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

May 13, 2014

Revised

Bernadette Burns, Superintendent
West Islip Union Free School District
100 Sherman Ave.
West Islip, NY 11795

Dear Superintendent Burns:

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

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

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

Thank you again for your hard work.

Sincerely,

John B. King, Jr.
Commissioner

Attachment

c: Dean Lucera

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

Annual Professional Performance Reviews

Created Tuesday, April 30, 2013
Updated Friday, December 20, 2013

1

Disclaimers

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

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

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

1. SCHOOL DISTRICT INFORMATION

1.1) School District's BEDS Number : 580509030000

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

580509030000

1.2) School District Name: WEST ISLIP UFSD

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

WEST ISLIP UFSD

1.3) Assurances

Please check all of the boxes below:

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

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

1.4) Submission Status

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

Submission of material changes to an approved APPR plan

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

Created Tuesday, April 30, 2013
Updated Tuesday, May 13, 2014

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, the State-provided growth measure will be used for 20 points in this subcomponent. NYSED will provide a HEDI subcomponent rating category and score from 0 to 20 points.

2.1) Assurances

Please check the boxes below:

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

STUDENT LEARNING OBJECTIVES AS COMPARABLE GROWTH MEASURES (20 points)

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

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

2.2) Grades K-3 ELA

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

	ELA	Assessment
K	State-approved 3rd party assessment	Measures of Academic Progress (MAP) - Primary Grades
1	State-approved 3rd party assessment	Measures of Academic Progress (MAP) - Primary Grades
2	State-approved 3rd party assessment	Measures of Academic Progress (MAP) - Primary Grades

	ELA	Assessment
3	State assessment	3rd Grade State Assessment

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

Use this box, if needed, to describe the general process for assigning HEDI categories for these grades/subjects in this subcomponent. If needed, you may upload a table or graphic at 2.11, below.	The teachers, in collaboration with the administrator, will establish individual student-growth targets using pre-assessment baseline data. Based on the overall percentage of students who meet their individual student growth target, a corresponding 0-20 HEDI score will be determined using the uploaded conversion chart in Question 2.11.
Highly Effective (18 - 20 points) Results are well-above state average for similar students (or District goals if no state test).	Teachers whose students exceed the established targets for similar students in the district and/or state, based on the evidence for the SLO.
Effective (9 - 17 points) Results meet state average for similar students (or District goals if no state test).	Teachers whose students meet the established targets for similar students in the district and/or state, based on the evidence for the SLO.

Developing (3 - 8 points) Results are below state average for similar students (or District goals if no state test).	Teachers whose students approach the established targets for similar students in the district and/or state, based on the evidence for the SLO.
Ineffective (0 - 2 points) Results are well-below state average for similar students (or District goals if no state test).	Teachers whose students are far below the established targets for similar students in the district and/or state, based on the evidence for the SLO.

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	Measures of Academic Progress (MAP) - Primary Grades
1	State-approved 3rd party assessment	Measures of Academic Progress (MAP) - Primary Grades
2	State-approved 3rd party assessment	Measures of Academic Progress (MAP) - Primary Grades

	Math	Assessment
3	State assessment	3rd Grade State Assessment

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

Use this box, if needed, to describe the general process for assigning HEDI categories for these grades/subjects in this subcomponent. If needed, you may upload a table or graphic at 2.11, below.	The teachers, in collaboration with the administrator, will establish individual student-growth targets using pre-assessment baseline data. Based on the overall percentage of students who meet their individual student growth target, a corresponding 0-20 HEDI score will be determined using the uploaded conversion chart in Question 2.11.
Highly Effective (18 - 20 points) Results are well-above state average for similar students (or District goals if no state test).	Teachers whose students exceed the established targets for similar students in the district and/or state, based on the evidence for the SLO.
Effective (9 - 17 points) Results meet state average for similar students (or District goals if no state test).	Teachers whose students meet the established targets for similar students in the district and/or state, based on the evidence for the SLO.
Developing (3 - 8 points) Results are below state average for similar students (or District goals if no state test).	Teachers whose students approach the established targets for similar students in the district and/or state, based on the evidence for the SLO.
Ineffective (0 - 2 points) Results are well-below state average for similar students (or District goals if no state test).	Teachers whose students are far below the established targets for similar students in the district and/or state, based on the evidence for the SLO.

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 Islip School District-developed grade 6 science assessment
7	District, regional or BOCES-developed assessment	West Islip School District-developed grade 7 science assessment

	Science	Assessment
8	State assessment	8th Grade State Science Assessment

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

Use this box, if needed, to describe the general process for assigning HEDI categories for these grades/subjects in this subcomponent. If needed, you may upload a table or graphic at 2.11, below.	The teachers, in collaboration with the administrator, will establish individual student-growth targets using pre-assessment baseline data. Based on the overall percentage of students who meet their individual student growth target, a corresponding 0-20 HEDI score will be determined using the uploaded conversion chart in Question 2.11.
Highly Effective (18 - 20 points) Results are well-above state average for similar students (or District goals if no state test).	A teacher's comparable growth measure is Highly Effective if 85-100% of students meet the established growth target.
Effective (9 - 17 points) Results meet state average for similar students (or District goals if no state test).	A teacher's comparable growth measure is Effective if 70-84% of students meet the established growth target.
Developing (3 - 8 points) Results are below state average for similar students (or District goals if no state test).	A teacher's comparable growth measure is Developing if 55-69% of students meet the established growth target.
Ineffective (0 - 2 points) Results are well-below state average for similar students (or District goals if no state test).	A teacher's comparable growth measure is Ineffective if less than 55% of students meet the established growth target.

2.5) Grades 6-8 Social Studies

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

	Social Studies	Assessment
6	District, regional or BOCES-developed assessment	West Islip School District-developed grade 6 social studies assessment
7	District, regional or BOCES-developed assessment	West Islip School District-developed grade 7 social studies assessment
8	District, regional or BOCES-developed assessment	West Islip School District-developed grade 8 social studies assessment

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

Use this box, if needed, to describe the general process for assigning HEDI categories for these grades/subjects in this subcomponent. If needed, you may upload a table or graphic at 2.11, below.	The teachers, in collaboration with the administrator, will establish individual student-growth targets using pre-assessment baseline data. Based on the overall percentage of students who meet their individual student growth target, a corresponding 0-20 HEDI score will be determined using the uploaded conversion chart in Question 2.11.
Highly Effective (18 - 20 points) Results are well-above District goals for similar students.	A teacher's comparable growth measure is Highly Effective if 85-100% of students meet the established growth target.
Effective (9 - 17 points) Results meet District goals for similar students.	A teacher's comparable growth measure is Effective if 70-84% of students meet the established growth target.
Developing (3 - 8 points) Results are below District goals for similar students.	A teacher's comparable growth measure is Developing if 55-69% of students meet the established growth target.
Ineffective (0 - 2 points) Results are well-below District goals for similar students.	A teacher's comparable growth measure is Ineffective if less than 55% of students meet the established growth target.

2.6) High School Social Studies Regents Courses

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

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

		Assessment
Global 1	District, regional, or BOCES-developed assessment	West Islip School District-developed Global 1 Summative 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 measuring student growth on the assessments listed for this Task.

Use this box, if needed, to describe the general process for assigning HEDI categories for these grades/subjects in this subcomponent. If needed, you may upload a table or graphic at 2.11, below.	The teachers, in collaboration with the administrator, will establish individual student-growth targets using pre-assessment baseline data. Based on the overall percentage of students who meet their individual student growth target, a corresponding 0-20 HEDI score will be determined using the uploaded conversion chart in Question 2.11.
Highly Effective (18 - 20 points) Results are well-above District goals for similar students.	A teacher's comparable growth measure is Highly Effective if 85-100% of students meet the established growth target.
Effective (9 - 17 points) Results meet District goals for similar students.	A teacher's comparable growth measure is Effective if 70-84% of students meet the established growth target.
Developing (3 - 8 points) Results are below District goals for similar students.	A teacher's comparable growth measure is Developing if 55-69% of students meet the established growth target.
Ineffective (0 - 2 points) Results are well-below District goals for similar students.	A teacher's comparable growth measure is Ineffective if less than 55% of students meet the established growth target.

2.7) High School Science Regents Courses

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

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

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

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

Use this box, if needed, to describe the general process for assigning HEDI categories for these grades/subjects in this subcomponent. If needed, you may upload a table or graphic at 2.11, below.	The teachers, in collaboration with the administrator, will establish individual student-growth targets using pre-assessment baseline data. Based on the overall percentage of students who meet their individual student growth target, a corresponding 0-20 HEDI score will be determined using the uploaded conversion chart in Question 2.11.
Highly Effective (18 - 20 points) Results are well-above District goals for similar students.	A teacher's comparable growth measure is Highly Effective if 85-100% of students meet the established growth target.
Effective (9 - 17 points) Results meet District goals for similar students.	A teacher's comparable growth measure is Effective if 70-84% of students meet the established growth target.
Developing (3 - 8 points) Results are below District goals for similar students.	A teacher's comparable growth measure is Developing if 55-69% of students meet the established growth target.
Ineffective (0 - 2 points) Results are well-below District goals for similar students.	A teacher's comparable growth measure is Ineffective if less than 55% of students meet the established growth target.

2.8) High School Math Regents Courses

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

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

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

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

NOTE: For Algebra 1, please specify whether your district will be offering the Integrated Algebra Regents, the Common Core Algebra Regents, or both and how the HEDI process will be adjusted accordingly.

Use this box, if needed, to describe the general process for assigning HEDI categories for these grades/subjects in this subcomponent. If needed, you may upload a table or graphic at 2.11, below.	The teachers, in collaboration with the administrator, will establish individual student-growth targets using pre-assessment baseline data. Based on the overall percentage of students who meet their individual student growth target, a corresponding 0-20 HEDI score will be determined using the uploaded conversion chart in Question 2.11. Note: Students enrolled in Common Core Algebra will take the NYS Regents Examination in Integrated Algebra in addition to the NYS Regents Examination in Algebra I (Common Core), and the higher of the two Regents Exam scores will be used for APPR purposes.
Highly Effective (18 - 20 points) Results are well-above District goals for similar students.	A teacher's comparable growth measure is Highly Effective if 85-100% of students meet the established growth target.
Effective (9 - 17 points) Results meet District goals for similar students.	A teacher's comparable growth measure is Effective if 70-84% of students meet the established growth target.
Developing (3 - 8 points) Results are below District goals for similar students.	A teacher's comparable growth measure is Developing if 55-69% of students meet the established growth target.
Ineffective (0 - 2 points) Results are well-below District goals for similar students.	A teacher's comparable growth measure is Ineffective if less than 55% of students meet the established growth target.

2.9) High School English Language Arts

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

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

	High School English Courses	Assessment
Grade 9 ELA	District, regional or BOCES-developed assessment	West Islip School District-developed grade 9 Common Core-aligned English assessment
Grade 10 ELA	District, regional or BOCES-developed assessment	West Islip School District-developed grade 10 Common Core-aligned English assessment
Grade 11 ELA	Regents assessment	NYS Comprehensive English Regents Exam and the NYS Common Core 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 measuring student growth on the assessments listed for this Task.

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

Use this box, if needed, to describe the general process for assigning HEDI categories for these grades/subjects in this subcomponent. If needed, you may upload a table or graphic at 2.11, below.	The teachers, in collaboration with the administrator, will establish individual student-growth targets using pre-assessment baseline data. Based on the overall percentage of students who meet their individual student growth target, a corresponding 0-20 HEDI score will be determined using the uploaded

	conversion chart in Item 2.11. Note: Students enrolled in English 11 and receiving Common Core instruction will take both the NYS Comprehensive English Regents Exam and the NYS Common Core English Regents, and the higher of the two Regents exam scores will be used for APPR purposes.
Highly Effective (18 - 20 points) Results are well-above District goals for similar students.	A teacher's comparable growth measure is Highly Effective if 85-100% of students meet the established growth target.
Effective (9 - 17 points) Results meet District goals for similar students.	A teacher's comparable growth measure is Effective if 70-84% of students meet the established growth target.
Developing (3 - 8 points) Results are below District goals for similar students.	A teacher's comparable growth measure is Developing if 55-69% of students meet the established growth target.
Ineffective (0 - 2 points) Results are well-below District goals for similar students.	A teacher's comparable growth measure is Ineffective if less than 55% of students meet the established growth target.

2.10) All Other Courses

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

	Course(s) or Subject(s)	Option	Assessment
	Grades K-12 Art	District, Regional or BOCES-developed	West Islip School District-developed grade/course specific art assessment
	Grades 9-12 Business	District, Regional or BOCES-developed	West Islip School District-developed grade/course specific business assessment
	All other secondary English	District, Regional or BOCES-developed	West Islip School District-developed grade/course specific English assessment
	Grades K-12 English as a Second Language	State Assessment	Grade-specific NYSESLAT
	Grades 7-12 Family & Consumer Science	District, Regional or BOCES-developed	West Islip School District-developed grade/course specific FACS assessment
	Grades 7-12 Foreign Languages	District, Regional or BOCES-developed	Long Island regionally-developed (FLACS) course specific language assessment
	Grades 7-12 Health	District, Regional or BOCES-developed	West Islip School District-developed grade specific health assessment
	All other secondary Math	District, Regional or BOCES-developed	West Islip School District-developed course-specific math assessment
	Grades K-12 Music	District, Regional or BOCES-developed	West Islip School District-developed grade/course specific music assessment
	Grades K-12 Physical Education	District, Regional or BOCES-developed	West Islip School District-developed grade/course specific physical education assessment
	All other secondary Science	District, Regional or BOCES-developed	West Islip School District-developed course specific science assessment
	All other secondary Social Studies	District, Regional or BOCES-developed	West Islip School District-developed course specific social studies assessment
	Grades 7-12 Technology	District, Regional or BOCES-developed	West Islip School District-developed grade/course specific technology assessment
	Grades K-8 Library	District, Regional or BOCES-developed	West Islip School District-developed grade/course specific assessment

	Grades K-5 Reading	School/BOCES-wide/group/ team results based on State	NYS Grades 3-5 English Language Arts Tests
	Grades 6-12 Reading	District, Regional or BOCES-developed	West Islip School District-developed grade/course specific assessment
	Grades K-12 Special Education (Resource Room)	School/BOCES-wide/group/ team results based on State	NYS grade-specific English & Math Assessments; NYS Comprehensive English Regents/NYS Common Core English Regents, NYS Common Core Algebra 1 Regents/NYS Integrated Algebra Regents
	Grades K-12 Special Education (LifeSkills)	State Assessment	Age-appropriate NYSAA

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

Use this box, if needed, to describe the general process for assigning HEDI categories for these grades/subjects in this subcomponent. If needed, you may upload a table or graphic at 2.11, below.	The teachers, in collaboration with the administrator, will establish individual student-growth targets using pre-assessment baseline data. Based on the overall percentage of students who meet their individual student growth target, a corresponding 0-20 HEDI score will be determined using the uploaded conversion chart in Question 2.11. Teachers being evaluated using a schoolwide measure will be evaluated based on the percentage of students school-wide meeting or exceeding the established individual growth target. Note: Students enrolled in Common Core Algebra will take the NYS Regents Examination in Integrated Algebra in addition to the NYS Regents Examination in Algebra I (Common Core), and the higher of the two Regents Exam scores will be used for APPR purposes. Note: Students enrolled in English 11 and receiving Common Core instruction will take both the NYS Comprehensive English Regents Exam and the NYS Common Core English Regents, and the higher of the two Regents exam scores will be used for APPR purposes.
Highly Effective (18 - 20 points) Results are well-above District goals for similar students.	A teacher's comparable growth measure is Highly Effective if 85-100% of students meet the established growth target.
Effective (9 - 17 points) Results meet District goals for similar students.	A teacher's comparable growth measure is Effective if 70-84% of students meet the established growth target.
Developing (3 - 8 points) Results are below District goals for similar students.	A teacher's comparable growth measure is Developing if 55-69% of students meet the established growth target.
Ineffective (0 - 2 points) Results are well-below District goals for similar students.	A teacher's comparable growth measure is Ineffective if less than 55% of students meet the established growth target.

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

(No response)

2.11) HEDI Tables or Graphics

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

assets/survey-uploads/12186/870831-TXEtxx9bQW/44863298-APPR Table - Item 2.11_1.docx

2.12) Locally Developed Controls

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

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

(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://www.engageny.org/resource/student-learning-objectives-guidance-document).	Checked
2.14) Assurances | Assure that past academic performance and/or baseline academic data of students will be taken into account when developing an SLO.	Checked
2.14) Assurances | Assure that the process for assigning points for SLOs for the Growth Subcomponent will use the narrative HEDI descriptions described in the regulations to effectively differentiate educators in ways that improve student learning and instruction.	Checked
2.14) Assurances | Assure that it is possible for an educator to earn each point, including 0, for SLOs in the Growth subcomponent scoring range.	Checked
2.14) Assurances | Assure that processes are in place to monitor SLOs to ensure rigor and comparability across classrooms.	Checked

3. Local Measures (Teachers)

Created Tuesday, April 30, 2013
Updated Tuesday, May 13, 2014

Page 1

Locally Selected Measures of Student Achievement or Growth

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

Growth or achievement measure(s) from these options.

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

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

Measures based on:

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

the percentage of a teacher's students earning the advanced performance level (four) on the 4th grade ELA or math State assessments compared to those students' performance levels on the 3rd grade ELA or math State assessments)

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

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

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

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

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

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

3.1) Grades 4-8 ELA

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

	Locally-Selected Measure from List of Approved Measures	Assessment
4	5) District, regional, or BOCES–developed assessments	West Islip School District-developed grade 4 math assessment
5	5) District, regional, or BOCES–developed assessments	West Islip School District-developed grade 5 math assessment
6	5) District, regional, or BOCES–developed assessments	West Islip School District-developed grade 6 content-specific assessment
7	5) District, regional, or BOCES–developed assessments	West Islip School District-developed grade 7 English Common Core-aligned assessment
8	5) District, regional, or BOCES–developed assessments	West Islip School District-developed grade 8 English Common Core-aligned ssessment

For Grades 4-8 ELA: describe the district-adopted expectations for the level of growth or achievement needed for a teacher to earn each of the four HEDI rating categories and the process for assigning points within rating categories that ensures it is possible for a teacher to earn any of the points in a scoring range, consistent with regulations and assurances.

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

Use this box, if needed, to describe the general process for assigning HEDI categories for these grades/subjects in this subcomponent. If needed, you may upload a table or graphic at 3.3, below.	At least 70% of a teacher's students will achieve a score of 65% or above on the summative assessment. A HEDI score will be determined using the uploaded conversion chart in Question 3.3. The 20-point chart will be used until value-added is implemented. After value-added is implemented, the 15-point

	chart will be used.
Highly Effective (14 - 15 points) Results are well above District- or BOCES-adopted expectations for growth or achievement for grade/subject.	Teachers are Highly Effective if 85-100% of students score 65% or above on the summative assessment.
Effective (8- 13 points) Results meet District- or BOCES-adopted expectations for growth or achievement for grade/subject.	Teachers are Effective if 70-84% of students score 65% or above on the summative assessment.
Developing (3 - 7 points) Results are below District- or BOCES-adopted expectations for growth or achievement for grade/subject.	Teachers are Developing if 55-69% of students score 65% or above on the summative assessment.
Ineffective (0 - 2 points) Results are well below District- or BOCES-adopted expectations for growth or achievement for grade/subject.	Teachers are Ineffective if less than 55% of students score 65% or above on the summative assessment.

3.2) Grades 4-8 Math

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

	Locally-Selected Measure from List of Approved Measures	Assessment
4	5) District, regional, or BOCES–developed assessments	West Islip School District-developed grade 4 Common Core-aligned math assessment
5	5) District, regional, or BOCES–developed assessments	West Islip School District-developed grade 5 Common Core-aligned math assessment
6	5) District, regional, or BOCES–developed assessments	West Islip School District-developed grade 6 Common Core-aligned math assessment
7	5) District, regional, or BOCES–developed assessments	West Islip School District-developed grade 7 Common Core-aligned math assessment
8	5) District, regional, or BOCES–developed assessments	West Islip School District-developed grade 8 Common Core-aligned math assessment

For Grades 4-8 Math: describe the district-adopted expectations for the level of growth or achievement needed for a teacher to earn each of the four HEDI rating categories and the process for assigning points within rating categories that ensures it is possible for a teacher to earn any of the points in a scoring range, consistent with regulations and assurances.

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

Use this box, if needed, to describe the general process for assigning HEDI categories for these grades/subjects in this subcomponent. If needed, you may upload a table or graphic at 3.3, below.	At least 70% of a teacher's students will achieve a score of 65% or above on the summative assessment. A HEDI score will be determined using the uploaded conversion chart in Question 3.3. The 20-point chart will be used until value-added is implemented. After value-added is implemented, the 15-point chart will be used.
Highly Effective (14 - 15 points) Results are well above District- or BOCES-adopted expectations for growth or achievement for grade/subject.	Teachers are Highly Effective if 85-100% of students score 65% or above on the summative assessment.
Effective (8- 13 points) Results meet District- or BOCES-adopted expectations for growth or achievement for grade/subject.	Teachers are Effective if 70-84% of students score 65% or above on the summative assessment.

Developing (3 - 7 points) Results are below District- or BOCES-adopted expectations for growth or achievement for grade/subject.	Teachers are Developing if 55-69% of students score 65% or above on the summative assessment.
Ineffective (0 - 2 points) Results are well below District- or BOCES-adopted expectations for growth or achievement for grade/subject.	Teachers are Ineffective if less than 55% of students score 65% or above on the summative assessment.

3.3) HEDI Tables or Graphics

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

assets/survey-uploads/12149/870832-rhJdBgDruP/3-3.docx

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

Growth or achievement measure(s) from these options.

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

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

Measures based on:

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

7) Student Learning Objectives (only allowable for teachers in grades/subjects without a Value-Added measure for the State Growth

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

3.4) Grades K-3 ELA

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

	Locally-Selected Measure from List of Approved Measures	Assessment
K	5) District, regional, or BOCES–developed assessments	West Islip School District-developed grade K Common Core-aligned math assessment
1	5) District, regional, or BOCES–developed assessments	West Islip School District-developed grade 1 Common Core-aligned math assessment
2	5) District, regional, or BOCES–developed assessments	West Islip School District-developed grade 2 Common Core-aligned math assessment
3	5) District, regional, or BOCES–developed assessments	West Islip School District-developed grade 3 Common Core-aligned math 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.	At least 70% of a teacher's students will achieve a score of 65% or above on the summative assessment. A HEDI score will be determined using the uploaded conversion chart in Question 3.13.
Highly Effective (18-20 points) Results are well above District- or BOCES-adopted expectations for growth or achievement for grade/subject.	Teachers are Highly Effective if 85-100% of students score 65% or above on the summative assessment.
Effective (9-17 points) Results meet District- or BOCES-adopted expectations for growth or achievement for grade/subject.	Teachers are Effective if 70-84% of students score 65% or above on the summative assessment.
Developing (3 - 8 points) Results are below District- or BOCES-adopted expectations for growth or achievement for grade/subject.	Teachers are Developing if 55-69% of students score 65% or above on the summative assessment.
Ineffective (0 - 2 points) Results are well below District- or BOCES-adopted expectations for growth or achievement for grade/subject.	Teachers are Ineffective if less than 55% of students score 65% or above on the summative assessment.

3.5) Grades K-3 Math

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

	Locally-Selected Measure from List of Approved Measures	Assessment
K	5) District, regional, or BOCES–developed assessments	West Islip School District-developed grade K Common Core-aligned math assessment

1	5) District, regional, or BOCES–developed assessments	West Islip School District-developed grade 1 Common Core-aligned math assessment
2	5) District, regional, or BOCES–developed assessments	West Islip School District-developed grade 2 Common Core-aligned math assessment
3	5) District, regional, or BOCES–developed assessments	West Islip School District-developed grade 3 Common Core-aligned math assessment

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

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

Use this box, if needed, to describe the general process for assigning HEDI categories for these grades/subjects in this subcomponent. If needed, you may upload a table or graphic at 3.13, below.	At least 70% of a teacher's students will achieve a score of 65% or above on the summative assessment. A HEDI score will be determined using the uploaded conversion chart in Question 3.13.
Highly Effective (18-20 points) Results are well above District- or BOCES-adopted expectations for growth or achievement for grade/subject.	Teachers are Highly Effective if 85-100% of students score 65% or above on the summative assessment.
Effective (9-17 points) Results meet District- or BOCES-adopted expectations for growth or achievement for grade/subject.	Teachers are Effective if 70-84% of students score 65% or above on the summative assessment.
Developing (3 - 8 points) Results are below District -or BOCES-adopted expectations for growth or achievement for grade/subject.	Teachers are Developing if less than 55-69% of students score 65% or above on the summative assessment.
Ineffective (0 - 2 points) Results are well below District- or BOCES-adopted expectations for growth or achievement for grade/subject.	Teachers are Ineffective if less than 55% of students score 65% or above on the summative assessment.

3.6) Grades 6-8 Science

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

	Locally-Selected Measure from List of Approved Measures	Assessment
6	5) District, regional, or BOCES–developed assessments	West Islip School District-developed grade 6 science assessment
7	5) District, regional, or BOCES–developed assessments	West Islip School District-developed grade 7 science assessment
8	5) District, regional, or BOCES–developed assessments	West Islip School District-developed grade 8 science 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.	At least 70% of a teacher's students will achieve a score of 65% or above on the summative assessment. A HEDI score will be determined using the uploaded conversion chart in Question 3.13.
Highly Effective (18 - 20 points) Results are well above District- or BOCES-adopted expectations for growth or achievement for grade/subject.	Teachers are Highly Effective if 85-100% of students score 65% or above on the summative assessment.
Effective (9 - 17 points) Results meet District- or BOCES-adopted expectations for growth or achievement for grade/subject.	Teachers are Effective if 70-84% of students score 65% or above on the summative assessment.
Developing (3 - 8 points) Results are below District- or BOCES-adopted expectations for growth or achievement for grade/subject.	Teachers are Developing if 55-69% of students score 65% or above on the summative assessment.
Ineffective (0 - 2 points) Results are well below District- or BOCES-adopted expectations for growth or achievement for grade/subject.	Teachers are Ineffective if less than 55% of students score 65% or above on the summative assessment.

3.7) Grades 6-8 Social Studies

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

	Locally-Selected Measure from List of Approved Measures	Assessment
6	5) District, regional, or BOCES–developed assessments	West Islip School District-developed grade 6 social studies assessment
7	5) District, regional, or BOCES–developed assessments	West Islip School District-developed grade 7 social studies assessment
8	5) District, regional, or BOCES–developed assessments	West Islip School District-developed grade 8 social studies assessment

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

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

Use this box, if needed, to describe the general process for assigning HEDI categories for these grades/subjects in this subcomponent. If needed, you may upload a table or graphic at 3.13, below.	At least 70% of a teacher's students will achieve a score of 65% or above on the summative assessment. A HEDI score will be determined using the uploaded conversion chart in Question 3.13.
Highly Effective (18 - 20 points) Results are well above District- or BOCES-adopted expectations for growth or achievement for grade/subject.	Teachers are Highly Effective if 85-100% of students score 65% or above on the summative assessment.
Effective (9 - 17 points) Results meet District- or BOCES-adopted expectations for growth or achievement for grade/subject.	Teachers are Effective if 70-84% of students score 65% or above on the summative assessment.
Developing (3 - 8 points) Results are below District- or BOCES-adopted expectations for growth or achievement for grade/subject.	Teachers are Developing if 55-69% of students score 65% or above on the summative assessment.

Ineffective (0 - 2 points) Results are well below District- or BOCES-adopted expectations for growth or achievement for grade/subject.	Teachers are Ineffective if less than 55% of students score 65% or above on the summative assessment.

3.8) High School Social Studies

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

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

	Locally-Selected Measure from List of Approved Measures	Assessment
Global 1	6(ii) School wide measure computed locally	NYS Regents Exam in Global History & Geography
Global 2	6(ii) School wide measure computed locally	NYS Regents Exam in Global History & Geography
American History	6(ii) School wide measure computed locally	NYS Regents Exam in U.S. History & Government

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

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

Use this box, if needed, to describe the general process for assigning HEDI categories for these grades/subjects in this subcomponent. If needed, you may upload a table or graphic at 3.13, below.	On the New York State Regents Exam, at least 70% of students will achieve a score of 65 or above. Teachers will be evaluated based on schoolwide results on the listed assessments. A 0-20 HEDI score will be determined using the uploaded conversion chart in Question 3.13.
Highly Effective (18 - 20 points) Results are well above District- or BOCES-adopted expectations for growth or achievement for grade/subject.	Teachers are Highly Effective if 85-100% of students score 65 or above on the Regents assessment.
Effective (9 - 17 points) Results meet District- or BOCES-adopted expectations for growth or achievement for grade/subject.	Teachers are Effective if 70-84% of students score 65 or above on the Regents assessment.
Developing (3 - 8 points) Results are below District- or BOCES-adopted expectations for growth or achievement for grade/subject.	Teachers are Developing if 55-69% of students score 65 or above on the Regents assessment.
Ineffective (0 - 2 points) Results are well below District- or BOCES-adopted expectations for growth or achievement for grade/subject.	Teachers are Ineffective if less than 55% of students score 65 or above on the Regents assessment.

3.9) High School Science

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

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

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

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.	On the New York State Regents Exam, at least 70% of students will achieve a score of 65 or above. A 0-20 HEDI score will be determined using the uploaded conversion chart in Question 3.13.
Highly Effective (18-20 points) Results are well above District- or BOCES-adopted expectations for growth or achievement for grade/subject.	Teachers are Highly Effective if 85-100% of students score 65 or above on the Regents assessment.
Developing (3 - 8 points) Results are below District- or BOCES-adopted expectations for growth or achievement for grade/subject.	Teachers are Effective if 70-84% of students score 65 or above on the Regents assessment.
Effective (9 - 17points) Results meet District- or BOCES-adopted expectations for growth or achievement for grade/subject.	Teachers are Developing if 55-69% of students score 65 or above on the Regents assessment.
Ineffective (0 - 2 points) Results are well below District- or BOCES-adopted expectations for growth or achievement for grade/subject.	Teachers are Ineffective if less than 55% of students score 65 or above on the Regents assessment.

3.10) High School Math

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

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

	Locally-Selected Measure from List of Approved Measures	Assessment
Algebra 1	3) Teacher specific achievement or growth score computed locally	NYS Regents Exam in Algebra 1 (Common Core) & the NYS Regents Exam in Integrated Algebra
Geometry	3) Teacher specific achievement or growth score computed locally	NYS Regents Exam in Geometry
Algebra 2	3) Teacher specific achievement or growth score computed locally	NYS Regents Exam in Algebra 2/Trigonometry

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

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

NOTE: As applicable, please specify whether your district will be offering the Integrated Algebra Regents, the Common Core Algebra Regents, or both and how the HEDI process will be adjusted accordingly.

Use this box, if needed, to describe the general process for assigning HEDI categories for these grades/subjects in this subcomponent. If needed, you may upload a table or graphic at 3.13, below.	On the New York State Regents Exam, at least 70% of students will achieve a score of 65 or above. A 0-20 HEDI score will be determined using the uploaded conversion chart in Question 3.13. Note: Students enrolled in Common Core Algebra will take the NYS Regents Examination in Integrated Algebra in addition to the NYS Regents Examination in Algebra I (Common Core), and the higher of the two Regents Exam scores will be used for APPR purposes.
Highly Effective (18 - 20 points) Results are well above District- or BOCES-adopted expectations for growth or achievement for grade/subject.	Teachers are Highly Effective if 85-100% of students score 65 or above on the Regents assessment.
Effective (9 - 17 points) Results meet District- or BOCES-adopted expectations for growth or achievement for grade/subject.	Teachers are Effective if 70-84% of students score 65 or above on the Regents assessment.
Developing (3 - 8 points) Results are below District- or BOCES-adopted expectations for growth or achievement for grade/subject.	Teachers are Developing if 55-69% of students score 65 or above on the Regents assessment.
Ineffective (0 - 2 points) Results are well below District- or BOCES-adopted expectations for growth or achievement for grade/subject.	Teachers are Ineffective if less than 55% of students score 65 or above on the Regents assessment.

3.11) High School English Language Arts

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

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

	Locally-Selected Measure from List of Approved Measures	Assessment
Grade 9 ELA	6(ii) School wide measure computed locally	NYS Common Core English Regents Examination & the NYS Comprehensive English Regents Exam
Grade 10 ELA	6(ii) School wide measure computed locally	NYS Common Core English Regents Examination & the NYS Comprehensive English Regents Exam
Grade 11 ELA	6(ii) School wide measure computed locally	NYS Common Core English Regents Examination & the NYS Comprehensive English Regents Exam

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

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

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

Use this box, if needed, to describe the general process for assigning HEDI categories for these grades/subjects in this subcomponent. If needed, you may upload a table or graphic at 3.13, below.	On the New York State Regents Exam, at least 70% of students will achieve a score of 65 or above. A 0-20 HEDI score will be determined using the uploaded conversion chart in Question 3.13. Teachers will be evaluated based on the percentage of students school-wide meeting or exceeding the achievement target. Note: Students enrolled in English 11 who received Common Core instruction will take both the NYS Common Core English Regents Examination & the NYS Comprehensive English Regents Exam and the higher of the two Regents Exam scores will be used for APPR purposes.
Highly Effective (18 - 20 points) Results are well above District- or BOCES-adopted expectations for growth or achievement for grade/subject.	Teachers are Highly Effective if 85-100% of students score 65 or above on the Regents assessment.
Effective (9 - 17 points) Results meet District- or BOCES-adopted expectations for growth or achievement for grade/subject.	Teachers are Effective if 70-84% of students score 65 or above on the Regents assessment.
Developing (3 - 8 points) Results are below District- or BOCES-adopted expectations for growth or achievement for grade/subject.	Teachers are Developing if 55-69% of students score 65 or above on the Regents assessment.
Ineffective (0 - 2 points) Results are well below District- or BOCES-adopted expectations for growth or achievement for grade/subject.	Teachers are Ineffective if less than 55% of students score 65 or above on the Regents assessment.

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 high school courses except math (9-12)	6(ii) School wide measure computed locally	NYS Common Core English Regents Examination & the NYS Comprehensive English Regents Exam
	All other middle school courses except Special Education/Resource Room (6-8)	6(ii) School wide measure computed locally	West Islip School District-developed grade 6, 7, 8 Common Core-aligned English assessments
	All other elementary courses except Special Education/Resource Room (K-5)	6(ii) School wide measure computed locally	West Islip School District-developed grade-specific reading assessment
	Special Education/Resource Room (K-8)	5) District/regional/BOCES–developed	West Islip School District-developed grade-specific math assessment
	Middle School Algebra 1	3) Teacher specific achievement/growth score computed locally	NYS Regents Exam in Algebra 1 (Common Core) & the NYS Regents Exam in Integrated Algebra
	All other math (9-12)	5) District/regional/BOCES–developed	West Islip School District-developed Common Core-aligned course-specific math assessment

Middle School Earth Science	3) Teacher specific achievement/growth score computed locally	NYS Regents Exam in Earth Science

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

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

Use this box, if needed, to describe the general process for assigning HEDI categories for these grades/subjects in this subcomponent. If needed, you may upload a table or graphic at 3.13, below.	For applicable high school teachers, HEDI points will be assigned based on the percentage of students will achieve a score of 65 or above on the New York State NYS English Regents. For "All other math teachers (9-12)", HEDI points will be assigned based on the percentage of students who achieve a score of 65 or above on the district-developed math assessment. Teachers using a school-wide measure will be evaluated based on the percentage of students school-wide meeting or exceeding the achievement target. For applicable middle school teachers, HEDI points will be assigned based on the percentage of students will achieve a score of 65 or above on the summative assessment. Teachers using a school-wide measure will be evaluated based on school-wide results on the listed assessment. For applicable elementary school teachers, HEDI points will be assigned based on the percentage of students meeting or exceeding the District-determined achievement target (grade level standards) for grades 3 through 5 as measured on the reading assessment. Teachers using a school-wide measure will be evaluated based on the percentage of students school-wide meeting or exceeding the achievement target. Note: Students enrolled in Common Core Algebra will take the NYS Regents Examination in Integrated Algebra in addition to the NYS Regents Examination in Algebra I (Common Core), and the higher of the two Regents Exam scores will be used for APPR purposes. Note: Students enrolled in English 11 who received Common Core instruction will take both the NYS Common Core English Regents Examination & the NYS Comprehensive English Regents Exam and the higher of the two Regents Exam scores will be used for APPR purposes. A 0-20 HEDI score will be determined using the uploaded conversion chart in Question 3.13.
Highly Effective (18 - 20 points) Results are well above District- or BOCES -adopted expectations for growth or achievement for grade/subject.	See attached chart in Question 3.13.
Effective (9 - 17 points) Results meet District- or BOCES-adopted expectations for growth or achievement for grade/subject.	See attached chart in Question 3.13.
Developing (3 - 8 points) Results are below District- or BOCES-adopted expectations for growth or achievement for grade/subject.	See attached chart in Question 3.13.

Ineffective (0 - 2 points) Results are well below District- or BOCES-adopted expectations for growth or achievement for grade/subject.	See attached chart in Question 3.13.

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

(No response)

3.13) HEDI Tables or Graphics

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

assets/survey-uploads/12149/870832-y92vNseFa4/3-13.docx

3.14) Locally Developed Controls

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

(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.

For those teachers being evaluated with more than one measure, the HEDI score will be averaged and weighted proportionally based on the percentage of students in each measure. Standard rounding rules will apply to the HEDI score.

3.16) Assurances

Please check all of the boxes below:

3.16) Assurances | Assure the application of locally-developed controls will be rigorous, fair, and transparent.	Checked
3.16) Assurances | Assure that use of locally-developed controls will not have a disparate impact on underrepresented students in accordance with any applicable civil rights laws.	Checked
3.16) Assurances | Assure that enrolled students in accordance with teacher of record policies are included and may not be excluded.	Checked
3.16) Assurances | Assure that procedures for ensuring data accuracy and integrity are being utilized.	Checked
3.16) Assurances | Assure that the process for assigning points for locally selected measures will use the narrative HEDI descriptions described in the regulations to effectively differentiate educators' performance in ways that improve student learning and instruction.	Checked
3.16) Assurances | Assure that it is possible for an educator to earn each point, including 0, for the locally-selected measures subcomponent.	Checked

3.16) Assurances | Assure that locally-selected measures are rigorous and comparable across all classrooms in the same grade/subject in the district.	Checked
3.16) Assurances | If more than one type of locally-selected measure is used for different groups of teachers within a grade/subject, certify that the measures are comparable based on the Standards of Educational and Psychological Testing.	Checked
3.16) Assurances | Assure that all locally-selected measures for a teacher are different than any measures used for the State assessment or other comparable measures subcomponent.	Checked

4. Other Measures of Effectiveness (Teachers)

Created Tuesday, April 30, 2013
Updated Thursday, April 24, 2014

Page 1

4.1) Teacher Practice Rubric

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

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

4.1) Teacher Practice Rubric | Rubric	NYSUT Teacher Practice Rubric (2012 Edition)

Second Rubric, if applicable	(No response)

4.2) Points Within Other Measures

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

Yes

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

(No response)

Multiple (at least two) classroom observations by principal or other trained administrator, at least one of which must be unannounced [at least 31 points]	40
One or more observation(s) by trained independent evaluators	0
Observations by trained in-school peer teachers	0
Feedback from students using State-approved survey tool	0
Feedback from parents/caregivers using State-approved survey tool	0
Structured reviews of lesson plans, student portfolios and other teacher artifacts	20

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

(No response)

4.3) Survey Tools (if applicable)

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

(No response)

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

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

4.4) Assurances

Please check all of the boxes below:

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

4.5) Process for Assigning Points and Determining HEDI Ratings

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

Each element within the NYSUT rubric will receive a rating of Highly Effective (4), Effective (3), Developing (2) and Ineffective (1). (Where an element receives different scores over multiple observations, an average score will be generated for that element.)

Each element within each standard will be averaged to create a score for each standard. Standards 1-5 of the NYSUT Rubric will be evaluated through observations. The average score for each standard will be weighted equally to create a final 1 to 4 rubric average for observations. Standards 6 and 7 of the NYSUT rubric will be evaluated through structured review of artifacts. The average score for each standard will be weighted equally to create a final 1 to 4 rubric average for artifacts.

The rubric average based on observations will be multiplied by 2/3 and the rubric average based on artifacts will be multiplied by 1/3 to account for their relative weightings. The sum of these two averages will result in a final overall rubric average.

The final average will be rounded to the nearest tenth using standard rounding rules, and applied to the attached chart to determine a final 0-60 score. See attached scoring methodology and conversion chart (Question 4.5).

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

assets/survey-uploads/12179/870833-eka9yMJ855/44863533-APPR Table - Item 4.5_2.docx

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

Highly Effective: Overall performance and results exceed NYS Teaching Standards.	Teachers are Highly Effective if they achieve above average performance in their knowledge of students and student learning, content and instructional planning, instructional practice, establishing a productive learning environment, using assessment for student learning, professional responsibilities and collaboration, and professional growth.
Effective: Overall performance and results meet NYS Teaching Standards.	Teachers are Effective if they achieve average performance in their knowledge of students and student learning, content and instructional planning, instructional practice, establishing a productive learning environment, using assessment for student learning, professional responsibilities and collaboration, and professional growth.
Developing: Overall performance and results need improvement in order to meet NYS Teaching Standards.	Teachers are Developing if they achieve below average performance in their knowledge of students and student learning, content and instructional planning, instructional practice, establishing a productive learning environment, using assessment for student learning, professional responsibilities and collaboration, and professional growth.
Ineffective: Overall performance and results do not meet NYS Teaching Standards.	Teachers are Ineffective if they achieve unsatisfactory performance in their knowledge of students and student learning, content and instructional planning, instructional practice, establishing a productive learning environment, using assessment for student learning, professional responsibilities and collaboration, and professional growth.

Provide the ranges for the 60-point scoring bands.

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

4.6) Observations of Probationary Teachers

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

By building principals or other trained administrators

Formal/Long	3
Informal/Short	1

Enter Total	4

By trained in-school peer teachers or other trained reviewers

Formal/Long	0
Informal/Short	0

Independent evaluators

Formal/Long	0
Informal/Short	0

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

- In Person

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

- In Person

4.7) Observations of Tenured Teachers

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

By building principals or other trained administrators

Formal/Long	1
Informal/Short	1
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 Tuesday, April 30, 2013
Updated Friday, January 31, 2014

Page 1

Standards for Rating Categories

Growth or Comparable Measures

Locally-selected Measures of growth or achievement

Other Measures of Effectiveness (Teacher and Leader standards)

Highly Effective

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

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

Overall performance and results exceed NYS Teaching Standards.

Effective

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

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

Overall performance and results meet NYS Teaching Standards.

Developing

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

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

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

Ineffective

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

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

Overall performance and results do not meet NYS Teaching Standards.

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

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

Where there is no Value-Added measure

Growth or Comparable Measures
Locally-selected Measures of growth or achievement
Other Measures of Effectiveness (60 points)

Overall Composite Score
Highly Effective
18-20
18-20
Ranges determined locally--see below
91-100
Effective
9-17
9-17
75-90
Developing
3-8
3-8
65-74
Ineffective
0-2
0-2
0-64

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

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

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

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

Overall Composite Score
Highly Effective
22-25
14-15
Ranges determined locally--see above

91-100
Effective
10-21
8-13
75-90
Developing
3-9
3-7
65-74
Ineffective
0-2
0-2
0-64

6. Additional Requirements - Teachers

Created Tuesday, April 30, 2013
Updated Friday, March 28, 2014

Page 1

6.1) Assurances -- Improvement Plans

Please check the boxes below:

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

6.2) Attachment: Teacher Improvement Plan Forms

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

assets/survey-uploads/5265/131138-Df0w3Xx5v6/Teacher Improvement Plan.pdf

6.3) Appeals Process

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

(1) the substance of the annual professional performance review

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

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

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

Appeals concerning a teacher’s performance review must be filed no later than seven (7) school days of the date when the teacher receives his/her final composite rating, and are limited to teachers receiving ratings of Ineffective or Developing. If an educator

receives a completed evaluation over summer vacation, the educator will have until the seventh (7th) working day of the new school year to file an appeal. Appeals concerning the district's issuance or implementation of a Teacher Improvement Plan (TIP) must be filed within seven (7) school days of the district's issuance or failure to implement the terms of the TIP.

A teacher wishing to initiate an appeal must submit, in writing, to the evaluator who authored the evaluation, a detailed description of the precise point(s) of disagreement over his/her performance review, along with any and all documents or written materials that he or she believes are relevant to the resolution of the appeal. Any such additional information not submitted at the time the appeal is filed shall not be considered in the deliberations related to the resolution of the appeal. This shall not prohibit the reviewer from seeking clarification of issues raised on appeal.

If, within three (3) school days, the evaluation is not changed by the administrator who authored it to reflect a rating of "effective" or "highly effective," the teacher may submit that which he/she submitted to the evaluator for the appeal to a review panel composed of one member selected by the Superintendent, one member selected by the WITA President, and one member selected jointly by the Superintendent and WITA President. The three (3) day timeline for reconsideration of the evaluation may be extended by agreement of the WITA President and the Superintendent, but in no event shall extend more than two (2) additional school days. Submission of the appeal to the review panel shall be done within two (2) school days of the authoring administrator(s) refusal to amend the evaluation. Within five school days of receipt of the appeal, the review panel shall provide an advisory opinion to the Superintendent.

Within five (5) school days of receipt of the appeal, the Superintendent of Schools shall render a written determination with respect to the appeal. The determination of the Superintendent of Schools shall be final and not subject to grievance, arbitration or any other claim.

All steps of the appeal must be completed in a timely and expeditious manner.

A teacher may challenge only the following in an appeal:
(1) the substance of the annual professional performance review;
(2) the school district's 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 issuance and/or implementation of the terms of the teacher improvement plan, as required under Education Law section 3012-c.

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

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

The Superintendent will ensure that all evaluators have been trained and that all lead evaluators have been trained and certified in accordance with regulation. The district will ensure that evaluator training and lead evaluator training and certification will be in accordance with SED procedures and processes. Evaluators will be trained in the NYSUT Rubric and such aspects of the NYSUT Teacher Evaluation and Development System (TED) as they relate to conducting observations and evaluations. The District will provide to WITA, on an annual basis, the names of the trained evaluators and the training they have received.

Evaluators and lead evaluators will attend training that meets the minimum requirements prescribed in Section 30-2.9 of the Commissioner’s regulations. Such training will address the nine elements listed in Item 6.5, and include a minimum of 25 hours for evaluators and 50 hours for lead evaluators. New administrative educators will receive the same or equivalent training upon hire.

Lead evaluators will be recertified annually to ensure inter-rater reliability. Lead evaluators will receive at least six hours of training each year to reinforce knowledge of the nine elements listed in Item 6.5, and to discuss the evidence that has been collected throughout the evaluation process to ensure objectivity and specificity, alignment to the standards, and that all performance indicators and elements are addressed.

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	Checked

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.	
6.6) Assurances -- Teachers | Assure that the APPR will be put on the district website by September 10 or within 10 days after approval, whichever is later.	Checked
6.6) Assurances -- Teachers | Assure that the evaluation system will be used as a significant factor for employment decisions.	Checked
6.6) Assurances -- Teachers | Assure that teachers will receive timely and constructive feedback as part of the evaluation process.	Checked
6.6) Assurances -- Teachers | Assure the district has appeal procedures that are consistent with the regulations and that they provide for the timely and expeditious resolution of an appeal.	Checked

6.7) Assurances -- Data

Please check all of the boxes below:

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

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

Created Tuesday, April 30, 2013
Updated Friday, January 31, 2014

Page 1

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

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

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

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

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

K-5
6-8
9-12

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

Please check the boxes below:

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

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

Student Learning Objectives will be the other comparable growth measures for principals in buildings or programs in which fewer than 30% of students take Grades 4-8 ELA, Math, and/or High School courses with State or Regents assessments. SLOs will be developed

using the assessments covering the most students in the school or program and continuing until at least 30% of students in the school or program are covered by SLOs. The district must select the type of assessment that will be used with the SLO from the options below.

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

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

List of State-approved 3rd party assessments

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

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

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

Use this box, if needed, to describe the process for assigning HEDI categories in this subcomponent. If needed, you may upload a table or graphic below.	
Highly Effective (18 - 20 points) Results are well above state average for similar students (or District goals if no state test).	All principals are covered by a State-provided growth score or value-added measure.
Effective (9 - 17 points) Results meet state average for similar students (or District goals if no state test).	All principals are covered by a State-provided growth score or value-added measure.
Developing (3 - 8 points) Results are below state average for similar students (or District goals if no state test).	All principals are covered by a State-provided growth score or value-added measure.
Ineffective (0 - 2 points) Results are well below state average for similar students (or District goals if no state test).	All principals are covered by a State-provided growth score or value-added measure.

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

(No response)

7.4) Special Considerations for Comparable Growth Measures

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

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

(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://www.engageny.org/resource/student-learning-objectives-guidance-document.	Checked
7.6) Assurances -- Comparable Growth Measures | Assure that the process for assigning points for SLOs for the Growth Subcomponent will use the narrative HEDI descriptions described in the regulations to effectively differentiate educator performance in ways that improve student learning and instruction.	Checked
7.6) Assurances -- Comparable Growth Measures | Assure that it is possible for a principal to earn each point, including 0, for SLOs in the Growth subcomponent scoring range.	Checked
7.6) Assurances -- Comparable Growth Measures | Assure that processes are in place to monitor SLOs to ensure rigor and comparability across classrooms.	Checked

8. Local Measures (Principals)

Created Tuesday, April 30, 2013
Updated Thursday, April 24, 2014

Page 1

Locally-Selected Measures of Student Achievement or Growth

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

	Grade Configuration/Program	Locally-Selected Measure from List of Approved Measures	Assessment
	K-5	(d) measures used by district for teacher evaluation	West Islip School District-developed grades K-5 math assessments
	6-8	(d) measures used by district for teacher evaluation	West Islip School District-developed grades 6-8 math assessments
	9-12	(d) measures used by district for teacher evaluation	NYS Common Core English Regents & NYS Comprehensive English Regents

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 same locally selected measures will be used for all principals in the same or similar programs or grade configurations across the district. For Grades K-5 and 6-8 principals, at least 70% of students will achieve a score of 65 or above on the summative math assessment. At the high school level, at least 70% of students will achieve a score of 65 or above on the NYS Comprehensive English Regents or the NYS Common Core English Regents Exam. (Note: Students enrolled in English 11 and receiving common core instruction will take both the NYS Comprehensive English Regents Exam and the NYS Common Core English Regents Exam and the higher of the two Regents Exam scores will be used for APPR purposes.) Scores will be aggregated and a final HEDI score will be determined. See attached Question 8.1. Note that the 15-point chart is to be used after a value-added measure is implemented.
Highly Effective (14 - 15 points) Results are well above District- or BOCES-adopted expectations for growth or achievement for grade/subject.	Principals are Highly Effective if more than 85% of students achieve 65 or higher on the designated summative assessment.

Effective (8- 13 points) Results meet District- or BOCES-adopted expectations for growth or achievement for grade/subject.	Principals are Effective if 70-84% of students achieve 65 or higher on the designated summative assessment.
Developing (3 - 7 points) Results are below District- or BOCES-adopted expectations for growth or achievement for grade/subject.	Principals are Developing if 55-69% of students achieve 65 or higher on the designated summative assessment.
Ineffective (0 - 2 points) Results are well below District- or BOCES-adopted expectations for growth or achievement for grade/subject.	Principals are Ineffective if less than 55% of students achieve 65 or higher on the designated summative assessment.

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

(No response)

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

assets/survey-uploads/12190/870837-qBFVOWF7fC/44863668-44863635-APPR Table - Item 8.1.docx

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

(g) percentage of a cohort of students that achieve specified scores on Regents examinations and/or Department approved alternative examinations (including, but not limited to, Advanced Placement examinations, International Baccalaureate examinations, SAT II,

etc.), for principals employed in a school with high school grades (e.g., the percentage of students in the 2009 cohort that scored at least a 3 on an Advanced Placement examination since entry into the ninth grade)

(h) students' progress toward graduation in the school using strong predictive indicators, including but not limited to 9th and/or 10th grade credit accumulation and/or the percentage of students that pass 9th and/or 10th grade subjects most commonly associated with graduation and/or students' progress in passing the number of required Regents examinations for graduation, for principals employed in a school with high school grades
(i) student learning objectives (only allowable for principals in programs/buildings without a Value-Added measure for the State Growth subcomponent). Used with one of the following assessments: State, State-approved 3rd party, or a District, regional, or BOCES-developed assessment that is rigorous and comparable across classrooms

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

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

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

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

Use this box, if needed, to describe the process for assigning HEDI categories. If needed, you may upload a table or graphic below.	
Highly Effective (18 - 20 points) Results are well above District- or BOCES-adopted expectations for growth or achievement for grade/subject.	n/a
Effective (9- 17 points) Results meet District- or BOCES-adopted expectations for growth or achievement for grade/subject.	n/a
Developing (3 - 8 points) Results are below District- or BOCES-adopted expectations for growth or achievement for grade/subject.	n/a
Ineffective (0 - 2 points) Results are well below District- or BOCES-adopted expectations for growth or achievement for grade/subject.	n/a

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

(No response)

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

(No response)

8.3) Locally Developed Controls

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

(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 Tuesday, April 30, 2013
Updated Thursday, April 24, 2014

Page 1

9.1) Principal Practice Rubric

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

9.1) Principal Practice Rubric | Rubric	Marshall's Principal Evaluation Rubric

Second rubric (if applicable)	(No response)

9.2) Points Within Other Measures

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

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

Is the following point assignment for all principals?

Yes

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

(No response)

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

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

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

downloadable copy of Form 9.2. (MS Word)

(No response)

9.3) Assurances -- Goals

Please check the boxes below if assigning any points to "ambitious and measurable goals":

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

9.4) Sources of Evidence (if applicable)

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

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

9.5) Survey Tool(s) (if applicable)

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

(No response)

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

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

NYC School Survey-2012 Teacher Survey	(No response)

9.6) Assurances

Please check all of the boxes below:

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

9.7) Process for Assigning Points and Determining HEDI Ratings

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

The Marshall Principal Evaluation Rubric will be utilized to evaluate Principals. Each time a subcomponent is observed, evidence will be collected for that subcomponent. Based on the totality of the evidence after multiple school visits, each of the 10 subcomponents within the six domains of the Marshall Rubric will be rated from 1 to 4, with 1 point earned if the principal is Ineffective, 2 points for Developing, 3 points for Effective, and 4 points for Highly Effective. The percentage of total points attained will be calculated using the total number of points earned divided by the total number of possible points from each observed subcomponent. The percentage of points attained has been converted to 0 – 60 points to derive the “Other Measures” score. (ex. If a Principal earns 180 possible points of 240 available points, the percentage of points earned would be 75%, which would translate to a score of 58.) If a Principal is rated Ineffective on every subcomponent in every domain, a score of zero will be generated.
See attached Item 9.7.
Summary of Conversion Scale:
Highly Effective 87.5 – 100% 59 – 60
Effective 62.5 – 87.4% 57 – 58
Developing 37.5 – 62.4% 55 – 56
Ineffective 0 – 37.4% 0 – 54

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

assets/survey-uploads/12205/870838-pMADJ4gk6R/44863745-APPR Table - Item 9.7.docx

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

Highly Effective: Overall performance and results exceed standards.	Principals whose performance and results exceed standards and achieve a rating of 59-60 will be considered Highly Effective in the categories measured on the principal practice rubric.
Effective: Overall performance and results meet standards.	Principals whose performance and results meet standards and achieve a rating of 57-58 will be considered Effective in the categories measured on the principal practice rubric.

Developing: Overall performance and results need improvement in order to meet standards.	Principals whose performance and results need improvement and who achieve a rating of 55-56 will be considered Developing in the categories measured on the principal practice rubric.
Ineffective: Overall performance and results do not meet standards.	Principals whose performance and results do not meet standards and achieve a rating of 0-54 will be considered Ineffective in the categories measured on the principal practice rubric.

Please provide the locally-negotiated 60 point scoring bands.

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

9.8) School Visits

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

Probationary Principals

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

Tenured Principals

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

10. Composite Scoring (Principals)

Created Tuesday, April 30, 2013
Updated Thursday, January 23, 2014

Page 1

Standards for Rating Categories

Growth or Comparable Measures

Locally-selected Measures of growth or achievement

Other Measures of Effectiveness (Teacher and Leader standards)

Highly Effective

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

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

Overall performance and results exceed ISLLC leadership standards.

Effective

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

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

Overall performance and results meet ISLLC leadership standards.

Developing

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

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

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

Ineffective

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

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

Overall performance and results do not meet ISLLC leadership standards.

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

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

Where there is no Value-Added measure

Growth or Comparable Measures
Locally-selected Measures of growth or achievement
Other Measures of Effectiveness (60 points)

Overall Composite Score
Highly Effective
18-20
18-20
Ranges determined locally--see below
91-100
Effective
9-17
9-17
75-90
Developing
3-8
3-8
65-74
Ineffective
0-2
0-2
0-64

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

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

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

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

Overall Composite Score
Highly Effective
22-25

14-15
Ranges determined locally--see above
91-100
Effective
10-21
8-13
75-90
Developing
3-9
3-7
65-74
Ineffective
0-2
0-2
0-64

11. Additional Requirements - Principals

Created Tuesday, April 30, 2013
Updated Friday, March 28, 2014

Page 1

11.1) Assurances -- Improvement Plans

Please check the boxes below.

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

11.2) Attachment: Principal Improvement Plan Forms

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

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

assets/survey-uploads/5276/141810-Df0w3Xx5v6/Principal Improvement Plan.pdf

11.3) Appeals Process

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

(1) the substance of the annual professional performance review

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

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

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

An appeal of a Principal's evaluation which has resulted in a rating of Ineffective or Developing shall be submitted to the Superintendent of Schools within ten (10) days of the receipt of such evaluation, shall be in writing, and shall set forth in detail the basis for the appeal. Issues not raised in the appeal are waived. There may only be one (1) appeal for any evaluation.

Such appeals may be based upon the substance of the evaluation, the District's adherence to the requirements of Education Law § 3012-c and the Regulations of the Commissioner, the District's adherence to these negotiated APPR procedures, and the District's issuance and/or implementation of the terms of a Principal Improvement Plan. The Principal shall have the burden of proof with respect to the appeal and such burden shall be a preponderance of the evidence.

Appeals related to the issuance or terms of a Principal Improvement Plan shall be submitted in writing within 10 school days of the issuance of the PIP or the district's failure to implement the terms of the PIP.

Within ten (10) days of receipt of an appeal, the Superintendent of Schools shall render a written determination with respect to the appeal. The determination of the Superintendent of Schools shall be final and not subject to grievance, arbitration or any other claim.

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

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

The Superintendent will ensure that all evaluators have been trained and that all lead evaluators have been trained and certified in accordance with regulation. The district will ensure that principal evaluator training and lead evaluator training and certification will be in accordance with SED procedures and processes. This training, which will comprise of 10 days (or the equivalent) of training, will include the application of the Marshall Rubric as an assessment instrument for principals.

Evaluators and lead evaluators will attend BOCES-provided and in-district training that meets the minimum requirements prescribed in Section 30-2.9 of the Commissioner's Regulations. New administrative educators who evaluate principals will receive the same or equivalent training upon hire.

Lead evaluators will be recertified annually to ensure inter-rater reliability. Evaluators will receive at least six hours of training each year to reinforce knowledge of the nine elements listed in Item 11.5, and to discuss the evidence that has been collected throughout the evaluation process to ensure objectivity and specificity, alignment to the standards, and that all performance indicators and elements are addressed.

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 Tuesday, May 13, 2014

Page 1

12.1)Upload the Joint Certification of the APPR Plan

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

assets/survey-uploads/12158/1321936-3Uqgn5g9Iu/Signature page 05-13-2014.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.

General Process for Assigning HEDI Categories for Student Growth

APPR Question 2.11

The general process for assigning HEDI categories for all teachers for whom an SLO is developed. If educators have more than one SLO for comparable growth, each measure will earn a score from 0-20 points, and the District will weight each measure proportionately based on the number of students in each SLO.

Points Conversion for Student Growth SLOs
(Questions 2.2 through 2.10)

Highly Effective		Effective		Developing		Ineffective	
95-100	20	83-84	17	67-69	8	51-54	2
90-94	19	81-82	16	64-66	7	41-50	1
85-89	18	79-80	15	61-63	6	0-40	0
		77-78	14	59-60	5		
		75-76	13	57-58	4		
		73-74	12	55-56	3		
		72	11				
		71	10				
		70	9				

General Process for Assigning HEDI Categories for Locally Selected Measures of Student Achievement

APPR Question 3.3

The general process for assigning HEDI categories for local assessment measures in Grades 4-8 for teachers receiving a state-provided growth score. The % represents the percent of students who scored 65% or above on the summative assessment.

Points Conversion for Local Achievement Measures
(Questions 3.1 and 3.2)

Highly Effective		Effective		Developing		Ineffective	
%	points	%	points	%	points	%	points
95-100	20	83-84	17	67-69	8	51-54	2
90-94	19	81-82	16	64-66	7	41-50	1
85-89	18	79-80	15	61-63	6	0-40	0
		77-78	14	59-60	5		
		75-76	13	57-58	4		
		73-74	12	55-56	3		
		72	11				
		71	10				
		70	9				

Points Conversion for Local Achievement Measures
(Questions 3.1 and 3.2)

Highly Effective		Effective		Developing		Ineffective	
%	points	%	points	%	points	%	points
93-100	15	82-84	13	67-69	7	51-54	2
85-92	14	79-81	12	64-66	6	41-50	1
		76-78	11	61-63	5	0-40	0
		74-75	10	58-60	4		
		72-73	9	55-57	3		
		70-71	8				

General Process for Assigning HEDI Categories for
Locally Selected Measures of Student Achievement

APPR Question 3.13

The general process for assigning HEDI categories for local assessment measures. The % represents the number of students who scored 65 or above on the summative assessment in the appropriate content area.

Points Conversion for Local Achievement Measures **(Questions 3.4 and 3.5)**							
Highly Effective		Effective		Developing		Ineffective	
%	points	%	points	%	points	%	points
95-100	20	83-84	17	67-69	8	51-54	2
90-94	19	81-82	16	64-66	7	41-50	1
85-89	18	79-80	15	61-63	6	0-40	0
		77-78	14	59-60	5		
		75-76	13	57-58	4		
		73-74	12	55-56	3		
		72	11				
		71	10				
		70	9				

Points Conversion for Local Achievement Measures **(Questions 3.6 through 3.11)**							
Highly Effective		Effective		Developing		Ineffective	
%	points	%	points	%	points	%	points
95-100	20	83-84	17	67-69	8	51-54	2
90-94	19	81-82	16	64-66	7	41-50	1
85-89	18	79-80	15	61-63	6	0-40	0
		77-78	14	59-60	5		
		75-76	13	57-58	4		
		73-74	12	55-56	3		
		72	11				
		71	10				
		70	9				

Points Conversion for Local Achievement Measures **(Question 3.12)** *All other high school courses except math (9-12)*							
Highly Effective		Effective		Developing		Ineffective	
%	points	%	points	%	points	%	points
95-100	20	83-84	17	67-69	8	51-54	2
90-94	19	81-82	16	64-66	7	41-50	1
85-89	18	79-80	15	61-63	6	0-40	0
		77-78	14	59-60	5		
		75-76	13	57-58	4		
		73-74	12	55-56	3		
		72	11				
		71	10				
		70	9				

APPR Question 3.13 *(continued)*

Points Conversion for Local Achievement Measures **(Question 3.12)** *All other middle school courses except Special Education/Resource Room (6-8)*							
Highly Effective		Effective		Developing		Ineffective	
%	points	%	points	%	points	%	points
76-100	20	53-54	17	35-39	8	21-24	2
66-75	19	51-52	16	33-34	7	16-20	1
55-65	18	49-50	15	31-32	6	0-15	0
		47-48	14	29-30	5		
		45-46	13	27-28	4		
		43-44	12	25-26	3		
		42	11				
		41	10				
		40	9				

Points Conversion for Local Achievement Measures **(Question 3.12)** *All other elementary school courses except Special Education/Resource Room (K-5)*							
Highly Effective		Effective		Developing		Ineffective	
%	points	%	points	%	points	%	points
76-100	20	47-49	17	33-34	8	21-24	2
66-75	19	45-46	16	31-32	7	16-20	1
50-65	18	43-44	15	29-30	6	0-15	0
		41-42	14	27-28	5		
		39-40	13	26	4		
		38	12	25	3		
		37	11				
		36	10				
		35	9				

Points Conversion for Local Achievement Measures **(Question 3.12)** *Special Education/Resource Room (K-8), Middle School Algebra 1 and Earth Science,* *All other math (9-12)*							
Highly Effective		Effective		Developing		Ineffective	
%	points	%	points	%	points	%	points
95-100	20	83-84	17	67-69	8	51-54	2
90-94	19	81-82	16	64-66	7	41-50	1
85-89	18	79-80	15	61-63	6	0-40	0
		77-78	14	59-60	5		
		75-76	13	57-58	4		
		73-74	12	55-56	3		
		72	11				
		71	10				
		70	9				

General Process for Assigning HEDI Scores and Ratings for NYSUT Teacher Practice Rubric

APPR Question 4.5

The general process for assigning points and determining HEDI ratings using the NYSUT Rubric for teacher effectiveness.

Points Conversion for Teacher Rubric (Question 4.5)		
Level	Overall rubric average score	60 point distribution for composite score
Highly Effective	3.5-4.0	59-60
Effective	2.5-3.4	57-58
Developing	1.5-2.4	50-56
Ineffective	1.0-1.4	0-49

Rubric Score to Subcomponent Conversion Chart (Question 4.5)		
4.0	60	Highly Effective
3.9	60	Highly Effective
3.8	60	Highly Effective
3.7	59	Highly Effective
3.6	59	Highly Effective
3.5	59	Highly Effective
3.4	58	Effective
3.3	58	Effective
3.2	58	Effective
3.1	58	Effective
3.0	58	Effective
2.9	57	Effective
2.8	57	Effective
2.7	57	Effective
2.6	57	Effective
2.5	57	Effective
2.4	56	Developing
2.3	55	Developing
2.2	55	Developing
2.1	54	Developing
2.0	53	Developing
1.9	53	Developing
1.8	52	Developing
1.7	51	Developing
1.6	51	Developing
1.5	50	Developing
1.4	49	Ineffective
1.3	37	Ineffective
1.2	25	Ineffective
1.1	12	Ineffective
1.0	0	Ineffective

TEACHER IMPROVEMENT PLAN

[to be completed jointly by the principal, director (if appropriate) teacher & coach]

Teacher _____ School _____ Date _____

Administrator _____ Facilitator _____

Domain/Standard in need of improvement	**Timeline for Achieving Improvement**	**Manner in which improvement is to be assessed**	**Differentiated activities to support improvement** *(if appropriate)*	**Evidence of Improvement** *(teacher responsibilities)*	**Support and assistance to be received** *(administrator responsibilities)*	**Determination as to whether adequate improvement has been made (Y/N)**

Teacher's Signature _____ Date _____

Principal's Signature _____ Date _____

Coach's Signature _____ Date _____

General Process for Assigning HEDI Categories for Locally Selected Measures of Student Achievement

APPR Question 8.1

Points Conversion for Local Achievement Measures (Question 8.1)							
Highly Effective		Effective		Developing		Ineffective	
%	points	%	points	%	points	%	points
95-100	20	83-84	17	67-69	8	51-54	2
90-94	19	81-82	16	64-66	7	41-50	1
85-89	18	79-80	15	61-63	6	0-40	0
		77-78	14	59-60	5		
		75-76	13	57-58	4		
		73-74	12	55-56	3		
		72	11				
		71	10				
		70	9				

Points Conversion for Local Achievement Measures (Question 8.1)							
Highly Effective		Effective		Developing		Ineffective	
%	points	%	points	%	points	%	points
93-100	15	82-84	13	67-69	7	51-54	2
85-92	14	79-81	12	64-66	6	41-50	1
		76-78	11	61-63	5	0-40	0
		74-75	10	58-60	4		
		72-73	9	55-57	3		
		70-71	8				

General Process for Assigning HEDI Scores and Ratings for Marshall Rubric (Principals)

APPR Question 9.7

The general process for assigning points and determining HEDI ratings using the Marshall Rubric for principal effectiveness.

Points Conversion for Marshall Rubric							
Highly Effective		Effective		Developing		Ineffective	
93.8-100	60	75.0-87.4	58	50.0-62.4	56	36.7-37.4	54
87.5-93.7	59	62.5-74.9	57	37.5-49.9	55	35.8-36.6	53
						35.0-35.7	52
						34.2-34.9	51
						33.3-34.1	50
						32.5-33.2	49
						31.7-32.4	48
						30.8-31.6	47
						30.0-30.7	46
						29.2-29.9	45
						28.3-29.1	44
						27.5-28.2	43
						26.7-27.4	42
						25.8-26.6	41
						25.0-25.7	40
						24.2-24.9	39
						23.3-24.1	38
						22.5-23.2	37
						21.7-22.4	36
						20.8-21.6	35
						20.0-20.7	34
						19.2-19.9	33
						18.3-19.1	32
						17.5-18.2	31
						16.7-17.4	30
						15.8-16.6	29
						15.0-15.7	28
						14.2-14.9	27
						13.3-14.1	26
						12.5-13.2	25
						11.7-12.4	24
						10.8-11.6	23
						10.0-10.7	22
						9.2-9.9	21
						8.3-9.1	20
						7.9-8.2	19
						7.5-7.8	18
						7.1-7.4	17
						6.7-7.0	16
						6.3-6.6	15
						5.8-6.2	14
						5.4-5.7	13
						5.0-5.3	12
						4.6-4.9	11
						4.2-4.5	10
						3.8-4.1	9
						3.3-3.7	8
						2.9-3.2	7
						2.5-2.8	6
						2.1-2.4	5
						1.7-2.0	4
						1.3-1.6	3
						0.8-1.2	2
						0.4-0.7	1
						0.0-0.3	0

PRINCIPAL IMPROVEMENT PLAN

(to be completed jointly by the supervising administrator, principal, & coach)

Principal _____ School _____ Date _____

Administrator _____ Coach _____

Domain/Standard in need of improvement	**Timeline for Achieving Improvement**	**Manner in which improvement is to be assessed**	**Differentiated activities to support improvement** *(if appropriate)*	**Evidence of Improvement** *(principal responsibilities)*	**Support and assistance to be received**	**Determination as to whether adequate improvement has been made (Y/N)**

Principal's Signature _____ Date _____

Supervising Administrator's Signature _____ Date _____

Coach's Signature _____ Date _____

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

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

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

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

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

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

- Assure that the evaluation system will be used as a significant factor for employment decisions and teacher and principal development
- Assure that the entire APPR plan will be completed for each teacher or principal as soon as practicable, but in no case later than September 1 of the school year next following the school year for which the classroom teacher or building principal's performance is being measured
- Assure that the district or BOCES will provide the teacher's or principal's score and rating on the locally selected measures subcomponent, if available, and on the other measures of teacher and principal effectiveness subcomponent for a teacher's or principal's annual professional performance review, in writing, no later than the last school day of the school year for which the teacher or principal is being measured
- Assure that the APPR plan will be posted on the district's or BOCES' website by September 10 or within 10 days after it is approved by the Commissioner, whichever is later
- Assure that accurate teacher and student data will be provided to the Commissioner in a format and timeline prescribed by the Commissioner
- Assure that the district or BOCES will report the individual subcomponent scores and the total composite effectiveness score for each classroom teacher and building principal in a manner prescribed by the Commissioner
- Certify that the district provides an opportunity for every classroom teacher and building principal to verify the subjects and/or student rosters assigned to them
- Assure that teachers and principals will receive timely and constructive feedback as part of the evaluation process
- Assure that any training course for lead evaluator certification addresses each of the requirements in the regulations, including specific considerations in evaluating teachers and principals of English Language Learners and students with disabilities

- Assure that educators who receive a Developing or Ineffective rating will receive a 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, 2013, assure that this was the result of unresolved collective bargaining negotiations

Signatures, dates

Superintendent Signature:	Date:
Bernadette M. Breen	5/13/14

Teachers Union President Signature:	Date:
[illegible]	5/13/14

Administrative Union President Signature:	Date:
Anthony Bridgeman	5/13/14

Board of Education President Signature:	Date:
[illegible]	5/13/14