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

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

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

January 10, 2013

Dr. Mark J. Crawford, Superintendent
West Seneca Central School District
1397 Orchard Park Road
West Seneca, NY 14224

Dear Superintendent Crawford:

Congratulations. I am pleased to inform you that your multi-year [Teachers 2012-2013 through 2013-2014 (expires on June 20, 2014) Administrators 2012-2013 through 2013-2014 (expires on June 30, 2014)] 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: Donald Ogilvie

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

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

Annual Professional Performance Reviews: 2012-13

Created Wednesday, May 16, 2012
Updated Thursday, January 10, 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 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 : 142801060000

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

14-28-01-06-0000

1.2) School District Name: WEST SENECA CSD

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

West Seneca Central School District

1.3) School Improvement Grant (SIG) Districts Only

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

Not applicable

1.4) Award Classification

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

(No response)

1.5) Assurances

Please check all of the boxes below:

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

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

Re-submission to address deficiencies

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

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

Teachers 2012-2013 through 2013-2014 (expires on June 30, 2014) Administrators 2012-2013 through 2013-2014 (expires on June 30, 2014)

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

Created Wednesday, May 16, 2012
Updated Thursday, January 03, 2013

Page 1

STATE-PROVIDED MEASURES OF STUDENT GROWTH

(25 points with an approved value-added measure)

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

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

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

2.1) Assurances

Please check the boxes below:

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

STUDENT LEARNING OBJECTIVES AS COMPARABLE GROWTH MEASURES (20 points)

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

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

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

If no State assessment or Regents exam exists:

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

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

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

State assessments, *required if one exists*

List of State-approved 3rd party assessments

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

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

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

2.2) Grades K-3 ELA

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

	ELA	Assessment
K	District, regional, or BOCES-developed assessment	West Seneca CSD developed Grade K ELA Assessment
1	District, regional, or BOCES-developed assessment	West Seneca CSD developed Grade 1 ELA Assessment
2	District, regional, or BOCES-developed assessment	West Seneca CSD developed Grade 2 ELA Assessment

	ELA	Assessment
3	State assessment	3rd Grade State Assessment

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

Use this box, if needed, to describe the general process for assigning HEDI categories for these grades/subjects in this subcomponent. If needed, you may upload a table or graphic at 2.11, below.	Baseline and summative testing will be conducted in accordance with 3012-c of the Education Law of the State of New York. Teachers will be provided opportunities for input on the goals of baseline and summative assessments. Teachers will establish individual growth targets in collaboration with building principals. Points will be awarded based on the percentage of students meeting or exceeding the targets.
Highly Effective (18 - 20 points) Results are well-above state average for similar students (or District goals if no state test).	Evidence indicates exceptional student learning gain across SLO's including special populations. Expectations described in SLO's are well above District expectations
Effective (9 - 17 points) Results meet state average for similar students (or District goals if no state test).	Evidence indicates significant student learning gain across SLO's including special populations. Expectations described in SLO's meet District expectations
Developing (3 - 8 points) Results are below state average for similar students (or District goals if no state test).	Expectations described in SLO's are nearly met. The teacher may have demonstrated an impact on student learning, but overall results are below District expectations.
Ineffective (0 - 2 points) Results are well-below state average for similar students (or District goals if no state test).	Evidence indicates little to no student learning gain across SLO’s. Expectations described in SLO’s are not met. Results are well below expectations.

2.3) Grades K-3 Math

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

	Math	Assessment
K	District, regional, or BOCES-developed assessment	West Seneca CS District-wide developed Grade K Math Assessment
1	District, regional, or BOCES-developed assessment	West Seneca CS District-wide developed Grade 1 Math Assessment
2	District, regional, or BOCES-developed assessment	West Seneca CS District-wide developedGrade 2 Math Assessment

	Math	Assessment
3	State assessment	3rd Grade State Assessment

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

Use this box, if needed, to describe the general process for assigning HEDI categories for these grades/subjects in this subcomponent. If needed, you may upload a table or graphic at 2.11, below.	Baseline and summative testing will be conducted in accordance with 3012-c of the Education Law of the State of New York. Teachers will be provided opportunities for input on the goals of baseline and summative assessments. Teachers will establish individual growth targets in collaboration with building principals. Points will be awarded based on the percentage of students meeting or exceeding the targets.

Highly Effective (18 - 20 points) Results are well-above state average for similar students (or District goals if no state test).	Evidence indicates exceptional student learning gain across SLO's including special populations. Expectations described in SLO's are well above District expectations
Effective (9 - 17 points) Results meet state average for similar students (or District goals if no state test).	Evidence indicates significant student learning gain across SLO's including special populations. Expectations described in SLO's meet District expectations
Developing (3 - 8 points) Results are below state average for similar students (or District goals if no state test).	Expectations described in SLO's are nearly met. The teacher may have demonstrated an impact on student learning, but overall results are below District expectations.
Ineffective (0 - 2 points) Results are well-below state average for similar students (or District goals if no state test).	Evidence indicates little to no student learning gain across SLO's. Expectations described in SLO's are not met. Results are well below expectations.

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 Seneca CSD developed Grade 6 Science Assessment
7	District, regional or BOCES-developed assessment	West Seneca CSD 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 student performance.

Use this box, if needed, to describe the general process for assigning HEDI categories for these grades/subjects in this subcomponent. If needed, you may upload a table or graphic at 2.11, below.	Baseline and summative testing will be conducted in accordance with 3012-c of the Education Law of the State of New York. Teachers will be provided opportunities for input on the goals of baseline and summative assessments. Teachers will establish individual growth targets in collaboration with building principals. Points will be awarded based on the percentage of students meeting or exceeding the targets.
Highly Effective (18 - 20 points) Results are well-above state average for similar students (or District goals if no state test).	Evidence indicates exceptional student learning gain across SLO's including special populations. Expectations described in SLO's are well above District expectations
Effective (9 - 17 points) Results meet state average for similar students (or District goals if no state test).	Evidence indicates significant student learning gain across SLO's including special populations. Expectations described in SLO's meet District expectations
Developing (3 - 8 points) Results are below state average for similar students (or District goals if no state test).	Expectations described in SLO's are nearly met. The teacher may have demonstrated an impact on student learning, but overall results are below District expectations.

Ineffective (0 - 2 points) Results are well-below state average for similar students (or District goals if no state test).	Evidence indicates little to no student learning gain across SLO's. Expectations described in SLO's are not met. Results are well below expectations.

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 Seneca CSD developed Grade 6 Social Studies Assessment
7	District, regional or BOCES-developed assessment	West Seneca CSD developed Grade 7 Social Studies Assessment
8	District, regional or BOCES-developed assessment	West Seneca CSD 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 student performance.

Use this box, if needed, to describe the general process for assigning HEDI categories for these grades/subjects in this subcomponent. If needed, you may upload a table or graphic at 2.11, below.	Baseline and summative testing will be conducted in accordance with 3012-c of the Education Law of the State of New York. Teachers will be provided opportunities for input on the goals of baseline and summative assessments. Teachers will establish individual growth targets in collaboration with building principals. Points will be awarded based on the percentage of students meeting or exceeding the targets.
Highly Effective (18 - 20 points) Results are well-above District goals for similar students.	Evidence indicates exceptional student learning gain across SLO's including special populations. Expectations described in SLO's are well above District expectations
Effective (9 - 17 points) Results meet District goals for similar students.	Evidence indicates significant student learning gain across SLO's including special populations. Expectations described in SLO's meet District expectations
Developing (3 - 8 points) Results are below District goals for similar students.	Expectations described in SLO's are nearly met. The teacher may have demonstrated an impact on student learning, but overall results are below District expectations.
Ineffective (0 - 2 points) Results are well-below District goals for similar students.	Evidence indicates little to no student learning gain across SLO's. Expectations described in SLO's are not met. Results are well below expectations.

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	WSCSD developed Global History 1 Assessment

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

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

Use this box, if needed, to describe the general process for assigning HEDI categories for these grades/subjects in this subcomponent. If needed, you may upload a table or graphic at 2.11, below.	Baseline and summative testing will be conducted in accordance with 3012-c of the Education Law of the State of New York. Teachers will be provided opportunities for input on the goals of baseline and summative assessments. Teachers will establish individual growth targets in collaboration with building principals. Points will be awarded based on the percentage of students meeting or exceeding the targets.
Highly Effective (18 - 20 points) Results are well-above District goals for similar students.	Evidence indicates exceptional student learning gain across SLO's including special populations. Expectations described in SLO's are well above District expectations
Effective (9 - 17 points) Results meet District goals for similar students.	Evidence indicates significant student learning gain across SLO's including special populations. Expectations described in SLO's meet District expectations
Developing (3 - 8 points) Results are below District goals for similar students.	Expectations described in SLO's are nearly met. The teacher may have demonstrated an impact on student learning, but overall results are below District expectations.
Ineffective (0 - 2 points) Results are well-below District goals for similar students.	Evidence indicates little to no student learning gain across SLO’s. Expectations described in SLO’s are not met. Results are well below expectations.

2.7) High School Science Regents Courses

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

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

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

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

Use this box, if needed, to describe the general process for assigning HEDI categories for these grades/subjects in this subcomponent. If needed, you may upload a table or graphic at 2.11, below.	Baseline and summative testing will be conducted in accordance with 3012-c of the Education Law of the State of New York. Teachers will be provided opportunities for input on the goals of baseline and summative assessments. Teachers will establish individual growth targets in collaboration with building principals. Points will be awarded based on the percentage of students meeting or exceeding the targets.
Highly Effective (18 - 20 points) Results are well-above District goals for similar students.	Evidence indicates exceptional student learning gain across SLO's including special populations. Expectations described in SLO's are well above District expectations
Effective (9 - 17 points) Results meet District goals for similar students.	Evidence indicates significant student learning gain across SLO's including special populations. Expectations described in SLO's meet District expectations
Developing (3 - 8 points) Results are below District goals for similar students.	Expectations described in SLO's are nearly met. The teacher may have demonstrated an impact on student learning, but overall results are below District expectations.
Ineffective (0 - 2 points) Results are well-below District goals for similar students.	Evidence indicates little to no student learning gain across SLO’s. Expectations described in SLO’s are not met. Results are well below expectations.

2.8) High School Math Regents Courses

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

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

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

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

Use this box, if needed, to describe the general process for assigning HEDI categories for these grades/subjects in this subcomponent. If needed, you may upload a table or graphic at 2.11, below.	Baseline and summative testing will be conducted in accordance with 3012-c of the Education Law of the State of New York. Teachers will be provided opportunities for input on the goals of baseline and summative assessments. Teachers will establish individual growth targets in collaboration with building principals. Points will be awarded based on the percentage of students meeting or exceeding the targets.

Highly Effective (18 - 20 points) Results are well-above District goals for similar students.	Evidence indicates exceptional student learning gain across SLO's including special populations. Expectations described in SLO's are well above District expectations
Effective (9 - 17 points) Results meet District goals for similar students.	Evidence indicates significant student learning gain across SLO's including special populations. Expectations described in SLO's meet District expectations
Developing (3 - 8 points) Results are below District goals for similar students.	Expectations described in SLO's are nearly met. The teacher may have demonstrated an impact on student learning, but overall results are below District expectations.
Ineffective (0 - 2 points) Results are well-below District goals for similar students.	Evidence indicates little to no student learning gain across SLO's. Expectations described in SLO's are not met. Results are well below expectations.

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	WSCSD developed Grade 9 English Assessment
Grade 10 ELA	District, regional or BOCES-developed assessment	WSCSD developed Grade 10 English Assessment
Grade 11 ELA	Regents assessment	Regents ELA Exam

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

Use this box, if needed, to describe the general process for assigning HEDI categories for these grades/subjects in this subcomponent. If needed, you may upload a table or graphic at 2.11, below.	Baseline and summative testing will be conducted in accordance with 3012-c of the Education Law of the State of New York. Teachers will be provided opportunities for input on the goals of baseline and summative assessments. Teachers will establish individual growth targets in collaboration with building principals. Points will be awarded based on the percentage of students meeting or exceeding the targets.
Highly Effective (18 - 20 points) Results are well-above District goals for similar students.	Evidence indicates exceptional student learning gain across SLO's including special populations. Expectations described in SLO's are well above District expectations
Effective (9 - 17 points) Results meet District goals for similar students.	Evidence indicates significant student learning gain across SLO's including special populations. Expectations described in SLO's meet District expectations
Developing (3 - 8 points) Results are below District goals for similar students.	Expectations described in SLO's are nearly met. The teacher may have demonstrated an impact on student learning, but overall results are below District

	expectations.
Ineffective (0 - 2 points) Results are well-below District goals for similar students.	Evidence indicates little to no student learning gain across SLO's. Expectations described in SLO's are not met. Results are well below expectations.

2.10) All Other Courses

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

	Course(s) or Subject(s)	Option	Assessment
	All other teachers not named above	District, Regional or BOCES-developed	WSCSD developed Course and grade specific summative assessment-Specific Summative Assessment

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

Use this box, if needed, to describe the general process for assigning HEDI categories for these grades/subjects in this subcomponent. If needed, you may upload a table or graphic at 2.11, below.	Baseline and summative testing will be conducted in accordance with 3012-c of the Education Law of the State of New York. Teachers will be provided opportunities for input on the goals of baseline and summative assessments. Teachers will establish individual growth targets in collaboration with building principals. Points will be awarded based on the percentage of students meeting or exceeding the targets.
Highly Effective (18 - 20 points) Results are well-above District goals for similar students.	Evidence indicates exceptional student learning gain across SLO's including special populations. Expectations described in SLO's are well above District expectations
Effective (9 - 17 points) Results meet District goals for similar students.	Evidence indicates significant student learning gain across SLO's including special populations. Expectations described in SLO's meet District expectations
Developing (3 - 8 points) Results are below District goals for similar students.	Expectations described in SLO's are nearly met. The teacher may have demonstrated an impact on student learning, but overall results are below District expectations.
Ineffective (0 - 2 points) Results are well-below District goals for similar students.	Evidence indicates little to no student learning gain across SLO's. Expectations described in SLO's are not met. Results are well below expectations.

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

(No response)

2.11) HEDI Tables or Graphics

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

assets/survey-uploads/5364/130484-TXEtxx9bQW/Table 3.4 (a) revisedAPPR Jan. 3, 2013.docx

2.12) Locally Developed Controls

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

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

No Controls.

2.13) Teachers with more than one growth measure

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

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

2.14) Assurances

Please check all of the boxes below:

2.14) Assurances | Assure the application of locally developed controls will be rigorous, fair, and transparent and only those used for State Growth will be used for Comparable Growth Measures.	Checked
2.14) Assurances | Assure that use of locally developed controls will not have a disparate impact on underrepresented students in accordance with applicable civil rights laws.	Checked
2.14) Assurances | Assure that enrolled students in accordance with teacher of record policies are included and may not be excluded.	Checked
2.14) Assurances | Assure that procedures for ensuring data accuracy and integrity are being utilized.	Checked
2.14) Assurances | Assure that district will develop SLOs according to the rules established by SED (see: http://usny.nysed.gov/rttt/teachers-leaders/slo/home.html).	Checked

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

3. Local Measures (Teachers)

Created Wednesday, May 16, 2012
Updated Wednesday, January 09, 2013

Page 1

Locally Selected Measures of Student Achievement or Growth

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

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

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

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

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

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

Growth or achievement measure(s) from these options.

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

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

Measures based on:

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

3.1) Grades 4-8 ELA

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

	Locally-Selected Measure from List of Approved Measures	Assessment
4	3) Teacher specific achievement or growth score computed locally	State ELA 4 Assessment
5	3) Teacher specific achievement or growth score computed locally	State ELA 5 Assessment
6	3) Teacher specific achievement or growth score computed locally	State ELA 6 Assessment

7	3) Teacher specific achievement or growth score computed locally	State ELA 7 Assessment
8	3) Teacher specific achievement or growth score computed locally	State ELA 8 Assessment

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

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

Use this box, if needed, to describe the general process for assigning HEDI categories for these grades/subjects in this subcomponent. If needed, you may upload a table or graphic at 3.3, below.	Classroom teachers will utilize a grade level performance index score* per building for math and ELA assessment scores. The goal is eighty percent (80%) proficiency which is equal to a performance index of 1.6. *Performance index formula is as follows: number of students at level 2 + level 3 + level 4 + level 3 + level 4 divided by total students tested. (Student on level 3 & 4 are counted twice)
Highly Effective (14 - 15 points) Results are well above District- or BOCES-adopted expectations for growth or achievement for grade/subject.	A locally developed calculation will be used, by each grade level per building, using the ELA Performance Index for the school year. See the attached graphic for 3.3
Effective (8- 13 points) Results meet District- or BOCES-adopted expectations for growth or achievement for grade/subject.	A locally developed calculation will be used, by each grade level per building, using the ELA Performance Index for the school year. See the attached graphic for 3.3
Developing (3 - 7 points) Results are below District- or BOCES-adopted expectations for growth or achievement for grade/subject.	A locally developed calculation will be used, by each grade level per building, using the ELA Performance Index for the school year. See the attached graphic for 3.3
Ineffective (0 - 2 points) Results are well below District- or BOCES-adopted expectations for growth or achievement for grade/subject.	A locally developed calculation will be used, by each grade level per building, using the ELA Performance Index for the school year. See the attached graphic for 3.3

3.2) Grades 4-8 Math

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

	Locally-Selected Measure from List of Approved Measures	Assessment
4	3) Teacher specific achievement or growth score computed locally	State Math 4 Assessment
5	3) Teacher specific achievement or growth score computed locally	State Math 5 Assessment
6	3) Teacher specific achievement or growth score computed locally	State Math 6 Assessment
7	3) Teacher specific achievement or growth score computed locally	State Math 7 Assessment
8	3) Teacher specific achievement or growth score computed locally	State Math 8 Assessment

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

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

Use this box, if needed, to describe the general process for assigning HEDI categories for these grades/subjects in this subcomponent. If needed, you may upload a table or graphic at 3.3, below.	Percentage of students meeting or exceeding the target will be used to determine points. Classroom teachers will utilize a grade level performance index score* per building for math and ELA assessment scores. The goal is eighty percent (80%) proficiency which is equal to a performance index of 1.6. *Performance index formula is as follows: number of students at level 2 + level 3 + level 4 + level 3 + level 4 divided by total students tested. (Student on level 3 & 4 are counted twice)
Highly Effective (14 - 15 points) Results are well above District- or BOCES-adopted expectations for growth or achievement for grade/subject.	A locally developed calculation will be used, by each grade level per building, using the Math Performance Index for the school year. See the attached graphic for 3.3
Effective (8- 13 points) Results meet District- or BOCES-adopted expectations for growth or achievement for grade/subject.	A locally developed calculation will be used, by each grade level per building, using the Math Performance Index for the school year. See the attached graphic for 3.3
Developing (3 - 7 points) Results are below District- or BOCES-adopted expectations for growth or achievement for grade/subject.	A locally developed calculation will be used, by each grade level per building, using the Math Performance Index for the school year. See the attached graphic for 3.3
Ineffective (0 - 2 points) Results are well below District- or BOCES-adopted expectations for growth or achievement for grade/subject.	A locally developed calculation will be used, by each grade level per building, using the Math Performance Index for the school year. See the attached graphic for 3.3

3.3) HEDI Tables or Graphics

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

assets/survey-uploads/5139/130489-rhJdBgDruP/Locally Selected Assessment Revisedagain charts 3-3 Jan. 3, 2013_1.docx

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

Growth or achievement measure(s) from these options.

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

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

Measures based on:

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

3.4) Grades K-3 ELA

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

	Locally-Selected Measure from List of Approved Measures	Assessment
K	7) Student Learning Objectives	West Seneca CSD developed Grade K ELA assessment
1	7) Student Learning Objectives	West Seneca CSD developed Grade 1 ELA assessment

2	7) Student Learning Objectives	West Seneca CSD developed Grade 2 ELA assessment
3	3) Teacher specific achievement or growth score computed locally	State ELA 3 Assessment

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

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

Use this box, if needed, to describe the general process for assigning HEDI categories for these grades/subjects in this subcomponent. If needed, you may upload a table or graphic at 3.13, below.	Classroom teachers for grade 3 ELA will utilize a grade level performance index score* per building for ELA assessment scores. The goal is eighty percent (80%) proficiency which is equal to a performance index of 1.6. *Performance index formula is as follows: number of students at level 2 + level 3 + level 4 + level 3 + level 4 divided by total students tested. (Student on level 3 & 4 are counted twice) For those with a locally developed assessment the achievement target is that students will receive a score of 65 or better. Teachers will be assigned a HEDI score based on the percentage of students meeting the target. The goal is eighty percent (80%) will meet that target for a HEDI score of 17 points.
Highly Effective (18-20 points) Results are well above District- or BOCES-adopted expectations for growth or achievement for grade/subject.	Evidence indicates exceptional student learning achievement including special populations. Achievement results are well above District expectations
Effective (9-17 points) Results meet District- or BOCES-adopted expectations for growth or achievement for grade/subject.	Evidence indicates significant student learning achievement including special populations. Achievement results meet District expectations.
Developing (3 - 8 points) Results are below District- or BOCES-adopted expectations for growth or achievement for grade/subject.	Evidence indicates student learning achievement results are below District expectations
Ineffective (0 - 2 points) Results are well below District- or BOCES-adopted expectations for growth or achievement for grade/subject.	Evidence indicates little or no learning achievement.

3.5) Grades K-3 Math

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

	Locally-Selected Measure from List of Approved Measures	Assessment
K	7) Student Learning Objectives	West Seneca CSD developed Grade K ELA assessment
1	7) Student Learning Objectives	West Seneca CSD developed Grade 1 ELA assessment

2	7) Student Learning Objectives	West Seneca CSD developed Grade 2 ELA assessment
3	3) Teacher specific achievement or growth score computed locally	State Math 3 Assessment

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

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

Use this box, if needed, to describe the general process for assigning HEDI categories for these grades/subjects in this subcomponent. If needed, you may upload a table or graphic at 3.13, below.	Classroom teachers for grade 3 Math will utilize a grade level performance index score* per building for Math assessment scores. The goal is eighty percent (80%) proficiency which is equal to a performance index of 1.6. *Performance index formula is as follows: number of students at level 2 + level 3 + level 4 + level 3 + level 4 divided by total students tested. (Student on level 3 & 4 are counted twice) For those with a locally developed assessment the achievement target is that students will receive a score of 65 or better. Teachers will be assigned a HEDI score based on the percentage of students meeting the target. The goal is eighty percent (80%) will meet that target for a HEDI score of 17 points.
Highly Effective (18-20 points) Results are well above District- or BOCES-adopted expectations for growth or achievement for grade/subject.	Evidence indicates exceptional student learning achievement including special populations. Achievement results are well above District expectations
Effective (9-17 points) Results meet District- or BOCES-adopted expectations for growth or achievement for grade/subject.	Evidence indicates significant student learning achievement including special populations. Achievement results meet District expectations.
Developing (3 - 8 points) Results are below District -or BOCES-adopted expectations for growth or achievement for grade/subject.	Evidence indicates student learning achievement results are below District expectations
Ineffective (0 - 2 points) Results are well below District- or BOCES-adopted expectations for growth or achievement for grade/subject.	Evidence indicates little or no learning achievement

3.6) Grades 6-8 Science

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

	Locally-Selected Measure from List of Approved Measures	Assessment
6	7) Student Learning Objectives	West Seneca CSD developed Science 6 Assessment
7	7) Student Learning Objectives	West Seneca CSD developed Science 7 Assessment

8	3) Teacher specific achievement or growth score computed locally	State Science 8 Assessment

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

Use this box, if needed, to describe the general process for assigning HEDI categories for these grades/subjects in this subcomponent. If needed, you may upload a table or graphic at 3.13, below.	Classroom teachers for grade 8 Science will utilize a grade level performance index score* per building for Science 8 assessment scores. The goal is eighty percent (80%) proficiency which is equal to a performance index of 1.6. *Performance index formula is as follows: number of students at level 2 + level 3 + level 4 + level 3 + level 4 divided by total students tested. (Student on level 3 & 4 are counted twice) For those with a locally developed assessment the achievement target is that students will receive a score of 65 or better. Teachers will be assigned a HEDI score based on the percentage of students meeting the target. The goal is eighty percent (80%) will meet that target for a HEDI score of 17 points.
Highly Effective (18 - 20 points) Results are well above District- or BOCES-adopted expectations for growth or achievement for grade/subject.	Evidence indicates exceptional student learning achievement including special populations. Achievement results are well above District expectations
Effective (9 - 17 points) Results meet District- or BOCES-adopted expectations for growth or achievement for grade/subject.	Evidence indicates significant student learning achievement including special populations. Achievement results meet District expectations.
Developing (3 - 8 points) Results are below District- or BOCES-adopted expectations for growth or achievement for grade/subject.	Evidence indicates student learning achievement results are below District expectations
Ineffective (0 - 2 points) Results are well below District- or BOCES-adopted expectations for growth or achievement for grade/subject.	Evidence indicates little or no learning achievement.

3.7) Grades 6-8 Social Studies

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

	Locally-Selected Measure from List of Approved Measures	Assessment
6	7) Student Learning Objectives	West Seneca CSD developed Social Studies 6 Assessment
7	7) Student Learning Objectives	West Seneca CSD developed Social Studies 7 Assessment
8	7) Student Learning Objectives	West Seneca CSD developed Social Studies 8 Assessment

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

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

Use this box, if needed, to describe the general process for assigning HEDI categories for these grades/subjects in this subcomponent. If needed, you may upload a table or graphic at 3.13, below.	For those with a locally developed assessment the achievement target is that students will receive a score of 65 or better. Teachers will be assigned a HEDI score based on the percentage of students meeting the target. The goal is eighty percent (80%) will meet that target for a HEDI score of 17 points.
Highly Effective (18 - 20 points) Results are well above District- or BOCES-adopted expectations for growth or achievement for grade/subject.	Evidence indicates exceptional student learning achievement including special populations. Achievement results are well above District expectations
Effective (9 - 17 points) Results meet District- or BOCES-adopted expectations for growth or achievement for grade/subject.	Evidence indicates significant student learning gain across SLO's including special populations. Expectations described in SLO's meet District expectations
Developing (3 - 8 points) Results are below District- or BOCES-adopted expectations for growth or achievement for grade/subject.	Evidence indicates student learning achievement results are below District expectations
Ineffective (0 - 2 points) Results are well below District- or BOCES-adopted expectations for growth or achievement for grade/subject.	Evidence indicates little or no learning achievement.

3.8) High School Social Studies

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

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

	Locally-Selected Measure from List of Approved Measures	Assessment
Global 1	7) Student Learning Objectives	West Seneca CSD developed Global 1 History Assessment
Global 2	7) Student Learning Objectives	Regents Global History
American History	7) Student Learning Objectives	Regents American History

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.	For those with a locally developed or Regents assessment the achievement target is that students will receive a score of 65 or better. Teachers will be assigned a HEDI score based on the percentage of students meeting the target. The goal is eighty percent (80%) will meet that target for a HEDI score of 17 points.
Highly Effective (18 - 20 points) Results are well above District- or BOCES-adopted expectations for growth or achievement for grade/subject.	Evidence indicates exceptional student learning achievement including special populations. Achievement results are well above District expectations
Effective (9 - 17 points) Results meet District- or BOCES-adopted expectations for growth or achievement for grade/subject.	Evidence indicates significant student learning achievement including special populations. Achievement results meet District expectations.
Developing (3 - 8 points) Results are below District- or BOCES-adopted expectations for growth or achievement for grade/subject.	Evidence indicates student learning achievement results are below District expectations
Ineffective (0 - 2 points) Results are well below District- or BOCES-adopted expectations for growth or achievement for grade/subject.	Evidence indicates little or no learning achievement.

3.9) High School Science

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

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

	Locally-Selected Measure from List of Approved Measures	Assessment
Living Environment	7) Student Learning Objectives	Regents Living Environment
Earth Science	7) Student Learning Objectives	Regents Earth Science
Chemistry	7) Student Learning Objectives	Regents Chemistry
Physics	7) Student Learning Objectives	Regents 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.	For those with a locally developed or Regents assessment the achievement target is that students will receive a score of 65 or better. Teachers will be assigned a HEDI score based on the percentage of students meeting the target. The goal is eighty percent (80%) will meet that target for a HEDI score of 17 points.
Highly Effective (18-20 points) Results are well above District- or BOCES-adopted expectations for growth or	Evidence indicates exceptional student learning achievement including special populations. Achievement

achievement for grade/subject.	results are well above District expectations
Developing (3 - 8 points) Results are below District- or BOCES-adopted expectations for growth or achievement for grade/subject.	Evidence indicates significant student learning achievement including special populations. Achievement results meet District expectations.
Effective (9 - 17points) Results meet District- or BOCES-adopted expectations for growth or achievement for grade/subject.	Evidence indicates student learning achievement results are below District expectations
Ineffective (0 - 2 points) Results are well below District- or BOCES-adopted expectations for growth or achievement for grade/subject.	Evidence indicates little or no learning achievement.

3.10) High School Math

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

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

	Locally-Selected Measure from List of Approved Measures	Assessment
Algebra 1	7) Student Learning Objectives	Regents Algebra 1
Geometry	7) Student Learning Objectives	Regents Geometry
Algebra 2	7) Student Learning Objectives	Regents Algebra 2

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

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

Use this box, if needed, to describe the general process for assigning HEDI categories for these grades/subjects in this subcomponent. If needed, you may upload a table or graphic at 3.13, below.	For those with a locally developed or Regents assessment the achievement target is that students will receive a score of 65 or better. Teachers will be assigned a HEDI score based on the percentage of students meeting the target. The goal is eighty percent (80%) will meet that target for a HEDI score of 17 points.
Highly Effective (18 - 20 points) Results are well above District- or BOCES-adopted expectations for growth or achievement for grade/subject.	Evidence indicates exceptional student learning achievement including special populations. Achievement results are well above District expectations
Effective (9 - 17 points) Results meet District- or BOCES-adopted expectations for growth or achievement for grade/subject.	Evidence indicates significant student learning gain across SLO's including special populations. Expectations described in SLO's meet District expectations
Developing (3 - 8 points) Results are below District- or BOCES-adopted expectations for growth or achievement for grade/subject.	Evidence indicates student learning achievement results are below District expectations
Ineffective (0 - 2 points) Results are well below District- or BOCES-adopted expectations for growth or achievement for grade/subject.	Evidence indicates little or no learning achievement.

3.11) High School English Language Arts

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

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

	Locally-Selected Measure from List of Approved Measures	Assessment
Grade 9 ELA	7) Student Learning Objectives	West Seneca developed Grade 9 ELA Assessment
Grade 10 ELA	7) Student Learning Objectives	West Seneca developed Grade 10 ELA Assessment
Grade 11 ELA	7) Student Learning Objectives	Regents ELA Assessment

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

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

Use this box, if needed, to describe the general process for assigning HEDI categories for these grades/subjects in this subcomponent. If needed, you may upload a table or graphic at 3.13, below.	For those with a locally developed or Regents assessment the achievement target is that students will receive a score of 65 or better. Teachers will be assigned a HEDI score based on the percentage of students meeting the target. The goal is eighty percent (80%) will meet that target for a HEDI score of 17 points.
Highly Effective (18 - 20 points) Results are well above District- or BOCES-adopted expectations for growth or achievement for grade/subject.	Evidence indicates exceptional student learning achievement including special populations. Achievement results are well above District expectations
Effective (9 - 17 points) Results meet District- or BOCES-adopted expectations for growth or achievement for grade/subject.	Evidence indicates significant student learning achievement including special populations. Achievement results meet District expectations.
Developing (3 - 8 points) Results are below District- or BOCES-adopted expectations for growth or achievement for grade/subject.	Evidence indicates student learning achievement results are below District expectations
Ineffective (0 - 2 points) Results are well below District- or BOCES-adopted expectations for growth or achievement for grade/subject.	Evidence indicates little or no learning achievement.

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 remaining High School Courses	7) Student Learning Objectives	West Seneca CSD developed Course and grade Specific Assessment
	All remaining Elementary School Courses	7) Student Learning Objectives	West Seneca CSD developed Course and grade Specific Assessment
	All remaining Middle School Courses	7) Student Learning Objectives	West Seneca CSD developed Course and grade Specific Assessment

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 those with a locally developed assessment the achievement target is that students will receive a score of 65 or better. Teachers will be assigned a HEDI score based on the percentage of students meeting the target. The goal is eighty percent (80%) will meet that target for a HEDI score of 17 points.
Highly Effective (18 - 20 points) Results are well above District- or BOCES -adopted expectations for growth or achievement for grade/subject.	Evidence indicates exceptional student learning achievement including special populations. Achievement results are well above District expectations
Effective (9 - 17 points) Results meet District- or BOCES-adopted expectations for growth or achievement for grade/subject.	Evidence indicates significant student learning achievement including special populations. Achievement results meet District expectations.
Developing (3 - 8 points) Results are below District- or BOCES-adopted expectations for growth or achievement for grade/subject.	Evidence indicates student learning achievement results are below District expectations
Ineffective (0 - 2 points) Results are well below District- or BOCES-adopted expectations for growth or achievement for grade/subject.	Evidence indicates little or no learning achievement.

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

(No response)

3.13) HEDI Tables or Graphics

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

and upload that file here.

assets/survey-uploads/5139/130489-y92vNseFa4/Locally Selected Assessment Revisedagain charts 3-3 Jan. 3, 2013_1.docx

3.14) Locally Developed Controls

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

No special adjustments, controls, or other special considerations will be used in setting targets for local measures.

3.15) Teachers with More Than One Locally Selected Measure

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

Teachers who have more than one locally selected measure will calculate their point value based upon the weighted percentage of students in each class rounded to the nearest whole number.

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 Thursday, May 17, 2012
Updated Wednesday, January 09, 2013

Page 1

4.1) Teacher Practice Rubric

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

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

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

Thoughtful Classroom Teacher Effectiveness Framework

(No response)

4.2) Points Within Other Measures

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

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

Is the following points assignment applicable to all teachers?

Yes

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

(No response)

Multiple (at least two) classroom observations by principal or other trained administrator, at least one of which must be unannounced [at least 31 points]	60
One or more observation(s) by trained independent evaluators	0
Observations by trained in-school peer teachers	0
Feedback from students using State-approved survey tool	0
Feedback from parents/caregivers using State-approved survey tool	0
Structured reviews of lesson plans, student portfolios and other teacher artifacts	0

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

(No response)

4.3) Survey Tools (if applicable)

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

(No response)

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

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

4.4) Assurances

Please check all of the boxes below:

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

4.5) Process for Assigning Points and Determining HEDI Ratings

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

Analyze evidence through all of the domains of the rubric and a finalized overall average will be calculated on a 1 to 4 scale. The Thoughtful Classroom Teacher rubric will be utilized. All 60 points is based upon the rubric score. Observations and bodies of work will be based upon the ten dimensions within the rubric. The total or composite score will be calculated based upon the average of the indicators on a scale of 1-4.

The following teacher effects conversion scale will be utilized to convert the rubric score to the HEDI rating. Trained evaluators will use the rubric to score the evaluation. The rubric score will be converted to the 60 point distribution for the composite score. West Seneca understands that the final HEDI score will be reported in whole numbers.

Level Overall rubric average score 60 point distribution for composite

Ineffective 1-1.4 0-49

Developing 1.5-2.4 50-56

Effective 2.5-3.4 57-58

Highly Effective 3.5-4 59-60

The following table is the conversion from the overall rubric average score to the 60 point distribution for the composite score:
Rubric Alignment
Overall Rubric Average Score 60-point score HEDI Level
1.0 0 Ineffective
1.1 12 Ineffective
1.2 25 Ineffective
1.3 37 Ineffective
1.4 49 Ineffective
1.5 50 Developing
1.6 50.7 Developing
1.7 51.4 Developing
1.8 52.1 Developing
1.9 52.8 Developing
2.0 53.5 Developing
2.1 54.2 Developing
2.2 54.9 Developing
2.3 55.6 Developing
2.4 56.3 Developing
2.5 57 Effective
2.6 57.2 Effective
2.7 57.4 Effective
2.8 57.6 Effective
2.9 57.8 Effective
3.0 58 Effective
3.1 58.2 Effective
3.2 58.4 Effective
3.3 58.6 Effective
3.4 58.8 Effective
3.5 59 Highly Effective
3.6 59.2 Highly Effective
3.7 59.4 Highly Effective
3.8 59.6 Highly Effective
3.9 59.8 Highly Effective
4.0 60 Highly Effective

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

assets/survey-uploads/5091/130760-eka9yMJ855/Conversion of Rubric to HEDI.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.	59-60 for overall performance and results that exceed standards.
Effective: Overall performance and results meet NYS Teaching Standards.	57-58 for overall performance and results that exceed standards.
Developing: Overall performance and results need improvement in order to meet NYS Teaching Standards.	50-56 for overall performance and results that exceed standards.
Ineffective: Overall performance and results do not meet NYS Teaching Standards.	0-49 for overall performance and results that exceed standards.

Provide the ranges for the 60-point scoring bands.

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

4.6) Observations of Probationary Teachers

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

By building principals or other trained administrators

4.6) Observations of Probationary Teachers | Formal/Long	1
4.6) Observations of Probationary Teachers | Informal/Short	1
4.6) Observations of Probationary Teachers | Enter 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 probationary teachers be done in person, by video, or both?

- In Person

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

- In Person

4.7) Observations of Tenured Teachers

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

By building principals or other trained administrators

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

By trained in-school peer teachers or other trained reviewers

Formal/Long	0
Informal/Short	0

Independent evaluators

Formal/Long	0
Informal/Short	0

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

- In Person

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

- In Person

5. Composite Scoring (Teachers)

Created Tuesday, October 09, 2012
Updated Thursday, October 11, 2012

Page 1

Standards for Rating Categories

Growth or Comparable Measures

Locally-selected Measures of

growth or achievement

Other Measures of Effectiveness

(Teacher and Leader standards)

Highly

Effective

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

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

Overall performance and results exceed NYS Teaching Standards.

Effective

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

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

Overall performance and results meet NYS Teaching Standards.

Developing

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

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

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

Ineffective

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

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

Overall performance and results do not meet NYS Teaching Standards.

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

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

2012-13 where there is no Value-Added measure

Growth or Comparable Measures

Locally-selected Measures of

growth or achievement

Other Measures of Effectiveness

(60 points)

Overall

Composite Score

Highly Effective

18-20

18-20

Ranges determined locally--see below

91-100

Effective

9-17

9-17

75-90

Developing

3-8

3-8

65-74

Ineffective

0-2

0-2

0-64

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

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

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

2012-13 where Value-Added growth measure applies

Growth or Comparable Measures

Locally-selected Measures of

growth or achievement

Other Measures of Effectiveness

(60 points)

Overall

Composite Score

Highly Effective

22-25

14-15

Ranges determined locally--see above

91-100

Effective

10-21

8-13

75-90

Developing

3-9

3-7

65-74

Ineffective

0-2

0-2

0-64

6. Additional Requirements - Teachers

Created Thursday, May 17, 2012
Updated Monday, December 17, 2012

Page 1

6.1) Assurances -- Improvement Plans

Please check the boxes below:

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

6.2) Attachment: Teacher Improvement Plan Forms

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

assets/survey-uploads/5265/130766-Df0w3Xx5v6/Teacher Improvement Plan (TIP) Rev.docx

6.3) Appeals Process

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

(1) the substance of the annual professional performance review

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

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

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

The Appeal Process - Teachers.

a) Members may appeal the components of TIPS, developing or ineffective ratings. A committee of five, three selected by the Union and two selected by the District will have the power to make final and binding decisions in these appeals only. Arbitration will continue to be the final step in the grievance procedure in disputes not related to the APPR.

b) This 3012-c appeals procedure shall constitute the exclusive means for initiating, reviewing and resolving any and all challenges and appeals related to a teacher performance review and/or improvement plan. A teacher who commences the appeal process described herein does not waive his/her right to submit a written rebuttal to the final evaluation.

c) Appeal Procedures

In order to implement the requirements of N.Y. Education Law 3012-c, and notwithstanding any other current bargaining obligations or agreement, the District and the Association herby agree as follows:

(1) Meeting with the Administrator who issued the evaluation. The first step in the appeal process will be for the teacher to request a meeting with the administrator issuing the evaluation or improvement plan within seven (7) working days of receiving the final evaluation or plan to discuss the substance of the evaluation, provide feedback, and obtain additional detail. The administrator shall consider any objection the teacher may have and may make adjustment to the evaluation or plan. Changes made to an evaluation or plan after the conferences or rebuttals concerning it may be made prior to submitting the report to the central office for inclusion in the employee's personnel folder. Changes and/or rebuttals shall be initialed by the evaluator and the classroom teacher.

(2) Filing an appeal. If after meeting with the administrator that issued the evaluation a teacher is challenging the issuance of a teacher improvement plan, or a portion thereof, and or an evaluation, an appeal must be delivered to the Superintendent's office no later than fifteen (15) working days after receiving said plan or evaluation. When filing an appeal, the teacher must submit a detailed written description of the specific areas of disagreement over his or her performance review, or the issuance and/or implementation of the terms of his or her improvement plan and any additional documents or materials relevant to the appeal. The performance review and/or improvement plan being challenged must also be submitted with the appeal. Teachers may not file multiple appeals regarding the same performance issues. This does not preclude a teacher from filing an appeal of their final summative rating. All grounds for appeal must be raised with specificity within one appeal. Any grounds not raised when the appeal is filed shall be deemed waived. Any information not submitted at the time the appeal is filed shall not be considered unless mutually agreed to by the parties.

Consideration of the Appeal for Teachers:

A. The Superintendent, upon receipt, will submit the appeal to the committee for their consideration.

B. The committee will review the improvement plan, or performance evaluation, and the detailed written description of the specific areas of disagreement over his or her performance review, or the issuance and/or implementation of the terms of his or her improvement plan and any additional documents or materials relevant to the appeal. It will be the option of the committee to determine the need to conduct a meeting regarding the merits of the appeal to answer any questions or to seek clarification.

C. Within 30 days from the date upon which the teacher delivered his or her appeal the committee will issue a final and binding determination of the improvement plan or performance evaluation.

D. The decision shall set forth the reasons and factual basis for each determination on each of the specific issues raised in the teacher's appeal. The committee will weigh substantial error, or defect or if procedures have been violated when evaluating the merits of the appeal. The committee is empowered to determine the appropriate remedy. The remedy may include that the evaluation or improvement plan is sustained, modified or nullified.

6.4) Training and Certification of Lead Evaluators and Evaluators

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

Annual Certification Criteria and Current State or Plan for Implementation.

Evaluators will be recertified on an annualized basis.

1. NYS Teaching Standards and the ISLLC, 2008 Leadership Standards

• The District assures that NYS Teaching Standards training has been held for administrators. New administrators will be trained, as needed.

• The District will assure that all current administrators will be trained in the ISLLC Standards; new administrators will be trained, as needed.

• Time will be devoted at District-level principals' meetings to examine case studies that reflect application of the ISLLC standards in a leadership setting.

2. Evidence-based observation techniques

• All administrators will be provided with training on evidence-based observation techniques.

• On August 27 and 28, 2012 professional development was provided to all District administrators in the Thoughtful Classroom Framework.

• Targeted trainings on evidence-based observations will be scheduled throughout the school year using the Thoughtful Classroom Teacher Framework.

3. Application and use of the student growth and value-added growth model

• A training module based on information provided by NYSED has been developed to present to all administrators. Training will take place in the fall of 2012.

4. Application and use of State-approved teacher/principal rubrics

• . Silver and Strong Associates provided extensive training on utilizing the Thoughtful Classroom Teacher Framework. All teacher evaluators attended the workshop in August of 2012.

• The District assures that Inter-rater reliability will be a quality control factor in the administration of the Thoughtful Classroom Teacher Framework.

• The district administrators worked with a trainer from Silver and Strong Associates. The training included viewing video clips of classroom instruction, applying the elements of the rubric, discussing observations based on evidence, and translating rubric results into appropriate ratings. Both similarities and differences were discussed in detail. Any differences in ratings were discussed as the groups worked to build inter-rater reliability.

A similar process will be utilized throughout the school year as administrators engage in follow-up professional development sessions.

5. Application and use of any assessment tools you intend to use (e.g., portfolios, surveys, goals)

• All principals and District administrators have received training in the development of SLOs. The District will utilize eDoctrina to create pre and post assessments as needed. Appropriate training for eDoctrina has been provided by BOCES. Additional training will be provided as needed if third party or other assessment measures are selected.

6. Application and use of any State-approved locally developed measures of student achievement you intend to use

• Additional support will be provided throughout the year, as needed.

7. Use of the Statewide Instructional Reporting System

• Administrators are receiving ongoing updates from NYSED regarding the Instructional Reporting System. These updates are provided by the Chief Information Officer and incorporated routinely into District-level Principals meetings.

8. The scoring methodology used by the department and/or your district

• All principals and District administrators, as well as the West Seneca Teachers Association (WSTA) and the West Seneca Administrators' Association (WSAA), have and will continue to participate in the scoring decisions that relate to APPR.

9. Specific considerations in evaluating teachers and principals of English language learners

• There is a District emphasis on best practices for ELL for curriculum, instruction, and assessment. This focus on these three inter-related areas is incorporated into all aspects of District work, including data team work, which will be considered in teacher and principal evaluations.

• *Assessment targets (SLO's and Locally Developed Assessments) will be developed which consider the performance of ELL.*

6.5) Assurances -- Evaluators

Please check the boxes below:

- Checked

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

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

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

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

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

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

(7) use of the Statewide Instructional Reporting System

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

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

- Checked

6.6) Assurances -- Teachers

Please check all of the boxes below:

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

6.7) Assurances -- Data

Please check all of the boxes below:

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

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

Created Tuesday, October 09, 2012
Updated Thursday, December 20, 2012

Page 1

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

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

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

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

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

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

Please check the boxes below:

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

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

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

State assessments, *required if one exists*

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

List of State-approved 3rd party assessments

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

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

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

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

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

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

(No response)

7.4) Special Considerations for Comparable Growth Measures

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

Note: The only allowable controls or adjustments for Comparable Growth Measures are those used in State Growth measures, which

include: prior student achievement results, students with disabilities, English language learners, students in poverty, and, in the future, any other student-, classroom-, and school-level characteristics approved by the Board of Regents.

(No response)

7.5) Principals with More Than One Growth Measure

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

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

7.6) Assurances -- Comparable Growth Measures

Please check all of the boxes below:

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

8. Local Measures (Principals)

Created Tuesday, October 09, 2012
Updated Wednesday, January 09, 2013

Page 1

Locally-Selected Measures of Student Achievement or Growth

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

	Grade Configuration	Locally-Selected Measure from List of Approved Measures	Assessment
	k-6	(d) measures used by district for teacher evaluation	NYS Assessment in ELA and Math Graed 3 to 6
	7-8	(d) measures used by district for teacher evaluation	NYS Assessments ELA 7-8, Math 7-8, Science 8, Earth Science Regents, Integrated Algebra Regents
	9-12	(d) measures used by district for teacher evaluation	NYS Regents Living Environment, Integrated Algebra Regents, Regents U.S. History, Regents English 3

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 HEDI points will be determined by the utilization of the Performance Index as a percentage of the potential 15 points. Standard rounding rules to apply to a whole number. The formula below indicates the calculation: The performance index will be used to calculate the number of points awarded based upon the following formula: number of students at (level 2 + level 3 + level 4) +(level 3 + level 4) / total number of test scores = PI [PI/2] *15pts The District will be using the performance index to determine the HEDI points for Principals in the locally selected measures. (Regents Exam qualifier - 85-100 = Level 4, 65 - 84.9 = Level 3, 50 - 64.9 = Level 2, 0 - 49.9 = Level 1.)
Highly Effective (14 - 15 points) Results are well above District- or BOCES-adopted expectations for growth or	Composite student achievement index is well above District expectations for achievement.

achievement for grade/subject.	
Effective (8- 13 points) Results meet District- or BOCES-adopted expectations for growth or achievement for grade/subject.	Composite student achievement index meets District expectations for achievement.
Developing (3 - 7 points) Results are below District- or BOCES-adopted expectations for growth or achievement for grade/subject.	Composite student achievement index is below District expectations for achievement.
Ineffective (0 - 2 points) Results are well below District- or BOCES-adopted expectations for growth or achievement for grade/subject.	Composite student achievement index is well below District expectations for achievement.

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

(No response)

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

(No response)

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

with high school grades

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

(No response)

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

(No response)

8.3) Locally Developed Controls

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

(No response)

8.4) Principals with More Than One Locally Selected Measure

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

Not Applicable

8.5) Assurances

Please check all of the boxes below:

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

9. Other Measures of Effectiveness (Principals)

Created Tuesday, October 09, 2012
Updated Wednesday, January 09, 2013

Page 1

9.1) Principal Practice Rubric

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

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

Marshall's Principal Evaluation Rubric

(No response)

9.2) Points Within Other Measures

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

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

Is the following points assignment for all principals?

Yes

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

(No response)

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

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

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

(No response)

9.3) Assurances -- Goals

Please check the boxes below (if applicable):

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

9.4) Sources of Evidence (if applicable)

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

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

9.5) Survey Tool(s) (if applicable)

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

(No response)

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

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

Principal Evaluation Tripod School Perception Survey (Combined Parent Survey)	(No response)
Principal Evaluation Tripod School Perception Survey (Combined Student Surveys)	(No response)

9.6) Assurances

Please check all of the boxes below:

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

9.7) Process for Assigning Points and Determining HEDI Ratings

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

All 60 HEDI points will be based upon the Marshall Rubric. All subcomponents will receive a score of 1-4. All the subcomponents will then be averaged to result in a composite rubric score from 1-4. This score will be converted to a HEDI rating from 0-60.

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

assets/survey-uploads/5143/191851-pMADJ4gk6R/9.7 WSCSD HEDI Dist-other.pdf

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

Highly Effective: Overall performance and results exceed standards.	59-60 for overall performance and results that exceed standards.
Effective: Overall performance and results meet standards.	57-58 for overall performance and results that meet standards
Developing: Overall performance and results need improvement in order to meet standards.	35-56 for overall performance and results that need improvement in order to meet standards
Ineffective: Overall performance and results do not meet standards.	0-34 for overall performance and results that do not meet standards

Please provide the locally-negotiated 60 point scoring bands.

Highly Effective	59 - 60
Effective	57 -58
Developing	35 -56
Ineffective	0 -34

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	3
By trained administrator	0
By trained independent evaluator	0
Enter Total	3

Tenured Principals

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

10. Composite Scoring (Principals)

Created Tuesday, October 09, 2012
Updated Thursday, October 11, 2012

Page 1

Standards for Rating Categories

Growth or Comparable Measures

Locally-selected Measures of

growth or achievement

Other Measures of Effectiveness

(Teacher and Leader standards)

Highly

Effective

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

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

Overall performance and results exceed ISLLC leadership standards.

Effective

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

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

Overall performance and results meet ISLLC leadership standards.

Developing

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

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

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

Ineffective

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

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

Overall performance and results do not meet ISLLC leadership standards.

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

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

2012-13 where there is no Value-Added measure

Growth or Comparable Measures

Locally-selected Measures of

growth or achievement

Other Measures of Effectiveness

(60 points)

Overall

Composite Score

Highly Effective

18-20

18-20

Ranges determined locally--see below

91-100

Effective

9-17

9-17

75-90

Developing

3-8

3-8

65-74

Ineffective

0-2

0-2

0-64

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

Highly Effective	59 - 60
Effective	57 - 58
Developing	35 -56
Ineffective	0 - 34

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

2012-13 where Value-Added growth measure applies

Growth or Comparable Measures

Locally-selected Measures of

growth or achievement

Other Measures of Effectiveness

(60 points)

Overall

Composite Score

Highly Effective

22-25

14-15

Ranges determined locally--see above

91-100

Effective

10-21

8-13

75-90

Developing

3-9

3-7

65-74

Ineffective

0-2

0-2

0-64

11. Additional Requirements - Principals

Created Thursday, October 11, 2012

Page 1

11.1) Assurances -- Improvement Plans

Please check the boxes below.

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

11.2) Attachment: Principal Improvement Plan Forms

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

assets/survey-uploads/5276/194009-Df0w3Xx5v6/Principal Director Improvement Plan Form.docx

11.3) Appeals Process

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

(1) the substance of the annual professional performance review

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

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

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

Members may appeal the components of P/DIPS and developing or ineffective ratings of the evaluation process. A committee of three, two selected by the Association and one selected by the Superintendent will have the power to make final and binding decisions in these appeals only. Arbitration will continue to be the final step in the grievance procedure in disputes not related to the APPR.
This 3012-c appeals procedure shall constitute the exclusive means for initiating, reviewing and resolving any and all challenges and appeals related to a Principal/Director

performance review and/or improvement plan. A Principal/Director who commences the appeal process described herein does not waive his/her right to submit a written rebuttal to the final evaluation.

Appeal Procedures

In order to implement the requirements of N.Y. Education Law 3012-c, and notwithstanding any other current bargaining obligations or agreement, the District and the Association herby agree as follows:

1. Meeting with the Evaluator who issued the evaluation. The first step in the appeal process will be for the Principal to request a meeting with the evaluator issuing the evaluation or improvement plan within seven (7) working days of receiving the final evaluation or plan to discuss the substance of the evaluation, provide feedback, and obtain additional detail. The evaluator shall consider any objection the Principal may have and may make adjustment to the evaluation or plan. Changes made to an evaluation or plan after the conferences or rebuttals concerning it may be made prior to submitting the report to the central office for inclusion in the employee's personnel folder. Changes and/or rebuttals shall be initialed by the evaluator and the Principal.

2. Filing an appeal. If a Principal or Director is challenging an evaluation or any components thereof, or the issuance or components of an improvement plan, an appeal must be delivered no later than 15 working days after receiving said evaluation or plan. When filing an appeal, the Principal or Director must submit a detailed written description of the specific areas of disagreement over his or her performance review, or the issuance and/or implementation of the terms of his or her improvement plan and any additional documents or materials relevant to the appeal. The performance review and/or improvement plan being challenged must also be submitted with the appeal. Principals and Directors may not file multiple appeals regarding the same performance issues. This does not preclude a Principal or Director from filing an appeal of their final summative rating. All grounds for appeal must be raised with specificity within one appeal. Any grounds not raised when the appeal is filed shall be deemed waived. Any information not submitted at the time the appeal is filed shall not be considered unless mutually agreed to by the parties.

Consideration of the Appeal

1. The Superintendent, upon receipt, will submit the appeal to the committee for their consideration.

2. The committee will review the improvement plan, or performance evaluation, and the detailed written description of the specific areas of disagreement over his or her performance review, or the issuance and/or implementation of the terms of his or her improvement plan and any additional documents or materials relevant to the appeal. It will be the option of the committee to determine the need to conduct a meeting regarding the merits of the appeal to answer any questions or to seek clarification.

3. Within 30 days from the date upon which the principal or directors delivered his or her appeal the committee will issue a final and binding determination of the improvement plan or performance evaluation.

The decision shall set forth the reasons and factual basis for each determination on each of the specific issues raised in the administrator's appeal. The committee will weigh substantial error, or defect or if procedures have been violated when evaluating the merits of the appeal. The committee is empowered to determine the appropriate remedy. The remedy may include that the evaluation or improvement plan is sustained, modified or nullified.

11.4) Training and Certification of Lead Evaluators and Evaluators

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

Certification and future recertification criteria:

1. NYS Teaching Standards and the ISLLC, 2008 Leadership Standards

• The District assures that NYS Teaching Standards training has been held for administrators. New administrators will be trained, as needed.

• The District will assure that all current administrators will be trained in the ISLLC Standards; new administrators will be trained, as needed.

• Time will be devoted at District-level principals' meetings to examine case studies that reflect application of the ISLLC standards in a leadership setting.

2. Evidence-based observation techniques

• All administrators will be provided with training on evidence-based observation techniques.

• On August 27 and 28, 2012 professional development was provided to all District administrators in the Thoughtful Classroom Framework.

• Targeted trainings on evidence-based observations will be scheduled throughout the school year using the Thoughtful Classroom Teacher Framework.

3. Application and use of the student growth and value-added growth model

• A training module based on information provided by NYSED has been developed to present to all administrators. Training will take place in the fall of 2012.

4. Application and use of State-approved teacher/principal rubrics

• . Silver and Strong Associates provided extensive training on utilizing the Thoughtful Classroom Teacher Framework. All teacher evaluators attended the workshop in August of 2012.

• The District assures that Inter-rater reliability will be a quality control factor in the administration of the Thoughtful Classroom Teacher Framework.

• The district administrators worked with a trainer from Silver and Strong Associates. The training included viewing video clips of classroom instruction, applying the elements of the rubric, discussing observations based on evidence, and translating rubric results into appropriate ratings. Both similarities and differences were discussed in detail. Any differences in ratings were discussed as the groups worked to build inter-rater reliability.

A similar process will be utilized throughout the school year as administrators engage in follow-up professional development sessions.

5. Application and use of any assessment tools you intend to use (e.g., portfolios, surveys, goals)

• All principals and District administrators have received training in the development of SLOs. The District will utilize eDoctrina to create pre and post assessments as needed. Appropriate training for eDoctrina has been provided by BOCES. Additional training will be provided as needed if third party or other assessment measures are selected.

6. Application and use of any State-approved locally developed measures of student achievement you intend to use

• Additional support will be provided throughout the year, as needed.

7. Use of the Statewide Instructional Reporting System

• Administrators are receiving ongoing updates from NYSED regarding the Instructional Reporting System. These updates are provided by the Chief Information Officer and incorporated routinely into District-level Principals meetings.

8. The scoring methodology used by the department and/or your district

• All principals and District administrators, as well as the West Seneca Teachers Association (WSTA) and the West Seneca Administrators' Association (WSAA), have and will continue to participate in the scoring decisions that relate to APPR.

9. Specific considerations in evaluating teachers and principals of English language learners

• There is a District emphasis on best practices for ELL for curriculum, instruction, and assessment. This focus on these three inter-related areas is incorporated into all aspects of District work, including data team work, which will be considered in teacher and principal evaluations.

• Assessment targets (SLO's and Locally Developed Assessments) will be developed which consider the performance of ELL.

The certification and recertification process will contain the same elements as indicated above. A year-long menu of professional development will be offered to build and refine skills. The superintendent will certify evaluators.

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, October 09, 2012
Updated Thursday, January 10, 2013

Page 1

12.1)Upload the Joint Certification of the APPR Plan

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

assets/survey-uploads/5581/191870-3Uqgn5g9Iu/12.1 WSCSD Cert1.10.13.pdf

File types supported for uploads

PDF (preferred)

Microsoft Office (.doc, .ppt, .xls)

Microsoft Office 2007: Supported but not recommended (.docx, .pptx, .xlsx)

Open Office (.odt, .ott)

Images (.jpg, .gif)

Other Formats (.html, .xhtml, .txt, .rtf, .latex)

Please note that .docx, .pptx, and .xlsx formats are not entirely supported.

Please save your file types as .doc, .ppt or .xls respectively before uploading.

The following chart applies to those teachers who will earn up to 20 points in the Growth Component or Comparable Measures

HEDI Point Scale (Zero to 20) Note: *Determined by SED Regulations*			
	HEDI Points *(Highly Effective, Effective, Developmental, Ineffective)*	**Target or Percent Achieved**	**HEDI Scores Range**
Ineffective	0	0%	0% to 2%
	1	3%	3% to 5%
	2	6%	6% to 8%
Developing	3	9%	9% to 11%
	4	12%	12% to 14%
	5	15%	15% to 17%
	6	18%	18% to 20%
	7	21%	21% to 27%
	8	28%	28% to 33%
Effective	9	34%	34% to 35%
	10	36%	36% to 39%
	11	40%	40% to 46%
	12	47%	47% to 52%
	13	53%	53% to 59%
	14	60%	60% to 66%
	15	67%	67% to 72%
	16	73%	73% to 79%
	17	80%	80% to 84%
Highly Effective	18	85%	85% to 89%
	19	90%	90% to 94%
	20	95%	95% to 100%

The following chart applies to those teachers who will earn up to 15 points in the Growth or Comparable Measures Component

HEDI Point Scale Note: *Determined by SED Regulations*		**(Zero to 15)**
	HEDI Points *(Highly Effective, Effective, Developmental, Ineffective)*	**Performance Index**
Ineffective	0	0 -0.2
	1	0.3 - 0.4
	2	0.5
Developing	3	0.6
	4	0.7
	5	0.8
	6	0.9
	7	1.0
Effective	8	1.1
	9	1.2
	10	1.3
	11	1.4
	12	1.5
	13	1.6 -1.7
Highly Effective	14	1.8 – 1.9
	15	2.0

The following chart applies to those teachers who will earn up to 20 points in the Growth or Comparable Measures Component

	HEDI Point Scale Note: *Determined by SED Regulations*	**Zero to 20**
	HEDI Points *(Highly Effective, Effective, Developmental, Ineffective)*	**Performance Index**
Ineffective	0	0.0
	1	0.05
	2	0.1
Developing	3	0.2
	4	0.3
	5	0.4
	6	0.5
	7	0.6
	8	0.7
Effective	9	0.8
	10	0.9
	11	1.0
	12	1.1
	13	1.2
	14	1.3
	15	1.4
	16	1.5
	17	1.6 – 1.7
Highly Effective	18	1.8
	19	1.9
	20	2.0

The following chart applies to those teachers who will earn up to 20 points in the Growth or Comparable Measures Component

HEDI Point Scale (Zero to 20) Note: *Determined by SED Regulations*			
	HEDI Points *(Highly Effective, Effective, Developmental, Ineffective)*	**Target or Percent Achieved**	**Target or Percent Achieved Range**
Ineffective	0	0%	0% to 2%
	1	3%	3% to 5%
	2	6%	6% to 8%
Developing	3	9%	9% to 11%
	4	12%	12% to 14%
	5	15%	15% to 17%
	6	18%	18% to 20%
	7	21%	21% to 24%
	8	25%	25% to 33%
Effective	9	34%	34% to 35%
	10	36%	36% to 39%
	11	40%	40% to 46%
	12	47%	47% to 52%
	13	53%	53% to 59%
	14	60%	60% to 66%
	15	67%	67% to 72%
	16	73%	73% to 79%
	17	80%	80% to 84%
Highly Effective	18	85%	85% to 89%
	19	90%	90% to 94%
	20	95%	95% to 100%

The following chart applies to those teachers who will earn up to 15 points in the Growth or Comparable Measures Component

HEDI Point Scale Note: *Determined by SED Regulations*		**(Zero to 15)**
	HEDI Points *(Highly Effective, Effective, Developmental, Ineffective)*	**Performance Index**
Ineffective	0	0 -0.2
	1	0.3 - 0.4
	2	0.5
Developing	3	0.6
	4	0.7
	5	0.8
	6	0.9
	7	1.0
Effective	8	1.1
	9	1.2
	10	1.3
	11	1.4
	12	1.5
	13	1.6 -1.7
Highly Effective	14	1.8 – 1.9
	15	2.0

The following chart applies to those teachers who will earn up to 20 points in the Growth or Comparable Measures Component

	HEDI Point Scale Note: *Determined by SED Regulations*	**Zero to 20**
	HEDI Points *(Highly Effective, Effective, Developmental, Ineffective)*	**Performance Index**
Ineffective	0	0.0
	1	0.05
	2	0.1
Developing	3	0.2
	4	0.3
	5	0.4
	6	0.5
	7	0.6
	8	0.7
Effective	9	0.8
	10	0.9
	11	1.0
	12	1.1
	13	1.2
	14	1.3
	15	1.4
	16	1.5
	17	1.6 – 1.7
Highly Effective	18	1.8
	19	1.9
	20	2.0

The following chart applies to those teachers who will earn up to 20 points in the Growth or Comparable Measures Component

HEDI Point Scale (Zero to 20) Note: *Determined by SED Regulations*			
	HEDI Points *(Highly Effective, Effective, Developmental, Ineffective)*	**Target or Percent Achieved**	**Target or Percent Achieved Range**
Ineffective	0	0%	0% to 2%
	1	3%	3% to 5%
	2	6%	6% to 8%
Developing	3	9%	9% to 11%
	4	12%	12% to 14%
	5	15%	15% to 17%
	6	18%	18% to 20%
	7	21%	21% to 24%
	8	25%	25% to 33%
Effective	9	34%	34% to 35%
	10	36%	36% to 39%
	11	40%	40% to 46%
	12	47%	47% to 52%
	13	53%	53% to 59%
	14	60%	60% to 66%
	15	67%	67% to 72%
	16	73%	73% to 79%
	17	80%	80% to 84%
Highly Effective	18	85%	85% to 89%
	19	90%	90% to 94%
	20	95%	95% to 100%

a) The following teacher effects conversion scale will be utilized to convert the rubric score to the HEDI rating:

Level	**Overall rubric average score**	**60 point distribution for composite**
Ineffective	1-1.4	0-49
Developing	1.5-2.4	50-56
Effective	2.5-3.4	57-58
Highly Effective	3.5-4	59-60

b) The following table is the conversion from the overall rubric average score to the 60 point distribution for the composite score:

Rubric Alignment

Overall Rubric Average Score	**60-point score**	**HEDI Level**
1.0	0	Ineffective
1.1	12	Ineffective
1.2	25	Ineffective
1.3	37	Ineffective
1.4	49	Ineffective
1.5	50	Developing
1.6	50.7	Developing
1.7	51.4	Developing
1.8	52.1	Developing
1.9	52.8	Developing
2.0	53.5	Developing
2.1	54.2	Developing
2.2	54.9	Developing
2.3	55.6	Developing
2.4	56.3	Developing
2.5	57	Effective
2.6	57.2	Effective

2.7	57.4	Effective
2.8	57.6	Effective
2.9	57.8	Effective
3.0	58	Effective
3.1	58.2	Effective
3.2	58.4	Effective
3.3	58.6	Effective
3.4	58.8	Effective
3.5	59	Highly Effective
3.6	59.2	Highly Effective
3.7	59.4	Highly Effective
3.8	59.6	Highly Effective
3.9	59.8	Highly Effective
4.0	60	Highly Effective

West Seneca Central School District

Teacher Improvement Plan (TIP)

The Teacher Improvement Plan (TIP) is developed by the District for the individual teacher receiving a developing or ineffective rating.

TIP guidelines/procedures are as follows:

a) The TIP will be developed collaboratively between the evaluating administrator and the teacher. The member has the right to include representatives of the Union in the TIP process if they desire. If a member chooses not to include union representation in the process, they will sign a waiver stating this fact.

b) TIPs must be implemented no later than 10 days after the date on which teachers are required to report prior to the opening of classes for the school year. An improvement plan defines specific standards-based goals that a teacher must make progress toward attaining within a specific period of time, such as a 12 month period, and shall include the identification of areas that need improvement, a timeline for achieving improvement, the manner in which improvement will be assessed, and, where appropriate, differentiated activities to support improvement in these areas.

   The plan should clearly describe the professional learning activities that the educator must complete. These activities should be connected directly to the areas needing improvement. The artifacts that the teacher must produce that can serve as benchmarks of improvement and evidence for the final state of the improvement plan should be described, and could include items such as lessons plans and supporting materials, including student work.

   The supervisor will clearly state the support and assistance that the educator will receive. In the final stage of the improvement plan, the teacher will meet with his or her supervisor to review the plan, alongside any artifacts and evidence from evaluations, in order to determine if adequate improvement has been made in the required areas outlined within the plan for the teacher.

c) In the event the Principal and Teacher disagree over a specific provision or content of the TIP the matter will be referred to the Appeal Board for resolution. The specific provision will be subject to the appeal board and will not be implemented until the Appeal Board has made a determination in the matter. However, all other provisions will be implemented in accordance with the TIP process.

(Please complete TIP worksheet on opposite side)

Improvement Plan Worksheet

The teacher and administrator will work cooperatively to develop an assistance plan for the teacher.

A. The plan must be:
   Achievable
   Clearly written
   Related to professional improvement

B. Performance area(s) in which need was identified:

Management Indicators	Instruction Indicators
____Classroom Management	____Content Area Knowledge
____Classroom Climate	____Varied Instructional Strategies
____Organization	____Lesson Plan Design
____Record Keeping	____Assessment
____Other	____Other

C. Statement of Objective(s):

D. Measurement Criteria:

E. Plan of Action:
   1. Description:

   2. Timeline:

   3. Required Resources:

_____ _____
Teacher's signature Date

_____ _____
Administrator's signature Date

Original to: *Human Resources Department ~* ***Copies to:*** *Administrator, Employee*

HEDI Point Distribution For Marshall's Principal Evaluation Rubric

HEDI Rating	Average	Point Distribution		HEDI Rating	Average	Point Distribution
Highly Effective	4.00	60		Ineffective	1.78	29
Highly Effective	3.80	59		Ineffective	1.72	28
Effective	3.60	58		Ineffective	1.66	27
Effective	3.50	57		Ineffective	1.60	26
Developing	3.44	56		Ineffective	1.54	25
Developing	3.38	55		Ineffective	1.47	24
Developing	3.32	54		Ineffective	1.41	23
Developing	3.25	53		Ineffective	1.35	22
Developing	3.19	52		Ineffective	1.29	21
Developing	3.13	51		Ineffective	1.23	20
Developing	3.07	50		Ineffective	1.17	19
Developing	3.01	49		Ineffective	1.11	18
Developing	2.95	48		Ineffective	1.04	17
Developing	2.89	47		Ineffective	1.00	0
Developing	2.82	46				
Developing	2.76	45				
Developing	2.70	44				
Developing	2.64	43				
Developing	2.58	42				
Developing	2.52	41				
Developing	2.46	40				
Developing	2.39	39				
Developing	2.33	38				
Developing	2.27	37				
Developing	2.21	36				
Developing	2.15	35				
Ineffective	2.09	34				
Ineffective	2.03	33				
Ineffective	1.96	32				
Ineffective	1.90	31				
Ineffective	1.84	30				

West Seneca Central School District

Principal/Director Improvement Plan (P/DIP)

The Principal/Director Improvement Plan (P/DIP) is developed by the District for the individual administrator receiving a developing or ineffective rating.

***P/DIP* guidelines/procedures are as follows:**

a) The P/DIP will be developed collaboratively between the evaluating administrator and the principal/director. The member has the right to include representatives of the Union in the P/DIP process if they desire. If a member chooses not to include union representation in the process, they will sign a waiver stating this fact.

b) P/DIPs must be implemented no later than 10 days after the date on which principals/directors are required to report prior to the opening of classes for the school year. An improvement plan defines specific standards-based goals that a Principal/Director must make progress toward attaining within a specific period of time, such as a 12 month period, and shall include the identification of areas that need improvement, a timeline for achieving improvement, the manner in which improvement will be assessed, and, where appropriate, differentiated activities to support improvement in these areas. The plan should clearly describe the professional learning activities that the Principal/Director must complete. These activities should be connected directly to the areas needing improvement. The artifacts that the principal or director must produce that can serve as benchmarks of improvement and evidence for the final state of the improvement plan should be described. The evaluator will clearly state the support and assistance that the Principal/Director will receive. In the final stage of the improvement plan, the Principal/Director will meet with his or her evaluator for a summative review of the plan, including any artifacts and evidence from evaluations, in order to determine if adequate improvement has been made in the required areas outlined within the plan for the Principal/Director.

(Please complete P/DIP worksheet on opposite side)

Improvement Plan Worksheet

The evaluator will work cooperatively with the principal/director to develop an assistance plan.

A. A listing of the areas in need of improvement:

B. The outcomes or goals of the plan:

C. Specific actions or strategies to be taken by the evaluator and the principal/director:

D. The achievement timeline:

E. Resources being provided to the principal/director to support improved performance:

F. Evidence of improvement

G. Meetings

H. Summative results of the implementation of this plan. (To be reported by the evaluator at the end of the timeline)

_____ _____

Principal/director's signature Date

_____ _____

Evaluator's signature Date

Original to: *Human Resources Department ~* ***Copies to:*** *Evaluator, Principal/Director*

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

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

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

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

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

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

Signatures, dates

Superintendent Signature: Date:

Mark J. Crawford 1/10/13

Teachers Union President Signature: Date:

1/10/13

Administrative Union President Signature: Date:

1/10/13

Board of Education President Signature: Date:

1/10/13