\ Continuously\ Enrolled\ Tested\ Students\ Performing\ at\ Levels\ 2,\ 3,\ and\ 4 + the\ Count\ at\ Levels\ 3\ and\ 4) \div the\ Count\ of\ All\ Continuously\ Enrolled\ Tested\ Students]$ -At the secondary level, the PI is calculated using the following equation: $100 \times [(Count\ of\ Cohort\ Members\ Performing\ at\ Levels\ 2,\ 3,\ and\ 4 + the\ Count\ at\ Levels\ 3\ and\ 4) \div the\ Count\ of\ All\ Cohort\ Members]$ On the English Regents, scores between 85-100 correlate to a PI of 4, scores between 65-84 correlate to a PI of 3, and scores between 55-64 correlate to a PI of 2. -In order to compute the state and school wide PI average, the most recent three-year New York State PI data available and the 2010-2011, 2011-2012 and 2012-2013 school wide ELA scores will be used.
<p>Highly Effective (14 - 15 points) Results are well above District- or BOCES-adopted expectations for growth or achievement for grade/subject.</p>	<p>The three year ELA building average PI is 15 or more points greater than the NYS ELA three year average PI.</p>
<p>Effective (8- 13 points) Results meet District- or BOCES-adopted expectations for growth or achievement for grade/subject.</p>	<p>The three year ELA building average PI between 8 and 14 points greater than the NYS ELA three year average PI.</p>
<p>Developing (3 - 7 points) Results are below District- or BOCES-adopted expectations for growth or achievement for grade/subject.</p>	<p>The three year ELA building average PI is between 2 and 7 points greater than the NYS ELA three year average PI.</p>
<p>Ineffective (0 - 2 points) Results are well below District- or BOCES-adopted expectations for growth or achievement for grade/subject.</p>	<p>The three year ELA building average PI is less than 0 to 1.5 points greater than the NYS ELA three year average PI.</p>

3.2) Grades 4-8 Math

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

	Locally-Selected Measure from List of Approved Measures	Assessment
4	6(ii) School wide measure computed locally	NYS 3-5 ELA Assessment
5	6(ii) School wide measure computed locally	NYS 3-5 ELA Assessment
6	6(ii) School wide measure computed locally	NYS 6-8 ELA Assessment
7	6(ii) School wide measure computed locally	NYS 6-8 ELA Assessment
8	6(ii) School wide measure computed locally	NYS 6-8 ELA 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.

<p>Use this box, if needed, to describe the general process for assigning HEDI categories for these grades/subjects in this subcomponent. If needed, you may upload a table or graphic at 3.3, below.</p>	<p>We are using a school-wide measure based on the performance of the grade specific students taking the assessment listed above. In order to hold all teachers of every subject to the expectation of the Common Core Standards that every teacher is a teacher of literacy, the difference between the three year average of the School's Performance Index in ELA and the three year average of the New York State Performance Index in ELA will be computed individually for each school. The chart below delineates the conversion from difference in Performance Index, as noted above, to the HEDI score for teachers in the building. This score will be used as the second 20% (15%) for all teachers in the building.</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> -The Performance Index is a value from 0 to 200 that is assigned to an accountability group (in this case the group used will be "all students") indicating how that group performed on the State ELA tests. -At the elementary level, the PI is calculated using the following equation: $100 \times [(Count\ of\ Continuously\ Enrolled\ Tested\ Students\ Performing\ at\ Levels\ 2,\ 3,\ and\ 4 + the\ Count\ at\ Levels\ 3\ and\ 4) \div the\ Count\ of\ All\ Continuously\ Enrolled\ Tested\ Students]$ -At the secondary level, the PI is calculated using the following equation: $100 \times [(Count\ of\ Cohort\ Members\ Performing\ at\ Levels\ 2,\ 3,\ and\ 4 + the\ Count\ at\ Levels\ 3\ and\ 4) \div the\ Count\ of\ All\ Cohort\ Members]$ On the English Regents, scores between 85-100 correlate to a PI of 4, scores between 65-84 correlate to a PI of 3, and scores between 55-64 correlate to a PI of 2. -In order to compute the state and school wide PI average, the most recent three-year New York State PI data available and the 2010-2011, 2011-2012 and 2012-2013 school wide ELA scores will be used.
<p>Highly Effective (14 - 15 points) Results are well above District- or BOCES-adopted expectations for growth or achievement for grade/subject.</p>	<p>The three year ELA building average PI is 15 or more points greater than the NYS ELA three year average PI.</p>

Effective (8- 13 points) Results meet District- or BOCES-adopted expectations for growth or achievement for grade/subject.	The three year ELA building average PI between 8 and 14 points greater than the NYS ELA three year average PI.
Developing (3 - 7 points) Results are below District- or BOCES-adopted expectations for growth or achievement for grade/subject.	The three year ELA building average PI is between 2 and 7 points greater than the NYS ELA three year average PI.
Ineffective (0 - 2 points) Results are well below District- or BOCES-adopted expectations for growth or achievement for grade/subject.	The three year ELA building average PI is less than 0 to 1.5 points greater than the NYS ELA three year average PI.

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/5139/129139-rhJdBgDruP/HEDI Conversion Charts for Subcomponents A and B_1.pdf

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

Growth or achievement measure(s) from these options.

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

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

Measures based on:

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

3.4) Grades K-3 ELA

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

	Locally-Selected Measure from List of Approved Measures	Assessment
K	6(ii) School-wide measure computed locally	West Hempstead UFSD - developed ELA Kindergarten Summative Assessment
1	6(ii) School-wide measure computed locally	NYS 3-5 ELA Assessment
2	6(ii) School-wide measure computed locally	NYS 3-5 ELA Assessment
3	6(ii) School-wide measure computed locally	NYS 3-5 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.

We are using a school-wide measure based on the performance of the grade specific students taking the assessment listed above. In order to hold all teachers of every subject to the expectation of the Common Core Standards that every teacher is a teacher of literacy, the difference between the three year average of the School's Performance Index in ELA and the three year average of the New York State Performance Index in ELA will be computed individually for each school. The chart below

delineates the conversion from difference in Performance Index, as noted above, to the HEDI score for teachers in the building. This score will be used as the second 20% (15%) for all teachers in the building.

- The Performance Index is a value from 0 to 200 that is assigned to an accountability group (in this case the group used will be “all students”) indicating how that group performed on the State ELA tests.
- At the elementary level, the PI is calculated using the following equation: $100 \times \left[\frac{\text{Count of Continuously Enrolled Tested Students Performing at Levels 2, 3, and 4} + \text{the Count at Levels 3 and 4}}{\text{Count of All Continuously Enrolled Tested Students}} \right]$
- The locally selected measure of student achievement at the Chestnut Street Kindergarten Center will be based on locally selected assessments in math and ELA. Using pre-assessments and any other available data, achievement targets will be collaboratively set by teachers and approved by administrators. All locally developed assessments will be approved by the building principal and shall be rigorous and comparable across classrooms. All locally developed assessments shall be scored according to the HEDI band as indicated in the upload in 3.13 below.
- At the secondary level, the PI is calculated using the following equation: $100 \times \left[\frac{\text{Count of Cohort Members Performing at Levels 2, 3, and 4} + \text{the Count at Levels 3 and 4}}{\text{Count of All Cohort Members}} \right]$ On the English Regents, scores between 85-100 correlate to a PI of 4, scores between 65-84 correlate to a PI of 3, and scores between 55-64 correlate to a PI of 2.
- In order to compute the state and school wide PI average, the most recent three-year New York State PI data available and the 2010-2011, 2011-2012 and 2012-2013 school wide ELA scores will be used.

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

For grades 1 through 3, if the three year ELA building average PI is 15 or more points greater than the NYS ELA three year average PI teachers will be rated highly effective. In the Chestnut Kindergarten Center, growth targets will be collaboratively set by the administrators and teachers. If 85% to 100% of the students meet the targets set, the teachers will be rated highly effective.

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

For grades 1 through 3, if the three year ELA building average PI is 8 through 14 points greater than the NYS ELA three year average PI teachers will be rated effective. In the Chestnut Kindergarten Center, growth targets will be collaboratively set by the administrators and teachers. If 60% through 84% of the students meet the targets set, the teachers will be rated effective.

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

For grades 1 through 3, if the three year ELA building average PI is 2 through 7 points greater than the NYS ELA three year average PI teachers will be rated as developing. In the Chestnut Kindergarten Center, growth targets will be collaboratively set by the administrators and teachers. If 20% through 59% of the students meet the targets set, the teachers will be rated developing.

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

The three year ELA building average PI is less than 0 to 1.5 points greater than the NYS ELA three year average

for grade/subject.

PI.

3.5) Grades K-3 Math

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

	Locally-Selected Measure from List of Approved Measures	Assessment
K	6(ii) School-wide measure computed locally	West Hempstead UFSD - developed Math Kindergarten Summative Assessment
1	6(ii) School-wide measure computed locally	NYS 3-5 ELA Assessment
2	6(ii) School-wide measure computed locally	NYS 3-5 ELA Assessment
3	6(ii) School-wide measure computed locally	NYS 3-5 ELA 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.

We are using a school-wide measure based on the performance of the grade specific students taking the assessment listed above. In order to hold all teachers of every subject to the expectation of the Common Core Standards that every teacher is a teacher of literacy, the difference between the three year average of the School's Performance Index in ELA and the three year average of the New York State Performance Index in ELA will be computed individually for each school. The chart below delineates the conversion from difference in Performance Index, as noted above, to the HEDI score for teachers in the building. This score will be used as the second 20% (15%) for all teachers in the building.

- The Performance Index is a value from 0 to 200 that is assigned to an accountability group (in this case the group used will be "all students") indicating how that group performed on the State ELA tests.
- At the elementary level, the PI is calculated using the following equation: $100 \times \left[\frac{\text{Count of Continuously Enrolled Tested Students Performing at Levels 2, 3, and 4} + \text{the Count at Levels 3 and 4}}{\text{Count of All Continuously Enrolled Tested Students}} \right]$
- The locally selected measure of student achievement at the Chestnut Street Kindergarten Center will be based on locally selected assessments in math and ELA. Using pre-assessments and any other available data, achievement targets will be collaboratively set by teachers and approved by administrators. All locally developed

assessments will be approved by the building principal and shall be rigorous and comparable across classrooms. All locally developed assessments shall be scored according to the HEDI band as indicated in the upload in 3.13 below.

-At the secondary level, the PI is calculated using the following equation: $100 \times \left[\frac{\text{Count of Cohort Members Performing at Levels 2, 3, and 4} + \text{the Count at Levels 3 and 4}}{\text{Count of All Cohort Members}} \right]$ On the English Regents, scores between 85-100 correlate to a PI of 4, scores between 65-84 correlate to a PI of 3, and scores between 55-64 correlate to a PI of 2.

-In order to compute the state and school wide PI average, the most recent three-year New York State PI data available and the 2010-2011, 2011-2012 and 2012-2013 school wide ELA scores will be used.

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

For grades 1 through 3, if the three year ELA building average PI is 15 or more points greater than the NYS ELA three year average PI teachers will be rated highly effective. In the Chestnut Kindergarten Center, growth targets will be collaboratively set by the administrators and teachers. If 85% to 100% of the students meet the targets set, the teachers will be rated highly effective.

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

For grades 1 through 3, if the three year ELA building average PI is 8 through 14 points greater than the NYS ELA three year average PI teachers will be rated effective. In the Chestnut Kindergarten Center, growth targets will be collaboratively set by the administrators and teachers. If 60% through 84% of the students meet the targets set, the teachers will be rated effective.

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

For grades 1 through 3, if the three year ELA building average PI is 2 through 7 points greater than the NYS ELA three year average PI teachers will be rated as developing. In the Chestnut Kindergarten Center, growth targets will be collaboratively set by the administrators and teachers. If 20% through 59% of the students meet the targets set, the teachers will be rated developing.

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

The three year ELA building average PI is less than 0 to 1.5 points greater than the NYS ELA three year average PI.

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	6(ii) School wide measure computed locally	NYS 6-8 ELA Assessment
7	6(ii) School wide measure computed locally	NYS 6-8 ELA Assessment
8	6(ii) School wide measure computed locally	NYS 6-8 ELA 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.

We are using a school-wide measure based on the performance of the grade specific students taking the assessment listed above. In order to hold all teachers of every subject to the expectation of the Common Core Standards that every teacher is a teacher of literacy, the difference between the three year average of the School's Performance Index in ELA and the three year average of the New York State Performance Index in ELA will be computed individually for each school. The chart below delineates the conversion from difference in Performance Index, as noted above, to the HEDI score for teachers in the building. This score will be used as the second 20% (15%) for all teachers in the building.

- The Performance Index is a value from 0 to 200 that is assigned to an accountability group (in this case the group used will be "all students") indicating how that group performed on the State ELA tests.
- At the elementary level, the PI is calculated using the following equation: $100 \times \frac{\text{Count of Continuously Enrolled Tested Students Performing at Levels 2, 3, and 4} + \text{the Count at Levels 3 and 4}}{\text{Count of All Continuously Enrolled Tested Students}}$
- At the secondary level, the PI is calculated using the following equation: $100 \times \frac{\text{Count of Cohort Members Performing at Levels 2, 3, and 4} + \text{the Count at Levels 3 and 4}}{\text{Count of All Cohort Members}}$ On the English Regents, scores between 85-100 correlate to a PI of 4, scores between 65-84 correlate to a PI of 3, and scores between 55-64 correlate to a PI of 2.
- In order to compute the state and school wide PI average, the most recent three-year New York State PI data available and the 2010-2011, 2011-2012 and 2012-2013 school wide ELA scores will be used.

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

The three year ELA building average PI is 15 or more points greater than the NYS ELA three year average PI.

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

The three year ELA building average PI is 8 to 14 points greater than the NYS ELA three year average PI.

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

The three year ELA building average PI is 2 to 7 points greater than the NYS ELA three year average PI.

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

The three year ELA building average PI is less than 0 to 1.5 points greater than the NYS ELA three year average PI.

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	6(ii) School wide measure computed locally	NYS 6-8 ELA Assessment
7	6(ii) School wide measure computed locally	NYS 6-8 ELA Assessment
8	6(ii) School wide measure computed locally	NYS 6-8 ELA 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.

<p>Use this box, if needed, to describe the general process for assigning HEDI categories for these grades/subjects in this subcomponent. If needed, you may upload a table or graphic at 3.13, below.</p>	<p>We are using a school-wide measure based on the performance of the grade specific students taking the assessment listed above. In order to hold all teachers of every subject to the expectation of the Common Core Standards that every teacher is a teacher of literacy, the difference between the three year average of the School's Performance Index in ELA and the three year average of the New York State Performance Index in ELA will be computed individually for each school. The chart below delineates the conversion from difference in Performance Index, as noted above, to the HEDI score for teachers in the building. This score will be used as the second 20% (15%) for all teachers in the building.</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> -The Performance Index is a value from 0 to 200 that is assigned to an accountability group (in this case the group used will be "all students") indicating how that group performed on the State ELA tests. -At the elementary level, the PI is calculated using the following equation: $100 \times [(Count\ of\ Continuously\ Enrolled\ Tested\ Students\ Performing\ at\ Levels\ 2,\ 3,\ and\ 4 + the\ Count\ at\ Levels\ 3\ and\ 4) \div the\ Count\ of\ All\ Continuously\ Enrolled\ Tested\ Students]$ -At the secondary level, the PI is calculated using the following equation: $100 \times [(Count\ of\ Cohort\ Members\ Performing\ at\ Levels\ 2,\ 3,\ and\ 4 + the\ Count\ at\ Levels\ 3\ and\ 4) \div the\ Count\ of\ All\ Cohort\ Members]$ On the English Regents, scores between 85-100 correlate to a PI of 4, scores between 65-84 correlate to a PI of 3, and scores between 55-64 correlate to a PI of 2. -In order to compute the state and school wide PI average, the most recent three-year New York State PI data available and the 2010-2011, 2011-2012 and 2012-2013 school wide ELA scores will be used.
<p>Highly Effective (18 - 20 points) Results are well above District- or BOCES-adopted expectations for growth or achievement for grade/subject.</p>	<p>The three year ELA building average PI is 15 or more points greater than the NYS ELA three year average PI.</p>
<p>Effective (9 - 17 points) Results meet District- or BOCES-adopted expectations for growth or achievement for grade/subject.</p>	<p>The three year ELA building average PI is 8 to 14 points greater than the NYS ELA three year average PI.</p>
<p>Developing (3 - 8 points) Results are below District- or BOCES-adopted expectations for growth or achievement for grade/subject.</p>	<p>The three year ELA building average PI is 2 to 7 points greater than the NYS ELA three year average PI.</p>
<p>Ineffective (0 - 2 points) Results are well below District- or BOCES-adopted expectations for growth or achievement for grade/subject.</p>	<p>The three year ELA building average PI is less than 0 to 1.5 points greater than the NYS ELA three year average PI.</p>

3.8) High School Social Studies

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

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

	Locally-Selected Measure from List of Approved Measures	Assessment
Global 1	6(ii) School wide measure computed locally	NYS English Regents
Global 2	6(ii) School wide measure computed locally	NYS English Regents
American History	6(ii) School wide measure computed locally	NYS English Regents

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

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

<p>Use this box, if needed, to describe the general process for assigning HEDI categories for these grades/subjects in this subcomponent. If needed, you may upload a table or graphic at 3.13, below.</p>	<p>We are using a school-wide measure based on the performance of the grade specific students taking the assessment listed above. In order to hold all teachers of every subject to the expectation of the Common Core Standards that every teacher is a teacher of literacy, the difference between the three year average of the School's Performance Index in ELA and the three year average of the New York State Performance Index in ELA will be computed individually for each school. The chart below delineates the conversion from difference in Performance Index, as noted above, to the HEDI score for teachers in the building. This score will be used as the second 20% (15%) for all teachers in the building.</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> -The Performance Index is a value from 0 to 200 that is assigned to an accountability group (in this case the group used will be "all students") indicating how that group performed on the State ELA tests. -At the elementary level, the PI is calculated using the following equation: $100 \times [(Count\ of\ Continuously\ Enrolled\ Tested\ Students\ Performing\ at\ Levels\ 2,\ 3,\ and\ 4 + the\ Count\ at\ Levels\ 3\ and\ 4) \div the\ Count\ of\ All\ Continuously\ Enrolled\ Tested\ Students]$ -At the secondary level, the PI is calculated using the following equation: $100 \times [(Count\ of\ Cohort\ Members\ Performing\ at\ Levels\ 2,\ 3,\ and\ 4 + the\ Count\ at\ Levels\ 3\ and\ 4) \div the\ Count\ of\ All\ Cohort\ Members]$ On the English Regents, scores between 85-100 correlate to a PI of 4, scores between 65-84 correlate to a PI of 3, and scores between 55-64 correlate to a PI of 2. -In order to compute the state and school wide PI average, the most recent three-year New York State PI data available and the 2010-2011, 2011-2012 and 2012-2013 school wide ELA scores will be used.
<p>Highly Effective (18 - 20 points) Results are well above District- or BOCES-adopted expectations for growth or</p>	<p>The three year ELA building average PI is 15 or more points greater than the NYS ELA three year average PI.</p>

achievement for grade/subject.	
Effective (9 - 17 points) Results meet District- or BOCES-adopted expectations for growth or achievement for grade/subject.	The three year ELA building average PI is 8 to 14 points greater than the NYS ELA three year average PI.
Developing (3 - 8 points) Results are below District- or BOCES-adopted expectations for growth or achievement for grade/subject.	The three year ELA building average PI is 2 to 7 points greater than the NYS ELA three year average PI.
Ineffective (0 - 2 points) Results are well below District- or BOCES-adopted expectations for growth or achievement for grade/subject.	The three year ELA building average PI is less than 0 to 1.5 points greater than the NYS ELA three year average PI.

3.9) High School Science

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

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

	Locally-Selected Measure from List of Approved Measures	Assessment
Living Environment	6(ii) School wide measure computed locally	NYS English Regents
Earth Science	6(ii) School wide measure computed locally	NYS English Regents
Chemistry	6(ii) School wide measure computed locally	NYS English Regents
Physics	6(ii) School wide measure computed locally	NYS English Regents

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

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

Use this box, if needed, to describe the general process for assigning HEDI categories for these grades/subjects in this subcomponent. If needed, you may upload a table or graphic at 3.13, below.	<p>We are using a school-wide measure based on the performance of the grade specific students taking the assessment listed above. In order to hold all teachers of every subject to the expectation of the Common Core Standards that every teacher is a teacher of literacy, the difference between the three year average of the School's Performance Index in ELA and the three year average of the New York State Performance Index in ELA will be computed individually for each school. The chart below delineates the conversion from difference in Performance Index, as noted above, to the HEDI score for teachers in the building. This score will be used as the second 20% (15%) for all teachers in the building.</p> <p>-The Performance Index is a value from 0 to 200 that is assigned to an accountability group (in this case the group used will be "all students") indicating how that group performed on the State ELA tests.</p> <p>-At the elementary level, the PI is calculated using the</p>
---	---

following equation: $100 \times \frac{\text{Count of Continuously Enrolled Tested Students Performing at Levels 2, 3, and 4} + \text{the Count at Levels 3 and 4}}{\text{Count of All Continuously Enrolled Tested Students}}$

-At the secondary level, the PI is calculated using the following equation: $100 \times \frac{\text{Count of Cohort Members Performing at Levels 2, 3, and 4} + \text{the Count at Levels 3 and 4}}{\text{Count of All Cohort Members}}$ On the English Regents, scores between 85-100 correlate to a PI of 4, scores between 65-84 correlate to a PI of 3, and scores between 55-64 correlate to a PI of 2.

-In order to compute the state and school wide PI average, the most recent three-year New York State PI data available and the 2010-2011, 2011-2012 and 2012-2013 school wide ELA scores will be used.

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

The three year ELA building average PI is 15 or more points greater than the NYS ELA three year average PI.

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

The three year ELA building average PI is 8 to 14 points greater than the NYS ELA three year average PI.

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

The three year ELA building average PI is 2 to 7 points greater than the NYS ELA three year average PI.

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

The three year ELA building average PI is less than 0 to 1.5 points greater than the NYS ELA three year average PI.

3.10) High School Math

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

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

	Locally-Selected Measure from List of Approved Measures	Assessment
Algebra 1	6(ii) School wide measure computed locally	NYS English Regents
Geometry	6(ii) School wide measure computed locally	NYS English Regents
Algebra 2	6(ii) School wide measure computed locally	NYS English Regents

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

We are using a school-wide measure based on the performance of the grade specific students taking the

this subcomponent. If needed, you may upload a table or graphic at 3.13, below.

assessment listed above. In order to hold all teachers of every subject to the expectation of the Common Core Standards that every teacher is a teacher of literacy, the difference between the three year average of the School's Performance Index in ELA and the three year average of the New York State Performance Index in ELA will be computed individually for each school. The chart below delineates the conversion from difference in Performance Index, as noted above, to the HEDI score for teachers in the building. This score will be used as the second 20% (15%) for all teachers in the building.

-The Performance Index is a value from 0 to 200 that is assigned to an accountability group (in this case the group used will be "all students") indicating how that group performed on the State ELA tests.

-At the elementary level, the PI is calculated using the following equation: $100 \times \frac{\text{Count of Continuously Enrolled Tested Students Performing at Levels 2, 3, and 4} + \text{the Count at Levels 3 and 4}}{\text{Count of All Continuously Enrolled Tested Students}}$

-At the secondary level, the PI is calculated using the following equation: $100 \times \frac{\text{Count of Cohort Members Performing at Levels 2, 3, and 4} + \text{the Count at Levels 3 and 4}}{\text{Count of All Cohort Members}}$ On the English Regents, scores between 85-100 correlate to a PI of 4, scores between 65-84 correlate to a PI of 3, and scores between 55-64 correlate to a PI of 2.

-In order to compute the state and school wide PI average, the most recent three-year New York State PI data available and the 2010-2011, 2011-2012 and 2012-2013 school wide ELA scores will be used.

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

The three year ELA building average PI is 15 or more points greater than the NYS ELA three year average PI.

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

The three year ELA building average PI is 8 to 14 points greater than the NYS ELA three year average PI.

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

The three year ELA building average PI is 2 to 7 points greater than the NYS ELA three year average PI.

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

The three year ELA building average PI is less than 0 to 1.5 points greater than the NYS ELA three year average PI.

3.11) High School English Language Arts

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

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

	Locally-Selected Measure from List of Approved Measures	Assessment
Grade 9 ELA	6(ii) School wide measure computed locally	NYS English Regents
Grade 10 ELA	6(ii) School wide measure computed locally	NYS English Regents

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

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

Use this box, if needed, to describe the general process for assigning HEDI categories for these grades/subjects in this subcomponent. If needed, you may upload a table or graphic at 3.13, below.

We are using a school-wide measure based on the performance of the grade specific students taking the assessment listed above. In order to hold all teachers of every subject to the expectation of the Common Core Standards that every teacher is a teacher of literacy, the difference between the three year average of the School's Performance Index in ELA and the three year average of the New York State Performance Index in ELA will be computed individually for each school. The chart below delineates the conversion from difference in Performance Index, as noted above, to the HEDI score for teachers in the building. This score will be used as the second 20% (15%) for all teachers in the building.

- The Performance Index is a value from 0 to 200 that is assigned to an accountability group (in this case the group used will be "all students") indicating how that group performed on the State ELA tests.
- At the elementary level, the PI is calculated using the following equation: $100 \times [(Count\ of\ Continuously\ Enrolled\ Tested\ Students\ Performing\ at\ Levels\ 2,\ 3,\ and\ 4 + the\ Count\ at\ Levels\ 3\ and\ 4) \div the\ Count\ of\ All\ Continuously\ Enrolled\ Tested\ Students]$
- At the secondary level, the PI is calculated using the following equation: $100 \times [(Count\ of\ Cohort\ Members\ Performing\ at\ Levels\ 2,\ 3,\ and\ 4 + the\ Count\ at\ Levels\ 3\ and\ 4) \div the\ Count\ of\ All\ Cohort\ Members]$ On the English Regents, scores between 85-100 correlate to a PI of 4, scores between 65-84 correlate to a PI of 3, and scores between 55-64 correlate to a PI of 2.
- In order to compute the state and school wide PI average, the most recent three-year New York State PI data available and the 2010-2011, 2011-2012 and 2012-2013 school wide ELA scores will be used.

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

The three year ELA building average PI is 15 or more points greater than the NYS ELA three year average PI.

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

The three year ELA building average PI is 8 to 14 points greater than the NYS ELA three year average PI.

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

The three year ELA building average PI is 2 to 7 points greater than the NYS ELA three year average PI.

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

The three year ELA building average PI is less than 0 to 1.5 points greater than the NYS ELA three year average PI.

3.12) All Other Courses

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

Course(s) or Subject(s)	Locally-Selected Measure from List of Approved Measures	Assessment
All other Social Studies courses	6(ii) School wide measure computed locally	Grade appropriate NYS ELA Assessments or NYS English Regents
All other English courses	6(ii) School wide measure computed locally	Grade appropriate NYS ELA Assessments or NYS English Regents
All other Math courses	6(ii) School wide measure computed locally	Grade appropriate NYS ELA Assessments or NYS English Regents
All other Science courses	6(ii) School wide measure computed locally	Grade appropriate NYS ELA Assessments or NYS English Regents
All Physical Education courses	6(ii) School wide measure computed locally	Grade appropriate NYS ELA Assessments or NYS English Regents
All Music courses	6(ii) School wide measure computed locally	Grade appropriate NYS ELA Assessments or NYS English Regents
All Art courses	6(ii) School wide measure computed locally	Grade appropriate NYS ELA Assessments or NYS English Regents
All Business courses	6(ii) School wide measure computed locally	Grade appropriate NYS ELA Assessments or NYS English Regents
All World Language courses	6(ii) School wide measure computed locally	Grade appropriate NYS ELA Assessments or NYS English Regents
All Technology courses	6(ii) School wide measure computed locally	Grade appropriate NYS ELA Assessments or NYS English Regents
All Family and Consumers Science courses	6(ii) School wide measure computed locally	Grade appropriate NYS ELA Assessments or NYS English Regents
All Health courses	6(ii) School wide measure computed locally	Grade appropriate NYS ELA Assessments or NYS English Regents
All ESL courses	6(ii) School wide measure computed locally	Grade appropriate NYS ELA Assessments or NYS English Regents
All other teachers not named above	6(ii) School wide measure computed locally	Grade appropriate NYS ELA Assessments or NYS English Regents

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	We are using a school-wide measure based on the performance of the grade specific students taking the assessment listed above. In order to hold all teachers of
---	---

graphic at 3.13, below.

every subject to the expectation of the Common Core Standards that every teacher is a teacher of literacy, the difference between the three year average of the School's Performance Index in ELA and the three year average of the New York State Performance Index in ELA will be computed individually for each school. The chart below delineates the conversion from difference in Performance Index, as noted above, to the HEDI score for teachers in the building. This score will be used as the second 20% (15%) for all teachers in the building.

-The Performance Index is a value from 0 to 200 that is assigned to an accountability group (in this case the group used will be "all students") indicating how that group performed on the State ELA tests.

-At the elementary level, the PI is calculated using the following equation: $100 \times \left[\frac{\text{Count of Continuously Enrolled Tested Students Performing at Levels 2, 3, and 4} + \text{the Count at Levels 3 and 4}}{\text{Count of All Continuously Enrolled Tested Students}} \right]$

-The locally selected measure of student achievement at the Chestnut Street Kindergarten Center will be based on locally selected assessments in math and ELA. Using pre-assessments and any other available data, achievement targets will be collaboratively set by teachers and approved by administrators. All locally developed assessments will be approved by the building principal and shall be rigorous and comparable across classrooms. All locally developed assessments shall be scored according to the HEDI band as indicated in the upload in 3.13 below.

-At the secondary level, the PI is calculated using the following equation: $100 \times \left[\frac{\text{Count of Cohort Members Performing at Levels 2, 3, and 4} + \text{the Count at Levels 3 and 4}}{\text{Count of All Cohort Members}} \right]$ On the English Regents, scores between 85-100 correlate to a PI of 4, scores between 65-84 correlate to a PI of 3, and scores between 55-64 correlate to a PI of 2.

-In order to compute the state and school wide PI average, the most recent three-year New York State PI data available and the 2010-2011, 2011-2012 and 2012-2013 school wide ELA scores will be used.

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

The three year ELA building average PI is 15 or more points greater than the NYS ELA three year average PI.

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

The three year ELA building average PI is 8 to 14 points greater than the NYS ELA three year average PI.

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

The three year ELA building average PI is 2 to 7 points greater than the NYS ELA three year average PI.

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

The three year ELA building average PI is less than 0 to 1.5 points greater than the NYS ELA three year average PI.

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/5139/129139-y92vNseFa4/HEDI Conversion Charts for Subcomponents A and B.pdf

3.14) Locally Developed Controls

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

(No response)

3.15) Teachers with More Than One Locally Selected Measure

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

The only teachers with more than one locally selected measure will be those that are shared between buildings. The locally selected measure for these teachers will be a weighted average of the locally selected measure used in each building in which they teach.

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 Monday, May 14, 2012

Updated Wednesday, January 02, 2013

Page 1

4.1) Teacher Practice Rubric

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

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

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

NYSUT Teacher Practice Rubric

Not Applicable

4.2) Points Within Other Measures

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

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

Is the following points assignment applicable to all teachers?

Yes

If you checked "no" above, fill in the group of teachers covered (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]	31
One or more observation(s) by trained independent evaluators	(No response)
Observations by trained in-school peer teachers	(No response)
Feedback from students using State-approved survey tool	(No response)
Feedback from parents/caregivers using State-approved survey tool	(No response)
Structured reviews of lesson plans, student portfolios and other teacher artifacts	29

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.

Teachers will begin the year by reflecting on their goals for the coming school year. These reflections will be discussed with administration and will establish teacher goals for the school year. Using the NYSUT Teaching Practice Rubric, non-tenured teachers will be observed at least four times per year, plus a summative evaluation. Tenured teachers will be observed at least two times per year, plus a summative evaluation. At least one observation for tenured teachers will be a formal observation which will include both a pre- and post-observation conference. At least two observations for non-tenured teachers will be formal observations which will include both a pre - and post observation conference. At least one observation will be unannounced for both non-tenured and tenured teachers. Additionally, the district will utilize the NYSUT scoring band conversion chart as approved by SED to assign teacher scores. To get the total rubric score each element within each standard is rated on a 1 through 4 scale which are then averaged together to get a total standard score on a 1 through 4 scale. Then the standards are averaged together to get a total rubric score which is then

converted to the 0 through 60 final score using the conversion chart provided.

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

assets/survey-uploads/5091/129147-eka9yMJ855/Rubric Score to Sub_1.pdf

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

Highly Effective: Overall performance and results exceed NYS Teaching Standards.	Teacher performance is well above expectations based upon the NYSUT Teacher Practice Rubric. Scoring band is from 59 to 60.
Effective: Overall performance and results meet NYS Teaching Standards.	Teacher performance meets expectations based upon the NYSUT Teacher Practice Rubric. Scoring band is from 57 to 58.
Developing: Overall performance and results need improvement in order to meet NYS Teaching Standards.	Teacher performance is below expectations based upon the NYSUT Teacher Practice Rubric. Scoring band is from 50 to 56..
Ineffective: Overall performance and results do not meet NYS Teaching Standards.	Teacher performance is well below expectations based upon the NYSUT Teacher Practice Rubric. Scoring band is from 0 to 49.

Provide the ranges for the 60-point scoring bands.

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

4.6) Observations of Probationary Teachers

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

By building principals or other trained administrators

4.6) Observations of Probationary Teachers Formal/Long	2
4.6) Observations of Probationary Teachers Informal/Short	2
4.6) Observations of Probationary Teachers Enter Total	4

By trained in-school peer teachers or other trained reviewers

Formal/Long	0
-------------	---

Informal/Short	0
----------------	---

Independent evaluators

Formal/Long	0
Informal/Short	0

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

- In Person

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

- In Person

4.7) Observations of Tenured Teachers

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

By building principals or other trained administrators

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

By trained in-school peer teachers or other trained reviewers

Formal/Long	0
Informal/Short	0

Independent evaluators

Formal/Long	0
Informal/Short	0

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

- In Person

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

- In Person
-

5. Composite Scoring (Teachers)

Created Friday, May 18, 2012

Updated Wednesday, January 02, 2013

Page 1

Standards for Rating Categories

Growth or Comparable Measures

Locally-selected Measures of

growth or achievement

Other Measures of Effectiveness

(Teacher and Leader standards)

Highly

Effective

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

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

Overall performance and results exceed NYS Teaching Standards.

Effective

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

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

Overall performance and results meet NYS Teaching Standards.

Developing

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

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

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

Ineffective

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

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

Overall performance and results do not meet NYS Teaching Standards.

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

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

2012-13 where there is no Value-Added measure

Growth or Comparable Measures

Locally-selected Measures of

growth or achievement

Other Measures of Effectiveness

(60 points)

Overall

Composite Score

Highly Effective

18-20

18-20

Ranges determined locally--see below

91-100

Effective

9-17

9-17

75-90

Developing

3-8

3-8

65-74

Ineffective

0-2

0-2

0-64

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

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

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

2012-13 where Value-Added growth measure applies

Growth or Comparable Measures

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

Other Measures of Effectiveness

(60 points)

Overall

Composite Score

Highly Effective

22-25

14-15

Ranges determined locally--see above

91-100

Effective

10-21

8-13

75-90

Developing

3-9

3-7

65-74

Ineffective

0-2

0-2

0-64

6. Additional Requirements - Teachers

Created Friday, May 18, 2012

Updated Thursday, December 27, 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/5265/130980-Df0w3Xx5v6/Teacher improvement plan.doc

6.3) Appeals Process

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

(1) the substance of the annual professional performance review

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

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

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

XIII. Appeals Procedures

The purpose of the internal APPR appeal process is to foster and nurture growth of the professional staff in order to maintain a highly qualified and effective work force. The appeal procedures shall provide for the timely and expeditious resolution of the appeal. All tenured and probationary employees who meet the appeal process criteria identified below may use the appeal process. A teacher may not file multiple appeals regarding the same performance review or TIP. All grounds for appeal must be raised within one appeal,

provided that the teacher knew or could have reasonably known the ground(s) existed at the time the appeal was initiated, in which instance a further appeal may be filed but only based upon such previously unknown ground(s).

A. Procedure:

Any unit member aggrieved by an APPR Summative rating of either “ineffective or “developing” may challenge that APPR. The Appeals forms are listed in Appendix L.

In accordance with Education Law §3012-c (5), an APPR that is subject of a pending appeal shall not be sought to be offered in evidence or placed in evidence in any Education Law §3020-a proceeding.

B. Grounds for an Appeal:

An appeal may be filed challenging the APPR based on one or more of the following grounds:

- a. The substance of the Annual Professional Performance Review;*
- b. 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;*
- c. The district’s failure to comply with either the applicable regulations of the Commissioner of Education or the procedures put in place in this Article*
- d. The district’s failure to issue/or implement the terms of the Teacher Improvement Plan, where applicable, as required under Education Law §3012-c.*

C. Notification of Appeal:

In order to be timely, the notification of the APPR appeal shall be filed, in writing, within 10 school days after the teacher has received the APPR. Notification of the appeal shall be provided to the superintendent of schools or his designee. The response must include any and all additional documents or written materials that are specific to the points(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 deliberation related to the resolution of the appeal. Within 10 school days of receipt of an appeal, the supervising administrator must submit a detailed written response. Material not submitted at the time the response is filed shall not be considered in the deliberation related to the resolution of the appeal.

D. Supervising Administrator’s written response to appeal:

The response must include any and all additional documents or written materials that are specific to the points(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 deliberation related to the resolution of the appeal.

E. Decision on Appeal:

Step 1 – Conference with the supervising administrator. Within twenty (20) school days of receipt of the APPR the bargaining unit member will have a conference with the supervising administrator. The bargaining unit member shall upon request be entitled to an Association representative being present. The supervising administrator may also choose to have an administrative unit representative present during the meeting. The conference shall be an informal meeting wherein the authoring administrator and the employee are able to discuss the evaluation and areas of dispute. If the bargaining unit member is not satisfied with the outcome, he/she may proceed to the next step.

Step 2 – The next step in the appeal process shall be initiated by the unit member notifying the President of the Association, the Grievance officer and the Superintendent of Schools within five (5) school days of the conclusion of the conference with the supervising administrator of the intention to appeal to the Superintendent.

Step 3 – The unit member shall appeal to the Superintendent within 10 school days of the initial meeting with the supervising administrator. The Superintendent shall consider the written record and schedule a meeting with the parties, and issue a written decision within ten (10) school days thereof. The determination of the Superintendent of Schools shall be final and shall not be grievable, arbitrable, nor reviewable in any other forum; however, the failure of either party to abide by the above agreed upon process shall be subject to the grievance procedure.

However, nothing shall prevent a teacher from challenging the substance of an evaluation within the context of a proceeding pursuant to Education Law §3020-a.

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.

Lead Evaluators and Evaluators will be trained on an ongoing basis as required by NYSED and the Board of Regents. (Section 30-2.9) This may be done through BOCES, in turnkey training within the school district, through professional organizations (such as LEAF) or through independent training opportunities.

Documentation of training will be submitted to the Superintendent of Schools, who will in turn recommend certification and/or re-certification of evaluators to the Board of Education. Training will include the NYS teaching standards, NYSUT and the Multi-Dimensional rubric use, collection of data evidence, APPR regulations and timelines, common core state standards, the district

Inter-rater reliability will be ensured through training on the NYSUT rubric, evidence collection and APPR regulations/timelines.

6.5) Assurances -- Evaluators

Please check the boxes below:

-
- Checked
-

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

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

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

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

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

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

(7) use of the Statewide Instructional Reporting System

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

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

-
- Checked
-

6.6) Assurances -- Teachers

Please check all of the boxes below:

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

6.7) Assurances -- Data

Please check all of the boxes below:

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

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

Created Friday, May 18, 2012

Updated Thursday, January 03, 2013

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):

1-5
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
Kindergarten Center	State-approved 3rd party assessment	STAR Early Literacy Enterprise

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

Use this box, if needed, to describe the process for assigning HEDI categories in this subcomponent. If needed, you may upload a table or graphic below.	The Principal of the kindergarten will develop an SLO which will include a HEDI score based upon the target(s) set. The SLO for the kindergarten principal will utilize State approved 3rd party assessments. The same assessments will be used across all classrooms in the same grade level. Targets will be set based on the pretest of the students in the Kindergarten Center. The percent of students reaching the target score on the final assessment will be used to determine the HEDI score. The percentage of students meeting the target score will be converted to a scale score of 0 to 20. The scale is shown below. The principal can achieve all scale points from 0 to 20.
Highly Effective (18 - 20 points) Results are well above state average for similar students (or District goals if no state test).	If 85% to 100% of all students meet the SLO target, the principal is rated Highly Effective.
Effective (9 - 17 points) Results meet state average for similar students (or District goals if no state test).	If 60% to 84% of students meet the SLO target, the principal is rated Effective.
Developing (3 - 8 points) Results are below state average for similar students (or District goals if no state test).	If 20% to 59% of students meet the SLO target, the principal is rated Developing.
Ineffective (0 - 2 points) Results are well below state average for similar students (or District goals if no state test).	If 0% to 19% of students meet the SLO target, the principal is rated Ineffective.

test).

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/5365/130981-lha0DogRNw/HEDI Conversion Charts for Subcomponents A and B_1.pdf

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 Friday, May 18, 2012

Updated Thursday, January 03, 2013

Page 1

Locally-Selected Measures of Student Achievement or Growth

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

Grade Configuration	Locally-Selected Measure from List of Approved Measures	Assessment
9-12	(d) measures used by district for teacher evaluation	NYS English Regents
1-5	(d) measures used by district for teacher evaluation	NYS ELA Grades 3 - 5
6-8	(d) measures used by district for teacher evaluation	NYS ELA Grades 6 - 8

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

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

<p>Use this box, if needed, to describe the process for assigning HEDI categories. If needed, you may upload a table or graphic below.</p>	<p>We are using a school-wide measure based on the performance of the grade specific students taking the assessment listed above. In order to hold all teachers of every subject to the expectation of the Common Core Standards that every teacher is a teacher of literacy, the difference between the three year average of the School's Performance Index in ELA and the three year average of the New York State Performance Index in ELA will be computed individually for each school. The chart below delineates the conversion from difference in Performance Index, as noted above, to the HEDI score for teachers in the building. This score will be used as the second 20% (15%) for all teachers in the building.</p> <p>-The Performance Index is a value from 0 to 200 that is assigned to an accountability group (in this case the group used will be "all students") indicating how that group performed on the State ELA tests.</p>
--	---

-At the elementary level, the PI is calculated using the following equation: $100 \times \frac{\text{Count of Continuously Enrolled Tested Students Performing at Levels 2, 3, and 4} + \text{the Count at Levels 3 and 4}}{\text{Count of All Continuously Enrolled Tested Students}}$

-At the secondary level, the PI is calculated using the following equation: $100 \times \frac{\text{Count of Cohort Members Performing at Levels 2, 3, and 4} + \text{the Count at Levels 3 and 4}}{\text{Count of All Cohort Members}}$ On the English Regents, scores between 85-100 correlate to a PI of 4, scores between 65-84 correlate to a PI of 3, and scores between 55-64 correlate to a PI of 2.

-In order to compute the state and school wide PI average, the most recent three-year New York State PI data available and the 2010-2011, 2011-2012 and 2012-2013 school wide ELA scores will be used.

Highly Effective (14 - 15 points) Results are well above District- or BOCES-adopted expectations for growth or achievement for grade/subject.

The three year ELA building average PI is 15 or more points greater than the NYS ELA three year average PI.

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

The three year ELA building average PI is 8 to 14 points greater than the NYS ELA three year average PI.

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

The three year ELA building average PI is 2 to 7 points greater than the NYS ELA three year average PI.

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

The three year ELA building average PI is less than 0 to 1.5 points greater than the NYS ELA three year average PI.

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/5366/130982-qBFVOWF7fC/HEDI Conversion Charts for Subcomponents A and B_1.pdf](assets/survey-uploads/5366/130982-qBFVOWF7fC/HEDI%20Conversion%20Charts%20for%20Subcomponents%20A%20and%20B_1.pdf)

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

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

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

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

- (a) student achievement levels on State assessments in ELA and/or Math in Grades 4-8 (e.g., percentage of students in the school whose performance levels on State assessments are proficient or advanced)*
- (b) student growth or achievement on State assessments in ELA and/or Math in Grades 4-8 for students in each specific performance level (e.g., Level 1, Level 2)*
- (c) student growth or achievement on State assessments in ELA and/or Math in Grades 4-8 for students with disabilities and English Language Learners in Grades 4-8*
- (d) student performance on any or all of the district-wide locally selected measures approved for use in teacher evaluations*
- (e) four, five and/or six-year high school graduation and/or dropout rates for principals employed in a school with high school grades*
- (f) percentage of students who earn a Regents diploma with advanced designation and/or honors for principals employed in a school with high school grades*
- (g) percentage of a cohort of students that achieve specified scores on Regents examinations and/or Department approved alternative examinations (including, but not limited to, Advanced Placement examinations, International Baccalaureate examinations, SAT II, etc.), for principals employed in a school with high school grades (e.g., the percentage of students in the 2009 cohort that scored at least a 3 on an Advanced Placement examination since entry into the ninth grade)*
- (h) students' progress toward graduation in the school using strong predictive indicators, including but not limited to 9th and/or 10th grade credit accumulation and/or the percentage of students that pass 9th and/or 10th grade subjects most commonly associated with graduation and/or students' progress in passing the number of required Regents examinations for graduation, for principals employed in a school with high school grades*
- (i) student learning objectives (only allowable for principals in programs/buildings without a Value-Added measure for the State Growth subcomponent). Used with one of the following assessments: State, State-approved 3rd party, or a District, regional, or BOCES-developed assessment that is rigorous and comparable across classrooms*

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

Grade Configuration	Locally-Selected Measure from List of Approved Measures	Assessment
Kindergarten	(d) measures used by district for teacher evaluation	West Hempstead UFSD-developed Kindergarten assessments in ELA and Math

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

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

Use this box, if needed, to describe the process for assigning HEDI categories. If needed, you may upload a table or graphic below.	The locally selected measure of student achievement at the Chestnut Street Kindergarten Center will be based on locally developed assessments in math and ELA. Using pre-assessments and any other available data, achievement targets will be collaboratively set by teachers and the principal. All locally developed assessments will be approved by the Superintendent or his designee and shall be rigorous and comparable across classrooms. All locally developed assessments shall be scored according to the HEDI band as indicated in the upload below.
Highly Effective (18 - 20 points) Results are well above District- or BOCES-adopted expectations for growth or achievement for grade/subject.	In the Chestnut Kindergarten Center, growth targets will be collaboratively set by the administrators and teachers. If 85% to 100% of the students meet the targets set, the Principal will be rated highly effective.
Effective (9- 17 points) Results meet District- or BOCES-adopted expectations for growth or achievement for grade/subject.	In the Chestnut Kindergarten Center, growth targets will be collaboratively set by the administrators and teachers. If 60% to 84% of the students meet the targets set, the Principal will be rated effective.
Developing (3 - 8 points) Results are below District- or BOCES-adopted expectations for growth or achievement for grade/subject.	In the Chestnut Kindergarten Center, growth targets will be collaboratively set by the administrators and teachers. If 20% to 59% of the students meet the targets set, the Principal will be rated developing.
Ineffective (0 - 2 points) Results are well below District- or BOCES-adopted expectations for growth or achievement for grade/subject.	In the Chestnut Kindergarten Center, growth targets will be collaboratively set by the administrators and teachers. If 0% to 19% of the students meet the targets set, the Principal will be rated ineffective.

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

(No response)

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

assets/survey-uploads/5366/130982-T8MIGWUVm1/HEDI Conversion Charts for Subcomponents A and B_1.pdf

8.3) Locally Developed Controls

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

(No 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.

(No response)

8.5) Assurances

Please check all of the boxes below:

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

9. Other Measures of Effectiveness (Principals)

Created Friday, May 18, 2012

Updated Wednesday, January 02, 2013

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.

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

9.6) Assurances

Please check all of the boxes below:

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

9.7) Process for Assigning Points and Determining HEDI Ratings

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

The process for assigning points in determining HEDI ratings for principals within the Multidimensional Evaluation Rubric will be at the discretion of the Superintendent of Schools or his designated evaluator. A score of 1 through 4 will be given for each observable element where evidence is collected within the six domains. An average of 1 through 4 will then be calculated for each domain. The final score will be the average for the six domains. The final score will then be converted to a HEDI score based on the conversion scale below. We understand the final composite score must be a whole number.

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/5143/130986-pMADJ4gk6R/Principal Rubric Score to Sub_1.pdf](#)

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

Highly Effective: Overall performance and results exceed standards.	If the total average is 59 to 60, the principal will be rated as highly effective.
Effective: Overall performance and results meet standards.	If the average score is 57 to 58, the principal will be rated as effective.
Developing: Overall performance and results need improvement in order to meet standards.	If the average score is 50 to 56, the principal will be rated as developing.
Ineffective: Overall performance and results do not meet standards.	If the average score is 0 to 49, the principal will be rated as ineffective.

Please provide the locally-negotiated 60 point scoring bands.

Highly Effective	59 to 60
Effective	57 to 58

Developing	50 to 56
Ineffective	0 to 49

9.8) School Visits

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

Probationary Principals

By supervisor	4
By trained administrator	2
By trained independent evaluator	0
Enter Total	6

Tenured Principals

By supervisor	2
By trained administrator	1
By trained independent evaluator	0
Enter Total	3

10. Composite Scoring (Principals)

Created Friday, May 18, 2012

Updated Wednesday, January 02, 2013

Page 1

Standards for Rating Categories

Growth or Comparable Measures

Locally-selected Measures of

growth or achievement

Other Measures of Effectiveness

(Teacher and Leader standards)

Highly

Effective

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

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

Overall performance and results exceed ISLLC leadership standards.

Effective

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

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

Overall performance and results meet ISLLC leadership standards.

Developing

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

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

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

Ineffective

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

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

Overall performance and results do not meet ISLLC leadership standards.

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

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

2012-13 where there is no Value-Added measure

Growth or Comparable Measures

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

Other Measures of Effectiveness

(60 points)

Overall

Composite Score

Highly Effective

18-20

18-20

Ranges determined locally--see below

91-100

Effective

9-17

9-17

75-90

Developing

3-8

3-8

65-74

Ineffective

0-2

0-2

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

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

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

2012-13 where Value-Added growth measure applies

Growth or Comparable Measures

Locally-selected Measures of growth or achievement

Other Measures of Effectiveness

(60 points)

Overall

Composite Score

Highly Effective

22-25

14-15

Ranges determined locally--see above

91-100

Effective

10-21

8-13

75-90

Developing

3-9

3-7

65-74

Ineffective

0-2

0-2

0-64

11. Additional Requirements - Principals

Created Friday, May 18, 2012

Updated Wednesday, January 02, 2013

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/5276/130988-Df0w3Xx5v6/West Hempstead PIP.doc>

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:

Principals may only appeal summative ratings of Ineffective or Developing. The Superintendent of Schools makes the final determination on all appeals. The appeal must be submitted in writing to the Superintendent of Schools within five days of receipt of the evaluation. Any issue not raised in the written appeal shall be deemed waived.

Grounds for an Appeal include:

- a. The substance of the APPR
- b. District's failure to adhere to the standards and methodologies required for the APPR
- c. District's failure to comply with applicable regulations or procedures set forth by the Commissioner of Education
- d. District's failure to issue or implement the terms of the Principal Improvement Plan

In the event that a principal appeals a summative rating of ineffective or developing, the appeal will be submitted in writing to the Superintendent of Schools within five days of receipt of the evaluation. Within five days a panel of three administrators will be convened: one selected by the President of the Administrators' bargaining unit, one from Central Office selected by the Superintendent, and a third administrator independent of the school district, who shall be mutually agreed upon by the parties. The panel will review the written record and will schedule a meeting with the Appellant if requested. The panel's written review recommendation shall be transmitted to the Superintendent and the Appellant within ten days of the formation of the panel. The Superintendent shall consider the written review recommendation of the panel and shall issue a written decision within three days. The determination of the Superintendent of Schools shall be final and shall not be grievable, arbitrable, or reviewable in any other 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 will be the lead evaluators for the principals' APPR. The Superintendent, the Deputy Superintendent and the Assistant Superintendent have attended several workshops to gain expertise in the evaluation of the principals for the new APPR. Workshops attended included those offered by: Nassau BOCES, NYSCOSS, LEAF, and independent consultants (i.e. Larry Aronstein).

As part of his ongoing training, the Superintendent will conduct a minimum of two school visitations of each non-tenured principal and a minimum of one school visitation of each tenured principal using the Multidimensional Principal Performance Rubric during the 2012-2013 school year. The evidence gathered from the visitations, as well as the artifacts that have been submitted by the principal, will be reviewed by the superintendent and aligned to the rubric to determine a rating. The Deputy Superintendent and the Assistant Superintendent may conduct evaluations of building principals as assigned by the Superintendent of Schools.

The evidence of all the training will be presented to the Board of Education who will certify that the Superintendent, the Deputy Superintendent and the Assistant Superintendent are highly qualified to be the lead evaluators for the principals' APPR. The Board will re-certify all lead evaluators each school year after reviewing the ongoing training they have received.

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 Friday, May 18, 2012

Updated Thursday, January 03, 2013

Page 1

12.1) Upload the Joint Certification of the APPR Plan

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

assets/survey-uploads/5581/130989-3Uqgn5g9Iu/WEST_HEMPSTEAD_APPR_CERTIFICATION_FORM.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.

Rubric Score to Sub-Component Conversion Chart
Subcomponent C
Measures of Teacher Effectiveness Based on the NYS Teaching Standards - 60%

Total Average Rubric Score	Category	Conversion Score for Composite
Ineffective 0-49		
1		0
1.1		12
1.2		25
1.3		37
1.4		49
Developing 50-56		
1.5		50
1.6		50.7
1.7		51.4
1.8		52.1
1.9		52.8
2		53.5
2.1		54.2
2.2		54.9
2.3		55.6
2.4		56.3
Effective 57-58		
2.5		57
2.6		57.2
2.7		57.4
2.8		57.6
2.9		57.8
3		58
3.1		58.2
3.2		58.4
3.3		58.6
3.4		58.8
Highly Effective 59-60		
3.5		59
3.6		59.3
3.7		59.5
3.8		59.8
3.9		60
4		60.25 (round to 60)

We understand that the final composite score must be a whole number.

HEDI Conversion Charts for Subcomponents A and B

HEDI Conversion Chart for Subcomponent A

(Using Student Learning Objectives (SLO) for Subcomponent A (Student Growth Measure))

and

Chestnut St. Kindergarten Center School-wide Locally Selected Measure of Student Achievement

	HEDI Points	SLO Target or Percent Mastery Achieved	HEDI scores and Mastery Range
Ineffective	0	0%	0% to 5%
	1	6%	6% to 12%
	2	13%	13% to 19%
Developing	3	20%	20% to 25%
	4	26%	26% to 31%
	5	32%	32% to 37%
	6	38%	38% to 44%
	7	45%	45% to 51%
	8	52%	52% to 59%
Effective	9	60%	60% to 61%
	10	62%	62% to 63%
	11	64%	64% to 66%
	12	67%	67% to 69%
	13	70%	70% to 72%
	14	73%	73% to 75%
	15	76%	76% to 78%
	16	79%	79% to 81%
	17	82%	82% to 84%
Highly Effective	18	85%	85% to 89%
	19	90%	90% to 95%
	20	96%	96% to 100%

HEDI Conversion for Locally Selected Measures

In order to hold all teachers of every subject to the expectation of the Common Core Standards that every teacher is a teacher of literacy, the difference between the three year average of the School’s Performance Index in ELA and the three year average of the New York State Performance Index in ELA will be computed individually for each school. The chart below delineates the conversion from difference in Performance Index, as noted above, to the HEDI score for teachers in the building. This score will be used as the second 20% (15%) for all teachers in the building.

- The Performance Index is a value from 0 to 200 that is assigned to an accountability group (in this case the group used will be “all students”) indicating how that group performed on the State ELA tests.
- At the elementary level, the PI is calculated using the following equation: $100 \times \left[\frac{\text{Count of Continuously Enrolled Tested Students Performing at Levels 2, 3, and 4} + \text{Count at Levels 3 and 4}}{\text{Count of All Continuously Enrolled Tested Students}} \right]$
- At the secondary level, the PI is calculated using the following equation: $100 \times \left[\frac{\text{Count of Cohort Members Performing at Levels 2, 3, and 4} + \text{Count at Levels 3 and 4}}{\text{Count of All Cohort Members}} \right]$
- In order to compute the state and school wide PI average, the 2009-10, 2010-11 and 2011-12 New York State and school wide ELA scores will be used.

Local PI Average less State PI Average to HEDI Conversion Chart

Building Average PI minus State Average PI	Points (0-20)	Points (0-15)	HEDI Rating
Less than 0 to 1.5	0-2	0-2	Ineffective
2 to 7	3-8	3-7	Developing
8-14	9-17	8-13	Effective
15-19 or greater	18-20	14-15	Highly Effective

- The locally developed measures of student achievement at the Chestnut Street Kindergarten Center will be based on locally selected assessments in math and ELA. Using pre-assessments and any other available data, achievement targets will be collaboratively set by teachers and approved by administrators. The locally developed assessment for determining the school-wide score will be approved by the building principal and shall be rigorous and comparable across classrooms. The school-wide score (percent of students reaching target) will be converted using the Subcomponent A conversion chart.

**HEDI Conversion Chart for Subcomponent B
(Locally Selected Measures of Student Achievement)**

Column A Building Avg PI - State Avg PI	Column B Points (0-20)	Column C Points (0-15)	Column D HEDI Rating
19 or More	20	15	Highly Effective
18	20	15	Highly Effective
17.5	19	15	Highly Effective
17	19	14	Highly Effective
16	18	14	Highly Effective
15	18	14	Highly Effective
14	17	13	Effective
13.5	16	13	Effective
13	15	13	Effective
12	14	12	Effective
11	13	11	Effective
10.5	12	10	Effective
10	11	10	Effective
9	10	9	Effective
8	9	8	Effective
7	8	7	Developing
6	7	6	Developing
5	6	5	Developing
4	5	4	Developing
3	4	4	Developing
2	3	3	Developing
1.5	2	2	Ineffective
1	2	1	Ineffective
0.5	1	1	Ineffective
0 or less	0	0	Ineffective

In intervals where half values are used in Column A the following rounding rules apply:

- 0.1 to 0.4 rounds down to the nearest whole interval.
- 0.6 to 0.9 rounds up to the nearest whole interval.

HEDI Conversion Charts for Subcomponents A and B

HEDI Conversion Chart for Subcomponent A

(Using Student Learning Objectives (SLO) for Subcomponent A (Student Growth Measure))

and

Chestnut St. Kindergarten Center School-wide Locally Selected Measure of Student Achievement

	HEDI Points	SLO Target or Percent Mastery Achieved	HEDI scores and Mastery Range
Ineffective	0	0%	0% to 5%
	1	6%	6% to 12%
	2	13%	13% to 19%
Developing	3	20%	20% to 25%
	4	26%	26% to 31%
	5	32%	32% to 37%
	6	38%	38% to 44%
	7	45%	45% to 51%
	8	52%	52% to 59%
Effective	9	60%	60% to 61%
	10	62%	62% to 63%
	11	64%	64% to 66%
	12	67%	67% to 69%
	13	70%	70% to 72%
	14	73%	73% to 75%
	15	76%	76% to 78%
	16	79%	79% to 81%
	17	82%	82% to 84%
Highly Effective	18	85%	85% to 89%
	19	90%	90% to 95%
	20	96%	96% to 100%

HEDI Conversion for Locally Selected Measures

In order to hold all teachers of every subject to the expectation of the Common Core Standards that every teacher is a teacher of literacy, the difference between the three year average of the School’s Performance Index in ELA and the three year average of the New York State Performance Index in ELA will be computed individually for each school. The chart below delineates the conversion from difference in Performance Index, as noted above, to the HEDI score for teachers in the building. This score will be used as the second 20% (15%) for all teachers in the building.

- The Performance Index is a value from 0 to 200 that is assigned to an accountability group (in this case the group used will be “all students”) indicating how that group performed on the State ELA tests.
- At the elementary level, the PI is calculated using the following equation: $100 \times \left[\frac{\text{Count of Continuously Enrolled Tested Students Performing at Levels 2, 3, and 4} + \text{Count at Levels 3 and 4}}{\text{Count of All Continuously Enrolled Tested Students}} \right]$
- At the secondary level, the PI is calculated using the following equation: $100 \times \left[\frac{\text{Count of Cohort Members Performing at Levels 2, 3, and 4} + \text{Count at Levels 3 and 4}}{\text{Count of All Cohort Members}} \right]$
- In order to compute the state and school wide PI average, the 2009-10, 2010-11 and 2011-12 New York State and school wide ELA scores will be used.

Local PI Average less State PI Average to HEDI Conversion Chart

Building Average PI minus State Average PI	Points (0-20)	Points (0-15)	HEDI Rating
Less than 0 to 1.5	0-2	0-2	Ineffective
2 to 7	3-8	3-7	Developing
8-14	9-17	8-13	Effective
15-19 or greater	18-20	14-15	Highly Effective

- The locally developed measures of student achievement at the Chestnut Street Kindergarten Center will be based on locally selected assessments in math and ELA. Using pre-assessments and any other available data, achievement targets will be collaboratively set by teachers and approved by administrators. The locally developed assessment for determining the school-wide score will be approved by the building principal and shall be rigorous and comparable across classrooms. The school-wide score (percent of students reaching target) will be converted using the Subcomponent A conversion chart.

**HEDI Conversion Chart for Subcomponent B
(Locally Selected Measures of Student Achievement)**

Column A Building Avg PI - State Avg PI	Column B Points (0-20)	Column C Points (0-15)	Column D HEDI Rating
19 or More	20	15	Highly Effective
18	20	15	Highly Effective
17.5	19	15	Highly Effective
17	19	14	Highly Effective
16	18	14	Highly Effective
15	18	14	Highly Effective
14	17	13	Effective
13.5	16	13	Effective
13	15	13	Effective
12	14	12	Effective
11	13	11	Effective
10.5	12	10	Effective
10	11	10	Effective
9	10	9	Effective
8	9	8	Effective
7	8	7	Developing
6	7	6	Developing
5	6	5	Developing
4	5	4	Developing
3	4	4	Developing
2	3	3	Developing
1.5	2	2	Ineffective
1	2	1	Ineffective
0.5	1	1	Ineffective
0 or less	0	0	Ineffective

In intervals where half values are used in Column A the following rounding rules apply:

- 0.1 to 0.4 rounds down to the nearest whole interval.
- 0.6 to 0.9 rounds up to the nearest whole interval.

HEDI Conversion Charts for Subcomponents A and B

HEDI Conversion Chart for Subcomponent A

(Using Student Learning Objectives (SLO) for Subcomponent A (Student Growth Measure))

and

Chestnut St. Kindergarten Center School-wide Locally Selected Measure of Student Achievement

	HEDI Points	SLO Target or Percent Mastery Achieved	HEDI scores and Mastery Range
Ineffective	0	0%	0% to 5%
	1	6%	6% to 12%
	2	13%	13% to 19%
Developing	3	20%	20% to 25%
	4	26%	26% to 31%
	5	32%	32% to 37%
	6	38%	38% to 44%
	7	45%	45% to 51%
	8	52%	52% to 59%
Effective	9	60%	60% to 61%
	10	62%	62% to 63%
	11	64%	64% to 66%
	12	67%	67% to 69%
	13	70%	70% to 72%
	14	73%	73% to 75%
	15	76%	76% to 78%
	16	79%	79% to 81%
	17	82%	82% to 84%
Highly Effective	18	85%	85% to 89%
	19	90%	90% to 95%
	20	96%	96% to 100%

HEDI Conversion for Locally Selected Measures

In order to hold all teachers of every subject to the expectation of the Common Core Standards that every teacher is a teacher of literacy, the difference between the three year average of the School’s Performance Index in ELA and the three year average of the New York State Performance Index in ELA will be computed individually for each school. The chart below delineates the conversion from difference in Performance Index, as noted above, to the HEDI score for teachers in the building. This score will be used as the second 20% (15%) for all teachers in the building.

- The Performance Index is a value from 0 to 200 that is assigned to an accountability group (in this case the group used will be “all students”) indicating how that group performed on the State ELA tests.
- At the elementary level, the PI is calculated using the following equation: $100 \times \left[\frac{\text{Count of Continuously Enrolled Tested Students Performing at Levels 2, 3, and 4} + \text{Count at Levels 3 and 4}}{\text{Count of All Continuously Enrolled Tested Students}} \right]$
- At the secondary level, the PI is calculated using the following equation: $100 \times \left[\frac{\text{Count of Cohort Members Performing at Levels 2, 3, and 4} + \text{Count at Levels 3 and 4}}{\text{Count of All Cohort Members}} \right]$
- In order to compute the state and school wide PI average, the 2009-10, 2010-11 and 2011-12 New York State and school wide ELA scores will be used.

Local PI Average less State PI Average to HEDI Conversion Chart

Building Average PI minus State Average PI	Points (0-20)	Points (0-15)	HEDI Rating
Less than 0 to 1.5	0-2	0-2	Ineffective
2 to 7	3-8	3-7	Developing
8-14	9-17	8-13	Effective
15-19 or greater	18-20	14-15	Highly Effective

- The locally developed measures of student achievement at the Chestnut Street Kindergarten Center will be based on locally selected assessments in math and ELA. Using pre-assessments and any other available data, achievement targets will be collaboratively set by teachers and approved by administrators. The locally developed assessment for determining the school-wide score will be approved by the building principal and shall be rigorous and comparable across classrooms. The school-wide score (percent of students reaching target) will be converted using the Subcomponent A conversion chart.

**HEDI Conversion Chart for Subcomponent B
(Locally Selected Measures of Student Achievement)**

Column A Building Avg PI - State Avg PI	Column B Points (0-20)	Column C Points (0-15)	Column D HEDI Rating
19 or More	20	15	Highly Effective
18	20	15	Highly Effective
17.5	19	15	Highly Effective
17	19	14	Highly Effective
16	18	14	Highly Effective
15	18	14	Highly Effective
14	17	13	Effective
13.5	16	13	Effective
13	15	13	Effective
12	14	12	Effective
11	13	11	Effective
10.5	12	10	Effective
10	11	10	Effective
9	10	9	Effective
8	9	8	Effective
7	8	7	Developing
6	7	6	Developing
5	6	5	Developing
4	5	4	Developing
3	4	4	Developing
2	3	3	Developing
1.5	2	2	Ineffective
1	2	1	Ineffective
0.5	1	1	Ineffective
0 or less	0	0	Ineffective

In intervals where half values are used in Column A the following rounding rules apply:

- 0.1 to 0.4 rounds down to the nearest whole interval.
- 0.6 to 0.9 rounds up to the nearest whole interval.

HEDI Conversion Charts for Subcomponents A and B

HEDI Conversion Chart for Subcomponent A

(Using Student Learning Objectives (SLO) for Subcomponent A (Student Growth Measure))

and

Chestnut St. Kindergarten Center School-wide Locally Selected Measure of Student Achievement

	HEDI Points	SLO Target or Percent Mastery Achieved	HEDI scores and Mastery Range
Ineffective	0	0%	0% to 5%
	1	6%	6% to 12%
	2	13%	13% to 19%
Developing	3	20%	20% to 25%
	4	26%	26% to 31%
	5	32%	32% to 37%
	6	38%	38% to 44%
	7	45%	45% to 51%
	8	52%	52% to 59%
Effective	9	60%	60% to 61%
	10	62%	62% to 63%
	11	64%	64% to 66%
	12	67%	67% to 69%
	13	70%	70% to 72%
	14	73%	73% to 75%
	15	76%	76% to 78%
	16	79%	79% to 81%
	17	82%	82% to 84%
Highly Effective	18	85%	85% to 89%
	19	90%	90% to 95%
	20	96%	96% to 100%

HEDI Conversion for Locally Selected Measures

In order to hold all teachers of every subject to the expectation of the Common Core Standards that every teacher is a teacher of literacy, the difference between the three year average of the School’s Performance Index in ELA and the three year average of the New York State Performance Index in ELA will be computed individually for each school. The chart below delineates the conversion from difference in Performance Index, as noted above, to the HEDI score for teachers in the building. This score will be used as the second 20% (15%) for all teachers in the building.

- The Performance Index is a value from 0 to 200 that is assigned to an accountability group (in this case the group used will be “all students”) indicating how that group performed on the State ELA tests.
- At the elementary level, the PI is calculated using the following equation: $100 \times \left[\frac{\text{Count of Continuously Enrolled Tested Students Performing at Levels 2, 3, and 4} + \text{Count at Levels 3 and 4}}{\text{Count of All Continuously Enrolled Tested Students}} \right]$
- At the secondary level, the PI is calculated using the following equation: $100 \times \left[\frac{\text{Count of Cohort Members Performing at Levels 2, 3, and 4} + \text{Count at Levels 3 and 4}}{\text{Count of All Cohort Members}} \right]$
- In order to compute the state and school wide PI average, the 2009-10, 2010-11 and 2011-12 New York State and school wide ELA scores will be used.

Local PI Average less State PI Average to HEDI Conversion Chart

Building Average PI minus State Average PI	Points (0-20)	Points (0-15)	HEDI Rating
Less than 0 to 1.5	0-2	0-2	Ineffective
2 to 7	3-8	3-7	Developing
8-14	9-17	8-13	Effective
15-19 or greater	18-20	14-15	Highly Effective

- The locally developed measures of student achievement at the Chestnut Street Kindergarten Center will be based on locally selected assessments in math and ELA. Using pre-assessments and any other available data, achievement targets will be collaboratively set by teachers and approved by administrators. The locally developed assessment for determining the school-wide score will be approved by the building principal and shall be rigorous and comparable across classrooms. The school-wide score (percent of students reaching target) will be converted using the Subcomponent A conversion chart.

**HEDI Conversion Chart for Subcomponent B
(Locally Selected Measures of Student Achievement)**

Column A Building Avg PI - State Avg PI	Column B Points (0-20)	Column C Points (0-15)	Column D HEDI Rating
19 or More	20	15	Highly Effective
18	20	15	Highly Effective
17.5	19	15	Highly Effective
17	19	14	Highly Effective
16	18	14	Highly Effective
15	18	14	Highly Effective
14	17	13	Effective
13.5	16	13	Effective
13	15	13	Effective
12	14	12	Effective
11	13	11	Effective
10.5	12	10	Effective
10	11	10	Effective
9	10	9	Effective
8	9	8	Effective
7	8	7	Developing
6	7	6	Developing
5	6	5	Developing
4	5	4	Developing
3	4	4	Developing
2	3	3	Developing
1.5	2	2	Ineffective
1	2	1	Ineffective
0.5	1	1	Ineffective
0 or less	0	0	Ineffective

In intervals where half values are used in Column A the following rounding rules apply:

- 0.1 to 0.4 rounds down to the nearest whole interval.
- 0.6 to 0.9 rounds up to the nearest whole interval.

Rubric Score to Sub-Component Conversion Chart
Subcomponent C
Measures of Principal Effectiveness Based on the Multidimensional Rubric - 60%

Total Average Rubric Score	Category	Conversion Score for Composite
Ineffective 0-49		
1		0
1.1		12
1.2		25
1.3		37
1.4		49
Developing 50-56		
1.5		50
1.6		50.7
1.7		51.4
1.8		52.1
1.9		52.8
2		53.5
2.1		54.2
2.2		54.9
2.3		55.6
2.4		56.3
Effective 57-58		
2.5		57
2.6		57.2
2.7		57.4
2.8		57.6
2.9		57.8
3		58
3.1		58.2
3.2		58.4
3.3		58.6
3.4		58.8
Highly Effective 59-60		
3.5		59
3.6		59.3
3.7		59.5
3.8		59.8
3.9		60
4		60.25 (round to 60)

We understand that the final composite score must be a whole number.

HEDI Conversion Charts for Subcomponents A and B

HEDI Conversion Chart for Subcomponent A

(Using Student Learning Objectives (SLO) for Subcomponent A (Student Growth Measure))

and

Chestnut St. Kindergarten Center School-wide Locally Selected Measure of Student Achievement

	HEDI Points	SLO Target or Percent Mastery Achieved	HEDI scores and Mastery Range
Ineffective	0	0%	0% to 5%
	1	6%	6% to 12%
	2	13%	13% to 19%
Developing	3	20%	20% to 25%
	4	26%	26% to 31%
	5	32%	32% to 37%
	6	38%	38% to 44%
	7	45%	45% to 51%
	8	52%	52% to 59%
Effective	9	60%	60% to 61%
	10	62%	62% to 63%
	11	64%	64% to 66%
	12	67%	67% to 69%
	13	70%	70% to 72%
	14	73%	73% to 75%
	15	76%	76% to 78%
	16	79%	79% to 81%
	17	82%	82% to 84%
Highly Effective	18	85%	85% to 89%
	19	90%	90% to 95%
	20	96%	96% to 100%

HEDI Conversion for Locally Selected Measures

In order to hold all teachers of every subject to the expectation of the Common Core Standards that every teacher is a teacher of literacy, the difference between the three year average of the School’s Performance Index in ELA and the three year average of the New York State Performance Index in ELA will be computed individually for each school. The chart below delineates the conversion from difference in Performance Index, as noted above, to the HEDI score for teachers in the building. This score will be used as the second 20% (15%) for all teachers in the building.

- The Performance Index is a value from 0 to 200 that is assigned to an accountability group (in this case the group used will be “all students”) indicating how that group performed on the State ELA tests.
- At the elementary level, the PI is calculated using the following equation: $100 \times \left[\frac{\text{Count of Continuously Enrolled Tested Students Performing at Levels 2, 3, and 4} + \text{Count at Levels 3 and 4}}{\text{Count of All Continuously Enrolled Tested Students}} \right]$
- At the secondary level, the PI is calculated using the following equation: $100 \times \left[\frac{\text{Count of Cohort Members Performing at Levels 2, 3, and 4} + \text{Count at Levels 3 and 4}}{\text{Count of All Cohort Members}} \right]$
- In order to compute the state and school wide PI average, the 2009-10, 2010-11 and 2011-12 New York State and school wide ELA scores will be used.

Local PI Average less State PI Average to HEDI Conversion Chart

Building Average PI minus State Average PI	Points (0-20)	Points (0-15)	HEDI Rating
Less than 0 to 1.5	0-2	0-2	Ineffective
2 to 7	3-8	3-7	Developing
8-14	9-17	8-13	Effective
15-19 or greater	18-20	14-15	Highly Effective

- The locally developed measures of student achievement at the Chestnut Street Kindergarten Center will be based on locally selected assessments in math and ELA. Using pre-assessments and any other available data, achievement targets will be collaboratively set by teachers and approved by administrators. The locally developed assessment for determining the school-wide score will be approved by the building principal and shall be rigorous and comparable across classrooms. The school-wide score (percent of students reaching target) will be converted using the Subcomponent A conversion chart.

**HEDI Conversion Chart for Subcomponent B
(Locally Selected Measures of Student Achievement)**

Column A Building Avg PI - State Avg PI	Column B Points (0-20)	Column C Points (0-15)	Column D HEDI Rating
19 or More	20	15	Highly Effective
18	20	15	Highly Effective
17.5	19	15	Highly Effective
17	19	14	Highly Effective
16	18	14	Highly Effective
15	18	14	Highly Effective
14	17	13	Effective
13.5	16	13	Effective
13	15	13	Effective
12	14	12	Effective
11	13	11	Effective
10.5	12	10	Effective
10	11	10	Effective
9	10	9	Effective
8	9	8	Effective
7	8	7	Developing
6	7	6	Developing
5	6	5	Developing
4	5	4	Developing
3	4	4	Developing
2	3	3	Developing
1.5	2	2	Ineffective
1	2	1	Ineffective
0.5	1	1	Ineffective
0 or less	0	0	Ineffective

In intervals where half values are used in Column A the following rounding rules apply:

- 0.1 to 0.4 rounds down to the nearest whole interval.
- 0.6 to 0.9 rounds up to the nearest whole interval.

HEDI Conversion Charts for Subcomponents A and B

HEDI Conversion Chart for Subcomponent A

(Using Student Learning Objectives (SLO) for Subcomponent A (Student Growth Measure))

and

Chestnut St. Kindergarten Center School-wide Locally Selected Measure of Student Achievement

	HEDI Points	SLO Target or Percent Mastery Achieved	HEDI scores and Mastery Range
Ineffective	0	0%	0% to 5%
	1	6%	6% to 12%
	2	13%	13% to 19%
Developing	3	20%	20% to 25%
	4	26%	26% to 31%
	5	32%	32% to 37%
	6	38%	38% to 44%
	7	45%	45% to 51%
	8	52%	52% to 59%
Effective	9	60%	60% to 61%
	10	62%	62% to 63%
	11	64%	64% to 66%
	12	67%	67% to 69%
	13	70%	70% to 72%
	14	73%	73% to 75%
	15	76%	76% to 78%
	16	79%	79% to 81%
	17	82%	82% to 84%
Highly Effective	18	85%	85% to 89%
	19	90%	90% to 95%
	20	96%	96% to 100%

HEDI Conversion for Locally Selected Measures

In order to hold all teachers of every subject to the expectation of the Common Core Standards that every teacher is a teacher of literacy, the difference between the three year average of the School’s Performance Index in ELA and the three year average of the New York State Performance Index in ELA will be computed individually for each school. The chart below delineates the conversion from difference in Performance Index, as noted above, to the HEDI score for teachers in the building. This score will be used as the second 20% (15%) for all teachers in the building.

- The Performance Index is a value from 0 to 200 that is assigned to an accountability group (in this case the group used will be “all students”) indicating how that group performed on the State ELA tests.
- At the elementary level, the PI is calculated using the following equation: $100 \times \left[\frac{\text{Count of Continuously Enrolled Tested Students Performing at Levels 2, 3, and 4} + \text{Count at Levels 3 and 4}}{\text{Count of All Continuously Enrolled Tested Students}} \right]$
- At the secondary level, the PI is calculated using the following equation: $100 \times \left[\frac{\text{Count of Cohort Members Performing at Levels 2, 3, and 4} + \text{Count at Levels 3 and 4}}{\text{Count of All Cohort Members}} \right]$
- In order to compute the state and school wide PI average, the 2009-10, 2010-11 and 2011-12 New York State and school wide ELA scores will be used.

Local PI Average less State PI Average to HEDI Conversion Chart

Building Average PI minus State Average PI	Points (0-20)	Points (0-15)	HEDI Rating
Less than 0 to 1.5	0-2	0-2	Ineffective
2 to 7	3-8	3-7	Developing
8-14	9-17	8-13	Effective
15-19 or greater	18-20	14-15	Highly Effective

- The locally developed measures of student achievement at the Chestnut Street Kindergarten Center will be based on locally selected assessments in math and ELA. Using pre-assessments and any other available data, achievement targets will be collaboratively set by teachers and approved by administrators. The locally developed assessment for determining the school-wide score will be approved by the building principal and shall be rigorous and comparable across classrooms. The school-wide score (percent of students reaching target) will be converted using the Subcomponent A conversion chart.

**HEDI Conversion Chart for Subcomponent B
(Locally Selected Measures of Student Achievement)**

Column A Building Avg PI - State Avg PI	Column B Points (0-20)	Column C Points (0-15)	Column D HEDI Rating
19 or More	20	15	Highly Effective
18	20	15	Highly Effective
17.5	19	15	Highly Effective
17	19	14	Highly Effective
16	18	14	Highly Effective
15	18	14	Highly Effective
14	17	13	Effective
13.5	16	13	Effective
13	15	13	Effective
12	14	12	Effective
11	13	11	Effective
10.5	12	10	Effective
10	11	10	Effective
9	10	9	Effective
8	9	8	Effective
7	8	7	Developing
6	7	6	Developing
5	6	5	Developing
4	5	4	Developing
3	4	4	Developing
2	3	3	Developing
1.5	2	2	Ineffective
1	2	1	Ineffective
0.5	1	1	Ineffective
0 or less	0	0	Ineffective

In intervals where half values are used in Column A the following rounding rules apply:

- 0.1 to 0.4 rounds down to the nearest whole interval.
- 0.6 to 0.9 rounds up to the nearest whole interval.

West Hempstead Performance Review
Teacher Improvement Plan (TIP)

_____ received a/an
 (Teacher Name)

	Observation		Summative Evaluation
--	-------------	--	----------------------

that was rated when being evaluated by

	Ineffective		Developing
--	-------------	--	------------

_____ on _____
 (Administrator) (Date)

The following TIP and timetable has been established in collaboration with the administrator and teacher, and will be discussed with the teacher at a follow up meeting on _____
 (Date)

Area for Improvement	Administrator recommended action plan	Teacher suggestions	Anticipated timeline for completion

Post Observation Conference _____

Follow-Up Meeting Scheduled for _____

Note: Follow-up meeting must be scheduled within 30 days of the post-observation conference/summative evaluation conference.

 Administrator Date

 Administrator Date

 Teacher Date

 Teacher Date

**West Hempstead Performance Review
Teacher Improvement Plan (TIP)**

Evidence of Action Taken Towards Improvement

Date	Evidence of Administrator Action	Date	Evidence of Teacher Action

Recommendation for Results of TIP

- The teacher has met the performance goals identified through the TIP**
- The teacher has not met the performance goals**

Optional Actions:

Teacher to speak with/observe consenting colleague who has expertise in the targeted needs	Role-playing opportunities to practice desired new behaviors or skills in a restricted environment before applying it
Attendance at workshops, courses and/or conferences that address the targeted needs of the teacher	Teacher self-records lesson assisted by the administrator
Teacher observe a demonstration lesson by an administrator	Self-review of teacher's individual lesson
Teacher to read support materials provided by the administrator, followed by a conversation regarding those materials	Teacher utilizes classroom management techniques recommended by the administrator
Teacher to watch recorded examples of successful lessons provided by the administrator	Peer review (as suggested and arranged by the teacher)
Teacher to read books, periodicals and websites provided by administrator, followed up by a conversation regarding those materials	Assignment of formal mentor
Teacher to attend collegial circles recommended by the administrator	Other activities as mutually agreed upon between administrator and teacher

Additional Comments/Reflection:



West Hempstead Performance Review

Principal Improvement Plan (PIP)

Name of Principal _____

School Building _____ Academic Year _____

Basis for the *developing* or *ineffective* performance rating outlined:

Developing

Ineffective

Elements identified from Multidimensional Principal Performance Rubric where improvement is needed:

-
-

Improvement Goals -Observable/measurable performance goals and specific expectations:

Timeline for Completion of identified goals:

Progress Monitoring: (Lead evaluator and principal initial each date to confirm meeting)

Meeting Dates: (Minimum 3)	Evaluator's Signature	Principal's Signature

Actions to be Taken

Evaluator's Suggestions	Evidence by which improvement will be assessed	Principal's Reflections

Recommended Resources

- Principal to participate in a literary discussion of professional resources recommended and provided by the evaluator
- Principal to attend conference(s) with direct relevance to the improvement goal stated above on the local, state and national level
- Principal shall be afforded networking opportunities outside the immediate district
- Principal to implement building management techniques as outlined by the evaluator
- Peer review (as suggested and arranged by the Principal)
- Assignment of a formal mentor in addition to the input of the lead evaluator
- Principal to speak with and/or observe a colleague within or outside the district
- Principal to provide evidence following a self-review of action steps taken
- Other activities to be clearly specified by the evaluator at initial meeting

Superintendent is to attach a narrative summary of improvement progress, including verification of the provisions of support and resources outlined above no later than 10 business days after the agreed upon completion date. Such a summary shall be signed by superintendent and principal with the opportunity for the principal to attach a comment.

Lead Evaluator Initial Date _____ _____
Lead Evaluator Completion Date

Principal Initial Date _____ _____
Principal Completion Date

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

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

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

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

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

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

Signatures, dates

Superintendent Signature: Date: 1/3/13



Teachers Union President Signature: Date:

 1/3/13

Administrative Union President Signature: Date:

 1/3/13

Board of Education President Signature: Date:

 1/3/13