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

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

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

October 1, 2013

Revised

David Langone, Superintendent
Whitesboro Central School District
67 Whitesboro Street
Yorkville, NY 13495

Dear Superintendent Langone:

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

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

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

Thank you again for your hard work.

Sincerely,

John B. King, Jr.
Commissioner

Attachment

c: Howard D. Mettelman

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

Annual Professional Performance Reviews

Created Tuesday, April 30, 2013
Updated Wednesday, August 28, 2013

1

Disclaimers

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

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

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

1. SCHOOL DISTRICT INFORMATION

1.1) School District's BEDS Number : 412902060000

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

412902060000

1.2) School District Name: WHITESBORO CSD

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

WHITESBORO CSD

1.3) Assurances

Please check all of the boxes below:

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

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

1.4) Submission Status

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

Submission of material changes to an approved APPR plan

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

Created Tuesday, April 30, 2013
Updated Monday, September 23, 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, the State-provided growth measure will be used for 20 points in this subcomponent. NYSED will provide a HEDI subcomponent rating category and score from 0 to 20 points.

2.1) Assurances

Please check the boxes below:

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

STUDENT LEARNING OBJECTIVES AS COMPARABLE GROWTH MEASURES (20 points)

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

For core subjects: grades 6-8 Science and Social Studies, high school English Language Arts, Math, Science, and Social Studies courses associated in 2010-11 with Regents exams or, in the future, with other State assessments, the following must be used as the evidence of student learning within the SLO:
State assessments (or Regents or Regent equivalents), *required if one exists*
If no State assessment or Regents exam exists:
District-determined assessments from list of State-approved 3rd party assessments; or

District, regional or BOCES-developed assessments provided that it is rigorous and comparable across classrooms
For other grades/subjects: district-determined assessments from options below may be used as evidence of student learning within the SLO:
State assessments, *required if one exists*
List of State-approved 3rd party assessments
District, regional, or BOCES-developed assessments provided that it is rigorous and comparable across classrooms
School- or BOCES-wide, group or team results based on State assessments
Please note: If your district or BOCES does not have grade/subject-specific teachers for one or more of the rows in questions 2.2 through 2.9, choose "Not applicable" from the drop-down box and type N/A in the assessment box. This would be appropriate if, for example, common branch teachers also teach 6th grade science and/or social studies and therefore would have State-provided growth measures, not SLOs; the district or BOCES does not have certain grades; the district does not offer a specific subject; etc.

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

2.2) Grades K-3 ELA

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

	ELA	Assessment
K	District, regional, or BOCES-developed assessment	Whitesboro Central School District (WCSD) developed Kdg. ELA Assessment
1	District, regional, or BOCES-developed assessment	WCSD developed Grade 1 ELA Assessment
2	District, regional, or BOCES-developed assessment	WCSD 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 measuring student growth on the assessments listed for this Task.

Use this box, if needed, to describe the general process for assigning HEDI categories for these grades/subjects in this subcomponent. If needed, you may upload a table or graphic at 2.11, below.	See 2.11 - Attachment A describes the general process for assigning HEDI categories in this subcomponent.
Highly Effective (18 - 20 points) Results are well-above state average for similar students (or District goals if no state test).	91-100% of the students meet the growth target cited in the SLO
Effective (9 - 17 points) Results meet state average for similar students (or District goals if no state test).	75- 90% of the students meet the growth target cited in the SLO
Developing (3 - 8 points) Results are below state average for similar students (or District goals if no state test).	65-74% of the students meet the growth target cited in the SLO

Ineffective (0 - 2 points) Results are well-below state average for similar students (or District goals if no state test).	0-64% of the students meet the growth target cited in the SLO

2.3) Grades K-3 Math

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

	Math	Assessment
K	District, regional, or BOCES-developed assessment	WCSD developed Kdg. Math Assessment
1	District, regional, or BOCES-developed assessment	WCSD developed Grade 1 Math Assessment
2	District, regional, or BOCES-developed assessment	WCSD developed Grade 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 measuring student growth on the assessments listed for this Task.

Use this box, if needed, to describe the general process for assigning HEDI categories for these grades/subjects in this subcomponent. If needed, you may upload a table or graphic at 2.11, below.	See 2.11 - Attachment A describes the general process for assigning HEDI categories in this subcomponent.
Highly Effective (18 - 20 points) Results are well-above state average for similar students (or District goals if no state test).	91-100% of the students meet the growth target cited in the SLO
Effective (9 - 17 points) Results meet state average for similar students (or District goals if no state test).	75-90% of the students meet the growth target cited in the SLO
Developing (3 - 8 points) Results are below state average for similar students (or District goals if no state test).	65-74% of the students meet the growth target cited in the SLO
Ineffective (0 - 2 points) Results are well-below state average for similar students (or District goals if no state test).	0-64% of the students meet the growth target cited in the SLO

2.4) Grades 6-8 Science

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

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

	Science	Assessment
8	State assessment	8th Grade State Science Assessment

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

Use this box, if needed, to describe the general process for assigning HEDI categories for these grades/subjects in this subcomponent. If needed, you may upload a table or graphic at 2.11, below.	See 2.11 - Attachment A describes the general process for assigning HEDI categories in this subcomponent.
Highly Effective (18 - 20 points) Results are well-above state average for similar students (or District goals if no state test).	91-100% of the students meet the growth target cited in the SLO
Effective (9 - 17 points) Results meet state average for similar students (or District goals if no state test).	75-90% of the students meet the growth target cited in the SLO
Developing (3 - 8 points) Results are below state average for similar students (or District goals if no state test).	65-74% of the students meet the growth target cited in the SLO
Ineffective (0 - 2 points) Results are well-below state average for similar students (or District goals if no state test).	0-64% of the students meet the growth target cited in the SLO

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	WCSD developed Grade 6 Social Studies Assessment
7	District, regional or BOCES-developed assessment	WCSD developed Grade 7 Social Studies Assessment
8	District, regional or BOCES-developed assessment	WCSD developed Grade 8 Social Studies Assessment

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

Use this box, if needed, to describe the general process for assigning HEDI categories for these grades/subjects in this subcomponent. If needed, you may upload a table or graphic at 2.11, below.	See 2.11 - Attachment A describes the general process for assigning HEDI categories in this subcomponent.
Highly Effective (18 - 20 points) Results are well-above District goals for similar students.	91-100% of the students meet the growth target cited in the SLO
Effective (9 - 17 points) Results meet District goals for similar students.	75-90% of the students meet the growth target cited in the SLO
Developing (3 - 8 points) Results are below District goals for similar students.	65-74% of the students meet the growth target cited in the SLO
Ineffective (0 - 2 points) Results are well-below District goals for similar students.	0-64% of the students meet the growth target cited in the SLO

2.6) High School Social Studies Regents Courses

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

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

		Assessment
Global 1	District, regional, or BOCES-developed assessment	WCSD developed Global 1Assessment

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

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

Use this box, if needed, to describe the general process for assigning HEDI categories for these grades/subjects in this subcomponent. If needed, you may upload a table or graphic at 2.11, below.	See 2.11 - Attachment A describes the general process for assigning HEDI categories in this subcomponent.
Highly Effective (18 - 20 points) Results are well-above District goals for similar students.	91-100% of the students meet the growth target cited in the SLO
Effective (9 - 17 points) Results meet District goals for similar students.	75-90% of the students meet the growth target cited in the SLO
Developing (3 - 8 points) Results are below District goals for similar students.	65-74% of the students meet the growth target cited in the SLO
Ineffective (0 - 2 points) Results are well-below District goals for similar students.	0-64% of the students meet the growth target cited in the SLO

2.7) High School Science Regents Courses

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

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

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

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

Use this box, if needed, to describe the general process for assigning HEDI categories for these grades/subjects in this subcomponent. If needed, you may upload a table or graphic at 2.11, below.	See 2.11 - Attachment A describes the general process for assigning HEDI categories in this subcomponent.
Highly Effective (18 - 20 points) Results are well-above District goals for similar students.	91-100% of the students meet the growth target cited in the SLO
Effective (9 - 17 points) Results meet District goals for similar students.	75-90% of the students meet the growth target cited in the SLO
Developing (3 - 8 points) Results are below District goals for similar students.	65-74% of the students meet the growth target cited in the SLO
Ineffective (0 - 2 points) Results are well-below District goals for similar students.	0-64% of the students meet the growth target cited in the SLO

2.8) High School Math Regents Courses

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

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

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

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

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

Use this box, if needed, to describe the general process for assigning HEDI categories for these grades/subjects in this subcomponent. If needed, you may upload a table or graphic at 2.11, below.	See 2.11 - Attachment A describes the general process for assigning HEDI categories in this subcomponent. Algebra 1 is a common core course. The NYS Integrated Algebra Regents will be used in addition to the NYS Common Core Algebra Regents. The higher of the two scores will be used to assess the target.
Highly Effective (18 - 20 points) Results are well-above District goals for similar students.	91-100% of the students meet the growth target cited in the SLO
Effective (9 - 17 points) Results meet District goals for similar students.	75-90% of the students meet the growth target cited in the SLO

Developing (3 - 8 points) Results are below District goals for similar students.	65-74% of the students meet the growth target cited in the SLO
Ineffective (0 - 2 points) Results are well-below District goals for similar students.	0-64% of the students meet the growth target cited in the SLO

2.9) High School English Language Arts

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

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

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

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

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

Use this box, if needed, to describe the general process for assigning HEDI categories for these grades/subjects in this subcomponent. If needed, you may upload a table or graphic at 2.11, below.	See 2.11 - Attachment A describes the general process for assigning HEDI categories in this subcomponent. For Grade 11 both the NYS Comprehensive English Regents and the NYS Common Core English Regents will be administered. The higher of the two scores will be used to assess the target.
Highly Effective (18 - 20 points) Results are well-above District goals for similar students.	91-100% of the students meet the growth target cited in the SLO
Effective (9 - 17 points) Results meet District goals for similar students.	75-90% of the students meet the growth target cited in the SLO
Developing (3 - 8 points) Results are below District goals for similar students.	65-74% of the students meet the growth target cited in the SLO
Ineffective (0 - 2 points) Results are well-below District goals for similar students.	0-64% of the students meet the growth target cited in the SLO

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
Self-Contained Special Education K-2	District, Regional or BOCES-developed	WCSD Developed Grade/Subject Specific Assessments
ESL	State Assessment	NYSESLAT
Art	District, Regional or BOCES-developed	WCSD Developed Grade Specific Art Assessment
Music	District, Regional or BOCES-developed	WCSD Developed Grade Specific Music Assessment
PE	District, Regional or BOCES-developed	WCSD Developed Grade Specific PE Assessment
Technology	District, Regional or BOCES-developed	WCSD Developed Grade Specific Technology Assessment
Family Consumer Science	District, Regional or BOCES-developed	WCSD Developed Grade Specific Family & Consumer Science Assessment
Foreign Language	District, Regional or BOCES-developed	WCSD Developed Grade Specific Foreign Language Assessment
Business	District, Regional or BOCES-developed	WCSD Developed Grade Specific Business Assessment
Non-Regents Science 9-12	District, Regional or BOCES-developed	WCSD Developed Grade Specific Non-regents Science Assessment
Non-Regents Social Studies 9-12	District, Regional or BOCES-developed	WCSD Developed Grade Specific Non-regents Social StudiesAssessment
Non-Regents English 9-12	District, Regional or BOCES-developed	WCSD Developed Grade Specific Non-regents English Assessment
Non-Regents Math 9-12	District, Regional or BOCES-developed	WCSD Developed Grade Specific Non-regents Math Assessment
AIS ELA teachers K-2	District, Regional or BOCES-developed	WCSD Developed Grade Specific ELA Assessment
AIS Math Teachers K-2	District, Regional or BOCES-developed	WCSD Developed Grade Specific Math Assessment
AIS ELA Teachers 3-8	State Assessment	NYS Grade Specific ELA Assessments
AIS Math Teachers 3-8	State Assessment	NYS Grade Specific Math Assessments
Self-Contained Special Education 3-8	State Assessment	NYS Grade Specific ELA and Math Assessments
Self-Contained Special Education 9-12	State Assessment	NYS Grade and Content Specific Regents

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

Use this box, if needed, to describe the general process for assigning HEDI categories for these grades/subjects in this subcomponent. If needed, you may upload a table or graphic at 2.11, below.	see 2.11 Attachment A describes the general process for assigning HEDI categories in this subcomponent.
Highly Effective (18 - 20 points) Results are well-above District goals for similar students.	91-100% of the students meet the growth target cited in the SLO

Effective (9 - 17 points) Results meet District goals for similar students.	75-90% of the students meet the growth target cited in the SLO
Developing (3 - 8 points) Results are below District goals for similar students.	65-74% of the students meet the growth target cited in the SLO
Ineffective (0 - 2 points) Results are well-below District goals for similar students.	0-64% of the students meet the growth target cited in the SLO

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

(No response)

2.11) HEDI Tables or Graphics

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

assets/survey-uploads/12186/576339-TXEtxx9bQW/Student Learning Objectives Conversion Chart REVISION2013.docx

2.12) Locally Developed Controls

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

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

No locally developed 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://www.engageny.org/resource/student-learning-objectives-guidance-document).	Checked
2.14) Assurances | Assure that past academic performance and/or baseline academic data of students will be taken into account when developing an SLO.	Checked
2.14) Assurances | Assure that the process for assigning points for SLOs for the Growth Subcomponent will use the narrative HEDI descriptions described in the regulations to effectively differentiate educators in ways that improve student learning and instruction.	Checked
2.14) Assurances | Assure that it is possible for an educator to earn each point, including 0, for SLOs in the Growth subcomponent scoring range.	Checked
2.14) Assurances | Assure that processes are in place to monitor SLOs to ensure rigor and comparability across classrooms.	Checked

3. Local Measures (Teachers)

Created Tuesday, April 30, 2013
Updated Monday, September 30, 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. Additionally, please provide a brief explanation in the HEDI general description box of why you have listed the grade/course as “Not Applicable” (e.g., district/BOCES does not offer this grade/subject; common branch teacher).

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

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

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

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

Growth or achievement measure(s) from these options.
One or more of the following types of local measures of student growth or achievement may be used for the evaluation of teachers. The options in the drop-down menus below are abbreviated from the following list:

Measures based on:

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

3.1) Grades 4-8 ELA

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

	Locally-Selected Measure from List of Approved Measures	Assessment
4	5) District, regional, or BOCES–developed assessments	WCSD developed Grade 4 ELA Assessment
5	5) District, regional, or BOCES–developed assessments	WCSD developed Grade 5 ELA Assessment
6	5) District, regional, or BOCES–developed assessments	WCSD developed Grade 6 ELA Assessment
7	5) District, regional, or BOCES–developed assessments	WCSD developed Grade 7 ELA Assessment
8	5) District, regional, or BOCES–developed assessments	WCSD developed Grade 8 ELA Assessment

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

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

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.	A scoring mechanism that scales assessment scores on the locally developed assessments to performance levels that are calculated the same for all 4-8 ELA teachers will be used. Until the VA model is implemented by the Board of Regents a 20-point conversion model, as described in 3.4, will be used. This number will be rounded to the nearest whole number in accordance with general rounding rules. Rounding will not result in movement between HEDI categories. The locally developed assessments will be scored as follows: Assessment Scores Performance Level 0-54 1 55-64 2 65-84 3 85-100 4 Calculation { (#students scoring 2,3,4)+ (#students scoring 3,4)} X 7.5 divided by # students tested
Highly Effective (14 - 15 points) Results are well above District- or BOCES-adopted expectations for growth or achievement for grade/subject.	The locally developed assessments wil be scored as follows: Assessment Scores Performance Level 0-54 1 55-64 2 65-84 3 85-100 4 Calculation { (#students scoring 2,3,4)+ (#students scoring 3,4)} X 7.5 divided by # students tested Total score of 14-15 is highly effective.
Effective (8- 13 points) Results meet District- or BOCES-adopted expectations for growth or achievement for grade/subject.	The locally developed assessments wil be scored as follows: Assessment Scores Performance Level 0-54 1 55-64 2 65-84 3 85-100 4 Calculation { (#students scoring 2,3,4)+ (#students scoring 3,4)} X 7.5 divided by # students tested Total score of 8-13 is effective.
Developing (3 - 7 points) Results are below District- or BOCES-adopted expectations for growth or achievement for grade/subject.	The locally developed assessments wil be scored as follows: Assessment Scores Performance Level 0-54 1 55-64 2 65-84 3 85-100 4 Calculation { (#students scoring 2,3,4)+ (#students scoring 3,4)} X 7.5 divided by # students tested Total score of 3-7 is developing.

Ineffective (0 - 2 points) Results are well below District- or BOCES-adopted expectations for growth or achievement for grade/subject.	The locally developed assessments wil be scored as follows: Assessment Scores Performance Level 0-54 1 55-64 2 65-84 3 85-100 4 Calculation { (#students scoring 2,3,4)+ (#students scoring 3,4)} X 7.5 divided by # students tested Total score of 0-2 is ineffective.

3.2) Grades 4-8 Math

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

	Locally-Selected Measure from List of Approved Measures	Assessment
4	5) District, regional, or BOCES–developed assessments	WCSD developed Grade 4 Math Assessment
5	5) District, regional, or BOCES–developed assessments	WCSD developed Grade 5 Math Assessment
6	5) District, regional, or BOCES–developed assessments	WCSD developed Grade 6 Math Assessment
7	5) District, regional, or BOCES–developed assessments	WCSD developed Grade 7 Math Assessment
8	5) District, regional, or BOCES–developed assessments	WCSD developed Grade 8 Math Assessment

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

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

Use this box, if needed, to describe the general process for assigning HEDI categories for these grades/subjects in this subcomponent. If needed, you may upload a table or graphic at 3.3, below.	A scoring mechanism that scales assessment scores on the locally developed assessments to performance levels that are calculated the same for all 4-8 Math teachers will be used. Until the VA model is implemented by the Board of Regents a 20-point conversion model, as described in 3.4, will be used. This number will be rounded to the nearest whole number in accordance with general rounding rules. Rounding will not result in movement between HEDI categories. The locally developed assessments will be scored as follows: Assessment Scores Performance Level 0-54 1 55-64 2 65-84 3 85-100 4 Calculation { (#students scoring 2,3,4)+ (#students scoring 3,4)} X 7.5 divided by # students tested
Highly Effective (14 - 15 points) Results are well above District- or BOCES-adopted expectations for growth or achievement for grade/subject.	The locally developed assessments wil be scored as follows: Assessment Scores Performance Level 0-54 1 55-64 2

	65-84 3 85-100 4 Calculation { (#students scoring 2,3,4)+ (#students scoring 3,4)} X 7.5 divided by # students tested Total score of 14-15 is highly effective.
Effective (8- 13 points) Results meet District- or BOCES-adopted expectations for growth or achievement for grade/subject.	The locally developed assessments wil be scored as follows: Assessment Scores Performance Level 0-54 1 55-64 2 65-84 3 85-100 4 Calculation { (#students scoring 2,3,4)+ (#students scoring 3,4)} X 7.5 divided by # students tested Total score of 8-13 is effective.
Developing (3 - 7 points) Results are below District- or BOCES-adopted expectations for growth or achievement for grade/subject.	The locally developed assessments wil be scored as follows: Assessment Scores Performance Level 0-54 1 55-64 2 65-84 3 85-100 4 Calculation { (#students scoring 2,3,4)+ (#students scoring 3,4)} X 7.5 divided by # students tested Total score of 3-7 is developing.
Ineffective (0 - 2 points) Results are well below District- or BOCES-adopted expectations for growth or achievement for grade/subject.	The locally developed assessments wil be scored as follows: Assessment Scores Performance Level 0-54 1 55-64 2 65-84 3 85-100 4 Calculation { (#students scoring 2,3,4)+ (#students scoring 3,4)} X 7.5 divided by # students tested Total score of 0-2 is ineffective.

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.

(No response)

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

Growth or achievement measure(s) from these options.
One or more of the following types of local measures of student growth or achievement may be used for the evaluation of teachers. The options in the drop-down menus below are abbreviated from the following list:

Measures based on:

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

3.4) Grades K-3 ELA

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

	Locally-Selected Measure from List of Approved Measures	Assessment
K	5) District, regional, or BOCES–developed assessments	WCSD developed Kdg. ELA Assessment
1	5) District, regional, or BOCES–developed assessments	WCSD developed Grade 1 ELA Assessment
2	5) District, regional, or BOCES–developed assessments	WCSD developed Grade 2 ELA Assessment
3	5) District, regional, or BOCES–developed assessments	WCSD developed Grade 3 ELA Assessment

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

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

Use this box, if needed, to describe the general process for assigning HEDI categories for these grades/subjects in this subcomponent. If needed, you may upload a table or graphic at 3.13, below.	A scoring mechanism that scales assessment scores on the locally developed assessments to performance levels that are calculated the same for all K-3 ELA teachers will be used. This number will be rounded to the nearest whole number in accordance with general rounding rules. Rounding will not result in movement between HEDI categories. The locally developed assessments will be scored as follows: Assessment Scores Performance Level 0-54 1 55-64 2 65-84 3 85-100 4 Calculation { (#students scoring 2,3,4)+ (#students scoring 3,4)} X 10 divided by # students tested
Highly Effective (18-20 points) Results are well above District- or BOCES-adopted expectations for growth or achievement for grade/subject.	The locally developed assessments wil be scored as follows: Assessment Scores Performance Level 0-54 1 55-64 2 65-84 3 85-100 4 Calculation { (#students scoring 2,3,4)+ (#students scoring 3,4)} X 10 divided by # students tested Total score of 18-20 is highly effective.
Effective (9-17 points) Results meet District- or BOCES-adopted expectations for growth or achievement for grade/subject.	The locally developed assessments wil be scored as follows: Assessment Scores Performance Level 0-54 1 55-64 2 65-84 3 85-100 4 Calculation { (#students scoring 2,3,4)+ (#students scoring 3,4)} X 10 divided by # students tested Total score of 9-17 is effective.
Developing (3 - 8 points) Results are below District- or BOCES-adopted expectations for growth or achievement for grade/subject.	The locally developed assessments wil be scored as follows: Assessment Scores Performance Level 0-54 1 55-64 2 65-84 3 85-100 4 Calculation { (#students scoring 2,3,4)+ (#students scoring 3,4)} X 10 divided by # students tested Total score of 3-8 is developing.
Ineffective (0 - 2 points) Results are well below District- or BOCES-adopted expectations for growth or achievement for grade/subject.	The locally developed assessments wil be scored as follows: Assessment Scores Performance Level 0-54 1 55-64 2

	65-84 3 85-100 4 Calculation { (#students scoring 2,3,4)+ (#students scoring 3,4)} X 10 divided by # students tested Total score of 0-2 is ineffective.

3.5) Grades K-3 Math

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

	Locally-Selected Measure from List of Approved Measures	Assessment
K	5) District, regional, or BOCES–developed assessments	WCSD developed Kdg. Math Assessment
1	5) District, regional, or BOCES–developed assessments	WCSD developed Grade 1 Math Assessment
2	5) District, regional, or BOCES–developed assessments	WCSD developed Grade 2 Math Assessment
3	5) District, regional, or BOCES–developed assessments	WCSD developed Grade 3 Math Assessment

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

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

Use this box, if needed, to describe the general process for assigning HEDI categories for these grades/subjects in this subcomponent. If needed, you may upload a table or graphic at 3.13, below.	A scoring mechanism that scales assessment scores on the locally developed assessments to performance levels that are calculated the same for all K-3 Math teachers will be used. This number will be rounded to the nearest whole number in accordance with general rounding rules. Rounding will not result in movement between HEDI categories. The locally developed assessments will be scored as follows: Assessment Scores Performance Level 0-54 1 55-64 2 65-84 3 85-100 4 Calculation { (#students scoring 2,3,4)+ (#students scoring 3,4)} X 10 divided by # students tested
Highly Effective (18-20 points) Results are well above District- or BOCES-adopted expectations for growth or achievement for grade/subject.	The locally developed assessments wil be scored as follows: Assessment Scores Performance Level 0-54 1 55-64 2 65-84 3 85-100 4 Calculation { (#students scoring 2,3,4)+ (#students scoring 3,4)} X 10 divided by # students tested Total score of 18-20 is highly effective.

Effective (9-17 points) Results meet District- or BOCES-adopted expectations for growth or achievement for grade/subject.	The locally developed assessments wil be scored as follows: Assessment Scores Performance Level 0-54 1 55-64 2 65-84 3 85-100 4 Calculation { (#students scoring 2,3,4)+ (#students scoring 3,4)} X 10 divided by # students tested Total score of 9-17 is effective.
Developing (3 - 8 points) Results are below District -or BOCES-adopted expectations for growth or achievement for grade/subject.	The locally developed assessments wil be scored as follows: Assessment Scores Performance Level 0-54 1 55-64 2 65-84 3 85-100 4 Calculation { (#students scoring 2,3,4)+ (#students scoring 3,4)} X 10 divided by # students tested Total score of 3-8 is developing.
Ineffective (0 - 2 points) Results are well below District- or BOCES-adopted expectations for growth or achievement for grade/subject.	The locally developed assessments wil be scored as follows: Assessment Scores Performance Level 0-54 1 55-64 2 65-84 3 85-100 4 Calculation { (#students scoring 2,3,4)+ (#students scoring 3,4)} X 10 divided by # students tested Total score of 0-2 is ineffective.

3.6) Grades 6-8 Science

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

	Locally-Selected Measure from List of Approved Measures	Assessment
6	5) District, regional, or BOCES–developed assessments	WCSD developed Grade 6 Science Assessment
7	5) District, regional, or BOCES–developed assessments	WCSD developed Grade 7 Science Assessment
8	5) District, regional, or BOCES–developed assessments	WCSD developed Grade 8 Science Assessment

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

Use this box, if needed, to describe the general process for assigning HEDI categories for these grades/subjects in this subcomponent. If needed, you may upload a table or graphic at 3.13, below.	A scoring mechanism that scales assessment scores on the locally developed assessments to performance levels that are calculated the same for all 6-8 Science teachers will be used. This number will be rounded to the nearest whole number in accordance with general rounding rules. Rounding will not result in movement between HEDI categories. The locally developed assessments will be scored as follows: Assessment Scores Performance Level

	0-54 1 55-64 2 65-84 3 85-100 4 Calculation { (#students scoring 2,3,4)+ (#students scoring 3,4)} X 10 divided by # students tested
Highly Effective (18 - 20 points) Results are well above District- or BOCES-adopted expectations for growth or achievement for grade/subject.	The locally developed assessments wil be scored as follows: Assessment Scores Performance Level 0-54 1 55-64 2 65-84 3 85-100 4 Calculation { (#students scoring 2,3,4)+ (#students scoring 3,4)} X 10 divided by # students tested Total score of 18-20 is highly effective.
Effective (9 - 17 points) Results meet District- or BOCES-adopted expectations for growth or achievement for grade/subject.	The locally developed assessments wil be scored as follows: Assessment Scores Performance Level 0-54 1 55-64 2 65-84 3 85-100 4 Calculation { (#students scoring 2,3,4)+ (#students scoring 3,4)} X 10 divided by # students tested Total score of 9-17 is effective.
Developing (3 - 8 points) Results are below District- or BOCES-adopted expectations for growth or achievement for grade/subject.	The locally developed assessments wil be scored as follows: Assessment Scores Performance Level 0-54 1 55-64 2 65-84 3 85-100 4 Calculation { (#students scoring 2,3,4)+ (#students scoring 3,4)} X 10 divided by # students tested Total score of 3-8 is developing.
Ineffective (0 - 2 points) Results are well below District- or BOCES-adopted expectations for growth or achievement for grade/subject.	The locally developed assessments wil be scored as follows: Assessment Scores Performance Level 0-54 1 55-64 2 65-84 3 85-100 4 Calculation { (#students scoring 2,3,4)+ (#students scoring 3,4)} X 10 divided by # students tested Total score of 0-2 is ineffective.

3.7) Grades 6-8 Social Studies

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

	Locally-Selected Measure from List of Approved Measures	Assessment
6	5) District, regional, or BOCES–developed assessments	WCSD developed Grade 6 Social Studies Assessment

7	5) District, regional, or BOCES–developed assessments	WCSD developed Grade 7 Social Studies Assessment
8	5) District, regional, or BOCES–developed assessments	WCSD developed Grade 8 Social Studies Assessment

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

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

Use this box, if needed, to describe the general process for assigning HEDI categories for these grades/subjects in this subcomponent. If needed, you may upload a table or graphic at 3.13, below.	A scoring mechanism that scales assessment scores on the locally developed assessments to performance levels that are calculated the same for all 6-8 Social Studies teachers will be used. This number will be rounded to the nearest whole number in accordance with general rounding rules. Rounding will not result in movement between HEDI categories. The locally developed assessments will be scored as follows: Assessment Scores Performance Level 0-54 1 55-64 2 65-84 3 85-100 4 Calculation { (#students scoring 2,3,4)+ (#students scoring 3,4)} X 10 divided by # students tested
Highly Effective (18 - 20 points) Results are well above District- or BOCES-adopted expectations for growth or achievement for grade/subject.	The locally developed assessments wil be scored as follows: Assessment Scores Performance Level 0-54 1 55-64 2 65-84 3 85-100 4 Calculation { (#students scoring 2,3,4)+ (#students scoring 3,4)} X 10 divided by # students tested Total score of 18-20 is highly effective.
Effective (9 - 17 points) Results meet District- or BOCES-adopted expectations for growth or achievement for grade/subject.	The locally developed assessments wil be scored as follows: Assessment Scores Performance Level 0-54 1 55-64 2 65-84 3 85-100 4 Calculation { (#students scoring 2,3,4)+ (#students scoring 3,4)} X 10 divided by # students tested Total score of 9-17 is effective.
Developing (3 - 8 points) Results are below District- or BOCES-adopted expectations for growth or achievement for grade/subject.	The locally developed assessments wil be scored as follows: Assessment Scores Performance Level 0-54 1 55-64 2 65-84 3 85-100 4 Calculation

	{ (#students scoring 2,3,4)+ (#students scoring 3,4)} X 10 divided by # students tested Total score of 3-8 is developing.
Ineffective (0 - 2 points) Results are well below District- or BOCES-adopted expectations for growth or achievement for grade/subject.	The locally developed assessments wil be scored as follows: Assessment Scores Performance Level 0-54 1 55-64 2 65-84 3 85-100 4 Calculation { (#students scoring 2,3,4)+ (#students scoring 3,4)} X 10 divided by # students tested Total score of 0-2 is ineffective.

3.8) High School Social Studies

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

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

	Locally-Selected Measure from List of Approved Measures	Assessment
Global 1	5) District, regional, or BOCES–developed assessments	WCSD developed Global 1 Assessment
Global 2	3) Teacher specific achievement or growth score computed locally	NYS Global 2 Regents
American History	3) Teacher specific achievement or growth score computed locally	NYS American History Regents

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

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

Use this box, if needed, to describe the general process for assigning HEDI categories for these grades/subjects in this subcomponent. If needed, you may upload a table or graphic at 3.13, below.	A scoring mechanism that scales assessment scores on the regents or locally developed assessments to performance levels that are calculated the same for all High School Social Studies teachers will be used. This number will be rounded to the nearest whole number in accordance with general rounding rules. Rounding will not result in movement between HEDI categories. The locally developed assessments and/or Regents assessments will be scored as follows: Assessment Scores Performance Level 0-54 1 55-64 2 65-84 3 85-100 4 Calculation { (#students scoring 2,3,4)+ (#students scoring 3,4)} X 10 divided by # students tested

Highly Effective (18 - 20 points) Results are well above District- or BOCES-adopted expectations for growth or achievement for grade/subject.	The locally developed assessments and/or regents assessments will be scored as follows: Assessment Scores Performance Level 0-54 1 55-64 2 65-84 3 85-100 4 Calculation { (#students scoring 2,3,4)+ (#students scoring 3,4)} X 10 divided by # students tested Total score of 18-20 is highly effective.
Effective (9 - 17 points) Results meet District- or BOCES-adopted expectations for growth or achievement for grade/subject.	The locally developed assessments and/or regents assessments will be scored as follows: Assessment Scores Performance Level 0-54 1 55-64 2 65-84 3 85-100 4 Calculation { (#students scoring 2,3,4)+ (#students scoring 3,4)} X 10 divided by # students tested Total score of 9-17 is effective.
Developing (3 - 8 points) Results are below District- or BOCES-adopted expectations for growth or achievement for grade/subject.	The locally developed assessments and/or regents assessments will be scored as follows: Assessment Scores Performance Level 0-54 1 55-64 2 65-84 3 85-100 4 Calculation { (#students scoring 2,3,4)+ (#students scoring 3,4)} X 10 divided by # students tested Total score of 3-8 is developing.
Ineffective (0 - 2 points) Results are well below District- or BOCES-adopted expectations for growth or achievement for grade/subject.	The locally developed assessments and/or regents assessments will be scored as follows: Assessment Scores Performance Level 0-54 1 55-64 2 65-84 3 85-100 4 Calculation { (#students scoring 2,3,4)+ (#students scoring 3,4)} X 10 divided by # students tested Total score of 0-2 is ineffective.

3.9) High School Science

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

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

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

Earth Science	3) Teacher specific achievement or growth score computed locally	NYS Earth Science Regents
Chemistry	3) Teacher specific achievement or growth score computed locally	NYS Chemistry Regents
Physics	3) Teacher specific achievement or growth score computed locally	NYS Physics Regents

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

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

Use this box, if needed, to describe the general process for assigning HEDI categories for these grades/subjects in this subcomponent. If needed, you may upload a table or graphic at 3.13, below.	A scoring mechanism that scales assessment scores on the regents assessments to performance levels that are calculated the same for all High School Science teachers will be used. This number will be rounded to the nearest whole number in accordance with general rounding rules. Rounding will not result in movement between HEDI categories. The locally developed assessments and/or Regents assessments will be scored as follows: Assessment Scores Performance Level 0-54 1 55-64 2 65-84 3 85-100 4 Calculation { (#students scoring 2,3,4)+ (#students scoring 3,4)} X 10 divided by # students tested
Highly Effective (18-20 points) Results are well above District- or BOCES-adopted expectations for growth or achievement for grade/subject.	The regents assessments will be scored as follows: Assessment Scores Performance Level 0-54 1 55-64 2 65-84 3 85-100 4 Calculation { (#students scoring 2,3,4)+ (#students scoring 3,4)} X 10 divided by # students tested Total score of 18-20 is highly effective.
Developing (3 - 8 points) Results are below District- or BOCES-adopted expectations for growth or achievement for grade/subject.	The regents assessments will be scored as follows: Assessment Scores Performance Level 0-54 1 55-64 2 65-84 3 85-100 4 Calculation { (#students scoring 2,3,4)+ (#students scoring 3,4)} X 10 divided by # students tested Total score of 3-8 is developing.
Effective (9 - 17points) Results meet District- or BOCES-adopted expectations for growth or achievement for grade/subject.	The regents assessments will be scored as follows: Assessment Scores Performance Level 0-54 1 55-64 2

	65-84 3 85-100 4 Calculation { (#students scoring 2,3,4)+ (#students scoring 3,4)} X 10 divided by # students tested Total score of 9-17 is effective.
Ineffective (0 - 2 points) Results are well below District- or BOCES-adopted expectations for growth or achievement for grade/subject.	The regents assessments will be scored as follows: Assessment Scores Performance Level 0-54 1 55-64 2 65-84 3 85-100 4 Calculation { (#students scoring 2,3,4)+ (#students scoring 3,4)} X 10 divided by # students tested Total score of 0-2 is ineffective.

3.10) High School Math

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

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

	Locally-Selected Measure from List of Approved Measures	Assessment
Algebra 1	3) Teacher specific achievement or growth score computed locally	NYS Integrated Algebra 1 Regents Assessment and NYS Common Core Algebra Regents
Geometry	3) Teacher specific achievement or growth score computed locally	NYS Geometry Regents
Algebra 2	3) Teacher specific achievement or growth score computed locally	NYS Algebra 2 Regents

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

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

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

Use this box, if needed, to describe the general process for assigning HEDI categories for these grades/subjects in this subcomponent. If needed, you may upload a table or graphic at 3.13, below.	A scoring mechanism that scales assessment scores on the regents assessments to performance levels that are calculated the same for all High School Math teachers will be used. For Algebra I the higher of the two regents scores will be used. This number will be rounded to the nearest whole number in accordance with general rounding rules. Rounding will not

	result in movement between HEDI categories. The locally developed assessments and/or Regents assessments will be scored as follows: Assessment Scores Performance Level 0-54 1 55-64 2 65-84 3 85-100 4 Calculation { (#students scoring 2,3,4)+ (#students scoring 3,4)} X 10 divided by # students tested
Highly Effective (18 - 20 points) Results are well above District- or BOCES-adopted expectations for growth or achievement for grade/subject.	The regents assessments will be scored as follows: Assessment Scores Performance Level 0-54 1 55-64 2 65-84 3 85-100 4 Calculation { (#students scoring 2,3,4)+ (#students scoring 3,4)} X 10 divided by # students tested Total score of 18-20 is highly effective.
Effective (9 - 17 points) Results meet District- or BOCES-adopted expectations for growth or achievement for grade/subject.	The regents assessments will be scored as follows: Assessment Scores Performance Level 0-54 1 55-64 2 65-84 3 85-100 4 Calculation { (#students scoring 2,3,4)+ (#students scoring 3,4)} X 10 divided by # students tested Total score of 9-17 is effective.
Developing (3 - 8 points) Results are below District- or BOCES-adopted expectations for growth or achievement for grade/subject.	The regents assessments will be scored as follows: Assessment Scores Performance Level 0-54 1 55-64 2 65-84 3 85-100 4 Calculation { (#students scoring 2,3,4)+ (#students scoring 3,4)} X 10 divided by # students tested Total score of 3-8 is developing.
Ineffective (0 - 2 points) Results are well below District- or BOCES-adopted expectations for growth or achievement for grade/subject.	The regents assessments will be scored as follows: Assessment Scores Performance Level 0-54 1 55-64 2 65-84 3 85-100 4 Calculation { (#students scoring 2,3,4)+ (#students scoring 3,4)} X 10 divided by # students tested Total score of 0-2 is ineffective.

3.11) High School English Language Arts

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

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

	Locally-Selected Measure from List of Approved Measures	Assessment
Grade 9 ELA	5) District, regional, or BOCES–developed assessments	WCSD developed Grade 9 ELA Assessment
Grade 10 ELA	5) District, regional, or BOCES–developed assessments	WCSD developed Grade 10 ELA Assessment
Grade 11 ELA	3) Teacher specific achievement or growth score computed locally	NYS Comprehensive English Regents Assessment and NYS Common Core English Regents 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.

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

Use this box, if needed, to describe the general process for assigning HEDI categories for these grades/subjects in this subcomponent. If needed, you may upload a table or graphic at 3.13, below.	A scoring mechanism that scales assessment scores on the locally developed or regents assessments to performance levels that are calculated the same for all High School English teachers will be used. For Grade 11, the higher score of the two regents exams will be used. This number will be rounded to the nearest whole number in accordance with general rounding rules. Rounding will not result in movement between HEDI categories. The locally developed assessments and/or Regents assessments will be scored as follows: Assessment Scores Performance Level 0-54 1 55-64 2 65-84 3 85-100 4 Calculation { (#students scoring 2,3,4)+ (#students scoring 3,4)} X 10 divided by # students tested
Highly Effective (18 - 20 points) Results are well above District- or BOCES-adopted expectations for growth or achievement for grade/subject.	The regents or locally developed assessment will be scored as follows: Assessment Scores Performance Level 0-54 1 55-64 2 65-84 3 85-100 4 Calculation { (#students scoring 2,3,4)+ (#students scoring 3,4)} X 10 divided by # students tested Total score of 18-20 is highly effective.

Effective (9 - 17 points) Results meet District- or BOCES-adopted expectations for growth or achievement for grade/subject.	The regents or locally developed assessment will be scored as follows: Assessment Scores Performance Level 0-54 1 55-64 2 65-84 3 85-100 4 Calculation { (#students scoring 2,3,4)+ (#students scoring 3,4)} X 10 divided by # students tested Total score of 9-17 effective.
Developing (3 - 8 points) Results are below District- or BOCES-adopted expectations for growth or achievement for grade/subject.	The regents or locally developed assessment will be scored as follows: Assessment Scores Performance Level 0-54 1 55-64 2 65-84 3 85-100 4 Calculation { (#students scoring 2,3,4)+ (#students scoring 3,4)} X 10 divided by # students tested Total score of 3-8 is developing
Ineffective (0 - 2 points) Results are well below District- or BOCES-adopted expectations for growth or achievement for grade/subject.	The regents or locally developed assessment will be scored as follows: Assessment Scores Performance Level 0-54 1 55-64 2 65-84 3 85-100 4 Calculation { (#students scoring 2,3,4)+ (#students scoring 3,4)} X 10 divided by # students tested Total score of 0-2 is ineffective.

3.12) All Other Courses

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

	Course(s) or Subject(s)	Locally-Selected Measure from List of Approved Measures	Assessment
	All Other Courses	5) District/regional/BOCES–developed	WCSD Developed Grade Level/Course Specific Assessments

For all additional courses, as applicable: describe the district-adopted expectations for the level of growth or achievement needed for a teacher to earn each of the four HEDI rating categories and the process for assigning points within rating categories that ensures it is

possible for a teacher to earn any of the points in a scoring range, consistent with regulations and assurances.

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

Use this box, if needed, to describe the general process for assigning HEDI categories for these grades/subjects in this subcomponent. If needed, you may upload a table or graphic at 3.13, below.	A scoring mechanism that scales assessment scores on the locally developed assessments to performance levels that are calculated the same for all teachers of other courses will be used. This number will be rounded to the nearest whole number in accordance with general rounding rules. Rounding will not result in movement between HEDI categories. The locally developed assessments wil be scored as follows: Assessment Scores Performance Level 0-54 1 55-64 2 65-84 3 85-100 4 Calculation { (#students scoring 2,3,4)+ (#students scoring 3,4)} X 10 divided by # students tested
Highly Effective (18 - 20 points) Results are well above District- or BOCES -adopted expectations for growth or achievement for grade/subject.	The locally developed assessments will be scored as follows: Assessment Scores Performance Level 0-54 1 55-64 2 65-84 3 85-100 4 Calculation { (#students scoring 2,3,4)+ (#students scoring 3,4)} X 10 divided by # students tested Total score of 18-20 is highly effective.
Effective (9 - 17 points) Results meet District- or BOCES-adopted expectations for growth or achievement for grade/subject.	The locally developed assessments will be scored as follows: Assessment Scores Performance Level 0-54 1 55-64 2 65-84 3 85-100 4 Calculation { (#students scoring 2,3,4)+ (#students scoring 3,4)} X 10 divided by # students tested Total score of 9-17 is effective.
Developing (3 - 8 points) Results are below District- or BOCES-adopted expectations for growth or achievement for grade/subject.	The locally developed assessments will be scored as follows: Assessment Scores Performance Level 0-54 1 55-64 2 65-84 3 85-100 4 Calculation { (#students scoring 2,3,4)+ (#students scoring 3,4)} X 10 divided by # students tested Total score of 3-8 is developing.
Ineffective (0 - 2 points) Results are well below District- or BOCES-adopted expectations for growth or achievement for grade/subject.	The locally developed assessments will be scored as follows: Assessment Scores Performance Level 0-54 1 55-64 2 65-84 3 85-100 4

	Calculation { (#students scoring 2,3,4)+ (#students scoring 3,4)} X 10 divided by # students tested Total score of 0-2 is ineffective.

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.

(No response)

3.14) Locally Developed Controls

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

(No response)

3.15) Teachers with More Than One Locally Selected Measure

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

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

3.16) Assurances

Please check all of the boxes below:

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

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

4. Other Measures of Effectiveness (Teachers)

Created Tuesday, April 30, 2013
Updated Monday, September 30, 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.)

Danielson's Framework for Teaching

(No response)

4.2) Points Within Other Measures

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

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

Is the following points assignment applicable to all teachers?

Yes

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

(No response)

Multiple (at least two) classroom observations by principal or other trained administrator, at least one of which must be unannounced [at least 31 points]	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, label accordingly, and combine them into a single file, and upload as an attachment for review. Click here for a downloadable copy of Form 4.2. (MS Word)

(No response)

4.3) Survey Tools (if applicable)

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

(No response)

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

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

4.4) Assurances

Please check all of the boxes below:

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

4.5) Process for Assigning Points and Determining HEDI Ratings

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

The Danielson's Framework for Teaching rubric consists of four domains, which will be weighted equally. Each domain has components which, in turn, have elements. Teachers will be given a rating of 1-4 in each element observed of each component observed during each observation. The ratings in the components will be averaged to arrive at a final rating between 1-4 in each of the the four domains. The mean of these final domain averages will be calculated, rounded to the nearest tenth of a whole number, based on general rounding rules, and used to determine a number between 0-60 as per the attached conversion chart. The rubric scores listed

on the chart are the minimum scores necessary to achieve the corresponding HEDI point value.

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/5091/137034-eka9yMJ855/Conversion Chart for Sections 4.5 and 9.7 REVISION and.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.	The final rubric average as described above is between 3.3-4.0.
Effective: Overall performance and results meet NYS Teaching Standards.	The final rubric average as described above is between 2.5-3.2.
Developing: Overall performance and results need improvement in order to meet NYS Teaching Standards.	The final rubric average as described above is between 1.5-2.4.
Ineffective: Overall performance and results do not meet NYS Teaching Standards.	The final rubric average as described above is between 1.0-1.4

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	3
4.6) Observations of Probationary Teachers | Informal/Short	0
4.6) Observations of Probationary Teachers | Enter Total	3

By trained in-school peer teachers or other trained reviewers

Formal/Long	0
Informal/Short	0

Independent evaluators

Formal/Long	0
Informal/Short	0

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

- In Person

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

- Not Applicable

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, April 30, 2013
Updated Wednesday, September 04, 2013

Page 1

Standards for Rating Categories

Growth or Comparable Measures

Locally-selected Measures of growth or achievement

Other Measures of Effectiveness (Teacher and Leader standards)

Highly Effective

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

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

Overall performance and results exceed NYS Teaching Standards.

Effective

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

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

Overall performance and results meet NYS Teaching Standards.

Developing

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

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

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

Ineffective

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

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

Overall performance and results do not meet NYS Teaching Standards.

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

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

Where there is no Value-Added measure

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

6. Additional Requirements - Teachers

Created Tuesday, April 30, 2013
Updated Monday, September 30, 2013

Page 1

6.1) Assurances -- Improvement Plans

Please check the boxes below:

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

6.2) Attachment: Teacher Improvement Plan Forms

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

assets/survey-uploads/5265/137035-Df0w3Xx5v6/TIP Plan Template FINAL.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:

Section 1 These grounds for appeals conform with the grounds for appeals enumerated in
Education Law section 3012-c. A teacher may request an administrative review of

his/her annual professional performance review in the following cases:

(a) A teacher who receives an overall rating of Ineffective may assert that (i) the procedures of this Plan for measuring student growth were not properly followed, (ii) one or more of the observations used to calculate the score for the "other measures" subcomponent was not conducted in compliance with the chosen rubric, (iii) that any Teacher Improvement Plan was not properly implemented, or (iv) the overall rating was adversely affected by a calculation error in adding up the subcomponent scores;

(b) A teacher who receives an overall rating of Developing for a second consecutive year may assert one or more of the errors described in subsection (a); and

(c) A teacher who receives a Teacher Improvement Plan may assert that the Plan is not reasonably specific in advising the teacher of the needed improvement.

Section 2 The initial request for administrative review of the annual professional performance review or implementation of TIP shall be submitted to the Assistant Superintendent for Learning and Accountability, in writing, signed by the teacher. The request for administrative review must be submitted to the Assistant Superintendent no later than ten (10) working days after the teacher is informed of his/her overall rating.

(a) The request shall identify which of the objections described in Section 1 are being asserted by the teacher, and shall specify, in detail, the reason(s) the evaluation is claimed to be deficient. Any documentation that the teacher wants to be considered in support of his/her objection shall be included with the request.

(b) The teacher shall simultaneously provide a copy of the request and supporting materials to the principal. The principal may, but is not required to, submit to the Assistant Superintendent a written response to the objections set forth in the request for review, but this must be done within five (5) working days of the teacher's submission of the request.

(c) The teacher may include in the request for review a request for a meeting with th Assistant Superintendent. If a meeting is requested, it shall be scheduled within ten (10) working days of the Assistant Superintendent's receipt of the request for review. The teacher may be accompanied at that meeting by one person who is either a member of the teacher bargaining unit or a representative of the teachers' association. The Assistant Superintendent may have one other administrator or labor relations representative present. The teacher shall be provided a reasonable opportunity to explain their objections to the evaluation as set forth in the initial request for review. The meeting shall not be conducted as a testimonial hearing.

(d) The Assistant Superintendent has the discretion to inspect documents or interview people the Assistant Superintendent concludes are relevant to making a determination.

(e) The Assistant Superintendent shall render a written decision within ten (10) working days of receiving the teacher's request for review, or ten (10) working days after the meeting with the teacher, whichever is applicable. If the Assistant Superintendent inspected documents other than those provided with the request for review, or interviewed people, the scope of that inquiry shall be described in the written response.

Section 3 The teacher may appeal the determination of the Assistant Superintendent to the Superintendent of Schools. Such appeal shall be submitted to the Superintendent, in writing, signed by the teacher. The request for administrative review must be submitted to the Superintendent no later than five (5) working days after the teacher is informed of Assistant Superintendent's determination. The Superintendent shall review the evaluation and the determination of the Assistant Superintendent and shall render a written decision within ten (10) working days of receiving the teacher's request for review.

Section 4 The time lines described in this Plan may be extended only in the event of unforeseen emergencies, and only by written agreement of the parties. Our district assures that the appeals process will be timely and expeditious in compliance with Education Law section 3012-c.

Section 5 The decision of the Superintendent shall be final and binding. It shall not be subject to the grievance procedures (including arbitration) provided in the parties' collective bargaining agreement. Any matter described in Education Law section 3012-c as being subject to an appeal is likewise excluded from the grievance

procedures (including arbitration) provided in the parties' collective bargaining agreement, whether or not that matter is eligible for review under Section 1 of this procedure.

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

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

The Board of Education will ensure that all evaluators have been trained and that all lead evaluators have been trained and certified in accordance with regulation. The district will utilize the Oneida Herkimer Madison BOCES Network Team evaluator/ lead evaluator training in
accordance with SED procedures and processes. The training will occur on a monthly basis throughout the school year with the total training time commensurate with SED expectations. Lead evaluator training will include training on:
1) The New York State Teaching Standards, and their related elements and performance indicators and the Leadership Standards and their related functions, as applicable;
2) Evidence-based observation techniques that are grounded in research;
3) Application and use of the student growth percentile model and the value-added growth model;
4) Application and use of the teacher or principal rubric(s), including training on the effective application of such rubrics to observe a teacher or principal's practice;
5) Application and use of any assessment tools that the school district or BOCES utilizes to evaluate its classroom teachers or building principals, including but not limited to, structured portfolio reviews; student, parent. teacher and/or community surveys; professional growth goals and school improvement goals, etc.;
6) Application and use of any locally selected measures of student achievement used by the district evaluate its teachers or principals;
7) Use of the Statewide Instructional Reporting System;
8) The scoring methodology including how scores are generated for each subcomponent and the composite effectiveness score and application and use of the scoring ranges prescribed by the Commissioner for the four designated rating categories used for the teacher's or principal's overall rating and their subcomponent ratings; and
9) Specific considerations in evaluating teachers and principals of English language learners and students with disabilities.

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

6.5) Assurances -- Evaluators

Please check the boxes below:

- Checked

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

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

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

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

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

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

(7) use of the Statewide Instructional Reporting System

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

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

- Checked

6.6) Assurances -- Teachers

Please check all of the boxes below:

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

6.6) Assurances -- Teachers | Assure the district has appeal procedures that are consistent with the regulations and that they provide for the timely and expeditious resolution of an appeal.	Checked

6.7) Assurances -- Data

Please check all of the boxes below:

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

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

Created Tuesday, April 30, 2013
Updated Friday, August 09, 2013

Page 1

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

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

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

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

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

K-5
6-8
9-12
(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(s) provided by NYSED will be used, where applicable	Checked
7.2) Assurances -- State-Provided Measures of Student Growth | Assure that the State-provided growth measure will be used if a value-added measure has not been approved	Checked

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

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

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

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

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

List of State-approved 3rd party assessments

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

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

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

Use this box, if needed, to describe the process for assigning HEDI categories in this subcomponent. If needed, you may upload a table or graphic below.	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 assigning points to a principal's score for this subcomponent, the rationale for including such factors, and the processes that will be used to mitigate potentially problematic incentives associated with the controls or adjustments.

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

(No response)

7.5) Principals with More Than One Growth Measure

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

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

7.6) Assurances -- Comparable Growth Measures

Please check all of the boxes below:

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

8. Local Measures (Principals)

Created Tuesday, April 30, 2013
Updated Monday, September 30, 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.

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

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

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

In the table below, please list the grade configurations of the school(s)/program(s) in your district/BOCES where it is expected that 30-100% of a principal's students are taking assessments with a State-provided growth or value-added measure (e.g., K-5, 6-8, 9-12). Then for each grade configuration, select a measure of growoth or achievement from the drop-down menu. As a reminder, the grade configurations/programs listed in Task 8.1 should be the same as those listed in Task 7.1.
Note: Districts and BOCES may select one or more types of growth or achievement measures for each grade configuration. If you are using more than one type of local measure for the evaluation of principals in a given grade configuration, list that grade configuration multiple times. If more space is needed, duplicate this portion of the form and upload additional pages (below) as an attachment.

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

(a) student achievement levels on State assessments in ELA and/or Math in Grades 4-8 (e.g., percentage of students in the school whose performance levels on State assessments are proficient or advanced)
(b) student growth or achievement on State assessments in ELA and/or Math in Grades 4-8 for students in each specific performance level (e.g., Level 1, Level 2)
(c) student growth or achievement on State assessments in ELA and/or Math in Grades 4-8 for students with disabilities and English Language Learners in Grades 4-8
(d) student performance on any or all of the district-wide locally selected measures approved for use in teacher evaluations
(e) four, five and/or six-year high school graduation and/or dropout rates for principals employed in a school with high school grades
(f) percentage of students who earn a Regents diploma with advanced designation and/or honors for principals employed in a school with high school grades
(g) percentage of a cohort of students that achieve specified scores on Regents examinations and/or Department approved alternative examinations (including, but not limited to, Advanced Placement examinations, International Baccalaureate examinations, SAT II, etc.), for principals employed in a school with high school grades (e.g., the percentage of students in the 2009 cohort that scored at least a 3 on an Advanced Placement examination since entry into the ninth grade)
(h) students' progress toward graduation in the school using strong predictive indicators, including but not limited to 9th and/or 10th grade credit accumulation and/or the percentage of students that pass 9th and/or 10th grade subjects most commonly associated with graduation and/or students' progress in passing the number of required Regents examinations for graduation, for principals employed in a school with high school grades

	Grade Configuration/Program	Locally-Selected Measure from List of Approved Measures	Assessment
	K-5	(d) measures used by district for teacher evaluation	WCSD developed ELA and Math Assessments Grades K-5
	6-8	(d) measures used by district for teacher evaluation	WCSD developed assessments in ELA, Math, Science & Social Studies Grades 6-8 and in all other subject areas Grades 6-8
	9-12	(d) measures used by district for teacher evaluation	All NYS regents assessments offered and all WCSD developed assessments offered in Grades 9-12

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

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

Use this box, if needed, to describe the process for assigning HEDI categories. If needed, you may upload a table or graphic below.	A scoring mechanism that scales assessment scores on the locally developed, state assessments, or regents assessments to performance levels that are calculated the same for all principals will be used. We will be using both sets of English and Algebra regents and taking the higher score of each set. This number will be rounded to the nearest whole number in accordance with general rounding rules. Rounding will not result in movement between HEDI categories. Assessment Scores Performance Level 0-54 1 55-64 2 65-84 3 85-100 4

	Calculation ((#students scoring 2,3,4)+ (#students scoring 3,4)) X 7.5 divided by # students in building tested Attached is the 20-point formula that will be used until the VA model is implemented.
Highly Effective (14 - 15 points) Results are well above District- or BOCES-adopted expectations for growth or achievement for grade/subject.	The locally developed or regents assessments will be scored as follows: Assessment Scores Performance Level 0-54 1 55-64 2 65-84 3 85-100 4 Calculation ((#students scoring 2,3,4)+ (#students scoring 3,4)) X 7.5 divided by # students in building tested Total score of 14-15 is highly effective
Effective (8- 13 points) Results meet District- or BOCES-adopted expectations for growth or achievement for grade/subject.	The locally developed or regents assessments will be scored as follows: Assessment Scores Performance Level 0-54 1 55-64 2 65-84 3 85-100 4 Calculation ((#students scoring 2,3,4)+ (#students scoring 3,4)) X 7.5 divided by # students in building tested Total score of 8-13 is effective
Developing (3 - 7 points) Results are below District- or BOCES-adopted expectations for growth or achievement for grade/subject.	The locally developed or regents assessments will be scored as follows: Assessment Scores Performance Level 0-54 1 55-64 2 65-84 3 85-100 4 Calculation ((#students scoring 2,3,4)+ (#students scoring 3,4)) X 7.5 divided by # students in building tested Total score of 3-7 is developing
Ineffective (0 - 2 points) Results are well below District- or BOCES-adopted expectations for growth or achievement for grade/subject.	The locally developed or regents assessments will be scored as follows: Assessment Scores Performance Level 0-54 1 55-64 2 65-84 3 85-100 4 Calculation ((#students scoring 2,3,4)+ (#students scoring 3,4)) X 7.5 divided by # students in building tested Total score of 0-2 is ineffective

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

(No response)

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

assets/survey-uploads/12190/576345-qBFVOWF7fC/20 Point Formula_1.docx

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

In the table below, list all of the grade configurations/programs used in your district or BOCES in which the district/BOCES expects that fewer than 30% of students will receive a State-provided growth score (e.g., K-2, K-3, CTE). Then for each grade configuration, select a measure from the drop-down menu. As a reminder, the grade configurations/programs listed in Task 8.2 should be the same as those listed in Task 7.3.
Note: Districts and BOCES may select one or more types of growth or achievement measures for each grade configuration. If you are using more than one type of local measure for the evaluation of principals in a given grade configuration, list that grade configuration multiple times. If more space is needed, duplicate this portion of the form and upload additional pages (below) as an attachment.

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

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

(No response)

8.4) Principals with More Than One Locally Selected Measure

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

Each principal's score in this area will be a result of the average of student achievement results on the assessments and calculations cited in section 8.1.

8.5) Assurances

Please check all of the boxes below:

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

9. Other Measures of Effectiveness (Principals)

Created Tuesday, April 30, 2013
Updated Monday, September 30, 2013

Page 1

9.1) Principal Practice Rubric

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

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

Multidimensional Principal Performance Rubric

(No response)

9.2) Points Within Other Measures

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

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

Is the following point assignment for all principals?

Yes

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

(No response)

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

Broad assessment of principal leadership and management actions based on the practice rubric by the supervisor, a trained administrator or a trained independent evaluator. This must incorporate multiple school visits by supervisor, trained administrator, or trained independent evaluator, at least one of which must be from a supervisor, and at least one of which must be unannounced. [At least 31 points]	60

Any remaining points shall be assigned based on results of one or more ambitious and measurable goals set collaboratively with principals and their superintendents or district superintendents.	0

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

(No response)

9.3) Assurances -- Goals

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

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

9.4) Sources of Evidence (if applicable)

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

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

9.5) Survey Tool(s) (if applicable)

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

(No response)

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

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

District variance	(No response)
Principal Evaluation Tripod School Perception Survey (Combined Parent Survey)	(No response)
Principal Evaluation Tripod School Perception Survey (Combined Student Surveys)	(No response)
NYC School Survey-2012 Parent Survey	(No response)
NYC School Survey-2012 Student Survey	(No response)
NYC School Survey-2012 Teacher Survey	(No response)

9.6) Assurances

Please check all of the boxes below:

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

9.7) Process for Assigning Points and Determining HEDI Ratings

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

Each dimension for each domain be rated accordingly:
Highly Effective 4
Effective 3
Developing 2
Ineffective 1
Probationary principals will be observed at least 3 times; tenured principals will be observed at least 2 times. The evaluation tool for all principals will be the Multidimensional Principal Performance Rubric. Based on evidence collected throughout multiple school visits, the principals will be scored in all domains of the rubric. The ratings for each of the dimensions cited in each domain will be added together and divided by the number of dimensions to arrive at an average score between 1-4. The average scores for each school visit completed will, in turn, be averaged. This average score will be rounded to the nearest tenth of a whole number, based on general rounding rules. This number will then be converted to a number between 0-60 as per the attached chart. The rubric scores listed on the chart are the minimum scores necessary to achieve the corresponding HEDI point value.

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/5143/181309-pMADJ4gk6R/Conversion Chart for Sections 4.5 and 9.7 REVISION and.docx

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

Highly Effective: Overall performance and results exceed standards.	A total rubric average of 3.3 - 4.0

Effective: Overall performance and results meet standards.	A total rubric score of 2.5 - 3.2
Developing: Overall performance and results need improvement in order to meet standards.	A total rubric score of 1.5 - 2.4
Ineffective: Overall performance and results do not meet standards.	A total rubric score of 1 - 1.4

Please provide the locally-negotiated 60 point scoring bands.

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

9.8) School Visits

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

Probationary Principals

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

Tenured Principals

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

10. Composite Scoring (Principals)

Created Tuesday, April 30, 2013
Updated Friday, August 09, 2013

Page 1

Standards for Rating Categories

Growth or Comparable Measures

Locally-selected Measures of growth or achievement

Other Measures of Effectiveness (Teacher and Leader standards)

Highly Effective

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

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

Overall performance and results exceed ISLLC leadership standards.

Effective

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

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

Overall performance and results meet ISLLC leadership standards.

Developing

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

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

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

Ineffective

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

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

Overall performance and results do not meet ISLLC leadership standards.

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

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

Where there is no Value-Added measure

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

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

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

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

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

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

Overall Composite Score
Highly Effective
22-25

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

11. Additional Requirements - Principals

Created Tuesday, April 30, 2013
Updated Monday, September 30, 2013

Page 1

11.1) Assurances -- Improvement Plans

Please check the boxes below.

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

11.2) Attachment: Principal Improvement Plan Forms

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

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

assets/survey-uploads/5276/181340-Df0w3Xx5v6/PIP Plan Template FINAL_1.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:

Section 1 These grounds for appeals conform with the grounds for appeals enumerated in Education Law section 3012-c. Appeals for review of a principal's annual professional performance review are limited to those as follows:

a) An appeal may only be initiated once a principal receives the overall composite score and rating. A principal receiving a rating of Ineffective may contend that the (i) procedures of the Plan for measuring student growth were not properly followed, (ii) one or more of the observations used to calculate the score for the "other measures" subcomponent was not conducted in compliance with the Multidimensional rubric, (iii)that any Principal Improvement plan was not properly implemented, or (iv) the overall rating was adversely affected by a calculation error with computing the subcomponent scores.

b) A principal who receives an overall rating of Developing for a second consecutive year may assert one or more of the errors described in subsection (1); and

c) A principal who receives a Principal Improvement Plan may contend that the Plan is not reasonably specific in advising the principal of the needed improvement.

Section 2 The initial request for review of the annual professional performance review or implementation of the PIP shall be submitted to the Superintendent of Schools, in writing and, signed by the principal. The request must be submitted to the Superintendent no later than ten (10) working days after the principal is informed of the overall rating.

a) The request shall identify which of the objections described in Section 1 are being challenged by the principal, and shall specify, in detail, the reason(s) the evaluation is claimed to be deficient. Any documentation that the principal wants to be considered in support of his/her objection shall be included with the request.

b) The principal will simultaneously provide a copy of the request and supporting materials to the Assistant Superintendent. The Assistant Superintendent may, but is not required to, submit to the Superintendent of Schools, a written response to the objections set forth in the request for review, but this must be done within five (5) working days of the principal's submission of the request.

c) The principal may include, in the request, a meeting with the Superintendent. If the meeting is requested, it shall be rendered within ten (10) working days of the Superintendent's receipt of the request for review. The principal may have a representative, from their association, accompany them. The Superintendent may have one other labor relations representative present. The principal shall be provided a reasonable opportunity to explain their objections to the evaluation as set forth in the initial request for review. The meeting shall not be conducted as a testimonial hearing.

d) The Superintendent has the discretion to inspect documents or interview people the Superintendent concludes are relevant to making a determination.

e) The Superintendent shall render a written decision within ten (10) working days following the principal's request for review or the meeting with the principal, whichever is applicable.

Section 3 The time lines, described in this Plan may be extended only in the event of unforeseen emergencies, and only with the written consent of both parties. Our district assures that the appeals process will be timely and expeditious in compliance with Education Law section 3012-c.

Section 4 The decision of the superintendent shall be final and binding. The determination shall not be grievable nor arbitable.

Section 5 Notwithstanding the foregoing, nothing in this Appeal Process shall be constructed as limiting the right of the employee to challenge said evaluation in any proceeding

brought pursuant to Education Law 3020-a.

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

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

The Board of Education will ensure that all evaluators have been trained and that all lead evaluators have been trained and certified in accordance with regulation. The district will utilize the Oneida Herkimer Madisin BOCES Network Team evaluator/ lead evaluator training in
accordance with SED procedures and processes. The training will occur on a monthly basis throughout the school year with the total training time commensurate with SED expectations. Lead evaluator training will include training on:
1) The New York State Teaching Standards, and their related elements and performance indicators and the Leadership Standards and their related functions, as applicable;
2) Evidence-based observation techniques that are grounded in research;
3) Application and use of the student growth percentile model and the value-added growth model;
4) Application and use of the teacher or principal rubric(s), including training on the effective application of such rubrics to observe a teacher or principal's practice;
5) Application and use of any assessment tools that the school district or BOCES utilizes to evaluate its classroom teachers or building principals, including but not limited to, structured portfolio reviews; student, parent. teacher and/or community surveys; professional growth goals and school improvement goals, etc.;
6) Application and use of any locally selected measures of student achievement used by the district evaluate its teachers or principals;
7) Use of the Statewide Instructional Reporting System;
8) The scoring methodology including how scores are generated for each subcomponent and the composite effectiveness score and application and use of the scoring ranges prescribed by the Commissioner for the four designated rating categories used for the teacher's or principal's overall rating and their subcomponent ratings; and
9) Specific considerations in evaluating teachers and principals of English language learners and students with disabilities.

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

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, April 30, 2013
Updated Monday, September 30, 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. Please note that Review Room timestamps each revision and signatures cannot be dated earlier than the last revision.

assets/survey-uploads/12158/576349-3Uqgn5g9Iu/APPR Signature Page 9-30-13.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.

Attachment A (applicable to sections 2.2 through 2.10)

STUDENT LEARNING OBJECTIVES CONVERSION CHART

20% of APPR composite score

Based on student population and pre-assessment results, the SLO targets will be written in the following format:

At least 75% of the students will grow by *the established growth target** or reach a score of 91-100 on the end of the year assessment.

*The growth target will be based on individual student growth targets that will be set collaboratively with the teacher and the building principal(s) and will take into consideration baseline data and student population. Each teacher's SLO will measure the growth of every individual student in his/her class.

In 2.10 courses using a state assessment or district developed assessment will use individual growth targets, using baseline data, to measure growth.

The student roster attached to SLO will include the names of all the teacher's students and columns where the following information will be recorded for each student: pre-assessment score, post assessment score, and whether or not the student achieved the target goal. Also to be recorded on this form will be the percent of students who achieved the target goal. This percentage will be converted to a score from 0-20 which will be used in the calculation of a teacher's composite score and will be based on the following conversion chart:

HEDI Rating	Component Subscore	% of students achieving growth target
Highly Effective	20	97-100
	19	94-96
	18	91-93
Effective	17	90
	16	88-89
	15	86-87
	14	84-85
	13	82-83
	12	80-81
	11	78-79
	10	76-77
	9	75
Developing	8	74
	7	72-73
	6	70-71
	5	68-69
	4	66-67
	3	65
Ineffective	2	60-64

	1	**50-59**
	0	**Below 50%**

Attachment B – for sections 4.5 and 9.7

The detailed conversion chart below allows districts to convert any average rubric score to a specific conversion score for that sub-component. The average rubric scores will be rounded to the nearest tenth based on general rounding rules.

Rubric Score to Sub-Component Chart

Total Average Rubric Score	Category	Conversion score for composite
Ineffective 0-49		
1		0
1.1		12
1.2		25
1.3		37
1.4		49
Developing 50-56		
1.5		50
1.6		51
1.7		51
1.8		52
1.9		53
2		54
2.1		54
2.2		55
2.3		56
2.4		56
Effective 57-58		
2.5		57
2.6		57
2.7		57
2.8		58
2.9		58
3		58
3.1		58
3.2		58
Highly Effective 59-60		
3.3		59
3.4		59
3.5		59
3.6		59
3.7		60
3.8		60
3.9		60
4		60

WHITESBORO CENTRAL SCHOOL DISTRICT
TEACHER IMPROVEMENT PLAN (TIP)

NAME: _____ DATE: _____ BUILDING(S): _____ GRADE LEVEL/DEPARTMENT: _____

AREA(S)/ DOMAIN(S) IN NEED OF IMPROVEMENT: _____
_____
_____

AREA(S)/DOMAIN(S)	PROFESSIONAL LEARNING ACTIVITIES (SUPPORT & RESOURCES)	ACTION/ACTIVITIES	EVIDENCE	TIMELINE

TEACHER SIGNATURE _____ ADMINISTRATOR SIGNATURE_____

THIS PLAN WILL BE REVIEWED ON THE FOLLOWING DATE(S): _____

Comments:

DATE OF REVIEW_____ TEACHER SIGNATURE_____ ADMINISTRATOR SIGNATURE_____

THIS PLAN HAS BEEN SATISFACTORILY COMPLETED AS OF _____.

TEACHER SIGNATURE_____ ADMINISTRATOR SIGNATURE_____ DATE_____

20-Point Formula

The following formula will be used until the VA model is implemented:

A scoring mechanism that scales assessment scores on the locally developed assessments and/or Regents assessments to performance levels that are calculated the same for all principals will be used. This number will be rounded to the nearest whole number in accordance with general rounding rules.

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

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

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

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

The locally developed assessments will be scored as follows:

Assessment Scores	Performance Level
0-54	1
55-64	2
65-84	3
85-100	4

This Formula will be used to calculate a number between 0-20; (HEDI designations are described above):

{(#students scoring 2,3,4)+ (#students scoring 3,4)} X 10 divided by # students tested

Attachment B – for sections 4.5 and 9.7

The detailed conversion chart below allows districts to convert any average rubric score to a specific conversion score for that sub-component. The average rubric scores will be rounded to the nearest tenth based on general rounding rules.

Rubric Score to Sub-Component Chart

Total Average Rubric Score	Category	Conversion score for composite
Ineffective 0-49		
1		0
1.1		12
1.2		25
1.3		37
1.4		49
Developing 50-56		
1.5		50
1.6		51
1.7		51
1.8		52
1.9		53
2		54
2.1		54
2.2		55
2.3		56
2.4		56
Effective 57-58		
2.5		57
2.6		57
2.7		57
2.8		58
2.9		58
3		58
3.1		58
3.2		58
Highly Effective 59-60		
3.3		59
3.4		59
3.5		59
3.6		59
3.7		60
3.8		60
3.9		60
4		60

WHITESBORO CENTRAL SCHOOL DISTRICT
PRINCIPAL IMPROVEMENT PLAN (PIP)

NAME: _____ DATE: _____ BUILDING: _____

AREA(S)/ DOMAIN(S) IN NEED OF IMPROVEMENT: _____
_____
_____

AREA(S)/DOMAIN(S)	PROFESSIONAL LEARNING ACTIVITIES (SUPPORT & RESOURCES)	ACTION/ACTIVITIES	EVIDENCE TO BE PROVIDED FOR GOAL ACHIEVEMENT	TIMELINE

PRINCIPAL SIGNATURE _____ SUPERVISOR SIGNATURE_____

THIS PLAN WILL BE REVIEWED ON THE FOLLOWING DATE(S): _____

MEETINGS TO REVIEW THE PROGRESS ON THIS PLAN SHALL OCCUR AT LEAST 2 TIMES PER YEAR (ONCE PER SEMESTER) AND NO LATER THAN APRIL 15.

Comments:

DATE OF REVIEW_____ PRINCIPAL SIGNATURE_____ SUPERVISOR SIGNATURE_____

THIS PLAN HAS BEEN SATISFACTORILY COMPLETED AS OF _____.

PRINCIPAL SIGNATURE_____ SUPERVISOR SIGNATURE_____ DATE_____

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

- Assure that educators who receive a Developing or Ineffective rating will receive a TIP or PIP plan, in accordance with the regulations, as soon as practicable but in no case later than 10 school days from the opening of classes in the school year following the performance year
- Assure that all evaluators and lead evaluators will be properly trained and that lead evaluators will be certified and recertified as necessary in accordance with the regulations
- Assure that the district or BOCES has appeal procedures that are consistent with the regulations and that they provide for the timely and expeditious resolution of an appeal
- Assure that, for teachers, all NYS Teaching Standards are assessed at least once per year, and, for principals, all Leadership Standards are assessed at least once per year
- Assure that it is possible for a teacher or principal to obtain each point in the scoring ranges, including 0 for each subcomponent and that the APPR Plan describes the process for assigning points for each subcomponent
- Assure that locally-selected measures are rigorous and comparable across all classrooms (for teachers, the same locally-selected measure is used across a subject and/or grade level; for principals, the same locally-selected measure must be used for all principals in the same or similar program or grade configuration)
- Assure that, if more than one type of locally-selected measure is used for different groups of teachers within a grade/subject, the measures are comparable based on the Standards of Educational and Psychological Testing
- Assure that, if more than one type of locally-selected measure is used for principals in the same or similar grade configuration or program, the measures are comparable based on the Standards of Educational and Psychological Testing
- Assure that the process for assigning points for all subcomponents and the composite scores will use the narrative HEDI descriptions described in the regulations to effectively differentiate educators' performance in ways that improve student learning and instruction
- Assure that district or BOCES will develop SLOs according to the rules and/or guidance established by SED and that past academic performance and / or baseline academic data of students is taken into account when developing an SLO
- Assure that Student Growth/Value Added Measure will be used where applicable
- Assure that any material changes to this APPR Plan will be submitted to the Commissioner for approval as soon as practicable and/or in a timeframe prescribed by the Commissioner
- Assure that this APPR Plan applies to all classroom teachers and building principals as defined in the regulation and SED guidance
- Assure that the district or BOCES will provide the Department with any information necessary to conduct annual monitoring pursuant to the regulations
- If this APPR Plan is being submitted subsequent to July 1, 2013, assure that this was the result of unresolved collective bargaining negotiations

Signatures, dates

Superintendent Signature: Date:

Dave Langone 9/30/13

Teachers Union President Signature: Date:

Julie Anne C. Venezio 9/30/13

Administrative Union President Signature: Date:

Tamara Kimball 9/30/13

Board of Education President Signature: Date:

9/30/13